A study examining patterns of moral orientation with a group of adolescents at two high schools in Durban, KwaZulu-Natal.

Mona Gagadelis

Submitted as a dissertation component in part - fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Education in Education Psychology

Faculty of Education

University of KwaZulu-Natal

Durban

9 January 2006

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this dissertation is a product of my original work, unless specifically indicated to the contrary in the text. It has not been submitted before for any degree at any University.

This dissertation was carried out under the supervision and direction of Professor Nithi Muthukrishna of the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban.

I declare that this dissertation has been submitted with my approval.

_____   _____

Ms Mona Gagadelis   Supervisor: Prof. A. Muthukrishna

Place: Durban

Date: 9 January 2006

ACKNOWLDEGMENTS

To my dearest family: My husband, Stratis, my children, Michelle, Ramona, Rosilyn and Troy, my mother, Joyce, and my precious grandson, Aaron, thank you for all your love, encouragement, support and patience you have given me during my studies. Thank you for believing in me.

To my dearest father, William, you would have been so proud of me.

To my supervisor, Professor Nithi Muthukrishna, thank you for your academic support and guidance you have given me.

ABSTRACT

Beginning with Piaget, literature has accumulated indicating that children's moral judgments pass through a series of stages culminating in the application of high order general principles to practical judgments. Principled moral reasoning, therefore, has come to be seen as similar in principle to other abstract sciences where less formal, narrative forms of thinking are seen to be less abstract and more immature. Kohlberg's research as inspired by the work of Piaget who had tried to connect the development of a child's moral judgment to its overall cognitive development. Kohlberg believed that as the whole human personality matures, our thinking about right and wrong starts at a preconventional level, then progresses to a conventional level, then finally arrives at postconventional thinking. Each of these three levels has two specific stages. Kohlberg's research included subjects from many cultures, and therefore, he believed that he was uncovering a universal innate developmental structure of the human personality. Carol Gilligan has posed a serious threat to this general scheme by suggesting that a more narrative contextual approach to moral reasoning, what she calls an "ethic of care", which far from applying abstract moral rules to particular cases, treats each case in terms of a host of considerations any or all of which may have some role in arriving at a judgment or an action. She argues that such moral reasoning is as valid an orientation of moral thinking as that based on the application of general, abstract rules, and furthermore, that the bias towards this orientation is, at base, a gender based. A rich body of data has now been collected congruent with these claims.

In order to explore the relationship between this alternate proposal and Gilligan's "justice" and "care" orientations, this study was designed to examine the moral orientation with a group of adolescents, fifteen boys and fifteen girls, at two high schools in Durban. The participants live in a working class, housing estate that has high levels of crime and violence. The adolescences were requested to reflect upon two scenarios depicting real life dilemmas, and then engage in moral judgments and decision-making in response to probing questions put to them in an interview situation. Results have shown

that, contrary to Gilligan's view; across age and gender the adolescences responses reflected a higher moral orientation to justice than care. 66% of boys' responses show greater use of a justice orientation in their reasoning than care orientation 34%. A similar pattern was evident with girls across the age ranges: 53% of girls' responses were justice oriented as against to 47 % that were care oriented. An interesting finding was that girls' use of a justice orientation increased with age, and the use of moral reasoning that reflected a care orientation decreased with age. However, in line with Gilligan's theory, boys' responses across age ranges reflected a higher orientation to justice than to care. Based on previous research findings (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988; Johnston, 1988), it was hypothesized that female learners would demonstrate higher ethic of care scores than men. The results from this study fell in line with this hypothesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER TWO: THE DEVELOPMENT OF MORAL REASONING –
A LITERATURE REVIEW

CHAPTER THREE: RESEACH METHODOLGY AND DESIGN

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

CHAPTER FIVE: REFLECTIONS

CHAPTER ONE: FOCUS, RATIONALE AND COURSE OF STUDY

1.1 Focus of Study

The aim of this study was to explore how adolescents formulate and express their moral orientations in the context of moral dilemmas they may encounter. This study examined the effect of gender on moral orientation among secondary school learners. Based on previous research findings (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988; Johnston, 1988), it was hypothesized that female learners would demonstrate higher ethic of care scores than men. Kohlberg and Gilligan (1971) hypothesized that the moral judgment of older subjects should be more advanced than that of younger subjects matched for cognitive level. In this study, age related patterns in moral reasoning were examined.

Gilligan (1982) claimed that men are more "justice" oriented while women are more "care" oriented. A justice orientation is motivated by logic and reason, requiring the moral person to treat others impartially and objectively and basing moral decisions on abstract principles of justice that can be universalised to every person and every situation. A care orientation allows the person to use subjective feelings and sentiments when making moral judgments. The caring decision is motivated by empathy. It recognizes particular relationships between people and extenuating circumstances in each situation. In the past, moral reasoning research has focused on how people view hypothetical dilemmas and situations, such as those exemplified on Kohlberg's measure of moral development (1984; Colby & Kohlberg, 1987). However, the use of hypothetical dilemmas has posed a problem for researchers interested in predicting and understanding how people come to view moral dilemmas in everyday life in particular ways. Much research suggests some people view different moral dilemmas in different ways, and some people view them in similar ways (Wark & Krebs 1996; 1997; 2000). It is possible that these individual differences stem from gender differences and /or differences in experience and personality.

It has been argued that children are more likely to adopt a care perspective as compared to a justice perspective, if they live in relatively affluent conditions where their rights have not been restricted (Beal, Garrod, Ruben, Stewart, & Dekle, 1997). Arising from the above, one hypothesis will be that children living under traumatic conditions may show an increased orientation to the principles of fairness and justice in reasoning about their moral issues. However, on the other hand, one could speculate that exposed to others suffering and hardships could increase a sense of empathy in a child and invariably show a heightened sense of concern for the well being of others (Garrod, Beal, Jaeger, Thomas, Davis Leisher, & Hodzic 2003). This research explored ways in which moral dilemmas are judged and explained by these adolescents who have experienced social hardships. Although this was a small-scale study, I investigated whether or not there were gender differences in moral orientation, and to see if the findings of this study were in line with Gilligan's framework.

1.2 Rationale for the Study

This research was prompted by an observation made in the literature that very little data exists in respect of moral development of children and adolescents within the South-African context. The data that exists is drawn from American and British studies, which compared to the South African situation, have social experiences that are vastly different. The current study seeks to redress the above omission by taking into account the South African context. In this way, it seeks to address a gap in literature.

In addition, the study was undertaken in a rather unique social context. The adolescents in this study live in a context where families are exposed to many social hardships. The community comprises individuals who are representative of the various race groups in South Africa that were demarcated in the apartheid era as Indian, White, African and Coloured. There are also immigrant families from Africa. I was an educator at one of the two high schools, and have had first hand insight into the context – that is, the various socio-economic problems children face, including displacement of families from their homes, the reality of a life in poverty, single parents, crime and violence.

9

Adolescent morality is a topic that has long been at the forefront of social policy debate internationally. In recent years internationally, the perceived lack of morality in the teen years has resulted in a groundswell of support for harsh sanctions against adolescents judged deficient in moral character. To give only two examples of this trend, in the U.S.A. expenditures have increased dramatically for the incarceration of adolescents and young adults convicted of crimes (Skolnick, 1994), and financial support for teenaged mothers has been restricted (Jencks & Edin, 1995), with both trends reflecting societal judgments that crime and pregnancy among teenagers reflect deep ethical flaws. I explored the moral reasoning of these adolescents who come from a background that is impacted by such social problems, and where their individual rights are often compromised. Most studies in the literature seem to have been conducted in more advantaged contexts (Beal et al. 1997).

It seems reasonable to suggest that adolescents that have experienced disadvantaged socio-cultural conditions may view moral dilemmas differently from relatively advantaged adolescents. The adolescents in this study live in a context where families are exposed to many social hardships and are deprived of simple basic needs. The term "deprivation" must be one of the most overworked words in the English language. Deprivation may refer to be a varied aspect of a person's environment. How much money people have determines their access to goods and services, and hence shapes their standard of living and influences their social status. Poverty shows important associations with poor physical development (Birch & Gussow 1970) and with many other aspects of disadvantaged such as inadequate housing, low educational attainments, problems in parenting and crime and exposed to violence. It is my view that poverty affects people in different ways. For some people, it may harden, making them cynical, callous, and greedy, and may result in loss of self-respect and pride. In the case of others, it may soften, giving them a deep sensitivity toward others.

Wylie (2000) claims that measured in terms of the distribution of household income, South Africa has had, and continues to have, among the greatest disparity between wealthy and poor anywhere in the contemporary world. Among black South Africans the

unemployment rate averages more than forty per cent; in many rural areas the rate tops seventy per cent. The violence and tyranny of everyday poverty remains a pervasive feature of the social landscape: grossly inadequate housing, water and sanitation; disease, malnutrition and infant death; alcoholism, broken families, sexual violence; extraordinarily uneven and usually woefully deficient access to healthcare. Three quarters of poor live in rural areas. Most recently, South Africa faces among the world's worst HIV/AIDS crisis, with infection rates in parts of the country reaching a staggering thirty per cent of the population. The South African society is exposed to social stress such as high inflation rates, increasing divorce statistics, increasing suicide and increasing death rates related to AIDS.

Muthukrishna, Hugo and Wedekind (2005) explain that in South Africa exposure to multiple forms of violence is a daily reality that impacts the lives of children, in particular those in urban communities. The fact that children experience the symbolic and physical violence of murder, abuse of women and children, rape, prejudice and discrimination, robbery and assault on a daily basis as a result of the combination of a highly unequal society and high crime levels in urban areas is well documented.

Given the above context of childhood in South Africa, there are sound reasons for examining the ways in which adolescents make everyday moral judgments and engage in moral decision- making when confronted with incidents of symbolic and physical violence.

Thus, the purpose of this study was to investigate whether moral dilemmas presented to adolescents exposed to harsh conditions would elicit care-oriented solutions more than justice-oriented solutions or visa versa.

In addition to the above, there is a belief that men and women differ in characteristics such as caring, empathy and concern about relationships. Females are attributed with these qualities more often than males (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988). There is also a belief that men and women differ in characteristics such as abstract and logical reasoning abilities. Therefore, this study examines gender trends in adolescents' moral reasoning.

I wanted to assess the relations among moral maturity, and moral reasoning. Research has shown that there are shifts in children's thinking. A study by Walker (1989) found that about moral dilemmas as they age. Both Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1984) hypothesize that social experiences help to promote advances in moral reasoning. Studies confirm that there is a cognitive basis for moral judgment as educational level correlates with score on moral reasoning tests. However, the dilemmas used for this study are seldom similar to the type faced in real-life. Younger people at lower stages expressed the normative, the egoistic and the utilitarian orientations more frequently than the ideal and the fairness orientations, whereas older people at higher stages used the latter two orientations more frequently. Kohlberg and Gilligan (1971) hypothesized that the moral judgment of older subjects should be more advanced than that of younger subjects matched for cognitive level. In this study, age related patterns in moral reasoning were examined.

1.3 Key Research Questions

Using the concepts of justice and care, this study will attempt to explore:

- How do the adolescents in a particular context judge and reason about real life moral dilemmas?
- Do the learners adhere to one orientation over another?
- Do socioeconomic hardships shape the way in which learners judge the real life situations that they confront?
- Are gender differences in reasoning about moral conflict situations?

CHAPTER TWO: The Development of Moral Reasoning – A Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews international literature on the development of moral reasoning, particularly in children and adolescents. The first section interrogates the question: what is morality? - as a starting point for discussion. Since the study focussed on moral reasoning amongst adolescents, attention is given to perspectives in literature on the psychological development of the adolescent. A section follows this on parenting and moral development. Following this, some key theories on moral development that have influenced empirical work in this area of research are examined. Finally, there is included a section on empirical research focussing on moral reasoning amongst children.

2.2 What is Morality?

Morality is an important aspect of our relations with others and some would argue it is the most important aspect. Morals are systems of social rules that guide our behaviour and shape our interactions. Our sense of right or wrong can influence our feelings of prejudice or altruism and it can have an effect on our relationships and on our daily lives. Therefore, the focus of the section is how we come to behave in moral or immoral ways.

Whereas most people would likely agree that they "know a good person when they see one', there is decidedly less agreement as to what characteristics centrally define psychological morality. Moral development involves the formation of a system of values on which to base decisions concerning "right" and "wrong," or "good" and "bad." Values are underlying assumptions about standards that govern moral decisions.

Although morality has been a topic of discussion since the beginning of human civilization, the scientific study of moral development did not begin in earnest until the

late 1950s. Lawrence Kohlberg (1927-1987), an American psychologist building upon Jean Piaget's work in cognitive reasoning, posited six stages of moral development in his 1958 doctoral thesis. Since that time, morality and moral development have become acceptable subjects of scientific research. Prior to Kohlberg's work, the prevailing positivist view claimed that science should be "value-free" - that morality had no place in scientific studies. By choosing to study moral development scientifically, Kohlberg broke through the positivist boundary and established morality as a legitimate subject of scientific research (Hunter 2000).

Etiquette is sometimes included as a part of morality, but it applies to behavior that is considered less serious than the kinds of actions to which morality usually applies. Law is distinguished from morality by having explicit rules, penalties, and officials who interpret the laws and apply the penalties, but there is often considerable overlap in the conduct governed by morality and that governed by law. Religion differs from morality in that it includes stories, usually about supernatural beings, that are used to explain or justify the behavior that it requires. Although there is often a considerable overlap in the conduct required by religion and that required by morality, morality provides only a guide to conduct, whereas religion always contains more than this. When "morality" is used simply to refer to a code of conduct put forward by a society, whether or not it is distinguished from etiquette, law, and religion, then it is being used in a completely descriptive sense (Bernard 2004).

There are several approaches to the study of moral development, which are categorized in a variety of ways. Briefly, the social learning theory approach claims that humans develop morality by learning the rules of acceptable behaviour from their external environment, an essentially behaviourist approach. According to Pelaez-Nogueras & Gewirtz (1995) Behaviourists focus on overt behaviour as the core of psychological morality; for example, sharing, helping, and cheating. Psychoanalytic theory proposes instead that morality develops through humans' conflict between their instinctual drives and the demands of society. Psychoanalytic models tend to focus on internalised societal norms for behaviour, that is, conscience or superego, and the corresponding emotions of self-reproach for their violations such as guilt and shame (Gilligan, 1976; Sagan, 1988).

Socio-cultural theorists emphasize the role of cultural transmission of values, personality traits (moral character), and cognitive patterns (Bandura, 1986; Etzioni, 1996; Shweder et al., 1987; Staub, 1979). Cognitive psychologists emphasize moral reasoning and decision-making (Kohlberg, 1976; Piaget, 1965). Cognitive development theories view morality as an outgrowth of cognition, or reasoning, whereas personality theories are holistic in their approach, taking into account all the factors that contribute to human development. Biologists tend to focus attention on evolutionary functions, genetic selection of moral characteristics, hormones (Alexander, 1987; Eysenck, 1976).

The differences between these approaches rest on two questions: Where do humans begin on their moral journey; and 2) where do we end up? In other words, how moral are infants at birth? And how is "moral maturity" defined? What is the ideal morality to which we aspire? The contrasting philosophies at the heart of the answers to these questions determine the essential perspective of each moral development theory. Those who believe infants are born with no moral sense tend towards social learning or behaviourist theories, as all morality must be learned from the external environment. Others who believe humans are innately aggressive and completely self-oriented are more likely to accept psychoanalytic theories where morality is the learned management of socially destructive internal drives (Kohn 1990).

What constitutes "mature morality" is a subject of great controversy. Each society develops its own set of norms and standards for acceptable behaviour, leading many to say that morality is entirely culturally conditioned. Does this mean there are no universal truths, no cross-cultural standards for human behaviour? The debate over this question fuels the critiques of many moral development theories. Kohlberg's six stages of moral development (Kohlberg 1969), for example, have been criticized for elevating Western, urban, intellectual (upper class) understandings of morality, while discrediting rural, tribal, working class, or Eastern moral understandings. Feminists have pointed out potential sexist elements in moral development theories devised by male researchers using male subjects only, such as Kohlberg's early work. Because women's experience in the world is different from men's in every culture it would stand to reason that women's moral development might differ from men's, perhaps in significant ways (Gilligan 1982).

Definitions of what is or is not moral are currently in a state of upheaval within individual societies, at least, in the Western world. Controversies rage over the morality of warfare, ecological conservation, genetic research and manipulation, alternative fertility and childbearing methods, abortion, sexuality, pornography, drug use, euthanasia, racism, sexism, and human rights issues, among others (Miller 1994). Determining the limits of moral behaviour becomes increasingly difficult as human capabilities, choices, and responsibilities proliferate with advances in technology and scientific knowledge. For example, prenatal testing techniques that determine birth defects in the uterus force parents to make new moral choices about whether to birth a child. Other examples of recently created moral questions abound in modern-day society.

In summary, the study of moral development is lively today. The rise in crime, drug and alcohol abuse, gang violence, teen parenthood, and suicide in recent years in Western society has also caused a rise in concern over morality and moral development. Parents and teachers want to know how to raise moral children, and they turn to moral development theorists to find the answers. Freudian personality theories became more widely known to the Western public in the 1960s and were understood to imply that repression of a child's natural drives would lead to neuroses (Walker & Taylor 1991). Many parents and teachers were, therefore, afraid to discipline their children, and permissiveness often became the rule. Cognitive development theories did little to change things, as they focus on reasoning and disregard behaviour. After a great deal of criticism in this regard, Kohlberg and other cognitive development theorists did begin to include moral actions in their discussions and education programs, but their emphasis is still on reasoning alone. Behaviourist theories, with their complete denial of free will in moral decision-making, are unattractive to many and require such precise, dedicated, behaviour modification techniques to succeed that few people are able to apply them in real-life situations.

2.3 The Psychological Development of the Adolescent

The participants of this research are in the adolescence stage so I will provide some key perspectives in this section on the psychological development of the adolescent. According to Coleman& Hendry (1999), adolescent maturation is a personal phase of development where children have to establish their own beliefs, values, and what they want to accomplish out of life. Because adolescents constantly and realistically appraise themselves, they are often characterized as being extremely self-conscious. The self-evaluation process leads to the beginning of long-range goal setting, emotional and social independence, and the making of a mature adult.

Adolescence is an important period of personal growth. During this time, teens are seeking to discover a unique identity for themselves. The sense of self that forms is largely based on their conformity to the rules and conventions of peers, family, and society. These rules and conventions also influence an adolescent's reasoning of right and wrong behaviours. The adolescent's identity and behaviour combine to produce a level of moral development. Investigation (Cleary 2000) reveals that adolescents are an extraordinarily diverse group of people. One thing common to all adolescents, however, is that they are engaged in a process of psychological development. Development is a process of change, but not all changes are developmental (Margolin& Gordis, 2000).

Adolescents face a range of challenges that children are not generally required to deal with during their first decade of life. These include such things as sexuality, including early marriage, early childbearing and parenting; livelihoods and economic activity and the impact of work on social status and personal identity; managing to sustain education and enhance knowledge and skills; maintaining personal health and confronting new morbidities, such as HIV/AIDS, drugs, alcohol and tobacco, suicide and unintentional injuries; learning to cope with violence, from organised gangs to armed conflicts; and assuming civic responsibilities, from involvement in voluntary organisations to voting (United Nations 2001).

Adolescence is neither a homogenous stage of development nor it is experienced uniformly (Adams, Montemayor & Gullotta 1996). The needs of older adolescents (15 –

17

19 years) differ from those of their younger counterparts (10 – 14 years). The experiences of rural adolescents and urban adolescents differ. Levels of education, overall socio-economic status of the family and psycho-social factors all influence how adolescence is experienced. Cutting across all of the above is gender: the needs and experiences of girls are very different from those of boys.

In summary, adolescence is marked by changes of many sorts – of physiology, cognitive functioning, personal identity, social relationships with family and peers, often, these take place within a changing cultural context. Demands, expectations, opportunities and sanctions vary over time and place.

2.4 Caregivers and Moral Development

Perhaps the most prominent influence a child receives is that of the parents or caregivers. The term 'parents' will be used in this chapter to include all caregivers in various forms of family structure. Caregivers not only provide the child with protection, support and basic material needs, in most cases parents also act as the principal figures that enforce moral and other rules.

While there are a number of models of the development of moral reasoning (Damon, 1977; Eisenberg 1986, Haan 1985, Kohlberg 1976, Piaget 1965), most research on the relation of parenting to moral reasoning development has relied predominantly on Kohlberg's theory. The effects of parenting on the development of Kohlbergian moral reasoning were largely ignored for decades. This was due in part to the Piagetian (1965) thesis that parents tended to be authoritarian and, therefore, suppress moral reasoning development, whereas peers were more egalitarian and, therefore, fostered moral reasoning development. Researchers eventually questioned or ignored this position (Holstein 1976, Lickona 1983, Parikh 1980, Youniss 1980) whereas other researchers had studied this with outcome variables other than Kohlberg stage (Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967).

A great deal of literature published before the 1990s examined the effects of parenting styles on children's outcomes, particularly establishing the benefits to children of authoritative parenting as opposed to the negative outcomes produced by authoritarian

18

and permissive parenting (Demo & Cox, 2000). Most of the existing studies that examine the relationship between parenting styles and children's cognitive development are comprised of families with adolescents (Aunola, Stattin & Nurmi, 2000; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman & Roberts, 1987; Leung &Kwan, 1998; Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998) or college students (Hickman, Bartholomae &McKenry, 2000; Kawamura, Frost, & Harmatz, 2002).

Many studies exist that examine parenting styles (Abell, Clawson, Washington, Bost, & Vaughn, 1996; Bluestone & Tamis-LeMonda, 1999). Baumrind's (1991) four parenting styles of authoritarian, indulgent (also referred to as permissive or nondirective), authoritative, and uninvolved are often used in studies investigating parenting styles in relation to diverse child outcome variables, such as academic achievement, self-confidence, aggression, delinquent behaviour, and substance abuse (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olsen, & McNeilly-Choque, 1998; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Shumow, Vandell, & Posner, 1998).

Authoritarian parents are highly demanding and directive, but not responsive. They are obedience- and status-oriented, and expect their orders to be obeyed without explanation (Baumrind, 1991). These parents provide well-ordered and structured environments with clearly stated rules. Authoritarian parents can be divided into two types: non-authoritarian-directive, who are directive, but not intrusive or autocratic in their use of power, and authoritarian-directive, who are highly intrusive.

Indulgent parents are more responsive than they are demanding. They are non-traditional and lenient, do not require mature behaviour, allow considerable self-regulation, and avoid confrontation" (Baumrind, 1991). Indulgent parents may be further divided into two types: democratic parents, who, though lenient, are more conscientious, engaged, and committed to the child, and nondirective parents. Indulgent parents tend to be loving and communicative but have little control and set few demands for mature behaviour.

Authoritative parents are loving, controlling, communicative, and set high maturity demands for their children. It is those latter parents, whom researchers have found to

19

produce the most positive child characteristics, including higher moral functioning. Authoritative parents are both demanding and responsive. They monitor and impart clear standards for their children's conduct. They are assertive, but not intrusive and restrictive. Their disciplinary methods are supportive, rather than punitive. They would like their children to be assertive as well as socially responsible, and self-regulated as well as cooperative" (Baumrind, 1991).

The fourth parental style includes a style called uninvolved or neglectful, which is characterised by low warmth and low control (Dekovic & Gerris, 1992; Glasgow, Dornbusch, Troyer, Steinberg, & Ritter, 1997; Lamborn et al., 1991; Leung & Kwan, 1998) call this parenting style uninvolved. They describe these parents as emotionally detached. Uninvolved, or neglectful, parents tend to keep their children at a distance, responding to child demands only to make them cease. Uninvolved parents are low in both responsiveness and in demanding. In extreme cases, this parenting style might encompass both rejecting-neglecting and neglectful parents, although most parents of this type fall within the normal range (Baumrind, 1991). Little is known about this parenting style, and research on this population of parents is lacking because they are typically not very responsive or involved in their children's lives and, therefore, do not volunteer to be studied. In a study of adolescents, Dornbusch et al. (1987) found that authoritarian and indulgent parenting styles were negatively associated with higher grades, whereas the authoritative parenting style was positively associated with higher grades. Radziszewska, Richardson, Dent, and Flay (1996) found similar results in their study of 15-year-olds. In another study of adolescents, Leung, Lau, and Lam (1998) found that that academic achievement was negatively related to authoritarianism.

There also are more direct ways that modelling can influence children's moral development. Children closely observe their parents' interactions with each other, with family members, and with people more generally, and from those observations learn a great deal about how to treat others. As parents can model respect and compassion toward others, so may they model behaviour that is harmful or abusive? For example, parents who resolve disagreements by belittling, coercing, or physically dominating their spouse may teach children that aggression is an appropriate response when their interests conflict with another's. Families marked by angry, poorly resolved parental conflict tend

to have children who are more aggressive (Grych & Fincham, 1990). Grych and Fincham (1990, 1993) have argued that children actively attempt to make sense of the causes and consequences of parental behaviour during conflicting interactions, and that these appraisals can have long term effects on their functioning. Although children may not imitate the specific behaviours they observe, their beliefs and attitudes about how to treat other people may well be shaped by such family experiences.

It appears that parents and children naturally tend to regulate the way they communicate when discussing moral topics with each other. Children who are most advanced in moral reasoning tend to have parents who, either naturally or through training, affectively support their children in the discussions, ask challenging questions and elicit children's reasoning, present advanced challenging moral perspectives, and openly reflect on and re-present their children's reasoning.

In reviewing the literature on parenting styles, there is a consistency with which authoritative upbringing is associated with both instrumental and social competence and lower levels of problem behaviour in both boys and girls at all developmental stages. The benefits of authoritative parenting and the detrimental effects of uninvolved parenting are evident as early as the preschool years and continue throughout adolescence and into early adulthood. Although specific differences can be found in the competence evidenced by each group, the largest differences are found between children whose parents are unengaged and their peers with more involved parents. Differences between children from authoritative homes and their peers are equally consistent, but somewhat smaller (Weiss & Schwarz, 1996). Just as authoritative parents appear to be able to balance their conformity demands with their respect for their children's individuality, so children from authoritative homes appear to be able to balance the claims of external conformity and achievement demands with their need for individuation and autonomy.

2.5 Theoretical Perspectives on Moral Development

This section focuses on moral development, discussing a range of theoretical perspectives from Piaget to Kohlberg, including Gilligan. In addition to the three theories, social learning theories and a review on empirical studies are included.

2.5.1 Piaget's theory

In his book, 'The Moral Judgment of the Child' written in 1932, Jean Piaget outlined his own theory of moral development and his central intention is to explain the consciousness of obligation. His aim is not the strict empirical question of explaining what is involved when children learn to feel obligated, but the philosophical, conceptual question. What do learning and obligation mean and why do children and adults feel obliged to follow rules?

To answer the question, Piaget focused on the moral lives of children, studying the way children play games in order to learn more about children's beliefs about right and wrong. The rules of these games, argued Piaget, were handed down from one generation of children to the next, in similar ways in which moral standards are handed down from adults to children. Piaget's starting point is the very young child who is from the beginning immersed in all kinds of social interactions. Underlying Piaget's ideas about moral development is the assumption that whenever people come together to form a group, then it is necessary for them to devise a set of social and moral rules in order to regulate the conduct of the group and of the individuals in it. According to Piaget, rules are necessary for the existence of any group, for without them, there can be no genuine co-operation and sense of group identity (Piaget 1932).

Piaget argued that games are important for moral development because they help children to develop an understanding of how rules function; where they come from; whether they can be changed; the consequences of changing rules, etc. He claimed that children generalize their experience of using rules in the context of games to the regulation of behaviour in other contexts. Piaget also recognized that there is a distinction between practice of moral rules and being able to explain those rules. His observations of

Geneavan children playing games of marbles showed that although they clearly lay down by sets of rules, children younger than 10 years were not able to explain why the rules were necessary, where rules came from or how they could be changed. This led him to propose that moral behaviour and moral understanding develop in identifiable stages, according to two separate but parallel sequences; a practical sequence and a verbal sequence. Therefore, based on his observations of children's application of rules when playing, Piaget determined that morality too could be considered a developmental process.

In addition to examining children's understanding of rules and games, Piaget interviewed children regarding acts such as stealing and lying. Piaget presented the children with moral stories and these stories contrasted the behaviour of two children in a range of situations. Piaget interviews were usually asked to judge whether one of the two people in the story was naughtier than the other. Younger children tended to regard the material consequences of action as the crucial determinants of right and wrong. Therefore the greater amount of damage done the naughtier the person is and the greater the reprimand from the adult figure. Older children tended to base their judgments more on the person's intentions and motivations.

Piaget claimed that the two types of moral reasoning were indicative of two fundamentally different ways of thinking about the source of morality. Younger children reasoned in a way, which described as heteronomous. Their decisions were largely influenced by the response of an adult or an older person and they made their decision on how much damage had been done. Piaget argued that heteronomous reasoning is egocentric, in making moral judgments, as young children are unable to simultaneously take into account their own view of things with the perspective of someone else.

However, amongst the older children who were interviewed, Piaget noted that reasoning was more autonomous in character. The older children's moral thoughts were based on assumption of intentions and motivation. Authority figures had no influence on the older children's morality. Autonomy though allows the child to understand that others have different moral perspectives from their own. The older child's thought is no longer

egocentric and this allows the child to construct an understanding of morality with others.

Piaget's assumptions that moral development is complete by about 12 years of age, and that children move from a constraint-based morality to one based on mutual respect, have both been challenged. Research by Schweder, Mahapatra & Miller (1990) has shown that some people never achieve the transition from a constraint-based morality to one based on mutual respect. Walderdine (1988) points out that Piaget's work displays his commitment to the triumph of reason over emotion. His discourse of moral reason and autonomy reflect his belief in a rational, democratic society, not in a naturally occurring human condition. Piaget believed the process of moral development to be universal, that is, fundamentally the same for all human cultures. Piagetian theory continues to exert a considerable influence on moral development, however many aspects of the theory has been criticized. The variation in culture values and the position of children in various cultures has been ignored. Barnes (1998) argues that many experiments especially with early year's children, are conducted in a contrived situation, and do not take into consideration the temperament, experience, and cultural and familial experience of the child. The concept of autonomy is actually imperialist in that some cultures do not value individualistic models of humanity. Further, Canella (1997) explains that the focus on the autonomous individual can result in the denial of racial, class, gender and cultural inequities.

According to Barnes (1998), Piaget recognized that his theory of moral development was not necessarily universal, and that the distinction between constraint and respect simply might not be relevant in some cultures. Where moral rules are derived from sacred texts, for example, children's moral behaviour becomes more constraint based as they grow older and are expected to learn the practice and observance of traditional rules handed down through generations.

A number of researchers, for example, Kohlberg (1963; 1984), Damon (1977) and Turiel (1983) have argued that Piaget's claim that heteronomous reasoners see adults as infallible authority figures is simply incorrect. Laupa & Turiel (1986) argue that young children do not show unilateral respect for adult authority figures. For example, when

asked whether an immoral action would be acceptable if an adult condoned it, young children often said that it would not. However, Laupa (1991) explains that the results did show some of the features of heteronomy and, in particular, the non-differentiation of adult authority attributes amongst young children and her studies. A major finding in the study of Kuwait Children by Nazar (2001) is that Piaget's time line for moral development of Muslim Kuwaiti children does not hold and this is consistent to the findings of Laupa & Turiel (1986). Therefore, the major findings in the study by Nazar (2001) seem to support the claim of domain theorists such as Laupa & Turiel (1986) and challenge Piaget's account of early morality.

2.5.2 Social Learning Theories

Social learning theory is the study of how people, behaviours, and the environment are inner-related. It is a rejection of behaviourism and cognitivism, because neither takes environmental influence into consideration. Social learning theory believes that learning occurs largely through modelling.

Behaviourists would stand by their beliefs that learning is an observable change in behaviour through a series of stimulus and response. Behaviourists do not believe that the environment has any effect on this stimulus-response relationship or the learning that occurs. However, social learning theorists (Hanna & Meltzoff 1993) insist that learning is not merely a change in behaviour, and that the model directly influences the learner, whether live, symbolic, or verbal.

Cognitivists, on the other hand, would also disagree. They believe, however, that learning occurs from a change in mental state, possibly an unobservable change. They also do not believe that the environment affects this learning. Cognitive learning occurs through a process of shaping and organizing information through working memory into long-term memory for later recall. Social learning theorists (Bandura 1986) do not agree with the cognitive position of imposing knowledge onto the learner. They believe that each learner

can achieve different results based on the environment. It is the task of the model to transfer the necessary skill or knowledge onto the learner.

A social learning approach has been suggested by Bandura (1986, 1989) who argued that children's moral development comes about through the more indirect process of observational learning. Bandura developed the basic principles of observational learning in order to answer the question: *How do we learn behaviour through observation of the behaviour of other people who act as models?*

Bandura and his co-workers (Bandura, Ross & Ross 1963) showed how powerfully social models influence children's behaviour. Bandura found that children who observed an adult model making moral judgments tended to give more mature responses themselves in a subsequent post-test. In one of these studies three groups of young children watched one of three films in somebody, the aggressor, assaulted and battered an inflatable doll called Bobo. In the first film, the model, the aggressor was rewarded with sweets and plenty praise. In the second film, the model was punished with a few smacks and some criticism. In the third film, there were no consequences for the model. Afterwards each child was allowed to play in a room full of toys, including Bobo. The children who had watched the first and the third films (where aggression was either rewarded or had no consequences) displayed far more aggressive behaviour towards the doll than those who had watched the aggressor being punished. Some children imitated the aggressor's behaviour minutely, and boys displayed more aggressive behaviour than girls. Bandura concluded that an important mechanism for the child's moral development is the mimicking or imitation of adult behaviour.

According to Bandura (1986) the child observes, internalises, and then replicates the moral judgment and behaviour of adults. As these observations increase in both depth and scope the child comes to grasp the complexities of more mature moral thought.

Social learning theorists (Bandura & McDonald 1963) emphasize the importance of the rules that govern behaviour and behavioural changes. They consider the rules as functions of environmental events more than the direct result of developmental stages.

Aspects of Bandura's approach needs clarification. If moral development is a product of the child's modelling of others' judgments it needs to be established whether all models are equally effective in promoting development. For example, is one parent more influential than the other as a model for the child's behaviour and judgment?

In summary, social learning focuses on the learning that occurs within a social context. It considers how people learn from one another, encompassing such concepts as observational learning, imitation, and modelling. Although many species of animals can probably learn by imitation, social learning theory deals primarily with human learning.... Social Learning theories have behaviourist roots, like cognitivism, but social learning rejects both behaviourism and cognitivism for not taking the environment into consideration.

2.5.3 Kohlberg's Theory

Over the last three decades, adolescent moral development has been studied thoroughly and extensively under the leading theory of Lawrence Kohlberg (Kohlberg 1969; Krebs, Schroeder & Denton 1987; Levine, Kohlberg, & Hewer 1985). Kohlberg carried Piaget's work into adolescence and adulthood. Kohlberg developed a theory of moral development, which shared with Piaget's a sense in which moral reasoning is fundamentally a cognitive process. Like Piaget, Kohlberg conceptualised morality as a system of social rules. He argued that our moral understanding is independent of social relations. Kohlberg argued that children developed a sense of moral understanding specifically through resolving cognitive conflicts within the individual's mind. Kohlberg's moral dilemma involved contrasts between two different moral rules. The classic Heinz and druggist dilemma is an example that contrasts the moral rule that it is wrong to steal with another moral rule, that it is right to preserve life. Kohlberg and his colleagues then interviewed children's responses to the dilemmas and coded their responses according to a scale devised by the researchers. The dilemma is presented below:

Heinz and the pharmacist (Kohlberg, 1984)

A woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that doctors' thought might

27

save her. It was a form of radium that a pharmacist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to a make, but the pharmacist was charging R12,000 or 10 times the cost of the drug, for a small dose. Heinz, the sick woman's husband, borrowed all the money he could, about R1, 000, or half of what he needed. He told the pharmacist that his wife was dying and asked him sell the drug cheaper or let him pay later. The pharmacist replied, "No, I discovered the drug, and I'm going to make money from it". Heinz then became desperate and broke into the chemist to steal the drug for his wife.

The question Kohlberg asked the interviewees was should Heinz have done that? Why or why not?

Kohlberg proposed that children form ways of thinking through their experiences, which include understanding of moral concepts such as justice, rights, equality and human welfare. As stated, Kohlberg followed the development of moral judgment beyond the ages studied by Piaget, and determined that the process of attaining moral maturity took longer and was more gradual than Piaget had proposed. Research on these moral dilemma stories the answers led him to the discovery of three levels of moral development with two stages each (Colby & Kohlberg 1987), as presented below.

The first level is called *Pre-conventional*. During this level children are concerned with avoiding punishment

Stage 1. Punishment, heteronomous morality – obedience and getting one's own needs met; avoidance of breaking rules backed by punishment.

Stage 2. Individualism; instrumental purpose and exchange – acting in accordance with individual interests; fairness is equal exchange based upon motivations of self-interest.

The second level is called *Conventional.* During this level children are more concerned with living up to the expectations of others.

Stage 3. Interpersonal conformity; mutual interpersonal expectations and relationships - want to do the right thing because it is good for the group, family, or institution; living up to what is expected of you; mutual relations of trust and respect should be maintained provided they conform to your expected social role.

Stage 4. Social system and conscience: rules are to be upheld except when they conflict

with other social duties; right is contributing to society and fulfilling social duties.

The third level is called *Post-conventional*. During this level individuals govern their behaviour by the relative values and opinions of the groups they live and interact with. Right behaviour is based on a social contact.

Stage 5. Social contract and individual rights – with others and in the validity of universal moral principles; awareness of the social contract between individuals, but also of the different moral perspectives of others; some individual right, however, transcend the different perspectives of others and, therefore, should be upheld.

Stage 6. Universal/ethical principals – which may or may not agree with societies laws. Laws that agree with universal moral principles are obeyed but when those laws violate these principles, the individual follows the principles instead.

According to Kohlberg (1984), each successive stage is more adequate since it is better for resolving moral conflicts than those that precede it. Thus, in development, children and adults progress through stages although not all people will develop fully and reach stage six.

Kohlberg's view of how moral learning occurs via cognitive judgments has provoked much criticism. Puka (1989) argues that the moral dilemmas presented by Kohlberg are too artificial to be a real test of peoples' capacity for moral reasoning. In ordinary life moral dilemmas are more complex, and do not allow time for or opportunity for such an armchair approach. Often we have to act immediately and there are no ethical rules that regulate morality in every life situation. Besides, moral judgments do not necessarily correlate with behaviour. People may exercise their judgment at the highest level of moral development; yet still act immorally (Damon 1985, Malinowski & Smith 1985).

Kohlberg's claim is that all individuals in all cultures use the same basic moral categories, concepts, or principles, and all in individuals in all cultures go through the same order of sequences of gross stage development, has caused much debate. Cannella (1997) criticizes the Kohlberg theory of moral reasoning. The sixth stage in this theory clearly illustrates the Western-Christian "ideology of individualism". In a comparative

study of moral development of Korean and British children, Baek (2002) indicated that children in both cultural groups made distinctions between moral and conventional transgressions. Many cultures do not share the same moral values traditionally ascribed to in the Western countries where Kohlberg conducted his research. In some cultural contexts, the highest level of morality is respect for elders, the avoidance of conflict, and the development of harmonious social relations, a form of knowledge that almost eliminates the construction of human beings as individuals.

Cognitive-developmental theories claim that moral rules are universal; however, this does not mean that everyone everywhere will abide by these rules. Across all cultures, lying, cheating and doing harm to others will be regarded as moral; therefore, culture plays an important role in moral reasoning.

Drawing from a study of a Hindu Indian population Miller (1994) argues that there is no universal model of morality. Morality may be best explained by describing what is found to be meaningful in a particular culture. For instance, duty based morality can be an alternative moral code in India. Shweder, Mahapatra & Miller (1987) explored the distinction between morality and convention amongst Hindu children in India. Shweder et al. (1987) asked both Indian and American children to rate rules in terms of how serious it would be to transgress them. Rather than finding a common set of moral rules, which were distinct from conventions, Shweder et al. (1987) found that amongst Indian samples the boundaries between morality and convention were less clear than amongst the Americans. For example, many of the Indian children believed that having a haircut and eating chicken after the death of your father was an extremely serious moral transgression. At the same time, a woman playing cards whilst her husband cooked rice was also rated as wrong. These transgressions were rated either as trivial or not moral transgressions at all by the Americans.

Turiel's (1983) claim that distinction between morality and convention is universally recognized is questioned by Shweder based on his findings. Shweder (1990) suggests that there may be many different moral realities that are the products of different cultures, their traditions and histories. He argues that Kohlberg's and Turiel's methods by their

nature underestimate the importance of culture to an individual's sense of the world.

The findings of a study Al-Shehab (2002) at Kuwait university faculty, Muslim members do not support the assumptions underlying Kohlberg's claims of universality. Al-Shehab (2002) strongly feels that the domain researchers should attempt a reorientation of moral psychology by taking culture and religion more seriously.

Another major objection is that Kohlberg's findings and views are biased in terms of gender (Gilligan 1982; Gilligan, Lyons & Hammer 1990; Gilligan, Ward & Taylor 1988). In her work on moral development, Gilligan (1982) made a particularly cogent argument for the existence of separate patterns of moral development for men and women. In so doing, she departed from the model of moral development conceived by Kohlberg (1969), which has dominated the field for many years. Kohlberg's research in different cultures was conducted mainly with boys, and his theory displays a male perspective of morality.

In her research, Gilligan (1982) shows that Kohlberg's male bias consists of his elevation of justice and fairness to supreme moral norms. Women have a different, important complementary approach to morality, namely, that moral judgments are also directed by care and compassion, based on awareness of the interrelatedness of human beings. According to Gilligan, this approach is more common among women because their sense of morality, more than that of men, stems from a sense of responsibility and compassionate concerns for people's well being. Moral abstractions, such as those applicable at the higher levels of Kohlberg's model, are subordinate to this female approach.

In summary, Kohlberg described three stages of moral development, which described the process through which people learn to discriminate right from wrong and to develop increasingly sophisticated appreciations of morality. He believed that his stages were cumulative; each built off understanding and abilities gained in prior stages. According to Kohlberg, moral development is a lifelong task, and many people fail to develop the more advanced stages of moral understanding.

Kohlberg's first 'preconventional' level describes children whose understanding of morality is essentially only driven by consequences. Essentially, "might makes right" to a preconventional mind, and they worry about what is right and wrong so they don't get in trouble. Second stage 'conventional' morality describes people who act in moral ways because they believe that following the rules is the best way to promote good personal relationships and a healthy community. A conventional morality person believes it is wrong to steal not just because he doesn't want to get punished but also because he doesn't want his friends or family to be harmed. The final 'postconventional' level describes people whose view of morality transcends what the rules or laws say. Instead of just following rules without questioning them, 'postconventional' stage people determine what is moral based on a set of values or beliefs they think are right all the time. For example, during the Angolan war, many South Africans who were drafted to be soldiers opposed the war on moral grounds and fled other countries rather than fight. Even though this behaviour was against the law, these people decided that these particular laws did not follow the higher rules they believed in, and they chose to follow their higher rules instead of the law.

2.5.4 Gilligan's Theory

As human beings grow we somehow develop the ability to assess what is right or wrong, acceptable or unacceptable. In other words; we develop morality, a system of learned attitudes about social practices, institutions, and individual behaviour used to evaluate situations and behaviour as good or bad, right or wrong (Lefton, 2000).

Gilligan was the first to consider gender differences in her research in moral development. In general, Gilligan noted differences between girls and boys in their feelings towards caring, relationships, and connections with other people. More specifically, Gilligan noted that girls are more concerned with care, relationships, and connections with other people than boys (Gilligan & Attanucci 1988). Thus, Gilligan hypothesized that as younger children girls are more inclined towards caring, and boys are more inclined towards justice. Gilligan suggests this difference is due to gender and

the child's relationship with the mother (Lefton 2000).

Kohlberg's moral development theory did not take into account gender. Gilligan found that girls do in-fact develop moral orientations differently than boys. According to Gilligan, the central moral problem for women is the conflict between self and other. Within Gilligan's theoretical framework for moral development in females, she provides a sequence of three levels (Belknap 2000).

At level one of Gilligan's theoretical framework, a woman's orientations are towards individual survival (Belknap 2000) - the self is the sole object of concern. The first transition that takes place is from being selfish to being responsible. At level two, the main concern is that goodness is equated with self-sacrifice. This level is where a woman adopts societal values and social membership. Gilligan refers to the second transition from level two to level three as the transition from goodness to truth. Here, the needs of the self must be deliberately uncovered. As they are uncovered, the woman begins to consider the consequences of the self and other (Belknap 2000).

Gilligan (1982) criticized Kohlberg's paradigm as being gender biased. This claim was sparked by Holstein's (1976) longitudinal study in which female respondents were typically scored at stage 3, whiles males were typically scored at stage 4. Holstein explained that these scores were a result of gender differences in moral reasoning. Gilligan (1982) argued that females were scored at stage 3 because their decisions were influenced by empathy and emotion, while males were scored at stage 4 because their decisions were less empathic, and more impartial and detached. Holstein's main complaint was that women's reasoning styles were arbitrarily devalued by Kohlberg's scoring system because it was considered less developed that mens reasoning styles.

Gilligan (1977, 1982) used Holstein's findings as a basis for her theory of gender differences in ego and moral development. She claimed that men are more "justice" oriented while women are more "care" oriented. A justice orientation is motivated by logic and reason, requiring the moral actor to treat others impartially and objectively and basing moral decisions on abstract principles of justice that can be universalised to every person and every situation. A care orientation allows the actor to use subjective feelings

and sentiments when making moral judgments. The caring decision is motivated by empathy. It recognises particular relationships between people and extenuating circumstances in each situation.

One study by Gilligan & Attanucci (1988) looked at the distinction between care and justice perspectives with men and women, primarily adolescences and adults when faced with real-life dilemmas. An example of one of the real-life dilemma, subjects were asked to consider was a situation with pregnant women considering an abortion (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988). The study showed that: a) concerns about justice and care are represented in people's thinking about real-life moral dilemmas, but that people tend to focus on one or the other depending on gender, and b) there is an association between moral orientation and gender such that women focus on care dilemmas and men focus on justice dilemmas (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988). This raised challenges to Kohlberg's view and contrary to his view she contends that men are likely to consider moral issues in terms of justice rules, and individual rights. Women, on the other hand, tend to consider such issues in terms of relationships, caring, and compassion. Gilligan explored women's moral reasoning by interviewing 29 American women who were pregnant (Leman 2001). These women faced a real-life choice as whether to continue with the pregnancy or have an abortion. From her interviews, she identified three levels of reasoning which bore some similarities to Kohlberg's levels. Gilligan (1977) produces her own stage theory of moral development for women. Like Kohlberg's, it has three major divisions: preconventional, conventional, and post conventional. But for Gilligan, the transitions between the stages are driven by changes in the sense of self rather than in changes in cognitive capability. Kohlberg's approach is based on Piaget's cognitive developmental model.

Gilligan's model is based on a modified version of Freud's approach to ego development (Barns 1998). Thus Gilligan is combining Freud (or at least a Freudian theme) with Kohlberg & Piaget. Gilligan's approach to understanding moral orientation and action employs the original Kohlbergian moral dilemmas, for example, the Heinz dilemma, and examines actual moral dilemmas confronting subjects. When Gilligan asks two 11 year old children, a boy, Jake, and a girl, Amy, how they would resolve Kohlberg's Heinz

34

dilemma, Jake's responses are consistent with Kohlberg's language of rights, whereas Amy uses women's language of responsibility. Each child's interpretation of the Heinz dilemma reveals two distinct conceptualisations of the moral domain. Jake views the question of whether Heinz should steal the drug to save his dying wife as a problem of conflicting rights and logical reasoning. The resolution of a moral dilemma for Jake is to solve an equation. Amy, on the other hand, interprets the Heinz dilemma as a problem of caring, communication, and relationship, whereas Jake views Heinz as making an amoral decision, without outside interference or assistance. Amy speaks of networks of relationship and communication. Therefore, according to Gilligan, the suggestion is that men and women differ in how they solve moral dilemmas (Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988; Gilligan & Wiggins, 1988).

According to Woods (1996) Gilligan's critics are not as numerous as Kohlberg's and the lack of criticism is most likely explained by the fact that Kohlberg's stage work began more than three decades ago and has developed significantly over time, while Gilligan's response to the stage model of morality was not widely published until 1982, and was yet to obtain significant empirical support. The participants of Gilligan's research are limited to mostly white, middle class children and adults. In general, literature reviews have provided that Gilligan's work needs a broader more multicultural basis.

Although Gilligan's initial study was conducted solely on women, reversing the bias in Kohlberg's methodology but in another sense, repeating the same mistake Kohlberg made. Gilligan & Attanucci (1988) claim to find a greater incidence of justice-oriented reasoning amongst men and care-orientation amongst women. However, a number of studies have failed to support Gilligan's claim when rather more rigorous methods are used (Walker 1984; Ford & Lowery 1986). In a study by Walker (1984) parents and children were interviewed twice separated by a two-year interval about hypothetical and real-life dilemmas to determine whether age or gender differences existed in moral development. The results showed gains in moral reasoning in all age groups during the two-year period, especially in children. Contrary to Gilligan's claim, no sex differences were found in the use of justice and care moral orientations.

Another concern with Gilligan's model is that is reproduces stereotypical notions of male and female roles (Sayers 1986). If one considers gender roles, attributes and expectations as social constructions (Walker 1984), then one should expect these roles are not fixed but changes as society changes. Different cultures invoke rather different notions of gender, and of the roles and expectations of men and women. Therefore, it is not clear whether Gilligan's ideas can endure across cultures and time.

In summary, Carol Gilligan has provided a framework for the moral development, in particular the moral development of women. Gilligan's theory is comprised of three stages: self-interest, self-sacrifice, and post-conventional thinking where each level is more complex. Overall, Gilligan found that girls do develop morality, differently than boys. Gilligan's theory holds particular implications for adolescent girls, specifically as this is typically when they enter the transition from level two to level three.

2.6 Empirical Studies on Moral Reasoning : A Review

Although throughout this paper reference has been made to empirical studies conducted by numerous researchers, I have based this chapter on two empirical studies, which I deal with in some depth, namely, Beal, Garrod, Ruben, Stewart & Dekle (1997) and Wark & Krebs (2000).

A growing concern for researchers has been whether the two moral orientations proposed by Kohlberg and Gilligan might be linked to gender. Some researchers have found that women interpret real-life dilemmas in more care-orientated terms than men do (Lyons 1983, Ford & Lowery 1986, Walker et al., 1987, Gilligan & Attanucci 1988). The results of some of these studies and others, however, have indicated that moral orientation is strongly determined by the type of real-life dilemma about which people make judgment.

In some cases, women appear generally more likely to express the care orientation than men. For example, Lyons (1983) found that women were more likely to talk about issues of care and concern for others when discussing their real-life dilemmas, whereas men were more likely to include comments about issues of fairness and individual rights. Although the evidence for gender differences in moral orientation among adolescents and

adults appears somewhat mixed, a related question is whether gender differences might be apparent earlier in development.

Beal, Garrod, Ruben, Stewart & Dekle (1997) found that in previous studies there were few differences in moral orientation among children. In their 1997 study, the aim was to find out if gender of the characters in the fables influence children's reasoning. They conducted two experiments with third grade children to examine if children's moral orientation would be affected by the gender of characters in a dilemma: all male, all female or mixed gender. An important alternative for assessing moral orientation in children is the "fable task" developed by Johnston (1985, 1988). The fable task includes two fables: 'Porcupine and Moles', and the 'Dog in the Manger'. In this task, children hear stories about animal characters that face a conflict. The fable task has several advantages for addressing developmental questions about gender differences. Firstly, although the fables are similar to the Kohlberg dilemmas in that they are hypothetical, the stories and characters are more engaging and accessible to primary school children. Secondly, the content of the fables is standardized so that all children respond to the same problem. If children have acquired different expectations about appropriate problem solving approaches for males and females, then a possibility is that both boys and girls might suggest more care-orientated solutions in fables that include female characters. The girl's concerns about maintaining relationships might not necessarily have been strongly elicited by stories involving male characters. If so, girls might be especially likely to show an increased orientation to the care perspective in stories in which the characters were female. In order to investigate these possibilities, two experiments were conducted with 8 year olds. This age was selected because prior work has shown that the children are cognitively advanced enough to consider and evaluate both orientations. The study allowed the researchers to examine the potential effects of character gender on which moral orientation emerges (Garrod et al., 1990 & Garrod & Beal 1993).

Prior to the study, a predication was made that character gender might influence children's reasoning - as gender stereotypes about conflict resolution tactics are strongly reinforced in children's literature. The third grade children were interviewed after reading the two fables in which animal characters are confronted with a problem. Results

showed that almost all of the children's responses reflected the care or rights orientation. No gender differences were found in the children's likelihood of suggesting solutions embodying the care orientation. Children's responses were not influenced by the gender of the characters in the fables. When cartoon drawings illustrating the stories were presented to reinforce the genders of the characters, the children's reasoning was still not affected by the gender of the characters and no gender differences in their moral orientations were found. This suggests that boys and girls reasoning about moral problems is similar in childhood. The failure to find gender differences in moral orientation during childhood stands in contrast to the findings for adolescents, and is also inconsistent with Gilligan's theoretical arguments about the early origins of gender differences.

In summary, (Beal et.al 1997) third-graders were interviewed after reading two fables in which animal characters are confronted with a problem to determine whether gender differences exist in children's reasoning and whether their reasoning about moral dilemmas is influenced by the gender of the characters involved. Results showed that almost all of the children's responses reflected the care or rights orientation. No gender differences were found in the children's likelihood of suggesting solutions embodying the care orientation. Children's responses were not influenced by the gender of the characters in the fables. When cartoon drawings illustrating the stories were presented to reinforce the genders of the characters, the children's reasoning was still not affected by the gender of the characters and no gender differences in their moral orientations were found.

Researchers, Wark & Krebs (2000) conducted a study and their primary purpose was to investigate the extent to which people construct moral problems, and the extent to which people interpret real-life moral dilemmas in terms of an internal orientation, as Gilligan (1982) has suggested. The participants of this study were a mixed gender of undergraduate students. They were presented with two dilemmas that were antisocial in nature and two were prosocial in nature and the last two involved social pressure. In this study, the researchers were unable to determine what it is about different individuals that lead some to interpret different dilemmas in similar ways, and other to interpret different dilemmas in different ways. They suggest that it is possible that individual differences

38

may stem from personal experience, or from internal cognitive phenomena such as values, cognitive complexity or field dependence versus field independence. Results show that when faced with personal real-life dilemmas, females made more care-based moral judgments than did males. The participants used different forms of judgment in response to different types of dilemmas. These findings implies that as children mature, their moral judgments become more complex and less of a measure of their level of moral development. Consistent with Gilligan's (1982) position, men viewed the set of dilemmas as involving more issues about upholding justice than did women. Contrary, to Gilligan's position, however, women did not view the entire set of moral dilemmas as involving more care-based issues than did men.

Although much of the research on moral reasoning has focused on the moral judgments people invoke in response to dilemmas, according to Walker et al., (1995) how we interpret and experience moral situations is at least as important as how we resolve them.

In summary, the study by Wark and Krebs investigated the extent to which people interpret real-life moral dilemmas in terms of an internal moral orientation, as Gilligan (1982, 1988) has suggested, or in terms of the content of the dilemma, as Wark and Krebs (1996, 1997) have reported. Thirty women and thirty men listed the issues they saw in descriptions of real-life prosocial, antisocial and social pressure types of moral dilemma. Results revealed that Gilligan's model underestimates the influence of dilemma content. Moral dilemmas differed in the extent to which they were viewed in terms of the same issues by different participants. There was relatively little within-person consistency in moral orientation. There were four gender differences. Compared to men, women rated social pressure dilemmas as involving more care-orientated issues, and prosocial dilemmas as more significant. Compared to women, men viewed all dilemmas as involving more justice-based issues, and reported experiencing more antisocial dilemmas.

2.7 Conclusion

Although the theories of moral development and moral reasoning were briefly introduced to serve as a conceptual bridge for the theories of moral judgment, more emphasis in the study presented in this dissertation was placed on the two theories of moral development

by Kohlberg and Gilligan because it has been at the centre of dispute on this topic since the early 80's.

Lawrence Kohlberg (1969) modified and elaborated Piaget's work, and laid the groundwork for the current debate within psychology on moral development. Consistent with Piaget, he proposed that children form ways of thinking through their experiences, which include understandings of moral concepts such as justice, rights, equality and human welfare. Kohlberg followed the development of moral judgment beyond the ages studied by Piaget, and determined that the process of attaining moral maturity took longer and was more gradual than Piaget had proposed.

A major critique of Kohlberg's work was put forth by Carol Gilligan, in her popular book, "In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development" (1982). She suggested that Kohlberg's theories were biased against women, as only males were used in his studies. By listening to women's experiences, Gilligan offered that a morality of care can serve in the place of the morality of justice and rights espoused by Kohlberg. In her view, the morality of caring and responsibility is premised in non-violence, while the morality of justice and rights is based on equality. Another way to look at these differences is to view these two moralities as providing two distinct injunctions - the injunction not to treat others unfairly (justice) and the injunction not to turn away from someone in need (care). She presents these moralities as distinct, although potentially connected.

Many researchers (Walker 1984; Ford & Lowery 1986; Garrod et al., 1990; Garrod & Beal 1993) now disagree with the empirical claim that men and women differ in their moral reasoning in the way Gilligan outlines. Several studies have now found men and women use both justice and care dimensions in their moral reasoning. However, researchers, Wark & Krebs (2000) found their research consistent with Gilligan's (1982) position. Men viewed the set of dilemmas as involving more issues about upholding justice than did women, but contrary, to Gilligan's position, women did not view the entire set of moral dilemmas as involving more care-based issues than did men. Other researchers have found that women interpret real-life dilemmas in more care-orientated

terms than men do (Lyons 1983, Ford & Lowery 1986, Walker et al., 1987, Gilligan & Attanucci 1988). According to Woods (1996) neither Kohlberg nor Gilligan have taken into account the many variables, which make up morality for people in modern society.

The present study is unique in that it examined moral reasoning within the South African context where there is limited research in this area of study. It further focuses on adolescents who live in a context where families are exposed to many social problems, in particular, exposure to crime, violence, and substance abuse.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the overall aim is to show how the data was collected and how it was analysed. The first section is focused on a qualitative research approach since this study is located within an interpretivist paradigm. This is followed by the research context, which gives the back ground to where the participants live and their socio-economic status. Following this, the next section is focused on the research methods and procedure and the two moral dilemma scenarios and semi-structured interviews that was used for this study. A section on ethical issues is next and finally a section on the data analysis.

This study is located within an interpretivist paradigm as my aim was to understand the moral reasoning patterns of this group of adolescents in a particular context. Interpretation is the attempt to extract meaning from observation and this is not simply a process of following the traditional scientific method. Traditional science can describe peoples' actions but sociologists do not just want descriptions they want reasons; they what to gain access to the 'meaning' behind peoples' actions (Schwandt 2000).

All human actions of any significance to sociology are meaningful actions and directed towards the achievement of a purpose. No significant scientific description, analysis, or explanation of those actions is possible without some fundamental consideration of those social meanings. Interpretivists deny that humans can be studied using the same philosophical base as used in studying physical objects or other animals. Humans make choices for they are active conscious beings.

According to Kincheloe & McLaren (2000) within the interpretivist paradigm it is seen as impossible to separate facts from values and the inherent subjectivity in any research conducted in relation to people, to the social world, is accepted. Because knowledge is seen as something that is socially constructed, rather than the discovery of an independently existing reality, the notion of causality is defined differently. From the interpretivist perspective, causal relationships are simply another, possible construction or explanation for certain aspects of the social world that we are researching. They are

not taken to be universal laws that govern people and their actions, including the acquisition and use of language. Rather than following the notion of causality as one variable preceding and causing another, interpretivism sees relationships as more complex and fluid, with directions of influence being mutual and shifting rather than unidirectional and fixed. Relationships within the social world, such as language, are not seen to be external and independent of our attempts to understand them. Rather than seeking a 'true' match between our research observations and reality, the interpretivist paradigm understands reality as being constructed in and through our observations and pursuit of knowledge (Schwandt 2000).

3.2   Qualitative Research Approach

Qualitative research is a generic term for investigative methodologies described as ethnographic, naturalistic, or participant observer research (Schwandt 2000).

It emphasises the importance of looking at variables in the natural setting in which they are found. Interaction between variables is important. Detailed data is gathered through open-ended questions that provide direct quotations. The interviewer is an integral part of the investigation (Creswell 1994).   This differs from quantitative research, which attempts to gather data by objective methods to provide information about relations, comparisons, and predictions and attempts to remove the investigator from the investigation.   According to Creswell (1994) the chief characteristic of qualitative research is that it is concerned with the understanding of real-life situation or event. It gives the opportunity to probe, allowing the researcher to reach beyond initial responses and rationales.   It also gives the researcher the opportunity to observe, record and interpret non-verbal communication as part of the participants feed back, which is valuable during interviews or discussions, and during analysis. As well as the above it gives the opportunity to engage participants in "play" such as projective techniques and exercises, overcoming the self-consciousness that can inhibit spontaneous reactions and comments.

In summary qualitative research is research that focuses on understanding, rather than predicting or controlling, phenomena. It is usually contrasted with traditional experimental and statistical research and is felt by many to be more appropriate to the

study of human life

3.3 The Research Context

The adolescents come from a rather bounded reality in Durban, Kwa Zulu Natal. There are six blocks, consisting of three stories of twelve council flats in each block. Each block is drab in colour and in dire need of a coat of paint. Broken windows, broken drain pipes and peeling paint is visible from the road. There is a small piece of open ground with a swing and slide which some would call a park, and some say it is a piece of ground where people openly drink, take drugs, smoke cannabis, and where prostitution takes place.

This council housing complex was historically for Whites only. Currently, the community is representative of all the main race groups in South Africa: White, Indian, African, and Coloured, including immigrants from African countries. Council housing in this area is so limited that multiple extended families live in the cramped dwellings originally designed for a family of two or three children. These flats have comparatively low rents so that there is greater number of families whose income is low either because of low wages, large families, unemployment, and people living on state pensions and grants. A small percentage of the adolescents are fortunate to have electricity and running water. There have been numerous incidents of violence in the complex, including domestic violence, in particular on the weekends as well as muggings, fights, and murder. Because of unemployment and the lack of money many of these adolescents come to school hungry. At the girls' school there is a feeding scheme in operation and I am involved in raising money for this feeding scheme.

Below is a letter written by a social worker (June 2000) who is employed by the girls' school. She had written to a secondary school in the UK where I previously worked to raise money for the feeding scheme. This letter will provide the reader with first hand knowledge about the hardships some of these adolescents living in the housing scheme experience on a daily basis.

I am a Social Worker employed by the Governing Body of the above School. Although the school fees are kept as low as possible to accommodate all members of the community, there are several families who are unable to contribute financially (often due to unemployment) and are in dire need of assistance themselves.

There are many children who come to school each day without having had breakfast and do not have any food to bring with them to school. There is no State system in place to provide food for needy scholars. As a school we have arranged a small feeding scheme where we provide lunches (sandwiches) to a few of the most indigent girls each day and food parcels to them once a month. We also assist pupils with second-hand school uniforms and shoes if they are in need of assistance. Many families can exist on the equivalent of fifty pounds per month.

There are some of our pupils who live in subsidized housing and some who live in shacks in informal settlements; many of them do not have electricity and have to study by candle-light and bathe in cold water. There are many girls who do not have funds for transport to school and have to walk several kilometers to and fro every day. We try to assist the ones who live the furthest from the school and those in ill-health. When they are ill they come to me as well as I am also a Registered Nurse and Midwife. I often take them to the State Clinic for treatment, or if it is an emergency, to the local Doctors and then the school is obliged to foot the bill. There is overcrowding at the Clinics (which are also under-staffed) and it can take several hours for a child to be seen. The same can be said of the local State Hospitals but they have to be referred by the Clinics unless an emergency such as attempted suicide. Some of the children have Tuberculosis and I try to assist by ensuring that they attend Clinic regularly and timeously to receive their medication and perform sputum tests. I also monitor that they take their medicine according to the programme and that they are receiving adequate nutrition. I am pleased to report that we have had a great deal of success in this regard.

There are many children who have been orphaned in the past year. Some have gone to live with grandparents or other family members and some have been placed in Foster care. They are the lucky ones. There are many children that have not been assisted by the Department of Welfare and have to rely on the goodwill of friends.

The worst problems I have to deal with are the abuse situations. There are many girls who have been severely physically assaulted and I have had to provide therapeutic intervention. The Police are seldom able to assist and the NGO's and State Departments' are "snowed-under". The child receives far more care and support much more quickly when I am with them. I have initiated several legal remedies on their behalf (e.g. Domestic Violence interdicts), approximately five during the past eighteen months. It is often easier for me to take the Interdict out on the child's behalf, and then the subsequent anger is deflected onto me and away from the child who is thus afforded the benefit of protection from the offending party. I also assist those girls who have been sexually assaulted, especially if there is a lack of parental support and have accompanied the girls to court on many occasions. I always feel more at ease if there is at least one supportive parent involved; sometimes there are none and that is when I make sure that I am available to provide the necessary support.

These are some of the issues we deal with on a daily basis and I would like to thank you for giving us the opportunity of sharing some of the burden of our problems.

On a positive note this neighbourhood does not lack social cohesion. Residents had a strong commitment to their local area irrespective of age, gender and ethnicity. There are strong bonds of reciprocity and mutual aid, particularly among older and more established residents. Informal social networks, and patterns of reciprocal support between family and friends, strengthened the residents' sense of attachment.

45

3.3.1 Participants

The participants in this qualitative study comprised of 30 learners (15 boys and 15 girls) between ages 13-18 years, who attend two high schools in the area. They were purposively sampled – the main criteria being that they reside in the above housing complex, and are exposed to the harsh conditions within this complex.

Purposive sampling is a type non-probability sampling. Bless & Smith (1995) maintains that purposive sampling is based on judgment of the researcher regarding the characteristics of the representative sample. Therefore, the sampling was purposive since the characteristics sought were that participants were adolescent learners, and that they have experienced social hardships. Gender was an additional criteria used.

3.4 Research Methods and Procedure

I visited the two schools one day prior to the research and arranged the convenient days and times with the heads of schools. I had a prior relationship with approximately 50% (fifty) of the learners, as I was at that time their Geography teacher. This presented both a unique opportunity and a limitation (Allen & Shockley, 1996; Baumann & Duffy, 2001). Even though the participants and I had related to each other with ease, in some instances, learners may not have been totally honest about their feelings.

To minimise the potential for bias the following steps were taken: (a) students were not exposed to the constructs of moral orientation, care or justice reasoning; (b) students were assured that participation in the interview was voluntary and not related to their class work; (c) one third of the interviews were coded by a second independent coder. Results from this group of participants did not differ significantly from the other group.

During the interview with the participants the dilemma and the interview questions were read in English to each participant. Each participant was interviewed individually and each interview lasted approximately 20 minutes. During the interviews, each participant was probed about his/her responses to the dilemmas until I was certain of their moral

orientation.

The main research tool was the interview. Participants were asked questions in response to two scenarios that depict moral dilemmas (see appendix 9). No problems were encountered in administering the interviews. The participants were all enthusiastic and expressed interest. The length of the interview occasioned no trouble to the participants being out of lesson, due to not much class work being done as exams had already been written. There was extensive probing to ensure that the moral reasoning of the participants was explicit. Some of the questions were based on the research of Krebs, Denton & Wark (1997). The questions that were used follow each scenario.

3.4.1 Scenarios

Table 1: Moral dilemmas in study

Scenario 1.

A woman was near death from cancer. One drug might save her, a form of radium that a pharmacist in the same town had recently discovered. The pharmacist was charging R12 000, ten times what the drug had cost him to make. The sick woman's husband, Heinz went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could get together only about half of what it should cost. He told the pharmacist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or to let him pay later. But the pharmacist said no. The husband got desperate and broke into the man's chemist to steal the drug for his wife.

- What is the story about?
- Was Hans right or wrong in what he did? Explain why?
- Was the Pharmacist right or wrong in what he did? Explain why?
- What do you think Hans should do?
- What would you have done in a situation like that?

Scenario 2.

Margaret lived with her 3 children in a small council house surrounded by other similar houses.

Margaret worked very hard to take care of her children. During the day, she sold fruit at a nearby market. At night she sewed clothes, which she also sold.

Margaret received a letter recently, which made her feel very unhappy. Her husband Mark who she has

47

never seen for many years wants to return home. She recalls that Mark left her and the children for another woman. In all the years that went by he did not contact her or even send money for the children. She read in the letter that some lady who did not return to fetch him left him in hospital. The letter states that he is very ill and requires to be nursed. He wishes to be with his family before he dies.

Margaret is very confused. Her children refuse to have their father home. The children feel that he was never around when they needed him. Therefore, they do not see the need to care for him. Within her heart she stills loves her husband and does not want him to suffer anymore or die feeling rejected.

- What is the story about?
- Was Mark right or wrong in what he did? Explain why?
- Are the children right or wrong in what they are doing? Explain why?
- What do you think Margaret should do?
- Should we help people like Mark? Explain why?

3.4.2 Semi-structured Interviews

Interviews were conducted in English, as all the participants are proficient in English. Interviews were audiotaped and later transcribed. Semi-structured interviews were used instead of structured interviews for this study. The semi-structured interview is one of the most frequently used qualitative methods (Mertens, 1998). An open individual interview can include a number of other qualitative procedures, among others dilemmas and different types of material representing a social situation (e.g. drawings, dolls, video, cartoons, etc.). It starts trying to minimize the hierarchical situation in order that the subject feels comfortable talking with the interviewer. An interview script is used, consisting of a set of questions as a starting point to guide the interaction. Nevertheless, as the aim is to capture as much as possible the participants thinking about a particular topic or a practical task, the interviewer follows in depth the process of thinking posing new questions after the first answers given by the participant. Consequently, at the end every interview can be different from each other. Semi-structured interviews are also seen as particularly suitable for sensitive subjects. Participants may be more likely to discuss sensitive and painful experiences if they feel that the interviewer is sympathetic and understanding. Semi-structured interviews provide the opportunity for developing

this kind of relationship. If participants feel at ease in an interview situation they will be more likely to open up and say what they really mean and are more likely to produce valid data. In summary a semi structured interview uses a schedule of questions very much like a questionnaire. The questions are usually open and the responses should be taped for later transcription. In a semi structured interview it is permissible to stray from the subject area and ask supplementary questions but there are some golden rules, which is never to change the order of the questions and never allow your opinions to show through, only prompt by asking could you give me more detail on the point or repeat the question. The taped recordings of the interview should be typed and then they can be analysed in the same way as for content analysis.

3.5 Ethical issues

Written consent was sought from the school principals, parents/caregivers and learners (see Appendix 2 – 8) who were informed of the nature of the research. A letter was sent home to parents of all participants who were selected for the study in order to obtain written signed consent. Consent was also sought from each participant prior to the research. The aims and nature of the study were explained to the participants. Confidentiality and anonymity was assured to both the participant and their parents/caregivers. It was impressed upon the participants that their participation was voluntarily, and that they could withdraw from participating at any stage. They were also be given the option of refusing to answer a question if they felt in any way uncomfortable.

3.6 Analysis of data

Data was gathered during individual interviews, using the semi-structured interview (Mertens, 1998). Responses were tape recorded, then transcribed and analysed.

The participants' moral orientations were examined within and across the two dilemmas. Using the interview transcripts, firstly, responses across both the dilemmas were examined to identify moral judgments, and then they were coded for the orientational logic, which they represented.

Krebs, Denton & Wark (1997) and Walker (1987) provide a scheme for coding

49

considerations of justice and care. Data was categorised according to the moral orientations discussed.

The participant's responses were classified as showing orientation to care/concern for others, or an orientation to justice/rights. The care perspective places special significance on attachment and compassion. Not to act unfairly towards others, and not to turn away from someone in need. Statements that contained both a care and a justice concern were separately coded and counted. Another unintegrated category-included answers that in which both care and justice statements appeared in the same statement, it could be interpreted either as care or justice. In these responses it was difficult to separate elements of care and justice. The final category uncodable includes statements that do not offer enough information to be reliably coded.

In order to check reliability of the coding procedure, a second independent coder who was familiar with the process coded one third of the interviews. In-depth discussions were held to reach consensus.

3.7 Summary

This chapter covered the research design, the method of data collection and analysis. In addition, ethical issues were discussed.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The results of the research will be presented and discussed in this chapter. It will then be reviewed in the light of relevant literature in order to locate the findings in the context of current knowledge and to identify the results that support the literature or claim unique contributions (Krebs et al. 1996, 1997 & Walker 1987).

4.2 Findings of the Study

4.2.1 Analysis according to justice vs care orientations

Across the two dilemmas the participants made 346 statements that expressed some moral orientation, 182 (53%) were statements that supported a justice orientation and 126 (36%) a care orientation. The other two classifications, "unintegrated' and 'uncodable' comprised 38 (11%) of the statements. There were 20 responses that fell into the unintegrated category and 18 in the uncodable category. 19 answers that fell in the 'both' classification were counted twice and were allocated to both justice and care.

Table 1: Examples of responses illustrating justice orientation and care orientation

(Scenario 1)

Care Orientation Examples

> *Heinz could speak nicely to the chemist, explain to the chemist that his wife will die without the drug and then maybe the chemist will change his mind. Explain to him that a*

life is more important than all the money in the world. (female, 15 years) (engage in interpersonal communication)

I understand how the chemist man feels, I'm sure he feels bad, but if he gives in to Heinz then he will have to give to everyone. And after all he did invent the drug and I do feel sorry for Heinz's wife. (male, 16 years) (empathy)

No Heinz must not steal the drug, if he goes to jail then who will look after his

wife. He should rather beg in the streets than steal the drug. (female, 14 years) (concern)

Plead with his family for the money, he shouldn't't steal, that's not the answer. If he really can't get all the money then he should leave what he's got with a note telling the chemist man that all he can afford and he will pay the rest off. (male, 14 years (aiming to promote the welfare of all involved)

Justice Orientation Examples

Yes, stealing in any situation is bad. It's just not right. (male, 17 years) (standards, norms)

Because it's his duty as a husband to look after his wife, because she depends on him (female 17 yrs) (duty, obligation)

Because it says so in the Bible that you should not steal. (male 17 yrs) (values)

The combined responses reflected a greater justice orientation than a care orientation across gender and age. 59% of the responses reflected a justice orientation, and 41% reflected a care orientation.

Overall, across age boys' responses reflected a more justice orientation than a care orientation as suggested by Gilligan as indicated in table 2 below.

Table 2: Examples of responses illustrating justice orientation by boys

It's the law, you must not steal.

(male, 14 years) (rules)

Heinz should not steal the medicine, because he will be put in prison.

(male, 15 years) (norms)

Yes, stealing in any situation is bad. It's just not right.

(male, 17 years) (standards, norms)

Heinz has a duty to his wife, to protect and keep her safe.

(male, 18 years) (obligation)

4.2.2 Analysis by age and gender trends

In Table 3, the responses of the participants on both justice and care orientation are presented by two age groups, 13 -15 years and 16 -18 years and gender.

59% (fifty nine) of the participants based their ethical decisions on principals of justice orientation, equality, impartiality and rights. 41% (forty one) of the participants based their decisions on a care orientation, which they need to preserve relationship and minimize hurt takes precedence over considerations of justice and rights.

Table 3: Number of Moral Orientation Responses by Age Range and Gender *

Age	Gender	Justice Orientation	Care Orientation	Total
13-15 yrs	Males (n=9)	42 (62%)	26 (38%)	68
	Females (n=10)	43 (52%)	39 (48%)	82
Total		*85 (57%)*	*65 (43%)*	*150*
16-18 yrs	Males (n=6)	52 (69%)	23 (31%)	75
	Females (n=5)	45 (53%)	38 (47%)	83
Total		*95 (61%)*	*63 (39%)*	*158*
Total across Gender	Males (n= 15)	94 (66%)	49 (34%)	143
	Females (n=15)	88 (53%)	77 (47%)	165
Total statements made		182 (59%)	126 (41%)	308

* adjusted for the 'Both" category.

Contrary to Gilligan's account, the female participations use of care orientation decreases with age. Between the two age groups, 13 – 15 and 16 -18 years, there was a drop of 1% (one) to responses reflecting care orientation. The 13 – 15 year age group reflected a 48% (forty eight) care orientation and the 16- 18 year group revealed 47% (forty seven).

Table 4: Examples of care and justice orientations by age

The man must talk nicely to the chemist, he will listen.

(female, 13 years) (communication)

No, he mustn't steal the drug. Who will look after his wife if he goes

to jail.

(female, 14 years) (concern)

I also feel sorry for the chemist; after all he did invent the drug.

(female, 15 years) (empathy)

I think I would do the same, however it is wrong to steal.

(female, 16 years) (standards)

Just on principle, I wouldn't steal the drug.

(female, 17 years) (values and principles)

Again there was a slight increase of 1% (one) reflected that use of justice orientation increased with age between the two female age groups. The 13 – 15 year group reflected a 52% (fifty two) justice orientation; it increased to 53% (fifty three) in the 16 – 18 year group.

In both age groups there was a slight increase of 1% (one) in justice orientation with age. In the 13 – 15 year group, the results reflected 52% (fifty two) of justice orientation and reflected 48% (forty eight) in care orientation. In the 16 –18 year group the results reflected 53% (fifty three) of justice orientation and reflected 47% (forty seven) in care orientation.

Overall the results showed that a higher portion of female participants responses were justice orientated based. A similar pattern was with males across the age ranges: 66% (sixty six) of the males' responses show greater use of a justice orientation in their

reasoning than care orientation of 34% (thirty four).

4.2.3 Analysis according to Kohlberg's levels and stages of moral reasoning

This study also examined the responses in terms of moral stages as delineated by Kohlberg. According to Kohlberg, people display different levels of mental moral maturity, and age is not necessarily a factor that determines these levels. Lawrence Kohlberg formulated a way to measure moral development. To Kohlberg, moral development and moral behaviour are considered to be two different things. Moral behaviour (actions) is not a good indication of one's maturity level. The reason behind the action on the other hand is a good indicator of mental moral maturity. Kohlberg conducted a series of studies in which he presented his subjects with moral dilemmas. He had a scoring system and based on the reasons given he found that a pattern would emerge. The most famous example of the moral dilemma that Kohlberg presented to his subjects is known as The Heinz Dilemma. Kohlberg told children moral dilemma stories (Colby & Kohlberg 1987), and he would ask them to tell him what they thought would be the right thing to do. Through his studies, Kohlberg formulated six stages of moral development and three levels under which these stages are categorized.

Kohlberg believed that as the whole human personality matures, our thinking about right and wrong starts at a preconventional level, then progresses to a conventional level, then finally arrives at postconventional thinking. Each of these three levels has two specific stages. Kohlberg's research included subjects from many cultures, and therefore he believed that he was uncovering a universal innate developmental structure of the human personality.

The data in this study revealed shifts across age in levels of moral reasoning, and these appear to follow Kohlberg's stages (Colby & Kohlberg 1987). This is explained below.

Level 1. Preconventional Morality

In the preconventional morality level, people judge an action by its direct consequences. The individual will respond to a certain moral dilemma based on what a higher authority figure has explained. The actions taken are based on the pleasure/pain principle. There is self-interest in the decisions made and the individual judges according to consequences.

Stage 1. Obedience and Punishment Orientation.

At this stage the participants make moral decisions on the basis of what is best for themselves, without regard for the needs or feelings of others. They obey rules only if established by more powerful individuals.

Stage one (*obedience*):

> *Heinz should not steal the medicine, because he will be put in prison.*

(male, 14 years)

Kohlberg's stage one is similar to Piaget's first stage of moral thought. The participant assumes that powerful authorities hand down a fixed set of rules, which he or she must unquestioningly obey. To the Heinz dilemma, the participant typically says that Heinz was wrong to steal the drug because "It's against the law," or "It's bad to steal," as if this were all there were to it. When asked to elaborate, the participant usually responds in terms of the consequences involved, explaining that stealing is bad "because you'll get punished".

Stage 2. Individualism and Exchange.

This individual seeks pleasure. There is a new perspective on society. Society is filled with individuals like oneself. The individual self comes first, but there is a realization that by helping another someday the favour will be returned. For example, you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours.

Stage two (*self-interest*):

Heinz should steal the medicine, because he will be much happier if he saves his wife, even if he will have to serve a prison sentence.

(female, 15 years)

Heinz might steal it because maybe they had children and he might need someone at home to look after them. Maybe he shouldn't steal it because he might not be able to handle prison.

(male, 14 years)

At this stage some of the participants recognized that there is not just one right view that is handed down by the authorities. What is right for Heinz, then, is what meets his own self-interests.

Participant's at both stages 1 and 2 talk about punishment. However, they perceive it differently. At stage 1 punishment is tied up in the participants' mind with wrongness; punishment "proves" that disobedience is wrong. At stage 2, in contrast, punishment is simply a risk that one naturally wants to avoid.

Participants at stage 2 are still said to reason at the preconventional level because they speak as isolated individuals rather than as members of society. They see individuals exchanging favours, but there is still no identification with the values of the family or community.

Level II. Conventional Morality

The value of the group is realized. Consequences to the self are not a deterrent for the actions taken. The individual has the ability to see themselves in someone else's shoes. Self worth is obtainable through conformity. The individual begins to have a sense of the social structure and the roles people in society should assume. Also, moral law is beginning to develop.

Stage 3. Good Interpersonal Relationships.

At this stage the participants make moral decisions on the basis of what actions will please others, especially authority figures. They are concerned about maintaining personal relationships through sharing, trust, and loyalty. They now consider someone's intentions in determining innocence or guilt.

> Stage three (*conformity*):
>
> *Heinz should steal the medicine, because his wife expects it.*
>
> (female, 15 years)

The participants see morality as more than simple deals. They believe that people should live up to the expectations of the family and community and behave in "good" ways. Good behaviour means having good motives and interpersonal feelings such as love, empathy, trust, and concern for others. Heinz, they typically argue, was right to steal the drug because "He was a good man for wanting to save her," and "His intentions were good, that of saving the life of someone he loves."

If Heinz's motives were good, the pharmacist was bad. The pharmacist, stage 3 participants emphasize, was "selfish," "greedy," and "only interested in himself, not another life." Some participants become so angry with the pharmacist that they say that he ought to be put in jail.

> *Heinz should report the man to the police.*
>
> (male, 15 years)

In this sequence there is a shift from unquestioning obedience to a relativistic outlook and to a concern for good motives.

Stage 4. Maintaining the Social Order.

At this stage the participants look to society as a whole for guidelines concerning what is right or wrong. They perceive rules to be inflexible and believe that is their duty to obey them.

Stage four (*law-and-order*):

Heinz should not steal the medicine, because the law prohibits stealing and if you let one get away with it, then everyone will want to steal.

(male, 16 years)

At stage 4 the participant becomes more broadly concerned with society as a whole (Kohlberg & Colby 1987). Now the emphasis is on obeying laws, respecting authority, and performing one's duties so that the social order is maintained. In response to the Heinz story, many participants say they understand that Heinz's motives were good, but they cannot condone the theft. What would happen if we all started breaking the laws whenever we felt we had a good reason? The result would be chaos; society couldn't function.

Stage 1 and stage 4 participants are giving the same response, so we see here why Kohlberg (1984) insists that we must probe into the reasoning behind the overt response. Stage 1 participants say, "It's wrong to steal" and "It's against the law," but they cannot elaborate any further, except to say that stealing can get a person jailed. Stage 4 participants, in contrast, have a conception of the function of laws for society as a whole, a conception that far exceeds the grasp of the younger person.

Level III. Postconventional Morality

There is a move to trying to define moral values. As an individual you question the views held by society. Moral decisions are not simply based on others reactions or thinking but on one's own accord.

Stage 5. Social Contract and Individual Rights.

At this stage the participants recognize that rules represent an agreement among many people about appropriate behaviour. They recognize that rules are flexible and can be changed if they no longer meet society's needs.

Stage five (*human rights*):

60

Heinz should steal the medicine, because everyone has a right to live, regardless of the law.

(male, 17 years)

Heinz should not steal the medicine, because the chemist has a right to fair compensation.

(female, 18 years)

Stage 5 participants make it clear that they do not generally favour breaking laws; laws are social contracts that we agree to uphold until we can change them by democratic means. Nevertheless, the wife's right to live is a moral right that must be protected.

It is the husbands duty to save his wife. The fact that her life is in danger transcends every other standard you might use to judge his action. Life is more important than property.

Stage 5 participants are working toward a conception of the good society. They suggest that we need to (a) protect certain individual rights and (b) settle disputes through democratic processes.

Stage 6: Universal Principles.

At this stage the participants adhere to a small number of abstract, universal principles that transcend specific, concrete rules. They answer to an inner conscience and may break rules that violate their own ethnical principles.

Stage six (*universal human ethics*):

Heinz should steal the medicine, because saving a human life is more value than the property rights of another person.

(female, 16years)

Heinz should not steal the medicine, because it breaks the rule of honesty and respect.

(male, 18 years)

Kohlberg (1984) believes that there must be a higher stage (stage 6), which defines the

principles by which we achieve justice.

According to Kohlberg, the principles of justice require us to treat the claims of all parties in an impartial manner, respecting the basic dignity, of all people as individuals. The principles of justice are therefore universal, for example, we would not vote for a law that aids some people but hurts others. The principles of justice guide us toward decisions based on an equal respect for all.

Kohlberg (1984) argues that we can reach just decisions by looking at a situation through one another's eyes. In the Heinz dilemma, this would mean that all parties, the pharmacist, Heinz, and his wife take the roles of the others. If the pharmacist did this, even he would recognize that life must take priority over property; for he wouldn't want to risk finding himself in the wife's shoes with property valued over life. Thus, they would all agree that the wife must be saved--this would be the fair solution. Such a solution requires not only impartiality, but the principle that everyone is given full and equal respect. If the wife were considered of less value than the others, a just solution could not be reached.

CHAPTER FIVE: REFLECTIONS

This small-scale exploratory study investigated adolescence's moral reasoning about real life dilemmas within the framework of the moral orientations delineated by Lawrence Kohlberg (1984) and Carol Gilligan (1993).

When Gilligan first challenged the field of moral psychology, she argued that moral psychology's traditional and singular focus on justice had obscured another dimension in people's moral concerns (Gilligan 1977, 1982). In addition to rights and fairness, the concerns of justice identified in Kohlberg's (1969, 1984) model of development, Gilligan suggested that females are more caring, sensitive to others' needs, concerned about relationships than males. Females also speak in a predominantly care voice and males in one of justice. Thus, when discussing moral dilemmas, it would appear that females more often than males explain their choices by mentioning the importance of caring about others, about relationships, and about relieving the burdens or suffering of others. Although overlap occurs and many females and males use both modes, males more frequently explain their choices by reasons of fairness, reciprocity and following standards or principles.

The findings in this study revealed that the adolescents were strongly oriented toward justice reasoning. 59% (fifty nine) of the adolescent's used justice reasoning, putting 41% (forty one) of the adolescent's in care-oriented categories. The higher percentages of adolescent's in the justice-oriented category does not support Gilligan's hypothesis on moral orientation. In the study, girls were more justice oriented than care oriented in their responses to the dilemmas. The findings of this study do not corroborate fully Gilligan's theory of moral orientation. In other words, the adolescent's across gender and age made more justice than care based responses.

As mentioned above, the majority of the adolescents expressed a justice orientation in their suggested solutions. The most common elements of justice responses were expressing issues of rights, norms, standards, obligations, fairness and undeserved punishment.

In this study, age related patterns in moral reasoning were addressed and the results were in line with Kohlberg and Gilligan (1971) hypothesizing that the moral judgment of older subjects should be more advanced.

The findings in this study lend some additional support to the notion that children who have been exposed to violence and situations where rights may have been restricted unfairly may exhibit a predominant justice orientation opposed to a care orientation (Garrod et.al. 2003). The adolescents in this study live in a context where families are exposed to many social hardships and are deprived of simple basic needs. In line with the findings by Garrod and his colleagues' (2003), in this study the majority of adolescents adopted a justice perspective than an orientation to care.

The study provides a glimpse into the moral orientations of adolescents in a specific South African context, but there is still much to learn about the variety of ways adolescents' judge and make decisions about moral issues. Further research is needed with a larger sample to confirm and clarify the patterns in this small-scale study.

References:

Abell, E., Clawson, M., Washington, W. N., Bost, K. K., & Vaughn, B. E. (1996). Parenting values, attitudes, behaviours, and goals of African American mothers from a low-income population in relation to social and societal contexts. *Journal of Family Issues, 17,* 593-613.

Adams G. R., Montemayor R., & Gullotta T. P. (Eds.). (1996). *Psychosocial development during adolescence: Progress in developmental contextualism.* 1-11. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ainsworth, M.D.S., Bell, S.M., & Stayton, D.J. (1972). *Individ*ual differences in the development of some attachment behaviours. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 18,* 123-143.

Allen, J., & Shockley, B. (1996). Composing a research dialogue: University and school research communities encountering a cultural shift. *Reading Research Quarterly, 31,* 220-228.

Al-Shehab, A.J. (2002). A cross sectional examination of levels of moral reasoning in a sample of Kuwait university faculty members. *Social Behaviour and Personality, 8,* 813-820.

Aunola, K., Stattin, H., & Nurmi, J. E. (2000). Parenting styles and adolescents' achievement strategies. *Journal of Adolescence, 23,* 205-222.

Baek, H-L. (2002) A comparative study of moral development of Korean & British children. *Journal of Moral Education, 31*(4), 16-21.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory.* New York: General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Barns, P. (1998) *Personal, Social and Emotional Development of Children.* London: Open University Press.

Baumann, J. F., & Duffy, A. M. (2001). Teacher-researcher methodology: Themes, variations, and possibilities. *Reading Teacher, 54,* 608-615.

Baumrind, D. (1971). *Current patterns of parental authority.* Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4(1), 18-23

Baumrind, D. (1980). New directions in socialization research. *Psychological Bulletin,* 35, 639-652.

Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and

substance use. *Journal of early adolescence*, 11(1), 56-95.

Berkowitz, M.W. (1982). Self-control development and relation to prosocial behaviour: A response to Peterson. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly.28, 223-236.*

Beal, C., Garrod, A., Ruben, K., Stewart, T. & Dekle, D. (1997) Children's Moral Orientation: does the gender of dilemma character make a difference? *Journal of Education,* 26(1), 1.

Beal, C. (1994) *Boys and Girls: the development of gender roles.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Belknap, R. (2000). One woman's life viewed through the interpretive lens of Gilligan's theory. *Violence Against Women, 6,* 586-605.

Bernard, G. (2004) *Common Morality: Deciding What To Do,* New York: Oxford University Press

Blasi, A., & Milton, K. (1991). The development of the sense of self in adolescence. *Journal of Personality,* 59, 217-242.

Blasi, A. (1995). Moral understanding and the moral personality: The process of moral integration. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L Gewirtz (eds.), *Moral development: An introduction (pp229-254)* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bless, C., & Smith, H. (1995) *Fundamentals of Social Research.* Cape Town. Juta & Co.

Bluestone, C., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (1999). Correlates of parenting styles in predominantly working- and middle-class African American mothers. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61,* 881-893.

Blum, R. W., T. Beuhring, M. L. Shew, L. H. Bearinger, R. E. Sieving, and M. D. Resnick. (2000). The Effects of Race/Ethnicity, Income, and Family Structure on Adolescent Risk Behaviors. *American Journal of Public Health* 90 (12): 1879-84.

Cleary, S. D. (2000). Adolescent victimization and associated suicidal and violent behaviors. *Adolescence*, 35, 671-682.

Cannella, G.S. (1997) *Deconstructing Early Childhood Education: social justice and revolution.* New York: Peter Lang.

Colby, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1987). *The measurement of moral judgement. Vol.1* Cambridge. Cambridge University press.

Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1992). *Some do care: Contemporary lives of moral commitment.* New York: The Free Press.

Coleman, J. C. & Hendry, L. B. (1999). *The Nature of Adolescence.* London: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Damon, W. (1988) *The Moral Child.* New York: Free Press.

Damon, W. (1977). *The social world of the child.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dekovic, M., & Gerris, J. R. M. (1992). Parental reasoning complexity, social class, and child-rearing behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54,* 675-685.

Demo, D. H., & Cox, M. J. (2000). Families with young children: A review of research in the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62,* 867-895.

Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., & Roberts, D. F. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development, 58,* 1244-1257.

Eysenck, H. (1976). The biology of morality. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior: *Theory, research, and social issues.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Ford, M.R. & Lowery, C.R. (1986) Gender differences in moral reasoning: a comparison of the use of justice and care orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 50, 777- 783.

Garrod, A., Beal, C., Jaeger, W., Thomas, J., Davis J., Leisher, N., & Hodzic, A. (2003) *Culture, Ethnic Conflict and Moral Orientation in Bosnian Children. Journal of Moral Education,* 32 (2).131-149

Gewirtz, L. (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development and behaviour* Vol. 1. 105-121 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gibbs, J.C. (1987). Social processes in delinquency: The need to facilitate empathy as well as sociomoral reasoning. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L. Gewirtz (eds.), *Moral development through social interaction.* New York: John Wiley.

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

Gilligan, C. & Attanucci, J. (1988) Two moral orientations: gender differences and similarities: *Merrill Palmer Quarterly.* , 34, 223-237.

Gilligan, C., Lyons, N. & Hanmer, T. (1990) *Making connections: the relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Gillian, C., Wark, R., & Krebs, L. (2002). The construction of moral dilemma's in everyday life. *Journal of moral Education,* 29(1). 68-92.

Glasgow, K. L., Dornbusch, S. M., Troyer, L., Steinberg, L., & Ritter, P. L. (1997). Parenting styles, adolescents' attributions, and educational outcomes in nine heterogeneous high schools. *Child Development, 68,* 507-529.

Hart, C. H., Nelson, D.A., Robinson, C. D., Olsen, S. F., & McNeilly-Choque, M. K. (1998). Overt and relational aggression in Russian nursery-school-age children: Parenting style and marital linkages. *Developmental Psychology, 34,* 687-697.

Hanna E. Meltzoff. A.N. (1993) Peer imitation by toddlers in laboratory, home and day-care contexts: implications for social learning and memory. *Developmental Psychology.* 29. 701-710

Hickman, G. P., Bartholomae, S., & McKenry, P. C. (2000). Influence of parenting style on the adjustment and academic achievement of traditional college freshmen. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(1), 41-54.

Higgins, A. (1980). Research and measurement issues in moral education interventions. In R.L. Mosher (Ed.), Moral education: *A first generation of research and development.* New York: Praeger.

Hoffman, M. L. (1977). Sex differences in empathy and related behaviours. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84(4): 712-722.

Holstein, C. (1976). Development of moral judgment: A longitudinal study of males and females. *Child Development* 47:51-61.

Hunter, J.D. (2000). The death of character: Moral education in an age without good or evil. New York: Basic Books.

Jencks, C., & Edin, K. (1995). *Do poor women have a right to bear children*? [On-line] The American Prospect, 20, 43-52. Available: http://epn.org/prospect/20/20jenc.html.

Johnston, K. (1988) Adolescents' solutions to dilemmas in fables: two moral orientations- two problem-solving strategies. In C. Gilligan, J. Ward, J. Taylor (Eds) *Mapping the Moral Domain.* Cambridge MA. Harvard University Press.

Kawamura, K. Y., Frost, R. O., & Harmatz, M. G. (2002). The relationship of perceived parenting styles to perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32*(2), 317-327.

Keating, D.P. (1980). Thinking processes in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.). *Handbook of adolescent psychology*.48 – 51. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Kohn, A. (1990). *The Brighter Side of Human Nature.* New York, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (2nd Ed.), pp. 279-313. Thousand Oaks, CA: PineForge (Sage).

Krebs, D., Denton, K. & Wark, G. (1997) The forms of function of real life moral decision maker. *Journal of Moral Education.* 26(2), 131-145.

Krebs, D., Schroeder, M., & Denton, K. (1987) The corruption of pure reason in the moral domain. Paper Presented at the symposium, *"From Moral Judgment to Moral Action and Back Again"*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Kohlberg, L. (1969) Stage and sequence: the cognitive-development approach to socialization, in: D. Goslin. (Ed.) *The handbook of socialization theory and research.* Chicago: Rand Nally.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development.* San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kohlberg, L. & Turiel, E. (1971). Moral development and moral education. In G. Lesser, (Ed). *Psychology and educational practice.* pp. 410-465

Kohlberg, L. & Gilligan, C. (1971) The Adolescent as a Philosopher. *Daedalus,* 100, 1051-1086,

Lamb, S., & Feeny, N.C. (1995). Early moral sense and socialization. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral development: An introduction* . Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development, 62,* 1049-1065.

Laupa, M. (1991) Children's reasoning about three authority attributes: adult status, knowledge and social position. *Development Psychology,* 27, 321-329.

Laupa, M. & Turiel, E. (1986) Children's conceptions of adult and peer authority. *Child Development.,* .57, 405-412.

Leman, P. (2001) The development of moral reasoning. In C. Fraser, B. Burchell, D. Hay & G. Duveen (Eds) *Introducing Social Psychology.*356 -398 Cambridge: Polity Press.

Leung, K., Lau, S., & Lam, W. L. (1998). Parenting styles and academic achievement: A cross- cultural study. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 44,* 157-172.

Leung, P. W. L., & Kwan, K. S. F. (1998). Parenting styles, motivational orientations, and self-perceived academic competence: A mediational model. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 44,* 1-19.

Levine, C., Kohlberg, L., & Hewer, A. (1985) The current formulation of Kohlberg's

theory and a response to critics. *Human Development,* 28, 92-100.

Lickona, T. (1983). *Raising good children.* New York: Bantam Books.

Liddell, D. L., Halpin, G., & Halpin, W. G. (1993). Men, women, and moral orientation: Accounting for our differences. *NASPA Journal,* 31,138 –144.

Linclon, Y.S., & Cuba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry.* Beverly Hills. Sage.

Linn, R. (2001) The heart has its reason and the reason has its heart: The insight of Kohlberg and Gilligan in moral development and counseling. *Social Behaviour and Personality,* 26(6), 593-600.

Linner, R. (1991). Sexual and moral development of Israeli female adolescents from City and Kibbutz: Perspectives of Kohlberg and Gilligan. *Academic Search Premier,* .26(101), 1-9.
Lyons, N. (1983). Two perspectives on self, relationships and morality. *Harvard Educational Review,* 53, 125-145.

Malinowski, C. & Smith, C. (1985) Moral reasoning and moral conduct: An investigation prompted by Kohlberg's theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Issues,* 49, 1016-1027.

Margolin, G., & Gordis, E. B. (2000). The effects of family and community violence on children. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 51, 445-479.

Mertens, D.M. (1998) *Research methods in education and psychology.* Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches. London: Sage.

Miller, J. (1994*)* Cultural diversity in the morality of caring: Individually oriented versus duty-based interpersonal moral codes. *Cross-Cultural Research,* 28, 3-39.

Muthukrishna. N, Wedekind. V, Hugo. W, & Khan. F. (2005) *Primary school children's moral orientation: Insights from an urban schooling context in South Africa.* Unpublished article. School of Education and Development, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg.

Nazar, F. (2001) Moral judgment of preschool children of the State of Kuwait. *International Education Journal,* 2 (2). 36 -45.

Parikh, B. (1980). Development of moral judgment and its relation to family environmental factors in Indian and American families. *Child Development,* 51. 247 - 321.

Park, K.A., & Waters, E. (1989). Security of attachment and preschool friendships. *Child Development,* 60 .147 -163

Pelaez-Nogueras, M., & Gewirtz, J.L. (1995). The learning of moral behaviour: A behavior-analytic approach. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L Gewirtz (eds.), *Moral development:*

An introduction (85 -105) Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Piaget, J. (1932). *The moral judgment of the child*. The Free Press: New York.

Power, F. C., Higgins, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1989). *Lawrence Kohlberg's Approach to Moral Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Puka, B. (1980). *Toward Moral Perfectionism*. NY: Garland Press.

Pratt, M.W., Golding, G., Hunter, W., & Sampson, R. (1988). Sex differences in adolescent moral orientations, *Journal of Personality*, 56, 373-391.

Radziszewska, B., Richardson, J. L., Dent, C. W., & Flay, B. R. (1996). Parenting style and adolescent depressive symptoms, smoking, and academic achievement: Ethnic, gender, and SES differences. *Journal of Behavioural Medicine, 19*(3), 289-305.

Rest, J.R. (1985). An interdisciplinary approach to moral education. In M.W. Berkowitz & F. Oser (Eds.), *Moral education: Theory and application*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum.

Schaffer, H.R. (1996). *Social development*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Schneider-Rosen, K., & Rothbaum, F. (1993). Quality of parental caregiving and security of attachment. *Developmental Psychology*, 29 213- 235.

Schwandt, T. D. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (eds), *The handbook of qualitative research* (2nd Ed.), 189-213. Thousand Oaks, CA: PineForge (Sage).

Schulman, M., & Mekler, E. (1985). *Bringing up a moral child: A new approach for teaching your child to be kind, just, and responsible*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schurink, E.M. (1998). The methodology of unstructured face-to-face interviewing. In De Vos, A.S. (ed). *Research at grass roots*. 260 – 265. Pretoria: J.L. Van Schaik.

Selman, R.L. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding: Developmental and clinical analyses*. New York: Academic Press.

Shumow, L., Vandell, D. L., & Posner, J. K. (1998). Harsh, firm, and permissive parenting in low-income families. *Journal of Family Issues, 19*, 438-507.

Skolnick, J. H. (1994). Wild pitch: "Three strikes, you're out" and other bad calls on crime [On-line]. The American Prospect, 17, 30-37. Available: http://epn.org/prospect/17/17skol.html.

Shewder, R., Malapert, M., & Miller,J.(1990). Culture and moral development. In Stigler,J., Schewder, R., & Herdt, G. (Eds.), *Cultural Psychology: Essays on Comparative Human Development* (pp. 130-204). Cambridge, England: Random Press.

Silverman, D. (1997). *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Stigler, R. Shweder & G. Herdt (Eds) *Cultural Psychology*: *Essays on comparative human development*, pp. 130-204 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turiel, E. (1983). *The Development of Social Knowledge: Morality & Convention*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

United Nations. (2001). Report on the preparatory committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly on Children. General Assembly Official Records. Twenty-seventh Special Session Supplement No. 2 (A/S-27/2). New York.

Youniss, J. (1980). *Parents and peers in social development:* A Sullivan-Piaget perspective. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Walker, L.J. (1984) Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: a critical review. *Child Development,* 55, 677-691.

Walker, L.J. (1989). A longitudinal study of moral reasoning. *Child development,* 60, 157-166.

Walker, L., DeVries, B., Trevethan, S. (1987). Moral stages and moral orientations in real life and hypothetical dilemmas. *Child Development,* 58, 842-858.

Wark, G.R. & Krebs, D.L. (2000) The construction of moral dilemmas in everyday life. *Journal of Moral Education*, 29, 5-21.

Wylie, D. (2001) Hunger and the triumph of cultural racism in modern South Africa. Charlottesville. University press of Virginia.

Woods. C, P. (1996). Gender differences in moral development and acquisition: A review of Kohlbergs and Gilligans model of justice and care. *Social behaviour and personality*, 24(4), 373-384.

Appendix 1: Letter of consent to parents

Dear Parent,

I am working on a Masters Degree through the University of KwaZulu-Natal. I am undertaking a study examining patterns of moral orientation with a group of adolescents. In other words, the aim of this research is to understand how adolescents' reason about moral dilemmas they may encounter. The research will focus on ways in which moral dilemmas are judged and explained by the adolescents.

The learners will be given the opportunity to participate in this research. Their participation is voluntary. If the learners choose to participate in this research, I will interview them, and they will be asked questions in response to two scenarios that depict moral dilemmas. After listening to the two scenarios, the learners must answer the questions, and give reasons for their answers.
For example, the scenarios will be very similar to this scenario:

A woman was near death from cancer. One drug might save her, a form of radium that a chemist in the same town had recently discovered. The chemist was charging R12 000, ten times what the drug had cost him to make. The sick woman's husband, John went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could get together only about half of what it should cost. He told the chemist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or to let him pay later. But the chemist said no. The husband got desperate and broke into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife. Should the husband have done that? Why? What would you have done in a situation like this?

I want to make sure that I record exactly what the learners say, so I would like to use a tape recorder in our interview. It will be kept very safe and will not be heard by anyone beside myself.
If you agree to be in this research, I want to emphasis that your child may withdraw at any time if he/she does not want to take part anymore. He/she can also choose not to answer any of the questions. The identity of your child will be kept anonymous, and all information I gather will be treated confidentially.

If you have understood the contents of this letter and if you want your child to be part of this research project, then please read the next sheet.

Yours sincerely,

Ms Mona Gagadelis
(Student)

Prof Nithi Muthukrishna
(Supervisor)

Appendix 2: Consent form for parents

I, (Please write in your full name) ....

understand all that is contained in the letter and *agree /disagree to my child's participation in this project.

Child's name..

Signature:..

Date: ....

* Please delete what is not appropriate

Appendix 3: Letter of consent to learners
Dear learners

I am working on a Masters Degree through the University of KwaZulu-Natal. I am undertaking a study about how adolescents think about and reason about moral dilemmas in life. In other words, I am interested in understanding what are adolescents' views about what is right and wrong.

Your participation in this study must be voluntary. If you agree to participate, I will interview you, and ask you questions about two scenarios that depict moral dilemmas or conflicts people have. After listening to the two scenarios, you will be required to answer questions, and give reasons for their answers.
For example, the scenarios will be very similar to this one:

A woman was near death from cancer. One drug might save her, a form of radium that a chemist in the same town had recently discovered. The chemist was charging R12 000, ten times what the drug had cost him to make. The sick woman's husband, John went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could get together only about half of what it should cost. He told the chemist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or to let him pay later. But the chemist said no. The husband got desperate and broke into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife. Should the husband have done that? Why? What would you have done in a situation like this?

I want to make sure that I record exactly what the learners say, so I would like to use a tape recorder in our interview. You do not have to give your names in the tape-recorded interviews. The tapes will be kept very safe and will not be heard by anyone besides myself.

If you agree to be in this research, I want to emphasis that you can withdraw at any time if you decide you want to stop. You can also choose not to answer a question if you feel you do not want to. Your name will not be used in the study – you will be anonymous. I promise that all information I gather will be treated confidentially.

If you have understood the contents of this letter, and if you want to take part in this study, then please read the next sheet.

Yours sincerely,

_____   _____

Ms Mona Gagadelis   Prof Nithi Muthukrishna
(Student)   (Supervisor)

75

Appendix 4: Consent Form for Learners

I, (Please write in your full name) ....

understand all that has been explained to me about the research project and I *agree / disagree to take part in the project.

Signature:..

Date: ....

* Please delete what is not appropriate

Appendix 5: Letter to Provincial Department of Education

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am working on a Masters Degree in the School of Educational Studies, University of KwaZulu-Natal. I am undertaking a study examining patterns of moral orientation with a group of adolescents. In other words, the aim of this research is to understand how adolescents' reason about moral dilemmas they may encounter. The research will focus on ways in which moral dilemmas are judged and explained by the adolescents.

Please find enclosed my research proposal that outlines the focus, research questions, and the design of the study.

I would like to undertake the study at the Queensburgh Girls High School, and Queensburgh Boys High in Malvern, Durban. Permission will be sought from the School principals, learners and their parents.

I request your permission to undertake this study at the schools.

Yours sincerely,

_____   _____
Ms Mona Gagadelis   Prof Nithi Muthukrishna
(Student)   (Supervisor)

Appendix 6: Consent form for provincial Department of Education

I, (Please write in your full name) ....

understand all that has been explained to me about the research project and *agree / disagree that this project can be undertaken at the schools.

Signature:...

Date: ....

* Please delete what is not appropriate

Appendix 7: Letter to school principals

Dear _____

I am working on a Masters Degree in the School of Educational Studies, University of KwaZulu-Natal. I am undertaking a study examining patterns of moral orientation with a group of adolescents. In other words, the aim of this research is to understand how adolescents' reason about moral dilemmas they may encounter. The research will focus on ways in which moral dilemmas are judged and explained by the adolescents.

For example, the scenarios will be very similar to this one:

A woman was near death from cancer. One drug might save her, a form of radium that a chemist in the same town had recently discovered. The chemist was charging R12 000, ten times what the drug had cost him to make. The sick woman's husband, John went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could get together only about half of what it should cost. He told the chemist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or to let him pay later. But the chemist said no. The husband got desperate and broke into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife. Should the husband have done that? Why? What would you have done in a situation like this?

I want to make sure that I record exactly what the learners say, so I would like to use a tape recorder in our interview. Learners do not to give their names in the tape-recorded interviews. The tapes will be kept very safe and will not be heard by anyone besides myself.

If learners agree to be part of this research, I want to emphasis that they can withdraw at any time if they decide they want to stop. They can also choose not to answer a particular question if you feel they do not want to. Their identity will be kept anonymous. All information I gather will be treated confidentially.

I request permission to conduct this research at your school. It will involve approx. 15 learners (15 boys and 15 girls) between ages 13-18 years who will be randomly selected by gender
If you would like to consider this request, and if the research is clear to you, please read the section below.

Yours sincerely,

_____   _____
Mona Gagadelis   Prof Nithi Muthukrishna
(Student)   (Supervisor)

Appendix 8: Consent form for principals

I, (Please write in your full name) ....

understand all that has been explained to me about the research project and *agree /
disagree that this project can be undertaken at the schools.

Signature:...

Date: ....

* Please delete what is not appropriate

Appendix 9: Scenarios and interview questions.

Scenario 1.

A woman was near death from cancer. One drug might save her, a form of radium that a pharmacist in the same town had recently discovered. The pharmacist was charging R12 000, ten times what the drug had cost him to make. The sick woman's husband, Heinz went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could get together only about half of what it should cost. He told the pharmacist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or to let him pay later. But the pharmacist said no. The husband got desperate and broke into the man's chemist to steal the drug for his wife.

- What is the story about?
- Was Hans right or wrong in what he did? Explain why?
- Was the Pharmacist right or wrong in what he did? Explain why?
- What do you think Hans should do?
- What would you have done in a situation like that?

Scenario 2.

Margaret lived with her 3 children in a small council house surrounded by other similar houses.
Margaret worked very hard to take care of her children. During the day, she sold fruit at a nearby market. At night she sewed clothes, which she also sold.
Margaret received a letter recently, which made her feel very unhappy. Her husband Mark who she has never seen for many years wants to return home. She recalls that Mark left her and the children for another woman. In all the years that went by he did not contact her or even send money for the children. She read in the letter that some lady who did not return to fetch him left him in hospital. The letter states that he is very ill and requires to be nursed. He wishes to be with his family before he dies.
Margaret is very confused. Her children refuse to have their father home. The children feel that he was never around when they needed him. Therefore, they do not see the need to care for him. Within her heart she stills loves her husband and does not want him to suffer anymore or die feeling rejected.

- What is the story about?
- Was Mark right or wrong in what he did? Explain why?
- Are the children right or wrong in what they are doing? Explain why?
- What do you think Margaret should do?
- Should we help people like Mark? Explain why?