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The present research attempted to modify Rest's Defining Issues Test (DIT) in order to better differentiate stage 6 moral reasoners from stage 5 reasoners. A review of the literature showed that the DIT seems to be both reliable and valid, yet it is unable to clearly differentiate between the stages of principled moral reasoning. After three pilot tests, newly developed stage 6 items were added to the DIT. The revised DIT was then administered to people believed to be stage 6 reasoners. Of the 30 respondents, three made the stage 6 cutoff. No stage 6 items were shown to clearly differentiate between stages 5 and 6.
Chapter I

Introduction

The aim of this project is to develop stage 6 items for Rest's Defining Issues Test (DIT) which differentiate stage 6 reasoning from stage 5 reasoning. The purpose is to revise the DIT to make it possible to use this instrument to identify those individuals who have attained the highest level of moral reasoning. A brief description of Kohlberg's cognitive-developmental theory of moral reasoning is given along with Kohlberg's method of assessment. James Rest's DIT is also described, and its reliability, validity, and predictive utility are reviewed. The theoretical and behavioral implications that stage 6 offers which stage 5 cannot offer are also discussed. Finally, criteria are outlined which, if met by the new stage 6 items, will provide items that only stage six reasoners should use in making decisions about moral dilemmas on the DIT.
Chapter II

An Overview of Kohlberg's Stages and Their Measurement

Kohlberg's Theory

Perhaps the most influential theory of moral development has been the cognitive-developmental theory proposed by Lawrence Kohlberg. Kohlberg's (1969) theory describes a six stage sequence in which persons progress from lower to higher stages by a series of cognitive restructurings or transformations. Each transformation produces qualitative changes that move the person toward more comprehensive, complex modes of reasoning about moral issues. This developmental progression is marked by the replacement of lower stage, less comprehensive modes of reasoning by higher stage, more comprehensive modes. These sequential stages of moral development are believed to be universal in that all persons, regardless of culture, pass through the same developmental sequence. Kohlberg divides moral development into three levels: preconventional, conventional, and post-conventional. Each level consists of two stages with the second stage a more refined organization of the first. Each level and stage as defined by Kohlberg is described in Table 1.
I. **Preconventional Level**

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

**Stage 1: The punishment and obedience orientation.** The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power are valued in their own right, not in terms of respect to an underlying moral order supported by punishment and authority (the latter being Stage 4).

**Stage 2: The instrumental relativist orientation.** Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's needs and occasionally the needs of others. Human relations are viewed in terms like those of the market place. Elements of fairness, of reciprocity, and/or equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in
physical, pragmatic ways. Reciprocity is a matter of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," not of loyalty, gratitude or justice.

II. Conventional level

At this level, maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, group, or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequence. That attitude is not only one of conformity to personal expectations and social order, but also of loyalty to it, of actively maintaining, supporting, and justifying the order and of identifying with persons or groups involved in it. At this level, there are the following two stages:

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

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

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

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

Stage 6: The universal ethical principle orientation. Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles appealing to logical
comprehensiveness, universality, and consistency. These principles are abstract and ethical (the Golden Rule, the categorical imperatives): they are not concrete moral rules like the Ten Commandments. At least, these are universal principles of justice, of reciprocity, and equality of human rights, and of respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons.

In his later elaborations, Kohlberg subdivided each stage into A and B substages. This distinction was to be helpful in the attempt to relate moral judgment to moral action — that is, that subjects using B-substage reasoning would be more likely to engage in the moral action they believed to be just than would users of A-substage reasoning (Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1983). The main distinction in thought between Level A and Level B individuals is that while both are equally aware of the rules of the social or moral order, Level B persons apply the rules less egocentrically, with greater fairness and social perspective. For example, when making a moral decision, a person at stage 4A decides in terms of "What does the system demand?" At stage 4B the individual would ask "What does the system demand and what does the individual in that system require?" The 4B person would seek a solution that strikes a balance between the two.

**The Moral Judgment Interview**

Kohlberg's assessment procedure (the Moral Judgment Interview, MJI) is a structured projective test consisting of hypothetical moral dilemmas (Colby, et al., 1983). After an interviewer presents a subject with a dilemma, the person makes a judgment about the situation and then justifies his choice. The interviewer probes with questions to encourage the subject to respond freely and elaborate on his comments. All the responses are recorded by the interviewer. Since the questions that the
interviewer asks vary according to the subject's original judgment, subjects do not receive the same questions. Because of the probing, the interview is quite time consuming. Scoring of the MJI is based on the reasoning which the subject gives in support of his judgment. The scoring is conducted according to certain guides outlined in the scoring manual. The scorer must have extensive training in order to correctly score the protocols. Kohlberg (1958) first developed his assessment procedure in his dissertation. Since then successive scoring systems have been published. Colby et al. (1983) have produced the current form of the scoring method for the MJI which is designed to be more specific in both content and structure in scoring of protocols.
Chapter III

The Defining Issues Test

The Defining Issues Test (DIT) is an objective measure of moral reasoning on general social problems. Developed by James Rest (1979), the DIT is designed to be consistent with Kohlberg's stage theory of moral development. Because it uses a multiple choice reporting format, the DIT also avoids the potential problem of confounding moral reasoning with the ability to articulate one's thinking (Nichols & Day, 1982).

The DIT presents six hypothetical moral dilemmas and asks the respondent to choose from three courses of action what he or she would have done in the dilemma. In each moral dilemma, the needs of two or more individuals are in conflict. For example, one of the six stories is the "Heinz and the drug" dilemma which was originally one of Kohlberg's dilemmas found in the MJI. This story says that Heinz's wife is near death from a special kind of cancer and there is only one drug that might save her but Heinz can not get enough money to buy the drug. Finally, Heinz gets desperate and begins to think about breaking into the druggist's shop to steal the drug for his wife. On the test, the respondent is first asked to choose whether Heinz should steal the drug or not. The respondent is then given a list of twelve issues that may have influenced his/her
choice and asked to rate each as to how important it was in resolving the moral dilemma using a five-point Likert-type rating scale. These twelve statements represent Kohlberg's six stages of moral development. As an example, "Whether a community's laws are going to be upheld" represents a stage 4 response. Another example, "Isn't it only natural for a loving husband to care so much for his wife that he'd steal?" represents a stage 3 response. Finally, the respondent rank-orders the four issues which he/she believes are the most important. Participants can respond to all six of the moral dilemmas or to only three dilemmas if the researcher uses the shorter version of the DIT.

The test produces a continuous number, the "P" score, which represents the relative importance a respondent gives to principled moral considerations, that is, to stages 5 and 6 issues (Rest, 1979). The P-score has been the most widely used index from Rest's test (Emler, Renwick, & Bernadette, 1983). It is important to note that the individual's choice among the three courses of action on a dilemma does not affect the P-score (Nichols & Day, 1982).

The DIT also produces the "M" score. M items are written to sound lofty and pretentious but not to mean anything. For example, an M item from the Heinz dilemma reads, "Whether the essence of living is more encompassing than the termination of dying, socially and individually." These "M" items do not represent any stage of thinking but rather probe for a respondent's tendency to endorse
statements for their "sound" rather than their meaning. If respondents consistently rate and rank the M items high, then it is uncertain that the respondent has the proper test taking set, and the protocol must be discarded. In this way the M score serves as a check on the adequacy of each respondent's mode of responding.

Another score that can be produced by the DIT is the D-index, an empirically weighted sum of rankings given to the first four items. Since the D-index is rarely used and not relevant to the present project, a description of it will not be given here but can be found in Rest (1979).

To obtain the DIT P-score, only the first four rankings from each story are considered. After finding the item's stage, the choices are weighed by giving a weight of 4 to the first rank ("most important"), 3 to the second rank ("second most important"), 2 to the third rank, and 1 to the fourth rank. Points are then totaled across the six stories (e.g., for stage 2, the numbers are added across the Heinz story, Student story, Prisoner story, etc.). There are 60 points in all, and (for the convenience of having scores in percentages) the total number of points at each stage is divided by .6 to yield the percentage score of all responses at each stage (Rest, 1979). This is done also for stages 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 6, and M. To get the raw principled morality score ("P"), the points from stages 5A, 5B, and 6 are added together. The P-score percentage is calculated by dividing this sum by .6. The stage with the
highest percentage score is considered the individual's predominant stage of moral reasoning.

No individual can score 100% on any one stage, due to the nature of the scoring system. For each dilemma, the subject must choose the four most important issues. However, there are not four issues of the same stage for any one dilemma. Thus, the respondent must choose issues from at least two different stages as the four most important issues on each story.
Chapter IV

Reliability and Validity of the DIT

Since the DIT is one of few objectively scored tests in the domain of cognitive-development theory of morals, it is now widely used (Loevinger & Knoll, 1983). The DIT is supported by studies showing high reliability, with test-retest coefficients in the high .70s to low .80s (Rest et al. 1978). Martin, Shafto, and Vandeinse (1977) found a partial Beta between P-scores and age to be .47. That is, scale scores on the DIT increased significantly as a function of age group (junior high, high school, and college students) and they increased in a manner which was consistent with the stage theory of moral reasoning. College students scored significantly higher than younger subjects on scale scores from each principled reasoning stage. Martin et al. also estimated the reliability of the P-score using the method of Kristof (1974). This method requires that the test be divided into thirds. There were 15 different ways to divide the DIT in thirds by combining partial P-scores from pairs of dilemmas. The median estimated reliability over these 15 splits was .70. The authors concluded that the DIT has a substantial advantage over the Moral Judgment Scale (Kohlberg's method of assessment which involves a structured interview) because it is an objective and quick measure of moral development.
Davison and Robbins (1978) found the overall indices of reliability for the DIT based on six stories to generally have internal consistency and test-retest reliabilities in the high .70's and low .80's. A longitudinal study by Rest (1975) demonstrated the stability of the DIT over two years for two different groups, \( r = .54 \) and \( r = .68 \).

The literature indicates that the DIT has substantial validity and predictive utility as well. It has been shown that people who score high and low on the DIT differ in religious motivation, compliance, cheating, volunteering, discipline style, concept of other people, delinquency, and values.

Sapp and Jones (1986) found that principled moral reasoning was significantly related to religion-as-quest, \( r = .49 \). A person high on religion-as-quest is characterized by a faith that has been formed through a process of doubt, investigation, readiness to be self-critical toward one's own beliefs, and an open-minded seeking of religious truth.

Froming and Cooper (1977) found compliance (reporting number of metronome clicks heard over headphones after confederates unanimously responded first) to be negatively correlated to level of moral judgment, \( r = -.31, p < .05 \). In a similar study, Froming (1978) found that subjects in moral judgment stages 3 and 4 complied significantly more than stage 5 subjects in a situation in which their personal count of a series of metronome clicks was
contradicted by a unanimous group.

Malinowski and Smith (1985) found that the lower the moral judgment score, (as measured by the DIT), the more likely a subject was to cheat on academic tests and the sooner he began to cheat. P-scores were correlated, $r = -.48$, $p < .001$, with the number of trials on which subjects cheated. Also, P-scores were positively correlated with how long subjects waited to begin cheating $r = .43$, $p < .001$. Interestingly, of 12 people who did not cheat, 11 were classified as high in moral judgment. However, Malinowski and Smith failed to control for intelligence or academic competence. Thus, these results should be interpreted with caution. Dunivant (1975), in an unpublished doctoral dissertation, also reported the P-score to be effective for predicting resistance to cheating.

Kohlberg's stages 5A and 5B (as measured by the DIT) powerfully predicted volunteering to help with a charity drive (actually attending an envelope-stuffing session). Kohlberg's stages 5A and 5B entered the regression equation (with no other variables and both with positive weights) yielding a multiple $R$ of $R = .80$, $p < .001$ (Tsujimoto & Emmons, 1983). Erkut, Jaquette, and Staub (1981) found that stage 5 subjects (as measured by the DIT) were significantly more likely to help an "ailing" person who needed help than stage 3 and 4 subjects, $t(13) = 3.8516$, $p = .0008$. 
Olejnik (1980) found that adults' induction as a method of reasoning with children was the preferred discipline style of principled-level individuals, while power assertion was preferred by individuals at lower levels of moral development. In another study on discipline and moral development, Bloom (1978) found persons preferring principled reasons for resolving moral dilemmas to have a more democratic-humanistic attitude toward discipline than their less principled reasoning peers.

Whiteman, Zucker, and Grimley (1978) showed a consistent relationship between students' level of moral development on the DIT and their positive attitudes about other people. A one-way analysis of variance showed that those students who had reached the higher (principled) stages of moral development felt more positively about other people than students at lower stages of moral development. P-scores correlated with positive attitudes towards other people, $r = .25$, $p = .001$.

In a study comparing delinquent boys with a comparison group of nondelinquent boys, the DIT revealed significant differences between the groups. The subjects were matched on age, IQ, SES, race, sex, same neighborhood, same school, one-parent vs. two-parent homes, and grades in school. The antisocial predelinquent group's mean P-index on the DIT was 16.9, considerably below that of the matched comparison group mean of 23.7, $t(25) = 3.58$, $p < .001$ (McColgan, Rest,
In a study relating values with moral judgment, Wilson (1983) found that subjects at the post-conventional level of moral judgment ranked significantly higher on the Rokeach Value Survey the values Freedom, Intellectual, Capable and Honest than did subjects at the other levels of moral maturity. Interestingly, they also ranked lower than others the values Pleasure, Salvation, Clean and Polite.

Moral development as measured by the DIT has also been studied in relation to personality. For example, Wahram (1981) found that greater dogmatism was associated with lower levels of moral judgment development. In another study, Polovy (1980) correlated students' P-scores with their scores on the California Personality Inventory (CPI). Subjects who preferred principled levels of moral reasoning were found to be more dependable, rational, creative, intelligent, and accepting of the rules and constraints of society, but at the same time, able to think independently and aware of the need for change than lower stage reasoners. See Rich (1983) for an extensive review of the literature associating moral development with personality variables.

Intelligence and moral thinking are so highly correlated that some have questioned whether high intelligence ensures high moral reasoning (Lickona, 1976). Studies have shown, however, that intelligence is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for moral
reasoning. For example, Kuhn, Langer, & Kohlberg (1976) found all adolescents and adults who scored at stages 5 or 6 to be capable of formal reasoning on Piaget's pendulum and correlation problems, but many persons who were formal-operational on these logical problems failed to show any moral reasoning at the highest, postconventional stages. It seems, then, that the research appears to show that being smart and being moral are not the same. Cognitive power may be needed for principled moral thought, but it is not enough (Lickona, 1976).

Studies on the DIT have been criticized by Kay (1982) to be so confounded with age and education that they lack discriminant validity from these characteristics. In fact, Kay claims the literature suggests that perhaps all the variance attributable to the age-education confound derives from education. However, a number of studies have found predictive validity for the DIT even in samples which are homogeneous on age and education. In the Tsujimoto and Emmons (1983) study mentioned earlier, volunteering behavior was powerfully predicted among subjects who were all introductory psychology students. It can be safely assumed that these students were very similar in both age and education. In other words, among subjects who were basically the same in age and education, the DIT discriminated among the different levels of moral reasoning quite well.

Coder (1975) collected demographic data, measures of
moral judgment, moral comprehension, intelligence, law and 
order orientation and liberalism on 87 adults from ages 25 
to 55. Critical comparisons showed that age did not 
correlate with the DIT, thus ruling age out as an index of 
moral development in adulthood.

Among 47 twelfth grade students, Rest (1973) 
classified eight students as stage 6, nine as stage 5, 
sixteen as stage 4, eleven as stage 3 and three as stage 2 
using Kohlberg's moral judgment interview.

Zeidler (1985) correlated scores from the Test of 
Logical Thinking (TOLT) with scores from the DIT using 99 
randomly selected tenth grade biology students. The TOLT 
consists of 10 items which measure five different modes of 
formal reasoning ability: proportional reasoning, 
controlling variables, probabilistic reasoning, 
correlational reasoning and combinatorial reasoning. All 
five of the formal reasoning variables were significantly 
correlated to postconventional moral reasoning with Pearson 
Correlation Coefficients ranging from .20 to .40. The sum 
of the five formal reasoning variables was significantly 
correlated with the DIT $r = .43$, $p = 0.0001$, using this 
sample which was similar both in age and education.

Olejnik (1980) found clear differentiation among 50 
young adults of similar education (college students between 
18 and 21 years of age) in the preferred discipline style 
of principled-level individuals.

McColgan, Rest, and Pruitt (1983) matched 26 anti-
social predelinquent boys with 26 nondelinquent comparison subjects. The pairs were similar on age, SES, and IQ. The fact that the DIT revealed significant differences between the groups in moral reasoning indicates that the DIT does measure something other than age and education.

Although Kay (1982) has reasonable criticism that age and education confound many studies using the DIT, the studies mentioned here indicate that the DIT does indeed have discriminant validity after age and education have been controlled. In other words, there is still considerable variance which age and education alone cannot explain, and this variance is correlated with relevant moral behavior, attitudes, and cognitive abilities.
Chapter V

Behavioral Implications of Separating 5s and 6s

Most studies using the DIT depend on the P-score to differentiate the higher morally developed (stages 5 & 6) from the lower stages. Little work has been done in discriminating among either the higher or lower stages. Researchers have not used stage 6 as an independent or dependent variable. Rather, they have used the P-score, a combination of stage 5 and stage 6 reasoning. In fact, the DIT is not usually scored for stage 6 (Rich, 1983), perhaps because stage 6s are either rare or difficult to find (Froming & Cooper, 1977). Also, this author has been unable to find real evidence for the discriminative validity between stages 5 and 6 or any direct tests for such validity.

Because of this difficulty with differentiating stage 6, most literature on the high levels of moral reasoning focuses on the "post-conventional" stages. Such a focus allows for consideration of so-called "high stage" reasoners while not demanding the tedious and difficult task of separating the 5s and 6s into their respective stages.

For several reasons, researchers have wandered away from showing that stages 5 and 6 are distinct. Firstly, while the theory of a sixth stage of moral development
makes conceptual sense, practically it has been difficult to find such people. Secondly, the fact that the DIT provides for a measure of determining highly "principled" moral thinkers instead of clearly distinguishing stage 6s indicates either a lack of ability or commitment to find these stage 6 people or a serious, but covert doubt by these researchers that such a stage pragmatically exists. Indeed, Kohlberg's latest manual for scoring his moral reasoning protocols drops stage 6 (Loevinger & Knoll, 1983). Finally, perhaps because of the first two reasons, researchers have shifted their interests to applying Kohlberg's theory and the DIT to practical problems such as antisocial behavior (McCcolgan, Rest, & Pruitt, 1983) and teaching moral education in the schools (Kohlberg & Turiel, 1971). Differentiating stages 5 and 6 has not been important for these practical issues since they concern young persons and delinquents who are at lower levels of moral reasoning.

One may wonder why the distinction of stage 6s should be revived. Even though the literature indicates that the stage 6 is elusive and that such people are rare, this does not mean that such a stage does not exist, nor that the search for such people should be abandoned. Indeed, the fact that such people are so rare increases the need to discover them and learn more about just what characteristics set them apart from the other stages, especially stage 5.
There are two justifications for such a search. The first lies in the presumption that there are different behavioral implications for stage 6 people than even stage 5 people. Stage 6 offers possibilities for moral behavior that stage 5 does not.

Milgram's (1963) obedience study is an example of how stage 6 behavior can be clearly different from stage 5 behavior. In the study an authority figure forces subjects to violate the welfare of another individual for the sake of the experiment. They found that "For stage 3 and 4 subjects, definition of "right" in this situation is synonymous with the dictates of conventional authority, hence there is likely to be little defiance of the experimenter. Despite the differentiation of human rights from conventional obligations at stage 5, these subjects also continue to punish the "learner" because of their sensitivity to a contractual agreement to work on the experiment. Only those capable of stage 6 reasoning, where human rights are differentiated from contractual agreement, can integrate the two claims into a hierarchy in which human rights have a clear priority. Because they are able to conceive of human rights as having precedence over contractual agreements, stage 6 subjects refuse to follow the orders of the experimenter's authority. The empirical results are consistent with this interpretation: 75% of stage 6 subjects defied experimenter's orders, while only 13% of those in lower stages were able to do so" (Erkut et al. 1981, p.3).

In this study no differences were found among people at stages 2, 3, 4, and 5. But these stages as a group differed from stage 6. The results of this study indicate that there can be a major difference between the behavior of a stage 5 person and that of a stage 6 person particularly with regard to the well being of other human beings.
In a study of moral judgments and their relation to attitudes about capital punishment, Kohlberg and Elfenbein (1975) found clear distinctions among the stages of moral development. The authors found that on the whole, the progression through the universal, invariant sequence of moral stages is accompanied by a radical decline in support for capital punishment. This decline occurs largely because, as individuals develop more mature conceptions of justice, they systematically narrow the range of considerations which can justify taking the lives of criminals. At stage 3 and below, almost all the subjects accepted the death penalty; stage 4 subjects were divided on the issue; all the stage 5 subjects rejected capital punishment. There were no stage 6 subjects in this study. The authors were able to show that although all of the stage 5 subjects of this study rejected capital punishment, stage 5 thinking does not necessarily lead one to oppose capital punishment when the assumption is made that it does deter potential murderers. For example, when asked the question, "Is it the same thing for a state to demand a life as it is for you or me to demand a life?", a stage 5 person replied,

"I think it is very similar. I think I could see the existence of the death penalty if it would serve as a real deterrent to some type of crime that would involve life and death. But I don't think anyone has come up with anything that can really prove that it serves as a deterrent." (Kohlberg & Elfenbein, 1975, p. 628)

Beyond stage 5, there is a higher stage of thinking, stage
6, which orients to universal moral principles and respect for individual persons. Because it is higher, stage 6 can resolve the contradictions in attitudes toward capital punishment still found at stage 5. The authors believe that by applying stage 6 principles to the problem of punishment, a theory of punitive justice based on equilibrated (original position) role-taking could be developed. Stage 6 thinking, which provides, in essence, that the justice of penal systems is to be judged from a completely impartial point of view, mandates the abolition of the death penalty on the grounds that it is unjust. Thus while stage 5 people may sometimes accept the death penalty, stage 6 people would never accept it. Again, the implication is that there is a marked distinction between the expected behavior of stage 5 and 6 people.

The differentiation between expected behaviors of stage 6 from stage 5 people was again illustrated by Kohlberg (1973) using the Heinz dilemma described earlier. Kohlberg showed that subjects classified as stage 5 recognized the woman's right to live and the duty of Heinz to steal for his wife, based on contract, even though they might have to go to jail for it. However, the stage 5 subjects recognized no duty to steal for a friend or stranger in the same predicament who equally had a right to life. On the other hand, a stage 6 person not only would steal for his wife, but also for the friend or stranger because "the value of a human life remains the same." The
behavioral implication is that the stage 6 person has to be prepared to go to jail to steal for a friend or acquaintance, but the stage 5 person does not. In other words, the stage 6 person recognizes a compelling duty to act on his/her higher personal principles. There is a "correlative duty" at the sixth stage which is not found at the fifth. Kohlberg's claim from this paper is that a higher or later stage of moral judgment is objectively preferable to or more adequate than an earlier stage of judgment.

As Kohlberg's theory suggests, the studies on capital punishment and obedience in the Milgram situation show that there is not only a more comprehensive moral philosophy with the stage 6 person, but also a greater consistency with that moral philosophy. The quote on capital punishment by the stage 5 subject shows that even at this high stage of moral development, the stage 5 reasoner can behave differently in the same situation depending on which issue he considers. This stage 5 person first said that he thought it is very similar for a state to take a life as it is for an individual to take a life. But then he goes on to say that if the death penalty deters life and death crimes then it is alright. However, the stage 6 person has no trouble in being consistent because his principles are more comprehensive. Capital punishment is unjust regardless of deterring effects because of a solid underlying principle which orients to universal moral
principles and respect for individual persons.

Only stage 6 has an articulated logic that justifies going against the law when it is against one's principles. As Kohlberg (1981) put it, stage 6 "assumes guidance by universal ethical principles that all humanity should follow.

1. Regarding what is right, Stage 6 is guided by universal ethical principles. Particular laws or social agreements are usually valid because they rest on such principles. When laws violate these principles, one acts in accordance with the principle. Principles are universal principles of justice: the equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of human beings as individuals. These are not merely values that are recognized, but are also principles used to generate particular decisions.

2. The reason for doing right is that, as a rational person, one has seen the validity of principles and has become committed to them." (p. 412).

Such guidance by universal ethical principles can explain behaviors referred to as civil disobedience. For example, some people who refused to go to Vietnam and fight were appealing to such a set of universal principles in their own minds although much of society perceived them as simply breaking the law by refusing to obey the government.

A second justification for the present project can be found in the writings of Abraham Maslow and M.A. Howe. Maslow (1971) proposed for research the use of superior specimens as biological assays for studying the best capability that the human species has. In other words, if we want to know of what human beings are capable we should look to this small and selected superior group rather than
to the whole of the population. As Maslow put it,

"If we want to answer the question how tall can the human species grow, then obviously it is well to pick out the ones who are already tallest and study them. If we want to know how fast a human being can run, then it is no use to average out the speed of a 'good sample' of the population; it is far better to collect Olympic gold medal winners and see how well they can do. If we want to know the possibilities for spiritual growth, value growth, or moral development in human beings, then I maintain that we can learn most by studying our most moral, ethical, or saintly people." (Maslow, 1971, p. 7)

It would be to society's benefit to know what characteristics the highest moral reasoners have in common and how they were developed. But to gain a better understanding of the highest moral reasoners, we first must be able to determine who they are.

Similarly, Howe (1982) stated that we have not improved our ability to predict intellectual excellence in individual cases. Even though the precise causes of individual excellence may be unique to each person, if we are to extend our knowledge, then it is beneficial to try to gain a fuller understanding of the causes of outstanding intellectual achievements. Howe further proposed that by intensely examining the lives of intellectually superior persons, insights may be gained about individual growth and development which might otherwise fail to emerge.

For the present paper, the benefit of clearly differentiating stage 6 reasoners can be in helping to easily identify this small portion of the population apart so that they can be studied. However, the previous review of the literature has shown that researchers have not been
very successful in showing who are clearly stage 6 moral reasoners. New items designed to provide such a marked distinction could significantly help the quest for understanding the highest moral reasoners in our culture.

In summary, both the theoretical and empirical literature indicates that there are different behavioral implications for each of Kohlberg's stages of moral development. It also indicates that the DIT is generally a valid and reliable measure of the stages and has been shown to have predictive utility. Although it has been shown to be a good measure, the present literature review indicates that the DIT's ability to differentiate between 5's and 6's is uncertain. Since it would be beneficial to better differentiate between these two stages more clearly, the purpose of this paper is to develop additional stage 6 items to be added to the DIT which can achieve this discrimination.
Chapter VI

Method

New items for the DIT were developed by the author and the chair of this thesis. The criterion for the development of new items was that the new items had to be consistent with the definition of stage 6 found in Table 1. Specifically, the items had to show (implicitly or explicitly) the following three criteria:

1) The choice is made by reference to a clear hierarchy of abstract principles such as justice, reciprocity, equality of human rights, and respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons.

2) Each item had to show a "corresponding duty" to act in harmony with these abstract principles for "only at stage 6 are rights and duties completely correlative" (Kohlberg, 1973).

3) The items had to show full role-reversibility. That is, that the decision is made on the basis of justice as considered by all parties in the story and as seen by a neutral third party.

These three criteria were chosen because Kohlberg has shown them to be three principle elements that differentiate stages 5 & 6 (Kohlberg, 1973). Secondly, these same three elements seem to be largely missing from the principled items on the DIT.
After the new items were written, they were reviewed by other psychologists familiar with Kohlberg's theory. Revisions were made based on comments and suggestions about the new items. The new items were added to the DIT so that each story had a total of two stage 6 items. The new version of the DIT was then administered to people who were considered likely stage 6 reasoners.

Criteria For Successful Scale Development

To help insure that the new items were accepted as clearly distinguishing stage 6 people from the other stages, certain criteria were developed:

I) There should be internal consistency within each story and across stories.

Individuals who choose one stage 6 item should predominantly choose the other stage 6 item from the same story.

As described earlier, the top four issues are rank-ordered according to importance and given 4, 3, 2, and 1 points, respectively. Hypothetically, the perfect stage 6 person should rank-order one stage 6 item as most important (4 points); and the other stage 6 item for that same story should be selected second (3 points). In other words, for each story, the two stage 6 items should be selected higher (more important) than any of the other items by the perfect stage 6 person. Theoretically, it would be possible for the perfect stage 6 person to get a total of 42 points on stage 6 across the six stories ((4 + 3) x 6 = 42). But
since it is unlikely that perfect stage 6 people exist or that 12 perfectly unambiguous stage 6 items could be written, we arbitrarily set a cutoff of 30 points. Thus, if a person received 30 or more points on stage 6, s/he was considered a stage 6 moral reasoner. The probability of someone who is not stage 6 in moral reasoning receiving at least 30 points on the stage 6 level is extraordinarily low.

The computation of the likelihood of scoring 30 or more points on stage 6 with random responding was calculated as follows: On each of the six stories, there are 182 random combinations in which the 14 items can be chosen for the first four choices. The likelihood that zero through seven stage 6 points would be received on each story through random responding is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>90/182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20/182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20/182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22/182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22/182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2/182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2/182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A basic program was written to compute the probability of each possible combination of points from the six stories. For example, the probability of getting 5,5,5,5,5,5 points on the six stories is simply \((4/182)^6\). The program also computed the total number of combinations of points on the six stories which would result in 30 or more stage 6 points (17,304). The sum of these 17,304 individual probabilities which represents an individual's
likelihood of scoring 30 or more by random responding is still only $p < .000009$. Thus, only 9 times out of one million would a person responding randomly score 30 points or more on stage 6 items.\textsuperscript{1} It is highly unlikely that someone who is not predominantly a stage 6 reasoner (and who ranks the items completely at random) will consistently rank-order stage 6 items across the six stories in the first and second most important slots (assuming that the items are true stage 6 items). Thus, a cutoff of 30 points is a very stringent criterion and would reflect very high internal consistency in selecting stage 6 items.

II) **5A and 5B items should be chosen next by stage 6 reasoners**

Subjects who predominantly choose stage 6 items should select a predominance of other P items next (i.e., 5A & 5B items). Kohlberg's theory states that there is an invariant progression upward through the stages with 6 as the highest stage. Thus, the consistent response would be for the stage 6 person to choose items that are closest to his/her way of thinking (i.e., stage 5 items).

To determine that 5A and 5B items are chosen next by stage 6 reasoners, the proportion of remaining points allotted to stages 5, 4, and 3 was determined. The number of points allotted to stage 6 were subtracted from 60. The difference was then divided into the points assigned to stages 5, 4, and 3, respectively. For example, if a participant scored 32 points on stage 6, 14 points on stage
5, 7 points on stage 4, and 5 points on stage 3, of the remaining possible points \((60 - 32 = 28)\), this person would have allotted 50\% to stage 5, 25\% to stage 4, and 18\% to stage 3.

III) Non-stage 6 persons should select stage 6 items only by chance.

If the new stage 6 items are truly stage 6, they should appeal only to stage 6 thinkers. Non-stage 6 students should not list the stage 6 items among the four most important items at more than a chance level since most undergraduates are at stage 3 or 4 in moral reasoning. Kohlberg's theory, and research on that theory (Rest, Turiel, & Kohlberg, 1969) have indicated that persons at the lower stages of moral development typically do not understand or endorse statements which represent higher stages of moral reasoning.

Selection of New Stage 6 Items

The first set of new items developed for the DIT are listed in Table 2. The DIT (with the new items) was administered to 36 introductory psychology students from Western Kentucky University as a pilot test. Any new stage 6 items chosen above a chance level were rejected. By chance alone, each item had a 4 in 14 or 28\% chance of being chosen among the top four items. The standard error of these choices is given by the formula, \(SEM=\sqrt{npq}\). For example, with 36 respondents, an item would be chosen on average \((.28)(36) = 10.08\) times, with a standard error of
2.71. Using a one-tailed test, the probability that an item would be chosen by 9 or more respondents by chance alone is less than 50%. We rejected all items that were selected by more than 10 people or 28% of the respondents.

First Pilot Test

The results of the first pilot test showed that several of the new items were chosen at random levels, but others were chosen quite frequently by the undergraduates (see Table 2). Even though the items were developed according to the criteria outlined earlier, these latter items still appealed to the undergraduate population. For example, the new stage 6 item for the Heinz story (#11) was chosen by 27 out of 36 students or by 75% of the respondents. Such a high percentage is clearly not acceptable as an item for discriminating stage 6 reasoning.

New items that passed the first pilot test were

#10 of the Student story,
#5 and #13 of Escaped Prisoner,
#14 of Webster,

New items which were rejected were:

#11 of Heinz story,
#8 of Doctor's Dilemma,
#11 of Webster,
#8 and #14 of Newspaper.
Table 2
First set of new stage 6 items for DIT and percentage of students who selected each item as first, second, third, and fourth most important (N=56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heinz and the Drug</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Does one person's right to live create an obligation for others to break the law if necessary to save that life?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act towards each other?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Take-Over</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In what situation should a person disrupt an institution to insure justice?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is taking over a building consistent with principles of justice?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Escaped Prisoner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If the law won't treat Mr. Thompson justly, how should one act to insure justice in this situation?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. From whose perspective should Mrs. Jones decide what is just?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctor's Dilemma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What would the doctor's responsibility be after he weighed the value of human life with the patient's right to decide?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is helping to end another's life ever a responsible act of cooperation?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From Rest's original test
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Webster</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Is adhering to the principle of justice more important than following the wishes of the customers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Does a society's responsibility to its minorities create a duty for Mr. Webster?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5.</td>
<td>What individual differences ought to be relevant in deciding how society's roles are filled?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>What is the principal's responsibility after weighing the parents' concerns, the need for an orderly school, and the students' right of free speech?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Does justice require the principal to allow the paper even if parents disapprove and it might cause disorder at school?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The implication of the first pilot test is that some characteristics of some of the new items made them attractive to the lower stage thinkers even though they were developed according to the stage 6 criteria given earlier. A continued search was needed for new stage 6 discriminators.

Interestingly, the frequencies for the original stage 6 items were quite low compared to the new items, an indication that there was something present in the original items that the new items did not have. Upon closer examination, it was evident that the original stage 6 items were more abstract than the new items (i.e., more removed from the specifics of the immediate dilemma). For example, the original stage 6 item for the Heinz story (#9) reads, "What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act towards each other?" On the other hand, the pilot test's stage 6 item for the same story (#11) reads, "Does one person's right to live create an obligation for others to break the law if necessary to save that life?"

The new stage 6 item is more specific to the concept of the story than the original item in that it mentions the "right to life" issue and the issue of breaking the law. Perhaps this specificity made the new items more attractive to the students.

Second Pilot Test

A second group of items was developed according to the same three criteria used for the first group of items, but
which was more abstract than the first group. This test was administered to 30 undergraduate students.

As Table 3 shows, the second new item for the Heinz story (#11) fared much better with only 20% selecting it as compared with 75% in the first pilot test. There were no significant reductions in frequencies among the other items that were chosen too frequently in the first pilot test. Following are new items that passed the second pilot test: #11 of the Heinz story, #13 of Escaped Prisoner.

In addition, #8 of Doctor's Dilemma still was accepted since none of the 30 students selected this issue as either their first or second choice.

Numbers 8 and 14 of the Newspaper story were both too popular with 43% and 40% of the subjects choosing them, respectively. Both items were rejected.

Third Pilot Test

From the first two pilot tests stage 6 items which were considered acceptable for the revised DIT were found for all dilemmas except the Newspaper story. Due to the high percentages of students who selected the stage 6 items for the Newspaper dilemma in both pilot tests, a third pilot test was conducted with only the Newspaper dilemma. Two new stage 6 items were developed for the Newspaper dilemma and then administered to 33 undergraduate introductory psychology students at Western Kentucky University. These two new items and the percentages of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heinz and the Drug</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What duties are created by another person's rights?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*9. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act towards each other?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Take-Over</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In what situation should a person disrupt an institution to insure justice? (Same as first set)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8. Is taking over a building consistent with principles of justice?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Escaped Prisoner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. From what perspective should one decide what justice requires?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How should one act to insure justice in an unjust situation?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctor's Dilemma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. By what principles should one decide what to do in this situation?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*10. Is helping to end another's life ever a responsible act of cooperation?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From Rest's original test
14. What duties does a society's responsibility to its minorities create for individuals?

*5. What individual differences ought to be relevant in deciding how society's roles are filled?

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Webster</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Third set of new stage 6 items for Newspaper story and percentage of students who selected each item as first, second, third, and fourth most important (N=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Is one obligated to defend the right of free speech of someone who is going to abuse that right?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What does justice obligate one to do in this case?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students who selected them are given in Table 4.

Number 8 was chosen by 30% of the subjects which was the lowest percentage for this item of the three pilot tests. Thus, this item was added to the final version of the revised DIT. Number 14 was chosen by 39% of the subjects. The lowest percentage for this item of the three pilot tests was given in the first pilot test (33%). Thus the item used for #14 in the first pilot test was used in the revised DIT.

The set of stage 6 items chosen from the three pilot tests to be used in the final version of the DIT are listed in Table 5 and the final version of the DIT is given in Appendix A.
Table 5
The Final Set of Stage 6 Items

Heinz
9. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act towards each other? (Original item)
11. What duties are created by another person's rights? (2nd pilot test)

Student
8. Is taking over a building consistent with principles of justice? (Original item)
10. In what situation should a person disrupt an institution to insure justice? (Same in 1st & 2nd pilot tests)

Escaped Prisoner
5. If the law won't treat Mr. Thompson justly, how should one act to insure justice in this situation? (1st pilot test)
13. How should one act to insure justice in an unjust situation? (2nd pilot test)

Doctor's Dilemma
8. By what principles should one decide what to do in this situation? (2nd pilot test)
10. Is helping to end another's life ever a responsible act of cooperation? (Original item)
Webster

5. What individual differences ought to be relevant in deciding how society's roles are filled? (Original item)

14. What duties does a society's responsibility to its minorities create for individuals? (2nd pilot test)

Newspaper

8. Is one obligated to defend the right of free speech of someone who is going to abuse that right? (3rd pilot test)

14. Does justice require the principal to allow the paper even if parents disapprove and it might cause disorder at school? (1st pilot test)
Administration of the Revised DIT

The next step of this study was to administer the revised DIT to possible stage 6 reasoners to determine if such reasoners consider the new stage 6 items to be stage 6.

Search Procedure

We expected that stage 6 individuals would be hard to find since, according to Kohlberg's theory, they are rare. However, a judicious procedure was used to select likely stage 6 respondents. We looked in populations where logic indicated stage 6 persons were likely to be found. We looked specifically in the following groups:

1) Individuals who study and/or teach moral philosophy. The assumption was that a high percentage of stage 6 persons should be among this group whose occupations center around the study and research of moral reasoning.

2) Individuals whose life styles indicate a commitment to "stage 6" principled moral issues. This includes those who actively advocate and participate in humanitarian and global causes. People who are committed to such causes are not necessarily stage 6 reasoners. However, this is considered a valid starting point in the search for stage 6 thinkers because such commitments and activities are implied in the definition of stage 6.

3) Religious leaders who appear to have developed
universalistic applications of their religious/moral beliefs; applications which actively address human needs and which promote justice, regardless of religious or social conventions.

4) It was likely that many people we selected to be stage 6 would turn out to be stage 5. Since in Kohlberg's theory a person can recognize one stage above oneself, we used stage 5 individuals to refer us to people who they thought might be stage 6 reasoners. That is, we asked those who scored the most points on stage 6 but who did not make the cutoff of 30 to recommend others.
Chapter VII

Results

Using the preceding criteria in Chapter VI, the revised DIT was given to 35 individuals. Thirty (86%) were returned. Of the 30 DITs completed for this project, three individuals met the cutoff of 30 points on stage 6 (see Table 6). Of these three, one person scored 33 points on stage 6 while the other two participants scored exactly 30. Since the odds by chance were only 9 in a million, it seems fair to say that we found at least 3 persons whose moral reasoning meets our criteria of stage 6. One other person scored 29 on stage 6, another scored 28, and one person scored 26 on stage 6. The remaining participants all scored 24 or below on stage 6.

All three stage 6 participants gave the highest proportion of remaining points to stage 5. The participant who received 33 points on stage 6 allotted 78% of the remaining points to stage 5, 15% to stage 4 and none to stage 3. The first participant who scored 30 points on stage 6 allotted 53% of the remaining points to stage 5, 30% to stage 4 and 10% to stage 3. The second participant who scored 30 on stage 6 allotted 53% of the remaining points to stage 5, 17% to stage 4 and 27% to stage 3. Clearly all three participants predominantly chose stage 5 items after stage 6 items as predicted.
The two participants who received 29 and 28 points on stage 6 also assigned the highest percentage of the remaining points to stage 5, 81% and 84% respectively (see Table 6). Table 7 presents the distribution of responses for all respondents arranged in descending order according to stage 6 responses.
Table 6
Top Stage 6 Respondents And Percentage Of Remaining Points Assigned To Stages 5, 4, 3, & 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Points at Stage 6</th>
<th>Percentage of Remaining Points At:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Raw Scores And Predominant Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5A</th>
<th>5B</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Pdt. Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ten participants scored predominantly stage 6 (i.e., more points were assigned to stage six than to any other stage). Thirteen subjects predominantly scored stage 5. Six subjects scored predominantly stage 4 and one subject scored equally on stages 5 and 6.

Since part of the objective for this study was to develop items that only appealed to stage 6 individuals and not stage 5 people, it was necessary to determine whether the new items appealed to only one of the stages or to both. To do this we looked to see if any items were excluded by stage 6 reasoners and by stage 5 reasoners. Because of the small sample size, the analyses were done by examining frequencies.

Table 8 shows that two items (Webster #5 and Newspaper #8) were each omitted by three out of the top six stage 6 individuals. The remaining stage 6 items were selected consistently by all of the top six stage 6 participants. The fact that those two were omitted by three out of six respondents indicates that those items may not be useful for discriminating stage 6.

Table 9 shows how the stage 6 items that were most popular among the highest stage 6 individuals were ranked by the predominantly stage 5 respondents. All four items were very popular among the stage 5 respondents. Number 10 of Student Take-Over was ranked among the four most important items by 12 out of 13 respondents, or 92%. Number 13 of Escaped Prisoner was selected by 54%, number
Table 8
Stage 6 Items Omitted By
The Highest Stage 6 Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Hz</th>
<th>St</th>
<th>Prs</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>Web</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Stage 5 Respondents' Rankings Of The Stage 6 ItemsWhichWereSelectedConsistentlyBy
The Highest Stage 6 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>St #10</th>
<th>EP #13</th>
<th>Web #14</th>
<th>NP #14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 of Webster by 85%, and number 14 of Newspaper by 69% of the respondents. It seems that these four stage 6 items that were popular among the predominantly stage 6 respondents were also popular among the stage 5 respondents.

As a final test of the new stage 6 items, the revised DIT was given to a cross-section of 36 undergraduates who would not be expected to be principle moral reasoners. Half of the sample was from an upper-level social psychology class and the other half was from an introductory psychology class from Western Kentucky University. The 36 scores on stage 6 ranged from zero to 16 with one exception (24). The median of the stage 6 scores was 7 while the average stage 6 score for the group was 8. The participants' scores on stage 5 ranged from 5 to 29 with a median of 16 and a mean of 17. The results indicate that, as a group, the undergraduates did not select this set of stage 6 items in a pattern consistent with stage 6 thinkers as Kohlberg's theory would predict.

In summary, the results indicate that the new stage 6 items do not seem to clearly differentiate between stages 5 and 6 as they were designed to do. We may have one large pool of principled items that cannot be divided into stages 5 and 6 on the basis of participants' responses.
Chapter VIII
Discussion

Some would say that the effort to clearly differentiate stage 5 people from stage 6 people is not possible in light of how rare such moral reasoners seem to be. It has been the conviction of this author that not only is such a distinction possible, but it is highly worthwhile given the behavioral implications discussed earlier.

The results indicate that the three individuals who made the stage 6 cutoff of 30 points were indeed stage 6 people according to the criteria set forth in this paper. First, as just mentioned, they did meet the stage 6 cutoff. The fact that three participants did make the cutoff is itself strong testimony that there is strong internal consistency among the stage 6 items given that the likelihood of anyone making the cutoff of 30 by chance is .000009.

Second, as predicted, they assigned more weight to stage 5 items than any other stage, except stage 6. Thus, it has been shown that a population can be found for whom the stage 6 criteria defined in this paper are central to their moral reasoning.

Even though three people making the cutoff lends support to the internal consistency of the new stage 6 items, it also indicates that stage 6 people are indeed
rare and hard to find, just as Kohlberg’s theory suggests. Given that stage 6 reasoners are supposed to be so rare, finding three in this study may sound like a lot. However, it should be remembered that the search procedure used to locate the final 30 participants for this study was extremely judicious.

It seems worthwhile to give a brief description of the characteristics of the three individuals who made the stage 6 cutoff. It should be noted, however, that these characteristics are similar to those of the rest of the sample since all participants were chosen according to the same criteria.

The individual who scored the highest on stage 6 is male, in his mid thirties, and currently works as a stock broker. The individual’s higher education consists of a bachelor of arts degree in German and a master’s degree in business administration. Although the individual leads a very active social life, this activity centers around family and church events rather than humanitarian and civil rights issues.

The second participant is also male, in his late thirties, and is currently working toward his Ph.D. in divinity school. Besides giving sermons on a regular basis this participant considers himself a social activist concentrating mainly on criminal justice issues. The participant is also a member of the Democratic Socialist Party.
The third participant who made the cutoff score for stage 6 grew up as the son of a minister. This individual worked as a parish minister for two years before going on to obtain his doctorate in christian ethics from a major American seminary. The individual is now a professor of religion with particular emphasis on christian ethics. The participant has also had a long history of involvement in issues of war and peace, civil rights, and has been active in nuclear arms controls.

Suggestions for Future Research

It might be worthwhile to move the cutoff of 30 for stage 6 down to 27 for two reasons. First, the likelihood of scoring 27 by chance is quite low at .0001. Second, the two individuals who scored 28 and 29 points on stage 6 also assigned the highest percentage of remaining points to stage 5 as did the three participants who scored 30 or above. Perhaps a cutoff of 30 was too stringent.

The next step in this study might be to look for stage 5 item clusters and stage 6 item clusters. That is, is there a certain group or cluster of items that people who are predominantly stage 5 select? Likewise, is there a different group or cluster of items that people who are predominantly stage 6 select? It would be worthwhile to show that the items empirically cluster at either stage 5 or stage 6. However, the very small sample of stage 6 people in this study prevents this statistical analysis.

Although it was not planned as part of this thesis, a
validation step that should be examined is a follow-up interview of the stage 5 and stage 6 respondents using the older form of the MJI which can be scored for stage 6. The convergent validity of the two tests could be used to confirm that the individuals indicated as predominantly stage 6 by the revised DIT are also classified as stage 6 according to the MJI. If the MJI's results are not similar to the revised DIT's, the implication would be that the new items of the DIT are not actually defining stage 6 characteristics. However, if the MJI results confirm the revised DITs' results, then there would be strong support that the new stage 6 items are indeed stage 6.

Additionally, about six of the purest stage 5 respondents (as identified by this study) should also be administered the MJI. This validation step will be done if it is decided to pursue the publication of this study in a professional journal.
OPINIONS ABOUT SOCIAL PROBLEMS

This questionnaire is aimed at understanding how people think about social problems. Different people often have different opinions about questions of right and wrong. There are no "right" answers in the way that there are right answers to math problems. We would like you to tell us what you think about several problem stories. Your answers are confidential.

Please give us the following information:

Name __________________________________________ female
Classification (Circle one) Fresh Soph Jr. Sr. male
Age ______ Class and period __________________________

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

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

If you were Frank, how important would each of these questions be in deciding what car to buy?

Instructions for Part A: (Sample Question)

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

Importance:

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

Instructions for Part B: (Sample Question)

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

MOST IMPORTANT SECOND MOST IMPORTANT THIRD MOST IMPORTANT FOURTH MOST IMPORTANT

5      2     3     1
In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost to make. He paid $20 for the radium and charged $2000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about $1000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So Heinz got desperate and began to think about breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife.

Should Heinz steal the drug? (Check one)

____ Should steal it  ____ Can't decide  ____ Should not steal it

**IMPORTANCE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Whether a community's laws are going to be upheld.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Isn't it only natural for a loving husband to care so much for his wife that he'd steal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is Heinz willing to risk getting shot as a burglar or going to jail for the chance that stealing the drug might help?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Whether Heinz is a professional wrestler, or has considerable influence with professional wrestlers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Whether Heinz is stealing for himself or doing this solely to help someone else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Whether the druggist's rights to his invention have to be respected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Whether the essence of living is more encompassing than the termination of dying, socially and individually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does Heinz think his wife would steal for him if he were dying?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act towards each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Whether the druggist is going to be allowed to hide behind a worthless law which only protects the rich anyhow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What duties are created by another person's rights?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Whether the law in this case is getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Whether the druggist deserves to be robbed for being so greedy and cruel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Would stealing in such a case bring about more total good for the whole society or not?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Most Important

Second Most Important

Third Most Important

Fourth Most Important
At Harvard University, a group of students, called the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), believe that the University should not have an army ROTC program. SDS students are against the war in Vietnam, and the army training program helps send men to fight in Vietnam. The SDS students demand that Harvard end the army ROTC training program as a university course. This would mean that Harvard students could not get army training as part of their regular course work and not get credit for it towards their degree. Agreeing with the SDS students, the Harvard professors voted to end the ROTC program as a university course. But the President of the University stated that he wanted to keep the army program on campus as a course. The SDS students felt that the President was not going to pay attention to the faculty vote or to their demands. So, one day in April, two hundred SDS students walked into the University's administration building, and told everyone else to get out. They said they were doing this to force Harvard to get rid of the army training program as a course.

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

Yes, they should take it over
Can't decide
No, they shouldn't take it over

Importance:

Great Much Some Little No

| 1. Are the students doing this to really help other people or are they doing it just for kicks? |
| 2. Do the students have any right to take over property that doesn't belong to them? |
| 3. Do the students realize that they might be arrested and fined, and even expelled from school? |
| 4. Would taking over the building in the long run benefit more people to a greater extent? |
| 5. Will the students become famous by taking over the building? |
| 6. Whether the president stayed within the limits of his authority in ignoring the faculty vote. |
| 7. Will the takeover anger the public and give all students a bad name? |
| 8. Is taking over a building consistent with principles of justice? |
| 9. Would allowing one student takeover encourage many other student takeovers? |
| 10. In what situation should a person disrupt an institution to insure justice? |
| 11. Did the president bring this misunderstanding on himself by being so unreasonable and uncooperative? |
| 12. Whether running the university ought to be in the hands of a few administrators or in the hands of all the people. |
| 13. Are the students following principles which they believe are above the law? |
| 14. Whether or not university decisions ought to be respected by students. |

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

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

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

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

 IMPORTANCE:

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

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

- Most Important
- Second Most Important
- Third Most Important
- Fourth Most Important
THE DOCTOR'S DILEMMA

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

What should the doctor do? (Check one)

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

IMPORTANCE:

Great  Much  Some  Little  No

1. Whether the woman's family is in favor of giving her the overdose or not.
2. Is the doctor obligated by the same laws as everybody else if giving her an overdose would be the same as killing her?
3. Whether people would be much better off without society regimenting their lives and even their deaths.
4. Whether the doctor could make it appear like an accident.
5. Does the state have the right to force continued existence on those who don't want to live?
6. What is the value of death prior to society's perspective on personal values?
7. Would the doctor lose his license or go to jail if he gave her the overdose?
8. By what principles should one decide what to do in this situation?
9. Whether the doctor has sympathy for the woman's suffering or cares more about what society might think.
10. Is helping to end another's life ever a responsible act of cooperation?
11. Whether only God should decide when a person's life should end.
12. What values the doctor has set for himself in his own personal code of behavior.
13. Can society afford to let everybody end their lives when they want to?
14. Can society allow suicide or mercy killing and still protect the lives of individuals who want to live?

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

Most Important
Second Most Important
Third Most Important
Fourth Most Important
Mr. Webster was the owner and manager of a gas station. He wanted to hire another mechanic to help him, but good mechanics were hard to find. The only person he found who seemed to be a good mechanic was Mr. Lee, but he was Chinese. While Mr. Webster himself didn't have anything against Orientals, he was afraid to hire Mr. Lee because many of his customers didn't like Orientals. His customers might take their business elsewhere if Mr. Lee was working in the gas station. When Mr. Lee asked Mr. Webster if he could have the job, Mr. Webster said that he had already hired somebody else. But Mr. Webster really had not hired anybody, because he could not find anybody who was a good mechanic besides Mr. Lee.

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

Should have hired Mr. Lee  Can't decide  Should not have hired him

**IMPORTANCE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Much Some Little No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the owner of a business have the right to make his own business decisions or not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Whether there is a law that forbids racial discrimination in hiring for jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whether Mr. Webster is prejudiced against Orientals himself or whether he means nothing personal in refusing the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Whether hiring a good mechanic or paying attention to his customers' wishes would be best for his business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What individual differences ought to be relevant in deciding how society's roles are filled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Whether the greedy and competitive capitalist system ought to be completely abandoned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do a majority of people in Mr. Webster's society feel like his customers or are a majority against prejudice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Whether hiring capable men like Mr. Lee would use talents that would otherwise be lost to society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Would refusing the job to Mr. Lee be consistent with Mr. Webster's own moral beliefs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Could Mr. Webster be so hard-hearted as to refuse the job, knowing how much it means to Mr. Lee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Would hiring Mr. Lee increase his business or service to the public?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Whether the Christian commandment to love your fellow man applies in this case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If someone's in need, shouldn't he be helped regardless of what you get back from him?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What duties does a society's responsibility to its minorities create for individuals?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Most Important

Second Most Important

Third Most Important

Fourth Most Important
Fred, a senior in high school, wanted to publish a mimeographed newspaper for students so that he could express many of his opinions. He wanted to speak out against the war in Vietnam and to speak out against some of the school's rules, like the rule forbidding boys to wear long hair. When Fred started his newspaper, he asked his principal for permission. The principal said it would be all right if before every publication Fred would turn in all his articles for the principal's approval. Fred agreed and turned in several articles for approval. The principal approved all of them and Fred published two issues of the newspaper in the next two weeks. But the principal had not expected that Fred's newspaper would receive so much attention. Students were so excited by the paper that they began to organize protests against the hair regulation and other school rules. Angry parents objected to Fred's opinions. They phoned the principal telling him that the newspaper was unpatriotic and should not be published. The principal must now decide whether or not to stop the paper.

Should the principal stop the newspaper? (Check one)

| Should stop it | Can't decide | Should not stop it |

**IMPORTANCE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the principal more responsible to students or to the parents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did the principal give his word that the newspaper could be published for a long time, or did he just promise to approve the newspaper one issue at a time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Would the students start protesting even more if the principal stopped the newspaper?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When the welfare of the school is threatened, does the principal have the right to give orders to students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the principal have the freedom of speech to say &quot;no&quot; in this case?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If the principal stopped the newspaper, would he be preventing full discussion of important problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Whether the principal's order would make Fred lose faith in the principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is one obligated to defend the right of free speech of someone who is going to abuse that right?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Whether Fred was really loyal to his school and patriotic to his country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What effect would stopping the paper have on the student's education in critical thinking and judgments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Whether Fred was in anyway violating the rights of others in publishing his own opinions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Whether the principal should be influenced by some angry parents when it is the principal that knows best what is going on in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Whether Fred was using the newspaper to stir up hatred and discontent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Does justice require the principal to allow the paper even if parents disapprove and it might cause disorder at school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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