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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to examine the possibilities of raising the moral level of seventh-grade students in the classroom through teaching a six-lesson unit on moral education and to examine if a correlation existed between selected background characteristics and pretest scores.

The moral unit, developed by the researcher, was presented to seventh-grade students enrolled in home economics at a middle school in southwest Arizona in the spring of 1976. The experimental research was conducted utilizing the pretest-posttest research design for three treatment groups -- Group I, the control group; Group II, involved in moral education for eighteen consecutive school days; and Group III, involved in moral education twice a week for nine weeks. To determine whether a significant gain in moral level had been made through the implementation of a moral education unit, pretest and posttest scores were subjected to the t test. Pretest scores were correlated to selected background characteristics utilizing analysis of variance and multiple regression.

The posttest scores showed a significant increase over pretest scores, but no one group increased significantly over another. Only Church Attendance on the Background Information Questionnaire related positively to pretest scores.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION


The aim of education is growth or development, both intellectual and moral. Ethical and psychological principles can aid the school in the greatest of all constructions -- the building of a free and powerful character. Only knowledge of the order and connection of the stages in psychological development can insure this. Education is the work of supplying the conditions which will enable the psychological functions to mature in the freest and fullest manner.

The American Association of School Administrators (1966) examined the needs of people in contemporary society and set down nine national educational goals. Three of these goals were: 1) to strengthen the moral fabric of society; 2) to constructively deal with psychological tensions; and 3) to work with other peoples of the world for human betterment.

Brown (1963) proposed the following basic objectives for home economics: 1) understanding of what is happening in our society interpreted in terms of dominant and variant value orientations; 2) understanding the effects of existing societal conditions upon the individual; 3) values consistent with what is necessary and important to achieving the dignity and worth of man; 4) value placed upon enlightenment and the use of man's power for reason in meeting life situations; 5) ability to solve problems by standards in keeping with those of logic and of
science; and 6) ability to think critically and creatively in daily life.

Goals of education developed for Amphitheater School District in Tucson, Arizona (Amphitheater School Views, 1973), included: 1) each student should develop a sense of self-worth; 2) each student should acquire attitudes, knowledge, and habits which permit him to function effectively as a responsible citizen; and 3) students should be exposed through active participation to situations which will allow them to make decisions, accomplish tasks, test new things, examine alternatives, and express creative thinking.

According to major statements of aims, formal education is intended to foster the development of character and sound values in students.

Conditions of the world and of society are rapidly changing. Many of these conditions are directly related to and responsible for the changing morality. The world has been threatened by resource depletion, population increases and hunger, the atomic threat, the tragedy of naively used technology, the literally breathtaking problems of polluted air, as well as oceans increasingly unfit to provide the harvests of fish upon which millions have depended for centuries. This has led to turmoil and to a reevaluation and rediscovery of purpose in education to serve more adequately a world in the process of transition (Leeper, 1975).

Leeper (1975) stated that there are five identifiable sources of the malaise which has turned the attention of society to the quest for clearer policies with relevance to moral issues and moral education:
1. From the permissiveness of the post-war era has stemmed frustrations. Permissive child-rearing techniques flourished in the 1950's and the 1960's and had its cumulative impact in the student power movement and student unrest of the 1960's.

2. Fear itself has pushed Americans toward a closer study of moral growth. Laboratory bombings, take over of campus buildings by student activists, the dead at Kent State were all developments since 1965 that have upset the American public and made the public question how those events ever occurred.

3. A heightened consciousness for a more humane world as expressed by writers has shaped the thinking of tens of thousands of individuals.

4. The materialism of the 1950's and the 1960's far exceeded the dreams of young materialists with respect to accumulation of worldly goods. With most material needs satisfied, there was still a longing for "spiritual" satisfaction. The dichotomy between spiritual longings and materialism caused discontent and new solutions are being sought to alleviate some of that discontent.

5. The Watergate trials held fundamental messages: that the American governmental environment is not immune to men with a lust for power, that our institutions do hold up in a crisis, and that there is a need to stress more thoughtful approaches to improving the human moral fiber through education.
According to Brown (1963), certain conditions have had an effect upon the individual. Strong pressures to conform in thought and behavior has led the individual to feel a need to conform or feel outcast by the group. It has led to loss of individual identity. Denial of values and loss of common values had led to a loss of feeling of community -- a feeling of aloneness. It has developed a need by the individual to feel superior to others, to condemn, to ridicule, to have power in order to have status. Constant change -- technologically, politically, socially, and economically, often has led the individual to confusion, to feelings of inadequacy in coping with situations, to boredom and meaningless in life, to anxiety, and to mental illness. The desire to escape reality has created its own unique societal problems. Confusion of values has been created through changes in ways of living.

Education should help youth to develop potentialities for living meaningful and satisfying lives today and in the tomorrows which will constantly be changing. Education can be involved and schools have a responsibility to aid, ease, and educate students toward that change. Sullivan (1975) stated that the school is an agent of socialization and part of its mandate is to help parents and society in the inculcation of moral norms. In school, the student is learning conventional morals that appear archaic to the student's life space. In our rapidly changing value system, Sullivan believed that it is imperative to examine both old and new morality. Conventional morality has not matched up with the problems presented to the student in contemporary society.
People do puzzle over value questions, obviously assuming that some answers are better than others; people do take facts into account, obviously assuming that they are relevant to value questions. And it is clear, from many considerations, that these assumptions are correct. In various important ways, value questions do admit to objective inquiry. Students have great difficulty in understanding exactly what is meant by values, although they discuss issues in value-laden terms all the time. Many students believe that values have their origin in religion or in rules that are being imposed from the outside. It has been alien to most individuals to create their own moral framework. It would seem, then, that educators should be concerned about effectiveness in these controversial areas as in all other areas of the curriculum (Sullivan, 1975).

A need has been established to pay some attention to morals so that every student can make some attempt to discover the nature of personalized values, and to find the implications of these beliefs for himself and for society. In Sullivan's view, it was also crucial that the student see the inherent contradictions present in attitudes and try to correct them. Finally, the student should see that in a pluralistic society there is no right and wrong that is the same for everyone. All these objectives must be pursued, Sullivan wrote, if the student is to become an honest, fair, and compassionate person (Sullivan, 1975).

**Moral Education:** Both the direct and indirect intervention of the school affects moral behavior and the capacity to think about issues of right and wrong defines moral education. A review of literature indicates that the aims of moral education are: 1) to personalize classroom
instruction -- to develop an operating classroom atmosphere of mutual trust and communication, and to stimulate a desire in the student to internalize instruction; 2) to develop cognitive skills -- to stimulate and gain experience in moral reasoning, to inculcate good discussion skills, and to learn the art and skills of decision making through conflict resolution; and 3) to develop affective skills -- to become more aware of the processes and criteria by which moral judgments are made, and to clarify substantive values to some degree. According to Sullivan (1975), the work in moral education has been interpreted as a program which encourages society-conformist-behavior. It encourages thinking that will lead to an understanding of society's norms -- with a view to critically rejecting or accepting the norms in adulthood. Conventional thinking of a young school child is significant for the child to be able to be functional in current society.

Approaches to Moral Education: There are three major approaches to moral education: indoctrinative moral education, values clarification, and cognitive-developmental approach to moral education. Indoctrinative moral education is the preaching and imposition of the rules and values of the teacher and his culture on the student. Values clarification takes the first step implied by a rational approach to moral education: the eliciting of the student's own judgment or opinion about issues or situations which cause conflict, rather than imposing the teacher's opinion on him. Values clarification elicits awareness of values; it is assumed that becoming more self aware about one's values is an end in itself. The cognitive-developmental approach recognizes that
moral education, like intellectual education, has its basis in stimulating the active thinking of the student about moral issues and decisions. It is developmental because it sees the aims of moral education as movement through moral stages.

Kohlberg (1973) has defined and evolved a cognitive-developmental approach to moral learning. The approach restricts value education to that which is moral, or more specifically to that which is justice. Kohlberg (1973) defined three moral levels inclusive of six stages:

I. Preconventional Level -- This is a pre-moral or amoral stage in which the person reacts according to biological and social impulses. No thinking is involved.

Stage 1. Heteronomous: The individual is blindly obedient to rules and authority to avoid physical punishment.

Stage 2. Stage of Individualism and Instrumental Purpose and Exchange: The individual is very self-centered and does things to accomplish his own goals and desires, including manipulating other people. There is no justice, or loyalty, or gratitude evident.

II. Conventional Level -- The rules are made by the group and there is a great deal of peer pressure. Group thinking is involved.

Stage 3. Interpersonal Relationships: The individual is aware of relationships, is family oriented, and can operate on an empathetic basis.

Stage 4. Society and Its Maintenance: The individual follows the rules of society to uphold the system.
III. Postconventional, Autonomous, or Principled Level -- This level involves more complex thinking. An individual's conduct is guided by individual thinking and self-judgment as to the purpose being "good" or "bad." The individual does not accept the standard of his group without reflection. Self thinking is involved.

Stage 5. Stage of Social Contract or Utility: This stage is where the individual does what is best for the greatest number of people. The individual realizes that laws can be made and changed through individual action.

Stage 6. Stage of Universal Ethical: The individual is guided by self-chosen principles which are often universal principles such as justice, equality, and respect. If a law is not moral, it should not be a law. There is an appeal by the individual to universality and consistency.

The moral stages are the structures of moral judgment or moral reasoning. Structures of moral judgment are distinguished from the content of moral judgment. The choice endorsed by a subject is called the content of his moral judgment in the situation. His reasoning about the choice defines the structure of his moral judgment. These stages are organized systems of thought. The stages form an invariant sequence and are hierarchical integrations giving a basis for moral learning (Kohlberg, 1975).
The cognitive-developmental approach is beneficial in that the students are able to assimilate the material presented at their own stage of thinking but are also afforded an opportunity to accommodate to higher levels of reasoning. According to Kohlberg's theory, this approach is the most expedient way of reaching all the students and stimulating more developmental advanced levels of thinking. If a student advances a moral stage because of classroom teaching, the efforts and objectives of moral education are justified. At each higher stage there is a more sophisticated form of reasoning which encompasses and integrates more facets of the moral problems presented by contemporary society. In the review of literature, Kohlberg (1975), Beck (1971), Sullivan (1975), and Maitland and Goldman (1974) have related and tested Kohlberg's theory on students enrolled in educational institutions.

Other Factors Involved in Moral Education: In addition to moral education, there are factors which could influence a student's moral reasoning ability. The home and the church have been two institutions accepting the responsibility for moral teaching. It was the belief of the researcher that religious affiliation, position in family constellation, age of parents, educational level of parents, and social affiliation might influence moral reasoning ability.

The beliefs of the researcher included the following:

1. The moral reasoning ability of students might be affected positively by church membership, or church attendance, or participation in church activities. This could be attributed to greater exposure to moral issues and moral teachings.
2. The student that is the oldest child in the family might reason morally at a higher level than the other children in the family due to a need of setting an example for others to follow and accepting responsibility for the family and home.

3. Students of older parents might place at a higher moral reasoning level than students of younger parents because of greater parental maturation and usually more conservative modeling.

4. Students of parents with greater education might place at a higher moral reasoning level than students of less educated parents. Parents with greater education may have highly evolved thinking processes and may give more rational reasons for expected behavior.

5. Students affiliated with social organizations, such as Brownies, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, Rainbows, and 4-H might reason morally at a higher level than those not affiliated due to the character-building nature of these social organizations.

**Rationale for Teaching Approaches:** Common questions often arise: "Whose values will be taught?", "What subject content will be taught?", and "What methods will be used?". Sullivan (1975) suggested the following general criteria as teaching approaches for moral education:

1. Selection of topics should be relevant to student life situations using a contextual approach and not an individualistic approach.

2. Selection of topics should be based on the background, interests, and concerns of students, readily adaptable to different teaching approaches.
3. Selection of methods should stimulate cognitive moral development. A variety of methods should be used designed to stimulate analysis, discussion, and response to value issues.

4. Selection of methods should draw on the individual's resources utilizing internal power to help others work through problems and issues.

Care needs to be taken to avoid indoctrination. This can be done by drawing out certain ideas, asking questions, and subtly steering the discussion so that the various positions are exposed. Educators can skillfully draw out those ideas which embody a more mature attitude through asking questions and pointing the way to higher stages of moral thinking.

Problem Statement

This study examined the possibilities of raising the moral level of seventh-grade students in the classroom, as defined by Kohlberg, by implementing a six-lesson unit on moral education presented over eighteen school days. The unit consisted of learning materials developed by the researcher. The following questions were tested:

1. Did students involved in a Moral Education Unit advance to a greater degree in moral reasoning than students who had not been exposed to moral education?

2. Did the students advance to a greater degree in moral reasoning when taught over a nine-week period with a time space between lessons rather than when taught consecutively?
3. Was there a correlation between students' moral reasoning and religious involvement and affiliation, position in family, age of parents, educational level of parents, or affiliation with social organizations?

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There will be no significant difference in gains in moral reasoning as measured by the Moral Judgment Scale when students are involved in a Moral Education Unit among:
   a. students who have not been exposed to the Moral Education Unit and those taught the Unit over eighteen consecutive days;
   b. students who have not been exposed to the Moral Education Unit and those taught eighteen days spaced over nine weeks; and
   c. students taught eighteen consecutive days and students taught eighteen days spaced over nine weeks.

2. There will be no significant difference in moral reasoning ability on the pretest as measured by the Moral Judgment Scale among:
   a. students affiliating with an organized religious group or participating in church-sponsored activities and students not affiliating;
   b. students attending church and students not attending;
c. students occupying the youngest position in the family, the middle position in the family, and the oldest position in the family;
d. students of younger parents (combined age of 81 years or less) and students of older parents (combined age greater than 81 years);
e. students of parents of varying combined educational levels -- parents who did not complete the eighth grade, those who did not complete high school, those who completed high school but no college, and those who had at least one year of college; and
f. students affiliating with selected social organizations -- Brownies, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, Rainbows, 4-H -- and students not affiliating.

Assumptions
The study was based on the following assumptions:
1. The classroom atmosphere and organization would exhibit post-conventional features to facilitate the development of students towards higher moral stages.
2. During the time that the researcher would be teaching moral education to Group III, the regular classroom teacher would not confound the lessons by discussion, by explanation, or through expansion of moral education material.
3. In the administration of the pretest and posttest, the researcher would show no bias towards particular responses.
4. Any learning that took place during the pretest or posttest would be negligible because of the lengthy situational test format and the subject nature of the test -- reasoning ability.

5. The moral education lessons developed and the teaching methods utilized by the researcher would be, in fact, sequential, cumulative, and hierarchical.

Limitations

The ability to generalize about the results of the research was limited by several factors:

1. The experimental groups were not voluntary groups. Value education programs ideally should be voluntary, not part of any compulsory curriculum.

2. The teaching materials had not been field tested.

3. The subjects for the study were females only.

4. The subjects for the study were from intact groups.

Definitions

1. Controversial area -- one in which the great majority of important statements and attitudes one might express could seriously and legitimately be questioned within the community or communities one has in mind.

2. Conventional morality -- moral behavior that has been acceptable in a society growing out of custom or usage.

3. Ethics -- a philosophical study of morality, the foundation on which morality is based and the practical implications of a
systematic moral outlook. Ethics refers to the study of moral conduct or behavior or a system or code that tends to become customary because of the approval or practice of the group.

4. Event approach -- the use of inductive reasoning, taking particular facts and drawing general conclusions.

5. Moral education -- the direct and indirect intervention of the school which affects both moral behavior and the capacity to think about issues of right and wrong.

6. Moral Education Unit -- the curriculum developed by the researcher consisting of six component parts or lessons.

7. Moral reasoning or moral judgment -- the ability to think logically, to analyze or to draw conclusions from facts known or assumed about moral issues.

8. Morals -- principles, standards, or habits with respect to right or wrong in conduct. Morals refers to the conduct of behavior itself that tends to become customary because of the approval or practices of the group.

9. Moral stages -- structures of moral judgment or moral reasoning. The levels of moral judgment trace moral growth through a series of sequential, qualitatively different periods, marked by quantitatively increasing stability and complexity in the process of moral development.

10. Post-Conventional -- the third major level of moral development as defined by Kohlberg, often referred to as the level of self-accepted moral principles. The two stages at this level are that of
morality of contract in which the rights of others are respected and that of morality of individual principles of conscience.

11. Principle approach -- the use of deductive reasoning -- reasoning from general principles to specific examples or from a premise to a logical conclusion.

12. Rules -- the prescriptions of kinds of actions ("thou shalt nots"), established guides or regulations for conduct.

13. Teacher -- a resource person, chairman, or leader given a degree of authority; these roles should be exercised only insofar as the group as a whole is convinced that it is necessary for the cooperative activities in which they are engaged.

14. Value -- something which a person prizes, chooses freely and thoughtfully from alternatives, acts upon (giving direction to life), repeats, and makes publicly known.

The following chapters give more detailed descriptions of the Moral Education Unit, review of related literature, procedures used to design and administer the evaluation, and an analysis of the data obtained.
Can you tell me, Socrates, whether virtue is acquired by teaching or by practice; or if neither by teaching nor practice, then whether it comes to man by nature, or in what other way? (Socrates in Beck, Crittenden, and Sullivan, 1971, p. 3)

This question to Socrates by Meno provoked interest concerning the nature of morality and virtue. These questions are significant even today for contemporary education.

Whether man will be able to make adjustments to the new age that is emerging and whether he has the moral and intellectual insight that is needed, are questions yet to be decided. Albert Einstein, one of the men who helped to forge the new age, is quoted as saying, "The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything except our way of thinking. We shall require a substantially new manner of thinking if mankind is to survive." (Titus and Keeton, 1966, p. 437)

There is a deep concern not merely for "cognitive" and "affective" learning, but also for "moral" learning. Men, seemingly, have always and everywhere been interested in morality, yet it has only been since 1950 that empirical studies of moral behavior have been conducted (Wright, 1971). Empirically confirmed data have been accumulated which point to certain patterns in moral theory and moral education that are now beginning to emerge, yet these data are very limited (Kay, 1968). Although there has been a revival of interest in moral behavior and moral education, much of the material has been thoroughly examined and reworked. Bibliographies often duplicated sources and contents. Most titles could not be found in university or public libraries and had to be specially
ordered and then many could not be obtained in the United States. The concern of this project was to find the literature most relevant to teachers in the classroom who wished to help students in the development of morals.

Theories of Moral Development

Wright (1971) categorized the distinctive traditions of thought or viewpoints regarding moral behavior into four groups: the social-group approach, the psychoanalytic approach, the learning-theory approach, and the cognitive-developmental approach.

The social-group approach treated moral behavior as a function of social control or control by others (Jones and Gerard, 1967). Behavior was shaped by the expectations and reactions of others towards the individual. The individual complied with the expectations of others out of an imperative need to be accepted by them. This approach represented a sociological viewpoint. There were two basic concepts of the social-group theory -- norm (Hare, 1962) and role (Sarbin and Allen, 1969). A norm was the force or pressure brought to bear upon each member of a group because the others expected him to behave in a certain way. The norms that were operative for an individual might be those of a group to which he belonged or to one which he aspired to belong. Role referred to the norms associated with the expectations of a particular position in a group. An individual's social role might extensively shape his moral behavior. Moral independence was achieved through the concept of a reference group, according to social-group theory (Jahoda, 1959).
The psychoanalytic theory emphasized the conscience as the determinant of positive moral behavior (Hall, 1954; Stafford-Clark, 1966; Flugel, 1945). Freud (1927, 1933, 1949) was the greatest advocator-leader of this theoretical approach. The psychoanalytic approach included extensive discussion of the id, libido, ego, and the superego. The mechanism involved was identification -- the process whereby the individual adopted the attributes of others, primarily his parents, and came to behave as if he were they. The conscience or the ego-ideal was the result of identification. This theory has been vulnerable to criticism and is now mainly of historical interest as far as empirical psychology is concerned (Hartmann, 1964; Malmquist, 1968). The value of this theory lies in the fact that it drew attention to the importance of both aggression and attachment in moral development, and it led to certain general expectations of an empirical kind (Wright, 1971).

The learning-theory approach analyzed the processes of discipline and modeling involved in moral training. Moral behavior was learned and the training procedures and processes did not differ in principle from other types of learned behaviors (Bandura and Walters, 1963; Bandura, 1969; Eysenck, 1964; Aronfreed, 1968, 1969). Basically, the learning-theory approach stated that parents shaped the behavior of their children in three ways: by punishment, by reward, and by examples that they set. Extensive research on animals and children supported the theory that negative and positive reinforcement (Solomon, Turner, and Lessac, 1968; Aronfreed and Rever, 1965; Walters, Parke, and Cane, 1965; Church, 1963; Walters and Parke, 1967), modeling (Mischel, 1966), and conditioning
(Berger, 1962) were sources of moral learning. Man becomes moral through a complex network of conditioned responses and learned habits, according to this theory.

The cognitive-developmental approach to moral learning was the fourth theoretical approach and is of importance to this study. The cognitive-developmental approach emphasized intelligent adaptation to the social environment. Moral behavior was learned through rational, sensible, and intelligent thinking. Common in this approach was support of an underlying cognitive structure and developmental changes in behavior. Kohlberg (1975) defined this approach as cognitive because it stimulated the active thinking of the child about moral issues and decisions and as developmental because it saw as the aims of moral education movements through moral stages.

The psychoanalytic approach, the learning-theory approach, and the cognitive-theory approach have three things in common: 1) all are psychological theories; 2) the approaches deal with processes of self-direction; and 3) all support the concepts of moral inhibition and self-control. Review of empirical studies of the cognitive-developmental approach was necessary for this study.

The Cognitive-Developmental Approach: Contemporary thinking and recent research were inspired by the work of the early moral developmentalists. Two questions were of concern to the cognitive-developmentalist: 1) what were the phases through which a child passed, that is, the concepts and operations of which he was capable at a given point; and 2) how did these phases relate to each other (Kay, 1968).
Macauley and Watkins (1925-1926) studied the environmental influences which affected the development of moral values. Two general conclusions about morality were reached: 1) children built a value system by the acceptance of social conventions; and 2) there appeared to be a pattern of development in this growth. Hartshorne, May, and Maller (1928, 1929) concluded from research that various aspects of moral actions were not necessarily related and that even behaviors within a particular category may not have been highly correlated. Hartshorne et al. argued that moral education should consist of teaching children to have socially acceptable habits in specific situations. There were sufficient data, according to Sears, Rau, and Alpert (1966), to indicate that it was not helpful to correlate moral reasoning with a measure of prosocial behavior due to the multifaceted variables involved in producing moral actions.

Piaget (1932) conducted extensive research on the way a child's thought processes developed. The Piagetian theory supported the idea that moral growth consisted of continuous development through a number of definite stages and that the child's mental operations were different in type from those of an adult. Piaget's theory was a general theory of behavior from the point of view of intelligence, and because moral behavior was seen as the manifestation of intelligence, it generated a great deal of research (Flavell, 1963; Baldwin, 1967).

Piaget (1932) formulated a single developmental theory of moral development which argued that there were two sequential types of morality, heteronomous and autonomous. The heteronomous (objective) stage was
based on an ethic of authority (prevalent approximately four to eight years of age). The child viewed moral rules as external phenomena laid down from above. This resulted in lack of an internalized rule system and, therefore, moral duty was seen as obedience to adult authority. The autonomous (subjective) stage was based on the utilization of an internal control system resulting from the democratic interaction with others (approximately eight years and above). Through mutual respect and cooperation, the individual came to realize that rules were compacts, arrived at and maintained by equals in the common interest. Punishment was understood in terms of a specific infraction and was no longer an absolute necessity.

The Piagetian theory involved the idea that moral maturity was marked by certain periods which were associated with particular age groups. As a child developed moral awareness and judgment, he passed through set stages that were sequential and cumulative. The following is a simplified version of these consecutive phases:

I. Sensori-motor stage (about 0 to 2 years): The child is learning to deal with his own perceptual and motor functions in an effective way. Activities consist of basic explorations of the nature of self and the external world. The foundation is being laid for later, more sophisticated concepts to develop on.

II. Pre-operational or representational stage (about 2 to 6 years): The pervasive characteristic of this stage is egocentrism. The child sees and thinks about his world from his own point of
view and is unable to conceive that there are other perspec-
tives. The child has no real concepts yet, but learns to
represent the world by means of symbols -- especially
linguistic symbols.

III. Stage of concrete operations (about 7 to 11 years): The child
is capable of operational thinking, which signals the decline
of egocentrism. He is able to disassociate his point of view
from others and to coordinate different points of view. Con-
cepts are applied to situations and problems but only as these
relate to the world as it can be immediately perceived.

IV. Stage of formal operations (from about 12 years): Thinking can
become abstract, reasoning can become hypothetical and general-
izations can be made for the first time in the formal opera-
tions stage. The individual is able to think of actual
relationships and events and also about those that might occur
in the future. The child is able to reflect on social rela-
tionships and to classify them and to construct principles and
ideals for ordering them.

The stages have been regarded as uni-directional and irrevers-
ible. The child moved through a developmental sequence in a fixed order
so that the ultimate objective was the highest stage, yet this must be
ignored until the child has reached the penultimate stage. Piaget (1932)
also explored the child's use and understanding of rules, concepts about
justice, fairness, punishment, and lying. The phases that evolved were
similar to the same author's general stages of intellectual development.
Piaget's work was greatly inspired by Durkheim (Kay, 1968) who also traced the development of certain basic moral attitudes. A comparative analysis revealed a simple list of attitudes which had to be inculcated in children if their moral development was to be assured, namely moral independence, rationality, altruism, and responsibility. Durkheim, Piaget, and later, Swainson and Peck and Havighurst placed different emphasis on these attitudes, agreeing on the necessity of each for moral maturity. In a morally mature person, one would expect to find all these moral attitudes in a developed form.

Reference to the work of Lerner (1937), Johnson (1962a,b), Kohlberg (1958, 1963, 1966, 1969), and Loughran (1967) confirmed some aspect of Piaget's general conclusions. Johnson, Kohlberg, and Loughran proved that Piaget's general conclusions concerning the development of moral judgment could be applied to adolescents as well as to children. There has not been any massive opposition to Piaget's general conclusions, although there has been some criticism of his theory (Isaacs, 1966; MacRae, 1950; Durkin, 1959).

Havighurst and Taba (1949) studied the moral character and personality of adolescents. Five character types were delineated: the self-directive, the adaptive, the submissive, the defiant, and the unadjusted persons. Case studies of each character type were given with some practical suggestions for curriculum planning of a course on moral education. Havighurst and Taba concluded that moral beliefs and values developed through an accumulation of reactions to specific and immediate situations and that moral education must take place with reference to
concrete acts. Moral education was implied to be a process which helped children develop their own moral philosophy. Rational, ethical principles serving as the foundation of a coherent value system should be the bases of the individual's self-directive life.

Swainson (Kay, 1968) attempted to trace the development of moral ideas from infancy to childhood to adolescence. Swainson professed that morality emerged from the inevitable tensions which existed between the social self and society. These tensions fit into a scheme of development of the kind outlined by Piaget (1932). "I-thou" tension in infancy involved the child in the need to be accepted by others and also to attempt to reduce the world to manageable proportions. Prudential and authoritarian modes of thinking governed moral conduct at this stage. In childhood, the authoritarian structure was perpetuated and provided a sense of security within which development took place. The collective morality of the peer group began to grow in importance which gave the social sanctions new force. "Self-society" tension was internalized in adolescence so that control came from within where previously it had been imposed externally. As personal sanctions emerged and external control became self-control, the process of moral autonomy was virtually complete. Swainson believed that moral development took place by means of the creative tension between a morality of being true to oneself and the morality of relating to others. In addition to the tension element in this developmental scheme, there also emerged the dominance of a love-morality, and the existence of a religious moral sanction (Kay, 1968).
McKnight (Kay, 1968) was able to show that four primary moral controls were effective among children studied: the prudential, the authoritative, the social, and the personal (McDougall, 1924; Kennedy-Fraser, 1944). McKnight also discerned some general trends in moral development, one of which was a correspondence between chronological age and level of moral control. McKnight concluded that the personal level exercised greater control of moral behavior with increased age. A scheme of development was traced within which principles of specificity in particular situations operated in terms of varying moral controls.

Smith (1937) and Gesell (Gesell, 1940; Gesell and Ilg, 1946; Gesell, Ilg, and Bates, 1956) outlined two other developmental schemes which assumed there were three stages in moral development. Smith was concerned with bringing developmental psychology to the attention and understanding of practicing teachers. In a published book called Growing Minds, Smith (1937) referred to three stages that emerged in children: the stage of obedience, of legalism, and of personal morality. Gesell and associates argued also that development proceeded in cycles, and that each of these lasted for five years: the intrinsic-self cycle, the social-reference cycle, and the reciprocal-self-and-social cycle. In the first five years of life, all of the basic moral attitudes were created or constructed; during the second and third five-year cycles, moral attitudes were developed further and elaborated still more. Each cycle was characterized by the emergence and development of a consistent value system because the same growth mechanisms were operating from early
infancy to adolescence. The internal value system remained relatively stable while growth in intellectual power, widening personal experiences, and increased social sophistication induced moral development.

The research of Swainson, Smith, and Gesell advanced the theories that there were distinctive stages of moral development, specifically three, that the stages were interrelated, and that the defined stages of moral development may have been roughly located at different stages of a child's general development. These schemes were complementary to each other and to the findings of Piaget (1932).

Peck and Havighurst (1960) classified moral character according to five types, varying in the difficulty involved in reaching a mature moral status. This motivational theory of morality in terms of psychosocial development hypothesized the descriptive character types as: amoral (infancy), expedient (early childhood), conforming and irrational-conscientious (later childhood), and rational-altruistic (adolescence to adulthood). These character types represented a definite sequential stage in a developmental scheme as well as demonstrating a motivational factor in moral development. In a follow-up study by the author, it was concluded that an individual's character-type is established by the age of 10 years, owing to the early moral training received at home. The characteristics of an individual's moral conduct remained the same despite developmental growth, according to this theory.

Research by Norman Williams of the Farmington Trust moral education research team proposed a scheme of personality description that corresponded closely to that of Peck and Havighurst (Williams and
Williams, 1970; May, 1971). Williams classified responses to questions of moral thinking into four categories, all implying some form of behavior control: expedient responses and responses revealing irrational inhibition (self-considering and self-obeying responses). These broad classifications were referred to as modes of moral thinking, each of which was composed of distinguishable types of responses. An individual's responses were scattered throughout the modes, although one mode may predominate numerically. Research of this type seriously questioned the developmental approach, arguing that moral growth was cumulative and not chronological. As part of this research program, Williams also suggested that there may well be six stages of morality: 1) morality based on obedience to external constraints; 2) morality based on irrational introjected values; 3) group-oriented morality; 4) empathetic morality; 5) morality based on the ego-ideal; and 6) rational morality.

John Wilson, Director of the Farmington Trust Research Unit into Moral Education, proposed that the attributes of a morally educated person be described in terms of a set of moral components (Wilson, 1969; Williams and Williams, 1970; May, 1971; Beck, 1971). This classification system identified components that underlay an individual's moral character and the development of all of these components should be the aim of moral education: 1) PHIL -- the degree to which one can identify with other people, an attitude or orientation towards others as being of equal moral worth; 2) EMP -- awareness of or insight into one's own and other people's feelings; 3) GIG -- the mastery of relevant factual and practical knowledge; 4) DIK -- the rational formulation and adoption of moral
principles incorporating PHIL, EMP, and GIG: and 5) KRAT -- the ability and power to translate one's moral principles into moral judgments and resolutions and then into moral action. Wilson (1969) detailed the moral components and the methods of assessment to which they apply in a guide for teachers and research workers entitled *Moral Education and the Curriculum*.

The research of Kohlberg (1971a) followed the tradition and was an extension of Piaget's findings into the area of moral reasoning in children. Kohlberg used adolescents in his research and confirmed Piaget's conclusions that were based on the young child. Both cognitive-developmentalists placed emphasis on cognitive development and social experience as being the foundation of moral development (Piaget, 1932; Kohlberg, 1958). Kohlberg's research attempted to show how social experiences and forces affected sequential stages of moral thought.

Kohlberg (1958) explored the child's moral judgments by means of the moral dilemma, a questionnaire which was inspired in content and form by the work of Piaget. This work covered many different aspects of morality but a general theme emerged -- that of conflict between obedience to legal and to social rules. Kohlberg concluded that there were six qualitatively different modes of thinking about morality that extended beyond childhood, through adolescence, and well into adulthood. Each stage depended upon the level to which the individual child's moral judgment had matured. This conclusion pointed to the fact that moral reasoning was more complex and long-term in development than Piaget considered.
The six stages of moral judgment as defined by Kohlberg (1975, p. 671) represented a motivational aspect of morality, and to some extent, these stages were his description of different types of moral character:

I. Preconventional level.
   Stage 1: The punishment and obedience orientation.
   Stage 2: The instrumental-relativist orientation.

II. Conventional level.
   Stage 3: The interpersonal concordance or "good boy - nice girl" orientation.
   Stage 4: The "law and order" orientation.

III. Post conventional, autonomous, or principled level.
   Stage 5: The social-contract, legalistic orientation.
   Stage 6: The universal-ethical-principle orientation.

The developmental stages formed an invariant sequence -- progress through the stages was consecutive, unidirectional, and irreversible. In order to progress from one stage to another, an individual must have passed through the preceding stage. The individual was seldom at a single stage but rather exhibited features of the stage above or the stage below or both. The differences between the six stages were only a matter of degree or emphasis. The type of situation that was involved and the individual's experience with it often dictated whether thinking would be at a higher or lower level. The developmental stages represented forms of moral thinking which were universal to all cultures.
Cross-cultural evidence indicated that the invariant stage sequence was common in such cultures as the United States, India, Martinique, etc. (Kohlberg, 1971b).

The work of Kohlberg (1969) has served as the basis for many educational programs of moral development for over a decade (Rest, 1974). Kohlberg's procedures for assessing the moral reasoning of students has been used widely (Porter and Taylor, 1972) and has served as a foundation for the development of other methods of assessing moral judgment (Maitland and Goldman, 1974; Rest et al., 1974).


Recent research explored certain ramifications and/or possible extensions of thought and methodology of Kohlberg's findings and the findings of other cognitive-developmentalists (Turiel, 1973a,b; Keasey, 1973, 1974; Damon, 1973; Selman, 1971; Rest, 1975; Rest et al., 1974; Rest and Kohlberg, 1975). Turiel (1973a,b) supported the position that the development of thinking about social rules or conventions involved a different structure than the one Kohlberg formulated of the development of moral judgment. Turiel provided a basis for the position that the social-conventional domain formed a developmental dimension as well as
qualitative findings concerning thinking about social rules by children. Keasey (1973, 1974) concluded that cognitive and moral development are definitely related and that cognitive development facilitated moral development.

It is possible to summarize the elements present in a cognitive-developmental approach to moral development. First, this approach to the study of morality assumed that as people developed they viewed moral dilemmas differently. These different conceptual frameworks for interpreting social interrelationships and responsibilities were described in terms of stages (Kohlberg, 1971a; Rest and Kohlberg, 1975). Moral development passed through these stages and characteristic behavior of each stage could be clearly described. The direction of growth was the same in each case. Second, specific kinds of controls governed moral behavior. These controls could be interpreted in terms of moral judgment, social relations, personality structures, or moral sanctions (Kay, 1968). Studies have ranged from simple descriptions of these controls to studies of the motivational elements in moral conduct. Third, the study of moral judgment was most concerned with the developing maturity of moral judgment and not so much concerned with behavior and its motivation. The focus here was on the intellectual element in moral reasoning. Last, moral development could be viewed in terms of insights provided by psychology where the personality of the individual was linked with his behavior and his stage of psycho-social development. These were basic elements present in the cognitive-developmental approach to moral development.
development although each author placed different emphasis on the respective elements.

**Moral Education**

Individuals often do not benefit from moral experiences because they do not know how to interpret them intellectually. A background in moral theory is necessary in developing a capability of learning from experiences. There must be interaction of intellectual and nonintellectual development in the development of morals. Most often the intellectual aspect is not stressed sufficiently. A balance can be attained through moral education when emphasis is placed on the importance of growth in the capacity to reason morally.

Expected behavior in regard to moral conduct is different and distinct at every stage of development from infant to adolescent to adult and our judgment of conduct is modified accordingly. Observation can verify this. Teachers should come not only to expect different kinds of morality from the three different age groups, but should accommodate their attempts at moral education to the developmental level of these children in our primary, junior, and secondary schools, respectively. Research in moral education confirms that moral development does take place, that there are descriptive characteristics at different stages in the sequential process, and that there are descriptive behaviors of expected moral conduct at every level (Kay, 1968). Research results do agree on the essential that individuals develop morally, just as they develop intellectually, spiritually, and physically.
Moral education has been defined as the direct and indirect intervention of the education agency which affects both behavior and the capacity to think about issues of right and wrong (Purpel and Ryan, 1975). This includes the direct, overt efforts and the indirect or hidden efforts of the education agency to influence the individual's moral growth. Moral education must take into account the student's capacity to reason about moral issues and the way in which the student actually behaves in situations involving right and wrong behavior.

Moral education came high on the list of educational priorities (Kay, 1968). Taylor (1967) stated that studies with respect to the role of the teacher suggest that most teachers place moral training first in importance with instruction in subjects a close second. The Committee of College and University Examiners (Bloom, 1956; Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, 1964) set down two distinct types of educational objectives -- the cognitive domain and the affective domain. This points to the fact that the cognitive domain does not exhaust the content of a particular subject. The cognitive domain refers to intellectual aims and involves the purely academic element in education. The affective domain refers to values, beliefs, and attitudes. Moral education should not be limited to the affective domain but should be integrated with cognitive content.

May (1971) stated that the aim for moral education is to encourage every child to develop in moral understanding and judgment and to determine personal conduct on the basis of internalized moral principles. The result would be rational, mature, responsible, autonomous, and ultruistic citizens, according to May. Sullivan (1975)
saw the need for moral education as an attempt to discover the nature of the individual's own values and what the implications are for the individual and for society. The student must see the inherent contradictions in the individual's own attitudes and attempt to correct them. The student should come to realize that there is no right and wrong that is the same for everyone, Sullivan wrote. Kohlberg (1975) set as the aim of the cognitive-developmental approach to moral education the stimulation of movement to the next stage of moral reasoning. The development of moral reasoning as a viable objective for the schools to pursue has been established (Sullivan, 1975; Kohlberg, 1975).

May (1971), representing educators involved in moral education research, supported the aims of moral education through the discussion of the outcomes of a moral education curriculum. Moral education, he said: 1) plays an important part in helping the growth of individual personalities; 2) through direct moral teaching, helps to clarify the student's own ideas and moral attitudes; 3) breaks down the linguistic barriers that separate people and allows for responsible communication; 4) meets the responsibility of educating "the whole child" since man is a moral creature; 5) serves as a link between many subject areas; 6) provides opportunities for special talks, lectures, films, and programs on topics that would never normally be included in regular school subjects; 7) allows many students who would not normally open such discussions of a moral nature to be able to discuss issues in a non-threatening atmosphere; and 8) develops closer ties between staff and students.
Traditionally in the schools, two methods have been used in the fostering of moral development (May, 1971). The first method has been to give explicit moral instruction, authoritarian in manner, reinforced by strict behavioral controls. The second way has been by indirect, incidental teaching. Schools' atmosphere and administration, the standards and values professed and practiced, and the interaction of the school community influenced the moral understanding and behavior of the student.

Three approaches to transmitting moral attitudes or values to individuals have commonly been used in the past -- moralizing, laissez-faire, and modeling (Toffler, 1974; Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum, 1972). Moralizing, also known as inculcation, imposition, indoctrination, or brainwashing, is the direct method used to attempt to transfer a set of values from one person or a group to another person or a group. This approach may be either gentle and subtle or direct and coercive. The laissez-faire approach leaves the individual free to make choices and discoveries, to find answers, and to follow where answers lead. This approach is popular where non-involvement means security, where educators would rather do nothing than to offend a segment of a community. The modeling approach presents the student with a living example of a particular set of values. The strength and clarity of a living example offers concrete alternatives for others to consider. Modeling presents the same drawback as moralizing -- that of so many different models. These methods have not provided a process for sorting out and choosing among
alternatives that individuals have been exposed to or the many alternatives that they will be exposed to in the future.

Humanistic education is a recent movement attempting to teach young people skills in intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships that are needed to deal with value conflicts and decisions of the future. The emphasis of humanistic education is not so much on content but rather on process. The many different approaches of humanistic education -- values clarification (Raths, Harmin, and Simon, 1966; Simon et al., 1972), Parent Effectiveness Training (Gordon, 1972), moral education (Sullivan, 1975; Kohlberg, 1958, 1966, 1975; Beck, 1971), and others -- place emphasis differently, yet the common bond is in the teaching of process. Conscious and deliberate teaching of processes is necessary to prepare the students to guide their own lives through all the difficult value choices ahead.

Germane to the discussion of moral education are methods developed recently such as the skills approach, the values clarification approach, the case study approach, and the Kohlberg "stimulation of natural development" approach (Toffler, 1974). While these more detached procedures for moral education do provide useful supplementary techniques, they neglect one of the central activities of moral education -- the cooperative development of a body of sound, substantive moral ideas.

The nature of the school's organization and structure, the teacher's personality, the relationship between the teacher and the pupils, the attitude of the school community towards discipline, and the actual happenings in the classroom can greatly affect a student's moral
development as well as to encourage or discourage a certain kind of morality (Sullivan, 1975; Wright, 1971).

Dewey (1934, p. 34) saw moral education as central to the school's mission: "The child's moral character must develop in a natural, just, and social atmosphere. The school should provide this environment for its part in the child's moral development." Whether a moral education program is successful or not often depends on the informal as well as formal school organizations and the amount and quality of moral education in the activities. Students derive notions of justice, fair play, and morality from dealings with institutions and the interaction of the representatives (Purpel and Ryan, 1975).

According to Kohlberg (1975), social institutions include two important dimensions which influence the moral growth of an individual. The first basic dimension is the role taking opportunities provided by the institution, the amount of social interaction and social communication in which an individual engages, and the individual's own sense of power in influencing the attitudes of others. The second dimension of social atmosphere is the level of perceived and real justice of the environment or institution. Research suggests that a higher level of institutional justice is a condition which is influential to an individual's development (Kohlberg et al., 1973). A school atmosphere and organization which exhibits post-conventional features can greatly facilitate the development of students toward the higher moral stages (Wright, 1971).
The concepts and sense of fair play and equality emerge early in the individual's moral development through family interaction. As individuals live in more structured societies, specifically the school as an institution, these students need and deserve assistance in examining rules, roles, and rights as members. Beck (1971) argued for an open curriculum where values, norms, and rules are consciously examined and revised for the good of the whole community. Following the cognitive-development theory, the school authority is the main distributor of punishment and rewards for conformity and compliance. The school is the individual's introduction into a larger world and a very powerful socializing influence. The philosophy and objectives of the school, and the beliefs and expectations of the head and the teaching staff about their work and their pupils are quickly communicated. The discipline and example exhibited by the staff and the students alike affect moral understanding and behavior (May, 1971).

Teachers as moral educators have three main spheres of influence -- personal example, concern for pupil behavior, and through the presentation of subject material. A survey conducted by May (1971) to determine where it was believed that the greatest influence in moral development took place revealed that almost every respondent felt that the influence of the individual teacher would contribute more to the moral development of pupils than any of the other options. Not only the teacher's classroom personality but also the moral level of the teacher had an effect on the students, it was found. It was the conviction of Sullivan (1975) that teachers should be at a post-conventional level of
morbility so as to stimulate higher levels of moral reasoning. It has been found that teachers who are successful in professional education circles usually have conventional moral norms (Sullivan, 1975). Conventional norms are important insofar as the school is an agent of socialization, and inherent in the educational purpose is the aiding of individuals in the inculcation of conventional moral norms. As a result, there is a predominance of teachers who remain for the most part in the conventional stages (Stage 3 or 4) of morality.

A realistic approach by educators toward moral education involves confrontation, insight, and commitment (Purpel and Ryan, 1975). Moral educators confront the inescapable reality that teachers and students are active participants in a moral enterprise. Moral education requires special insight into and understanding of its complex facets. There must be commitment by educators toward both their personal moral behavior and their role as moral educators.

The teacher's classroom personality can either discourage or nurture an environment to foster moral development. Intellectual humility -- the ability to admit ignorance, acknowledge a mistake, and to modify views -- is as important as respect, allowing and accepting the student's thoughts, views, and values (May, 1971). The spirit of a cooperative search can be developed by using the student as a resource. The students should be allowed to take part in curriculum decisions. The roles of the teacher as a guide, chairman, and leader are exercised only when they are useful to the group (Sullivan, 1975).
For positive development of internal morality, students must feel that there is democratic equality and relationships of mutual liking and caring in the classroom (Wright, 1971). The teacher should treat students as individuals with diverse abilities and desires with whom the instructor happens to be engaged in certain semipersonal cooperative activities (May, 1971).

The relationship between the teacher and the student considerably influences the effectiveness of the teacher as a source of reinforcement and of discipline. Clear and definite standards are needed for an individual to learn to choose responsibly and to act or refrain from acting with proper restraint. As the school demands certain standards of behavior from the students, the teacher must also establish what he expects of the students for effective teaching. Conformity to certain rules is as necessary as is the encouragement of reasonable behavior. Discipline serves a three-fold purpose: 1) it develops an awareness of law; 2) it develops moral awareness in the individual, giving him a fuller understanding of himself and his own nature; and 3) it helps a person to recognize his moral obligations to others for the smooth running and welfare of the society as a whole. Discipline establishes order in an individual's life and, hopefully, develops self-discipline. Individuals need to be taught to understand and to apply moral concepts, to see the significance of behaving or not behaving in a consistent way that recognizes the needs and interests of others. A clear framework of rules is essential for moral growth, although enforced learning of and
obedience to such a code should not be an end, but rather a framework to operate within (May, 1971).

In the operation of the classroom, mutual trust, respect, and cooperation can be encouraged through a few simple procedures. Students do not have to go through the teacher to speak to each other. Students can speak without permission if respect is shown for what is going on in the classroom. The seating arrangement can be changed to facilitate discussion where all students have eye contact with each other. Students may have considerable opportunity to select the topics to study and the learning activities. Democratic procedures should be followed in the learning situation. Ideally, a free atmosphere would allow the teacher to express views and inject new ideas into the discussion without being accused of imposing those ideas on the students. Simple courtesies should be encouraged and practiced in the classroom to supplement that which is taught at home (Beck, 1971; Sullivan, 1975).

Instruction in morals is a controversial value area in education today (Sullivan, 1975). The fact that an area is controversial is not reason enough not to study it. Controversial areas should be given a major part of our attention in education if education is to be restored to a proper place in society and in our lives. This does not necessarily mean that controversial areas should be added as new subjects. Sullivan recommended that at least half of the time should be spent grappling with controversial issues and the facets and implications of these issues. Moral education could strengthen respect for the pluralistic traditions
of America; it should not further weaken any existing school program, and it should be free of indoctrination (Purpel and Ryan, 1975).

**Moral Education Content:** Most teachers are involved in moral education simply because discussion of ideas leads to discussion of values. Castle (1958) has shown that educators have always attempted to educate their students morally. It is merely that now the efforts are becoming more efficient. If moral education is to be conducted in the schools, it must be with the commitment of the educators who consciously plan it as part of the curriculum. Moral education should be brought into the curriculum and approached with due caution and seriousness. Educational methods that have been tested and proved effective for moral education should be given the same respect as those used in other academic areas. The usual questions that are raised concerning moral education are what should be taught, and where and how should moral education fit into the school curriculum.

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) has been working to provide guidelines for moral and religious education in the schools. A moral development program that was recommended by OISE (Beck, 1971) was carefully planned and administered throughout the entire school spectrum. The program had as its focus character building, ethics, social attitudes, and moral values and principles. Moral education was organically fused with the ongoing activities in the school to overcome various political obstacles both inside and outside the school. Subject areas that were found conducive for fusing were those of family living, social studies, and guidance at the elementary level; and health
and physical education, history, civics, English, guidance, and home economics at the secondary level. The aim of the program was to provide comprehensive coverage of moral education and to avoid overlap of subject material. A continuous organized program throughout the grade levels insured that the students grasped the connecting concepts and principles. The student was provided with a relatively integrated approach to value problems and was given a basis upon which to develop morally after formal schooling was over.

An integration and correlation of moral education and other academic areas can be achieved in almost every school lesson. Particular time emphasis in an academic area could be set aside for thorough study of one or more moral questions. The time element involved is not as important as the consistency of the unit. Students who have been exposed to moral education for brief periods of time have expressed a desire for a moral education course that would be longer, perhaps as long as a full year (Sullivan, 1975).

In order for a student to reason morally, a body of moral principles and theories -- moral content -- is necessary. As an individual develops, expands, and refines his body of moral knowledge, there will be a resulting improvement in the content of the individual's evaluative structure. Content and methodology are dependent upon each other and cannot be considered as separate entities.

What characterizes a morally mature person? As moral maturity is the aim of moral education, this criteria is vital in the selection of moral content. Various writers have suggested the following as being
characteristic of a morally mature person: 1) the ability to have consideration for the feelings and interests of others as well as for one's own; 2) the ability to grasp, and if necessary, to modify moral principles; and 3) the ability to take account of the facts of any situation and to act with a clear awareness of the likely consequences. Wilson (May, 1971) added the ability to be lucid and logical in the use of language. As a result, a morally mature person acts with the welfare and interests of others clearly in mind.

The moral behavior of an individual is influenced by the following: self-control, self-respect, the ability to concentrate, the ability to look ahead, the ability to be patient and to wait for better and greater gains rather than enjoying immediate and perhaps inferior satisfaction (May, 1971).

As an intellectual activity, even independent of moral action, moral education has relevance in the classroom (Sullivan, 1975; Dewey, 1959). Kohlberg's theory places emphasis on stimulating the development of the young person's power to make value judgments and moral decisions. The teaching of fixed virtues is of least importance. Moral education in the elementary schools should be a process by which children learn the art and skills of decision making through conflict resolution. Conventional thinking may also be considered a significant achievement in the elementary school child. Conventional thinking encourages the student to conform, and leads the child to an understanding of society's norms. As the ability to reason morally develops, the student will learn critical analysis of the norms as he enters adulthood (Sullivan, 1975; Beck, 1971).
Beck (1971) presented a list of suggested classroom topics which follow an orderly progression through moral issues with the purpose of moving the student through the various levels of moral reasoning. The topics generally dealt with personal and social values, human relations, decision making, human issues in the world today, and value theory.

There is an urgent need for a number of moral education textbooks and teacher guides suitable for different age groups (May, 1971). At the time of this writing, few books were available with content suggestions.

Topics that are selected for presentation are not so important as the process used in the discussion and reasoning of the topics. Sullivan (1975) suggested that the selection of topics be relevant to the student's life situation and readily adaptable to different approaches based on the background, interest, and concerns of different groups of students. The selected topics should stimulate cognitive moral development and should be conducive to a variety of teaching methods which stimulate analysis, discussion, and response to value issues. The topics selected should draw on student resources so that the students on their own help each other work through issues and problems. Material for discussion should be deliberately selected from sources remote from the students' personal lives, as this allows the students opportunities to express honest feelings without involving themselves in a high-risk situation. Students can, in this way, relate to the situation yet not be personally involved in it. Controversial topics of high affect, such as abortion or euthanasia are not suitable because it is nearly impossible with such issues to maintain a satisfactory level of discussion and
attempt to bring in morals and values. Such topics are personal, usually conclusive, and force the student to take too hard a look at himself (Sullivan, 1975).

Above all else in moral education, the aim is to help students learn how to make sound decisions. Topics that will aid in this reasoning development include: identifying goals, ranking goals in terms of priorities, and determining the emphasis to be given to each goal in different circumstances. Students should learn to identify the supporting reasons behind morality and thereby develop a healthy respect for morality. The student should see the necessity of balance between living for others and living for oneself and the importance of discrimination in human relationships.

Moral Education -- Learning Approaches: Educators are accepting two related facts: 1) there is a pattern of development that can be discerned in every area of a child's personality; and 2) readiness for learning is a principle that can be applied to the practice of moral education. There are certain tasks which are appropriate to particular stages of human development. Havighurst (1953) has set down developmental tasks to establish behavior patterns an adolescent must learn in order to be reasonably successful and happy. In adolescence there is but one supreme task -- that of acquiring a mature moral system to guide conduct. In moral growth, just as in physical maturation and intellectual development, there are clearly defined stages, and each has tasks not only appropriate to it, but also essential for subsequent development. The developmental model of moral learning enables students to see
more clearly that the most effective help is that which is appropriate to
the child's level or development, and that which guides to the highest
level of morality. Accommodation of material to the student's develop-
mental moral pattern is necessary for effective teaching.

As with readiness in any academic area when the child reaches a
certain level, opportunities to be involved in preparatory experiences
are valuable. There need be no attempts to force this development; it is
the teacher's privilege to feed in the ideas which the developing mind
can assimilate and handle. Without preparatory experiences, under-
standing is superficial. Forcing moral development results often in
articulate, intellectual misfits who are only able to pay lip-service to
morality (Kay, 1968).

Moral instruction can include free-wheeling classroom discus-
sions, student self-instruction, decision-making procedures, or a variety
of other learning techniques. The methods employed in a course of moral
education are not as important as certain considerations in regard to
these methods (Beck, 1971). The level of moral instruction should be
appropriate for the student. This level depends on three things: where
the student is at present, where the student is headed, and what is the
best way to assure that the student progresses toward the higher levels.
It is recommended that the teacher assess as accurately as possible the
student's predominant stage of moral development by determining views on
various types of moral issues. For persons involved in moral education,
the place to be headed is towards and through Kohlberg's Stages 5 and 6.
Beck recommends a multidimensional approach so that the students are able
to assimilate the material presented at their own stage of thinking as well as being offered the opportunity to accommodate to higher levels of reasoning. Higher stage approaches towards moral reasoning should be presented as alternatives that lower stage students may want to adopt in the future. Lessons are not to be geared exclusively for the higher stage student. According to Kohlberg's theory, this approach is the most expedient way of reaching all the students and stimulating more developmentally advanced levels of thinking.

Moral discussions can be a usable and effective part of the curriculum at any grade level if they are interesting to the students and have direction and purpose. Discussions help the students achieve a deeper understanding of man and a new perspective for handling decisions they personally have to make. Discussions demonstrate to the students that there are several alternatives upon which to base decisions and seldom is there one absolute answer or view to an issue. Through the exchange of personal experiences and problems, students can relate various theories, ideas, and principles in a meaningful way. With a satisfying sharing of experiences, young people can gain knowledge, understanding, and problem-solving ability in the area of morals. Gaining information from many sources, the students progressively build up a body of theories and principles that can be brought to bear upon value questions.

Research conducted in classroom discussions of conflict-laden hypothetical moral dilemmas showed that moral discussions raise the moral stage of the student (Kohlberg, 1975). For moral discussion to be an
effective learning method, the student must: 1) be exposed to the next higher stage of reasoning; 2) be exposed to problems and contradictions in situations that will lead to dissatisfaction with the current moral structure and level; and 3) experience an atmosphere of openness, interchange, and dialogue. It has been recommended by Kohlberg that in classroom discussions the teacher first support and clarify the arguments that are one stage above the lowest stage among the students. When it appears that the arguments are understood by the students, the teacher should then challenge the level of thinking by using new situations and clarifying the arguments one stage above the previous one (Kohlberg, 1975). Discussions and disagreement among members of a peer group concerning present concepts of moral issues and relationships will create some conflict and dissatisfaction for an individual. The task of the educator is to ask questions that draw out a more critical attitude towards moral issues and then to sustain this kind of thinking in discussion (Sullivan and Beck, 1975).

Free-for-all discussions of moral issues which have a cathartic effect upon the student are to be avoided. Although it may be good for the student who is confessing intimate experiences, many other students become bored and completely "tune out" what is going on in class, waiting to tell their problems and experiences. Only very close friends seem willing to take the time to listen to lengthy problems. Help can be given to others but to be confessor and confidante to more than a small group of people is unrealistic. Using the group for purely cathartic purposes will tend to focus too much attention on concrete and specific
problems at the expense of general principles. Personal experiences can be useful in the consideration of general principles but selection of the relevant from the irrelevant experiences becomes important. Cathartic discussions are inefficient for classroom discussions (Beck, 1971).

A key word in moral education is "structure." The event approach to moral discussions and the theoretical discussion method gives the student a sense of structure. Both discussion approaches require the teacher to seriously consider the content, structure, pace, and range of topics so that all of these elements relate in a dynamic way (Sullivan and Beck, 1975; Sullivan, 1975; Beck, 1971).

The event discussion approach utilizes inductive reasoning designed to stimulate involvement, response, and an unfolding of principles. Event study can include current events, hypothetical situations, or personal vignettes which provide a basis of facts from which to draw general conclusions. The event approach considers at what level the student is reasoning and the learning materials developed should stimulate discussions at a slightly higher level. Peer response is an effective resource available in any group. This event approach allows the teacher to learn what and how the students are thinking (Sullivan, 1975).

The theoretical discussion method is a deductive approach to reasoning about moral issues. A major feature of the theoretical discussion approach is the teacher taking a strong leader role. The teacher controls both the content and the line of discussion in the pure theoretical discussion form. The teacher raises the moral topic and the students respond, giving the teacher an opportunity to perceive the
students' level of understanding. Often study notes are used so that
the students are able to perceive the issues logically and orderly.
Study notes allow the teacher to follow student pace and to examine a
range of issues relating to a topic.

Moral reasoning is a mental process; therefore, those methods
which encourage the student to "think" should be employed in a course of
moral education. Raths et al. (1967) suggested the following criteria
to consider in the selection of activities to encourage the development
of thinking abilities related to: 1) purpose; 2) operations of thinking;
3) students; and 4) to curriculum content. Students are stimulated to
think when they have a problem to solve. The problem must be real to the
learner. The student must feel something is not just right and the indi-
vidual must want to correct it or make it right. Raths et al. emphasized
various "thinking operations" and encouraged the use of these methods in
the classroom -- comparing, summarizing, observing, classifying, inter-
preting, criticizing, looking for assumptions, imagining, collecting and
organizing data, hypothesizing, applying facts and principles in new
situations, decision making, designing projects or investigations, and
coding. In the utilization of these methods it must be remembered that
the experience, the process, must be real. The purpose for the analysis
and the motive must be real. If vicarious experiences are used they must
be real enough to the student to stimulate thinking.

Burton, Kimball, and Wing (1960) stated that problems that
encourage thinking and learning may take any of the following forms:
1) to find an answer, or to explain, discover, or verify something; 2) to
make a decision given a situation; 3) to determine goals, attitudes, or policies to guide future action; 4) to determine the validity or to give reasons for beliefs, conclusions, or opinions; 5) to create something new; 6) to draw logical inferences from accepted statements; or 7) to make value judgments. At a more practical level, this may mean to create something to publish, place on display, or dramatize. Short films, records, and tapes can be used to demonstrate principles. Questions following the presentation can help to formulate theories and to clarify values. Case studies, brainstorming, interviews, and debates are also effective methods to stimulate thinking.

A question that concerns moral educators is the relationship which exists between expressed classroom sentiments about moral issues and actual moral commitments carried out in extra-curricular settings. Sullivan (1975) states that it is virtually impossible to see if there is a relationship. McPherson (Kay, 1968) studied the effects of a course of moral instruction. He found that although the instruction enabled children to understand more clearly what they should do, it was discovered that this had hardly any effect at all on what in fact they would do under the same circumstance. A discrepancy between verbal classroom responses and actual situational responses seemed to exist. Written assignments correlated more closely with actual moral commitments than classroom comments. As Kohlberg pointed out (Beck et al., 1971), ego strength is an important factor in moral behavior. Some correspondence must be maintained between the student's stage of moral development and the moral demands that are placed upon him. If there is not this
correspondence, there will be a loss of ego strength and a consequent loss in ability to behave morally at the higher stage.

The quality of moral judgments can be improved through normal educational techniques. Moral judgments are essentially cognitive in form. Those methods of learning which stimulate thinking in other academic areas are practical to employ in moral education. Considering this knowledge, a positive practical plan of moral education can evolve.

Factors Associated with Moral Development

Researchers found that moral judgment and conduct are influenced by cultural and subcultural factors, by various sanctions, and by individual differences (May, 1971; Kay, 1968).

Different cultural groups place emphasis on factors which directly or indirectly influence an individual's moral conduct and moral judgment. Conflict in type of moral values has been related to different racial and religious backgrounds (Kay, 1968; Durkheim, 1961).

McKnight and Swainson (Kay, 1968) studied the various sanctions which influenced moral action. The findings demonstrated that moral action is governed by prudential, authoritarian, personal, and social principles. Religious sanctions and conscience were also influential. Neubauer (1949) found in her research that church membership per se is not an independently powerful influence, although it was often associated with other factors which lent themselves to moral development. Swainson (Kay, 1968) found that the influence of religion in the development of morality appeared in the child during the school years, although it did not appear in the pre-school child. As related to intellectual
endeavors, it has been discovered that among Protestant and Catholic students, parental pressures for achievement are less powerful driving forces in the child's life. As a group, Protestants put more stress on achievement than Catholics (Hurlock, 1967). Adolescents of the Catholic faith have more emphasis placed on moral training in the home than do those of other faiths. The conscience is used to guide the moral behavior among Catholics at an earlier age (Boehm, 1962; London, Schulman, and Black, 1964).

Hurlock (1967) found that the ordinal position of the child in the family has been related to a particular status and to the expectations of the child. The first-born was usually the center of attention, permitted either greater or lesser freedoms than those who followed, encouraged to fulfill high aspirations, and was expected to set a good model for younger siblings and to assume responsibilities for some of their care. The second or middle child was treated more casually and less was expected of him. Often this child felt neglected and did not receive encouragement that the older child did. The last-born child was the most favored in the family. Less was expected of him, he was protected against physical and verbal aggressions, and he was allowed to get by with aggressive attacks on the older siblings. The only child in the family was often overprotected yet much was expected of the child by the parents. The child was treated more democratically which is conducive to a happy, relaxed, non-frictional home life.

Bossard and Boll (1960), Bell (1958), Von Mehring (1955), and Hurlock (1967) concluded that the age of the parents has a marked
influence on the child's attitudes concerning roles in the family. Older parents were likely to be strict in discipline, overprotective, and demanding of greater responsibility and achievements with their children. Older parents were more relaxed and consistent in their methods of raising children. Because older parents have greater experience they were found to have higher aspirations for their children than did younger parents. Younger parents of children were more casual about their parental responsibilities. Often this was caused by inadequate feelings in the handling of the responsibilities that parenthood brought. The effect was expressed in nervousness, tenseness, and inconsistency in the treatment of children. Younger parents were found to encourage their children to have fun and enjoy themselves while they were young.

No specific information could be obtained as to the effect of the parents' education on the intellectual and social development of their children. However, Udry (1960) and Hurlock (1967) found that different cultural groups had different attitudes about the value of education. Many white middle-class parents encouraged their children to study hard and reinforced this through praise and rewards of pleasure. High academic standards were encouraged as well as high ambitions. Demos (1962) found that Mexican youth in the United States developed unfavorable attitudes toward education stemming from a lack of parental aspirations and support of education.

Hurlock (1967) wrote that social participation in groups, all other factors being equal, provided opportunities to be accepted and known to members of the peer group. Social participation and acceptance
were closely interrelated; as the child made himself known by his activities and became poised and confident in a group, the child felt free to contribute his individuality without fear of rejection (Feinberg, 1953; Naegele, 1958). The quality of social participation is more important than the quantity (Hurlock, 1967).

Peck and Havighurst (1960) concluded in their research of moral values that adolescents were strongly conditioned by family and peers, the community morals, and church attendance. Newson and Newson (1965) found that the parents and home background of the child had the most significant influence on a child's moral development. The child's behavior was often evaluated by the parents through the parents' own moral attitudes. From birth on an individual was exposed to the moral attitudes and conduct practiced by the parents in the home. This general thesis has been confirmed by Sugarman (Kay, 1968).

Assessing Moral Development

Assessment of where a student is at present and where that student might be heading is as important to moral education as to other areas of learning. Assessment is necessary so that the teacher can be of greater assistance to the student in his moral development. People, including teachers specifically important to this discussion, make judgments about moral reasoning of others, or about advice which is given concerning moral dilemmas, and about the way another person defines a particular problem or issue of a moral nature. Moral assessments of individuals are being made daily -- the concern of moral developmentalists is to increase the sophistication of these assessments.
Rather rough assessments of a student's moral reasoning may include the nature of his response patterns in classroom discussions, behavior patterns in the classroom and outside of the classroom, reasoning employed in written work, and interactions with others in the environment (Beck, 1971). From these sources the teacher would be able to draw some conclusions concerning the moral type and stage of the student. This method of evaluation has many drawbacks -- mainly that of subjectivity and the lack of a uniform conceptual model which could be meaningful for future or parallel use.

Beck (1971) recommended another form of evaluating the student's moral character through the use of a moral virtues checklist. The checklist would include a list of interpersonal and individual virtues that are self explanatory and the teacher rates the student as on a continuum.

John Wilson, as discussed earlier in the section entitled "Theories of Moral Development" (p. 18), proposed a general classification system whereby the evaluator would attempt to identify components that underlie a student's moral character (Wilson, 1969; Beck, 1971). The moral components represented the aims of moral education and served as a foundation to formulate questions for assessment. Two advantages of using the moral component approach were: 1) it drew attention to more general and basic factors underlying moral behavior; and 2) it pointed out the fact that there were many different moral sub-types even within a particular stage of development. Detailed descriptions of the moral components and how to use them were provided by Wilson (1969) in a guide
for teachers and research workers entitled Moral Education and the Curriculum.

Based on Kohlberg's stages of moral development, a number of tests have been developed to assess a student's moral reasoning ability -- Kohlberg's moral reasoning questionnaire, the Moral Judgment Scale, and the Defining Issues Test (DIT).

Kohlberg's moral reasoning questionnaire has been used widely and is regarded as the most sophisticated and reliable instrument that the psychological assessment devices have to offer (Sullivan, 1975). Almost all research based on Kohlberg's moral stages has utilized the moral reasoning questionnaire for assessment or a somewhat modified version of it (De Palma and Foley, 1975). The questionnaire may be administered either by interview or in written form and Kohlberg has provided a detailed set of guidelines for scoring the questionnaire. The instrument (Kohlberg, 1958) consisted of hypothetical conflict stories with corresponding sets of probing questions concerning different moral issues. Scoring of the questionnaire was difficult without a strong background in the cognitive-developmental moral theory and without training in the procedures of scoring (Sullivan, 1975).

Kohlberg's methodology of assessment lent itself to criticism (De Palma and Foley, 1975). The moral judgment assessment produced material that was not strictly comparable from subject to subject. The questionnaire was subject to the interviewer's scoring biases which were based on complex interpretations gathered from inferential data. The reliability of test-retest in different studies had been poor (Blatt and
Kohlberg, 1971; De Palma and Foley, 1975; Turiel, 1966). Correlations of the Kohlberg questionnaire and other methods of assessment based on moral dilemmas that utilized similar procedures for interview and scoring have been only moderate (Gilligan et al., 1975; De Palma and Foley, 1975).

Although it has been argued that it is too soon to attempt assessment of moral judgment with an objective test (De Palma and Foley, 1975), two tests have been developed and are currently under investigation -- the Defining Issues Test (DIT) and the Moral Judgment Scale (MJS).

Rest et al. (1974) and Rest and Kohlberg (1975) have attempted to develop an objective test of moral judgment, the Defining Issues Test, based on Kohlberg's type of moral dilemmas. The subject was presented with a moral dilemma and then selected from among 12 statements those issues that were important in making a decision about the case. The issue statements were representative of thinking characteristic of Kohlberg's stages. For each of the six moral dilemmas the subject evaluated the issues, indicated how important each issue was in deciding what ought to be done on a Likert scale of importance, and ranked their first four choices of the most important issues. The DIT provided a measure of moral judgment based on the respondent's selection of issues.

The Defining Issues Test had many advantages over other methods of assessment of moral judgment (De Palma and Foley, 1975). The DIT was highly structured so that information obtained from subjects was comparable. The test was objectively scored which minimized scoring time and scorer's biases. Because the test did not rely on verbally expressed
responses, the variance in scores was minimized. The DIT lent itself to progressive refinement through discrete items and subject responses that could be analyzed individually, checked for reliability, and evaluated according to trends. Rest et al. (1974) systematically investigated the reliability and validity of the DIT and it appeared that progress had been made in the development of an objectively scored measurement of moral judgment. Ongoing longitudinal and cross-cultural studies are investigating what correlation exists between the DIT and other attitude and personality measures. Investigators are also studying the internal structure of the DIT -- item analyses, scaling techniques, and internal checks on random responding.

Maitland and Goldman (1974) developed the Moral Judgment Scale in an attempt to develop an objective method for the assessment of moral maturity. Adherence to Kohlberg's theoretical scheme and philosophical beliefs was maintained in the development of the moral reasoning test. The Moral Judgment Scale consisted of fifteen vignettes followed by a question aimed at evoking thought about one issue of moral judgment. Six statements followed, characteristic of thinking of Kohlberg's six stages of moral development. The respondent selected from among the six stage alternatives that were randomly presented following the vignette. The stage score of the respondent was determined by summing the numerical value of each stage option chosen. The Moral Judgment Scale was designed in an attempt to eliminate the lengthy procedural requirements and the imprecision of unstructured scoring of Kohlberg's questionnaire. The
administration of the Moral Judgment Scale was simple yet was based on the theoretical structure of Kohlberg's system.

The Moral Judgment Scale has been shown to be reliable as an objective short-term measurement for assessment of moral maturity. The internal consistency of the measurement appears high for reliable use with students in grades 7 to 12. As with the Defining Issues Test, the Moral Judgment Scale has been the subject of further research for assessment of test validity. For the purpose of this study, the researcher selected the Moral Judgment Scale.

The literature reviewed showed an increasing interest in moral education. An increasing awareness of the need to direct attention to the study of moral education and related factors was also found to exist. The literature reviewed failed to show the existence of any systematically organized educational materials for the development of moral reasoning ability in moral education.
CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of a classroom Moral Education Unit designed to raise the moral level of students through developing moral reasoning ability. The cognitive aspects of moral education were stressed in order to develop a cognitive awareness of moral content which ideally should lead to a higher developmental moral level. The cognitive-developmental approach to moral education was supported by Kohlberg (1975), Beck (1971), and Sullivan (1975).

Students in seventh grade home economics classes in the spring semester 1976 participated as subjects for this research. Because of the small number of subjects available, the decision was made to randomly combine six classes into three groups, thereby adding to the reliability of this study. Group I functioned as the control group; Group II was involved in moral education for eighteen consecutive school days, a total of six lessons; and Group III was involved in moral education twice a week for nine weeks, a total of six lessons.

To minimize the effects of other previous teaching by the researcher, Groups I, II, and III were composed of students not assigned to the researcher's regularly scheduled classes. The researcher exchanged classes with another teacher during the classroom sessions of moral education. There was only one teacher, the researcher, involved in the dissemination of moral education content. The control group was
taught the regular home economics curriculum by the regular classroom teacher throughout the duration of this study.

The two experimental groups, Groups II and III, met with the researcher during the subjects' regularly scheduled class period -- the time of day was always the same. The instructional class periods were forty-five minutes in length. Experimental Group II began eighteen consecutive school days of moral education at the beginning of the fourth nine-week grading period in the spring semester 1976. Subjects in experimental Group III were involved in moral education each Tuesday and Thursday beginning instruction at the same time as Group II began instruction, and continuing throughout the nine-week period.

**Research Design**

The experimental research was conducted utilizing the pretest-posttest research design with three groups. There were six classes. Two classes were used in each group -- one control group and two experimental groups. Two treatments were applied to the experimental groups, Groups II and III. Although both groups were taught six moral education lessons, Group II was taught moral education for eighteen consecutive school days and Group III was taught eighteen days of moral education distributed over a nine-week period.

**Subjects for the Group Study**

Seventh-grade students, ages twelve and thirteen, were selected as subjects for this study because this age point in the lives of people was considered one of the most crucial periods in life for applying moral
reasoning abilities. At the age of twelve and thirteen, moral education concentrates more on personal aspects of clarifying values and developing morals. Seventh-grade students should be able to use moral reasoning theory in everyday life to develop strong reasoning bases for decision making about moral issues (Beck, 1971).

The subjects for this study were seventh-grade students enrolled in intact home economics classes at a middle school in southwest Arizona. Home economics was a required course of all seventh-grade female students; therefore, the subjects who formed the groups were not present in classes voluntarily. The students had not had any previous courses which considered explicitly the cognitive aspects of morals.

The data-producing students included 88 students who completed the Moral Judgment Scale pretest and posttest and the Background Information Questionnaire.

The Moral Education Unit

The Moral Education Unit consisted of six moral education lessons. The six moral education lessons used in this study were designed so that the subjects would gain some experience in moral reasoning and would become more aware of the processes and criteria by which moral judgments are made. The moral education lessons included objectives, conceptual statements, learning experiences, and evaluative experiences. The unit was designed to be used as part of a total moral education program or the components of the unit to be used as individual lessons to personalize learning wherever desired (see Appendix E for Moral Education Sample Unit).
It was recommended that the moral education teacher's level or stage of moral development be at a post-conventional level, Stage 5.0 or higher, to insure that the moral educator had a high understanding of morals (Sullivan, 1975). A reliability check was made by the researcher, as tested by the Moral Judgment Scale, and revealed a post-conventional score of 5.80.

The teaching approach to cognitive-developmental moral education needs a framework to operate within, yet the approach should not be prescriptive. Moral education teaching techniques and methods should have continuity and flexibility. The researcher utilized a workbook concept in developing the moral lessons. Each topic occupied approximately three forty-five minute class periods. The study notes and work sheets gave the students a sense of structure and a sense of direction. The notes allowed the researcher to follow student pace and provided concepts as a foundation for classroom discussions.

The students had very little to read as part of the lessons, except for writings in the moral education workbook. There was no basic textbook for the students. References on ethics that incorporated a philosophical approach to moral reasoning were used by the teacher as a basis for cognitive material and as further reading for interested students. There were no out of class assignments for study or research and no exams that were graded. The students were given time in class each day to complete the assignments; no work was allowed to leave the classroom.
Classroom requirements and standards were set high. Effort and improvement were expected. The researcher used positive reinforcement as much as possible during classroom discussions and on written work to encourage acceptable behavior. Emphasis was placed on the importance of involvement in written work and periodic checks were made of workbooks to determine the progress of the students. The classroom work that students missed due to absences was made up prior to the next moral education session. The researcher attempted to maintain a relaxed, yet structured and disciplined atmosphere. This was often done through cajolery.

Beck (1971) organized areas of moral learning into various age groups. The developmental lessons or topics which related to the twelve- and thirteen-year-old subjects of this research concerned the decision-making process in relation to moral issues. The following topics were adapted from Beck and were used as an emphasis for this study:

I. What is morality?

II. Personal decision making in general.
   B. Consideration of alternatives.
   C. Importance of self-evaluation.
   D. Valuing.
   E. What is right all things considered.

III. Consequences of actions.
   A. Need to stop and think (at times).
   B. Need to look ahead.
C. Why should we do what is right? Why do we do what is right?

D. Place of beliefs and rules in moral decision making.

IV. Need for self-control.

A. Controlling undesirable behavior.
B. Personality differences and problems.
C. Consideration of the group.
D. Feelings.

V. Personal moral virtues.

A. Moral character and personality traits.
B. Moral and nonmoral values.

VI. Dependence/Independence.

A. Parent-child relationships.
B. Accepting responsibilities.

Moral learning is cumulative, sequential, and hierarchical. So that the student would be able to see where the student had been and where the student still had to go, the researcher included movement from stages below where the student pretested about moral issues to higher levels of understanding. This assured thoroughness and variety in the treatment of cognitive moral issues (Beck, 1971).

The topics and format varied to provide sufficiently different perspectives on each problem, to avoid boredom, and to insure a sense of progress. A variety of media was used to accomplish these objectives -- slide presentations, recordings, overhead transparencies, and dittoed materials. Teaching techniques included inductive and deductive
reasoning -- event approach to moral problem solving and principle approach to decision making.

The student gained different perspectives on problems and approached problems from different angles through classroom discussions (Sullivan, 1975). The teaching method which was employed during discussions of moral content was the principled-discussion method. This systematic, organized, directed discussion method insured that new information and ideas were injected and allowed freedom for students to disagree, propose alternatives, and change opinions. When questioned by the students as to a personalized point of view, the researcher suggested his viewpoint as one possible solution, accepting other viewpoints presented, and giving the students freedom of choice and decision.

At the time of this research, suggested concepts for moral education were indeed rare to find. Very few teaching materials had been developed for use by the classroom teacher for moral education. The researcher followed closely the suggestions given by Sullivan (1975) and Beck (1971) regarding classroom procedures and teaching techniques relevant to moral education.

The first lesson with each group was designed to give the students an overview of the Moral Education Unit. At this time, expected classroom behavior was discussed as well as the proper procedures to follow in class discussions. The students were given the title sheet of their workbook, "My Gift to Life."

Lesson One, "What Is Moral?", was used as an introduction to the Moral Education Unit because it was thought necessary to give all
students a semblance of a common vocabulary that would assist in overcoming communication problems in discussions. Lesson One included definitions of terms as well as a brief discussion of moral developmental processes. A worksheet was provided for the students to apply their understanding of "What Is Moral?". Newspaper articles and stories from magazines using the term "moral" were read to the students for their interpretations of the meaning of the terms.

Lesson Two, "How Do I Decide?", included a brief review of Lesson One and a discussion of steps for problem solving (Raths et al., 1966; Simon et al., 1972; Howe and Howe, 1975). The process of valuing (Raths et al., 1966) was included. The students were given a hypothetical situation, "The San Pedro River Flood," and working in small groups followed each step of the decision making process to reach a logical conclusion. Current events involving a moral issue were analyzed on worksheets in the same manner.

Lesson Three, "What's Happening?", considered the emotional, psychological, physical, and mental reactions of the best alternative that was chosen in the decision making process. Overhead transparencies clarified the Law of Action and Reaction (Zitko, 1963). Students were given a list of actions and were to consider the reactions of that particular action. The researcher developed a slide presentation to the song "Put Another Log On The Fire" (Tompall, 1974) to use as a basis for discussion. The students read newspaper articles involving moral issues and considered the consequences of the individual's choice involved in the situation. To personalize this lesson, students wrote in some detail
a problem concerning themselves, analyzed and logically thought through the problem to a conclusion with emphasis on the reaction of their choice. To conclude this mini-topic, the record "I Started A Joke" (The Bee Gees, n.d.) was played so that the students could reflect back into their past and think through the consequences of actions. This was recorded in their workbooks.

Lesson Four, "Easier Said Than Done ...", provided the student with an opportunity to consider the need for self-control (Appendix E). The students evaluated self-responses in a variety of situations and considered alternative approaches to the situation, exhibiting greater emotional, mental, and physical self-control. Through the use of overhead transparencies, individual problems, and societal problems were discussed dealing with self-control. The dilemmas and vignettes utilized were either modified or manufactured to meet the needs of the lesson. Several plans for developing self-control were offered to the student and designed to be applied to the individual's situation. Environmental designs, modeling behavior, habitual learning, distraction techniques, overindulgence, self-punishment, and avoidance were the methods discussed for developing self-control. Overhead transparencies contained content material, and workbook sheets were designed to personalize the information.

Lesson Five, "What A Character!", was designed to develop an awareness of traits of character and virtues that have been considered necessary or desirable for the survival or welfare of society. Each student wrote a list of virtues for men to follow and rank ordered the
traits. Twenty posters were used, each depicting a different moral virtue, to encourage creative thinking by corresponding a virtue to an illustrated situation. Individual students verbally created stories based on the posters which became a relevant and interesting foundation for the discussion of character development. Poetry and vignettes were used to emphasize specific desirable traits of character in man.

Lesson Six, "... Doing My Own Thing!", considered dependence and independence as a means for the development of moral maturity. This lesson included discussion of terms, the dependent and independent personality, and stages in an individual's life where growth must necessarily take place in order to develop morally. Students role played various conversations which led to discussion and clarification of dependence and independence as either positive or negative qualities. Students considered reasons for not granting independence and the effects of dependence and independence on family relationships. A self evaluation was included. The researcher developed a slide presentation to the record "We Love You, Call Collect" (Linkletter, n.d.). The tragic death of Diane Linkletter was discussed from a newspaper article and from Linkletter's (1973) book, Drugs At My Doorstep, stimulating sensitive thinking on the effects of too much independence.

Each lesson built on the preceding ones and reinforcement of the previous lessons was implicit in each session. This allowed for cumulative, sequential, and hierarchical learning.

The teaching materials were developed by the researcher. The overhead transparencies were developed from coloring book pictures and
cartoons. Bulletin boards were changed with each lesson to reinforce learning. For a complete listing of the references used in the development of each lesson, refer to Appendix F -- References for Moral Education Unit.

**Measurement Plan**

The Moral Judgment Scale was developed and tested by Maitland and Goldman (1974). The Scale, as an objective measure, determined the moral maturation level of the student. Information obtained from the Moral Judgment Scale pretest was useful to the researcher in developing teaching materials and in guiding classroom discussions appropriate to the students' moral reasoning level.

The Moral Judgment Scale was used for both the pretest and the posttest to measure the student's moral reasoning ability and moral stage (Appendix B). The Moral Judgment Scale consisted of fifteen situations and six alternative responses, each one of the six representing a different stage of moral reasoning as defined by Kohlberg. The pretest was administered prior to Lesson One and required two full days for its completion. The Moral Judgment Scale was given to the students in written form. The students were given a test booklet and an answer sheet (Appendix C). The researcher read each vignette and each alternative response orally. Questions were answered by the researcher regarding vocabulary, though no further explanations were offered pertaining to the responses to avoid biased interpretations. Test booklets and answer sheets were collected at the end of each test session.
Scoring of the Moral Judgment Scale was done by the researcher using the scoring key (Appendix D) provided by Maitland with the Scale. The pretest was scored immediately following the completion of the test on the second day. The situations on the scoring key are placed vertically with the selected responses placed horizontally. For each situation the number was circled below the corresponding item selection. The circled numbers were totaled in each column and then added together for a grand total. The grand total was divided by fifteen to obtain a numerical average score which corresponded to the subject's stage of moral reasoning.

A Moral Education Unit consisting of six lessons was taught over eighteen days to the treatment groups -- Groups II and III. Following this instruction, Groups II and III were posttested utilizing the Moral Judgment Scale to ascertain the effects of the Moral Education Unit. At the same time the control group, Group I, was posttested to evaluate the effect of maturation on moral reasoning abilities.

The posttest was administered in two days to Groups I, II, and III following the completion of the sixth moral lesson by Group III. The Moral Judgment Scale was administered following the same procedures and utilizing the same methods of scoring as for the pretest.

The Background Information Questionnaire (Appendix A) was developed by the researcher and was critiqued by a statistician at The University of Arizona to contribute to its content validity. Included in the questionnaire was the following information:
-- Age at time of pretest
-- Ethnic background
-- Religious involvement
-- Religious affiliation
-- Position in family constellation
-- Age of parents
-- Educational level of parents
-- Social affiliations

The Background Information Questionnaire was given to the students one day prior to the pretest. Subjects unable to complete the data collection sheets were allowed to bring the accurate information to class for recording the following day. Subjects completed all categoric responses to enable them to be included in this study.

Data Analysis Plan

A statistical analysis of pretest-posttest scores from the Moral Judgment Scale was tabulated (Table 2, p. 83). Analysis of the results of the Moral Judgment Scale pretest and posttest consisted of computing the mean and the standard deviation for the pretest and posttest. These statistics were important in determining the developmental level of a particular class of research subjects.

To determine whether a significant gain had been made in the moral developmental level of a particular treatment group, the results of the pretest and the posttest were subjected to an analysis of variance (Table 3, p. 86). The t test for small groups was computed to determine
whether a significant difference did in fact exist. Significance at the 0.05 level or higher was considered to be a significant difference.

Each categoric response from the Background Information Questionnaire was correlated to pretest scores from the Moral Judgment Scale to determine significant similarities and/or differences among the groups. An analysis of variance was used to determine whether a significant relation existed between each qualitative categoric response from the Background Information Questionnaire and pretest scores. A linear regression was used applying the least-squares criterion for predicting whether quantitative categoric responses from the Background Information Questionnaire were linearly related to the pretest scores.

All mathematical data analysis was run on a CDC 6400 computer at the Computer Center, University of Arizona, using a Multivariance Program distributed by National Educational Resources, Inc. and a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Vogelback Computing Center, Northwestern University.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was two-fold: 1) to examine the possibilities of raising the moral level of seventh-grade students in the classroom as measured by the Moral Judgment Scale through implementation of the Moral Education Unit; and 2) to examine what correlation existed between selected background characteristics and pretest scores on the Moral Judgment Scale.

Background Information Questionnaire

Information from the Background Information Questionnaire was tabulated (Table 1). Eighty-eight seventh grade home economics students who were enrolled in the study completed the questionnaire, pretest, and posttest. No students were eliminated from this study.

The age range of the subjects at the time of the pretest was from 12 to 14 years of age; 65% were twelve years old, 30% were thirteen years old, and 5% were fourteen years old. From the cultural backgrounds of the subjects two major groups emerged; 51% Anglo-American, 47% Mexican-American; while 2% were classified as Indian.

The religious involvement of the subjects was categorized by church attendance and church-related activities. Sixty-eight percent of the subjects attended church every week, 18% once a month, 10% less than once a month, and 4% never attended church. Church-related activities
Table 1. Background Information for Subjects by Percent. — Data analyzed at the University of Arizona Computer Center using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences distributed by Vogelback Computer Center, Northwestern University. N denotes the number of subjects in each research experimental group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Characteristic</th>
<th>Control (N=26)</th>
<th>Treatment I (N=31)</th>
<th>Treatment II (N=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every week</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church-related participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend church only</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church and youth organizations</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activities</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1, Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Characteristic</th>
<th>Research Experimental Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control (N=26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly of God</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist -- Conservative</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist -- Missionary</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist -- Southern</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah's Witnesses</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position in Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Age of Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 81 years</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 81 years</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1, Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Characteristic</th>
<th>Control (N=26)</th>
<th>Treatment I (N=31)</th>
<th>Treatment II (N=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined Educational Level of Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than eighth grade</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed at least one year of college</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in Social Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No membership</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
included three major areas of involvement -- church, social activities, and youth organizations. Thirty-six percent of the subjects were involved in a combination of church, youth, and social activities; 33% attended church only; 18% attended church and were involved in youth organizations; 7% participated only in social activities; and 6% had no involvement in church or related activities.

The subjects of the study were affiliated with religious organizations as follows: 44% Catholic, 14% Southern Baptist, 13% Mormon, 7% Church of Christ, 5% Presbyterian, 5% Conservative Baptist, 3% Assembly of God, 3% Missionary Baptist, 3% Jehovah's Witnesses, 1% Lutheran, 1% Methodist, and 1% Other.

Position in the family structure was recorded to determine the position among siblings -- whether the oldest child, youngest child, middle child, or only child. Forty-three percent of the subjects were the middle child in the familial structure, 34% were the youngest, 18% were the oldest, and 5% were the only child in the family.

The combined age of parents was tabulated to determine the frequency above and below the combined age of 81 years of age; 75% were below the combined age of 81 years and 25% were above the combined age of 81 years.

The combined educational level completed by parents was divided into four categories: those that did not complete eighth grade, those that did not complete high school, those that completed high school but no college, and those that had at least one year of college. Five percent of the parents completed less than 8th grade, 38% completed less
than high school, 25% completed high school, and 32% had at least one year of college.

The participation of the subjects in social organizations as members during two years prior to this study revealed that 53% were active members in social organizations selected for this study -- Brownies, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, Rainbows, 4-H -- and 47% were not.

**Moral Judgment Scale Pretest/Posttest**

The Moral Judgment Scale pretest-posttest consisted of fifteen questions valued from one to six points. The numeric score represented the subject's moral stage, six being the highest developmental level.

Analysis of the pretest scores for the six study groups showed mean scores ranging from 3.91 to 4.30 with standard deviations from 0.33 to 0.68 (Table 2). All posttest scores significantly increased over the pretest scores as revealed by the t test significant at the 0.05 level. Posttest mean scores ranged from 4.17 to 4.83 with standard deviations from 0.32 to 0.56. Scores increased for all six study groups from the pretest to the posttest with increases ranged from 0.05 to 0.53.

The six study groups were divided into three treatment groups: the Control Group which had no exposure to the Moral Education Unit; Treatment Group I which was taught six unit lessons over eighteen consecutive school days; and Treatment Group II which was taught six unit lessons twice a week for a total of eighteen days. The t test for small groups was computed to determine whether a significant difference did in fact exist at the 0.05 level. Pretest mean scores revealed no significant difference between the groups -- Control, $T_I$, and $T_{II}$. The mean
Table 2. Statistical Analysis of Pretest-Posttest Scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Experimental Groups</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed Means</td>
<td>Standard Deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Control</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T I</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T II</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Data analyzed at the University of Arizona Computer Center using Multivariance Program distributed by National Educational Resources, Inc.

$^b$Posttest mean minus Pretest mean equals $\gamma$.

$^c$Z denotes the number of subjects in each research experimental class.
pretest score for the Control group was 4.09, for $T_I$ was 4.10, and for $T_{II}$ was 4.07 (Table 2). The findings of the pretest lend credence to the conclusions that the moral developmental stage of the subjects was homogeneous among the six study groups. The subjects were reasoning at Stages 3, 4, and 5 with Stage 4 the clearly dominant stage throughout the study groups. The scoring results indicated dominant but transitional Stage 4 thinking among the groups.

An examination of the pretest scores among the subjects in the six study groups on the Moral Judgment Scale showed mean scores ranging from 3.91 to 4.30. These scores have a direct correlation to Kohlberg's moral developmental stages. The scores on the Moral Judgment Scale appear to be higher than scores of representative stages obtained from Kohlberg's interview questionnaire. Sixth-grade students tested by Sullivan (1975) hovered generally at Stages 2 and 3. Although maturity may account for an increase in pretest scores over a one-year period, this appears to be a large increase. Among the three levels of morality, the lower stages are seen in the lower and middle elementary school students, while the middle stages are seen in most high school students with a low frequency of the later stages in the later high school years. In a developmental study, Kohlberg and Gilligan (1971) estimated that among 10-year-olds, 66% of behavior is at Stages 1 and 2; 32% is at Stages 3 and 4; and 1% is at Stages 5 and 6. Among 16-year-olds, Kohlberg and Gilligan estimated that 20% of behavior is at Stages 1 and 2; 44% at Stages 3 and 4; and 35% at Stages 5 and 6. The lowest level of thinking is most frequent in the 12-year-olds (Sullivan, McCullough,
post-conventional thinking (Stages 5 and 6) is absent (Sullivan, 1975).
Beck (1971) states that in a class of 16-year-olds the students would probably be predominantly in Stages 3 and 4 with a couple at Stage 2 and a few at 4 and 5. Beck's findings are similar to Kohlberg's. This was not true in this study, considering individual scores on the Moral Judgment Scale which were predominantly at Stage 4.

Posttest mean scores were not significantly higher among the treatment groups than pretest mean scores as revealed by an Analysis of Variance with two degrees of freedom. The Control group increased 0.25 over the pretest mean with a posttest mean of 4.33; $T_1$ increased 0.49 over the pretest mean with a posttest mean of 4.59; and $T_{II}$ increased 0.35 with a posttest mean of 4.42 (Table 3).

An examination of posttest mean scores among the subjects in the six study groups on the Moral Judgment Scale showed mean scores ranging from 4.17 to 4.83. All groups tested significantly higher on the posttest as revealed by the $t$ test significant at the 0.05 level. The treatment groups tested higher than the control groups on the posttest but not significantly higher. These findings were similar to findings of other research utilizing the same pretest-posttest research design, often with a follow-up test one year later. Sullivan (1975) found that there were no statistically significant differences in stage of reasoning between the experimental and control group on the pretest. At the end of the first year of moral education, all students responded to the posttest at a significantly higher level than on the initial pretest. However,
Table 3. Comparison of Posttest to Pretest Scores.\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Experimental Groups</th>
<th>Pretest Observed Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Observed Mean</th>
<th>(\gamma)</th>
<th>Analysis of Variance</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.088</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>4.098</td>
<td>4.588</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.432(^d)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T(_{II})</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>4.423</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.354(^e)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Data analyzed at the University of Arizona Computer Center using Multivariance Program distributed by National Educational Resources, Inc.

\(^b\)Posttest mean minus Pretest mean equals \(\gamma\).

\(^c\)Analysis of variance was run on treatment groups against control group to determine significance of increase.

\(^d\)Analysis of variance run at two degrees of freedom.

\(^e\)Analysis of variance run at three degrees of freedom.

\(^f\)\(N\) denotes the number of subjects in each research experimental group.
there was no significant difference among the groups at the end of the first year. A follow-up test was given to these same students one full year later. Those students that had received moral education responded at a significantly higher level than those students who did not receive moral education. The importance here was that the groups differed significantly on the follow-up test though not on the pretests and posttests (Beck, 1971). The significant change occurred one year later, after the completion of the course, in an interim in which no moral education was offered.

The results of the Moral Judgment Scale pretest-posttest support the validity of the null hypotheses of this study: 1) students involved in a Moral Education Unit advance to a greater degree in moral reasoning than students who are not exposed to moral education, though the difference is not a significant one; 2) whether students are taught with a time space between lessons, or are taught consecutively, or are not taught formal lessons on moral reasoning at all, there is no significant difference in their rate of advance toward a higher level of moral reasoning; 3) there are no differences in gains in moral reasoning as measured by the Moral Judgment Scale among students taught eighteen consecutive days and students taught eighteen days spaced over nine weeks.

Correlation of Pretest Scores to Background Information

Information from the Background Information Questionnaire (BIQ) was correlated with pretest scores to examine the relationship between selected background characteristics and student scores on the pretest.
An Analysis of Variance at 0.05 significance was used to correlate qualitative responses on the Background Information Questionnaire with pretest scores. Age, cultural background, religious affiliation, position in family, and membership in social organizations were found to have no relationship to the pretest scores.

Multiple Regression at 0.05 significance was used on quantitative items on the Background Information Questionnaire to determine the linear relationship to pretest scores. Involvement in church activities, age of parents, and educational level of parents were found to have no relationship to the pretest scores. Church attendance was significant at 0.039; therefore, it could be related positively to pretest scores.

The findings of this study supported other researchers' work on the influence of religion on an individual's moral reasoning ability. The influence of religion in the development of moral codes was widely accepted (Hurlock, 1967). Swainson (Kay, 1968) found that the effects of religion became apparent during the schools years on the moral development of the child. Lazerwitz and Rowitz (1964) and Clarke (1963) found that the younger child believed that church attendance was necessary to help him lead a good life; therefore, church attendance was quite regular among younger children as compared to older adolescents.

There were differences in student's moral reasoning on the Moral Judgment Scale pretest when considering the selected background characteristic of church attendance. As church attendance increased the moral reasoning scores increased as well. Frequency of church attendance was related positively to moral reasoning ability; therefore, the null
hypothesis that church attendance would make no difference among students in moral reasoning ability as measured by the Moral Judgment Scale pretest was rejected. The null hypothesis was accepted that the following selected background characteristics would have no significant relationship to scores on the Moral Judgment Scale pretest: age, cultural background, religious affiliation and participation, position in family, age of parents, education of parents, and membership in social organizations.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this research was to examine the possibilities of raising the moral level of seventh-grade students in the classroom by implementing a six-lesson unit on moral education, taught over eighteen consecutive days and eighteen days spaced over nine weeks. A second purpose was to examine what correlation existed between selected background characteristics and present scores on the Moral Judgment Scale.

Generalizations cannot be made beyond this sample since there were only seventh-grade female subjects enrolled in home economics in the group tested, and no attempt was made to compare this group with a more universal population.

Church attendance was the only selected characteristic on the Background Information Questionnaire that could be positively correlated to high pretest scores on the Moral Judgment Scale. This study indicates that church attendance has an influence on the moral reasoning ability of twelve, thirteen and fourteen-year-old individuals. Religious educators could use the findings of this study to develop more effective programs which place emphasis on morality and that meet the needs and interests of this age group.

An examination of the Moral Judgment Scale pretest scores showed that the students reasoned morally at predominantly Stage 4. For
educators and others working with youth groups, the findings of this study should facilitate planning curricula which is relevant to the understanding of students in this age group. Students predominantly at Stage 4 see the need for a broad network of general rules, necessary and enforceable to maintain order and control in society. Maintaining order and following rules is often viewed as an end, although an awareness of more obvious life goals is emerging in the student. Authority-maintained morality evolves as the individual develops general concern about other people. When the educator understands the process by which individuals develop moral reasoning power and what the predominant stage is of the group at hand, the educator may become more effective in presenting alternative viewpoints intended to stimulate thinking at higher moral levels.

At the completion of the six moral education lessons, all groups were posttested utilizing the Moral Judgment Scale and the scores were found to have increased significantly. The treatment groups tested higher than the control groups on the posttest but not significantly higher. The element of time did not have any significant effect on the posttest scores of the two treatment groups. This does not imply that the moral education lessons were ineffective in raising the moral reasoning level of the subjects. In reality, the moral education lessons could have been quite effective yet not appeared as significant data at the time of the posttest. Affective learnings are assumed to develop slowly in the individual and for changes to be visible in appraisal measurements, long interims are often required (Krathwohl,
et al., 1964). The results of this study seem to favor support of the concept that affective learnings are often not measurable and immediate. 

Recommendations for further work in this area would include:

1. Follow-up study of subjects one full year later to examine any change in scores, direction of change, and difference in scores between the control and the treatment groups.

2. Repetition of this or completion of a similar study with students enrolled in subject areas other than home economics.

3. Reexamination of the evaluative device, the Moral Judgment Scale, to determine the effectiveness of this tool with this particular age group. Since the scores on the Moral Judgment Scale appeared so high as compared to other studies utilizing a similar evaluative device, it is recommended that a larger population be tested with this appraisal tool. Test scores on the Moral Judgment Scale appear to be somewhat dependent upon the subject's background experience with the vignettes. The questions dealing with war in particular were difficult for the students to relate to, eliciting perhaps conjectured responses. Sections of each vignette seemed obscure. The vocabulary in parts seemed quite advanced for seventh-grade students. Students who were high achievers seemed to do better on the Moral Judgment Scale than students who were average or low achievers, perhaps due to the fact that they have greater command of the language and not necessarily because they are able to reason about moral issues better.
Other recommendations for further work in this area would include:

4. Field-testing of the Moral Education Unit.

5. Selection of students for research with a homogeneous intelligence quotient.

6. Repetition of this or completion of a similar study with greater numbers of both male and female subjects to give the study external validity.

7. Pre- and post-observation of student behavior and interrelationships with others correlated to scores on written tests and/or written assignments.

It is the researcher's opinion that the need to help students develop moral reasoning power is becoming increasingly apparent. If through the implementation of the Moral Education Unit, each student advanced a moral stage, even if it were not to the post-conventional level, moral education would be justified. At each higher stage the student develops a more sophisticated form of reasoning, engulfing more and more facets of contemporary moral issues.
APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire was designed by the researcher to be used as a source for gathering personal data for this research.
Name_______________________________

Your Age Today ________  Birthdate ____________________

Check the category that best applies to you:

CULTURAL BACKGROUND

___ Anglo  ___ Mexican American

___ Indian  ___ Other

RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT

How often do you attend church?

___ Every week

___ Once a month

___ Less than once a month

___ Never

What is your involvement in church-related activities? Check one only.

___ Attend church only.

___ Church and youth organization

___ Social activities (dances, trips, etc.)

___ Church, youth organization, and social activities

___ None of the above

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

___ Assembly of God

___ Baptist -- Conservative

___ Baptist -- Missionary

___ Baptist -- Southern

___ Catholic

___ Church of Christ

___ Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints

___ Episcopal

___ Jehovah's Witnesses

___ Lutheran

___ Methodist

___ Presbyterian

___ United Church of Christ

___ Other

___ None
Name______________________________

POSITION IN FAMILY

___ Number of brothers in family
___ Number of sisters in family
___ Number of brothers and sisters older than you

AGE OF PARENTS

___ Age of father               ___ Age of mother

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF PARENTS

___ Highest completed grade by
       father
       ___ Highest completed grade by
       mother

Explanation of grades:

Highest completed grade 1 through 12
One year of college . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Grade 13
Two years of college . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Grade 14
Three years of college . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Grade 15
Four years of college . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Grade 16
Five years of college . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Grade 17
Six years of college . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Grade 18
Seven years of college or more . . . . . . . . Grade 19

MEMBERSHIP IN SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS

(Brownies, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, Rainbows, 4-H)

___ Membership in one or more organizations within the past two years

___ No membership in one or more organizations within the past two years.

Date______________________________

Period______________________________
APPENDIX B

MORAL JUDGMENT SCALE PRETEST/POSTTEST

The test following in this section was given to students before being taught and after the completion of the Moral Education Unit. The Moral Judgment Scale was developed and tested by Maitland and Goldman (1974) at The University of Florida, and is reproduced here, through the courtesy of Goldman, as an evaluative device in this study.
1. You want very much to go on a trip with your youth group. Your father promises you that you can go if you save up the money for the trip yourself. So you work hard at your part-time job and save up the money it will cost to go on the trip, and a little more besides. But just before the time of the trip, your father changes his mind. Some of his friends have decided to go on a special fishing trip, and your father is short of the money it will cost. So he asks you to give him the money you have saved from your job. You don't want to give up going on your trip so you think about refusing to give your father the money.

Does it matter that it is your father involved here, rather than someone else? Why?

(1) Yes, though only as an issue of greater emotional concern because of the nature of this relationship. My affection for him and the expectation of mutual interest would lead me to expect more from the "contract" which we made.

(2) Yes, my father is in the position to do something nice for me in return for a favor or to punish me for not doing what he asks. Others do not have as much power to do this.

(3) Yes, I have a responsibility to my father and an obligation to honor his wishes. This is an opportunity for me to repay him for things he has done for me in the past.

(4) Yes, obligations here are defined by conscience. Love or affection for my father is a value which I have chosen and I should be aware of the implications of that choice.

(5) Yes, I should feel gratitude and appreciation for what my father has done for me in the past. His affection is important to me. I should be concerned for his feelings and willing to act unselfishly.

(6) Yes, it is my duty to do what my father asks and give him the money. Obedience to my father is essential.
2. You want to go on the trip but you are afraid to refuse to give your father the money. So you give him $10 and tell him that is all you have made. You take your remaining $40 and pay for your trip with it. You tell your father that the director said you could pay later. So you go off on your trip and your father doesn't go on his fishing trip. Before you leave on your trip, you tell your younger brother that you really have made $50 and that you lied to your father and said that you had made only $10. He is now wondering if he should tell your father or not.

Why would you think your brother should not tell your father what he knows?

(1) I won't trust him anymore if he does and he may very well need me to do the same thing for him someday.

(2) Keeping secrets is a necessary part of maintaining friendships. He knows that I won't desire his friendship if I can't trust him.

(3) He shouldn't see the need to tell him. He should respect my rights as those of anyone else and respect my ability to make decisions and to tell whomever I choose.

(4) He has a right to privacy, if my father doesn't ask he's really not doing anything wrong. He is merely withholding information which has not been requested.

(5) He shouldn't tell because he is younger than I am and therefore shouldn't break his word to me. I have more power and authority than he does. If he breaks his word he risks the consequences of going against that authority.

(6) I told him because I trusted him and thought I could rely on him. If he tells, he'll force reconsideration of that trust.
3. Your mother is near death from a special form of cancer. There is one drug that the doctors think might save her. It is a form of radium that a druggist in your town has recently discovered. The drug is expensive to make, but the druggist is charging ten times what the drug costs him to make. He pays $200 for the radium and charges $2000 for a small dose of the drug. You have gone to everyone you know to borrow the money, but you can only get together about $1000, which is half of what it costs. You tell the druggist that your mother is dying and ask him to sell it to you cheaper or let you pay later. But the druggist says, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So you get desperate and break into the man's store to steal the drug for your mother.

Why shouldn't you steal the drug?

(1) I am quite desperate in this situation and I may not truly realize I'm doing wrong when I steal the drug. But I'll certainly know I've done wrong after I'm punished and sent to jail. I'll always feel guilty about being dishonest and breaking the law.

(2) I may not get much of a jail term if I steal the drug, but my mother will probably die before I get out so it won't do me much good. If my mother dies, I shouldn't blame myself, it isn't my fault she has cancer.

(3) I'll get caught and sent to jail if I do. If I get away my conscience will bother me thinking how the police will catch up with me at any minute.

(4) It isn't just the druggist who will think I am a criminal, everyone else will too. After I steal it, I'll feel bad thinking how I've brought dishonor on my family and myself; I won't be able to face anyone again.

(5) If I stole the drug, I wouldn't be blamed by other people but I'd condemn myself because I wouldn't have lived up to my conscience and standards of honesty.

(6) I would lose my standing and respect in the community and violate the law. I'd lose respect for myself if I'm carried away by emotion and forget the long-term effects of my action.
4. The drug didn't work and there is no other treatment known to medicine which can save your mother, so you know she has only about six months to live. She is in terrible pain, but she is so weak that a good dose of pain killer would make her die sooner. She is delirious and almost crazy with pain and in her calm periods she asks you to give her enough of her medicine to kill her. She says she can't stand the pain and she is going to die in a few months anyway.

How would the law influence your decision in this instance?

(1) I'd consider the rule about killing, but with the view that they should not be finally determining here. The sympathetic nature of my killing her out of mercy makes the action not really murder.

(2) No one has the right to take someone else's life and mercy killing is in fact violation of the law, but I would expect modification of the law in this situation.

(3) I would hesitate to institutionalize or legalize mercy killing since human life retains its value even under conditions of pain, but I would be conscious of the necessity to value human personality and life in other than physical terms.

(4) Killing her wouldn't be bad because it has no effects, she would die anyway. I could avoid legal complications by getting her permission in writing, suggesting suicide, or making the death look natural.

(5) I wouldn't see murder rules or laws as binding in this situation. It is hardly murder when agreement and consent of the "victim" are involved.

(6) It is against the law to torture people and make them suffer. By refusing to give her the drug, I'm violating the law.
Imagine your country has been attacked in war. You are fighting in a company of troops which is way outnumbered and is retreating before the enemy. Your company has crossed a bridge over a river, but the enemy is still on the other side. If someone goes back to the bridge and blows it up, with the head start the rest of the company would have, they could probably escape alive; there will be about a 4 to 1 chance that he will be killed. You, the leader, are the one who knows best how to lead the retreat. You ask for volunteers, but no one will volunteer. If you go yourself, the troops will probably not get back safely and you are the only one who knows how to lead the retreat.

Do you have the right to order a man to go if you think that is the best thing to do?

(1) Yes, it is part of my job to see that respect is maintained. Respect for my position is a symbol of respect for the rules and laws of society. It is, therefore, my duty to exercise the power associated with my position.

(2) Yes, in this instance I am aware of what is in the best interest of all concerned. I can better understand the circumstances than my subordinates as well as being aware of their point of view.

(3) Yes, I have been placed in command of the company. Anything I have the power to command I also have the right to command.

(4) Yes, I have the right in that the others in the company, including the man ordered to go, would see the necessity for my order. I give the order with the understanding that my request is something the man ordered to comply with would himself choose to do.

(5) Yes, I have the right to order my troops to do whatever I consider necessary. They may not respect my authority, but they must obey my commands.

(6) Yes, according to the rules of military command I have the right to order a man to do this. However, I must also recognize that individual autonomy of a subordinate allows him the right to refuse to comply.
6. You have finally decided to order one of the men to stay behind. You think it is best to pick one of your two demolition men. Both of these men have been trained to use dynamite to blow up bridges and fortifications at the least risk to themselves. One of the demolition men has a lot of strength and courage, but is a bad troublemaker. He is always stealing things, beating up other men, and not doing his work. The second demolition man has gotten a bad disease and is likely to die in a short time anyway, though he is strong enough now to do the job.

How should either of these men feel about obedience to your orders, as opposed to a request from another person to do the same thing?

(1) It is worse not to obey my official orders because it does more harm. It is deviation against government, or public service, rather than against an individual.

(2) Though my request may be more directly relevant to the general social system, one man's request or order holds no more weight than that of another.

(3) My position of authority comes from the trust and respect which the company has placed in my judgment -- the exercise of that authority is like the return of an act of trust. It would seem most important to be consistent with this trust in obeying my orders.

(4) He should feel that it is not that bad to refuse my order because a refusal would not affect me that much. I am in the position to order another man to do the same thing.

(5) It would be worse not to obey my order because I give so much in my responsibility for the company and work so hard to get things done in the ways that are best for all.

(6) He should realize that it is always worse to disobey the request of an authority than that of anyone else.
In your town a few years ago there was a poor man who could find no work. Without money, he stole food and medicine that he needed for himself and his family. He was captured and sentenced to prison for six years. After a year, he escaped from prison and went to live in another part of the country under a new name. He saved money and slowly built up a big factory. He gave his workers the highest wages and used most of his profits to build a hospital for people who couldn't afford good medical care. A number of years has passed since that time. You see the factory owner and recognize him as being the same man -- the escaped convict whom the police had been looking for back in your home town.

What would be your feelings about the punishment he now deserves?

(1) It would be very wrong to punish a man who thought he was doing the correct moral thing. He has more than adequately demonstrated his respect for other men and his commitment to right. He shouldn't be punished.

(2) He broke the law and was sentenced. The rest of his sentence is yet to be served.

(3) Neither his motives nor intent at the time of the crime were evil. Minimal punishment would be sufficient to indicate that stealing is not a practice to be followed.

(4) Illegal acts are wrong, regardless of the motive. In spite of the fact that he has acted favorably since the time of the crime, I can appreciate the position of the victim of his crime and see the need to punish him.

(5) He has undone the harm which he caused and there would, therefore, be little need to punish him.

(6) Someone should not be punished in a situation where everyone would be expected to do the same thing; laws come from the will of the community and the will of the community in this instance would be not to punish.
8. You are involved in war and your city is often bombed by the enemy. So each person in the city has been given a post to go to right after the bombing to help put out the fires the bombs started and to rescue people in burning buildings. You have been made the chief in charge of one fire engine post. The post is near where you work so you can get there quickly during the day, but it is a long way from your home. One day there is heavy bombing and you leave the shelter in the place you work and go toward your fire station. But when you see how much of the city is burning, you get worried about your family. So you decide you have to go home first to see if your family is safe, even though your home is a long way off and the station is nearby and there is somebody assigned to protect your family's area.

Was it right for you to do this? Why?

(1) No, I should respect all person's rights equally. By leaving my post I'm showing that I don't have that respect. It is inconsistent with equal regard for all men and the rights of equal treatment.

(2) No, the authority and power of those above me requires me to go to my post under such circumstances. I act here in violation of those commands.

(3) No, if I am to expect protection for myself and my family I must earn that by doing my assigned job.

(4) No, if I do this I am violating the rights of others to protection. My personal rights can only come from a general social order.

(5) No, I am putting myself in a lot more danger by going across the city. My first duty is to myself, not others. I should stay at my post.

(6) No, I am expected by others in the town to be at my post; I am not doing my expected job in deserting my station.
9. Imagine that you are living before the Civil War and that there are laws that allow slavery. According to the law, if a slave escapes, he has to be returned to his owner like a runaway horse. You don't believe in slavery and disobey the law and hide runaway slaves and help them to escape.

Relate your feelings about slavery to your actions in this situation.

(1) Laws shouldn't interfere with individual rights. I have a responsibility to protect those rights for others since they form the basis of our whole system of justice.

(2) Every human life has a right to respect and equal treatment. Slavery laws violate these rights and go against the principles of human dignity and conscience.

(3) Slavery is wrong; you can't own other people. However, as the law stands, it is wrong to help escaped slaves.

(4) People with more power have a right to control those with less. The law says that slavery is legal, by acting in this way I break the law.

(5) I did break the law, but I don't know if it's right to have laws which restrict others' rights.

(6) Everyone has a right to do what he wants, the law can't tell me how to live my life.
Imagine that you are the owner of a rooming house which holds seven rooms. The rent from the rooming house provides you with just enough money to make ends meet. All of your roomers are white and you know them very well. They have told you that if you ever rent a room to a Negro they would move out. If this happens you will receive much less money than the small amount you now receive. But you also know that if you refuse a Negro a room you could get into trouble because the open housing law makes it illegal for you to refuse to rent a room to a person because of his race. A young Black man, Mr. Jones, has just received a job in town. He has looked around the town all day for housing without success and toward evening notices the sign "Room for Rent" in front of your house. When he asks you about the room, you tell him that you have just rented the room and that there are no more rooms left. In fact, there are two vacant rooms in your house at the time.

Should you have the right to say who lives in your rooming house? Why?

(1) Yes, I work hard for the small amount I get from the house. I have a right to what I earn and no one can ask me to give that up for them.

(2) Yes, ideally, but property cannot be owned and controlled outside of a system of general justice where each man's rights and duties are respected equally, discrimination goes totally against that equality.

(3) Yes, I have the right to control my own property. It's none of the business of the people to whom the house does not belong. I have absolute rights in matters concerning my house.

(4) Yes, I should be able to expect my tenants to value my property and appreciate my need to maintain a full rooming house, an impossibility if I allow a Black man to move into the house.

(5) Yes, but I must recognize that property rights come only from individual rights and by not equally respecting the rights of all I risk forfeiting the right to control my property.

(6) Yes, I own the house and people who live there are under my authority.
11. You have a very close relationship with a (boys) girl, (girls) boy during your senior year in high school. Separated for the summer, you grow apart and return with very mixed feelings about one another. One evening, feeling again your former closeness and attraction, you go further and further and have sexual intercourse. A few weeks later you find out that (boys) she is, (girls) you are pregnant.

What would be your feelings about abortion in this instance?

(1) It's not really killing. The fetus is not really alive. It's killing something that was never really there. The life isn't worth anything to the baby and it can only cause trouble for me.

(2) It's an unborn baby, that's the whole point. If a kid isn't born I can't see how anyone can say he's alive. Even little kids, babies when they're just born, the only reason they're alive is because someone knows them. And so the only people that they really hurt if they die are their parents. But if this kid isn't born yet, then I don't -- nobody knows him. It wouldn't be hurting anyone.

(3) Life is a universal human right. The life of the fetus, apart from all of the considerations of difficulty for me, has value in its own right, and deserves the equal treatment of any human being.

(4) Life should be considered in the context of the baby's future. It should be viewed not as a biological phenomenon, but as an attitude of respect for personality and justice. The fetus exhibits only the biological aspects of life and the chances for respect for its personality and justice for it in the future under these circumstances seem limited.

(5) Physically the fetus hardly exists, one way or the other it really makes very little difference.

(6) An unborn baby has just as much right to live as anyone else and I don't think that I or anyone else have the right to decide whether it should live or not. Life is sacred and humans have not the right to terminate it.
12. Your parents are away for the weekend and you are alone in the house. Unexpectedly, on Friday evening your (girls) boyfriend, (boys) girlfriend comes over. You spend the evening together in the house and after a while start necking and petting and have sexual intercourse.

What considerations would lead you to think your behavior wrong in this instance?

(1) It would be wrong if we had sexual intercourse without any thought about pregnancy because of the inconveniences -- a child could cause a lot of disturbance -- especially to kids in high school.

(2) If we did not have intercourse we would show discipline and our ability to wait for marriage when sex will be more meaningful for us and more satisfying because it will not be in violation of social and religious norms.

(3) Because of our youth and even minimally dependent upon our parents, we cannot fully respond to considerations of personal dignity and responsibility most necessary under such circumstances.

(4) If pregnancy resulted from intercourse in this instance, my parents would be most upset and even my friends might shy away from me.

(5) Since we were not totally convinced of the rightness of our actions and able to fit them into a logically thought out pattern, we would be apt to be bothered by conscience or other considerations.

(6) Sex in this instance could be an example of our using each other for personal advantage. It would be very difficult at this age to have built a relationship of real honesty and trust which would eliminate the difficulties of personal advantage seeking.
13. You are thinking about putting out a mimeographed newspaper for students in your school which would express many of your strong feelings. In particular, you want to voice your opposition to the war in Viet Nam and to many of the school's regulations. Before publishing your newspaper, you ask your principal for permission. The principal agrees on the condition that you submit all of your articles to him for approval. You agree and begin to submit your articles. The principal approves all of them and you publish two issues of the paper in the next two weeks. But the principal has not thought about the great attention your newspaper would receive. Students read the paper eagerly and are beginning to organize against school rules. Many classes are spent talking about the paper and rallies are held before and after school. Furthermore, many parents who favor the Viet Nam war are phoning the principal and angrily telling him that the newspaper is unpatriotic and should not be published. As a result of the commotion, the principal considers ordering you to stop publishing the newspaper. He gives as a reason that your activities are disruptive to the operation of the school.

If you had advocated the dropping of nuclear bombs on North Viet Nam and China, what difference, if any, should this have made on the consideration of your rights to continue publication?

(1) Rights and duties are very different. In this case it would seem that legally I would have the right to publish what I want, but the rightness of my actions in the latter case would be doubtful. My rights here come from equal respect for others' rights -- publication of the latter articles would not show that respect.

(2) It's nobody else's business what I write in my newspaper. I have absolute rights to write and publish whatever I want.

(3) It's all in the hands of the principal. If the latter positions were less acceptable to him, then my rights to their publication would also be less.

(4) I have worked to publish this newspaper. That right to publish is mine in spite of others' interpretations of my use of it as good or bad. I have the right to publish what I choose to publish.

(5) A student newspaper should express the views of students in general. The latter positions do not fairly represent these views and therefore I don't have as much right to publish them.
(6) Equal rights have meaning only within a system of general justice for all. The latter positions are in violation of the principles of justice. I can expect the rights to consistently publish what I want only if I am personally consistent in upholding an equal justice structure for all.
14. You have gotten into serious trouble. You are secretly leaving town in a hurry and need money. You can't get it from anyone you know and you are faced with going to a retired old man who is known to help people in the town. If you tell this man that you are very sick and need $500 to pay for an operation, he will give it to you. Really, you aren't sick at all and have no intention of paying the man back. Although he does not know you very well, he would loan you the money.

How important is it that you tell the truth in this instance?

(1) The old man gives money to people he doesn't even know. It really shouldn't matter to him what the money is used for. It's not like I'd be lying to someone I know and who depends on me. What I say to him really makes little difference.

(2) My telling the truth is essential. Truth forms the whole basis of our social order; it's something I have the right to expect and people must expect from me.

(3) Since I need the money so badly, the truth matters very little. I should do and say what I have to in order to get the money.

(4) The value of my word goes beyond situational considerations. Justice and respect for human dignity can only be upheld in the context of consistent truth.

(5) If this man is willing to give me money, he has earned the right to expect the truth from me.

(6) He has lots of money and power so his word is important. I don't have any money or power, so my word is worth very little one way or the other.
15. One day the air raid sirens begin to sound. Everyone realizes that a hydrogen bomb is going to be dropped on the city by the enemy and that the only way to survive will be in a bomb shelter. Not everyone has bomb shelters, but those who do run quickly to them. Since you have built a shelter, you immediately go to it. You have enough air space inside to last you and your family five days. You know that after five days the fallout will have diminished to the point where you could safely leave the shelter. If you leave before that, you will die. There is enough air for you and your family alone. Your next door neighbors have not built a shelter and are trying to get in yours. You know that you will not have enough air if you let the neighbors in, and that you will all die if they come inside. So you refuse to let them in. So now the neighbors are trying to break the door down in order to get in. You take your rifle and tell them to go away or else you will shoot. They won't go away. So you either have to shoot them or let them come into the shelter.

Why should you shoot?

(1) I have the most power in this situation and I must do what it will require to hold that position.

(2) Society is based on living up to special obligations of contract or agreement. The special obligations to my family require that I see first to their protection in this instance.

(3) There is nothing to be gained from letting them in and much to be lost from their entrance. I have no responsibility to protect them.

(4) I have placed myself in a position where my family depends on me. In spite of love and all other considerations, I owe more to those who depend on me than I owe to humans in general. I must protect my family first.

(5) My family is more important to me and personal affection makes my duty to protect them the most binding.

(6) My rights to property are essential here. My family must see me as responsible and reliable in my care for them.
APPENDIX C

MORAL JUDGMENT SCALE: ANSWER SHEET

The following student answer sheet was provided by Maitland and Goldman to record responses to the Moral Judgment Scale, and is reproduced here through the courtesy of Goldman.
INSTRUCTIONS:

You will find on each of the pages of this booklet a story about a situation in which you are involved. Each story is followed by a question. Six alternative ways of acting or looking at the situation in terms of the question are then presented. For each situation you are to choose one of the six options which is closest to the type of reasoning you would employ in the particular situation. In each case mark the number of that answer you would choose next to the story number above. Make one and only one choice for each situation. Although in some cases none of the six options will truly represent the type of reasoning you would use, choose that option which would be closest to your own reasoning. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these questions.

PLEASE DO NOT MAKE ANY MARKS IN THE TEST BOOKLET.
APPENDIX D

MORAL JUDGMENT SCALE: SCORING KEY

Following is a scoring key designed to record student responses to the Moral Judgment Scale and to evaluate the student's moral level of reasoning. The scoring key was provided by Maitland and Goldman with the Moral Judgment Scale, and is reproduced here through the courtesy of Goldman.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS

GRAND TOTAL

STAGE OR LEVEL (AVERAGE)
APPENDIX E

MORAL EDUCATION SAMPLE UNIT

Following is a sample lesson from the Moral Education Unit developed by the researcher for the purpose of this study. Lesson Four, "Easier Said Than Done ...", considered the need for self-control. The student workbook sheets were numbered decimally. Overhead transparencies were made from pages 123 through 128 and were used as a focus for classroom discussions. Some of the illustrations used were adapted from Treasures of Truth (1970) and Valett (1974).
Dear Diary,

You just wouldn't believe what happened today! Do you remember I told you about the party Eddie was giving and how he asked if I would help him get the food ready? Well, this is what happened ...

Our friends were arriving. Eddie realized he forgot the Cokes for the party. I volunteered to go to the grocery store. I got caught in the Saturday football traffic. I had to wait five minutes to get a space in the crowded parking lot. After finding the Cokes (which took a little doing!), I had to wait fifteen minutes in the "quick check" line. I kept thinking of everyone arriving at the party. I was nervous!

I ran out of the store just in time to be splashed by a passing pick-up truck. Can you believe the man driving turned around and laughed at me covered with muddy water? I finally made it to the car. A large station wagon angled for my parking place and the driver began honking to hurry me up. Wouldn't you think that would be enough? Oh no!

I reached in my purse -- once, twice! No keys! I locked myself out of the car. The driver kept honking at me and then yelled, "Hey, Chick! Will you move it?"

I*

*What would your response be in this situation? Complete the story as you would react in this situation.
"EASIER SAID THAN DONE"

A man without self-control is as defenseless as a newborn child.

-- Vallett

Self-control means the control of one's emotions, mind, and actions. Self-control also means learning to approach a situation:

1. with a rational attitude (being able to draw conclusions from assumed or known facts);

2. realistically and not emotionally (SEEING THINGS AS THEY ARE); and

3. without reading meanings into the situation that could give rise to emotional reactions.

You, as an individual, should learn to control your emotions and the mental reactions to those emotions. You should learn to control your actions, both physical and verbal, that are undesirable and unacceptable in the society that you live. Being able to control these things is called "maturity" and maturity is a big step towards "morality." With self-control an individual is ruler of his own life, and HE can determine HIS OWN future.

Let's go back to page 4.1, "Dear Diary." What emotions were created by YOU in this situation? WHAT DID YOU FEEL?

What was your mental reaction to the emotions you felt? WHAT DID YOU THINK?

What were your actions in this situation, physical and verbal? WHAT DID YOU DO?
1. Do you believe that your actions were acceptable and desirable in our society today?

2. Do you consider your reaction to the situation "moral"?

Let's review Lesson Two, "How Do I Decide?", for a moment. Did you consider the steps in decision making when reacting in this situation?

Yes ______ No ______

Step 1 ______  Step 2 ______ Step 3 ______ Step 4 ______ Step 5 ______ Step 6 ______ Step 7 ______

If you did not answer "Yes" to all of the questions above, perhaps you did not react in a way that shows maturity and self-control. What would be a "mature" reaction be -- one that shows self-control -- in this situation?

Happiness and health spring from a well-balanced and disciplined life.

-- Titus

Without self-control, other people can easily influence or "use" you for their own purposes. Without self-control, you are also easily manipulated by your environment -- the physical conditions around you and in which you involve yourself. When you do not have self-control from within, control is usually forced on you by outside authority and power. This outside authority decides what is best for the individual. Laws have been written and forced on individuals because down through the ages people have not shown self-control. Laws against drinking and driving, speed laws in school areas, and laws against animal abuse are examples of such laws.
What additional laws can you think of that have been forced on individuals because they have not shown self-control in their behavior?

1. 
2. 
3. 

A person who does not have self-control invites the control of others and a life of imprisonment and conflict within himself and between himself and society. A child who cannot control his behavior in a public place will be forcibly removed. A person who fails to get to work on time will be removed from the job. A person who lacks self-control is seldom happy. A person who lacks self-control is often referred to as an "unbalanced" person.

Everyone has some problems of self-control. What are your weak areas of "self-control"?

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. 

Give one example from your own life experiences of a time when you, or someone close to you, had to be controlled by others. Discuss the specific problem and describe why control was imposed on you.
HOW DO YOU LEARN SELF-CONTROL?

You are moving right now in your life from a child who wants to satisfy each desire the moment it arises to a young adult who is able to think and delay responses to a situation. A child is not able to look forward into the future nor has a child the courage and patience that it often takes to get something in the future. A young "mature" adult can "hold back," be thoughtful, and be willing to forego immediate desires for more important, beneficial, and long-range goals.

Child-----------------------------------------Young "mature" adult

Where would you place yourself on this scale?

You can gain self-control and avoid great damage to yourself physically and mentally. There are two suggestions that should help you to gain greater self-control. Both suggestions should be considered:

1. Admit to yourself the emotions you are trying to control in a situation.

2. Ask yourself these questions and answer honestly:

   *What has created this emotion?
   *Do you have a reason for this emotion, act, or thought?
   *Could this cause be satisfied in another way that is more desirable?

When problems of self-control exist, they should be clearly identified and faced, rather than avoided or denied. You should be honest and true to yourself and search for your errors and mistakes. If you can recognize your faults and use your conscience to judge when you have done wrong, you should gain greater self-control. Self-control results from honest self-observation, dedicated study, commitment to a purpose for which you are working, and practice. A person who has learned to control his inappropriate use of language and anger, to regulate his hours of sleep and his hours of activity, to be moderate in use of food, and to restrain his actions is a person with self-control and happiness.
There are several helpful plans of developing self-control. Let's look at them.

1. ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN: Plan and create an environment that will help you gain greater self-control and aid you in accomplishing your goals. If you need and desire peace and quiet, it is possible to build a house or rearrange a home so that your surroundings contribute to that goal. Perhaps you can change the furnishings or the layout of a room. Have you considered adding a garden to your yard?

What are some ways in which you could change your living conditions at home to aid you in more positive behavior?
2. **MODELING:** Find someone who you could look up to and who is successful in accomplishing what you would like to do. Study that person, watch how he acts, and then imitate his strong points or qualities. By pretending "what would I do if I were ..." and practicing the proper behavior, self-control and desired skills can be improved.

Who might you respect and admire enough to serve as a model of behavior for you to imitate? Write their name in the blank.

Someone You Know
A Historic Figure
A Public Figure
Other

From the list below select those particular qualities of character that you have observed in the people named above whom you respect and admire.

Someone You Know
A Historic Figure
A Public Figure
Other

Ability to Accept Responsibility
Ability to Set and Accomplish Goals
Ability to Express Love
Creativity
Courage
Vision
Honesty
Humility

Leadership
Cooperation
Openmindedness
Acceptance
Sense of Humor
Justice
Loyalty
Devotion
Peace
Harmony
Wisdom

To what extent do you think you can learn to model your behavior after these people?

___ not at all    ___ considerably

___ a little    ___ completely
3. HABITUAL LEARNING: Self-control is learned through practice of desirable behaviors. If you repeat a behavior that is "good" over and over, the behavior becomes automatically available to you when it is needed later on. Examples of habitual learning are multiplication tables, shifting gears in an automobile, and brushing teeth.

4. DISTRACTION TECHNIQUE: Find something that interferes with an undesirable behavior and acts as a suitable substitute for it. The substitute will act as a crutch when needed, until it is no longer needed.
5. OVERINDULGENCE: Often overindulgence can be a good thing if repeating the unacceptable behavior is less likely later on. Smoking until you become ill and drinking until you are sick are two examples. Annoying behaviors such as cracking knuckles, popping gum, and tapping feet can usually be stopped using this technique.

6. SELF-PUNISHMENT: This technique helps you to control your behavior by punishment that you yourself choose and carry out. This technique often shocks you back to self-control. This is where you might say to yourself that "if I do this ... then I will be able to do that ...." Sometimes a person will take away a privilege from himself to complete a task that was started long ago. A driver that is tired might slap or bite himself to wake himself up and to regain self-control.
7. AVOIDANCE: Avoid those people, places, or things that might strengthen an undesirable behavior. By avoiding the person you want to fight, you will not become angered enough to fight. By avoiding a candy store, you will eat less candy.

There are many other techniques for developing self-control and discipline. All of them involve mental and physical exercises. Some examples are breathing exercises, meditation, self-suggestive (self-hypnosis) techniques. What other alternative plans have worked for you in the development of self-control?
"EASIER SAID THAN DONE ..."

There are several helpful plans of developing self-control. Let's look at them!

1. ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

What are some ways in which you could change your living conditions at home to aid you in more positive behavior?

2. MODELING

A. Who might you respect and admire enough for you to imitate? Write their name in the blank.

Someone You Know__________________
A Historic Figure__________________
A Public Figure__________________
Other______________________________

B. What particular qualities of character have you observed in the people named above that you respect and admire? Refer to the list of virtues on the board.

Someone You Know__________________
A Historic Figure__________________
A Public Figure__________________
Other______________________________

C. To what extent do you think you can learn to model your behavior after these people?

___ not at all  ___ considerably
___ a little  ___ completely
3. HABITUAL LEARNING

What "habits" would you like to develop in order to gain greater control of your life?

___ become aware of inappropriate language and not use swear words
___ become aware of language so as not to hurt others through criticism and gossip
___ become more friendly to others
___ control temper
___ exercise every day
___ increase ability to concentrate

others: _____________________________________

4. DISTRACTION TECHNIQUE

A. What could a person do that would help to disrupt, suppress, or weaken the act that is described below?

nailbiting

smoking

making cutting or critical comments about others

cheating on tests

B. What are some annoying habits that you have that you would like to gain greater control of? List at least five habits on the left and write how you could distract yourself from these behaviors on the right.

1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________
5. __________________________________________
5. OVERINDULGENCE

What have you ever done in your life to the extent of disgust, resulting in behavior that was stopped temporarily or permanently?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

6. SELF-PUNISHMENT

You can punish yourself through verbal disapprovals, refusals to satisfy physical desires, or restrictions you place on yourself. Which method do you think would be most effective in helping you gain greater self-control?

________________________________________________________________________

7. AVOIDANCE

What undesirable behavior have you tried to change by ignoring or avoiding the situations that might make the behavior stronger?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

To what extent have you controlled the undesirable behavior?

___ not at all  ___ some  ___ often  ___ always  ___ don't know
APPENDIX F

REFERENCES FOR MORAL EDUCATION UNIT

Following is a list of references used by the researcher in the development of the Moral Education Unit.
LESSON ONE — "What Is Moral?"


LESSON TWO — "How Do I Decide?"


LESSON THREE — "What's Happening?"


LESSON FOUR — "Easier Said Than Done ..."


LESSON FIVE -- "What A Character!"


LESSON SIX -- "... Doing My Own Thing"
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