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The present research is an idiographic study of the moral development of six individuals at the highest stage of morality, Kohlberg's (1958, 1976) stage six. The subjects range in age from an 83 year old retired geography professor to a 21 year old bright college senior. The life of each individual was examined through a three to four hour semi-structured interview. Questions were designed to cover a wide spectrum of the individual's life, such as early family influences, religion, critical life events, and influential people and writers, while affording each subject the opportunity to tell his or her own story. The results are presented as case studies. Commonalities between subjects are discussed and related to Kohlberg's theory.

The individual differences are impressive, although there are some commonalities. The subjects' backgrounds ranged from growing up in a southern, rural village to early life in a large northeastern city. The childhood homes and environments of each subject were also different. One home was described as a "concentration camp," while another was characterized as loving and supportive. In the development of their respective moral philosophies, some subjects drew upon the writings of unique writers, such as Emerson and
Thoreau, while others drew upon religious teachings, communal experiences and drug experimentation. Generally, however, the subjects evidence a strong religious background and influence. They have achieved ego identity. They generally have liberal political outlooks. Concern for others is central in their moral philosophies. On the 16-PF, the subjects tend to be tender-minded, imaginative, intelligent and self-assured.
Chapter I

Introduction

This study is an investigation of the character traits, dispositions, family patterns, and life experiences of those who have reached the highest level of moral reasoning. The question is: "What makes a "good" person?" An idiographic approach will be adopted, following Maslow's "good specimen" model (1971), to answer the question. Basically, Maslow recommended selecting superior specimens for studying human being's fullest capabilities. For example, if we want to determine how tall the human species can grow, then it is reasonable to identify and study humans who are already among the tallest. Similarly, if we want to know the potential for moral development, we can learn most from studying morally mature people.

The study of moral development derives in large part from the work of Lawrence Kohlberg. Since the present study will focus on the personal qualities of morally mature people, it is necessary to first summarize Kohlberg's theory and then review what is known of the relations between moral reasoning and personality.

In his dissertation, Lawrence Kohlberg (1958, 1976) proposed a theory of moral development following a cognitive-developmental model. His theory seeks to account
for the structure of beliefs about right and wrong, instead of the content of these beliefs. According to Kohlberg, moral development is primarily concerned with how one believes, not what. The sequential stages of moral development are universal in that all persons, regardless of culture, experience the same developmental stages. 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. Presumably, there is upward movement through the stages, with stage one being the lowest level of moral development and stage six being the highest. Each level and stage as defined by Kohlberg is described in the Table 1 below.
Table 1

Kohlberg's Definitions of Moral Stages

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 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 of 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. The 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 heart, 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.

Each stage can be further subdivided into two substages, type A and type B (Kohlberg, 1976). Type A's are oriented to the normative order and utility consequences of an act. Type A persons focus on the rules of the social or moral order when making a moral decision. Although Type B's are aware of the rules, they make a judgment as to the fairness of the rules. B's are more internal, making moral judgments upon the basis of what is personally acceptable and what ought to be. The type B substage is regarded as more mature than the A substage. B's have a more balanced social perspective. 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.

Moral development has been studied extensively, with a portion of the research being devoted to the relationship between personality and stages of moral development. Table 2 summarizes the principle findings of all available studies which have related moral development and personality. Studies of postconventional moral reasoning will be discussed in the section following Table 2. Although the Table also presents research on lower levels of moral reasoning these studies will not be discussed because the focus of this study is the highest level of morality.
TABLE 2
Summary of Studies Relating Personality Variables To Moral Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Principle Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Motivation 1</td>
<td>Sperry, L., Choy, C. (1975)</td>
<td>40 boys &amp; 40 girls selected from the senior classes of two Catholic high schools.</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: Resultant Achievement Motivation Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression (measure: Hogan-Dickstein Measure of Moral Values)</td>
<td>Davis, G.H. (1974)</td>
<td>Student &amp; non-student men and women</td>
<td>Subjects obtaining high scores on personality factors analogous to &quot;primitive&quot; morality also obtained high scores on the measures of trait aggression and hostility (measure: Buss Aggression, Hostility, and Guilt Inventories).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority 3</td>
<td>Johnson, J.A., Hogan, R., Zunderman, A.B. (1981)</td>
<td>205 male &amp; 275 female college freshmen &amp; sophomores (study was replicated using 46 females and 43 males).</td>
<td>Persons endorsing the &quot;ethics of social responsibility&quot; had more favorable attitudes toward authority than did those endorsing the &quot;ethics of personal conscience.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism 2</td>
<td>Speidell, P.F. (1978)</td>
<td>78 female &amp; 54 male adult evening college students.</td>
<td>Moral reasoning was found to be significantly correlated with all five scales of authoritarian-related personality traits, and all four scales of authoritarian-related family traits. Subjects displaying high levels of moral reasoning appeared less rigid in personality and less conventional in their attitudes toward family structure and relationships (measure: Traditional Family Ideology Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (measure: Carroll Test of Moral Reasoning for 7th grade sample &amp; DIT for college sample)</td>
<td>Zavadovsky, P.C. (1978)</td>
<td>92 7th grade students &amp; 96 junior college students</td>
<td>For the 7th grade sample autonomy showed a statistically significant linear relationship with moral development (measure: subtest of the California Test of Personality).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Development 2</td>
<td>Cauble, M.A. (1976)</td>
<td>45 male &amp; 45 female undergraduates.</td>
<td>Integrated formal thinkers used 67% principled moral reasoning. Early formal thinkers used 69% principled reasoning. Subjects in the transitional stage had 63% principled reasoning. Concrete thinkers used 6% principled moral reasoning. (measure: three Piagetian formal operations tasks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Development 1</td>
<td>Jurkovic, G.J., Prentice, N.M. (1977)</td>
<td>36 juvenile delinquents &amp; 12 non-delinquents, mean age 15.68.</td>
<td>Moral maturity scores were significantly related to scores on a Piagetian pendulum task ($r=0.31, p&lt;0.03$), and the Piagetian balance task ($r=0.55, p&lt;0.001$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Development 1</td>
<td>Rowe, I., Marcia, J.E. (1980)</td>
<td>26 college students &amp; non-academic campus staff (20 males, 6 females).</td>
<td>Results confirmed the expectation that formal operations would be a necessary but not sufficient condition for the development of postconventional thought (measure: Piaget's beam balance and colored liquids combinations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Development 1</td>
<td>Tomlinson-Keasey, C. Keasey, C.B. (1974)</td>
<td>30 6th grade girls &amp; 24 college coeds.</td>
<td>Formal operations and principled moral reasoning were correlated .58 (p&lt;.01) for the coeds; and .60 (p&lt;.01) for the 6th grade girls. Separate one-way ANOVA's showed that the mean moral judgment scores of the girls and coeds differed significantly as a function of their stage of conceptual development: girls' F (2, 27) = 7.71, p&lt;.01; and coeds' F (2, 21) = 3.69, p&lt;.05. The results of this study support the hypothesis that there is a time delay between the attainment of formal operations and its application to moral reasoning. Results also support the hypothesis that formal operations are not a sufficient conditions for the emergence of principled moral reasoning (measure: three formal operations tasks - the pendulum, balance and flexibility problems).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity 3</td>
<td>MacDonald, A.P. (1971)</td>
<td>44 male undergraduate students.</td>
<td>Stronger endorsement of the ethics of social responsibility was found to be positively related to conformity (r=.45, p&lt;.01) (measure: MacDonald's Conformity Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity 1</td>
<td>Doherty, W.J., Corsini, D.</td>
<td>146 female college sophomores.</td>
<td>Creativity scores had a significant positive association with moral maturity scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity 1</td>
<td>Sharfman, B.N.</td>
<td>315 Jewish 12th grade students.</td>
<td>Creativity was significantly related to moral judgment at the .01 level (measure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity 2</td>
<td>Ross, B.L.</td>
<td>167 community college students.</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: Guilford's tests - Divergent Production, Fluency and Flexibility).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1978)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism 1</td>
<td>Alker, H.A., Poppen, P.J.</td>
<td>192 undergraduates (103 males, 89 females).</td>
<td>There was a significant negative correlation between dogmatism and principled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1973)</td>
<td></td>
<td>moral reasoning ($r = -.35, p &lt; .05$, measure: Rokeach Dogmatism Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism (mea-</td>
<td>Davis, G.H.</td>
<td>Student &amp; non-student men and women.</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: Rokeach Dogmatism Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sure: Hogan</td>
<td>(1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickstein Mea-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sure of Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism (mea-</td>
<td>Spector, M.</td>
<td>300 children in grades 3, 5, &amp; 7, consisting</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: dogmatism scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sure: moral</td>
<td>(1974)</td>
<td>of 50 boys and 50 girls at each grade level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relativism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism 2</td>
<td>Wahrman, I.S. (1981)</td>
<td>124 college students from a Roman Catholic college, an Orthodox Jewish college, and several public and private colleges.</td>
<td>Dogmatism correlated .153 with moral judgment, p&lt;.04 (measure: Rokeach Dogmatism Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Development 1</td>
<td>Lambert, H.I. (1972)</td>
<td>35 11-year-old children, 24 15-year-old children, 15 male young adults ranging in age from 20 to 27, 14 members of the Dept. of Psychology, Illinois State Psychiatric Institute ranging in age from 26 to 60, 5 social workers ranging in age from 25 to 50, 14 graduate students ranging in age from 21 to 60.</td>
<td>Pearson product-moment correlation between the total protocol rating on the Loevinger’s Sentence Completion Test and Kohlberg’s Moral Maturity Test was .80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Identity 2</td>
<td>Cauble, M.A. (1976)</td>
<td>45 male &amp; 45 female undergraduates.</td>
<td>A significant correlation between ego identity and moral development was obtained (r= .40, p&lt;.001, measure: Inventory of Personality Development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Identity 3</td>
<td>Hayes, J.M. (1978)</td>
<td>66 male college students aged 18 to 22.</td>
<td>Significant differences were found among identity status groups in scores of the Survey of Ethical Attitudes (p&lt;.001, measure: Marcia's Identity Status Interview and Simmon's Identity Achievement Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Identity</td>
<td>Podd, M. (1972)</td>
<td>112 junior &amp; senior male undergraduates.</td>
<td>Those subjects who achieved an ego identity were usually characterized by the most mature level of moral judgment, while those with a relative lack of ego identity were generally characterized by either the least mature level of moral judgment or a transitional period between moderate and highly mature moral reasoning. People undergoing an identity crisis were found to be unstable and inconsistent in their moral reasoning (measure: Marcia's Identity Status Interview).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Identity</td>
<td>Rowe, I., Marcia, J.E. (1980)</td>
<td>26 college students and non-academic campus staff (20 males, 6 females).</td>
<td>A significant relationship between identity and post-conventional moral reasoning was obtained (measure: Marcia's Ego Identity Status Interview).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Stage 1</td>
<td>Haan, N., Stroud, J., Holstein, C. (1973)</td>
<td>58 &quot;hippies&quot; ranging in age from 16 to 35.</td>
<td>N.S. (ego stage determined by psychiatric interview and Loevinger's Sentence Completion Test).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy 1</td>
<td>Kalle, R.J., Suls, J. (1978)</td>
<td>90 male college students.</td>
<td>A statistically significant correlation between stage 4 moral reasoning and empathy was obtained ($r = .276$, $p &lt; .05$, measure: Mehrabian and Epstein's 33-item Empathy Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy 2</td>
<td>Zavadowsky, P.C., (1978)</td>
<td>92 7th grade students and 96 junior college students.</td>
<td>Empathy, autonomy, and socialization (taken as a unit) were significantly related to dominant stage of moral development (measure: Mehrabian - Epstein's Empathy Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Independence-Dependence 1</td>
<td>Bloomberg, M., Soneson, S. (1976)</td>
<td>36 female undergraduates.</td>
<td>Chi-square test yielded significantly more subjects in the field independent internal group at stage 5 than would be expected by chance ($X^2 = 9.00$, df=1, $p &lt; .005$). The field independent-internal group was higher in moral maturity (362.11) than other groups (field dependent-internal, field independent-externals, field dependent-externals) who, in turn, did not differ significantly among themselves (m=272.89) (measures: Rod and Frame Test &amp; Rotter's Internal-External Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Independence-Dependence 2</td>
<td>Goldman, S.S. (1978)</td>
<td>42 undergraduate students.</td>
<td>Field independent females obtained a higher $P$-score than field dependent subjects (measure: Group Embedded Figures Test).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Independence-Dependence 1</td>
<td>Jones, J.A. (1974)</td>
<td>108 high school students.</td>
<td>Preconventional adolescents were more field dependent than were conventional and post-conventional students (measure: Group Embedded Figures Test).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt 1</td>
<td>Ruma, E.H., Mosher, D.L. (1967)</td>
<td>36 delinquent male adolescents age 15 - 17.</td>
<td>Moral judgment stage was significantly related to the Mosher Guilt Inventory ($r=.55, p&lt;.01$), the content analysis for speech ($r=.47, p&lt;.01$), and the global clinical rating of the transgression interview ($r=.43, p&lt;.01$) (measures: Mosher Guilt Scale, content analysis of responses, speech disturbances in the transgression interview, and global clinical rating of the transgression interview).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Complexity 2</td>
<td>Collins, L.J. (1978)</td>
<td>Education students from two schools, 102 from the first school and 96 from the second school.</td>
<td>Integrative complexity was found to be significantly related to stage of moral development at one school but not the other (measure: Tuckman's ITI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence 1</td>
<td>Doherty, W., Corsini, D. (1976)</td>
<td>146 female college sophomores.</td>
<td>SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) verbal scores correlated significantly with moral maturity scores ($r=.38, p&lt;.05$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Eisenberg-Berg, N. (1979)</td>
<td>72 students in grades 9, 11, &amp; 12.</td>
<td>Scholastic aptitude scores were significantly correlated to level of more, for males judgment ($r=.57$, $p&lt;.001$, measure: Iowa Test of Educational Development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(measure: 4 pro-social moral reasoning stories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.Q. is indirectly related to moral judgment (measure: California Test of Basic Skills).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence 1</td>
<td>Haan, N., Stroud, J., Holstein, C. (1973)</td>
<td>58 &quot;hippies&quot; ranging in age from 16 to 35.</td>
<td>There was a correlation between level of moral judgment and intelligence (measure: subject's cumulative records).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence 1</td>
<td>Harris, S., Mussen, P., Rutherford, E. (1976)</td>
<td>33 5th grade boys approximately 10½ years of age.</td>
<td>A significant correlation between moral judgment and intelligence was obtained ($r=.52$, $p&lt;.01$, measure: vocabulary items taken from the Stanford Achievement Test).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence 2</td>
<td>Hilton, J.M. (1978)</td>
<td>195 11th grade students.</td>
<td>Intelligence was related to level of moral maturity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence 1</td>
<td>Jones, J.A. (1974)</td>
<td>108 high school students.</td>
<td>Intelligence was significantly correlated with moral judgment for males ($r=.31$, $p&lt;.05$), for females ($r=.39$, $p&lt;.01$) and for the total sample ($r=.40$, $p&lt;.01$, measure: Henmon-Nelson I.Q.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control 1</td>
<td>Alker, H.A., Poppen, P.J. (1973)</td>
<td>192 undergraduates (103 males, 99 females).</td>
<td>A significant negative correlation between principled moral reasoning and external locus of control was obtained (r=-.40, p&lt;.05, measure: Rotter's Internal-External Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control 2</td>
<td>Bloomberg, M. (1974)</td>
<td>53 undergraduates.</td>
<td>Internals chose a significantly greater average percentage of items which exemplify stage 6 thinking, 8.7% (t=2.12, df=51, p&lt;.05, measure: Rotter's Internal-External Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control 1</td>
<td>Bloomberg, M., Soneson, S. (1976)</td>
<td>36 female undergraduates.</td>
<td>Chi-square test yielded significantly more subjects in the field independent-internal group at stage 5 than would be expected by chance (X²=9.00, df=1, p&lt;.005). The field independent-internal group was higher in moral maturity (362.11) than other groups (field dependent-internal, field dependent-externals, and field independent-externals) who, in turn, did not differ signifi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control 2</td>
<td>Collins, L.J. (1978)</td>
<td>Education students from two schools, 102 from the first school, 96 from the second school.</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: Rotter's Internal-External Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control 2</td>
<td>Dortzbach, J.R. (1976)</td>
<td>185 adults ages 25 to 71.</td>
<td>Obtained correlations between LC-E and moral judgment scores were: $r = -0.211$, $p &lt; 0.002$ with modal stage score: $r = -0.167$, $p &lt; 0.01$ with P-score (measure: Norwicki &amp; Strickland I-E Test).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control 2</td>
<td>Goldman, S.S. (1978)</td>
<td>42 undergraduates.</td>
<td>Internal LOC was positively correlated with postconventional stages of moral reasoning ($r = 0.28$, $p &lt; 0.05$, measure: Rotter's Internal-External Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Gutkin, D.C., Suls, J. (1979)</td>
<td>184 undergraduates.</td>
<td>Hogan’s Survey of Ethical Attitudes was significantly and positively correlated with Collin's revision (1974) of Rotter's Internal-External Scale ($r = 0.378$, $p &lt; 0.01$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control 1</td>
<td>Jones, J.A. (1974)</td>
<td>108 high school students.</td>
<td>Preconventional students expressed a greater belief in fatalism control than the conventional and postconventional students (measure: Internality-Externality Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control 2</td>
<td>Ross, B.L. (1978)</td>
<td>167 community college students.</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: Reid-Ware Three Factor Internal-External Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Snyder, W. (1974)</td>
<td>College students.</td>
<td>The relationship between LOC to moral choice was significant in response to 3 dilemmas on the DIT (measure: Modified I-E Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control 2</td>
<td>Trainotti-Greiner, M.M. (1978)</td>
<td>102 college students.</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: Reid-Ware Three Factor Internal-External Scale).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism 1</td>
<td>Sawyer, J.C. (1977)</td>
<td>64 female subjects 17 to 27 years of age.</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: Christie &amp; Geis's Test of Machiavellianism).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPI (measure:</td>
<td>Brown, P.M. (1976)</td>
<td>39 males in upper-division college classes</td>
<td>Persons at level II moral judgment scored highest on the social-desirability (K scale) of the MMPI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Dilemma Inventory, adapted from that used by Haan, Smith and Block)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principal Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Orientation</td>
<td>Wilson, J.P., Wilson, S.B.</td>
<td>110 male undergraduates ages 18 to 25</td>
<td>Mean moral maturity score for esteem-oriented subjects (M=478, SD=47.14) was signifi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(measure: Maitland Moral</td>
<td>(1977)</td>
<td></td>
<td>cantly higher than that found for safety-oriented subjects (M=378, SD=38.87, t=6.95,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df=42, p&lt;.0005, measure: Aronoff Sentence Completion Test).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Structure</td>
<td>Wilmoth, G.</td>
<td>80 adult students.</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: Personal Orientation Inventory).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization 1</td>
<td>Gruver, E.W.</td>
<td>57 community college students.</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization 1</td>
<td>Wilmoth, G.</td>
<td>80 adult students.</td>
<td>Being reserved, assertive, and tender-minded increased as moral development increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1977)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginativeness, experimentingness, and self-sufficiency also increased as moral de-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>velopment increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept</td>
<td>Benninga, J.S.</td>
<td>40 children between the ages of 5 years-1</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: &quot;I Feel...Me Feel&quot; Self Concept Appraisal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1977)</td>
<td>month, and 6 years-6 months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept</td>
<td>Blackner, G.Y.</td>
<td>High school &amp; post high school subjects</td>
<td>Significant relationships were found between preference for principled levels of moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td>judgment and certain self-concept variables. The high school groups responded dif-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ferently from the post high school groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept 1</td>
<td>Harris, S., Mussen, P., Rutherford, E. (1976)</td>
<td>33 5th grade boys, approximately 10½ years old.</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: 70 statements adapted from Coopersmith by Perkins and Shannon).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept 2</td>
<td>Trainotti-Greiner, M.M. (1978)</td>
<td>102 college students.</td>
<td>Positive correlation coefficients ranging from .20 to .58 were reported between DIT-P-cores and 11 16-PF factors (outgoing, bright, stable, assertive, expedient, venturesome, sensitive, imaginative, forthright, self-assured, and experimenting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Gutkins, D.C., Suls, J. (1979)</td>
<td>184 undergraduates.</td>
<td>A positive correlation between the Snyder Self-Monitoring Scale and stage 4 morality (as assessed by the DIT) was obtained ($r = .393$, $p &lt; .01$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (measure: Moral Judgment Test)</td>
<td>Benninga, J.S. (1977)</td>
<td>40 children between the ages of 5 year-1 month, and 6 years-6 months.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex 1</td>
<td>Poppen, P.J. (1974)</td>
<td>104 college males &amp; females.</td>
<td>More males than females were postconventional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (measure: interview technique first developed by Piaget)</td>
<td>Rosenbrough, T.L. (1976)</td>
<td>2nd &amp; 4th grade students.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex 2</td>
<td>Ross, B.L. (1978)</td>
<td>167 community college students.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex 1</td>
<td>Schnurer, G.H. (1977)</td>
<td>50 male &amp; 50 female college undergraduates, ages 19 to 24.</td>
<td>Males attained higher levels of moral reasoning when compared to females. The moral reasoning of women was more pragmatic, stereotyped, and immature, while the reasoning of men appeared more vigorous, autonomous, and independent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex 1</td>
<td>Weisbroth, S.P. (1970)</td>
<td>37 male &amp; 41 female college graduates, ages 21 to 39.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (measure: Carroll Test of Moral Reasoning)</td>
<td>Zavadowsky, P.C. (1978)</td>
<td>92 7th grade students &amp; 96 students from a junior college.</td>
<td>Males significantly predominated at stages 2 &amp; 3, while females clustered at the principled stages. This finding seemingly stands in opposition to findings reported by Kohlberg &amp; Kramer who found that adult females stabilize at stage 3 and adult males stabilize at stage 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Guilt 1</td>
<td>D’Augelli, J.F., Cross, H.J.</td>
<td>119 unmarried college women</td>
<td>Subjects at stage 4 were significantly higher on sex guilt than those at the other stages, ( F(2, 114) = 24.5, p &lt; .001 ), measure: Forced-Choice Guilt Inventory, Mosher, 1968.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76 unmarried college couples</td>
<td>Partners who were in couples in which both were oriented at the law and order stage scored significantly higher on sex guilt than partners in couples in which both were oriented at the social contract stage or personal concordance stage, ( F(7, 52) = 3.05, p &lt; .01 ), and ( F(8, 54) = 3.01, p &lt; .01 ), for men and women, respectively (measure: Forced-Choice Guilt Inventory, Mosher, 1968).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Role Development 2</td>
<td>Wilson, S.L. (1978)</td>
<td>161 male &amp; female undergraduate students.</td>
<td>N.S. (measure: Bem’s Sex Role Inventory).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure of Moral Values)</td>
<td>Zavadowsky, P.C. (1978)</td>
<td>92 7th grade students &amp; 96 junior college students.</td>
<td>Autonomy, socialization, and empathy (taken as a unit) were significantly related to dominate stage of moral development (measure: Socialization subtest on the California test of Personality).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Principle Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jurcovic, G.J., Prentice, N.M.</td>
<td>36 juvenile delinquents &amp; 12 non-delinquents, mean age = 15.68.</td>
<td>Moral maturity scores were significantly related to scores on the Vocabulary sub- test of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (r=.56, p&lt;.001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Ability 1</td>
<td>Sperry, L., Choy, E. (1975)</td>
<td>40 boys &amp; 40 girls selected from the senior classes of two Catholic high schools.</td>
<td>Verbal comprehension correlated significantly with moral development at the .05 level for combined data and for the girls' data separately, but not for the boys' data separately (measure: Comprehension subtest of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because many researchers fail to mention the exact stage or level of their subjects' moral development (as seen in Table 2), it is difficult to identify research which has dealt directly with postconventional subjects. If Kohlberg is correct in his assumption that most adults function at stages three and four, then it seems likely that most studies use conventional subjects with only a few postconventional subjects.

The few studies of postconventional moral reasoning have found some commonalities between postconventional subjects. Most research in the area of cognitive development and its relation to moral development has concluded that there is a significant positive relationship between formal operations and principled moral reasoning, and that the attainment of formal operations is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the development of postconventional thought (Tomlinson-Keasey and Keasey, 1974; Cauble, 1976; Rowe and Marcia, 1980). Tomlinson-Keasey and Keasey also found a time delay between the attainment of formal operations and its application to moral reasoning.

The attainment of ego identity is also positively related to postconventional moral development. In Podd's (1972) study of the relationship between ego development and moral development, subjects who had achieved an ego identity were usually characterized by the most mature level of moral judgment. Rowe and Marcia (1980) also found
a significant relationship between ego identity and postconventional moral reasoning.

Research has shown that postconventional subjects tend to have an internal locus of control (Alker and Poppen, 1973; Goldman, 1978). Bloomberg (1974) found that subjects having an internal locus of control chose a significantly greater percentage of items which exemplify stage six thinking. In another study, Bloomberg and Soneson (1976) examined field independence-dependence and locus of control in relationship to moral development. They found significantly more subjects in the field-independent internal group at stage five than would be expected by chance ($\chi^2=9.00$, df=1, $p<.005$) Other researchers, however, have failed to find a significant relationship between locus of control and postconventional moral reasoning (Hanson, 1977; Collins, 1978; Ross, 1978; Trainotti-Greiner, 1978).

There are contradictory findings on the relationship of gender to postconventional moral reasoning. Poppen (1974) found more males than females were postconventional in his study of 104 college males and females. Zavadowsky (1978) in a study of seventh grade students and junior college students, however, reported that females clustered at the principled stages of moral reasoning, while males significantly predominated at stages two and three.

Alker and Poppen (1973) found a significant negative relationship between dogmatism and postconventional moral
reasoning \((r=-.35, p<.05)\). In a study of the relationship between authoritarianism and moral development, Speidell (1978) found subjects who displayed a high level of moral reasoning appeared less rigid in personality and in their attitudes toward family structure and relationships than those functioning at lower levels of moral reasoning.

In most studies of postconventional subjects the subjects' exact stages of moral development have usually been unspecified. As a consequence, the label "postconventional" in these studies may refer to stage five subjects only, or to an undifferentiated mixture of stage five and six subjects. There are, however, differences between the two stages in their moral orientation, as may be seen in Table 1, and there may also be differences in the developmental and personality antecedents of the two stages.

The reason for the lack of specificity regarding the stages of those at the highest level of moral development is simple: most postconventional subjects are at stage five; pure stage six persons are rare. Thus, when postconventional subjects are used, they probably cluster at the fifth stage of moral development. Separating the few subjects who may fall at stage six from other postconventional subjects may be considered statistically meaningless. In fact, Kohlberg's latest system does not score for stage six. Additionally, the Defining Issues Test (DIT, Rest, 1979), the most widely used objective test
for measuring one's level of moral development, is not usually scored for stage six (the DIT yields a P-score representing the percentage of principled reasoning used by the subject.) In short, those at the highest levels of moral reasoning have been the least studied. Although these people are rare, they do exist and can be located. It is particularly important to understand them, since we still know so little about what makes "good" people.

This study is a descriptive analysis of a small group of persons at the highest level of moral reasoning. The life of each of these persons was studied in considerable detail. The justification for this research parallels both Maslow's reasoning and Howe's recent arguments for studying the development of intellectually outstanding individuals (1982). Essentially, Howe argues that we have made considerable progress toward understanding the effects of environmental influences in children's early lives, but we have not improved our ability to predict intellectual excellence in individual cases. Precise causes of individual excellence may be unique to each person. Nevertheless, 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. By intensely examining the lives of intellectually superior persons, insights may be gained about individual growth and development which might otherwise fail to emerge.

Similar arguments can be made for the study of morally
mature individuals. We are currently unable to predict who will reach the highest level of moral reasoning, although we can document the influence of certain environmental influences (e.g., educational level and socialization techniques). The causes underlying the attained level of moral reasoning may be different for each person. Consequently, it may be impossible to explain why any particular individual achieves the highest level of moral judgment. However, if we want to further our knowledge of moral development, then gaining a better understanding of morally mature individuals is desirable. An intense study of the lives of selected morally mature persons may provide new insights into how such persons move from one moral stage to the next and, eventually, to the highest level of moral thought.

The present study differs from Howe's research paradigm in several respects, however. Howe proposes an objective study of intellectually outstanding historical figures using biographical evidence. The present study uses a phenomenological approach and draws on the clinical method. Each individual was asked to tell his or her own story. Each gave a retrospective account of the paths and influences which led him or her to "stage six."
Chapter II

Method

Instruments

A modified version of the DIT (Appendix A) was developed for use as a screening device in identifying individuals who have attained the highest level of moral development. Five of the DIT stories contain only one stage six statement for consideration, the remaining story has none. The lack of stage six statements was perceived to be a problem given that this research is essentially concerned with identifying stage six people. Therefore, Dr. McFarland, chair of the committee guiding this research, created an additional item for each story which was believed to be a stage six consideration. The additional items were then added to the list of issues for each story. The modified DIT was administered to approximately 100 undergraduates for the purpose of validation. Generally, students obtaining a high P-score (50 or above) chose the additional items as one of their considerations. Each additional item was then examined separately to determine which ones principled students chose often and which ones were selected less frequently. Infrequently chosen items were reworded so that the issues more closely approximated principled considerations.
(Appendix B). Since the revised DIT was intended as an initial screening device and not as the final selection instrument, the new items were not subjected to full validation procedures. Nevertheless, the pattern of responses of the final subjects on these items strongly suggests that four of these items are valid stage six discriminators. (Five of the final subjects took the revised DIT; one had been administered the standard DIT at an earlier date and was not retested.) All five of the final subjects selected the new stage six item on the Newspaper story as the most important of the thirteen considerations. Four of the five subjects selected the new stage six item on the Heinz story as the most important moral issue; the fifth selected it as the second most important. Three of the five selected the new item on the Webster story as the most important issue and one selected it as the second most important. All of the subjects selected the new item of the Doctor story as among the four most important considerations. The new and revised item on the Student and Prisoner stories still do not appear to discriminate stage six individuals.

Individuals who had a high P-score (65 or higher) on and/or selected many of the additional items on the modified DIT were orally administered two stories from the Kohlberg Moral Maturity Test (MMT), the Heinz Story and the Doctor's Dilemma. They were also administered one story from the Sexual Moral Judgment Scale (SMJS), the Abortion
Story, as a final hurdle to confirm their stage of moral development before selection for inclusion in this study (Appendix C). Kohlberg's 1972 system was used for scoring the stories because it scores for stage six. Two raters, i.e., the interviewers, judged the stories. Administration of the stories lasted approximately 45 minutes for each subject. Therefore, it is difficult to capsule the whole interview in the text of this study. However, one or two statements from each interview were chosen to exemplify the stage six flavor of the subject's responses. Where possible, statements in response to the same items have been selected.

One standard personality test, the 16 PF - Form B, served as the measure for personality traits of each subject. This test was used because it covers many aspects of the individual's personality and has norms for comparison. Subject's scores were compared to the appropriate norm group for their gender and status (male or female, college students or general population). Scores falling in the eighth sten and above, or third sten and below, are reported in the case results.

Ego identity was assessed informally by orally describing the four different stages of ego development (Rowe and Marcia, 1980) to the subjects, and having them identify the stage at which they saw their ego development during their high school and college years, and how they see themselves currently. Briefly, the four stages and
their descriptions are 1) identity achievement -- the person has gone through a decision-making period and is occupationally and ideologically committed, 2) moratorium -- the person is currently in the decision-making period and has nonspecific commitments, 3) foreclosure -- the person is committed, but has undergone little decision-making, usually just adopting parent dictates, and 4) identity diffusion -- the person may or may not have experienced decision-making, but is uncommitted.

Subjects

Based on their knowledge of Kohlberg's definition of the stage six person, the committee's chair and the master's candidate identified 14 people (four women and ten men) who, through personal knowledge, were believed to be at the postconventional level of moral reasoning. A second committee member was asked to identify subjects, but was not familiar with Kohlberg's theory. This method of subject selection introduces bias into the sample because subjects were not randomly selected. Instead, subject selection was limited to the personal acquaintances of the above mentioned people. As a consequence, most of the selected subjects were from a religiously-oriented, limited area of the country.

The modified DIT was administered to the 14 individuals identified as possible subjects for this study. From this sample, seven individuals whose P-scores on the modified DIT ranged from 75 to 86 were selected for further
testing with the MMT and SMJS. This process facilitated the selection of a sample of six predominantly, although not pure, stage six people. The subjects were given alias names selected at random from the telephone directory. A first name was selected, then a last.

Procedure

Once the small sample of morally mature individuals was identified, intense semi-structured interviews were conducted. Questions were designed to probe each person's life history, key influences, significant events, early family life, relations to parents and siblings, education, religion, direction and purpose in life, and present life style (see Appendix D). The semi-structured format allowed covering common domains for all subjects and exploring particular, unique dynamics as they arose in each interview. Questions were asked which addressed specific areas of the individual's life, while giving each person freedom to tell his/her own story. Interviews lasted approximately four hours, instead of the expected two hours. The first 45 minutes was used to administer the moral dilemmas. (One subject, Thomas Morgan, was interviewed first before administration of the moral dilemmas. During the interview, Thomas showed clear stage six moral reasoning. Both interviewees concurred that there was no necessity to administer the moral dilemmas). The length of the interview was extended to provide adequate coverage of the subject's moral development.
Longer interviews with six subjects were deemed preferable to shorter interviews with more subjects.

All interviews were conducted jointly, i.e., with both interviewers present, and were tape recorded to provide an exact record. In order to insure confidentiality the recordings will be available only to persons directly connected to this research. The subjects living in the Bowling Green area were interviewed at their residences and at the College of Education building on the Western Kentucky University campus. Individuals living out-of-town were interviewed at their respective residences.

Although this study did not follow any explicit model in the design of the interview, other researchers have used similar interview techniques for studying the individual (Stein, MacKenzie, Rodgers, and Meirs, 1955; White, 1975; Hay, 1982). This research is idiographic in Allport's (1961) best sense. The purpose of the proposed investigation was to study each subject separately and explore the uniqueness of the individual. Therefore, the results were written as case studies. The case results include an introductory paragraph, chronology of life and present life style, moral philosophy, personality profile, early family influences, religion, critical life events, significant others, books and writers (if any were identified), and a summary. The cases were organized in this manner because these categories allowed focusing directly on the subject's moral development, while
providing broad coverage of critical areas. Because subjects gave a retrospective account of their lives interpretation of life events may differ from how these events orginally occurred. Due to this limitation in the data, case studies should be interpreted cautiously.

It was not presupposed that there would be any necessary commonalities across subjects. Indeed, the research has uncovered six very different paths to moral development. There are, however, generalizations which can be drawn from the cases and these are reported in the concluding chapter of this study.
Chapter III

Thomas Morgan

The attainment of moral maturity for Tom has meant extending and redefining early Christian beliefs in an effort to understand life and people. In his desire to understand his world, Tom has searched several areas of literature which have enabled him to explore and redefine his values and beliefs, and to identify the primary purpose in his life -- to have and demonstrate a deep concern for the well-being of others. Ultimately, his search has brought him to a moral philosophy characterized by the highest level of moral reasoning.

Chronology of Life

Tom is an 83 year old retired geographer and professor. He was born in a country village in central Kentucky. Tom is the middle of three male children. Tom's father was a blacksmith and a very quiet, shy person. In contrast, his mother was outspoken and aggressive. His family belonged to a fundamentalist church. While he was growing up Tom spent a lot of time with his grandmothers, who played an important role in his life.

In 1914 Tom began attending an academy which was both a high school and a college. It was there that Tom met his future wife. He completed high school and two years of
college, and then transferred to the University of Chicago where he became interested in geography. Even though Tom was already pursuing a double major in math and physics, he thought geography better suited him and it became his third major.

After receiving his bachelor's degree in 1922, Tom accepted a graduate assistantship at the University of Wisconsin and received his master's degree in 1923. He started his career as a college professor in Michigan. While teaching at a university Tom completed work on his doctorate. He remained at his first teaching post for six years and then returned to Wisconsin as an assistant professor. He was later promoted to associate professor in the department that had granted his doctorate degree.

In 1940 a college in Tennessee offered Tom a position as chairman of its Department of Geography. He accepted the post and remained at the college until he was forced to retire at age 68. Upon retirement, another university in Tennessee recruited Tom and he taught, mostly part-time, for eleven additional years, retiring just prior to his 80th birthday.

During his lifetime he has served as chairman of a university geography department, been president of two national associations for geographers, written two books and many articles, served as an editor for a major publishing company, and been an outstanding teacher (according to former students' reports). Since Tom has
retired he has become interested in psychology and reads widely in the discipline, particularly on the psychology of the person. Tom also enjoys reading religious and moral philosophy. He continues to grow both intellectually and spiritually. Tom recognizes that he is in the final phase of his life, but he is determined to live it purposefully.

Moral Philosophy

Tom considers himself a Christian because he believes no other religion has articulated "the sanctity of the individual and the welfare of the individual and the need for all of us to be concerned with the welfare of all men" as clearly as has Christianity (in its best form). His overriding purpose in life, to have a deep regard for the well-being of all individuals, parallels this Christian doctrine. Tom actively seeks opportunities to demonstrate his concern for the well-being of others. For example, he participated in the civil rights sit-ins during the 1960's, when he was in his sixties, in order to show his concern for the rights of blacks. Since his retirement at age 80, he has served as a volunteer chaplain at a Veteran's Administrations Hospital, and served for one year as the full-time chaplain.

Several things "have become clear" to Tom within his lifetime. He has recognized the centrality of truth as a moral principle and the almost overwhelming importance of free will, choice, and responsibility in an individual's life. The ideas of the "God within" (within each of us)
and the human spirit have become working concepts which help him better understand God and people.

Tom identifies two universal moral principles which guide his own life: truth (i.e., the overriding importance of truthfulness in human relations) and compassion for others. When these principles conflict a person should act in terms of human need and sacrifice commitment to truth for the happiness and well-being of others. Being untruthful, however, always entails a cost, both to the individual and to the particular relationship. Truth and compassion were values which were present in his childhood home, but Tom did not recognize their critical centrality until later in life.

Tom envisions himself as a "part of a larger whole," and he believes there is a "connectedness" which unites all people with each other and with their world across time. With these concepts in mind, he organizes his reading and thinking around five themes: 1) human kind, from early glacial periods to the present, 2) the development and history of Western thought, from Gnosis on Crete to Washington, D. C., 3) the people of earth, from one person to four and a half billion people, 4) submicroscopic particles to the cosmos, and 5) evolution, from blue-green algae to man.

Personality Profile

Throughout his life Tom has been a "constitutional doubter," a "constant inquirer," and feels that he is too
serious. Shyness has also been a problem for Tom until just a few years ago (his late 70's). Although he sees himself as compassionate, this is a characteristic which he feels has crystallized only in the latter part of his life. Tom also describes himself as predominantly a thinker, an idealist, a lover of order and system, and a loner. On the 16 PF Tom scored in the tenth sten on Factor I (tender-minded, sensitive, clinging, overprotected), Factor N (astute, polished, socially aware), and Factor Q2 (self-sufficient, resourceful, prefers own decisions). His score fell in the first sten on Factor F (i.e., he is sober, taciturn, serious), and in the second sten on Factor E (i.e., he is humble, mild, easily led, docile, accommodating). He scored in the ninth sten on Factor G (conscientious, persistent, moralistic, staid), and in the eighth on Factor Q3 (controlled, exacting willpower, socially precise, compulsive).

**Early Family Influences**

While growing up, Tom spent much time with his two grandmothers. Tom's emphasis on having a deep concern for the well-being of others derives in part from their influence. He remembers his maternal grandmother as kind, generous, and soft-spoken. His paternal grandmother was equally eager to be helpful to others, but she had a sharp tongue.

Tom's fundamentalist upbringing gave him the seeds for some basic values which are still a part of his religious
and moral outlook -- a concern for truth, and a concern for the welfare of others.

The country village in which he grew up ingrained in Tom a fondness for rural scenery. He developed a love for the land and a sense of connectedness with the land. In his country village he became aware of a continuity and connectedness in human relationships across time, which is evident in his description of his grandmothers. This sense of connectedness with the land and in human relationships has been incorporated in his moral philosophy, and has been extended to include a connectedness between all people and the world.

Growing up in a country village also gave Tom "an abiding appreciation of manual labor." This appreciation was reinforced at the college he attended, where labor was required of all students. Although Tom is a highly educated professional person, he has a deep respect for manual laborers whom he considers as equals. This appreciation of labor has helped Tom develop a respect for unskilled workers and for all people regardless of their occupations or educational accomplishments.

The motto of his college, "God hath created of one blood all nations of men," was a philosophy which permeated the campus. Belief in the equality of men was important to Tom. Paradoxically, blacks were excluded from the school, and it took several years for Tom to extend the school's motto to include blacks. Tom became close friends with a
black person in graduate school, a fellow waiter at the restaurant where Tom worked. Through this friendship Tom extended his belief in equality to include blacks.

Religion

Tom remained a fundamentalist until his college years. He now considers himself a religious eclectic in that he does not adhere uniformly to the doctrine of any one church. Rather, he selects those religious ideas from different denominations which are consistent with his concept of God, Christianity, and his moral philosophy.

Changing his religious beliefs has been a gradual process. The theme of William James's Will to Believe, that you have the right to believe whatever you chose if there is absolutely no evidence to the contrary, resulted in Tom changing his religious beliefs cautiously and slowly. Through the years, however, Tom has questioned all of his religious beliefs, such as the virgin birth of Christ. Religious ideas which he could not accept were discarded, new ones were added, and his ideas were rearranged. His fundamentalist background served as a frame of reference, a starting point from which to depart.

Tom believes that Jesus should not be labeled the only Son of God because we are all Sons of God, although great religious leaders, such as Jesus, have insights which others do not. A firm part of Tom's faith is that there is in each of us a part of God's spirit. This idea is consistent with his concept that God exists within.
Tom feels that Jesus saved us by His life and love, rather than by His death. The most important aspect of Christianity for Tom is its emphasis on the sanctity and welfare of the individual and the need for us to be concerned with the welfare of others. This Christian ideal parallels Tom's life purpose, to have a deep regard for the well-being of all individuals. Concern with the welfare of others is also reflected in his central value, compassion.

Critical Life Events

Tom did not identify any major life events which affected his current moral philosophy. Instead, he has gradually developed his belief system through years of reading other's ideas on the nature of man, God, the meaning and purpose of life, and morality. He identifies his mother's decision to send him to the academy for his high school education and part of his college education as a critical event. This school provided him with intellectual stimulation and a core orientation toward mankind. His wife's decision to attend this school was also critical, since she has been his consistent partner in the development of his moral outlook.

Significant Other

Aside from the people he has read and his grandmothers, the most influential person in Tom's life has been his wife. He and his wife have been reading religious and other literature together since they were first married, 61 years ago, and, according to Tom, she has
always been one step ahead of him in thinking through religious ideas. By word and deed his wife has helped him further his search for deeper meanings in life, and she helped bring him to the realization that having a deep concern for the welfare of others is the most important purpose of life.

Books and Writers

Since he was in his twenties Tom has searched for an understanding of life in general, and people in particular. Tom's search first led him to science, then to philosophy, to cultural studies, and to nature studies. As his interest in human behavior, especially moral behavior, intensified, Tom began reading creative literature. He enjoys reading moral and religious essays. A major area of study for Tom since his retirement is psychology of the person.

In deriving a satisfactory understanding of life, and in developing a moral philosophy, Tom has put together bits of wisdom he has derived from his readings. Although he could not mention all of them, Tom identified a few of the writers who have been influential in his life: Since his early twenties Tom has read the sermons of Phillip Brooks, an Episcopalain minister, for help in clarifying and exploring religious and moral beliefs. When making moral decisions Tom has found support in Brook's sermon on courage in which he wrote that moral courage "requires that a man should have studied life and chose for himself what
he ought to do, and gone and done it in spite of all prescriptions and conventionalities."

Marcus Aurelius's Meditations has also been influential. In his writings, Aurelius explores what his values really are, and decides that if he lived up to these values then he need not worry what the rest of the world thought. His writings encouraged Tom to explore his own values and live accordingly. Tom has learned from Aurelius that the central Christian virtues of truth and compassion as well as the concept of the "God within" each person were found in wise men in many cultures.

In his desire to understand people Tom has found the writings of Emerson and Montaigne extremely helpful. In Tom's opinion, both of these writers "netted the seas" for general ideas about people. These ideas have provided Tom with direction in his search for an understanding of people.

A pamphlet by a missionary entitled One Increasing Purpose became the slogan in Tom's life. The pamphlet caused Tom to search for one increasing purpose in his own life, which he identifies as having a deep regard for the well-being of all individuals. Sir William Osher, a physician and writer, taught Tom that compassion is one of the highest virtues. Tom has incorporated this virtue in his moral philosophy.

Tom was also influenced by the autobiography of John Stuart Mill. Mill stated that when he wrote his Political
Economy he was only writing "a part of a larger whole." This phrase stuck with Tom. It became a thematic in his work as a geographer, so that he worked at the boundary of geography and toward the "larger human condition." This idea also served to organized Tom's thinking about himself, the world, and humankind.

The writings of Viktor Frankl and Abraham Maslow have been influential in the latter part of Tom's life. Frankl's logotherapy and its focus of the meaning of human existence, as well as on man's search for such meaning, parallels Tom's search for meaning in his own life. The writings of Abraham Maslow have influenced Tom because he feels Maslow is the only person to ask "Of what is man capable?" Maslow has an optimistic outlook which Tom finds refreshing.

Summary

In his search for an understanding of life and people Tom has attained the highest level of moral maturity. His early values and beliefs have served as the foundation on which to build his moral philosophy. Both as a student and a teacher, education has provided him with the intellectual stimulation necessary for challenging and expanding his ideas and beliefs. Outside of school, his study of disciplines related to man and his world, such as science, philosophy, and psychology, has contributed to his conception of people and the development of his moral philosophy. Once a fundamentalist in his religious
beliefs, Tom gradually reduced his dogma to the emphasis Christianity places on the sanctity and welfare of the individual, and the need to be concerned about the welfare of others. From this ideal Tom has derived his central values of truth and compassion and his overriding purpose in life: to express a deep regard for the well-being of others.
Chapter IV
William Laurence

Exposure to discrimination in the south and to poverty in Latin America caused Bill to examine his values and principles. As a consequence of observing man's inhumanity and suffering first hand, concern for the human condition became Bill's central value. The result was a liberal political outlook and a morally mature philosophy of life.

Chronology of Life

Bill is a 46 year old Director of a School of Library Science. He was born in a large southern city, the first of two sons. When he was two and a half, Bill's father was killed in a hunting accident. Financial necessity forced him and his brother and mother to move in with his paternal grandparents. Bill's mother returned to work for an insurance agency.

Bill received a public education through high school. After high school he attended a church affiliated college and majored in English. After completing college, Bill met a graduate of another Christian college at a summer camp and they married in December of that same year.

Bill continued his education in English and library science at a university in Georgia for six additional years. Upon receiving his doctorate he returned to his
undergraduate college for two years as a professor and librarian. As a result of a disagreement over religious matters with the college administration, Bill left his undergraduate college and accepted a teaching post at a university in the same city. He has remained at this school for 18 years, where he is now the Director of the School of Library Science.

Bill divorced in 1976 after fourteen years of marriage. Two years later he married a woman whom he had met through his children.

While in graduate school Bill made his first trip to Mexico to study Spanish as a requirement for his doctoral degree. He returned to Latin America in as a Fulbright Scholar in 1971. He spent six months teaching at a Columbian university and six additional months teaching in Costa Rica. Since then he has taught for various periods in other Latin American countries, including Mexico, Venezuela, and Paraguay. He has been returning to Mexico on a regular basis for the past three or four years.

Moral Philosophy

Bill used predominantly stage six moral reasoning in responding to Kohlberg's moral dilemmas. For example, in response to the question "Should Heinz have stolen the drug?" Bill answered "Yes...when you got a case where life versus an economic system that provides no other options." When asked "Do you believe the death sentence should be given in some cases?" Bill replied "No...I have a great
deal of trouble dealing with any civilized judicial system that condones the taking of life."

Concern for the human condition is the central value in Bill's moral philosophy. Bill tries to live in accord with several basic principles of human dignity and human rights that constitute a set of higher laws. He strongly believes in everyone's right to have access to those things necessary to preserve people's dignity, such as decent living conditions and enough food to insure health and freedom from hunger. He feels that we need to be sufficiently caring and empathetic to be able to identify with somebody else. Societies that have ample resources should share what they have with those that have less.

According to Bill, the greatest obscenity of our time is that sometimes society "builds its own structure and wealth in the name of good intentions and Christianity (and it does so) at the expense of other cultures which don't hold the same beliefs." Bill believes we should have a "caring tolerance" toward different cultures. Over the past 20 years Bill has experienced an evolving toward a greater interest in the "corporate" good. He believes strongly in the rights of the individual, but feels individual rights must be balanced with the rights of all members of society.

**Personality Profile**

Bill believes that patience and tolerance are two of his more salient character traits. He has seen and
experienced enough cultural diversity to have respect for other's opinions. He can work with people, even those who disagree with him. Bill also describes himself as independent, a self-initiator who is persistent. His most meaningful accomplishments are those things he has done on his own. Bill learns best when he teaches himself. He has always considered himself a conservationist, a value which was reinforced by his exposure to poverty in Latin America. In terms of ego development, Bill has achieved an ego identity.

On the 16 PF Bill scored in the ninth sten on Factor B (more intelligent, abstract-thinking, bright), Factor I (tender-minded, sensitive, clinging, overprotected), and Factor M (imaginative, Bohemian, absent-minded). His score fell on the eighth sten on Factor Q1 (experimenting, liberal, free-thinking), Factor Q2 (self-sufficient, resourceful, prefers own decisions), and Factor Q3 (controlled, exacting willpower, socially precise, compulsive). Bill scored in the first sten on Factor O (i.e., he is self-assured, placid, secure, complacent, and serene) and in the third sten on Factor A (i.e., he tends to be reserved, detached critical, aloof, and stiff).

**Early Family Influences**

Throughout childhood Bill was exposed to diversity in both his family and in the public schools he attended. Within the family, Bill's mother, grandmother, and grandfather were all very different. They did not provide
a single or a unified view of the way the world should be. As a consequence of not having a prescribed world view or outlook, Bill enjoyed the freedom to develop his own perspectives. He was encouraged to do so by his mother. Bill's mother always made it clear that he was free to formulate his own decisions with regard to moral judgments and religious beliefs.

His mother was a skeptical and pragmatic person, one disinclined to succumb to dogmas. She was a realist who saw people as they were and was primarily concerned with their welfare. His mother's genuine concern for others impacted on Bill and he incorporated concern for others into his own moral philosophy, in some measure as a function of her influence.

Bill attributes his strong sense of caring in part to the sense of community in the lower middle-class neighborhood in which he grew up. Anything that affected one person affected everyone else. The community always came to the rescue when there was a serious problem or tragedy. Bill, however, has extended his sense of community and caring to include all people throughout the world.

Religion

Bill belonged to a fundamentalist Christian church from childhood through graduate school. The community in which he grew up was very church-oriented, but his family was not strongly religious. His mother attended church
with him, although she did not become a church member until Bill did at age 12 years. Bill believes his mother had no "theological underpinnings," at least she did not preach what Bill heard in the church.

Even in childhood Bill experienced great difficulty in accepting two major aspects of his church's teachings. The first was the denomination's claim to exclusive religious "truth." This view excluded everyone else from having the "truth," i.e., everyone else was going to hell. Some of Bill's best friends were not church members and he could not accept the idea that they were going to hell. Additionally, as Bill's mother was not baptized into the church (until Bill was 12), he had difficulty accepting what the preachers were saying because it implied that she, too, was headed for hell.

The legalistic aspect of the church also bothered Bill. The church held that the Bible was a set of laws and that one must follow the Bible word for word to be saved. At one time this legalistic logic appealed to Bill, but this logic produced some very dictatorial and harsh sermons which Bill could not accept.

The particular congregation Bill attended as a youth was moderate in terms of the strictness with which it adhered to denominational tenets. He saw, however, the negative side of the denomination's teachings at gospel meetings he attended in other congregations. The "hellfire and brimstone" preaching and the sheer vehemence he heard
from these ministers distressed him, particular when he
contrasted their statements and behavior with the sensible,
logical practices of his regular church.

College was not a period of religious growth or
spiritual change for Bill. It was a period of moratorium
-- lots of ideas and information were coming in, but Bill
was not generating any new syntheses or new
self-understanding. Once out of college, however, he began
to see a more heterogenous political and religious
structure. The minister associated with Bill's church in
Georgia was open and liberal. He exposed Bill to a
different approach to religion, one that stressed concern
for others. Without the support and encouragement provided
by this minister, Bill feels his religious development and
change would have progressed much more slowly.

When this minister was transferred, the church hired
an extremely legalistic and dictatorial preacher. This was
a crucial time for Bill because he was in the process of
changing and redefining his religious beliefs. The
attitude of the new preacher contributed to Bill's decision
to turn away from his church.

Part of the legalistic attitude which most impacted on
Bill was the anti-Catholic sentiment prevalent in the
church during the 1960 presidential election. Sermons
which degraded Catholics were painful for Bill, partially
because he realized how discriminatory the church was and
also because he admired John Kennedy. During these sermons
Bill wanted to walk out of the church and he did on at least one occasion. The reaction in the church to the assassination of President Kennedy served to drive Bill even further from the church. He could not understand church members who said the assassination was the "will of God." This attitude countered his value of concern for others. Moreover, the attitude clearly indicated to Bill what church teachings did to the minds and values of its members.

The final event, and the one which caused Bill to finally leave the church for good, happened after he returned to teach at his undergraduate college. The church in Georgia had hired another minister who was even more negative and legalistic than the previous one. Bill still received the church newspaper from Georgia, and in it the new minister attacked particular people who left the church. After reading a particularly vicious article about a very devout couple who were friends of his, Bill wrote a letter to the elders of the church expressing his dismay over treating ex-church members in this manner. The minister protested the letter to the administration of the school where Bill taught. Bill was subsequently dismissed from his position because he refused to retract the letter. Although the event failed to provide Bill with any genuinely new insights, it did offer him total freedom to choose his own religious beliefs. He was no longer a faculty member of a church affiliated school. Bill
remained with the church for a short while longer and then left.

After 15 years of non-attendance, within the last year Bill has attended the "only truly open and liberal church" of his original denomination in the city in which he presently resides. He has not, however, been able to join the church as a full member again. Bill adheres to those religious beliefs and practices which are consistent with his moral philosophy, i.e., those beliefs and practices which emphasize concern for people and the human condition. His central attraction to the church, however, is that it provides an orientation and opportunities for service to others which are not often found in secular institutions.

Critical Life Events

The only critical event which affected Bill's moral development in high school was joining a bird club after reading several books on birds. The bird club made it possible for Bill to leave his uneducated community for the first time and see how other people lived. Most other club members were older and highly educated. They exposed Bill to dimensions and viewpoints on life he was not experiencing in high school. They provided him, through their comments, questions, and observations, with the intellectual stimulation that prompted him to begin developing his own belief system and philosophy.

Bill maintains that he led a very sheltered life in college. He cannot identify any critical life events
during this time. The summer after graduation, however, Bill's experience as a church camp counselor camp proved critical in his moral development. Camp was his first real contact with blacks on an equal basis. He learned a great deal about blacks, especially black children, by living with them. The experience strengthened his conviction that blacks were equal and had the same human rights as whites. As his respect for blacks deepened, so also did his respect for all people.

The civil rights movement of the sixties proved crucial to Bill's moral development. The movement came at a sensitive time in his life, just as he was moving away from the sheltered college existence. The early 1960's were a time of change for Bill, just as they were for most of the country. Bill was formulating a religious and political philosophy in which respect and concern for the rights of others were central. In Georgia, Bill was exposed personally and directly to overt discrimination both in his church and in the larger society. Because of his growing commitment to equality Bill felt segregation was unacceptable at best and absurd at worst. Consequently, he would purposely sit in the back of buses where blacks were required to sit. He recognized that the widespread civil disobedience of that time was a direct consequence of depriving people of basic human rights. This realization reinforced his commitment and concern for the dignity and rights of all people.
Bill's experiences in Latin America have contributed to his universalistic perspective. While living abroad he saw tremendous social problems and poverty. As a result of his travel and observations Bill saw the role and responsibility of the United States in world affairs in a new light. The United States was a wealthy nation that should be willing to share with other societies in an effort to improve the human condition. Bill believes that societies (i.e., groups of people) cannot isolate themselves and ignore problems of other people. We need to be concerned with the condition and dignity of all people.

**Significant Others**

John Kennedy was an influential figure in Bill's life because of his progressive political stance, i.e., trying to exert influence throughout the world with something other than arms (e.g., the Peace Corp). Bill was impressed by Kennedy's emphasis on addressing social problems both in our country and throughout the world. Kennedy was the first politician Bill felt he understood because he believed they held similar political philosophies.

Bill identifies Nehru as the most enlightened leader of our time because he was trying to embody the teachings of Gandhi into the political structure of his nation. Nehru was a peaceful man trying to create a just society, one that respected the rights of the individual while protecting the dignity and welfare of all its members.
This ideal matched Bill's view on how a society should operate.

The two dictatorial preachers in Bill's former church at Georgia (discussed earlier) also influenced Bill. They made it clear for him that the legalistic orientation of the church resulted in a negative attitude toward non-church members. Legalism does not promote concern for others. Rather, it inhibits the development of this concern. As mentioned previously, the liberal minister at the Georgia church also promoted Bill's moral and religious development by exposing him to a different approach to religion, one that stressed concern for others.

Over the years Bill has had a few close friends whom he considers mentors. They have all held moral philosophies similar to his. Bill has shared philosophical and moral questions with these friends, and in doing so he has been influenced by their thinking.

**Books and Writers**

Bill does not recall being influenced by anything he read as an undergraduate. Since that time, however, he has been influenced by a variety of writers. He could not identify all the writers who have impacted on his thinking, but did discuss some of the major ones.

While in graduate school Bill began to develop a liberal political outlook which is evident in his moral philosophy. Two writers, in particular, were influential in the development of his political outlook. One was
William O. Douglas, former United States Supreme Court Justice. Douglas's *America Challenged* sets forth a political system based on a just society, one which is concerned with the dignity and rights of all people. This book served as a foundation for Bill's political philosophy. The other writer, William Fulbright, was a United States senator. Fulbright's political philosophy was similar to Douglas's, but he was able to translate philosophy into concrete political action.

John Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath*, a novel which pointed out that we do not have a perfect political system, also influenced Bill's political outlook. The image of farmers pouring out milk they couldn't sell while hungry people watched stuck with Bill and led him to start thinking about ways to structure the whole of society so that it can serve the needs of each individual. Although this novel was about problems of people in our country during the Great Depression of the 1930's, these problems, such as lack of concern for the individual, are universal.

Emerson and Thoreau were particularly influential because they planted in Bill the importance of individualism and being able to subscribe to higher ideals, such as concern for the welfare of all people. *Walden* and *Civil Disobedience* left Bill with the message that even if you believe in ideals which society does not hold, you may be right.
Thomas Wolfe wrote extensively about the difficulties in breaking away from a closed society. Bill was influenced by Wolfe because he identified with the difficulties involved in breaking away from a social system. Many of the events and experiences that Wolfe writes of typify Bill's experiences when breaking away from a closed religious community in which he grew up.

_Bueno el Martyr_, a novel by the Spanish philosopher Uno, brought Bill face to face with the question of agnosticism. This book caused Bill to re-evaluate his religious beliefs and helped him to define them.

Norman Cousins, editor of the _Saturday Review_, has been influential in Bill's life over a long period of time. Bill sees Cousins as a person with viewpoints similar to his. He considers Cousins to be a universalist and a liberal philosopher.

**Summary**

Through exposure to social problems both in our country and abroad, Bill developed a liberal political outlook which resulted in a morally mature philosophy of life. His mother's attitude of concern for the welfare of others helped to engender a similar attitude in Bill, an attitude which was promoted in his childhood community. As he grew older, Bill extended his attitude of concern to include all people. Critical events where those events in which he saw people stripped of their dignity and denied basic human rights and events which gave him the
opportunity to develop a respect for blacks and people in other cultures. Influential people and writers have been individuals who have held politically liberal and/or highly moral philosophies. These people have aided Bill in the development of his political and moral outlook. Although Bill belonged to a fundamentalist church, he enjoyed, largely through his mother's encouragement, freedom to make religious and moral decisions. As the church's condemning attitude toward those not affiliated with the church became increasingly and painfully obvious to Bill, he left the church. Bill adheres to religious beliefs and practices which are consistent with his central value of concern for the human condition. Through a long process of experience, observation, and sometimes painful challenge, Bill has developed a morally mature philosophy of life.
Chapter V

Ann Walters

For Ann, the attainment of moral maturity has stemmed from intellectual development, an alteration of her religious beliefs, and an expanded ability to care about others. Ann has confidence in her intellectual abilities, a confidence she recalls having as early high school when she began to think beyond the religious beliefs of her childhood fundamentalist church. From that point, her own belief system began to evolve.

Chronology of Life

Ann was born in Tennessee, the third of five children and the only girl. Her parents owned a grocery store and later managed a motel. She belonged to a fundamentalist church and attended a high school and college affiliated with this church.

In college Ann majored in elementary education and minored in English and Bible. After graduation she taught for two years in New Jersey. Subsequently, she returned to her childhood home. Shortly thereafter she began dating an old high school classmate. They were engaged within six weeks and married within a year. The first year of marriage her husband taught at a church related college in
Oklahoma, and Ann taught at an inner-city school in the same city.

Following that one year Ann moved to West Virginia where her husband had found a better job teaching at a college affiliated with a more liberal church. They stayed there for two years, enjoyed it, and made plans to settle there. Ann's husband, however, received an opportunity to complete his doctorate in Tennessee, so they moved back to their home state. After two years in Tennessee, Ann and her husband moved to Kentucky where her husband accepted a faculty position at a state university. Once settled in Kentucky, they adopted two children, one boy and one girl. They have remained at the location for 14 years. Ann, now 45, operates her own nursery school.

**Moral Philosophy**

Ann's responses to Kohlberg's moral dilemmas reflect predominantly stage six moral reasoning. For example, in response to the question of whether Heinz should steal a drug that may save a stranger's life (Heinz Dilemma), Ann replied "Yes, he should steal the drug...because everybody is tied up in everyone else's life, and I think it (stealing drug) would be participation in this life, doing your part to help someone in need." When asked "What responsibility does the judge have to follow the law?", Ann stated that there "are higher laws than the law Heinz broke. The judge has to look at higher laws than the law
of the land." For Ann, the right to life is one of those laws.

Ann believes that God created man in His own image, and that people are a part, or extension, of God. She cannot separate her relationship with God from her relationship with other people; they are intertwined. For her, the most important aspect in relating to another person is seeing God in that person, and treating him or her as if they were a part of God. During the interview, Ann used the word "spiritual" when referring both to her relationship with God and other people. She does not see religion as merely being involved in church, although church may facilitate religion. Ann feels that church affiliation can also have a negative influence on people in some aspects. Church "can be a cover-up." People can feel good about going to church, reading the Bible and praying, but these activities can easily become central while more important activities are ignored. Reaching out to other people and caring about what happens to them is true religion in Ann's view. Ann is disappointed in organized religion because she feels it only serves the members of the church, when it ought to reach out to others.

Politically, Ann aligns herself with the Democratic party. The ideal of the Democratic party, that of reaching out to help the underdog and the small man, is "very dear to her heart."
Personality Profile

When asked to describe herself, Ann states that she is impulsive, sensitive to other people, and at times can feel enormous joy and sadness simultaneously. There is an unsettled sense within her of always "trying to figure things out and tie things together, or relate everything." Since childhood Ann has always felt a need for change. She likes to experience new things and new people. In terms of ego development, Ann feels that she has achieved an ego identity. In college she was "halfway between moratorium and identity." Ann tries to live every moment of each day, and not focus on the future. Her attitude is related to her husband's near death in 1975. The incident made her aware of the fact that she is going to die while intensifying her desire to make the most of life. On the 16 PF Ann scored in the ninth sten on Factor H (venturesome, uninhibited, socially bold) and Factor Q1 (experimenting, liberal, free-thinking). Paradoxically, on Factor Q2 Ann's score fell in the first sten (i.e., she tends to be group-dependent, a "joiner", and a sound follower) and she is known for her parties which bring diverse people together. She scored in the eighth sten on Factor A (outgoing, warmhearted, easy-going, participating) and Factor O (apprehensive, self-reproaching, insecure, worrying, troubled).

Ann truly enjoys people and feels there is much she can learn from others. It is important for her to be aware
of how other people perceive life. When she meets someone casually she will go out of her way to get to know them. Ann says that she has always cared about what was happening to people. She feels she has a particular sensitivity toward people which most others do not have. By this statement, Ann means that she can read things in people's voices and eyes, and later she will find out what is there, i.e., the meaning or feeling associated with the vocal or visual cue.

Reading has always been one of Ann's favorite hobbies. Books on spirituality and self-improvement are especially interesting to her. All the books she reads affect her in some manner.

Early Family Influences

A sense of caring about people was prevalent in Ann's childhood home, and this sense of caring continues to play an important part in Ann's moral philosophy. Ann recalls her parents giving away food from their grocery store to people in need. "No one ever made a big deal of it, it was just the natural thing to do." There were times when Ann's parents would rather not have given the food because to do so placed a hardship on the family. Nevertheless, her mother and father firmly believed in and practiced helping others.

Ann's parents had a variety of friends. She saw a contradiction between her parents' religious beliefs and the people with whom they associated. For example, her
mother was a strong Christian fundamentalist, but most of her close friends were either non-religious or belonged to different denominations. Ann specifically remembers her mother's close friendship with a Catholic woman who cursed frequently, something Ann's mother never did. She also remembers her parent's close friendship with a non-religious patented medicine salesman. Ann believes that her parent's friendship with these persons left a message, presumably unintended by her parents, that people were people regardless of their religion and behavior. In Ann's moral development, this message is reflected in her belief that we are all a part of God and of each other.

Religion

Ann's religious beliefs, which serve as the foundation for her moral philosophy, have broadened and changed through the years. From fifth through eighth or ninth grade Ann was deeply involved in the fundamentalist church to which she belonged. The church had clear-cut answers to everything, and the church led Ann to believe that if you were good everything would work out for you. However, her church placed a heavy burden on its members to save the world, and the guilt feelings resulting from these pressures eventually contributed to Ann's leaving the church.

The summer before Ann's senior year in high school she went to California for a summer job. While there, Ann attended a church of her denomination in Berkeley. The
minister had a Ph.D., the church members were educated, and the atmosphere of the church was free and open. This very different church experience provided intellectual stimulation and helped Ann to expand her religious views. When she came home in the fall she experienced extreme disappointment in the rural church she attended where the people were uneducated. In contrasting her church at home with the one in California, Ann began to see negative aspects to her church. She began to see that religion could offer her more and could contribute to her intellectual development more than it had to that point in her life.

Ann minored in Bible in college. During her senior year she took a class called "Errors in Denominationalism," which left Ann with bitter feelings toward her church. The teacher's task was to point out biblical errors with the teachings and religious practices of Baptists, Methodists, Catholics, Lutherans, etc. Ann found his condemning attitude toward other religions very offensive. When the mid-term examination required her to list these errors of other denominations, Ann refused to answer any of the questions and, instead, wrote a note to the teacher saying he had a terribly unchristian attitude. By this point in her life Ann had formulated her own views of Christianity. She realized that her church often had a negative influence on its members by emphasizing differences among people and
rendering judgments on others, instead of making its members more open to other people.

Ann finally and officially left her church a few years after she married, but her feelings toward the church had changed earlier. Throughout her adult life Ann has explored a variety of religions, searching for one that would match her concept of Christianity, and her moral philosophy. She now belongs to a Christian church which offers her a sense of community while encouraging freedom of thought and care for others. These values and practices fit into Ann's religious and moral beliefs.

Critical Life Experiences

After graduating from high school Ann became a counselor at church camp in New Jersey. Inner-city children were brought to camp to experience the joys of summer in the country. Preparation for counseling entailed going into the inner city and becoming aware of the people, their environment, and their problems. Not only did Ann become aware of the problems of inner-city people, she was also exposed to people -- the camp staff -- who really cared about others. The experience caused Ann to prioritize her values, and realize that caring and participating in the lives of others was of critical importance in her life. Instead of seeking a summer job, Ann continued as a volunteer counselor at the camp throughout the summers of her college years.
Ann went through two crises during her senior year in college which contributed to the development of her moral outlook. The first, her experience in her Bible class "Errors in Denominationalism," was discussed earlier. About the same time Ann was involved in a disappointing love affair. The pain and disappointment associated with the ending of her romance seriously bothered her and it became a source of doubt. Her religious upbringing had taught her that if you were good everything would work out for you. The disparity between her behavior and how things had worked out caused Ann to discard many of the beliefs and teachings of her church, and to develop her own set of broader beliefs.

**Significant Others**

The people who have been influential in Ann's life have all in some way contributed to her intellectual development and have helped to deepen and expand her religious beliefs. During her junior year in high school Ann had an English teacher who influenced her life. This woman's general Christian attitude was combined with an intellectual openness Ann had not previously encountered. She and her teacher shared ideas with one another. When in the company of her teacher Ann felt free to express her ideas and thoughts, and thus develop them. This freedom contrasted sharply with the inhibition of free thinking Ann was experiencing elsewhere in her church and school.
The manager of the church camp where Ann served as a counselor was also influential. Ann was impressed by how much meaning and feeling this man would put into his songs during worship periods. Also, he was a very caring person who demonstrated to Ann that being religious meant far more than just following the teachings and beliefs of the church. Ann saw him as someone with whom she could express her thoughts and ideas about religion.

In college Ann had two teachers who influenced her Christian attitude. One teacher was a missionary with whom Ann studied Bible. He had travelled extensively throughout the world and applied his Christian practices everywhere -- both overseas and in every human relationship -- not just within the context of the church. His Christian attitude helped Ann to broaden her own religious beliefs. The other teacher, a professor of religion, helped her understand the Christian doctrine of grace, which, according to Ann, is that God's love reaches out to all mankind. Looking back at the people who had influenced her Ann feels she was searching for persons who would say the things about Christian faith she wanted to hear.

**Summary**

The development of Ann's current moral philosophy centers around a broadening and changing of her early fundamentalist religious beliefs and learning to care about others. Ann's caring attitude derives from the caring atmosphere present in her childhood home. As she grew
older, she met other genuinely caring people who reinforced the idea that caring about others was important in life. Critical life events for Ann were those events which exposed her to new ways of thinking about religion and/or caused her to question the religious teachings of the fundamentalist church in which she was brought up. Influential people in Ann's life were ones whose religious beliefs and practices extended beyond the teachings of the church. They provided Ann with the intellectual stimulation and personal support she needed to formulate her ideas about religion and morality.
Chapter VI
Audrey Bowles

Audrey's path to moral maturity has been difficult. Her development began with an unhappy childhood which left her with a deep need for understanding herself, people, and the world, and a desire for a better way of life. In her seemingly aimless search for this understanding and a better life, Audrey left her first husband, lived in communes, experimented with LSD, went through psychoanalysis, and suffered a mental breakdown. Through all of these experiences Audrey developed an understanding of her world and acquired a personal and mature moral philosophy.

Chronology of Life

Audrey is a 40 year old part-time college student. She was born in Boston, but shortly after her birth her family moved to Pennsylvania. She had a brother two years older than she and a sister four years younger. Her family belonged to a liberal church. Audrey attended a large public high school in which her class alone had 1600 students. After graduation she attended a small, private college of 1600 students in central Pennsylvania.

In college Audrey studied elementary education, English, and art. She enjoyed school and came fairly close
to graduation, but decided to withdraw from school and marry at age 20. After five years of marriage, Audrey left her husband because the marriage had not provided her with opportunities for personal growth. Audrey moved to California. Her California experience was very unsettling and she remained there only eight months until a friend invited her to New Mexico.

Once in New Mexico, Audrey stayed with her friend in a communal-type living arrangement. Because of a personality conflict with one of the commune's founders, however, Audrey stayed only a month. Audrey moved and lived in a "hippy" commune for several months. Once again, she was not happy with the people at the commune and decided to leave.

After leaving the second commune Audrey had a little money and could afford to think for a while about what she really wanted to do. She decided that she wanted to teach children, and she taught at a private school nursery school for two or three years. She then worked as a secretary/bookkeeper at a legal services office for four or five years. During this time Audrey met her future husband, lived with him for a year, and decided to marry. Audrey and her husband wanted to live in the country and own land. Since they could not find what they wanted in New Mexico they moved to rural Kentucky.

The stress of coming to Kentucky led to a mental breakdown for Audrey and she was hospitalized in a state
mental institution for two months. Audrey is currently completing her undergraduate degree at a state university. She has lived on a small farm with her husband for the past three years in an old country house they have renovated. Audrey has just given birth to her first child.

**Moral Philosophy**

Audrey displayed primarily stage six moral reasoning in her responses to Kohlberg's moral dilemmas. For example, in response to the question on the Heinz Dilemma "Should Heinz have stolen the drug?" Audrey answered "Of course he should have stolen the drug...the right to life is enormous." When asked "Should the Judge punish Heinz?" Audrey replied "If I were the judge I would not punish Heinz because he was acting in an interest that was higher than the law...the life of another human being."

Audrey defines morality as a process of internal constructs which enable a person to make decisions about reality. For some people it is important to have these constructs elaborated outside themselves. They need laws to tell them how to act. Ultimately, at some point in a mature life, the question of what is moral in any situation is decided internally. It is not a question that someone else can answer for you. Audrey believes the responsibility for answering this question is a lonely and singular task. Your way of thinking may be so different from that of everyone else that it may cause you to lose friends and/or
your sense of security. Nevertheless, you must make your own decisions.

One of Audrey's highest moral beliefs is "that there is no blame." No one is ever completely right or wrong. "There is always something else going on in a situation. If I can figure out what that something else is, then I can unlock a puzzle which helps to heal everyone concerned." A second belief which Audrey feels strongly about is that "most aggressive acts are motivated by fear." By recognizing that fear motivates aggressive acts she believes she can create a positive situation, instead of escalating a negative one.

Audrey believes there is a harmony in the world in that we all have something in common with each other which we call God. Because of God we are connected by a force called love. The sense of Godliness within each person is like a giant kaliedescope which has a pattern, but each part is a little different. Audrey tries to give a symbolic image to her thoughts and pictures the sense of Godliness in each person as a light. That image has given her the ability to see through facades of physical stature and mental abilities. Audrey tries to send love in the direction of that light in each person.

Personality Profile

Audrey sees herself as possessing a great deal of strength, but underneath the strength is vulnerability and fragility. Audrey describes herself as a warm person, as
one who likes to touch people. She senses when people are feeling down, and tries to extend a little extra something to lift their spirits. This may involve paying them a compliment or just saying a few kind words. According to Audrey, she has a way of "listening to how people act," a way of looking at what's under the surface and responding to that. Since childhood she has been introspective. Audrey sometimes becomes impatient with people. It is hard for her to comprehend why it takes others such a long time to understand or to not be afraid of new ideas. In terms of ego development, Audrey feels she has achieved an identity. She has a liberal political outlook, which is reflected in her social concerns. Audrey strongly believes in freedom from poverty and hunger and her beliefs have led to the development of a conservation ethic.

On the 16 PF Ann scored in the tenth sten on Factor M (imaginative, Bohemian, absent-minded) and Factor Q1 (experimenting, liberal, free-thinking). Her scores fell in the ninth sten on Factor E (assertive, aggressive, stubborn, competitive) and Factor Q2 (self-sufficient, resourceful, prefers own decisions,). On Factor I (tender-minded, sensitive, clinging, overprotected) Audrey scored in the eighth sten. She scored in the third sten on Factor N (i.e., she tends to be forthright, unpretentious, genuine but socially clumsy).

As she has grown older, Audrey sees herself moving toward much more stability within her life. Her plans are
to concentrate on rearing her baby and to attend graduate school in order to train as a psychotherapist.

**Early Family Influences**

Audrey's early family life, and the confusion resulting from it, contributed to her current moral outlook. It created within her the need to sort things out and the need to find out why people act the way they do. It contributed to her way of looking at the world, a viewpoint which does not accept superficial explanations of people and events.

Childhood was an unhappy time for Audrey. Home was "like a concentration camp" with a strong authoritarian atmosphere. Audrey felt unloved and unsupported. Her mother was an unhappy person, who took out her unhappiness through continual criticism of her children. She could not express love within the close confines of the family. Her mother was hostile toward other people, especially toward Audrey's father. Throughout childhood, Audrey's mother constantly told her she was a bad, terrible person and she grew up believing this characterization to be true.

Audrey's father was an alcoholic. He was also paranoid and mistrustful of others. Audrey recalls her father coming home angry almost every night. This would inevitably lead to some kind of difficulty at supper. In order to cope with her father's behavior, Audrey developed a strategy of placating him whenever he walked in the door so that nothing would irritate him.
To protect herself, Audrey denied her feelings and emotions. She retreated into books and became an avid reader. Many books have influenced Audrey’s way of thinking about people and problems. Her reading has also helped her to define her values.

Audrey learned to care about people at an early age, a value which is an obvious part of her moral outlook. Through extending her own threatening family situation, Audrey learned that others were also unhappy. To somehow encourage them or help them feel better made a difference to Audrey. Helping others made her feel good about herself. The first person she can remember caring about was her brother who had polio. Audrey also recalls feeling warmly toward a girl she met in Sunday school during fifth grade. The girl had a very poor self-concept and Audrey thinks that the warmth she felt for this girl might have been a sense of natural empathy for one in her same condition. Audrey cared for the elderly, too. When she was young she used to fantasize about having a home for old people where she would cook them good hot meals, and the residents would have dignity.

Religion

Audrey’s religious background also contributed significantly to her moral development. She began going to a very liberal church at age five. In Sunday school Audrey learned about many different religions which led her to develop a deep respect for an individual’s way of looking
at the world. It made her realize that people are different and that this is okay. In relation to her moral philosophy Audrey sees each person as being a little different, but believes that we all have something in common between and within us, which is called God.

Audrey has searched through many different religions, including eastern religions. Presently, she does not belong to any particular church because "everywhere is church" for Audrey in that it is always possible to experience God.

**Critical Life Events**

Outside of her early family life, Audrey does not identify any critical event until her adult life. While Audrey was living at the hippy commune in New Mexico she had a profound experience through taking LSD. She characterizes the experience as more intellectual than hallucinogenic. Audrey could see a vital life connection between all living things, and even inorganic things. Her mind described this force as love. The idea of a vital life force in the universe has led to Audrey's belief that there is a harmony in the world and that we all have something in common which connects us to each other. We call this vital force God.

At age 35 Audrey, troubled about her childhood and herself, began psychoanalysis. Audrey had an intense working relationship with her psychiatrist. With her psychiatrist's aid she was able to "sort out" much of the
confusion resulting from her childhood. The experience helped her to develop a philosophy of not blaming others and not accepting superficial explanations for people's behavior.

Moving from New Mexico to Kentucky was very stressful and the stress resulted in a mental breakdown for Audrey. Through her experiences at a psychiatric hospital Audrey gained compassion. She no longer has a superficial attitude toward people who are mentally ill, just as she no longer has a superficial attitude toward anybody or anything. She looks beyond what is apparent and extends love toward that light within each person which she sees as God.

Significant Others

Audrey has been influenced by a variety of people for different reasons. Audrey was impressed by Ram Dass who spoke at the commune about his search for a oneness in the universe and his connection with that oneness. About this time Audrey was developing her idea that there is a harmony in the universe, and that everything is connected by a force called love. Audrey found Dass to be the most open and honest person she had ever met. Though this encounter was brief, his thoughts and experiences aided her in the formulation of her own philosophy.

As discussed earlier, her psychiatrist had an immeasurable effect on her because he helped her sort out the confusion in her life. He was influential in the development of that part of her philosophy which says there
is no blame and that you need to look beyond a person's behavior in order to understand them.

Audrey's relationship with her husband has had a positive effect on her life, too. The relationship is stable and meaningful and provides Audrey with room to grow and encouragement to develop her outlook on life.

Books and Writers

Several writers and books have influenced Audrey's moral philosophy. The writings of Carl Jung have had a tremendous influence on Audrey. His concept of the collective unconscious has helped her develop a universalistic perspective on life and has reinforced her sense of the connectedness of all people. Bettelheim's works on autistic children and mental institutions were enlightening as Audrey struggled to understand her own experiences in a mental institution and her early family life. The major theme of his work, as Audrey understands it, is compassionate understanding through love, which is essentially her philosophy when interacting with others.

Audrey was introduced to the book of Chinese philosophy, I Ching, when she lived in New Mexico and it has been a continual source of direction for her since then. According to Audrey, I Ching presents a philosophy of life which goes beyond such concepts as vengeance. Audrey compares looking to I Ching for advice to turning to a very old, very wise person for advice. "This person is so far beyond anger, retaliation, and fear that almost
invariably he can penetrate to the center of your problem and give advice which raises your sense of values."
Undoubtedly, I Ching has been influential in teaching Audrey to look beyond anger and aggression and in not blaming others.

Summary

Achieving a deep understanding of herself, people, and the world, and developing a sense of compassion has resulted in a morally mature philosophy of life for Audrey. Her unhappy childhood caused her to seek out people, especially writers, who provided her with an understanding of herself and others that went beyond a superficial explanation. Critical life events were those which led to the development of a universalistic perspective on the world and humanity and also helped her formulate a clearer picture of herself and others. Another major theme running through the books she has read and critical events in her life is compassion and caring for others. As a child Audrey cared about others who were also unhappy like her. As she developed a better understanding of herself and others, her sense of compassion for others has deepened and broadened to include the whole human race.
Chapter VII

David Huston

David sees his moral reasoning as a subset of his well-developed general reasoning abilities. Before attaining a high level of moral reasoning he first developed other reasoning skills which he then applied to Christian teachings. Combining Christianity with his general reasoning ability led to development of David's current moral philosophy.

David informed the interviewers that he was familiar with Kohlberg's theory of moral development before selection as a subject for this study. Because of this, there was some concern about whether he was truly a morally mature person or just mimicking Kohlberg. After two hours of interviewing him, the interviewers concluded that David was genuinely a stage six person.

Chronology of Life

David is a 28 year old graduate student. He was born in North Carolina, the first of three sons of an Army officer. At age two his family moved to Germany, but returned to the United States two years later to live in Maryland where David remained until he graduated from high school.
David attended a college in Virginia on an army scholarship and majored in mathematics and military science. The day after graduation David began a four-year tour of duty in the army as required by his scholarship. David served at Fort Knox for three years. During that time he married a woman he began dating in high school. Two months after they were married David was sent to Korea for one year. That year completed his obligation to the army. He left the army with the rank of captain. After returning to Kentucky, David enrolled in a graduate program in speech communication at a state university and found a part-time job as assistant manager of a retail store. After two years, he is still a graduate student, but he is not now otherwise employed.

Moral Philosophy

David's predominantly stage six moral reasoning is seen in his immediate response to the question "Should Heinz have stolen the drug?" -- "Yes, because the woman's right to life takes precedent over the druggist's property rights." In answering the question "Is it ever right to disobey the law?" David replied "Yes...when you are in a situation where the ethics conflict with the law, ethics take priority."

Ethics, for David, are a set of principles higher than the law. His overriding moral principle is Christ's commandment of "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." From this one principle David derives other
moral principles, such as the right to life, the right to freedom, and the right to free speech. The essential criteria to consider when making moral judgments are the rights of the individual, the circumstances of the situation, and the existent law. Although he considers the law when making a moral decision, David believes the principles cited above are higher laws which take priority over man-made law.

Ultimately, David can track his moral beliefs back to Christian teachings, but feels he would still hold the same moral principles even if Christ had not expounded them. David believes there is something inborn in him, a "conscience," which allows him to reason through and distinguish what is right from what is wrong.

**Personality Profile**

David describes himself as a "puzzle-solving person," which means he enjoys thinking through intellectual problems and applying logic and reason. His academic interests have always been in science and math (his math GRE score was 710), where he could use his reasoning abilities. Compared to other people, David feels he has highly developed reasoning skills.

Because he is not an emotional person, David sometimes has trouble relating to others. Consequently, he does not always respond to situations in which it is possible for him to help another. With the aid of his wife, however, David has developed a fuller awareness of his feelings and
is becoming more interpersonally sensitive to the needs of others.

David describes himself as honest, tolerant, and diligent. He also loves order and enjoys arranging things. In terms of ego development, David sees himself as still in the process of developing an identity. He considers himself to be apolitical, but feels he will take liberal political stances at some point in the future.

On the 16 PF David scored in the first sten on Factor F (i.e., he is sober, taciturn, and serious). His scores fell in the ninth sten on Factor G (conscientious, persistent, moralistic, staid) and Factor Q2 (self-sufficient, resourceful, prefers own decisions). On Factor C (emotional stability, mature, faces reality, calm), Factor H (venturesome, uninhibited, socially bold), and Factor Q4 (controlled, exacting will power, socially precise, compulsive) David scored in the eighth sten. David scored in the third sten on Factor A (i.e., he tends to be reserved, detached, critical, aloof, and stiff) and Factor Q4 (i.e., he tends to be relaxed, tranquil, unfrustrated, and composed).

Early Family Influences

David described his early family as unaffectionate and unemotional. This lack of emotion was conducive to a family atmosphere which favored analytic reasoning. When problems arose his parents dealt with them by applying analytic techniques. This example taught David to behave
in the same manner, and initiated the development of reasoning processes which he applied later in life to the area of morality. David continued to develop his reasoning abilities throughout his formal education, and he was rewarded with high grades for doing so.

David has had to learn about his emotions on his own. In the process of doing so, he has also learned to be more empathetic and sensitive to others. Developing a sense of caring has promoted David's moral development.

David's father emphasized doing what was right despite what others may think, a value which impacted strongly on David. For his father, following the law was always the right thing to do and David also felt this way throughout high school. As David moved into principled levels of moral reasoning, however, the importance of adhering to the law, although still evident, has diminished. Nevertheless, the moralistic concern for doing what is right has remained. David believes in following higher moral principles even when they conflict with the law or with the opinion of others.

Religion

David belonged to a Catholic church from early childhood through his third year in college. When in high school David realized that he was going through all the motions and rituals of his church, but religion meant nothing to him personally. He felt his church ingrained considerable guilt into the members, and that the church
did not have a basis for its beliefs. David, however, continued to attend church through the second year of college, even though though he felt like a hypocrite for doing so. Feelings of guilt had kept David attending church.

David recalls that when he was a college freshman people came to his dormitory room to share the Bible. Although he had heard the words before, they made more sense to him this time, and these words left him with a good feeling. The experience started him thinking about Christianity, but he was not ready to totally accept and internalize Christian teaching and beliefs. He stopped attending church completely during his last two years of college.

While in Korea, David began exploring Christianity again by questioning other army members who considered themselves Christians. David was influenced by one man he considered to be a devout Christian. This man impressed David because "he wasn't a holier-than-thou person that spit out textbook answers." He was someone who was wrestling with the same religious issues as David.

David returned to church, but began attending a different denomination than that of his youth. Upon returning from Korea David had reached a point in his life when he wanted to know the truth about who and what God was. David realized that he was a part of a larger system, and that there was something higher and greater than
himself. In this overall scheme David began to sense that he might have responsibilities to others.

Although David believes in the Christian faith, he does not embrace "less important" church teachings such as the story of the Garden of Eden. He feels that God has revealed himself to people of other faiths and that other religions contain bits of the truth just as Christianity does.

**Critical Life Events**

David matured in college and believes that it was during this time that he started moving into higher levels of moral reasoning. A class in logic enabled him to develop his reasoning skills and he began applying his skills to the area of moral reasoning. He also remembers a psychology professor whose class enabled him to put reason into his papers. As a math major, David's math classes were also useful in the development of his reasoning skills.

David was the representative for the cadet corp on the board of governors for his college during his senior year. When the cadet corp budget was brought before the board David realized that it had been inflated and recommended to the board that the budget be cut. The cadet corp "crucified" him when they found out what he had done. Even though it was an unpopular thing to do, David stood up for something he believed was right. This event marked both a move into an independence of moral judgment and a move
toward a higher level of moral reasoning for David, one in which moral decisions were based on a higher set of laws.

Until he attended college, however, David believed "the law is the law." When in the cadet corp he started to question basic rules and regulations of the organization and the foundation for his belief in the law began to crumble. Although he could not find reasons behind some regulation, (prohibitions against mustaches, etc.) David still felt compelled to obey.

Once in the army, David became responsible for enforcing the rules on subordinates. Although David could tolerate the rules when it meant just following them himself, he could not merely accept the rules when it meant enforcing them on others. At this point, David began making judgments about the fairness and reasonableness of the law. If he could not find a reason for the rules, or if the reasons did not justify the rules, he would often by-pass rules in favor of his own decisions. David was now reasoning beyond the law, and coming up with his own set of rules, or principles, based on his own sense of reason and fairness.

**Significant Others**

The first person who helped David look beyond conventionality was a high school social studies teacher. This teacher had a questioning disposition, and his teachings were unconventional in that he taught his students to question things instead of merely accepting
what they are told. This teacher made David aware that people did not always have to follow conventional customs and procedures. Eventually, David realized that laws and customs were not determinate or fixed.

David believes he gained a thinking process, "not just a lot of formulas," from several of his more intelligent college professors. Because of their influence, David began reasoning at higher levels and with greater precision. At this time he was also interested in Christianity, and began to apply his reasoning skills in the area of religion. Combining reasoning skills with Christianity eventually resulted in David's high level of moral reasoning.

In the army David was influenced by three people. The first was a devout Christian who was wrestling with the same religious issues as David (discussed earlier). The other two were soldiers in David's company who applied for conscientious objector status. Because he was an administrative company commander, David was responsible for processing their requests. He was impressed that these two people, who faced considerable internal and external conflict, were standing up for what they thought was right. More importantly, however, he was impressed by the rightness of their position. They placed the importance of human life above the laws of the nation and the dictates of the military. At the time he met these two people David had only one year remaining in the service. Had he had
several years of service remaining, David believes he would also have applied for conscientious objector status. The situation made him realize that his military involvement was now ethically unacceptable because his perspective of right and wrong had changed since he entered the service. The importance of life in his value scheme was inconsistent with the concept of war. He no longer strictly adhered to man-made laws, but began developing a set of higher laws based on fairness and reason. David knew that staying in the army was hypocritical, but he only had one year left. The men applying for conscientious objector status were at a point in their moral development very close to his. Indeed they helped push him one step closer to moral maturity.

David's wife, a most significant other, has helped him learn to care about others. She made him aware of some emotions and feelings he was suppressing, and thus helped him become a more sensitive person, one who could better identify with people. Without her influence, reaching moral maturity would have taken much more time for David.

Books and Writers

David readily admits that he does not particularly enjoy reading. Nevertheless, he has been influenced by some writers. While enroute to Korea David read Hal Lindsey's *The Late Great Planet Earth*, a book about the destruction of the world. The book caused him to think about issues of morality and religion and brought to mind
many of the Christian principles he was taught as a child. David began critically examining his religious beliefs and moral principles.

Richard Weaver's *Ideas Have Consequences*, has been influential in David's life. Weaver's view, that mankind is on a decadent spiral and that laws enable people to assume a bare minimum of thought and responsibility, is one that David finds to be accurate. People just live by the law. Weaver argues that they fail to realize that the law serves as a basis for an attitude we should cultivate; to cooperate in an effort to promote the moral good for society. David shares Weaver's viewpoint so strongly that he believes the book is something he would have written.

David was introduced to Lawrence Kohlberg in a sermon. The minister used Kohlberg's theory of moral development to explain why Christ came at the time he did. According to the minister, people were ready to move into higher levels of moral reasoning and Christ set the example. Since then, David has read several of Kohlberg's works. Kohlberg's theory helped "gel together" David's beliefs.

**Summary**

Through a process of combining Christian beliefs with highly developed reasoning skills David arrived at his current moral philosophy. His reasoning skills developed in an unemotional home atmosphere very conducive to analytic thinking and logic, and his skills continued to
develop throughout his formal education. Critical life events were those events which aided in the development of his reasoning abilities, led him to question the law as absolute, and helped him learn to be sensitive to himself and others. He has been influenced by people and writers who have helped him to question and challenged his beliefs and/or have held beliefs similar to his. Although David belonged to a Christian church from childhood through the first two years of college, he never fully integrated the Church's tenets into his thinking. During his latter college years and his years in the military, David began exploring Christianity seriously for the first time. He eventually affiliated with a Christian church because he wanted to know God. In working through his religious beliefs, David applied his reasoning skills and developed a morally mature philosophy of life.
Chapter VIII
Russel Hinton

The attainment of moral maturity for Russ has meant internalizing Christian values he was taught early in life and extending them into a broader schema of universal principles. Through a process of intellectual development and critical examination of his Christian beliefs Russ derived his universal principles.

**Chronology of Life**

Russ is a 21 year old college senior. He was born in a town of about 2000 people in rural Kentucky. He has one brother who is five years younger than he. While Russ was growing up, both of his parent worked, his father as a plant foreman and his mother as a registered nurse. Consequently, Russ was cared for regularly by a babysitter. Religion was and continues to be stressed in the home. He and his family are active in a Christian church.

Russ was a sickly child during his first few years. He suffered from allergies and almost died of pneumonia on more than one occasion. As he grew he regained his health and led a normal childhood. He excelled in school and was active in church activities.

College has been a time of personal and intellectual growth. Russ has continued to be active in his church and
and other community activities such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters. Currently he is a college senior majoring in philosophy and religion and minoring in psychology. He has completed a four-year college program in three years and will graduate in the spring. After graduation he plans to attend a seminary and pursue a divinity degree. Later, he hopes to do graduate work in psychology. His career objective is to teach pastoral counseling.

Moral Philosophy

Despite his youth, Russ's responses to Kohlberg's moral dilemmas reveal predominantly stage six moral reasoning. For example, in response to the question on the Hienz's Dilemma "Should Hienz have stolen the drug?" Russ replied "I think in that case he was justified in stealing the drug...the person's right to life overcomes the laws society has made to protect the inventor's invention." When asked "Is it ever right to disobey the law?" Russ answered "I think sometimes it is. The law is the thing that is commonly agreed upon by the people to make sure things go smoothly in the normal course of things, but there are some principles which are higher than the law." Russ defines two of these principles as the right to life and freedom of choice.

Russ defines a moral as a broad or universal ethical principle, and the person who abides by such principles as a moral person. Russ sees morality as a continuum. People are very seldom totally moral or immoral, people do
not always follow universal principles nor do they totally ignore them. Man-made laws and mores are no longer absolutes for Russ. There are values higher than the law, however, which he does see as absolutes.

Russ identifies three levels of morality. First, and most importantly for him, there are universal principles which apply to everyone, everywhere. A person's right to life and to choose how he's going to live are examples of universal principles. Christian values, in Russ's opinion, derive from universal values. Cultural morals constitute a second morality level. People in a certain culture may abide by a set of morals which do not apply to other societies. The third level of morality characterizes an individual's self-selected principles. An individual can have individual moral principles which are not imposed on others. An example of an individual moral principle for Russ is that premarital sex is wrong. Although he feels that it is personally wrong for him, he does not condemn others for not adhering to his principle.

Much of Russ's moral philosophy parallels Christian beliefs. Russ does believe, however, that there are values which extent beyond Christianity. When he was younger Russ accepted Christianity totally and without question; now he explores and questions Christian ideals before he accepts and internalizes them.
Personality Profile

Russ sees himself as a people-oriented, caring person who relates well to others and is sensitive to their needs. Through leadership positions he has held in church related organizations Russ has learned to be a good listener. In comparison with others his age, Russ considers himself more mature. In terms of ego development, Russ feels he is between a stage of moratorium and ego identity. He has only recently become interested in politics and is in a dilemma as to what political party he favors. Russ is attracted to the democratic party because of its emphasis on social concerns, but feels that Regan's supply-side economic policies may benefit the country.

Intellectual, introspective, and organized are other principle terms Russ uses to describe himself. He sees himself as a leader, but not as a socializer. Impatience is one of the more negative characteristics Russ sees in himself. On the 16 PF Rus scored in the tenth sten on Factor B (intelligent, abstract-thinking, bright), Factor I (tender-minded, sensitive, clinging, overprotected), and Factor Q3 (controlled, exacting will power, socially precise, compulsive). He scored in the eighth sten on Factor M (imaginative, Bohemian, absent-minded) and Factor Q2 (self-sufficient, resourceful, prefers own decisions). On Factor F he scored in the third sten (i.e. he tends to be sober, taciturn, and serious) and he also scored in the
third ten on Factor Q4 (i.e. he tends to be relaxed, tranquil, unfrustrated, composed).

**Early Family Influences**

Russ identifies three factors in childhood which influenced his moral development. One early influence was the atmosphere of acceptance and love which characterized his home. Because of the home atmosphere Russ felt free to explore himself and to explore different values and beliefs. He was able to question Christian values before deciding to internalize them as his own.

A second factor affecting Russ's moral development was his religious upbringing. Within the home there was a Christian morality, i.e., belief in a set of values coming from a higher source than man, a sense of caring for others which provided a background upon which he could develop his own moral outlook. In his present moral philosophy, Russ still subscribes to higher principles. He believes that from these universal principles he can derive Christian values.

The third factor influencing his moral development was his comparative poor health as a child. Because he was sickly, Russ was unable to participate in sports. Consequently he turned to academics. He became a voracious reader and this reading exposed him to many viewpoints and ideas. This exposure caused Russ to rethink and broaden his own ideas, including his ideas about morality. His reading exposed him at an early age to writers, such as
Emerson, Thoreau, Plato and Aristotle, whose conceptions of what is moral extend beyond society's laws and church teachings. Russ began to realize that there were higher principles to be followed.

**Religion**

Church has always been central in Russ's life. While a senior in high school he was the President of his church youth group and served on the pastoral search committee for his church. Russ organizes his life around his religion. For him, religion provides direction, purpose, and meaning for life.

During high school Russ felt a great deal of self-imposed guilt and inhibition because of his religious ideals. He had his religious ideals shaken when he realized that ministers were human and sometimes made errors in judgment and conduct. While Russ was a freshman in high school, a respected youth minister was dismissed for taking a sexual interest in the choir girls. Prior to the incident, Russ had dichotomized people into religious or non-religious. That dichotomous scheme became less distinct after this event. He also began questioning both religion and what it meant to be religious. A second event which brought Russ to the realization that ministers are really human occurred while he was serving on the pastoral committee for his church. Searching for a new pastor involved investigating the personal lives of
ministers. The searches revealed human flaws and weaknesses in people Russ had previously idealized.

Although Russ began questioning his religious beliefs as a high school freshman, serious doubts about religion were not problematic until two events of his junior year in high school. During this year his childhood babysitter died, and Russ was exposed to a college environment. Following the summer of his junior year Russ went through a period of serious doubt about the doctrines and ideas articulated by his church. He rethought whether he had to believe what the church said or whether belief was optional and he could choose beliefs in accord with his own conscience and individual principles. The period of doubt extended through his freshman year in college. This experience opened new categories of higher laws for Russ. He no longer dichotomized the world into black or white or right or wrong according to the doctrine of his church, but saw things from a larger perspective. Both intellectually and spiritually, Russ was ready to broaden his moral outlook.

Russ no longer interprets the Bible literally. Rather, he recognizes that fiction and mythology exist in the Bible. Through his collegiate study of Biblical languages he has come to realize that people can interpret the Bible as saying whatever they wish to hear. Even prior to college Russ engaged in reading which made him question the literal interpretation of the Bible. His college
experience served to verify many ideas and beliefs he was already considering.

**Critical Life Events**

During his junior year in high school, Russ's childhood babysitter, a woman with whom he shared a close and long relationship, died of cancer. This incident had a very sobering effect on him, in that it forced him to come to terms with death. Russ began taking things more seriously, such as his beliefs and Christianity.

Russ had the opportunity to attend college as a junior scholar the summer prior to his senior year in high school, which meant he received college credit for taking college courses. The open atmosphere of a college setting was most conducive to exploring, questioning, and challenging beliefs which Russ had simply accepted while growing up. The early exposure to the intellectual environment of college led to a period of doubt about religion in general and the doctrines of his church in particular. Russ eventually returned to the core of his Christian beliefs, but with a more universalistic perspective.

**Significant Others**

Both of Russ's parents worked while he was growing up, and his main caretaker was Mary, his babysitter. Mary served as a role model for Russ's moral development. She was, in Russ's view and recollection, a very religious person who influenced him substantially throughout childhood and adolescence. Russ spent more time with her
than he did with children his own age, and she became his mentor. Her Christian attitude provided Russ with a basis for the development of his own Christian values.

Russ attributes part of his intellectual development and the broadening of his religious outlook to a professor of religion with whom he has studied biblical languages in college (discussed earlier). This professor helped Russ to realize that people insert their own views into the text of the Bible. This insight enabled Russ to better understand how people can hold different beliefs after reading the same text. It also reinforced his belief that there are higher values than the doctrines elaborated by different Christian religions.

**Summary**

Russ has achieved his moral maturity by rethinking the Christian values he merely accepted as a child and fitting them into a broader category of universal principles. Extensive reading has exposed Russ to a wide variety of ideas which, in turn, helped him to develop a broader moral outlook. People who have influenced Russ's moral development have served as role models and/or provided intellectual stimulation for Russ to examine his beliefs. Critical life events have been those events which have shaken religious ideals and caused questioning of fundamental beliefs. The loving and accepting home atmosphere and his religious upbringing have enabled Russ to
explore different values and beliefs, while providing a foundation on which to build his own belief system.
Chapter IX

Conclusion

The subjects in this study all evidence universalistic perspective and subscribe to higher laws, i.e., sets of self-chosen ethical principles. These characteristic are consistent with Kohlberg's conceptualization of the stage six person. The commonalities are written quickly of necessity. A longer period of reflection on the case studies may provide new and different insights on the commonalities between subjects.

From our study of these individuals, it is apparent that individual differences are more impressive than are the commonalities. The backgrounds and personalities of these six individuals vary in many ways. The kinds of events and key influences which promoted "stage six" were similarly quite varied. Early family life ranged from growing up in a southern, rural village to childhood in a large northeastern city. The childhood homes and environments of each subject were also different. One home was described as a "concentration camp," while another was characterized as loving and supportive. In the development of their respective moral philosophies some subjects drew upon unique writers, while others drew upon religious teachings, communal experiences, and drug experimentation.
Still, there are a few fairly common features. The subjects' 16 PF profiles revealed some common personality traits. In general terms these subjects can be described as intelligent, tender-minded, imaginative, self-sufficient, controlled, and serious. As expected, all subjects were average or above average intelligence, although only two were in the ninth and tenth sten (Bill and Russ). All subjects were above the mean on Factor I (tender-minded, sensitive, clinging, overprotected), with four falling in the eighth sten or above in this scale (Audrey, Bill, Russ, and Tom). Four of the subjects (Russ, Bill, Ann, and Audrey) scored in the eighth sten or above on Factor M (imaginative, Bohemian, absent-minded). All but one subject scored in the eighth sten or above on Factor Q2 (self-sufficient, resourceful, prefers own decisions), but Ann actually scored in the first sten on this scale. On Factor Q3 (controlled, exacting willpower, socially precise, compulsive) the four male subjects scored in the eighth sten or above. Audrey and Ann scored in the fifth and third sten, respectively, on this scale. Three subjects (Russ, Tom, and David) scored in the third sten or below on Factor F (they are sober, taciturn, and serious). Bill and Audrey scored in the fourth sten on this scale, while Ann scored in the seventh sten.

Religion played an important role in moral development of all six subjects, but in different ways. Four grew up in -- and away from -- fundamentalism. Because these four
subjects have spent much of their lives in the south, a religiously-oriented region, this commonality may be an idiosyncrasy of the sample. Although none of these subjects still adhere to the dogma of their respective churches, their moral philosophies reflect basic Christian values which they have critically examined, redefined, and broadened. Their fundamentalism gave them a frame of reference from which to depart in development of their respective moral philosophies. Audrey's childhood church gave her a respect for diversity among people. David's search for truth led him back to a Christian church.

Audrey, Ann, and Tom all have developed an eminent conception of God. They see a part of God within each person, and relate to others on that basis. These subjects see a connectedness between all people, which Audrey and Ann attribute to the Godliness within everyone. This connectedness extends to include the entire world and everything in it.

In spite of their common rejection of church dogma, the person of Jesus serves as an exemplar of morality for the subjects. All of the subjects, except one, find the life and teachings of Jesus to express a high point in moral thought and behavior. Jesus is a rare model, but not unique one. Each subject has other luminaries. For example, Emerson and Thoreau were identified as influential in the moral development of three subjects (Russ, Tom, and Bill). Phillips Brooks, Marcus Aurelius, Montaigne,
Maslow, and Frankl were influential in Tom's life. Audrey saw Carl Jung and Bettelheim as playing tremendous roles in her moral development. The influential people and writers in the subjects' lives were often people who held philosophies similar to theirs, a characteristic which suggests that the ideas and beliefs were already present within the subjects, although perhaps not fully developed. The subjects seemed to turn to people and writers who addressed issues of concern to them and who helped to provide clarity as their philosophies emerged.

An apparent commonality among the subjects is a genuine concern for all people. Five subjects (Ann, Audrey, Russ, Tom, and Bill) have developed a deep sense of caring which they try to demonstrate in their everyday lives. The vocations chosen by these subjects -- nursery school teacher, psychotherapist, pastoral counselor, professor/geographer, and professor -- are ones which serve human needs. Aside from their careers, they engage in other activities which demonstrate concern for others. Russ is a volunteer in the Big Brother/Big Sister program. Tom has been a volunteer chaplain at a VA hospital. Bill has been consistently involved in educating and working with third world people. The sixth subject, David, sees himself as still in the process of developing his sense of caring. Gilligan (1982) has suggested that males and females have different moral ideologies, with males centering on the ethics of rights and justice and females
centering on an ethic of care. Based on the results of this study, it appears that justice and care merge at the highest level of moral reasoning.

The four male subjects all identify influential females in their moral development. Russ was heavily influenced by his babysitter, Tom by his grandmothers, Bill by his mother, and David by his wife. These females role models all helped instill a concern for others in these four subjects. Audrey does not identify any influential women in her moral development, and Ann only identifies one woman, her teacher, among several men seen as influential.

Along with a concern for people, three of the subjects (Bill, Russ, and Audrey) expressed a strong conservation ethic and a great concern for our natural resources. Not only do they show a concern for the preservation of human life, but also for the preservation of the earth so that it may continue to provide humanity with those things necessary for life. This conservation ethic is possibly true of the others, but they did not volunteer this concern and were not asked about it.

According to their self-analyses, all subjects have achieved an ego identity, or (for the younger two subjects) are in the process of developing an ego identity. None have experienced any foreclosure or diffusion in their ego development. Four subjects (Ann, Audrey, Tom, and Bill) have liberal political outlooks. Russ is currently in a dilemma in his political outlook, between his attraction to
social welfare and justice on the one hand and his belief in supply-side economics on the other. David is apolitical, but believes that he will one day take a liberal political stance as he works out the requirements of his moral philosophy for social life.

Three of the subjects are middle children (Ann, Audrey, and Tom), and three are oldest children (Russ, Bill, and David). None are youngest children or only children. All of the subjects grew up in middle-class or lower middle-class families. None were raised in poverty or wealth.

The subjects are all thoughtful, reflective, and questioning. They cannot accept ideas and beliefs without critically examining them. They have carefully thought through their beliefs, rejecting the unacceptable and trivial, while incorporating the important. These persons are independent, responsible and remarkably self-directed. In a very real sense, their moral philosophies may be considered original.
Appendix A
OPINIONS ABOUT SOCIAL PROBLEMS

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

Please give us the following information:

Name ____________________________ female  
Age ______ Class and period ____________ male  
School ____________________________

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

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

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

Instructions for Part A: (Sample Question)

On the left hand side check one of the spaces by each statement of 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:

Great Much Some Little No

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

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

3. Whether the car dealer was a friend of Frank. (Note that if you are unsure about what "cubic inch displacement means, then mark it "no importance").

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

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

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

Instructions for Part B: (Sample Question)

From the list of questions above, select the most important one of the whole group. Put the number of the most important question on the top line below. Do likewise for your 2nd, 3rd and 4th most important 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 #4 were thought to be very important. In deciding what is the most important, a person would re-read #2 and #4, and then pick one of them as the most important, then put the other one as second most important, and so on.)

MOST SECOND MOST IMPORTANT THIRD MOST IMPORTANT FOURTH MOST IMPORTANT

5 2 3 1
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 good 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should report him</th>
<th>Can't decide</th>
<th>Should not report him</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**IMPORTANCE:**

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

1. Hasn't Mr. Thompson been good enough for such a long time to prove he isn't a bad person?
2. Everytime someone escapes punishment for a crime, doesn't that just encourage more crime?
3. Wouldn't we be better off without prisons and the oppression of our legal systems?
4. Has Mr. Thompson really paid his debt to society?
5. Would society be losing what Mr. Thompson should fairly expect?
6. What benefits would prisons be apart from society, especially for a charitable man?
7. How could anyone be so cruel and heartless as to send Mr. Thompson to prison?
8. How should one weight the good Mr. Thompson is doing in comparison to the importance of maintaining the legal system?
9. Would it be fair to all the prisoners who had to serve out their full sentences if Mr. Thompson was let off?
10. Was Mrs. Jones a good friend of Mr. Thompson?
11. Would it be a citizen's duty to report an escaped criminal, regardless of the circumstances?
12. How would the will of the people and the public good best be served?
13. 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
Mr. Webster was the owner and manager of a gas station. He wanted to hire another mechanic to help him, but good mechanics were hard to find. The only person he found who seemed to be a good mechanic was Mr. Lee, but he was Chinese. While Mr. Webster himself didn't have anything against Orientals, he was afraid to hire Mr. Lee because many of his customers didn't like Orientals. His customers might take their business elsewhere if Mr. Lee was working in the gas station.

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

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

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

**IMPORTANCE:**

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

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

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

- Most Important
- Second Most Important
- Third Most Important
- Fourth Most Important
STUDENT TAKE-OVER

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

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

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

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

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

IMPORTANCE:

Great Much Some Little No

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

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

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. Should a life which is in total anguish still be preserved.
8. Whether the doctor has sympathy for the woman's suffering or cares more about what society might think.
9. Is helping to end another's life ever a responsible act of cooperation.
10. Whether only God should decide when a person's life should end.
11. What values the doctor has set for himself in his own personal code of behavior.
12. Can society afford to let everybody end their lives when they want to.
13. 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
In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about $1000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. 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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Whether a community's laws are going to be upheld.</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Whether Heinz is a professional wrestler, or has considerable influence with professional wrestlers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Whether Heinz is stealing for himself or doing this solely to help someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Whether the druggist's rights to his invention have to be respected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Whether the essence of living is more encompassing than the termination of dying, socially and individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act towards each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Whether the druggist is going to be allowed to hide behind a worthless law which only protects the rich anyhow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How should one weight the relative importance of the druggist's property rights, of obeying the law, and of human life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Whether the law in this case is getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Whether the druggist deserves to be robbed for being so greedy and cruel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Would stealing in such a case bring about more total good for the whole society or not.</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 paper in the next two weeks.

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

Should the principal stop the newspaper? (Check one)

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

IMPORTANCE:

<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. The relative importance of the parents' concerns, the principal's responsibility to maintain an orderly school, and the students' right of free speech.</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>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Most Important
Second Most Important
Third Most Important
Fourth Most Important
Appendix B
Additions to the DIT

Escaped Prisoner: 8. How should one weight the good Mr. Thompson is doing in comparison to the importance of maintaining the legal system?

Webster: 11. Is adhering to the principle of justice more important than following the wishes of the customers?

Student Take-Over: 9. Whether or not the illegal act of taking over the building will ultimately save lives.

The Doctor's Dilemma: 7. Should a life which is in total anguish still be preserved.

Heinz and the Drug: 10. How should one weight the relative importance of the druggist's property rights, of obeying the law, and of human life.

Newspaper: 8. The relative importance of the parents' concerns, the principal's responsibility to maintain an orderly school, and the students' right of free speech.
Appendix C

Heinz's Dilemma

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

Should Heinz have stolen the drug? Was it actually right or wrong? Why?

Does stealing the drug have anything to do with being a good husband? Would a good husband do it?
What are the rights of the druggist in this case? Does he have a right to charge that much? Why or why not?

Answer the next three questions only if you think Heinz should have stolen the drug.

Suppose Heinz and his wife were not getting along and didn't love each other any more. Would that make a difference? What should Heinz do then?

Suppose it was not Heinz's wife that was dying, but a close friend. Should Heinz still have stolen the drug?

Suppose it was just someone Heinz didn't know very well but there was no one else to help. What should Heinz do, if anything?

Everyone should answer the following questions.

Would you have stolen the drug if it was your wife who was dying? Why or why not?

If you were the one dying, would you want your husband (or wife) to steal the drug?

Suppose that Heinz was arrested and brought before the judge.
Should the Judge punish Heinz? Why or why not?

What responsibility does the Judge have to follow the law? to the druggist? to Heinz?

Is it ever right to disobey the law? Why? If so, when?
The Doctor's Dilemma

The drug didn't work, and there was no other treatment known to medicine which could save Heinz's wife, so the doctor knew that she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a good dose of pain-killer, like ether or morphine, would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, and in her calm periods she would ask the Dr. to give her enough ether to kill her. She said she couldn't stand the pain and she was going to die in a few months anyway.

Should the doctor do what she asks and give her the drug that will make her die? Why or why not?

When a pet animal is badly wounded and will die, it is killed to put it out of its pain. Does the same thing apply here? Why or why not?

Answer the following questions only if you think the doctor should not give her the drug.

Would you blame the doctor for giving her the drug?

What would have been the best for the woman herself, to have had her live for six months more in great pain or have died sooner? Why?
Some countries have a law that doctors could put away a suffering person who will die anyway. Should the doctor do it in that case?

Everyone should answer the remaining questions:

The doctor finally decided to kill the woman to put her out of her pain, so he did it without consulting the law. The police found out and the doctor was brought up on a charge of murder. The jury decided he had done it, so they found him guilty of murder even though they knew the woman had asked him.

What punishment should the judge give the doctor? Why?

Would it be right or wrong to give the doctor the death sentence? Why or why not?

Do you believe that the death sentence should be given in some cases? Why or why not?
The Abortion Story

A man and a woman have a very close relationship. Separated for the summer, they grow apart and return with very mixed feelings about each other. One evening, feeling again their former closeness and attraction, they go further and further and have sexual intercourse. But afterwards the doubts about the relationship return. A few weeks later the woman finds that she is pregnant.

What would be the right thing for them to do? Why?

Who is responsible for making this decision? Why? What if they disagree about the right thing to do?

She knows that she could arrange an abortion. Would it be right or wrong for her to arrange an abortion? Why?

She considered having the baby and placing it for adoption as an alternative to abortion. Would that be the right thing to do? Why or why not?

The woman decided that she wants to get married and have the baby. Is it the man's responsibility to marry her? Why? (If no:) What is his responsibility to her?

They decide that abortion is the best solution. Why is ending the life of an unborn baby different from ending any
other human life?

What about the child seriously defective at birth -- would it be right for the doctor to let it die? Why or why not?

Are there any conditions that might make abortions right (and wrong)? What and why?

What if they were married and just didn't want the baby?

Would it make any difference if abortion was legal or illegal? Why or why not? Should abortions be legalized?

Do you think these issues about sex have anything to do with morality or immorality?

What does the word moral mean, and is its relation to sex?

Can you tell me something that you think is immoral in sex? Why?

Is this immoral for all people everywhere or only in societies where it is not accepted? Why?
Appendix D
Interview Questions

According to the tests we have administered to you, you have attained a high level of moral reasoning. We want you to tell us your own story on how you have developed your current moral outlook. We will be probing into certain key areas of your life, which will be explored in terms of how they relate to your moral development.

1. Tell us how you came to develop your moral outlook, including critical life events, people in your life, books, and religious beliefs. Tell us, as precisely as possible, how and what each of these have contributed to you.
2. To what degree do you consider your moral philosophy original to you -- not that others do not have the same outlook, but the extent to which you consider your philosophy your own?
3. What family beliefs, attitudes, and values during your childhood have influenced your moral development?
4. What was the religious orientation of your family while you were growing up, and how has this affected your moral outlook? Was religion stressed in the home?
5. What was the method of discipline used by your parents? Can you think of any way their method of discipline
affected your moral development?
6. What kinds of early opportunities did you have while growing up which have influenced your moral development?
7. How many siblings do you have? How has your relationship with them affected your way of thinking?
8. Has parental encouragement and involvement in your life affected the development of your moral philosophy?
9. In relation to your moral development, what was the family atmosphere like in your home (e.g., close? authoritarian? permissive? overprotective?)?
10. What kind of responsibilities did you have as a child and adolescent (e.g., chores to do, taking care of younger siblings)? How have early responsibilities influenced your current moral outlook as an adult?
11. Who was your main caretaker while growing up, and how did he/she influence your moral reasoning?
12. What was the occupation and socioeconomic status of your parents?
13. How have peer relationships affected your moral development? Were you close to others your age, younger than you, or older than you?
14. What critical things affected your moral development in junior high school? high school? college? graduate school?
15. What people have significantly influenced your way of thinking?
16. Which books have influenced your way of thinking?
17. What critical life events have affected the development of your moral philosophy?

18. What is your occupation? Marital status? Family status? Your role in the family?

19. What are your religious beliefs and practices, and how do they relate to your moral philosophy?

20. Do you participate in community activities? If so, how do these activities relate to your moral philosophy?

21. What are your most outstanding character traits?

22. In terms of your moral philosophy, describe the following: Your drives? Motives? Desires? Hopes? Ambitions?

23. What do you see as your direction and purpose in life?

24. What is your political outlook?

25. In terms of ego development, where do you see yourself at (explanation of ego stages)?
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