

Measurable Gender Differences in Moral Standards

Jenee Sikma & Kate Warhol¹

In 1982, Carol Gilligan tested Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning claiming that his research favored men. Lawrence Kohlberg limited his research to studying 75 boys from adolescents through young adulthood (Kohlberg, 1981). His theory of moral reasoning stemmed from that research. The purpose of this project was to test Carol Gilligan's claims that women have different moral tendencies than men. The hypothesis for this study was that there would be measurable differences between the way men and women judge different scenarios. The survey used for this study was the Defining Issues Test 2 which included demographic information created by James Rest in 1975. Statistical significance was found in the difference between men and women in their moral tendencies. This was distinguished by comparing the participants' genders and type indicator. The results of this study supported Carol Gilligan's claim that women and men do indeed have different moral tendencies. It was found that men and women approach moral scenarios in a different manner.

Keywords: Carol Gilligan, Lawrence Kohlberg, James Rest, moral tendencies, gender differences, Defining Issues Test 2

¹ Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to Jenee Sikma, Lindenwood University, 209 S. Kingshighway, St. Charles, MO 63301, jls971@lionmail.lindenwood.edu; Kate Warhol, Lindenwood University, 209 S. Kingshighway, St. Charles, MO 63301, kmw968@lionmail.lindenwood.edu

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there are gender differences in perspectives based on scenarios involving moral decisions. The underlying principle was to test the claims Carol Gilligan made in 1982. She stated that Kohlberg's theory of moral development favored men (Gilligan, 1982). Kohlberg studied the growth of moral judgment and character over the course of 15 years primarily by tracking the same cluster of 75 boys from early adolescence through young adulthood (Kohlberg, 1981). Kohlberg proposed six different moral stages and based on the results of testing, the subjects could be placed into these different levels according to their moral judgments (Jewell, 2001).

The first stage consists of those who comply with rules in order to evade penalty. The individuals in the second stage of moral development conform in order to receive rewards or have the favor returned. For example, the saying "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours". Those in the third stage incorporated those who simply do the accepted behavior in order to avoid disapproval. The fourth stage includes those who conform to avoid being reprimanded by the government. Those who conform to protect the high opinion of the neutral observer judging the community's wellbeing were placed in the fifth stage. The sixth and final stage included those who conform to avoid personal conviction (Kohlberg, 1981).

Gilligan put Kohlberg's theory to the test. Gilligan asked two 11-year-old children, one male and one female, the same question that Kohlberg used in determining where an individual falls on the scale of his moral development stages (Gilligan, 1982). The question related to Heinz and his wife who had a special kind of cancer. The doctors stated that there was one drug available that may save her life. It consisted of radium and the druggist who discovered it charged a price that exceeded what it cost to create the drug. He paid \$200 and charged \$2,000 for a limited amount of the drug. Heinz attempted to borrow the money from the community, but

he was still \$1000 short. When informing the druggist that his wife was on her death bed, he begged the druggist to compromise by allowing him to pay later or sell it cheaper. The druggist replied with, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." The participant was then to answer whether Heinz should steal the drug or not (Rest, 1975). According to this scenario the children's answers varied significantly. Jake, the male subject, answered in a logical manner stating that the drug should be stolen, solving this problem in a mathematical matter (Gilligan, 1982). Jake stated that judgment is more black and white. His explanation was firm and he did not budge (Gilligan, 1982). Amy responded much more indecisively. She focused mainly on the relationship between Heinz and his wife, seeing the problem more as a narrative of relationships rather than as a math problem. A main focus of Amy's thought process was not that the drug should be stolen, but that Heinz and the druggist should have better communication and work the problem out between themselves (Gilligan, 1982).

Kohlberg and Gilligan are known for their recurring debate in this particular area of study (Jorgensen, 2006). Kohlberg focused more on the justice system and abiding by the laws of the government, whereas Gilligan focused more on care, empathy and compassion (Sherblom, personal communication, September 28, 2010). In Kohlberg's theory of morality, women are evaluated as developmentally inferior because of the empathy and caring aspects identified in his third moral stage (Gibbs, Arnold, & Burkhart, 1984). Women are considered to be more prominent in stage three and Kohlberg views this stage as less advanced in moral development (Gibbs et al., 1984). Amy scored a full stage lower than Jake on level of maturity according to Kohlberg's stages of morality (Gilligan, 1982). Amy's results indicated that she was between the second and third stages. According to Kohlberg, this meant that she was unable to think systematically about morality or law and was seen as powerless in the world (Gilligan, 1982).

Morality is generally thought to be the way in which a person behaves toward another (Jewell, 2001). The idea is to make it visible to an observer what steps individuals take when approaching moral predicaments (Nichols & Day, 1982). Since Gilligan claimed that Kohlberg's method favored one gender more than the other, the Defining Issues Test 2 (DIT-2) was chosen to measure the moral development of participants in this study. The DIT-2 contains questions addressing moral dilemmas, allowing the participant to think about the balance between justice and care. In regards to the DIT 2, the format of the test presents each subject with five moral dilemmas and then has questions concerning those particular scenarios (Rest, 1975). Demographic questions regarding the participants' gender, age, political views, citizenship, language, and grade level were located on the bottom of the DIT-2 test.

DIT-2 tests were administered to undergraduate men and women students at Lindenwood University in order to determine whether there are sex differences in how they score. The hypothesis for this study was that there are measurable differences between genders in accordance to moral decision making.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited through the Lindenwood Participant Pool (LPP) as well as selected Lindenwood University undergraduate 2010 fall courses. The students participating through the LPP voluntarily signed up in a delegated time slot for the experiment. Select professors were emailed requesting permission to arrange recruitment through their classrooms. When recruiting in this manner, experimenters recited a strict verbal script to participants (see Appendix B). The students who elected to participate in the experiment through the LPP received extra credit in their introductory psychology, sociology, exercise science, and athletic

training courses. The students who chose not to partake in experiments were also given an opportunity to write a paper for the same amount of extra credit to prevent coercion. The reward given when recruiting through select fall courses consisted of candy and a verbal thank you. The total number of participants was 139 students, 56 being male and 83 being female.

The age of participants ranged from 18 to 61 years old. The greatest number of participants was seniors in college, 30.20%. Second, 27.30% were sophomores in college. Juniors followed at 25.90% while freshman participants were at 16.50%. The majority of the participants, 89.90%, were citizens of the United States leaving 10.10% who were not American citizens. English was the primary language of 92.80% of the participants, while 7.20% had a different primary language. Depending on whether the participant is more liberal or conservative, it may have influenced their moral standards. As a result, their political view was included in the demographic survey. It was found that the leading view was “neither liberal nor conservative” at 38.8%.

Materials

Different classrooms were obtained through the Lindenwood Participant Pool (LPP) in order to recruit participants. An experiment description form was used to inform the possible participant about what the study entailed. Sign-up sheet B was posted under the description to allow the participants to sign up for available time slots. Both of those forms were printed and filled out in their entirety with all appropriate information. Using a room request form, three different classrooms were obtained for three separate days. Classrooms used through the LPP all were equipped with over 15 desks and chairs. While recruiting through fall 2010 courses, Professor Bobo allowed the study to be conducted twice in rooms which also including over 15 desks and chairs. Dr. RincónGallardo and Dr. Kelly permitted researchers to enter two

classrooms with more than 20 desks and chairs.

Before the assigned day of research, the experimenters printed out an experimenters' list of participants' sheet as well as enough participant receipts for all who signed up. The experiment description form consisted of the name of the study, the experimenters' names with contact information, an outline of the study, and an estimate of the length of the study of 15 min, see Appendix B. Sign-up sheet B contained the experiment name, the experimenters responsible, the room assigned, time slots, and the dates for the experiment. The experimenters created informed consent forms explaining the rights of the participants as well as a general overview of the study they were taking part in. The Defining Issues Test, (DIT-2) by Rest, Narvaez, Thoma & Bebeau (1975), see Appendix E, was used in order to score an individual on his or her morality. The survey consisted of stories that challenged ones moral thought processes. The first question presents a scenario in which a man must choose between stealing money for his family to live or uphold the law and let his family die. The second question deals with a reporter faced with a dilemma of whether to print a story about a politician's past or to not print the story because the politician changed his life around. The third question is one in which a school board chairman has the decision to either continue or discontinue having meetings that result in violence. The fourth question refers to whether a doctor should give a patient enough morphine to kill her at her request or to not kill her. The final question is asking whether students at a university should continue to hold illegal demonstrations according to something they believe in. After reading each story, participants were to rate the presented questions in terms of its importance in that particular moral dilemma. The next process was to rank the most important top four items. A feedback letter, complete with contact information, was also produced with the purpose of debriefing each participant and creating a method for future communication if further

questions should arise, see Appendix A. Prior to any research, sufficient consent forms, surveys, experimenter's list of participant sheets, participant receipts, and feedback letters were produced in order to cover the number of those who were participating. In addition, the experimenters had sufficient ink pens and band-aids present in case of any paper cuts from the survey. Additionally, the Lindenwood University Counseling Center's number was available in case any individuals found the content to be emotionally detrimental.

Prior to conducting research through the participants from the fall 2010 courses, the experimenters visited a local grocery store to buy bags of assorted candy to bring to the classrooms. The assortment included Reeses, Starburst, Snickers and Butterfingers. Along with the candy, the appropriate forms and surveys were brought along as well. A verbal script was adhered to in order to ensure the same speech was given to each classroom (see Appendix B).

Procedure

Before conducting any research, creating and submitting an application for the Lindenwood University Institutional Review Board (IRB) to approve the study was completed. Experimenters completed an ethics test in order to recruit participants through the Lindenwood Participant Pool (LPP). An email was sent to the LPP with a request for a classroom on specific days and times. Experiment description form (see Appendix C) and sign-up sheet B were posted on the appropriate bulletin board across the hall from the LPP office (Young 407).

When using the assigned classrooms in Young Hall, the participants first showed up at the designated time. The participants filled out the information on the experimenter's participant list. After completing this task, they were given two informed consent forms (see Appendix D) one for their records and the other for the experimenter to keep. The next form given to them was a copy of the DIT-2 survey that addressed different moral dilemmas and demographic

information, see Appendix E. The survey took around 15 minutes to complete and consisted of five different questions. Upon completion of the survey, participants were debriefed about the experiment and received a feedback letter in case they would have any further questions. A participant's receipt was then given to them. Next, participants were instructed to fill out the top portion before turning it into Young 407 in order to obtain their extra credit. A verbal thank you was then administered.

For those who participated outside the classroom setting, through the fall 2010 courses, a different approach was taken. Recess, Starburst, Snickers and Butterfingers were purchased in order to compensate the volunteers for their time. Permission to conduct the study in the different classrooms was granted from different professors. The experimenters typed up a verbal script (see Appendix B) of what was said to each class so that the study was administered in the same manner to all participants. It was explained that the survey was completely voluntary and that participation was not only anonymous but would also have no reflection on one's grade in the course. The professor left the room to avoid possible coercion. An informed consent form and the survey were distributed to the students who decided to take the survey. Feedback letters and candy were handed out as the participants turned in their completed consent form and survey. The feedback letter provided contact information of the researchers, information on the study, and also thanked them for their valuable contribution.

After all data were collected the search for a scoring guide began. Unfortunately, in order to use the DIT-2 test one normally receives permission and orders the test through a scoring center offering the option to send in the data to get it scored and sent back. Through Dr. Sherblom, Dr. Thoma's contact information was obtained for assistance. All the data were entered into an SPSS program and sent to Dr. Thoma's email for scoring.

Results

The hypothesis for this study stated that there would be measurable differences between the moral tendencies between men and women, supporting Carol Gilligan's claims. The DIT-2 placed individuals into seven different stages of moral tendencies reported as the type indicator (see Appendix F). The highest percentage was predominant in maintaining norms schema, but transitional; personal interests secondary schema (Type 3) was at 28.70% (see Table 1). An independent t-test was conducted with participant's gender as the independent variable and type indicator as the dependent variable. Of the 139 participants, only 129 were included in the independent t-test. This was due to those individuals not passing the reliability check when Dr. Thoma scored the DIT-2 tests. Heterogeneity of variances was found between the scores of the two genders and equal variances were not assumed because of the difference in the percent of participants that was men versus women. As a result the degrees of freedom were adjusted accordingly. A measurable sex difference existed in type indicator was found, $t(124.577) = -3.075, p=.003$.

Discussion

Our results supported Carol Gilligan's claim that women have different moral tendencies than men. Gilligan (1982) claimed that women had more relational and indecisive moral reasoning while men had more logical and solution-based moral reasoning. Men and women in our research did show a significant difference with the means of the type indicator with men being at 2.92 and women being at 3.54.

One room in which research was conducted, an obnoxious air conditioning unit may have affected the results. This could have swayed the scores given by the participants because of the distraction variable.

The fact that all the questions were presented in the same order to all of the participants may have affected the validity of the study. Since all stories were taken in the same order it may have been beneficial to have the stories counterbalanced. Fatigue may have influenced the participants' answers towards the end of the test due its length. A possible bias may have been present if the participant was answering in terms of what was thought to be socially acceptable rather than what one believed. The effect sizes were swayed towards female participants, since 53 men and 76 women participated in this study.

A significantly longer period of time to complete the survey may have been beneficial since some of the participants may have felt rushed in the allotted time frame of fifteen minutes. Also one participant was not able to complete the test because of a language barrier, so that data were excluded as well.

This study was successful in gaining information on moral reasoning and was of great importance to the viewing of Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning. The study also extended the views of how men and women think in moral terms, due to the finding of measurable differences.

References

- Gibbs, J., Arnold, K., & Burkhart, J. (1984). Sex differences in the expression of moral judgment. *Child Development*, 55(3), 1040-1043.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). The contribution of women's thought to developmental theory: The elimination of sex bias in moral development research and education.
- Jewell, P. (2001). Measuring moral development: Feeling, thinking, and doing. *Special Education and Disability Studies*.
- Jorgensen, G. (2006). Kohlberg and Gilligan: duet or duel? *Journal of Moral Education*, 35(2), 79- 196.

- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row.
- Nichols, M. & Day, V. (1982). A comparison of moral reasoning of groups and individuals on the 'defining issues test.' *Academy of Management Journal*, 25(1), 201-208.
- Rest, J. (1975). New options in assessing moral judgment and criteria for evaluating validity.
- Sherblom, S. (2010, September 28). Qualitative Research. Lindenwood University. Interview.
- Woods, C. (1996). Gender differences in moral development and acquisition: A review of Kohlberg's and Gilligan's models of justice and care. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 24(4), 375.

Appendix A

Feedback Letter

Thank you for participating in our study. The survey inquiring about different demographics and moral standards was used in order to determine whether or not gender plays a role in those decision processes. The demographics were necessary in order to see the range of participants.

Please note that we are not interested in your individual results; rather, we are only interested in the results of a large group of participants, of which you are now a part of. No identifying information about you was associated with any of the findings.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding any portion of this study, please do not hesitate to bring them up now or in the future. Our contact information is found at the bottom of this letter. If you are interested in obtaining a summary of the findings of this study at a later date, please contact us and we will make it available to you at the completion of this project.

Thank you again for your valuable contribution to this study.

Sincerely,

Principal Investigators:

Kate Warhol (636)578-7350 (kmw968@lionmail.lindenwood.edu)
Jenee Sikma (618)267-8686 (jls971@lionmail.lindenwood.edu)

Supervisor:

Dr. Michiko Nohara-LeClair (636)949-4371(mnohara-leclair@lindenwood.edu)

Appendix B

Verbal Script

Upon entering into the Lindenwood University undergraduate course the researchers will first explain their project. "You are being asked to complete two tasks. You were asked to fill out a survey that requires you to read various moral scenarios and indicate how you would respond. The entire procedure should take no more than 10-15 minutes of your time. This is a voluntary experiment; you should not feel the need to have to participate in this experiment. If you would like to participate then they will receive an award of candy and a thank you after completion of survey. You was left alone in the room to avoid any coercion. We are passing out consent forms please read and sign. These sheets are the surveys for the experiment please do not start till we leave the room." Researchers will then leave the room. Researchers return to the room and debrief the participants and handout a thank you and candy.

Appendix C

Project #: _____

Experimenter's name(s): Jenee Sikma and Kate Warhol

Experimenter's contact information: (618)267-8686;(636)578-7350

Approximate amount of time experiment will take: 10-15 minutes.

Type of experiment (survey, interactive, etc.): Survey.

Experiment name: Gender and Morality

Description of the experiment: In this study, you are asked to complete two tasks. You are asked to fill out a survey that requires you to read various moral scenarios and indicate how you would respond. The entire procedure should take no more than 10-15 minutes of your time.

Appendix D

Consent Form

I, _____ (print name), understand that I was taking part in a research project that requires me to fill out a survey regarding information about my demographic information and the ways in which I would react in different moral situations. I understand that I should be able to complete this study within 10 to 15 minutes. I am aware that my participation in this study is voluntary and that I may choose to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty or prejudice. I should not incur any penalty or prejudice because I cannot complete the study. I understand that the information obtained from my responses was analyzed only as part of aggregate data and that all identifying information was absent from the data in order to ensure anonymity. I am also aware that my responses was kept confidential and that data obtained from this study will only be available for research and educational purposes. I understand that any questions I may have regarding this study shall be answered by the researcher(s) involved to my satisfaction. Finally, I verify that I am at least 18 years of age and am legally able to give consent or that I am under the age of 18 but have on file with the LPP office, a completed parental consent form that allows me to give consent as a minor.

_____ Date: _____
 (Signature of participant)

_____ Date: _____
 (Signature of researcher obtaining consent)

Student Researcher's Names and Numbers:

Jenee Sikma
 (618)267-8686
 jls971@lionmail.lindenwood.edu

Kate Warhol
 (636)578-7350
 kmw968@lionmail.lindenwood.edu

Supervisor:

Dr. Michiko Nohara-LeClair
 Course Instructor
 (636)949-4371
 mnohara-leclair@lindenwood.edu

Appendix E

Famine— (Story #1)

The small village in northern India has experienced shortages of food before, but this year's famine is worse than ever. Some families are even trying to feed themselves by making soup from tree bark. Mustaq Singh's family is near starvation. He has heard that a rich man in his village has supplies of food stored away and is hoarding food while its price goes higher so that he can sell the food later at a huge profit. Mustaq is desperate and thinks about stealing some food from the rich man's warehouse. The small amount of food that he needs for his family probably wouldn't even be missed.

[If at any time you would like to reread a story or the instructions, feel free to do so. Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues and rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]

Reporter— (Story #2)

Molly Dayton has been a news reporter for the *Gazette* newspaper for over a decade. Almost by accident, she learned that one of the candidates for Lieutenant Governor for her state, Grover Thompson, had been arrested for shop-lifting 20 years earlier. Reporter Dayton found out that early in his life, Candidate Thompson had undergone a confused period and done things he later regretted, actions which would be very out-of-character now. His shop-lifting had been a minor offense and charges had been dropped by the department store. Thompson has not only straightened himself out since then, but built a distinguished record in helping many people and in leading constructive community projects. Now, Reporter Dayton regards Thompson as the best candidate in the field and likely to go on to important leadership positions in the state. Reporter Dayton wonders whether or not she should write the story about Thompson's earlier troubles because in the upcoming close and heated election, she fears that such a news story could wreck Thompson's chance to win.

[Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues for this story, rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]

School Board— (Story #3)

Mr. Grant has been elected to the School Board District 190 and was chosen to be Chairman. The district is bitterly divided over the closing of one of the high schools. One of the high schools has to be closed for financial reasons, but there is no agreement over which school to close. During his election to the school board, Mr. Grant had proposed a series of “Open Meetings” in which members of the community could voice their opinions. He hoped that dialogue would make the community realize the necessity of closing one high school. Also he hoped that through open discussion, the difficulty of the decision would be appreciated, and that the community would ultimately support the school board decision. The first Open Meeting was a disaster. Passionate speeches dominated the microphones and threatened violence. The meeting barely closed without fist-fights. Later in the week, school board members received threatening phone calls. Mr. Grant wonders if he ought to call off the next Open Meeting.

[Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues for this story, rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]

Cancer— (Story #4)

Mrs. Bennett is 62 years old, and in the last phases of colon cancer. She is in terrible pain and asks the doctor to give her more pain-killer medicine. The doctor has given her the maximum safe dose already and is reluctant to increase the dosage because it would probably hasten her death. In a clear and rational mental state, Mrs. Bennett says that she realizes this; but she wants to end her suffering even if it means ending her life. Should the doctor give her an increased dosage?

[Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues for this story, rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]

Demonstration — (Story #5)

Political and economic instability in a South American country prompted the President of the United States to send troops to “police” the area. Students at many campuses in the U.S.A. have protested that the United States is using its military might for economic advantage. There is widespread suspicion that big oil multinational companies are pressuring the President to safeguard a cheap oil supply even if it means loss of life. Students at one campus took to the streets, in demonstrations, tying up traffic and stopping regular business in the town. The president of the university demanded that the students stop their illegal demonstrations. Students then took over the college’s administration building, completely paralyzing the college. Are the students right to demonstrate in these ways?

[Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues for this story, rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]

DIT-2 Answer Sheet

University of Minnesota
Copyright, James Rest and Darcia Narvaez
All Rights Reserved, 1998

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

Please read story #1 in the INSTRUCTIONS booklet.

Famine -- (Story #1)

What should Mustaq Singh do? Do you favor the action of taking the food? (Mark one.)

- ① Should take the food ② Can't decide ③ Should not take the food

GREAT
MUCH
SOME
LITTLE
NO

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 1. Is Mustaq Singh courageous enough to risk getting caught for stealing?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 2. Isn't it only natural for a loving father to care so much for his family that he would steal?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 3. Shouldn't the community's laws be upheld?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 4. Does Mustaq Singh know a good recipe for preparing soup from tree bark?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 5. Does the rich man have any legal right to store food when other people are starving?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 6. Is the motive of Mustaq Singh to steal for himself or to steal for his family?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 7. What values are going to be the basis for social cooperation?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 8. Is the epitome of eating reconcilable with the culpability of stealing?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 9. Does the rich man deserve to be robbed for being so greedy?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 10. Isn't private property an institution to enable the rich to exploit the poor?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 11. Would stealing bring about more total good for everybody concerned or wouldn't it?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 12. Are laws getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of a society?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most important item ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Third most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Second most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Fourth most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Now please return to the Instructions booklet for the next story.

Reporter -- (Story #2)

Do you favor the action of reporting the story? (Mark one.)

- ① Should report the story ② Can't decide ③ Should not report the story

GREAT
MUCH
SOME
LITTLE
NO

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 1. Doesn't the public have a right to know all the facts about all the candidates for office?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 2. Would publishing the story help Reporter Dayton's reputation for investigative reporting?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 3. If Dayton doesn't publish the story wouldn't another reporter get the story anyway and get the credit for investigative reporting?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 4. Since voting is such a joke anyway, does it make any difference what reporter Dayton does?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 5. Hasn't Thompson shown in the past 20 years that he is a better person than his earlier days as a shop-lifter?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 6. What would best serve society?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 7. If the story is true, how can it be wrong to report it?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 8. How could reporter Dayton be so cruel and heartless as to report the damaging story about candidate Thompson?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 9. Does the right of "habeas corpus" apply in this case?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 10. Would the election process be more fair with or without reporting the story?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 11. Should reporter Dayton treat all candidates for office in the same way by reporting everything she learns about them, good and bad?
 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 12. Isn't it a reporter's duty to report all the news regardless of the circumstances?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most important item ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Third most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Second most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Fourth most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Now please return to the Instructions booklet for the next story.

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



909209

School Board -- (Story #3)

Do you favor calling off the next Open Meeting?

- ① Should call off the next open meeting ② Can't decide ③ Should have the next open meeting

GREAT
MUCH
SOME
LITTLE
NO

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 1. Is Mr. Grant required by law to have Open Meetings on major school board decisions?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 2. Would Mr. Grant be breaking his election campaign promises to the community by discontinuing the Open Meetings?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 3. Would the community be even angrier with Mr. Grant if he stopped the Open Meetings?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 4. Would the change in plans prevent scientific assessment?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 5. If the school board is threatened, does the chairman have the legal authority to protect the Board by making decisions in closed meetings?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 6. Would the community regard Mr. Grant as a coward if he stopped the open meetings?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 7. Does Mr. Grant have another procedure in mind for ensuring that divergent views are heard?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 8. Does Mr. Grant have the authority to expel troublemakers from the meetings or prevent them from making long speeches?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 9. Are some people deliberately undermining the school board process by playing some sort of power game?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 10. What effect would stopping the discussion have on the community's ability to handle controversial issues in the future?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 11. Is the trouble coming from only a few hotheads, and is the community in general really fair-minded and democratic?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 12. What is the likelihood that a good decision could be made without open discussion from the community?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

- Most important item ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫ Third most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫
 Second most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫ Fourth most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Now please return to the Instructions booklet for the next story.

Cancer -- (Story #4)

Do you favor the action of giving more medicine?

- ① Should give Mrs. Bennett an increased dosage to make her die ② Can't decide ③ Should not give her an increased dosage

GREAT
MUCH
SOME
LITTLE
NO

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 1. Isn't the doctor obligated by the same laws as everybody else if giving an overdose would be the same as killing her?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 2. Wouldn't society be better off without so many laws about what doctors can and cannot do?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 3. If Mrs. Bennett dies, would the doctor be legally responsible for malpractice?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 4. Does the family of Mrs. Bennett agree that she should get more painkiller medicine?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 5. Is the painkiller medicine an active heliotropic drug?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 6. Does the state have the right to force continued existence on those who don't want to live?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 7. Is helping to end another's life ever a responsible act of cooperation?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 8. Would the doctor show more sympathy for Mrs. Bennett by giving the medicine or not?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 9. Wouldn't the doctor feel guilty from giving Mrs. Bennett so much drug that she died?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 10. Should only God decide when a person's life should end?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 11. Shouldn't society protect everyone against being killed?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 12. Where should society draw the line between protecting life and allowing someone to die if the person wants to?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

- Most important item ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫ Third most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫
 Second most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫ Fourth most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Now please return to the Instructions booklet for the next story.

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Demonstration -- (Story #5)

Do you favor the action of demonstrating in this way?

- ① Should continue demonstrating in these ways ② Can't decide ③ Should not continue demonstrating in these ways

GREAT
MUCH
SOME
LITTLE
NO

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 1. Do the students have any right to take over property that doesn't belong to them?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 2. Do the students realize that they might be arrested and fined, and even expelled from school?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 3. Are the students serious about their cause or are they doing it just for fun?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 4. If the university president is soft on students this time, will it lead to more disorder?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 5. Will the public blame all students for the actions of a few student demonstrators?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 6. Are the authorities to blame by giving in to the greed of the multinational oil companies?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 7. Why should a few people like Presidents and business leaders have more power than ordinary people?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 8. Does this student demonstration bring about more or less good in the long run to all people?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 9. Can the students justify their civil disobedience?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 10. Shouldn't the authorities be respected by students?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 11. Is taking over a building consistent with principles of justice?
- ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ 12. Isn't it everyone's duty to obey the law, whether one likes it or not?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most important item ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫
 Second most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Third most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫
 Fourth most important ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩ ⑪ ⑫

Please provide the following information about yourself:

1. Age in years:

0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9

2. Sex (mark one): Male Female

3. Level of Education (mark highest level of formal education attained, if you are currently working at that level [e.g., Freshman in college] or if you have completed that level [e.g., if you finished your Freshman year but have gone on no further].)

- Grade 1 to 6
- Grade 7, 8, 9
- Grade 10, 11, 12
- Vocational/technical school (without a bachelor's degree) (e.g., Auto mechanic, beauty school, real estate, secretary, 2-year nursing program).
- Junior college (e.g., 2-year college, community college, Associate Arts degree)
- Freshman in college in bachelor degree program.
- Sophomore in college in bachelor degree program.
- Junior in college in bachelor degree program.
- Senior in college in bachelor degree program.
- Professional degree (Practitioner degree beyond bachelor's degree) (e.g., M.D., M.B.A., Bachelor of Divinity, D.D.S. in Dentistry, J.D. in law, Masters of Arts in teaching, Masters of Education [in teaching], Doctor of Psychology, Nursing degree along with 4-year Bachelor's degree)
- Masters degree (in academic graduate school)
- Doctoral degree (in academic graduate school, e.g., Ph.D. or Ed.D.)
- Other Formal Education. (Please describe: _____)

4. In terms of your political views, how would you characterize yourself (mark one)?

- Very Liberal
- Somewhat Liberal
- Neither Liberal nor Conservative
- Somewhat Conservative
- Very Conservative

5. Are you a citizen of the U.S.A.?

- Yes No

6. Is English your primary language?

- Yes No

Thank You.

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Table 1

Type Indicators

Type Indicator	Frequency (N)	Percent
Type 1 Predominant in personal interests schema consolidated	9	6.5
Type 2 Predominant in personal interests schema, but transitional	35	25.2
Type 3 Predominant in maintaining norms schema, but transitional; personal interests secondary schema	37	26.6
Type 4 Predominant in maintaining norms schema, but consolidated	15	10.8
Type 5 Predominant in maintaining norms schema and transitional; postconventional secondary schema	13	9.4
Type 6 Predominant in postconventional schema; but transitional	16	11.5
Type 7 Predominant in postconventional schema and consolidated	4	2.9