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Abstract

The relationship between Values Education and corresponding moral reasoning development has been explored within a group of forty-six year eight students (twelve and thirteen years old). Participants were tested with a Sociomoral Reflection Objective Measure instrument to index their moral reasoning stage development (reported as a Moral Maturity Score). Randomly dividing the group into two equal proportions they were assigned to an Experimental or Control group. The Experimental group was presented with Values Education through exposure to age relevant moral dilemmas which envelope a societal value drawn from the Core Shared Values (Curriculum Council of Western Australia, 1998). Within each session the discussions were both inductive and didactic. After a ten-week exposure to forty-minute sessions the students were re-tested.

The aim is to investigate evidence of significant change in moral development of the Experimental group compared to the Control group. The degree to which changes occur impinges upon the relevance of inclusion of Core Shared Values into the *Curriculum Framework* (Curriculum Council of Western Australia, 1998) being established in Western Australian schools. The Core Shared Values are to be infused into the curriculum in order to enrich the morality of students, the future societal generations, and raise the moral standards of our society. The presupposition is that the integration of these values will in fact enhance moral development through moral reasoning.

The findings of this study did not support the premise that using a Values Education will improve the moral reasoning capability of students within an Experimental group above that of a Control group. Even though overall improvements were made in both groups, neither reached statistical significance. Recommendations included in the body of the text include the consideration of a longitudinal study using values integrated into the curriculum rather than an interventionist approach.
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Chapter One

Introduction to the Study

1.1 Background

Morality is a system of beliefs, values and underlying judgements about the rightness and wrongness of acts. Morality ensures that individuals will act to keep their obligations to others in society and will behave in a way that does not interfere with the rights and interests of others. (Zimbardo, 1988, p87)

Morality is the choosing between right and wrong; what establishes it, what influences it, can it be changed? Our society is beginning to realise that a transition in our ideology has meant a fundamental move away from the traditional value systems and ‘laws’ that helped establish a set of common social moral goals in western society. No longer can it be assumed that we all reason according to the same moral standards that provide an infrastructure within western society. An effort is being pursued at a school curriculum level to reintroduce some of those Core Shared Values, but is it really possible to influence and shape the moral thinking of contemporary students?

The process of moral development had not been seriously considered until the 1920s and as a result neither was the idea of moral education (the precursor of Values Education). This system of values, which was to influence the right action, was traditionally thought to have been passed down through generations by the espousal of positive values from father to son, mother to daughter or in more recent times by teachers to students, through communication of those values and
by example. Hoffman (1970) examined the various techniques of induction, the transmission of values to the internalised conscience of the child. He concluded that the most powerful method was the other-orientated induction where the parent reasons with the child to help them to understand how their action negatively affects the other person. Limitations to this method include the lack of consequence when the child chooses to ignore the instruction; also young children may simply lack the reasoning ability to comprehend the instruction. This is why Hoffman concludes that communication of values is most effective when inductive reasoning (explaining the value) is used judiciously with the more practical methods of demonstrating the value, power assertion (e.g. spanking) and so on (Peterson, 1996).

There has been growing awareness of the breakdown in transmission of values. Media reports have accentuated the moral crisis that is being faced, through the exposure of high rates of crime, suicide and other social concerns. The necessity of moral values in society is highlighted by Richard Eckersley as a need within Australian society in order to prevent its destruction. “This basic issue is the values of our society, our moral values. The source of our problems, and the source of our failure to resolve the problems, is rooted in the moral priority we give to the individual over the community, the present over the future, the ephemeral over the enduring, the material over the spiritual.” (1990, p43).

The public of Australia has not been blind or indifferent to this loss of values and has begun to express its concern. The action taken reflects the preciousness parents see in their children. Over the years 1991 to 1998, government school
enrolments grew 0.4%, the remaining growth was in non-government schools, of which 64.5% was in independent non-Catholic schools (Bagnall, 1999, p23). In an effort to explore why parents are moving their children Diana Bagnall (1999, p21) asks, "has there been a fundamental change in what parents are asking of educators? .... Or a rejection of what appears to be failing - that is, the secular humanist values that are the baseline of public education?". She answers this question with the statement "who would have thought that value-laden education would be the hottest item in the education marketplace in a resolutely secular modern Australia.". This does not mean that all government schools have folded their hands and done nothing to respond to these changes. For instance Bagnall (1999, p22) cites the Victoria Schools of the Future program. Established in 1993 this program devolves authority to the school principals to engage a team of people, holding the values and beliefs consistent with the ethos of the school, to develop these in the school.

Values Education in Western Australia has had a history. To trace that history to its rivulets is not central to the purpose of this study but it is worth mentioning that it is not a new concept. It finds its inclusion in the Social Studies K-10 Syllabus issued from the Curriculum Branch of the Education Department of Western Australia in 1981. For a number of pages there is the emphasis on Values Education and value approaches which give suggestions to the teacher about how to facilitate Values Education in the classroom. Prior to this, circa 1975, Keith Currie, Education Department of W.A. Superintendent for Social Studies, conducted in-service courses for, what was then termed, Senior Masters. One such in-service focussed on this topic of moral education with the title Education for
Morality. A copy of this has been included in Appendix 1. It was not a policy statement but rather a discussion document to introduce to schools the thinking on this topic of “numerous modern theorists” and the question of whether moral education was appropriate for schools. Included in that appendix is a document issued to schools in 1980 for inclusion of values clarification in high school Health Education courses.

The recognition of the need for Values Education was raised in Western Australia in concurrence with the national statements and profiles publicised in 1989. The subsequent commissioning of the Curriculum Corporation by the Australian Education Council to develop student outcome statements for the national statements and profiles led to the nine volumes of *Curriculum Profiles for Australian Schools* (1994). This in turn led the Education Department of Western Australia to converge with the national efforts for student outcome statements by establishing cross sectional consortiums devising State based Outcome Statements. One such consortium developed the Values Outcomes Statements now incorporated into the *Curriculum Framework* (Curriculum Council of Western Australia, 1998).

1.2 Significance of the Study

The presence of the Values Outcome Statements in the *Curriculum Framework* implies the recognition of the need for such a moral values base in education. The driving motivation behind the need to incorporate such values is not clearly stated except to say, “the National documents are regrettably coy about providing
outcomes which deal with values” (National Professional Development Program [NPDP] WA Cross-Sectional Consortium, 1995, p3). In order to rectify this the Values Outcome Statements were developed. As one of the aims of the project it was stated, “Politically, we hope by this means to enhance public recognition of the place of values objectives in the general curriculum.” (NPDP WA Cross-Sectional Consortium, 1995, p3). Evidently the adoption of these values was seen as important, hence their inclusion in the Curriculum Framework. In the foreword to the Agreed Minimum Values Framework Tom Wallace states, “Young people in our schools have a right to an education which is infused with those values about which there is significant consensus in our community. Indeed their wholeness and the health of the wider community will be enhanced when our youth are helped to find a set of values which ennoble their lives and by which they can live.” (NPDP WA Cross-Sectional Consortium, 1995, p1).

The objective of the Cross-Sectional Consortium, as stated above, is to give the scope for a Values Education so that young people will have a richer choice of moral values within their life perspectives. This aids our youth in moral decisions for moral action upon the issues that will confront them in our society. The impetus in presenting these values intimates an importance attached to them. The title ‘values’ implies these are the customs and principles that have been rated as desirable for our society to function. A society exists because a group of people has common aims and ethos. Words such as fellowship, community, company, companionship all describe society; there is interdependence, a common good or mutual benefit to achieve. The introduction of values into education seeks to educate young people with these values that enhance this common good. Since
these values relate to a common good, not simply personal good, it becomes necessary to make a moral choice. The question becomes, "will I adopt these societal values for the good of all or will I continue with my own egocentric values?". Rokeach (cited in Ostini and Ellerman, 1997, p692) in defining 'values' describes them as, "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence." As Ostini and Ellerman go on to explain the "mode of conduct" refers to the 'means' or instrumental values of goal achievement whereas "end-state" refers to the 'ends' or terminal values, such as in the adage "the ends justifies the means". Clearly there are the two value systems governing how to achieve my goal and what acceptable goal to set but also a dual system in personal and societal values. It may be that these value systems can be in conflict in their operation, for example, will I reveal potentially damning information about a colleague in order to advance myself towards a promotional position? Here both personal values and societal values (good for myself or good for others) and the question of whether the "means justifies the ends" comes into play. Hampshire goes into detail explaining how two people can totally agree on instrumental values but then disagree on terminal values in his fourth diatribe on *Fallacies in Moral Philosophy* (Hampshire, 1983, p61).

The Values Outcome Statements focus(es) exclusively on societal values and does not differentiate these as instrumental or terminal values. Adopting societal values (for the common good of society) put forward by the Curriculum Council in the *Curriculum Framework* document involves a moral choice. Moral choice is made through moral reasoning. A higher moral reasoning stage of development moves
us from this ‘self’ perspective to an ‘others’ perspective (Rest, 1979, p18). The underlying and fundamental premise to Values Education is that moral reasoning can be developed to a higher stage by having individuals assimilate moral values that are not already possessed by the individual. Indeed it is this assimilation that Tom Wallace referred to in the quotation on page thirteen. Grier & Firestone in their moral reasoning intervention program, discussed more fully in Chapter Three, attempted to develop moral reasoning by, “the active engagement of subjects in discussion and challenging their positions, promoting the inadequacies of their own reasoning. Children are also offered a more comprehensive perspective that is understandable.” This refers to the adding of values to the subjects through moral dilemmas, values that are above the current level of reasoning. In a portion of Rest’s Development in Judging Moral Issues he speaks of Kohlberg’s efforts in applying these principles to moral education (1979, p12). Rest also begins his second chapter with the statement, “the fundamental assumptions of moral judgement research are that a person’s moral judgements reflect an underlying organisation of thinking and that these organisations develop through a definite succession of transformations” (1979, p17). Kilpatrik, in his criticism of the current moral education program, points out this premise as a fallacy, “he (Kohlberg) mistakenly assumed that youngsters would be able to arrive at universal ethical principles solely through a process of unaided reason…”(1997, p5).

Earlier research in critiquing this premise is as Ostini and Ellerman observe “surprisingly little” (1997, p691). It has been largely assumed that human values and moral reasoning are closely related. Feather (cited in Ostini and Ellerman,
1997) proposes two reasons why there should be a strong positive relationship. Stage theory, as expounded by Kohlberg and developed in Chapter Three, proposes there is a shift in values as moral reasoning develops and secondly, moral reasoning and value preferences arise from a common impetus of socialisation experiences and prior learning. Values and moral reasoning both have within them a similar underlying basis. The Curriculum Council in defining values borrowed from Lemin, Potts and Welsford (cited in Curriculum Council of Western Australia, 1998, p324) and starts by saying “values are determined by the beliefs we hold.”. It is also the beliefs we hold which shape our moral reasoning. As Hampshire has stated, “Whenever we argue about any moral question which is not trivial, our beliefs and assumptions, however rudimentary and half-formulated, about psychological, sociological and probably theological questions are recognised as relevant, as logically involved in the nature of the dispute.”(1983, p60). It is therefore not surprising to conclude that there is a relationship between values and moral reasoning since both are calling upon the use of our belief system. What is surprising is the report by Ostini and Ellerman. Interestingly, Ostini and Ellerman conclude from their research that only weak relationships exist between values and moral reasoning. Further information regarding this study is elaborated in Section 2.2.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The aim of this study is to determine if the premise underlying Values Education, viz raising students to higher moral reasoning stages through the application of Values Education, is achievable. From this point forward the term ‘values’ will
refer to societal values so as to align with the Values Outcome Statements of *Curriculum Framework*. Is it possible to develop moral reasoning through introducing Values Education into an individual's life perspective and so affect moral choice that will ultimately lead to moral action under the influence of those values? The purpose of this study is to address this question of Values Education as a causative agent upon moral reasoning development.

**1.4 Research Hypothesis**

The aim of this research is to establish the strength of the following hypothesis:

Moral reasoning can be the subject of intervention and improved by subjecting individuals to a moral reasoning developmental program involving Values Education.

**1.5 Definition of Terms**

In order to build a definition of moral reasoning the separate definitions of 'reason' and 'moral' shall be drawn upon. To 'reason' is to be able to "have the power of comprehending, inferring, or thinking especially in orderly rational ways" this then gives "a sufficient ground of explanation or of logical defense; especially: something (as a principle or law) that supports a conclusion or explains a fact". More simply put 'reason' is the power to think, using consistent patterns (rational), in order to make a judgement. 'Moral' is defined as "of or relating to principles of right and wrong in behavior". (Merriam-Webster, 1999)
Melding these two definitions we derive ‘moral reasoning’ as the activity of thinking, using consistent patterns, to make judgements about right and wrong behaviour.

Earlier in Section 1.2 regarding the Significance of the Study some defining of values was required in order to make the connection between values and moral reasoning. We will here simply refer to the definition given in the Curriculum Framework. “Values are determined by the beliefs we hold. They are the ideas about what someone or a group thinks is important in life and they play a very important part in our decision making. We express our values in the way we think and act.” (Curriculum Council of Western Australia, 1998, p324).

The inter-relationships between the terms ‘moral’, ‘morality’, and ‘values’ needs clarification because they are seemingly used interchangeably without differentiation. In Appendix 1 Keith Currie has dissected the terms. ‘Moral’ is rules and codes of conduct (social mores) determining what is right and wrong, against which peoples’ thoughts and actions can be measured. ‘Morality’ is more than knowledge of the social mores; it is the making of moral choices and carrying out moral duties. Our moral choices are based on our evaluations, which are directed by our values, our values being those beliefs that we hold as important in life. This is why Zimbardo (see Background section) defined morality as beliefs that determine choices about the rightness and wrongness of actions based on peoples’ obligations to society. Figure 1 gives a compressed
visual aide of the interconnections. Figure 2 expands the intermediate steps between Morals and Morality from Figure 1.

**Figure 1: Steps from Belief to Morality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Morals</th>
<th>Morality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- we believe</td>
<td>- important or</td>
<td>- rules, codes of conduct</td>
<td>- morals in action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many things.</td>
<td>valued beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Expanded Steps from Morals to Morality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- rules, codes of conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moral Education is about teaching those rules and codes of society about what is right and wrong. These rules or social mores are determined by societal values. Since Values Education is about teaching what society determines are important beliefs for the functioning of society, it can be seen that Values Education is really a precursor to Moral Education. The essential difference being that Moral Education lays down the rules while Values Education moves back one step and tries to give the reasons for those rules. In either case the main ingredient is to impose upon the individual the societal beliefs, whether as values or morals, in order to expand the individual’s storehouse of beliefs and hopefully retrieve some of those societal beliefs as personal values.

The means by which the Core Shared Values were to be implemented into the curriculum was never made explicit because, as with all the learning outcomes, the method was never prescribed. The *Curriculum Framework* only suggests the necessity for the integration of the Core Shared Values into the curriculum. The implication is that Values Education was not to be seen as a subject on its own but
rather the values would be highlighted in the natural course of any lesson as the opportunity arose. The students were to be assisted in the adoption of the values through discussion and modelling as an integral part of the learning process. In conversation with Tom Wallace, both the Chairman of the NPDP Steering Committee and the Education Consultant and Chaplain for the Anglican Schools Commission, this integrated approach to Values Education is indeed the intention of the members of the NPDP Cross-Sectional Consortium.
Chapter Two

Review of Literature

Literature in the field of moral development abounds, particularly post 1960's. The breadth can be narrowed by considering only that which pertains to moral reasoning and still further by considering only intervention studies. Even more concisely, the interest is in intervention of moral reasoning through study of moral education not peripheral studies on aggressive behaviour or similar such psychological fields.

As Rulon (1993, p40) points out, the majority of research in adult development interventions have been in academic or prison classroom settings. Cited reports are: Arbuthnot, 1984; Candee, 1985; Higgens & Gorden, 1985; Kuhmerker, Mentkowski & Erickson, 1980; McPhail, 1985; Oja & Sprinthall, 1978. This should not be surprising since moral education lends itself to the academic arena and the aims of developing moral reasoning.

2.1 Measuring Instruments and Method.

The main current criticism of moral education is that its popular measuring instruments, Kohlberg’s Moral Judgement Interview (MJI) and Rest’s Defining Issues Test (DIT), only provide an index of internal cognitive structure. The MJI involves presenting moral dilemmas and scoring the participant’s responses, not only their opinions but more importantly their rationale for their judgement, from
an interview situation into stages of moral development; trained and qualified raters are required to perform the analysis. The DIT presents the dilemmas and then gives a series of moral stage graded statements which are to be ranked in importance by the participant. The four most important statements are further identified and the responses are correlated to moral stage of development.

What has been lacking according to Nicholas Emler (1996) is the measure of moral outcomes in the way of moral action. This lament is not new, even Aristotle recognised the incongruity between the moral reasoning and moral action (Hampshire, 1983, p59, 63). The MJI and the DIT only show reasoning gains in educational moral interventions that are based on the theories supporting the method of intervention. He confesses that this does not mean that there is no value in the method of moral education but that a far more complex set of links must be explored to measure any gain in moral action from moral reasoning development. A discussion of some of those links can be found in a report by Grier and Firestone (1998, p268). Elmer raises many other shortcomings in the ways in which moral reasoning is being measured. These include: the insensitivity of the measures, lack of randomisation, isolation of variables, limited sample sizes and the enduring effect of the development. Factors that Emler discusses have been useful for consideration in the construction of the method used for this research.

One of the main reasons for using moral reasoning and not moral action (morality) is because, as Grier and Firestone (1998) explain, the step from moral reasoning to moral conduct has multiple agencies shaping the outcome. This makes it difficult to determine whether it has been the manipulated variable using moral reasoning
development or some other of those multiple factors, which has had the desired effect. This is the lament they give in their conclusion “it is impossible from the present research to discern what specific changes were most central to the advances in behavioral conduct.” (1998, p276).

The Sociomoral Reflection Objective Measure (Gibbs et al., 1984) does not address many of the issues raised by Emler, largely because it preceded his article. Even if Gibbs, et al. were to have recognised some of the implications, the construction of the SROM may not have greatly varied because it aimed to provide an alternative measure for moral reasoning not moral action. The main objective of the SROM was to simplify the MJI by using recognitory selections, in the form of multiple choice responses, rather than an oral or written answer. The SROM provides the basis of the measuring instrument used in this research. Gibbs, et al. thoroughly tested the SROM for its validity and reliability. He concludes that it gave a sufficiently strong performance as an index to measure moral reasoning level in many adolescent and adult populations.

Greenspan (1997) elaborates that the roots of morality are established in the example of our parents as compassionate towards others and the degree to which they show care towards their children. Carol Gilligan agrees (1988, p4). Greenspan points out that we have some well formed ideas of what is right and wrong by the reactions of others, even at a preverbal stage. Augmenting this position is research by Emde (1991) (cited in Peterson, 1996, p281) where the internalisation process (the beginning of conscience, Hoffman (1970)) begins with the ‘dos’ and ‘don’ts’ of parents. There is the opinion that Kohlberg is inadequate.
when explaining moral development as emanating from moral reasoning and this from developing reasoning strategies (Greenspan, 1997, p121) since the earliest signs of morality appear long before reasoning strategies significantly evolve. Kilpatrick also concurs that reasoning needs to have a concrete base to work from; that base is character - the distinguishing and choosing between right and wrong behaviour (1997, p1). It is for this reason that in the intervention program applied in this research a necessary strategy has been to publicly commit to an opinion about what is right and wrong moral action with respect to the dilemma. This follows also the advice from Lind (n.d.) in the guidelines on Moral Dilemma Discussion.

In order to provide character base for the cementing of moral reasoning the sessions with the Experimental group included consideration of whether their course of action in the dilemma was feeding a vice or a virtue. They were given in each session a list of virtues and vices along with a brief explanation of each. The structure of the handout sheets can be seen in Appendix 2. From this they were required to analyse their decision and to probe into the motivating reasons for their choice of action. This had the double achievement of causing deeper reflection and the exposure to the character traits – both positive and negative. Many recognised without any prompting that the adherence to positive character traits, such as those seen in the virtues, was desirable.

2.2 Alternative Intervention Studies

The Panowitsch-Balkcum study (cited in Rest, 1979, p207) tracked changes in moral judgement for a group of seventy-three undergraduate ethics students and
twenty-eight undergraduate logic studies students (the logic studies involved: hypothetical syllogisms, propositional logic, truth tables and formal proofs) aged seventeen to forty-four. The students were pre- and post-tested with Rest's DIT prior to and after the completion of the two year course, to determine moral judgement. The students in the logic studies class did not show a significant improvement on the DIT whereas the ethics students made a significant improvement with the $t$-test probability being less than 0.04. This means that less than four in one hundred participants could have made those gains purely by chance; if chance is then discounted the improvement must have been due to the intervention of the causative variable, namely the ethics program (other variables being held constant). Twenty-six of those ethics students were re-tested five months after the class finished; those students scored only a little less than at the completion of the course showing that the developmental gains had been maintained. Rest also summarises sixteen other intervention studies (1979, p212) but only those that have used his DIT for moral judgement indexing.

Ian Wright conducted an elaborate study of numerous variables among which was the determination of the effect of ‘treatment’ on delinquent and non-delinquents from Canadian elementary schools in the age range ten to thirteen years. The treatment was six, one-half hour sessions held once per week in which they were shown a moral dilemma on filmstrip and then discussed reasons for courses of action. The post testing, using a MJI, occurred four weeks after the program completed. The conclusions were that neither the delinquent nor the non-delinquent group made any significant gains in moral development. Of the two,
the non-delinquents were, "slightly affected by the experimental treatment." (1978, p204).

In 1992 Steven Ries established within an Illinois junior college introductory psychology course, curriculum involving moral experiences using moral reasoning that was to be discovered by the students and applied (in theory) to life experiences. Moral development was measured by Kohlberg's MJI and reported both by stage and by Moral Maturity Score. The classes were two, one and a half hour classes per week for eighteen weeks. The experimental group showed, on average, almost a whole stage gain; this is a considerable improvement in moral reasoning considering Kohlberg's studies showed a complete stage gain takes about twelve years (Rest, 1979, p205). By comparison the control group exhibited minimal gain. Significance testing showed there was clearly a significant difference between the experimental and control groups.

In Child Study Journal Grier and Firestone report on "The Effects of an Intervention to Advance Moral Reasoning and Efficacy" (1998). This is, as the title implies, a dual intervention. Grier and Firestone have opted to measure moral reasoning and efficacy but have also included ethical conduct. Moral reasoning was measured with the MJI within five weeks of beginning and ending the intervention. The participants were nine fifth grade students with a mean age of 10.7 and twenty-one sixth grade students with a mean age of 11.5. Nineteen of these formed the Experimental group and eleven the Control group. The intervention took the form of moral dilemmas or "cognitive conflict" formats. In this program children were exposed to dilemmas which required a one stage
higher reasoning than they had measured in the pretest. The program extended over sixteen weeks but only five weeks utilised thirty-minute sessions focussing on moral dilemmas. At the conclusion to the intervention program analysis showed that the treatment group did not demonstrate advances in moral reasoning yet there was some improvement in behavioural conduct as determined from informal reporting.

Expanding horizons to include intervention studies outside of education yields further observations to aid in the interpretation of the data collected for this thesis. Dorothy Rulon of Harvard University reports the next closest intervention study. In her chapter “Significance of Job Complexity in Workers’ Moral Development” from the book Development in the Work Place (Demick and Miller, 1993) she has measured the effectiveness of using moral dilemma to improve moral reasoning. The purpose for wishing to improve moral reasoning was so that top-down decisions, which were normally made by administrative authorities, could be devolved to the workers once they understood better the mechanisms for the decisions. The study used a pre-test/moral education treatment/post-test and was applied to both teachers and to health care workers. In the schools the twice-weekly staff meeting provided the opportunity for real-life dilemma discussions. The health care workers had a business meeting scheduled every second week and alternate weeks were administrative meetings. It was in the business meetings that discussion of real-life and hypothetical dilemmas created the moral education program. Analysis of the pre- and post-tests for the teachers showed a change in moral development whereas the health care workers did not produce a statistically significant result by comparing pre- and post-tests. In both groups however it was
reported that there was an upward trend in the overall score on Kohlberg's Moral Judgement Interviews. The specific duration of the intervention period was not revealed but comments on page forty-six referring to factors occurring after three and a half months and then another reference to one month later suggest a minimum period of four and a half months. Possibly, but it cannot be said for certain, the statement that the study lasted for two years with the teachers and one and a half years for the health-care workers may indicate the length of the intervention. The end conclusion to this study states, "the results of this study have suggested that workers' moral maturity can be stimulated through participation in a moral education intervention while they are engaged in on-site work activities" (Rulon, 1993, p52)

Concerns over the moral development of physicians have prompted the reports issued in Academic Medicine 1991, 1996 and now a latest article in 1998 (Self, Olivarez and Baldwin, p517). The research considers the moral reasoning development of medical students immediately prior to their first year, at the end of first semester after completing a course on medical ethics and then at the completion of their fourth and final year of undergraduate study. At every stage of assessment the changes in moral development were significant, two interesting facts emerge though. Firstly, that the greatest change occurred after the first semester, this is attributable to the program of medical ethics. Secondly, that the more significant development occurred in the female medical students. Interestingly these results conflict with the two previous studies. The 1991 study used a sample size of twenty students, while the 1996 study used thirty students. This latest study used ninety-five students and the DIT as compared to the MJI
and SRM used previously.

Strongly related to these intervention exercises which seek to establish the relationship between Values Education and moral reasoning development is the probing question of whether such a cause and effect connection can be made. Manipulating the variable of values and observing the response of moral reasoning works from a premise that the two are cause and effect. Ostini and Ellerman (1997) sought to clarify the correlation by simply measuring the values structure of participants using a Values Survey and correlating this to the results of a DIT for the same participants. The hypothesis was that the higher the Values Survey score then the higher will be the moral reasoning ability. Of the 124 university students tested there was only a weak relationship described between the two factors. Breaking the Values Survey down further into components and reporting the DIT scores as percentages at each stage of moral development did yield some evidence for mature moral reasoning to be prompted by principle, tolerance, benevolence and orientation to others (1997, p699). Ostini and Ellerman summarised their findings by stating “although the detail of the predictions made from cognitive developmental theory is unclear, some clarity of form emerges.” (1997, p699).

2.3 Conclusions

A cursory glance suggests that there may be no uniform correlation between taking participants through a moral development intervention program and an
improvement in their moral reasoning. However, there are clear distinctions between the studies reviewed. The ages under trial and the duration of the program vary between the given studies. Recalling that moral judgement is based on conceptual development, which is age related, can elucidate the variation in results that were dependent upon student ages. Older children would have a greater reasoning capacity and so be more influenced by reasoning development. Older students participating in a developmental program are, on this basis, more likely to produce higher stage gains than younger students. This rationale is supported by Piagetian theory (Piaget, 1932). There is also a seeming relationship between the length of the program and its effectiveness. The interpretation suggests that a longer program is more effective and this would seem to be a logically deduced conclusion.

The new *Curriculum Framework* applies from kindergarten to year twelve age levels. The values incorporated into this document are for the moral development over this age span but they are more likely to be reasoned effectively in the higher years of learning. The thirteen-year old age bracket has been selected to capture a group in the approximate stage two through to four moral stage development (Colby & Kohlberg cited in Peterson, 1996, p395). This age has potentially the widest stage span to consider the effect of Values Education and a suitable reading ability for the SROM to be an accurate measure of moral stage. The time for each class and length of the program are inhibited by school term lengths and accessibility to the students at the target school.
It was in 1928 that Hartshorne and May, with a team of Yale University behaviourists, began to study how to empirically measure internalised conscience. By measuring degree of honesty in their subjects and correlating this to other factors such as intelligence or economic, religious and ethnic backgrounds, it was hoped that a key might be found to optimise moral growth. The conclusion to these experiments was that, “morality was not a stable quality in people…” (Zimbardo, 1988, p87). Zimbardo has also made the observation that, “some recent researchers have found similar results”, quoting per example Mischel and Mischel (1974). Due to the difficulties in measuring moral action (in this experiment through honest action), as mentioned in the previous section, that attention turned more towards the driving internalised reasoning of moral behaviour. Since in this experiment the indicators of internalised conscience such as guilt, confession and reparation were not considered it would be difficult to substantiate the claims by Hartshorne and May that children only act morally because of two driving factors, to avoid disapproval or to gain approval, and do not develop a conscience until fifteen or sixteen years of age (Peterson, 1996, p284).

Sigmund Freud took interest in what motivated moral behaviour. He felt moral behaviour came about as a balance between the id and the superego which is borne out through the ego. The id drives us with impulses of the pleasure principle while
the superego as our store of values speaks to us of the moral principle. The ego then, "arbitrates between id impulses and superego demands." (Zimbardo, 1988, p433). In choosing actions the ego will avoid pain (because it is contrary to the id), such as guilt from wrong actions. In so doing, the individual will be guided by the ego to adopt the morally correct behaviour, as directed by the superego.

In the approach to the 1960’s social events such as the Civil Rights movement, protests over the Vietnam War, Watergate and the Women’s Movement in Northern America led to a focus on social justice and in turn on morality. By the 1960’s the other major influence in the surge of interest in moral development was the attention of psychology to the area of cognition in humans (Rest, 1979, p3). Out of this arose the work of French psychologist Jean Piaget.

In 1960 Piaget adapted his constructs of cognitive development towards moral development. It was Piaget who investigated the structures underlying peoples’ judgements and the development of this judgement; he termed this psychological construct, "moral judgement" (Rest, 1979, p5). Piaget concerned himself with identifying the internal psychological influences that were the driving factors in moral thinking. He felt that moral judgement was strongly associated with cognitive development. This intrinsically meant that moral judgement was going to be age-related. Piaget introduced two stages of moral development. The first stage, the heteronomous stage, where moral judgement is based on adherence to rules and obedience. This stage, because of their egocentrism, results from a child’s inability to objectively view actions; this leads to importance placed on the outcome of actions rather than the intentions behind the act. Secondly, the child
has a social relationship with adult authority where power structure places the
child at the reception not transmission end. Through interpersonal interactions
moral judgment develops because of the need to encompass a greater range of
experience. This leads to the autonomous stage. This higher stage, because the
child can now see from another's perspective, shows itself through the child
applying rules selected on the basis of mutual respect. It is in this last point that
Durkheim differs from Piaget. Durkheim believed that the group immersion was
necessary but the individual did not develop through cooperation and mutual
benefit but through respect for the rules and authority structures existing within the
group (Murray, n.d.). Piaget found that children believed it was worse to tell a lie
to an adult for two reasons. Firstly, the adult was more likely to determine that it
was a lie and secondly, because the adult was more capable of punishing the
perpetrator of the lie. By the time children reached the age of ten, the thinking had
reversed so that it was considered worse to lie to a peer because the child found it
undermined social cooperation and trust. Natural consequences such as being
excluded from a game because of cheating had an effect even though the peers did
not spank or reason about why the rules had to be adhered to.

Building upon Piaget's foundation of a cognitive approach to moral development,
Lawrence Kohlberg proposed six sequential stages instead of the two stages
described by Piaget. These six stages were the accretion of recurrent responses in
many interviews of subjects by Kohlberg. Table 1 (p35) gives a summary of the
three levels and six stages formulated by Kohlberg. Since his original work, a
seventh stage was proposed. After even more extensive work in this psychological
field Kohlberg agreed with reviewers of his theorised stages that stage six and
beyond were not easy to substantiate so he opted to categorise only the first five stages in empirical measurements. Each stage is characterised by a different basis used to make a moral judgement. The bases used were derived from expansive data detailing not only the respondent's point of view or opinion regarding their judgement on a moral dilemma but more-so the internal motivating factors or intentions which drew that judgement. This flew in the face of the behaviourist approach at the time (1969) which suggested that moral decisions were made based on conformity to group norms. Kohlberg focussed on "moral reasoning". Determining a moral stage was based not on the decision but the reasoning behind the decision. As a person moves through the stages of moral development their thinking encompasses and enlarges their previous arguments with new arguments that demonstrate progression in their moral reasoning bringing greater harmony and cohesiveness of reasoning through deeper, more principled thinking. As Kohlberg stated,

Moral development may be defined in terms of the qualitative reorganization of the individual's pattern of thought rather than the learning of new content. Each new reorganization integrates within a broader perspective the insights that were achieved at lower stages. (cited in Peterson, 1996, p394)

The three levels are based around the perception of "conventions". 'Preconventional' level considers that societal norms are to be obeyed, the perception of these norms is concrete and seen egocentrically. The next highest level is 'conventional' where the individual reasons that these norms are necessary for the satisfactory continuance of society. The highest level is 'postconventional' where reasoning is based on the principles that underlie the norms. The MJI, as introduced in the Review of Literature section, became the chief means of
assessing moral reasoning. With this in mind the development of the methodology used for this research reflects the widely accepted derivations of Kohlberg.

| Table 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kohlberg’s Stages of Moral Reasoning.a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levels and stages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1: Preconventional Morality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 Heteronomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 Individualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2: Conventional Morality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 Mutual Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4 Social System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3: Postconventional (Principled) Morality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5 Social Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6 Cosmic (Universal ) Orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Kohlberg’s Six Stages of Moral Judgement. (Colby and Kohlberg, 1987, p18)*

James Rest essentially concurs with Kohlberg but rejects the simple stage model where individuals move in moral development from one stage to the next. He believes a complex model more accurately reflects the percentage use of stages. At any point in development an individual may draw on all five stages but to varying degrees (Rest, 1979, p67).
Critique of Kohlberg’s theory of moral reasoning developmental stages condenses to four major criticisms.

1. The impact of changing the stages and scoring after the theory was published;
2. The assumption that moral reasoning predicts moral behaviour;
3. The possibility of cultural bias in Kohlberg’s scheme;
4. The possibility of gender bias in Kohlberg’s scheme.

(Peterson, 1996, p396)

Changes to the scoring system made in the 1980's were aimed to address criticism against the original model that was said to have subjective bias and unreliability in the scoring. Kohlberg was able to reanalyse his old data using the new Standard Issue Scoring technique (Colby & Kohlberg, 1983) but other researchers were not able to re-access their data using the improved criteria for stage scoring. Further work is being done to confirm the changes and defuse any uncertainty in the model.

The question of whether verbal responses to a hypothetical dilemma truly reflects the moral action that would be taken in a real moral situation limits the extrapolation of using moral reasoning as a measure of moral action. “Kohlberg himself believed that moral reasoning does directly and unequivocally predict moral action.” (Peterson, 1996, p396). His evidence to support this claim lay in the 1984 analysis of soldiers involved in the My Lai massacre of innocent civilians in Vietnam. Those soldiers with higher moral reasoning stages refused to participate but those with lower stages did as they were told and killed innocent women and children. Haan, Smith & Block (1968) (discussed in Peterson, 1996) reversed the procedure by scoring moral reasoning stage before the participants expressed their moral action at a sit-in protest for freedom of speech. Their results supported
Kohlberg’s position by finding that the higher stage students were more likely to put their beliefs into action by protesting and facing arrest. This cannot discount the wealth of accumulating evidence that rears up from the years of moral reasoning development placed into North American society which has not produced any corresponding measurable moral action.

All has been quiet on the moral education front over the last ten years but not on the social pathological front. Clear evidence of increasing violent crimes, suicides, sexual promiscuity and hence broken relationships punctuates western society. This has recently caused a hard look at the methodology of moral education in North America over the last forty years. If indeed moral education, in its current form of moral reasoning development, had achieved its purpose then American society should have more highly developed moral reasoning comparative to other societies. It is now emerging that experiments in moral education over the last forty years have failed to produce any improvement in moral action. In truth, the moral stance of western society is worse than it was before the current formal moral education began (Eckersley, 1998). Substantiating this stance Eckersley draws upon numerous sources. He has cited, for example, the increasing illicit drug use and associated health problems (Hall & Darke 1997, Fombonne 1998, Health Education Unit 1998, Patterson et al 1998, Williams 1998) and the rising crime rate (Mukherjee & Dagger 1995, Fombonne 1998). As William Kilpatrick (1997) has said, this detour in moral education through moral reasoning development was in fact a dead-end, it is not the path leading to the objective of higher moral standards. Many moral educators are taking up the approach preceding the current formal moral education that began in the 1960’s. In this prior
approach, virtues such as honesty, kindness, self-control, are again being laid through word and deed as a necessary foundation for values. The force behind values is virtue, which is the habit of knowing, loving and doing the good. Moral education has now come full circle, back to serious consideration of its historical application as outlined in the Background of the Introduction section.

In a study by Kohlberg examining the ‘universality of the stage sequence’ he examined moral reasoning in boys of cultures other than those in his original sample of middle-class, well educated, urban American boys. He concluded that although these boys did progress through stages as he had proposed, they developed more slowly. This could have been due to a cultural bias because Kohlberg’s proposed progression through stages was based on the expression of values derived from American culture. Moral concepts that may have been important to that other culture did not score unless they matched the thinking of his original American sample. Secondly, the moral dilemma used in the MJI may have borne no significance in the alternative culture. The idea of personal possession of material goods in a Western culture may not be at all relevant in another culture or the degree to which we obey our parents will alter significantly according to cultural values (Peterson, 1996). Turiel crystallised and differentiated the cultural bias by separation of moral and social convention in his “Domain Theory”.

Turiel’s “Domain Theory” has clarified the postulations by Kohlberg by recognising that not all of what Kohlberg considered as moral reasoning was based on moral cognition. Moral cognition has at its core the duality of human welfare
and justice. Concurrent to this are social conventions that aid the smooth running of society but are not moral in nature. For example queuing at a theatre is not a moral but a social convention (of Western culture). Making social decisions requires the parallel use of the two frameworks of morality and convention. Pushing to the front of the queue plays on a fairness issue, which is moral. Turiel reported that even young children understood the difference between social conventions and moral prohibitions. He found, for instance, that children believed it was never acceptable to violate a moral rule such as stealing, even if there was not a rule that stated such. Stealing (moral) was rated as worse than calling a teacher by a nickname (rule of etiquette) or a boy wanting to become a nurse (sex-role convention). Siegal (1985) in an Australian study found the same. Children felt that it was worse to hit another child (moral) than to put a toy away on the wrong shelf (social convention) (Peterson, 1996, p294). While both actions were considered wrong there was a clear distinction between them based on whether it was a moral or social convention action. Turiel maintained that to overcome the cultural bias in Kohlberg's work it was necessary to use only dilemmas that projected moral agents in a 'moral domain', not social conventions which are culturally based. Domain theory impinges upon moral education by helping to identify the moral agents as opposed to purely social convention. This allows the "domain appropriate" values to be selected that relate to moral education, values centred on human welfare and justice, for incorporation into Values Education and specifically into the Values Education program developed in the methodology of this research.
Carol Gilligan challenged Kohlberg's developmental pathway. Gilligan argues that women develop morally equally to men but by a different pathway; she proposes that Kohlberg's analysis is flawed because of its gender bias. She states that for women it is the human welfare, or care, issue that predominately determines their reasoning. Against this is the thought that men use mostly judicial issues in their moral reasoning. Gilligan has claimed,

The very traits that have traditionally defined the 'goodness' of women, their care for and sensitivity to the needs of others, are those that mark them as deficient in moral judgement. The infusion of feeling into their judgements keeps them from developing a more independent and abstract conception in which concern for others derives from principles of justice rather than compassion and care. (cited in Peterson, 1996, p397)

The reason why women score on average one moral reasoning stage lower than men, argues Gilligan, is that the developmental model Kohlberg promotes was constructed by males, based on males, and tested on males. Kohlberg concedes this is correct but subsequently also tested females in order to validate his progression of stages. Bussey and Maughan (1982) offered the suggestion that the differences in level of moral development between males and females may be linked to something as simple as gender bias in the sex-roles bound within the dilemmas used for the scoring of the MJI. To investigate this they tested one hundred and fifty males and females with a 'female' version of the MJI where a female replaced the protagonist male. The previous average stages of four for males and three for females now adjusted to stage three for both genders (Peterson, 1996). Gilligan is not willing to capitulate to the problem being so simplistic. She contends that women's moral development, through completely divergent moral experiences to the male, is fundamentally different. Because of this it is not reasonable to use a construct designed around male moral development. A new set
of pathways is required for females. Further research suggests the evidence is not clear; moral reasoning is not as gender bound as Gilligan first believed. Such evidence cited includes studies by Clopton and Sorrel (1993) where males and females both equally showed tenderness and concern. From their study it seems more likely that the female developmental pathway is not distinctive but actually derives out of formative moral experiences normally encountered by females, but in which males can equally participate (Peterson, 1996). What Gilligan’s research has contributed to moral education is to ensure that a good balance between care issues and justice issues is maintained in moral education.

Traditionally moral behaviour was thought to have sprung out of positive character traits such as honesty, patience and kindness. Moral education was to espouse the positive traits or virtues by example and communication. Development occurred when these virtues were then exercised and accordingly rewarded. Values-Cla rification (see Appendix One) then came into vogue as a response to the dilemma of which virtues and values were considered as important to Values Education. To avoid teachers hoisting their value system onto students and so promoting an ethical relativity, teachers became moderators of discussion and students pooled their divergent values (Kilpatrick, 1997, p2). Values-Cla rification held that all views were correct as long as the value was clear and consistently acted upon. The goal was not to agree on a ‘best’ value by which to judge the ethical dilemma but the goal was to comprehend that people have varying values and expose others to those values. The failure of Values-Cla rification was that it did not clarify by convergence but instead created turbidity by divergence and in so doing did not move people forward in their moral development (Murray, n.d.,
p4). By applying Kohlbergian principles, moral education would seek to move an individual from one stage to another. In order to do this the education must present the person with information that does not fit their current life perspective. This then forces the person to adjust their perspective to accommodate the new information. The mechanism for presenting this new information in moral education is the "moral dilemma". The dilemma provided the framework for the new information causing moral reflection and a progression to a higher moral stage.

The researchers and theorists referred to in this theoretical framework have, as the name implies, provided the infrastructure of major developmental theories which shape the direction and thinking of current research. This infrastructure gives the qualitative and quantitative means to track changes in moral reasoning development. Developmental features in moral reasoning theory, such as stage theory and domain theory, provide a 'skeleton' for the ongoing 'fleshing out' or superstructure which is being pursued by many other researchers and theorists, from Arbuthnot to Zimbardo. This study is but a 'cell' in the overall body, utilising the work that has previously been done to formulate procedures to accomplish a determination of the validity of the hypothesis provided in Chapter One.
Chapter Four

Research Design and Methodology

In the light of the theoretical framework presented in the previous section and through the work of former researchers, considered in the Review of Literature, a moulding of the methodology used in this research reflects the postulations and infrastructure provided by those that have previously probed moral reasoning.

4.1 Target School Selection

Initially consideration was given to using students of age eleven or twelve. This involved contacting principals of both government and non-government schools to begin questioning the possibility of access to students for research. While this was in progress, the literature being reviewed pointed more towards the thirteen to fourteen year olds being in the greatest state of flux, displaying the first four stages and in good proportion of each stage. Peterson demonstrates this in Figure 11.4 (1996, p395). This factor was raised earlier in Section 2.3, the conclusion to the literature review. The obvious school with access to this age group would be the one that the researcher is associated with but the question of whether it was the best choice still remained. The argument for using a government school was that it was more likely to give a representative sample of all the stages of moral reasoning. Counter to that was the thought that it would not matter at what stage participants were at, what was of importance was the changes to the moral reasoning. Once it was decided that the moral reasoning developmental program would be run embedded into the formal curriculum the choice became obvious. The Principal of the non-government school that this researcher is associated with
was willing to accommodate the plans to introduce the program and incorporate it into the English syllabus. One of the English teachers, in consultation with the Head of Department, then began to work on how to assess students in terms of outcomes as they progressed through the unit of work which was to be the moral reasoning developmental program. That English teacher became an observer while the researcher took the children through the ten weeks of the program. The remaining detail to work through was when to do the testing using the SROM. It was agreed that the testing times should be at similar times during the week to minimise variations in concentration from before midday to after midday and early in the week to late in the week. Also, minimal interruption to the normal schedule of work for the students was factored in.

4.2 Subject Sample

The subjects have been drawn from a mixed gender group of students in their eighth year of formal schooling in Western Australia. This means that the average age of the students is thirteen years. In order to reduce the range of moral reasoning, all the subjects were chosen from within the same school structure. For this particular study the students have been nominated from a private school system all attending the same campus. The original cohort of forty-six students was then randomly assigned to the Experimental group and to the Control group so that the two groups were of equal proportion. While it was not necessary from a statistical point of view to maintain equal proportions, it did allow maximum sample sizes to be achieved in both Experimental and Control groups so reducing skewing of results by outliers (scores greater than one and a half standard deviations from the mean). Randomisation of the genders was done separately so
as to maintain an equal proportion of each gender within each group; thus the
number of females in each group was equal and the number of males was equal.
The aim of this was to eliminate gender imbalance, so preventing bias in the result
due to gender differences. The final size of the sample from each group varied
according to limitations such as those unable to complete both the pre- and post-
testing, and those that invalidated their test by selecting a critical number of
pseudo responses. These pseudo responses are aimed at isolating individuals that
are randomly or without comprehension, making their selections from the
available responses. This also automatically screens those with a reading ability
inadequate for the testing instrument. Final numbers in the Control group rested at
fifteen and in the Experimental group at eighteen.

4.3 Design

The experiment is designed to measure variation in moral reasoning; the causative
variable is the Values Education program. The experiment involves a test - retest
application of the appropriate measuring instrument. A recognised program for
the “ANalysis Of VAriables” (ANOVA) is then applied for the 2×1 factorial
analysis of mean variation (Grimm & Yarnold, 1995, p250). Significance of
variance in means of the moral reasoning developmental stage, applied through a
t-test, before and after the Values Education program will indicate the
effectiveness of the program and therefore the readiness of moral reasoning to
respond to development. Further to this, individual response to the re-testing will
be considered where it demonstrates a variation from the norm of the group.
4.4 Measuring Instrument

In order to measure the subject's moral reasoning, group self-testing procedures and instrumentation was applied. For moral reasoning the instrument used was the "Sociomoral Reflective Objective Measure" (SROM).

The basis of the instrument is the SROM developed by John Gibbs (Gibbs et al., 1984, p527) which is a recognised and tested basis for the measurement of moral reasoning. "The results generally support a conclusion that the SROM provides an objective index of reflective sociomoral reasoning that is reliable and valid for high school as well as college or adult subjects." (Gibbs et al., 1984, p534) In the reliability results both the test-retest, with a weakest correlation of 0.7, and the internal consistency, with a correlation of 0.78 from the derivation sample, were sufficiently high to support the reliability of the SROM. Validity of the instrument was maintained through the use of pseudo responses and by concurrent comparison to the SRM and the MJI. Correlation to scores on the MJI were 0.66 and construct validity showed that factors such as IQ and gender correlated with the SROM scores as would be expected.

The SROM evolved from the SRM, which did not use the recognitory responses of the SROM. Use of the SRM has been sited in the Academic Medicine journal (Self, Olivarez and Baldwin, p518). The Sociomoral Reflection Objective Measure is a multiple choice test following a Kohlbergian model of moral development. There are five sociomoral responses provided for each question. These follow the more general opportunities for participants to clarify their
thinking about the question, the first two responses (for example responses 1. and 1a) do not require the respondent to consider why they think that way or having to justify their answer. Each of the next five responses corresponds to a stage of thinking representing a Kohlbergian stage. Participants choose responses on the basis of how closely the statement reflects their own reasoning for the actions they chose earlier in the question. They can make multiple selections that may all be indicative of their thinking if they so desire but in the final response they must choose only the best reason, the one that best reflects their thinking and hence is indicative of their moral reasoning stage.

As was first raised in Section 4.2 Subject Sample, the inclusion of pseudo responses, which makes up the sixth response, is a sophisticated sounding 'red herring' or lure. It does not have any bearing on the actual scenario or is in any way a suitable response to the question probing the participant’s moral reasoning. The inclusion of the pseudo response is to determine whether the students have sufficient comprehension of the text. If they have then it is expected that they will avoid the pseudo response because they either recognise it is a nonsensical statement or because they truly have no idea what it is about and so correctly select the "not sure" response. Only students who concurrently do not understand the statement and do not know how to deal with it correctly will indicate that it is "close" to their thinking. In this case they endanger the sample because they do not provide sufficient reliability in their answering to truly reflect their moral reasoning processes. Other probable causes for selecting the pseudo response lie in lack of reading comprehension or that the student cannot be bothered thinking through the questionnaire so they are randomly making their choices. Either of
these student types will still need to be eliminated from a viable sample. Appropriation of these pseudo responses is a device constructed and used by James Rest (Rest, 1979), the use thereof is acknowledged by Gibbs (Gibbs et al., 1984, p532). In Gibbs original *Instructions for Use of the Sociomoral Reflection Objective Measure* (see Appendix 3) suitable adjustment was made in the third step of scoring, "Determining Eligibility of the Protocol" by reducing the ineligibility from seven to four pseudo responses in the "close" column. Also the number required in the "best reason" scoring column was reduced to two from three. Additionally, to be eligible for inclusion in the sample the participant had to have at least 3 fully valid arrays by having responses in both the "close" and "best reason" columns. These changes reflect the reduction of the questionnaire from two problems to one and the corresponding number of responses from sixteen to ten. The primary reason for decreasing the number of problems was to reduce the testing time from fifty to thirty minutes (see Administration section of Appendices 3 and 4). It was regarded that this was more suitable test time duration for the participants' age level.

The SROM when applied gives both a Kohlbergian stage and a Moral Maturity Score (Rest, 1979, p72) which is a weighted average of each stage used to answer the questions. The Moral Maturity Score ranges from 100 to 500 and has the advantage of being able to provide a scale that is more refined than assigning an individual to one Kohlbergian stage or another. The Moral Maturity Score is more useful for measuring short-term changes in moral reasoning (see also the subsection Limitations).
Modifications to the measure have been to make it simpler to administer, more understandable through readability and format, and to present a scenario more relational to a wider range of ages. One of the advantageous byproducts of using the SROM was the exposure to the development of a testing instrument without having to work from the ground up. Changes to the instrument have been superficial but sufficient to aid in the understanding of the construction and application of the instrument. Including the scoring key alongside the questions has reduced transcription errors. This eliminates the need to transcribe the responses to a separate scoring sheet (see Appendix 4). One criticism of this change is that the participants of the questionnaire may then, upon seeing the scoring key, communicate different responses because they considered it to be a test. Any effect due to this is negated by the consistency of reading by an individual participant from pre- to post-test, in other words they would perceive the questionnaire the same way each time. Secondly, the instructions given before the questionnaire is applied helps negate this 'test' effect. The first instruction given stated "There are no right or wrong answers...", this in itself should alleviate any thought that it was necessary to seek out and give the 'right' answers.

Changes to the readability were simply to reduce the required reading level. Words that could be substituted for simpler words or phrases and that could be rewritten in a more coherent way for a lower reading level, were applied. Examples of these changes can be represented by response 5 d); the original SROM reads "because character must constitute legal procedure"; in my revisions this response reads "because character makes up legal procedure". The response 8
b) was changed from “because conscience is predicated on leniency” to “because what John thought was right is established on tolerance”. Format changes meant placing only one question per page and utilising the additional space to spread out the responses so that the page was less cluttered. This also gave room for the repetition of phases, where necessary, to remind the respondent of the question to which they were responding. For example, in question 1 b) the question is stated at the beginning but because of the ensuing instructions after the question, the question was restated immediately prior to the responses. This helps the respondent to focus on choosing a response appropriate to the question asked.

Lastly, changes to the scenario appeal to a wider audience. The additional benefit is the alignment of the dilemma used in the training and those in the evaluation. Grier and Firestone state this factor as a possible consequence for inconsistencies in their findings. They emphasise the reports by Maag (1989) and Arbuthnot & Gordon (1986) that it is necessary to use real world experiences to promote behavioural change. It is these real world dilemmas, meaning that they are real to that age range, that provide a concrete platform for children to visualise, analyse and act on dilemmas rather than the dilemma being only an abstract formulation in the mind of the child (Grier & Firestone, 1998, p276). Children would not relate as well to a marriage bond as to the bond between best friends. To emphasise the closeness of this relationship, as in a marriage relationship, the idea of a blood pact was introduced. In order to place the respondents in a predicament they could connect with by seeing themselves in that situation, a hiking accident was employed in place of the need for a healing drug. To make clear the urgency of the situation it was clearly communicated that John realised his friend would die.
without his help, otherwise it may have been assumed the accident was not serious. John was issued with his driver's license to reduce the focus on issues such as John not even knowing how to drive a car and to avoid overweighing the justice issue by introducing breaking the law by driving without a license. As in the original Heinz problem the 'right' of the farmer, in the revisions, to withhold the use of the car is emphasised. In order to force this thinking into a 'no other alternative' dilemma, it has been made clear that there are no near neighbours and the only alternative is walking, in which time John's friend may die. Upon reflection of this scenario and after thinking through some of the implication behind gender bias, I would, if repeating this scenario for further study, change the genders of both protagonist and friend to female.

The internal reliability check introduced by the second question in the original was dispensed with in order to reduce the overall test time to approximately thirty minutes, down from the original fifty minutes. A fifty-minute test was considered too long to maintain good concentration for the age of the target group. Pilot testing showed that thirty minutes was an appropriate amount of time for the participants to complete the revised test. An alternative reliability check can be accomplished through the test-retest of the Control group. If it shows that there has been an insignificant change in the results over the ten-week period then the level of reliability is sufficiently high.

A copy of both the Gibbs SROM and my modified SROM are provided in Appendix 5.
Changes have been made to the SROM in consultation with the Edith Cowan University supervisor, Dr. Bill Connell, the Principals of the pilot and target schools, and by sending the revisions to John Gibbs should he wish to make comment.

Permission was sought and granted to do a pilot test of the SROM modified from the Gibbs SROM. The purpose of this test was to establish student response to the modifications and ensure that scores emanating from the instrument were not wildly variant from those expected of children at the age of the participants. The pilot school chosen was of a similar cultural base to the target school, also socio-economics and age of participants would be similar. The Principal supplied a mixed gender, randomly chosen sample of five. From the pilot testing two further modifications became evident after going through the completed SROM page by page with the students. Firstly, was to more clearly state the need for participants to give their response to all subsections of a question. Secondly, there was an evident pattern in many of the students selecting the pseudo response in question nine. This suggests that the students too readily interpret it as a valid response. Rewording the pseudo response rectified this problem. Other than these changes, the students indicated that they understood what they were to do, they were able to comprehend the questions within the SROM and associate with the scenario of the moral dilemma. The analysis of the pilot sample is contained in Appendix 6.

Self-reporting has some inherent problems in its use; these are outlined by Peterson as reporting bias, communication problems and genuine forgetfulness (Peterson, 1996, p45). In this study forgetfulness is not an issue since participants
are not required to recall issues so much as to place themselves within a moral
dilemma. The problem of communication has been dealt with in Section 4.2 and
arises further in this section when considering modifications to the SROM. Lastly,
answering to reporting bias it again has to be clarified that it is not moral action
under consideration but moral reasoning. Thus a respondent can only correctly
choose from the alternatives given, those which they can actually reason through
and understand. If they begin to randomly select responses then the pseudo
responses will detect this pattern and invalidate the questionnaire, so eliminating
the reporting bias.

4.5 Procedure

Sampling was achieved by assigning code numbers to the population of all year
eight students at the target high school. From these participants, the Experimental
group and the Control group were randomly assigned in equal numbers. Parental
permission for each child's involvement was gained. This was done in
coordination with the Principal. Permission from each child was not sought
because of the nature of the integration of the study into the normal curriculum
means that the parents had only to be notified of impending inclusion of the
Values Education and the testing involved. This procedure was in conformity with
the requirements applied by the Ethics Committee. Copies of the letters issued to
parents and the Ethics Committee clearance are included in Appendix 7.

Both groups were tested for moral reasoning by administration of the SROM
instrument. Specific verbal instructions given before the commencement of the
testing period using the SROM questionnaire can be found in Appendix 8. The
Experimental group was subjected to a moral reasoning developmental program using Values Education. Although it is recognised that the intention of the Values Consultative Group was for an integrated approach to values exposure, it could be confidently assumed that if intensified exposure were not successful in changing moral reasoning then it is even more unlikely that shorter, less well defined, approaches would be more successful. Of course this raises the question, if the research hypothesis proves to be true, whether it would still stand true for an integrated approach to Values Education? Only further testing would tell.

For ten weeks the Experimental group was exposed to Values Education by completing a single forty-minute session per week of discussions over a moral dilemma. The moral dilemma was extracted from the book *Sticky Situations* (Schmitt, 1997). Each excerpt was chosen on the basis of values listed as the Core Shared Values published in the *Curriculum Framework* (Curriculum Council of Western Australia, 1998, p325). The first week, for instance, the dilemma was called “Cashing In”. Here the student is confronted with Danielle who receives more change from a cashier than she should have received. This focuses on the *Curriculum Framework* value 2.3 that states,

> Ethical behaviour and responsibility: Each person has freedom of will, is responsible for his or her own conduct and should be encouraged to develop discernment on ethical issues and to recognise the need for truthfulness and integrity. (Curriculum Council of Western Australia, 1998, p325).

As wide a range as possible of the Core Shared Values will be covered within the time constraints of the developmental period. In the discussion pursuant of the moral dilemma, the aim was to get students to reason through why the selected value is the most favoured action in that scenario, respect will be maintained for
persons of alternative opinions. The specific procedure for the forty minute sessions followed a recognised order such as Georg Lind uses for *Leading Moral Dilemma Discussions* (Lind, n.d.) which has been developed from the Kohlberg-Blatt approach. The specific program used and the time allocations for each step can be seen in Appendix 9.

Essentially, the students were presented with the written dilemma; then they were quizzed about what happened, to be sure they understood the situation and its context. The floor is then opened up to discussion about what are some possible actions to be taken to resolve the dilemma. Students were required to not only jot down their own thoughts about actions but to include at least three other alternatives - if that many were offered. As was previously explained in Measuring Instruments and Method, the next step is bringing to the students my opinion and the reason for it. To include the element of Biblical stance I used a quotation from the Christian Bible to highlight my reasoning; the quote was included on their worksheet for their reference. A hand vote is then done on what action, of those discussed, they would take. Small groups of five are then assembled according to similar preference for action. Within these groups students construct arguments both for and against the action they have chosen to take to resolve the dilemma. The whole class then joins in discussion, raising the various arguments formulated in the smaller groups. While this is in progress students are adding relevant arguments for and against their stance that the entire group has contributed. In order to try and bring the responsibility of their chosen action to bear, students are then encouraged to try and see themselves in the scenario or to relate situations they have been in or have seen that are like the dilemma before
them. In relating these situations, no names of individuals have been nominated. To further probe their reasoning and to help them see the foundation for the value they are operating on to make their moral choice, students then consider what virtue or vice is shown by their chosen action. A list of virtues and vices was provided on the reverse of their worksheet with a brief explanation of each. In having students look through the list of Core Shared Values provided by the Curriculum Framework to decide which value epitomized the value reflected in the scenario, I directed their attention to just one column and then had them decide which value best fitted the scenario. It was then time for a final re-vote; this was the decision they would write onto their sheets as the final determination for action they reasoned would be taken to resolve the dilemma. In the closing comments a time of reflection was included to ask what had been learnt that session.

At the end of the developmental period if the exposure to Values Education and the process of reasoning with those values has had any significant effect then it will show as a significant variance in the means of the pre- and post-testing by the SROM instrument. The results and analysis of these is elucidated in the Results section.

The Control group students were not withdrawn from their normal classes. If they had been withdrawn they would not have been exposed to Values Education through the developmental program. This would mean that they would go through some other work with me as the experimenter but not related to Values Education. The only contributing factors to any change in the moral reasoning for the Control
group would be either my presence instead of their normal teacher or the fact of being withdrawn for a forty minute time to do some alternative work with me, as did the Experimental group. It is not considered that either of these factors would give significant cause for any change in moral reasoning and so would still be under control even if the Control group was not withdrawn. This strategy conforms with Ian Wright's findings (1978, p203) where his placebo and control groups showed no significant difference in moral development. Rulon in her intervention program had the comparison group simply continue on with their "regular high school teaching programs" (Rulon, 1993, p41), rather than invite those teachers to an alternative staff meeting with no moral education component. At the end of the program the Control group was post-tested using the SROM measure to determine any moral reasoning development that may have occurred over the ten-week period.

4.6 Data Analysis

The hypothesis whereby moral reasoning can be the focus of intervention and improved is based upon the application of a developmental program. The mean variance of the developmental stage of moral reasoning by a Kohlbergian measure between the pre- and post-testing using the SROM will indicate any significant difference in the moral reasoning ability before and after the elapsed time of the developmental program. The mean of the Kohlbergian measure for the Experimental group obtained from the SROM given before the developmental program will be compared with the mean measure after the developmental program. Also the mean of the Control group before the program began, will be
compared to the mean of the Control group at the completion of the ten-week program.

Further data collected will be in the form of observations of each session during the developmental program. Analysis of these observations may provide clues to either the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the developmental program to achieve the intended outcome of improving moral reasoning.

4.7 Answers to Limitations within the Study

The population will be screened to exclude those with a reading ability lower than the average reading ability of eleven-year-old students in Western Australia. It is felt that these students may find the reading comprehension level of the SROM too difficult. The unsuitability to participate in the statistical analysis would be due to the uncertainty of their responses and whether they were able to understand the selections they have responded with. The SROM has devises built in to identify those participants that are randomly or without understanding making selections because of lower comprehension through reading inadequacies.

There are many factors that can influence moral reasoning development. Factors such as parental (family) influence, culture, gender and intelligence. It is impossible to control for each influence. To do this would mean that an individual would have to be isolated from their normal environment, such as the parental influence, in case they may morally develop due to that influence and not solely
due to the developmental program. Even if it were possible to isolate the participants from all other factors the sheer factor of isolation could in itself create a variation. The effect of outside influences is largely negated by the random sampling and by the test-retest. Random sampling should ensure a random mix of external influencing factors occurs in both groups. Even if there were an imbalance, the mean variation is based on the same group (either Control or Experimental) and so we are only considering changes within that group. All participants are from similar cultural perspectives. In addition to this, as long as the possible external influencing factors have not changed over the ten-week program it will not alter the results of the testing. Fixing the variables for such an intervention study using a Values Education program would prove to be substantially simpler than trying to control variables for a longitudinal study involving integrated values. Maintaining a Control group that did not receive any education in values would be impossible without a major interruption of the participants normal working environment because of the many avenues in which values are received. This is a further reason why this study is interventionist in approach, in order to circumvent such limitations.

While using a Moral Maturity Score instead of a less sensitive Kohlbergian stage has the advantage of picking up smaller shifts in moral reasoning, it has the disadvantage of being influenced more by what James Rest calls "story pull" (Rest, 1979, p72). If a dilemma is constructed so that it has a bias for or against a particular stage then the individuals being tested would have an over or underestimated score in that stage. For the analysis being pursued this is not a disadvantage since it is only differences in the Moral Maturity Score that are of
significance. This requires precision in the measurements but accuracy is not as critical.

Some information is being discarded as the responses to each question are averaged. Again this is not detrimental because it is only the overall shift in developmental stage that is of interest, not the fine resolution of each stage used and its percentage of use. This also answers the challenge that using a Kohlbergian stage will only represent the weighted mean stage of moral development. It does not matter if the focus of this experiment is on the mean stage because it is only the shift in the mean that is of importance in the analysis.

There are limitations in the generalisation of the results. To assume results could easily be extrapolated to a larger group would be fallacious. As discussed further in the Recommendations, the approach of the study (in this case, interventionist) and the sample numbers would have to increase in order to begin to extrapolate inferences from the analysis of the sample in the study onto the population being targeted for a Values Education.
Chapter Five

Results and Recommendations

5.1 Setting of the School

The target school is a co-ed school with a population of approximately 200 students. Year levels range from eight through to twelve encompassing ages of twelve through to eighteen. Year eight students are all in the twelve to thirteen age bracket. The Christian ethos of the school provides some similarity in cultural background for all the students. Ethnic cultural background is also similar in that most students are of white Australian descent, although many would have non-Australian parents or grandparents that are of European descent. Not only does the school itself have a Christian cultural basis, most children come from an actively Christian home and are involved in Christian Church activities on a Sunday. Others are involved in further Church activities during the week. The school is seen as an extension of the Christian home. The approach to education is fairly traditional with an historical trend towards catering for the more academic student. Few students are involved in enrichment courses. Those who are, do so as extra-curricular and external-to-school activities. None of the participants in the sample group were involved in any enrichment programs. More intensive tutoring is accomplished through smaller class sizes, and greater pastoral care through even smaller pastoral care groups which meet twice in the week for shorter blocks of time and once for a longer block of time. The shorter times are used for an eclectic Biblical instruction time. This is in addition to the formal, class structured Bible subjects. The longer block of time is dedicated to pastoral care through
having students consider themselves and their environment and how the two
interact in a more personal way. It is at this time that the greatest amount of
Values Education would be imparted or infused through the global inclusion of
teacher’s and other students’ values in the course of discussion and activities. This
does not preclude the transference of teacher’s values in the course of subject
teaching. It is expected that the idea of teaching Christianly would in fact pervade
the atmosphere of the classroom and the induction of Christian values and
perspectives permeating throughout the entire day.

5.2 The Data and its Analysis

The approach to the analysis of results is to firstly determine the Moral Maturity
Scores. The calculations based on the responses to the SROM are outlined in
detail in Appendix 4 for the conversion of the raw data into a Moral Maturity
Score and the weighting applied to the various SROM responses. The original
forty-six participants sitting the SROM reduced in number due to some exceeding
the acceptable count of pseudo responses. As was outlined in Section 4.4
regarding the Measuring Instrument, the pseudo responses are to help evaluate
participants, who are not cognitively processing the responses but are more
randomly selecting responses. This discharge criterion is used also in the DIT.
Discounting participants who were not available to do the post-testing left an
overall body of thirty-three participants who did yield usable data. Of these,
fifteen comprised the Control group and eighteen the Experimental group.
Specific Moral Maturity Scores for the data are given in Appendix 10. A simple
analysis of variables using t-testing for paired two sample means provides the
information in Table 2 and 3, the entire analysis can be seen in Appendix 11.

Level of significance (the alpha) was set at 0.05. This is standard for this type of social scientific data.

Table 2: Abridged ANOVA analysis results for the Control group.
t-Test: Paired Two-Sample for Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>338.88</td>
<td>354.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Control group the significance testing showed $t_{(15)}= 2.14$, P=0.094. This indicates that the mean variation between the scores for the pre- and post testing within the Control Group were not significant enough to prove that any notable change had occurred. As the Discussion section will pursue, this is a result harmonious with the expectation that no significant improvement in the moral reasoning scores of the Control group should be evident. Two-tailed analysis of

Table 3: Abridged ANOVA analysis results for the Experimental group.
t-Test: Paired Two-Sample for Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>339.88</td>
<td>344.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Experimental group yielded \( t(18)=2.11, \ P=0.51 \). Failure to reject the null hypothesis indicates, as in the Control group, that the Experimental group did not statistically significantly improve in their moral reasoning.

The correlation coefficient for the Experimental group also testifies, with a value of 0.49, there has not been a strong, positive (increasing) trend in the scores as the correlation between pre- and post-testing is aligned. Rather there have been only about 25% of the scores that have assumed some similarity of change from pre- to post-testing; this is a weak, positive relationship. The Moral Maturity Scores from the pre- and post-testing can be displayed graphically and the linear trend superimposed on the data, Figure 3 shows this pattern.

Figure 3: Scattergram with trend-line for Pre- and Post-Test Experimental Group Moral Maturity Scores.
Similarly the linear trend for the Control group can be shown, this is seen below in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Scattergram with trend-line for Pre- and Post-Test Control Group Moral Maturity Scores.

5.3 Discussion

Not surprisingly the mean changes in the Control group have proved to be insignificant. This would be expected since the Control group was not subjected to any manipulation by a causative factor of moral reasoning change, such as a Values Education. When the focus is moved onto the Experimental group, the data analysis provides indicators to resolve the posed hypothesis; "moral reasoning can be the subject of intervention and improved by subjecting
individuals to a moral reasoning developmental program involving Values Education.” While the change in the means from pre- to post- testing did rise, the t-testing showed that the increase was not outside of that which could normally be expected from any randomly chosen group undergoing the same pre- and post-testing in the absence of any intervention. The correlation within the Experimental group also indicated that there was only a weak relationship between the Moral Maturity Scores for the pre- and post- testing. This leads to the conclusion that within the constraints applied in this research, the hypothesis is not supported, viz intervention by Values Education does not impact upon moral reasoning in order to improve the standard of that reasoning.

If we now turn attention to the trend lines, as displayed in Figures 3 and 4, it is possible to see that for both Control and Experimental groups there has been an increase in the overall Moral Maturity Score and hence an improvement in the moral reasoning stage. It could be argued that there has been development in the Experimental group; it has simply not reached significance when the group as a totality is considered. Twice the number of students improved in their scores as did those who scored lower. Two of those in the Experimental group improved their scores by forty-nine points which converts to a half stage improvement, to be fair however it should be noted that one student also decreased by more than a half a stage. Factors have been at work to increase moral reasoning but it is not possible to conclusively state that it has been the intervention program that has been responsible.
The other complicating factor is the similar improvement in the Control group. Trends from Figure 4 show a slight improvement in overall moral reasoning but insufficient to be significant. Since the program was only over a small time period there should have been no improvement or very minimal if changes in intelligence had been a factor. Other influencing factors, such as parental input over this time can not be easily ascertained but it could reasonably be assumed that they would be fairly constant. At this time in the life of the participants there may be fluctuations and variations that are commonly seen in teenage behaviour and attitude. It is again only speculation as to whether it is these unforeseen complications which cause these unexpected shifts in the data.

Rectification of this can only be through maintaining a significantly larger sample so that skewing of data through a few outlying pieces of data is not as pronounced. An example of this sort of effect can be seen in the Control group. One of the respondents has improved by an entire stage over the ten-week interval. This is more likely to be a factor of not comprehending the test instrument questions adequately on the pre-testing, or to feeling poorly, or some incident at home which affected concentration, and so it goes on, showing that it is not really possible to know all the determinants that precipitated this change. The best that can be done is to assure that the effects of any students showing such variance between scores are counterbalanced by the bulk of data. The effect of a student, showing such variance between scores, in skewing the analysis of small samples can be shown by recalculating the correlation coefficient with the removal of this one piece of data, for participant code 37, from the Control group.
The correlation jumps from 0.54 to 0.71 taking the result from a mere weak relationship to a moderate, positive relationship.

Consideration of the Alternative Intervention Studies outlined in Section 2.2 helps us to see correlating patterns in the duration and intensity of the application of those programs and the measurable effect of the intervention on moral reasoning.

The table given in Figure 5 summarises the duration of the intervention (how long it ran for), and the intensity (how much time was given in each session). Also given is the number and age of participants from the Experimental group. Accumulating a greater quantity of such programs would further confirm any trends that become evident.

Figure 5: Tabulated summary of alternative intervention parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Participant Age</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intensity per week</th>
<th>Effectiveness (significant - yes or no)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panowitsch-Balkcum</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17 - 44</td>
<td>quarter long</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10-12 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10 - 13</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>0.5 hour</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ries</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>avg. 18.4</td>
<td>18 weeks</td>
<td>2 × 1.5 hour</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grier &amp; Firestone</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10 - 11</td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
<td>0.5 hour</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geiss*</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>4 × 1 hour</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piwko*</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>college</td>
<td>quarter long</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan &amp; Kickbush*</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rulon</td>
<td>2 × 5</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>twice</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- healthcare workers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self, Olivarez &amp; Baldwin</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>one semester</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* (cited in Rest, 1979, p212-213)
Scrutinising these interventions for patterns reveals that studies that yield a significant improvement in moral reasoning stage contain a combination of the following factors:

1. The participants are at least in the upper teenage bracket.
2. The longer the duration of the study the greater the change. Studies should be an absolute minimum of ten weeks.
3. An intensity of not less than 30 minutes.

Emler (1996) points out that it is a problem of the DIT, which is the predominant moral reasoning measuring instrument used in the studies summarised above, to require a reading age requirement because the DIT distinguishes differences in moral reasoning more towards the upper stages than the lower. Gibbs (1984) recognises that this is also a potential reason for the limitation of his SROM and the explanation behind the validity of the SROM reducing with age of the participant. It can be concluded that while these measuring instruments do give suitable validity for the age levels being measured in this study, it would be more likely to have gained a significant result using older participants. In addition to this is the factor that Piaget (1979) introduced, this being that the older the participant the greater their reasoning ability and so their moral reasoning ability. Stage gains would, under this age determinant, be more subject to change in older participants. It is difficult to determine then whether the greater improvements seen in older participants is a factor of their greater reasoning or their reading ability in accomplishing the measuring instruments.
While this study did meet the minimum requirements for the duration of an intervention study, it is evident that a longer study would give a greater likelihood of yielding significant results. The longer exposure to the Values Education gives the participant longer to cognitively process the added information and determine if it is an applicable value to resource in that individual's storehouse of morals. One of the observations made during this intervention (Appendix 12) was the turning point at week seven. Until then conformity to the norm, limited discussion and unwillingness to probe their own motivation had plagued the success of each session. From, and including, the seventh week there was a change in all three of these items. It may be that this was an element of exposure. A settling in to the researcher, or the method, or could it have been a greater empathy with the dilemma. I do not believe it was the last of these because the high level of discussion and quality of content continued from that week. This does not mean that in weeks prior there was no discussion of any value, it simply was not of the same high standard experienced after week seven. I could draw a loose conclusion from this: in any intervention study it would take a number of hours of exposure to the process of the study to bring the participants to a point where they feel comfortable about entering into meaningful dialogue. From this they engage their deeper cognitive processes needed for reasoning and consequently moral reasoning encounter.

At this point in the discussion the problem mentioned in the previous paragraph of group conformity to a norm set by the socialisation of the group was clearly evident in the weekly observations. Comments such as “boys and girls polarised in their voting” (week 1), “I had hoped that the students would more freely move
to be with another of the same opinion however they looked at each other near them and essentially voted as their friend/s did” (week 4), “students fell into line with what I had said” (week 6), all indicate an unwillingness to take moral action that would break them from conformity to their social group. The break-through was in week seven, this time the observation was “for the first time students in their normal seating actually got up and shifted into a small group that reflected their similar thinking”. The shifting away from their normal social group and group thinking demonstrated some underlying changes in their approach to the dilemmas. This sort of ‘social group moral norm’ behaviour has been noted by previous researchers (Harre 1987, Friedman 1988) and is commented on by Grier and Firestone (1998) in the discussion of their study. Citing Carpendale and Krebs (1992), the comment is made that the prevailing “moral order” is a greater influence on moral judgement than the level of the individual’s moral reasoning. “Moral order” is explained by Harre (1987) as the perceived moral standards or norms of behaviour within a community (cited in Grier and Firestone, 1998). In other words, moral judgements are formed more from the effects of the prevailing ethos of the social group than by what individuals reason to be right in that situation. This explains the reluctance of the participants in this study to act independently in decision making when forming appropriate moral action for the given dilemma even though within the group there would have been variations in Moral Maturity Score reflecting variations in moral reasoning approach to the dilemma.

Lastly, the intensity would not seem to be such a critical factor. Further meta-analysis of intervention studies may provide greater perception of any minimum
time for each exposure to intervention. At this point it could be reasoned that productive time is most likely linked with factors such as length of concentration and other age-related constraints. Lind (n.d.) draws upon work by Oser (1986), Power, Higgins & Kohlberg (1989) and Sprinthall, Sprinthall & Oja (1994) to give guidelines for the development of moral dilemma discussions. In this he claims that the optimal length of a session of dilemma discussion is eighty to one hundred minutes. This time length used in his program, he asserts, is suitable for various age groups and is still very effective for children as young as grade five (10 year olds).

Emler (1996) questions the effectiveness of moral reasoning interventions to improve moral reasoning if that does not lead to moral action (morality). This was discussed in detail in Section 2.1, but also adds that if any improvements are not lasting then they are of little consequence. Long before this, Rest (1979) identified follow-up testing as a necessary feature of any effective study, criticising those studies which had not seen fit to incorporate a re-examination of the participants of the study at a later time to test for the stability of gains. It could be that any increase in moral stage following an intervention program has only been through heightened moral reasoning through the exposure and this will retrogress as time distances the mind from gains of the intervention. This is a well-founded point and should certainly be pursued in any intervention study of this type. In this particular study the follow-up testing was not pursued on the grounds that since a statistically significant gain was not achieved from the pre- to the post-testing it was not necessary to consider if any changes in Moral Maturity Score would persist. Had it been that gains had been evident then a further testing should have
been conducted at a ten-week interval after the intervention had ceased. I would suggest that a time delay of approximately the same duration as the intervention should allow sufficient time for normalisation to occur. After this time the gains could be considered to be stable. It is reasoned that if the intervention period was able to produce gains in the span of the duration of the intervention then in an equal time the gains could be lost if they are not stable. Emler refers to Schlaefli (cited in Emler, 1996, p121) in remarking that it is common practice now to test the maintenance of any gains for up to a year beyond the completion of an intervention.

In summary: This study of year 8 students from an independent Western Australian school did not produce a statistically significant result with the t-test for the Experimental group resulting $t_{(18)}=2.11, P=0.51$ in an intervention on moral reasoning development using Values Education as the causative factor. The Experimental group did show overall gains in Moral Maturity Scores that were used to graduate moral reasoning however the Control group also showed similar gains over the ten week intervention period. Observations revealed that fruitful discussions and breaking away from the social moral norms of the group towards individuality in decisions did not occur until seven weeks into the program. Comparison of alternative interventions proposes studies of greater duration using older participants are more likely to yield greater gains in moral reasoning development.
5.4 Recommendations

Some of those parameters that have previously been raised in the discussion of results bring to bear in the formulation of recommendations for future studies.

The sample size is an important consideration in the usefulness of the analysis of the accumulated data. When a small sample is used it leaves the study vulnerable in two ways. Firstly, the results of the study may suffer because of a minority of highly irregular variations in the raw data. This is where a small number of scores have deviations from the mean considerably higher than the remaining data. These scores which are further than one and a half standard deviations from the mean of the scores present a problem in the way they skew the mean to give an unrepresentative depiction of the central tendency of the data. This can work to give the impression that the study has been significant when if that score or scores were removed would establish the correct analysis of the data and yield the opposing result, the converse of this can also be true. Using a greater sample size will reduce the skewing effect of these few outlying scores because the bulk of the data will hold the mean steady. Secondly, it becomes increasing difficult with smaller samples to be able to accurately project any extrapolations of the results of the analysis to the population. So it becomes unreasonable to assert that any findings should be implemented when the result was found to be true only for a small, isolated sample. If larger samples of more than thirty were used for each of the Experimental and Control groups it should successfully counteract the effects of skewing the mean but would still leave the extrapolation of the data in doubt. At best the study would provide the impetus for a larger scale study if it were
found to be significant in its results. In some studies (for example, Wright 1978) a third group is introduced. This third group is a Placebo and would have been withdrawn for 'treatment' (participation in a program but not the intervention program) but not have undergone any 'treatment' which pertained to the elements of the study. This is only possible if the sample is larger and can afford to divide the sample into three parts yet maintain reasonable sized numbers in each group. Studies of this type tend to utilise only Experimental and Control groups. The only reason for introducing the third, Placebo, group is to eliminate all doubt that the presence of the researcher or the fact of drawing participants into a differing environment had any effect on the moral reasoning development.

Drawing upon the inferences of Figure 5 it can only be reiterated that there are features of studies where gains in moral reasoning have been achieved which should be incorporated into future studies. A meta-analysis of many such studies would be required to be able to predict with certainty some of the parameters needed to effect an instrumental study. One of the difficulties already perceived in a further analysis of this type would be the constraint of accumulating all the required data. Some of the studies do not make explicit all the variables applied and constrained. For example, in the Self, Olivarez & Baldwin (1998) study the length of each session is not given. The researchers have left it to the reader to extrapolate session times from the information given about the participants being university students, this assumes all university classes are of the same time length as that in which the study was completed.
Where the research has been over an extended period of time there is an improved likelihood of achieving greater gains. It is not possible to be definitive about the duration of the intervention because of the influence of other factors which also contribute to the moral reasoning development; but it can be stated that the longer the study the better probability of producing substantial gains. It would seem from the limited comparison provided that a ten-week duration is likely to be a minimum requirement. The length of each session will have an impact upon the degree to which development can occur. Self-evidently, the longer the time in considering and discussing the moral dilemma, the time in contemplation of alternative expressed views, social moral values and character virtues, will extend moral reasoning in the participants. All of this presupposes that the program of the intervention contains elements that challenge participants to consider new and higher stage moral values. In considering these new values the participant then incorporates those values into their storehouse of morals and so moves gradually onwards toward a higher stage of moral reasoning. Or it may be that the participant is challenged to think through the morals they are already aware of and consider replacing a lower order moral with a higher order moral which will move them onwards in moral stage of development. It could also be concluded that if a higher degree of gain were the greatest sought after goal then it would be wiser to deal with older participants in order to achieve this. This would though, result in a biased study. If intervention studies are structured to eliminate biases, such as gender bias, then why not age bias as well? The objective of the Curriculum Council in the inclusion of core shared values was to “enhance the learning opportunities within school communities” (Curriculum Council of Western Australia, 1998, p324). This does imply the whole school community not simply
the upper age levels. The recommendation for future studies is that they should not focus exclusively on one age bracket but search to qualify that gains are happening over a spectrum of ages through the inclusion of core shared values in the curriculum. One way to ensure this is to exercise a longitudinal study. In doing a study by this means, the added advantage is not only examining whether gains are being made over a range of ages, also the study would more closely follow the intended application of the core shared values. As was stated in Section 1.5, Definition of Terms, these values were to be integrated in the daily teaching, to be a part of each lesson not an additional subject entitled “Moral Development” or anything such like. Evaluating effectiveness of introducing Core Shared Values into the curriculum can not be adequately assessed by an intervention program that simulates more the subject approach rather than the intended integrated approach. A study of this length and magnitude will lend itself more towards a doctoral study and thesis.

In taking an integrated approach and wishing to see the real effect on students of the inclusion of core shared values into the curriculum by the teachers themselves and not the impact of the researcher in an intervention; the researcher should be an observer, not participator, in the room. Gains in moral reasoning should still be assessed periodically using a measuring instrument of moral reasoning. In addition to this would be a wealth of additional information in the form of observations that can give more leads to the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the inclusion of the core shared values to the change in moral reasoning. Also, because the researcher is able to be free to observe, and not be tied into the face-to-face administration of a program, would give the researcher more time to
capture more of the events of the interactions rather than trying to effectively recall and record these after class. Going back to the earlier comment about periodically measuring moral reasoning brings forward the issue of what instrument to use. An instrument that has had extensive use would have had many of the criticisms of that instrument addressed and rectified. For this reason it would be best to use the MJI or DIT. In determining which of these would yield the best analysis, the position is not any clearer because they both have shortcomings. Nicholas Emler (1996), among others, gives a balanced account of the strengths and weakness of both instruments. He concludes that the DIT “lacks many of the MJI’s problems. In particular it is easy to administer and to score with large sample sizes.” (1996, p119). The biggest downfall of the DIT is that it was “devised to detect differences towards the upper rather than the lower end of the developmental scale” (Emler, 1996, p119). This causes complications in giving a truly representative longitudinal study that includes the younger age set. Even despite this, it would seem that the DIT would be the preferred choice of instrument for the sort of analysis required here.

In addition to the observations and DIT scores, a more intense study could begin to address the criticism drawn to many previous studies that failed to measure any changes in morality (moral action). Emler, while being critical of this lack of flow through to moral action from moral reason, did offer some suggestions towards the means of beginning to assess changes in moral action. For example, self-reporting on moral behavioural changes and ratings performed by acquaintances for individual assessment; for group measures, to use level of truancy, exclusions from school, participation in community service and so on (1996, p122-123).
Assessing changes in moral action allows progression of research to explore the links to shaping an effective moral or value education program. Grier and Firestone is the sole study under consideration which did seek to include a measure for ethical conduct. Two different measures were used: “The first was a nineteen-item five-point rating scale which measured physical and verbal aggression, honesty, prosocial behaviour and general conduct” (1998, p270); assessment was performed by teachers observing the children. The second was the degree to which children cheated on marking their own test. Results for this study were promising with an improvement in moral conduct, contrasted to no significant improvement in moral reasoning, however assessments using the “cheating task” were not decisive. This gives some direction to a future study that can begin to explore whether the determinants of moral reasoning are pressing on towards evolving higher levels of moral action; or should the focus rest on some alternative causative agent to increase moral action; or which of the purported determinants is the one providing the impetus.

Taking the previous thought further, there has been research conducted which has converged the multiple factors affecting moral behaviour development. Osatini and Ellerman (1997) in citing the work by Schlaefli, Rest & Thoma (1985) report there are four main components in the evolution of moral behaviour. These are: moral judgement, moral sensitivity, moral motivation and moral character. Any study probing the development of moral action will have to isolate and measure each of the four contributing factors, devise means to project each as a manipulative factor while controlling the other three factors and have some
technique to measure, as outlined previously, the responding variable of moral action.

Reverting back to the 'simpler' task of considering how to implement values into the participants by means of a Values Education causes the question to be asked, how else may values be introduced into the moral storehouse of individuals? If, even without the use of Values Education, individuals moving through life still acquire values then there must be other multiple factors at work to vie for a place to input values into people. One of the more obvious would be consumerism which would desire to hoist its value system onto consumers to dictate that they must purchase certain products because the consumer has acquired values urging it is important to make those purchases. Eckersley (1998) identifies five such factors at work in our western culture which are acting to introduce values. He lists these as: economism, consumerism, postmodernism, pessimism and individualism. The aim of a Values Education is to introduce societal (and even personal) values which, when assimilated, over time give a broader base of society with values that will not only preserve that society but to improve the social condition. How though will those seeing the need for such a Values Education, such as the Curriculum Council, be able to address the negative elements of these other influences on values? Will the introduction of Values Education be of any effect against a tide of alternative influences if those influences are bringing detrimental values to society? Again it is a complex area but it needs to be considered if future efforts to counter the shift in the breakdown of society is to be tackled effectively. The following quote from Eckersley
underlines this trend and again emphasises the need to continue efforts to pursue an effective program of Values Education.

And it seems to me that in recent times, we have reached the point where the cultural negatives are reinforcing each other, and we now lack the necessary cultural balances. Thus, far from providing a moral counter-weight to economism and consumerism, the moral ambiguity of postmodemism and the loss of faith in a better world strengthen their celebration of the individual and the gratification of personal needs and wants that are never sated because new ones keep getting created. (1998, p11).
Bibliography

Books


Journals, Articles, Reports and Theses.


Currie, Keith. (c.1975, July). Education for Morality. Presentation at an annual conference for government high school Social Studies senior masters' organised by the Education Department of Western Australia, Perth, WA.


On-Line


Appendices

Appendix One: Education for Morality

Unpublished Presentation: The following is a summary of a presentation by Dr. Currie (c.1975) at a government high school Social Studies senior masters' conference organised by the Education Department of Western Australia.

“EDUCATION FOR MORALITY”

By Dr Keith Currie

This article consisting of a number of statements, many of which represent the thoughts of numerous modern theorists in this field, has been presented in this manner to stimulate thought and discussion amongst teachers. A source bibliography to direct further reading has been included.

1. MAJOR PROBLEMS: (a) definitions of such words/terms as moral, moral development, character training, ethics, and related values, particularly the spiritual; (b) methodology - involving answers to questions: Can we teach morality? How does moral and character development take place? (c) Religious Education - should moral education be treated apart from the religious in the normal State systems of education.

2. THE PROBLEM OF DEFINITION: Educators have a good working concept of the meanings of “moral”, “morality”, of “rightness and wrongness” in social behaviour and personal thought and action. In general, the term “moral” will be understood as a set of rules or code of conduct (social mores) against which a citizen’s thoughts and actions can be evaluated. Such rules tend to be related to a particular culture, so that what is moral in one society may not be in another. In turn, “morality” indicates not only a knowledge of the mores, but also the quality of being moral or the practice of carrying out one’s moral duties, and hence involves the making of moral choices. The latter, in turn are guided by “values”, but not always directly: more correctly they are guided by “evaluations”, made through our conscious, intellectual and discursive processes, in which consequences of our choice of action on ourselves and others are constantly weighed.

3. SHOULD WE TEACH MORALS?
3.1 Perhaps the strongest argument in support of moral education may be summarised as follows: The development of morality is akin to that of human intelligence. We may not be able to teach intelligence directly, but unless a healthy, stimulating environment is provided for its nurture, its development will undoubtedly be retarded and its full potential restricted.

3.2 The teacher must accept an important duty in the teaching of moral values and become involved in preparing her pupils to take their proper place in society and conform to the conventional standards. In doing this, she attempts to help her pupils to make all their values consistent and to develop
stable elements in their personality. The pupils will find difficulty in making
decisions on moral values, if they have not been initiated into some of the
moral practices.

3.3 While progress in moral education may be hindered by many factors, outside
the educator’s control, such as deprivation in its many aspects, there is also a
basic truth that the very range of moral practices in society and its
institutions, gets limits on what moral decisions can be justifiably and
intelligently made: they must not be left to the casual whim of its citizens.

3.4 If we try to avoid teaching values, or at least teaching about values we run the
danger of leading our pupils to believe that values are not very important,
since no provision is made for discussing them, or with the motion that they
are purely a theological matter, hence a little concern in the practical affairs of
every day life. They might also include that nothing really matters, and that
they can do anything they wish, so long as they obey the law.

3.5 Not only is deliberate education never morally neutral, but a definite
expression of preference for certain human values and ends is also inherent in
all our efforts to guide the experience of the young. In order to make them
act intelligently, we must stress not only what to think but also how to think.

3.6 The educational role of the school includes a crucial part of moral education,
with the emphasis placed on modes of moral reasoning and inquiry, and not
with the substance of moral practices. Pupils learn by acting under guidance
and from the examples of others, who have acquired the mastery. Judgements
about life’s values inescapably pervade and undergird the whole process of
providing and guiding experience, especially those concerned with human
existence.

3.7 The ideas we have and the ways in which we put them together, the things we
feel and approve, or reject, our yearnings and our values are all learned. All
the ways of behaving are integrated into our total behaviour patterns our
personality.

3.8 Despite the fact that moral development is a complex subject, it should not,
on that account, be avoided by those responsible for the education of children.

4. HOW CAN WE TEACH MORAL VALUES?

4.1 What moral education is and how it is achieved will remain insoluble
problems, so long as we differ in our interpretation of what is moral, or in the
reasons we have for erecting a system of morality and attempting to make
others adhere to it.

4.2 Moral teaching is not just a matter of practice and habit. We do not teach
“right answers”, but a methodology of action which the pupils can learn and
act on their own. Moral thinking, too, is part of the school curriculum in its
own right. A morally educated person is not one who obeys and conforms to
a set of rules or to an authority; he is a rational, autonomous being, who
makes up his own mind sensibly and reasonably about what is right and
wrong, with a full awareness of the consequences of his actions. This does
not mean however, that moral education has nothing to do with rules,
obedience, contracts and authority.

4.3 We must avoid the creation of a moral vacuum. What is wrong with letting
our pupils know how they ought to think and act? Teaching implies a
deliberate act and when we teach values we must be deliberate. We must
replace and supplant incidental conditioning. Evaluations made through the
conscious intellectual and discursive process, in which consequences of choice of action are constantly evaluated, can be taught in the same way as many other school subjects are taught, but the essential aspect of the learning experience must depend on the way educators approach the task.

4.4 All individuals must come to terms with their own lives. Therefore teachers could help them to understand the concepts and values that they hold, and thus help the students find a meaning to life.

4.5 Unfortunately there are many obstacles to successful moral teaching including the muddled thinking of teachers about what they should teach and how they should go about it. Perhaps a more positive lead in methodology should be given. As the students mature less success will be gained by the shallow enthusiasm of their teachers. While personal example and sincerity will still rank high in teacher-attributes, the successful teachers must continue to be critically aware of the way basic human needs, group types in social decision-making operate, and the influence of peer interests and standards influence in personal development and self-esteem.

4.6 The educator must also be ready to wean the students away from false methodologies - such as reliance on the peer-group, anti-authority influences and even authoritarian - by giving them insight into possible underlying motives. Moreover, the school must be ready to provide compensations to combat the development of certain interests and abilities, behaviour patterns which are the product of former mishandling such as may arise from an inadequate home background.

4.7 Positive evaluation of past methods of moral education must be made and experimental approaches initiated. More fruitful methods may replace former moral instruction which used moral homilies and catechetical methods to impress society’s imperatives. Perhaps the most encouraging areas of reform lie in the use of problem-solving strategies, group-decision making and follow-up involvement planning, pitched at the students’ levels of development and comprehension. Thus students become aware of the skills, techniques and qualities required to get the right answers to moral questions and also receive practice in solving real-life moral problems. Moreover, moral reasoning must not be treated in isolation, but involved in learning directly about feelings, dispositions, attitudes and beliefs, which are all part of living morally. While an untrained mind is liable to use fumbling trial-and-error learning methods, that of the trained mind enables an individual to make decisions in terms of ideas and concepts.

4.8 In education, as in other realms of human activity the actual practices of a school are more potent than its verbal professions. Maximum results are achieved when both the declared aims and the actual deeds of a school are unified, and its students reared in an environment that supports in its daily practices, that which it affirms in theory.

4.9 In the last analysis, the success or failure of a school is measured in moral terms, that is, by what it does with and for the human beings entrusted to its care. It is a choice among significant life alternatives, that is the essence of the moral act, and choice among values necessarily pervades those human actions by which the school’s programme is organised and communicated. The term ‘moral’ refers to both the end and the means of the organised effect of the school to guide the process by which the young achieve and forms of their being, their thinking and their doing.
4.10A parent may object to a teacher teaching a particular substantive value - parents hold a right to teach their child what to believe and the teacher hasn’t. But no objection can be held on a study about values - so that a child may examine his feelings, his standards and his values.

5 SHOULD MORAL EDUCATION BE SEPARATED FROM RELIGIOUS EDUCATION?

5.1 Although there is no agreement as to the successful methods that are distinctive to religious education, much of what has been considered as vital to moral education could also be considered. Society includes the religious and an educated person should be aware of what is meant by religious/spiritual values.

5.2 Basic to any study on the education for morality is the ultimate question of the general purpose of human life as a whole: what man was made for and what is his place in the scheme of things? Too often the individual develops a dissatisfaction for society-based objectives and rules. Why should I conform? True morality is not just law-keeping. For many people the ultimate sanctions for morality are religious. To speak of absolute terms is for them to use the language of religion. They also believe that there is no real substitute for the religious kind of vision which lies behind morality.

5.3 Of the various religious and idealistic codes of conduct, the Christian ethic is the most self-consistent and distinctive. Christianity asserts that moral norms have universal validity and that truth is unitary in character. The proper reaction to all Christian moral training is obedience to the Law of God. Lack of obedience and of self-discipline, says Christian Teaching, leads to imbalance and excess in both the personal and social life of an individual. Moreover, in view of the significant tradition to the Western intellectual and artistic tradition, and pervasive influence in Western morality and society, there is much to be said for making the Judaeo-Christian tradition a central focus in moral education.

5.4 Humanists have no right these days to be more confident about what they mean by the natural, than Christians in what they mean by the supernatural. When all of us ask the truly relevant questions about life and the absolutes, we must merge into an “open-minded” union: as teachers, we should work together to help our pupils obtain understanding as well as knowledge, insight as well as expertise, and distinctions such as between indulgence and love and belief and faith. A pupil’s establishment of a moral or religious stance must be a free and rational act if it is to be worthwhile.

5.5 To support the teaching of morality within a religious framework we have the traditional wealth of stories and history, and to some extent a range of successful methods. Why not continue to use these until better methods are discovered? Why create a vacuum within which the pupils lose out? Of course, if a teacher is uncertain, then he could profitably consolidate and build upon the known and traditional, without “throwing the baby out with the bath-water”. Our ultimate decision must be made in relation to the goal of producing the good citizen and a realisation of what society requires of its schools.

5.6 Educators are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of timing in the training and acquisition of certain skills. The Plowden Report (Chapter 1) refers to these critical periods (imprinting) in a child’s life when certain
learning abilities are at their height. These critical periods not only occur at highly specific times, but their results are irreversible. Delay in the acquisition of certain skills may be caused by depriving the child of the opportunities to practice them at the peak of their maturation. Perhaps religious education, like that of morality, should not be delayed but included as part of the whole process of education of the young.

5.7 There is a desperate need these days for all men and women of good will, especially teachers: (a) to concentrate more upon their common ground for belief and action than upon their differences; and (b) to mitigate the effects on our system of education of those disrupting tensions and divisions in our modern society.

6. THE DEVELOPMENTAL SYSTEM representing the theories of Piaget, Kohlberg, Havighurst et al and supported by the empirical evidence of the latter may be summarised as follows:

6.1 All organisms adapt to their environment with the basic invariants of the functioning being organisation and adaptation. For instance a baby reacts to its environment and builds up a sequence of patterns and schemes. Learning has a subordinate role to the factors underlying development, but the child should do his own learning with the teacher providing situations of suitable complexity for the child to experiment with.

6.2 There is a fixed sequence of stages in the growth of thought and the type of thinking at each stage is qualitatively different from any other. Each stage sees the elaboration of new mental abilities which set the limits and determines the character of what can be learned during that period. The development of morality is tied to that of intellectual function and runs parallel to it. (P)

6.3 Development does not take place evenly throughout the child’s life (e.g. deprivation, under-nourishment etc.) (P)

6.4 Havighurst: As the individual grows, he finds himself possessed of new physical and psychological resources. His inner and outer forces continue to set for the individual, a series of developmental tasks, which must be mastered if he is to develop into a successful being. Some tasks arise purely from physical maturation (e.g. learning to walk). Others, arise primarily from cultural pressures of society (learning to read and to participate socially).

Personal values and aspirations, which are part of an individual’s personality and self, emerge from his inter-action with environmental forces. As self evolves, it becomes increasingly a force in its own right in the subsequent development of the individual (choosing and preparing for an occupation, achieving a scale of values and a philosophy of life).

6.5 Piaget sees the child’s environment as a social situation in which the child increasingly understands the rules by spontaneously resisting his moral experiences in an effort to make them meaningful to him. This means that the essential mechanism is that external rules are transformed into internal principles.

6.6 While all collective habits are not moral, all moral practices are undoubtedly collective habits. (P)

6.7 Four factors underlay development: (a) Maturation; (b) the role of experience of the effects of the physical environment on the structures of intelligence; (c)
the social milieu or social transmission in its broadest sense; and (d) self
regulation - a factor of equilibrium - often ignored but perhaps the principal
factor. (P)

6.8 For Piaget, there are two groups of Social and Moral Facts: (a) constraints or
unilateral respect - coercion during the earliest age to the laying down of
ready-made laws en bloc; and (b) co-operation and mutual respect - a method
of reciprocal control and intellectualising in the establishment of rules.

6.9 Kohlberg denies the psycho-analytic theory of guilt and resistance to
temptation, but sees the concept of guilt as a conscious self-controlling
response. He stresses role-learning theory and identification. Moral reasoning
is identified as developing along a set of definite rules or techniques which
are directed towards a desired end. He criticises many moral learning
programmes as being over-simplified and tend to underestimate the
sophistication of many children; or over-shooting children's levels of
comprehension. Moral programmes must be designed to match stages in
developmental sequence - his ideas influenced curriculum makers and
influenced the Canadian Mackay Report.

6.10 Kohlberg contends that moral education should not be presented as
indoctrination aimed at teaching a set of morals, but rather should be
concerned with developing organising abilities involving analysis,
interpretation and decision making with social problem exercises. Not
everyone will reach the same stage in ability but teachers should encourage
pupils to lift their sights.

6.11 Piaget's theories in the development of morality were not developed beyond
the age of twelve years (adolescence) when ideas and ideals expand rapidly.
The growth of formal thinking was thought to lead to moral autonomy.
Havighurst on the other hand presented a theory of development which
extended to the age of 60 years and beyond. Moreover, with his five stages of
development in morality, he perceived the possibility that an individual could
be at different levels/stages for different moral skills (e.g. stealing different
from lying, cheating, etc.) - Hence rating scales.

6.12 Empirical evidence has been restricted due to the undue stress placed on
verbal response during questioning and the proof that stages exist, the manner
in which each concept is formed and the movement through one stage to the
next - all remain mysteries because no clear-cut answers of evidence has been
accumulated.

7 PIAGET'S 4 MAIN STAGES in the growth of moral judgement.

7.1 Heteronomy - 4 to 8 years - rules/laws sacred and fixed for all occasions as
they have been given by adults and older children. The letter rather than the
spirit of the law must be observed. Behaviours will be judged, not in terms of
motives but by conformity with the rules. Egocentricism will not allow a
child to see moral values as relative to a situation: there is a confusion of
subjective phenomena with objective things making moral laws fixed and
eternal and not as psycho-social phenomena.

7.2 Equality: permeated by the spirit of equalitarianism. Child no longer
dominated by the letter of the law: rewards/punishments must be distributed
equally and the latter must be related to the misdeed. Justice should be
reciprocal - blow for blow. A growing mutual respect for others.
7.3 **Equity** - relationship now tied to real causes and extenuating circumstances, with allowances made for individual motives, needs and deserts.

7.4 **Moral Autonomy** - No one is omniscient (all knowing), no clear cut decisions are sometimes possible; a realisation that neither side in a conflict completely right.

8. **HAVIGHURST'S 5 MAIN STAGES**

8.1 **Amoral Impulsive** - animal-like. "I want it I should have it" - infant like inability to control himself in social situations.

8.2 **Ego-centric Expedient** - Conforms in order to avoid punishment or disapproval, or to gain rewards. Primarily self-centred and will readily do immoral things if he sees an advantage for himself. An adult caught in this stage is the kind of person who is always seeking his own satisfactions, but is smart enough to put up a "front" of morality - hence in the long run morally inconsistent.

8.3 **External Conforming** - Goes along passively with the social and moral rules in a rather literal way. He conforms to the rules of his family and later to the rules of his peer-group. He accepts social conformity as good for its own sake and makes this his principle motive in life. He follows a system of literal rules, specific for each occasion with no over-all consistency. No strong inner control or conscience. If thrown into situations where the rules are not clear or where the prevailing moral standards are hard ones - they change to the colour of their surroundings.

8.4 **Irrational - Conscience** - lives by absolute rules which have been internalised from the moral voices of his parents: may become a slave to it. He does what his conscience tells him to do, regardless of its effect on other people. Thus if he is taught to tell the truth, he may do so in a rigid way that he hurts other people. He has no flexibility and cannot readily apply two different moral principles such as kindness and honesty in the same situation. An act is 'good' or 'bad' to him because his conscience tells him so, and not because of its good or bad consequences in his own life and the lives of others. Maybe known as a "strong" character who feels guilty if he does not obey his conscience. He can stand out against the crowd unable to look rationally at the consequences of his behaviour and adapt it to serve moral ends.

8.5 **RATIONAL - INTERNALISED - ALTRUISTIC** - the highest level of moral maturity. He has an internalised set of moral principles by which he judges and directs his own behaviour - he has rational control of himself which allows him to assess the results of his actions in a given situation, and to approve or disapprove them in relation to consequences and not by his own intentions. He reacts with emotion appropriate to the occasion - he is not unemotional - for he is enthusiastic about promoting what is good and aroused to prevent what is bad. He is able to accommodate one principle to another - an honesty to kindness - when they seem to conflict and require some sort of rational calculus of their consequences with one principle gaining priority. This person is capable of self-sacrifice if he knows it will genuinely help others, but he does not sacrifice himself for neurotic self-satisfaction.
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STRATEGIES FOR HEALTH EDUCATION

Values Clarification

One of the major concerns of health education is to encourage people to make rational decisions about their health. To do this, some educators have used strategies developed by moral educators. One such strategy is VALUES CLARIFICATION.

Values clarification aims at helping people:
- Be more purposeful.
- Become more productive.
- To sharpen their critical thinking processes.
- To have better relations with each other.

Some of the advantages of values clarification are that:
- It is a very flexible approach.
- People enjoy doing it.
- It doesn't take any special training other than reading a book or two.
- It can deal with fundamental issues with the teacher remaining neutral.
- It provides people with a way to examine how they look at choices and how they make decisions.

Some of the disadvantages of values clarification are that:
- It fails to distinguish between moral and non-moral values issues.
- It seems to promote value relativity. It gives the impression that all values held by individuals are acceptable.
- There is no attempt to get individuals to defend their values against argument.
- It can interfere with people's privacy rights.

Values clarification activities.
- Rank ordering
- Spread of opinion
- Values voting
- Moral dilemmas
- Inventory

Most values clarification exercises fit into one of the above categories.

Rank ordering
Students make choices and identify preferences and priorities. For example, students are asked to rank from one to four:

Which is your favourite snack?
- potato chips
- ice cream
- fruit
- cheese

Spread of opinion
A continuum, with extreme viewpoints is shown to students and they are asked to position themselves according to their beliefs. For example, using the topic of nutrition, students could be asked to arrange themselves on the following continuum.

Eat junk food
whenever I want to  never eat junk food

Values voting
Students vote on an issue according to the following system.
- strongly agree
- agree
- pass
- disagree
- strongly disagree

Moral dilemmas
a. What would you do if.....? e.g.
- You were a guest at someone's home and didn't like the taste of the main dish?
- Your doctor told you to cut out all ice cream?
- You wanted to get your family to eat less - without nagging them?
- One of your friends who has acne always ordered French fries?
b. Students listen to or read a story which describes a difficult situation and then do some rank orders based on the story.

Inventories
Students are asked to list things like:
- the 20 things I most like to do.
- my 10 favourite people.

From these five basic activities many others can be devised to help teach health education. Here is a list of books which may be of help to teachers who wish to know more about values clarification.
Appendix Two: Dilemma Hand-out Sheets Weeks One to Ten

Week 1

Name: __________________________

Dilemma

Cashing In

Danielle is buying a few school supplies at the newsagent. She makes her selections and takes them to the cashier. The total is $8.50, and Danielle pays the cashier with a ten-dollar bill. The cashier gives Danielle her change. As Danielle walks out the door, she notices the cashier has mistakenly given her $5.50 in change instead of $1.50.

The cashier is already ringing up the next customer. What should Danielle do?


Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for and against the action you would take:

Virtue or Vice:

Circle the virtue or vice you think your action is showing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Vice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Covetous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>Laziness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gluttony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write down the Value statement the positive action is supporting.

What is your final decision for action?
Bible Verse:

Proverbs 11:3
If you are good you are guided by honesty. People who can’t be trusted are destroyed by their own dishonesty.

Virtues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisdom- good judgement</th>
<th>Justice - regulates person to person relationships</th>
<th>Self-control - restrains impulses</th>
<th>Courage - goes beyond difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td>Moderation - eating and drinking only what is needed.</td>
<td>Generosity - gives even if it hurts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Modesty - not overemphasizing sexual appetite.</td>
<td>Patience - can wait it out for a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obedience - gives to others what is owed them.</td>
<td>Humility - not overrating self.</td>
<td>Honour - will not give in for the lesser but aims for the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty - holds to what is right and true.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect - the other is given consideration above self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covetousness - desire to unrightfully possess.</th>
<th>Pride - thinking better of yourself than is true.</th>
<th>Laziness- not willing to work.</th>
<th>Anger- violent revengeful emotion. Hot displeasure.</th>
<th>Gluttony- excessive eating and drinking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lust - sexual craving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envy-discontent, jealousy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greed - want more than is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Week 2 Name: ___________

**Dilemma**

Mrs. Todd is known for giving the toughest tests in the English department. Today's test is no exception. In fact, it should be the most difficult test that Jason has had all year because it covers material the class has studied since March. Jason has spent hours studying for this test. All that is left to do now is take it. Jason is glad he has Mrs. Todd's class first period. He can get it over with as soon as possible - and hopefully before he begins to forget everything he has studied! After the test, Jason walks out of Mrs. Todd's class and breathes a sigh of relief. It was tough but Jason felt that he did pretty well. At least he doesn't have the test hanging over his head the rest of the day.

At lunchtime, Jason's friend Freddie asks him about the test. Jason tells him it was OK and leaves it at that. Freddie, who has yet to take the test, asks Jason what questions are included. He hasn't had much time to study because of hockey practice and band rehearsals after school. Jason knows that if Freddie hasn't studied much he will have a hard time passing the test. Jason would hate to see Freddie flunk the test. After all, Freddie is the star goalie for the school's hockey team, and he can't play if he doesn't pass his classes. What should Jason do?


### Actions

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reasons for and against the action you would take:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Virtue or Vice:

Circle the virtue or vice you think your action is showing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Vice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Covetous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>Laziness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write down the Value statement the positive action is supporting.

|          |
|----------|----------|
|          |          |
What is your final decision for action?

Bible Verse:

Proverbs 20:10
The Lord hates people who use dishonest weights and measures.

Virtues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisdom - good judgement</th>
<th>Justice - regulates person to person relationships</th>
<th>Self-control - restrains impulses</th>
<th>Courage - goes beyond difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderation - eating and drinking only what is needed.</td>
<td>Generosity - gives even if it hurts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modesty - not overemphasizing sexual appetite.</td>
<td>Patience - can wait it out for a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience - gives to others what is owed them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Humility - not overrating self.</td>
<td>Honour - will not give in for the lesser but aims for the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty - holds to what is right and true.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect - the other is given consideration above self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covetousness - desire to unrightfully possess.</th>
<th>Pride - thinking better of yourself than is true.</th>
<th>Laziness - not willing to work.</th>
<th>Anger - violent revengeful emotion. Hot displeasure.</th>
<th>Gluttony - excessive eating and drinking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lust - sexual craving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envy - discontent, jealousy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greed - want more than is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dilemma

Making Fun
Lisa and her friends always sit at the same table for lunch. They are among the oldest kids in the school, and it's an unwritten rule that no one else can sit at that table. Lisa and her friends spend their lunchtime goofing around with each other, telling jokes, or comparing horror stories from gym class. Typically, they ignore any students younger than themselves.

Lately, however, some of Lisa's friends have been picking on a younger student. This girl is small for her age, rather bookish, and extremely shy. She sits by herself for lunch. While the girl never has said anything to Lisa's friends, some of them seem to enjoy making fun of her and calling her names. Lisa can tell this is making the girl very uncomfortable and unhappy, but these are her friends. What should Lisa do?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for and against the action you would take:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Virtue or Vice:**

Circle the virtue or vice you think your action is showing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Vice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom Justice Self-control Courage</td>
<td>Covetous Pride Laziness Anger Gluttony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write down the Value statement the positive action is supporting.

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your final decision for action?

Bible Verse:

Psalm 82:4
Rescue the poor and needy from the grasp of evil men. LB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtues</th>
<th>Justice - regulates person to person relationships</th>
<th>Self-control - restrains impulses</th>
<th>Courage - goes beyond difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom- good judgement</td>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others. Responsibility - can be trusted Obedience - gives to others what is owed them. Honesty - holds to what is right and true. Respect - the other is given consideration above self.</td>
<td>Moderation - eating and drinking only what is needed. Modesty - not overemphasizing sexual appetite. Humility - not overrating self.</td>
<td>Generosity - gives even if it hurts. Patience - can wait it out for a result. Honour - will not give in for the lesser but aims for the better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vices</th>
<th>Pride - thinking better of yourself than is true.</th>
<th>Laziness - not willing to work.</th>
<th>Anger - violent revengeful emotion. Hot displeasure.</th>
<th>Gluttony - excessive eating and drinking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covetousness - desire to unrightfully possess.</td>
<td>Lust - sexual craving. Envy - discontent, jealousy. Greed - want more than is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Dilemma

## Facing Unjust Criticism

Carson is having a difficult time getting along with the band instructor, Mr. Parke. Carson enjoys music, and he practices his clarinet faithfully. He is not the best player in the clarinet section, but he’s not the worst, either. Carson always gets to band on time and has never missed a rehearsal. For whatever reason, however, Mr. Parke seems to pick on him. Last week, for example, the students were having a hard time settling down to play. At least three or four kids in the clarinet section were still talking when Mr. Parke raised his baton. But whom did Mr. Parke single out and punish? Carson. And he wasn’t even one of the culprits.

Today is the worst. The clarinet section is having trouble with a certain passage. Mr. Parke stops the entire band and asks the section to play. The clarinets manage to get through it, but it is obvious to everyone in the band there were a few clunkers. Mr. Parke yells at the clarinets and then asks Carson to play the difficult passage. Carson has practiced that passage many times, and he can play it. But playing it under the fierce gaze of Mr. Parke is another story. With pounding heart and sweaty hands, Carson gives it his best shot, but it is a total disaster. He can’t hit a right note. The entire band laughs, and Carson feels utterly humiliated. What do you think he should do?


## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Reasons for and against the action you would take:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Virtue or Vice:

Circle the virtue or vice you think your action is showing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Vice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Covetous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>Laziness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gluttony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write down the Value statement the positive action is supporting.

---
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What is your final decision for action?

Bible Verse:

1 Samuel 1:10 - 17
She (Hannah) was in deep anguish and was crying bitterly as she prayed to the Lord.... Eli noticed her mouth moving as she prayed silently and, hearing no sound, thought she must have been drunk. "Must you come here drunk?" he demanded. "Throw away your bottle."
"Oh, no, sir!" she replied, "I'm not drunk! But I am very sad and I was pouring out my heart to the Lord. Please don't think I am just some drunken bum!"
"In that case," Eli said, "cheer up! May the Lord God of Israel grant you your petition, whatever it is!"

Virtues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisdom - good judgement</th>
<th>Justice - regulates person to person relationships</th>
<th>Self-control - restrains impulses</th>
<th>Courage - goes beyond difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td>Moderation - eating and drinking only what is needed.</td>
<td>Generosity - gives even if it hurts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Modesty - not overemphasizing sexual appetite.</td>
<td>Patience - can wait it out for a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obedience - gives to others what is owed them.</td>
<td>Humility - not overrating self.</td>
<td>Honour - will not give in for the lesser but aims for the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty - holds to what is right and true.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect - the other is given consideration above self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covetousness - desire to unrightfully possess.</th>
<th>Pride - thinking better of yourself than is true.</th>
<th>Laziness - not willing to work.</th>
<th>Anger - violent revengeful emotion, Hot displeasure.</th>
<th>Gluttony - excessive eating and drinking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lust - sexual craving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envy-discontent, jealousy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greed - want more than is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dilemma

The Real Race

Theo never considered himself a prejudiced person. He gets along with everyone and tries to be respectful of different people. But lately he’s beginning to wonder. Recently, the school boundary lines have been redrawn in his town. Now Theo attends a school with kids from different racial backgrounds. Since the beginning of school several fights have broken out between different racial groups. Theo has not been personally involved in any fight, but today, as he was walking home, a group of kids of another race called him names.

The more Theo thinks about the incident, the angrier he becomes. He didn’t even know any of those kids. How dare they say those sorts of things about him? Without realising it, Theo begins thinking badly of them and about how he can get back at them. He has been invited to a party this weekend, which he was planning to attend. Now he doesn’t think he wants to. After all, some of “those kinds” of kids will be there. Theo isn’t sure he wants to mingle with them. What do you think Theo should do?


Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for and against the action you would take:

Virtue or Vice:
Circle the virtue or vice you think your action is showing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Vice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Covetous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>Laziness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gluttony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write down the Value statement the positive action is supporting.

What is your final decision for action?
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**Bible Verses:**

John 4: 4-10 ... 27-30

Now he had to go through Samaria. So he came to a town in Samaria called Sychar, near the plot of ground Jacob had given to his son Joseph. Jacob's well was there, and Jesus, tired as he was from the journey, sat down by the well. It was about the sixth hour. When a Samaritan woman came to draw water, Jesus said to her, "Will you give me a drink?" (His disciples had gone into the town to buy food.) The Samaritan woman said to him, "You are a Jew and I am a Samaritan woman. How can you ask me for a drink?" (For Jews do not associate with Samaritans.) Jesus answered her, "If you knew the gift of God and who it is that asks you for a drink, you would have asked him and he would have given you living water."

Just then his disciples returned and were surprised to find him talking with a woman. But no one asked, "What do you want?" or "Why are you talking with her?" Then, leaving her water jar, the woman went back to the town and said to the people, "Come, see a man who told me everything I ever did. Could this be the Christ?" They came out of the town and made their way toward him.

---

**Virtues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisdom - good judgement</th>
<th>Justice - regulates person to person relationships</th>
<th>Self-control - restrains impulses</th>
<th>Courage - goes beyond difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td>Moderation - eating and drinking only what is needed.</td>
<td>Generosity - gives even if it hurts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Modesty - not overemphasizing sexual appetite.</td>
<td>Patience - can wait it out for a result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience - gives to others what is owed them.</td>
<td>Humility - not overrating self.</td>
<td>Honour - will not give in for the lesser but aims for the better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty - holds to what is right and true.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect - the other is given consideration above self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Vices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covetousness - desire to unrightfully possess.</th>
<th>Pride - thinking better of yourself than is true.</th>
<th>Laziness - not willing to work.</th>
<th>Anger - violent revengeful emotion. Hot displeasure.</th>
<th>Gluttony - excessive eating and drinking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lust - sexual craving.</td>
<td>Envy - discontent, jealousy.</td>
<td>Greed - want more than is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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The Star Player

Howard is the undisputed star of the basketball team. In fact, in an area where basketball is followed with a passion, Howard is the best player around. He has the potential to be named Mr. Basketball of the state, and will be able to play State Team basketball wherever he wants. Some people even think that with hard work, Howard will be able to make the NBL. Unfortunately Howard has already adopted the attitude of a superstar.

On the court, Howard keeps up a steady stream of trash talk. Not only does he try to outplay his opponents, but he goes out of his way to humiliate them. Howard often embarrasses his own team with his showboat antics. A few of his teammates have tried to tell him to tone down his cocky attitude, but Howard dismisses such talk as jealousy.

The word is out that a State Team scout will be at the game tonight. Howard has been bragging all week to his teammates that the scouts are coming only to see him play. Right before the game, the team captain informs Howard that if he trash talks against the other team and tries to showboat, his teammates will do whatever they can to keep the ball away from him - even if it means losing the game. Howard is floored. What do you think he should do?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reasons for and against the action you would take: |
|-------|--------|
| For   | Against|
|       |        |
|       |        |
|       |        |
|       |        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtue or Vice:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circle the virtue or vice you think your action is showing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Write down the Value statement the positive action is supporting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
What is your final decision for action?

Bible Verse:

Isa 30:15
This is what the Sovereign Lord, the Holy One of Israel, says: “In repentance and rest is your salvation, in quietness and trust is your strength, but you would have none of it.”

Virtues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisdom- good judgement</th>
<th>Justice - regulates person to person relationships</th>
<th>Self-control - restrains impulses</th>
<th>Courage - goes beyond difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Moderation - eating and drinking only what is needed.</td>
<td>Generosity - gives even if it hurts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience - gives to others what is owed them.</td>
<td>Honesty - holds to what is right and true.</td>
<td>Modesty - not overemphasizing sexual appetite.</td>
<td>Patience - can wait it out for a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect - the other is given consideration above self.</td>
<td>Humility - not overrating self.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honour - will not give in for the lesser but aims for the better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covetousness - desire to unrightfully possess.</th>
<th>Pride - thinking better of yourself than is true.</th>
<th>Laziness - not willing to work.</th>
<th>Anger - violent revengeful emotion. Hot displeasure.</th>
<th>Gluttony - excessive eating and drinking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lust - sexual craving.</td>
<td>Envy - discontent, jealousy.</td>
<td>Greed - want more than is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dilemma
Show a Little Respect
The boys at Ginny’s school are hopping mad. The other day the principal announced that there would be no more class trips this year. It seems that on the last school trip, half a dozen students decided to leave their group and go their own way instead. They got lost, and the teachers and chaperones spent several frantic hours searching for them. Those students were punished individually, but the principal cancelled all the other trips for this year.

As editor of the school newspaper, Ginny is receiving letter after letter from angry students about this new policy. Some of the letters offer helpful ideas. Others are downright nasty and disrespectful. Ginny is pressured by her newspaper staff and her friends to run some of the letters – the nastier, the better. Ginny doesn't agree with the principal’s decision, and she is disappointed. One of her classes was supposed to go to the new water park this spring as a part of its science project, but now the class can’t go. Ginny has to admit many of the nastier letters are pretty funny, but she wonders if it is right to print them. What do you think Ginny should do?


Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for and against the action you would take:

Virtue or Vice:
Circle the virtue or vice you think your action is showing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Vice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Covetous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>Laziness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gluttony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write down the Value statement the positive action is supporting.
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What is your final decision for action?

Bible Verse:

1 Peter 2:13,14
Submit yourselves for the Lord's sake to every authority instituted among men: whether to the king, as the supreme authority, or to governors, who are sent by him.

Virtues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisdom - good judgement</th>
<th>Justice - regulates person to person relationships</th>
<th>Self-control - restrains impulses</th>
<th>Courage - goes beyond difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Obedience - gives to others what is owed them.</td>
<td>Moderation - eating and drinking only what is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Obedience - gives to others what is owed them.</td>
<td>Honesty - holds to what is right and true.</td>
<td>Modesty - not overemphasizing sexual appetite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Obedience - gives to others what is owed them.</td>
<td>Honesty - holds to what is right and true.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect - the other is given consideration above self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humility - not overrating self.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covetousness - desire to unrightfully possess.</th>
<th>Pride - thinking better of yourself than is true.</th>
<th>Laziness - not willing to work.</th>
<th>Anger - violent revengeful emotion. Hot displeasure.</th>
<th>Gluttony - excessive eating and drinking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lust - sexual craving.</td>
<td>Envy - discontent, jealousy.</td>
<td>Greed - want more than is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Dilemma**

The Group Project

Every year, Dalton's school sponsors a science fair. This year, the students in Dalton’s science class are assigned to a group project. Each group has been given broad guidelines for the project and instructions on how to do it. But the instructions are very specific about one thing — each member of the group must contribute to the project. At the first group meeting, Dalton was selected to head the project team. It took the group the rest of the meeting time to select a topic, assign different parts of the project to various team members, and set up a schedule to complete the project on time.

During the first several meetings in the early phases of the project, it became obvious to Dalton that one member of the group was not pulling his weight. The boy never came to the first meeting. The second time, he came late and had forgotten his materials. Dalton let it slide because there was still plenty of time to complete the project. But now the project is due in two weeks, and the boy still has yet to do his part. The rest of the group is grumbling and demanding that Dalton do something about it. Dalton realizes that something needs to be done, but he doesn’t know what to do. What do you think he should do?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reasons for and against the action you would take: |
|---------|---------|
| For     | Against |
|         |         |
|         |         |
|         |         |
|         |         |

Virtue or Vice:

Circle the virtue or vice you think your action is showing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Vice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom Justice</td>
<td>Covetous Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>Laziness Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Gluttony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write down the Value statement the positive action is supporting.

|                                |
|                                |
|                                |
|                                |
|                                |
What is your final decision for action?

Bible Verse:

1 Thessalonians 5:14

And we urge you, brothers, warn those who are idle, encourage the timid, help the weak, be patient with everyone.

Virtues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisdom - good judgement</th>
<th>Justice - regulates person to person relationships</th>
<th>Self-control - restrains impulses</th>
<th>Courage - goes beyond difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td>Moderation - eating and drinking only what is needed.</td>
<td>Generosity - gives even if it hurts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Modesty - not overemphasizing sexual appetite.</td>
<td>Patience - can wait it out for a result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience - gives to others what is owed them.</td>
<td>Humility - not overrating self.</td>
<td>Honour - will not give in for the lesser but aims for the better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty - holds to what is right and true.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect - the other is given consideration above self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covetousness - desire to unrightfully possess.</th>
<th>Pride - thinking better of yourself than is true.</th>
<th>Laziness - not willing to work.</th>
<th>Anger - violent revengeful emotion. Hot displeasure.</th>
<th>Gluttony - excessive eating and drinking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lust - sexual craving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envy - discontent, jealousy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greed - want more than is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dilemma
Moving On
Darren knows it is trouble when his dad calls a family meeting. As soon as he sits down at the kitchen table, he knows what’s coming. “Well, kids,” his father begins, “I just got this great promotion ....” A groan goes up from his brothers and sisters. “Oh no!” “Do we have to move?” “You promised this was the last time,” the chorus goes on. But after the initial din, it becomes clear that Darren and his family are moving before the end of the school year.

Darren is angry and confused. He doesn’t want to move – that much he knows. He just got into the honour band; he made the football team; he’s had a lot of friends. How could dad do this to him? What if his new school doesn’t have a band program – or at least one like his school does now? What kinds of kids go to the new school? What if they don’t like him? Where will they go to church, and what if they don’t have a youth group like his church does? The countless questions swirl in his mind. He just doesn’t know what to do with this bombshell. What do you think Darren should do?


Actions

Reasons for and against the action you would take:

Virtue or Vice:
Circle the virtue or vice you think your action is showing.

Virtue | Vice
--- | ---
Wisdom | Covetous
Justice | Pride
Self-control | Laziness
Courage | Anger
Gluttony

Write down the Value statement the positive action is supporting.
What is your final decision for action?

---

**Bible Verse:**

1 Peter 5:7
Cast all your anxiety on him because he cares for you.

Phil. 4:19
And my God will meet all your needs according to his glorious riches in Christ Jesus.

---

**Virtues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisdom - good judgement</th>
<th>Justice - regulates person to person relationships</th>
<th>Self-control - restrains impulses</th>
<th>Courage - goes beyond difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Moderation - eating and drinking only what is needed.</td>
<td>Generosity - gives even if it hurts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Modesty - not overemphasizing sexual appetite.</td>
<td>Patience - can wait it out for a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Humility - not overrating self.</td>
<td>Honour - will not give in for the lesser but aims for the better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Vices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covetousness - desire to unrightfully possess.</th>
<th>Pride - thinking better of yourself than is true.</th>
<th>Laziness - not willing to work.</th>
<th>Anger - violent revengeful emotion. Hot displeasure.</th>
<th>Gluttony - excessive eating and drinking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lust - sexual craving.</td>
<td>Envy - discontent, jealousy.</td>
<td>Greed - want more than is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Dilemma

The Walking Trail or Trial?

Tim and Jayden have been planning their camping trip for weeks. Firstly they settled on a free weekend and got their parents permission. Next they mapped out their walking trail. They would start in the Forrest Reserve and on Sunday go up to Thompson’s Peak in the National Park, then back down the mountain onto the other side of the Forrest Reserve. There was no camping allowed in the National Park but they would only be passing through. They planned their menu and over the next week bought the canned, packeted and dried foods they would need. A week in advance they got together and filled their back-paks checking off each item as they went – they were prepared.

The walk through the forest on the following Saturday proved to be tougher than they had thought, the slope leading up to the base of Thompson’s Peak was greater than it appeared on the maps. One thing about it, after a good meal on Saturday night, they slept well. They knew when they crossed into the National Park, the signs reminded them of no camping and litter fines. By the time they got even halfway up the peak their back-paks were beginning to feel like lead weights. It was then that Jayden realized they were carrying more weight than they needed. Most of their canned and packet food was eaten but they were still carrying the empty containers because there weren’t any bins. Jayden proposed that they bury the rubbish to lighten their load. Tim felt uneasy about this. The sign clearly said “No Littering”. Jayden argued, it wasn’t littering, they were burying it – besides the packets would rot away. “What about the tin cans?” asked Tim, “them too – eventually!” Jayden replied, “and we could tie the plastic bags to a tree because they break down in sunlight.” Tim sure didn’t want to carry more than he had to or look stupid in front of his friend by carrying rubbish all the way home, what do you think Tim should do?

Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for and against the action you would take:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virtue or Vice:

Circle the virtue or vice you think your action is showing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Vice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Covetous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>Laziness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gluttony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Write down the Value statement the positive action is supporting.


What is your final decision for action?


Bible Verse:

**Genesis 2: 15**
The Lord God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and **take care** of it.

---

**Virtues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wisdom</strong>- good judgement</th>
<th><strong>Justice</strong> - regulates person to person relationships</th>
<th><strong>Self-control</strong> - restrains impulses</th>
<th><strong>Courage</strong> - goes beyond difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty - sticks by others.</td>
<td>Moderation - eating and drinking only what is needed.</td>
<td>Generosity - gives even if it hurts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility - can be trusted</td>
<td>Modesty - not overemphasizing sexual appetite.</td>
<td>Patience - can wait it out for a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obedience - gives to others what is owed them.</td>
<td>Humility - not overrating self.</td>
<td>Honour - will not give in for the lesser but aims for the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty - holds to what is right and true.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect - the other is given consideration above self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Vices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Covetousness</strong> - desire to unrightfully possess.</th>
<th><strong>Pride</strong> - thinking better of yourself than is true.</th>
<th><strong>Laziness</strong> - not willing to work.</th>
<th><strong>Anger</strong> - violent revengeful emotion. Hot displeasure.</th>
<th><strong>Gluttony</strong> - excessive eating and drinking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lust - sexual craving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envy-discontent, jealousy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greed - want more than is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Appendix Three: Instructions for Use of the SROM – Original

May 1984
The Ohio State University

Instructions for Use of the Sociomoral Reflection Objective Measure

The Sociomoral Reflection Objective Measure (SROM) is designed to provide an at least moderate-validity estimate of an individual's (Kohlberg-type) moral judgment stage level where accomplishment of a high-validity assessment through use of a production measure (the Moral Judgment Interview, Colby, Kohlberg, Speicher-Dubin, Gibbs, Candee, Power, Hewer, & Kaufman, in press; or, the Sociomoral Reflection Measure, Gibbs & Widaman, 1982) is not feasible (due to time or resource limitations). The reliability and validity of the SROM are acceptable for most adolescent and adult populations (see Gibbs, Arnold, Morgan, Schwartz, & Gavaghan, 1984). Because the SROM elicits recognitory rather than production self-report responses (specifically, multiple-choice self-ascriptions of moral justification rather than oral or written moral justifications), moral judgment stage assessment though its use requires only arithmetic computation rather than trained inference work. The bias problem of such recognitory self-report data is reduced through use of certain rules for excluding suspect data (see below).

The SROM questionnaire is titled “Social Reflection Questionnaire.” Subjects respond to 16 multiple-choice arrays. For example, for the SRM affiliation (marriage and friendship) norm, the first stimulus array is as follows.

1. What if Heinz's wife asks him to steal the drug for her? Should Heinz:
   - steal / not steal / not sure (circle one)?

1a. How important is it for a husband to do what his wife asks, to save her by stealing, even when he isn't sure whether that's the best thing to do?
   - very important / important / not important (circle one)

1b. Let's say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for a husband to do that. What reason would you give? Is any of the following reasons close to the one you would give? (If a reason is too hard to understand, seems silly, or makes no sense, just circle "not close," or "not sure."

   a. because it's his wife, and she told him to do it, so he should do what she says.  
      close / not close/ not sure (circle one)

   b. because he married her and if he didn't want to help her, why did he marry her in the first place?
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   c. because they may have formed together a deep mutual commitment.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   d. because a good husband is expected to help his wife through sickness and health.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   e. because he cannot recognize her without acceptance.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   f. because he has accepted a responsibility as her husband.
      close / not close / nor sure (circle one)

1c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:
   - a b c d e f (circle one)
Most options on the b components of the SROM questions are representative of a Kohlbergian sociomoral stage (1-5; a sixth option consists of a marginally or pseudomeaningful and sophisticated-sounding justification; cf. Rest, 1979). For question 1b of the illustration item, option a embodies Stage 1; option b, Stage 2; c, Stage 3; d, Stage 3; e, pseudo; and f, Stage 4.

Administration

The SROM can be administered with valid results to subjects at least as young as 14 years (ninth grade), and probably as young as 12 years (seventh grade), unless they are deficient in reading skills (as are, for example, many juvenile delinquents). A 50-minute period is usually ample time for most subjects to complete the questions. Subjects typically complete the questionnaire without having to ask questions. Occasionally, a subject will ask the meaning of a word; refer the subject to the instruction to circle as "not close" or "not sure" reasons that are "too hard to understand."

Scoring

The four steps of SROM scoring are: (1) computing the mean stage of the options selected as "close"; (2) computing the mean stage of the options selected as "closest"; (3) determining protocol eligibility; and (4) computing the SROM indices.

Step 1: Computing the Mean Stage Of the Options Selected as "Close"

For each question array, circle on the score sheet (attached) the letter(s) of the option or options (among a through f) for which the "close" label has been circled.

Based on the option information, make an entry (dash, pseudo, or stage value) for each question array under the "close' stage selections" column. If no options have been designated "close," then just enter a dash. If one of the options circled "close" is the array's "pseudo" option, then enter only a "ps" (for "pseudo")—even if stage-associated options have also been selected as close. (Rationale: If the respondent was careless enough to fall for the pseudo option, then the neighboring selections are of dubious validity. Use of this exclusion rule, like the others stated below, did in fact optimize SROM validity; see Gibbs et al., 1984.) If one option has been selected as close, then enter the stage number corresponding to that option. If more than one option has been selected as close (unless the array includes the pseudo as close), then compute the mean of the stage values corresponding to those options and enter the stage mean.

After making an entry in the "close" column for all 16 questions, you should then compute the grand mean of the "close" stage values and enter it appropriately in the SROMS formulas (see Step 4) on the bottom of the score sheet.

Step 2: Computing the Mean Stage Of the Options Selected as "Closest"

For each question array, circle on the score sheet the letter of the option (or, in rare cases, letters of the options) selected as "closest."

Based on the option information, make an entry (dash, pseudo, or stage value) for each question array under the "closest' stage selection" column. Enter a "dash" if: (a) no option has been selected as "closest"; (b) more than two stage-associated options have been selected as "closest"; (c) the pseudo option in the array was selected as "close" (extension of Step 1 exclusion rule); or (d) none of the options in the array was selected as "close" (rationale: If the respondent has judged none of the options in the array to be self-descriptive, then the "closest" selection could not have much validity). Enter a "ps" if the option corresponding to "pseudo" has been selected as "closest." Enter a mean stage value in the (rare) event that two stage-associated options have been selected as closest.

Note: For data coding purposes, do not use protocol screening results. Omit them from the SROM indices.
After making an entry in the "closest" column for all 16 questions, you should then compute the grand mean of the "closest" stage values and enter it appropriately in the SROMS rules (see Step 4) on the bottom of the score sheet.

3: Determining Eligibility of the Protocol

The protocol should be dropped if it contains an excess of pseudo or missing data. Consider the protocol ineligible for index computation if 7 or more pseudo's are evident in the see column, or if 3 or more pseudo's are evident in the "closest" column. Also, valid rows must contain at least 5 fully valid arrays (i.e., arrays with stage entries in both see and "closest" columns).

4: Computing the SROMS index

If the protocol meets the eligibility rules, then the SROM indices should be computed. The primary index value is the Sociomoral Reflection Objective Maturity Score (SROMS), which can range from 100 (minimum Stage 1) to 500 (maximum Stage 5). The SROMS represents a weighted average of the "close" column mean (Step 1) with the "closest" column mean (Step 2). The formula is given below.

\[ \text{SROM} = \frac{100 \times (1) \text{"close" stage mean} + (2) \text{"closest" stage mean}}{3} \]

On the average, SROMS scores exceed production-measure scores by approximately 1/2 to 1 stage for college or adult subjects, two-thirds stage for high school subjects. Information is important for researchers using the SROM to obtain an indirect estimate of an individual's producible moral judgment level. The table below (adapted from Gibbs et al., 1984) provides guidelines for such inferences, e.g., an 18 year-old is likely to score 55 points or less on a production measure (the Sociomoral Reflection Measure) than on the SROM.

Table 1

Comparison of the SROM with SRM by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Years of Age</th>
<th>Mean SROMS</th>
<th>Mean SRMS</th>
<th>Signeda</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>323.75</td>
<td>254.13</td>
<td>69.63</td>
<td>69.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>354.95</td>
<td>299.72</td>
<td>55.22</td>
<td>55.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>381.88</td>
<td>343.71</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>39.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>350.02</td>
<td>293.85</td>
<td>56.17</td>
<td>57.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aAll signed discrepancies entail a higher mean SROMS rating.
The other index value from the SROM is Global Stage. Determine Global Stage from iROMS (use Table 2 below) and enter on score sheet.

Table 2
Conversion of SROMS to Global Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SROMS</th>
<th>Global Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 - 125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 - 149</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 - 174</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 - 225</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226 - 249</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 - 274</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275 - 325</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326 - 349</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 - 374</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375 - 425</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426 - 449</td>
<td>4(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450 - 474</td>
<td>5(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475 - 500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Close Stage</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Closest Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Problem One**

**Global Stage:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Close Stage</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Closest Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Problem Two**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Close Stage</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Closest Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{SRoms} = 100 \times \frac{1(\text{___}) + 2(\text{___})}{3}
\]
Appendix Four: Instructions for Use of the SROM – Modified

Instructions for Use of the Sociomoral Reflection Objective Measure
Modified for use with the 1999 Revised SROM.

The Sociomoral Reflection Objective Measure (SROM) is designed to provide an at least moderate-validity estimate of an individual's (Kohlberg-type) moral judgment stage level where accomplishment of a high-validity assessment through use of a production measure (the Moral Judgment Interview, Colby, Kohlberg, Speicher-Dubin, Gibbs, Candee, Power, Hewer, & Kaufman, in press; or, the Sociomoral Reflection Measure, Gibbs & Widaman, 1982) is not feasible (due to time or resource limitations). The reliability and validity of the SROM are acceptable for most adolescent and adult populations (see Gibbs, Arnold, Morgan, Schwartz, & Gavaghan, 1984). Because the SROM elicits recognitory rather than production self-report responses (specifically, multiple-choice self-ascriptions of moral justification rather than oral or written moral justifications), moral judgment stage assessment though its use requires only arithmetic computation rather than trained inference work. The bias problem of such recognitory self-report data is reduced through use of certain rules for excluding suspect data (see below).

The SROM questionnaire is titled "Social Reflection Questionnaire." Subjects respond to 10 multiple-choice arrays. For example, for the SRM affiliation (marriage and friendship) norm, the first stimulus array is as follows.

1. Robert asked John to, “do whatever it takes to save me”. Should John steal the car because of what Robert has said?

   steal / not steal / not sure (circle one)

1a. How important is it to do what your best friend asks if it’s to save your friend by stealing?

   very important / important / not important (circle one)

1b. Let’s say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT to do what a best friend has asked, if it’s to save your friend. What reason would you give? Are any of the following reasons close to the one you would give? (If a reason is too hard to understand, seems silly, or makes no sense, just circle “not close” or “not sure”.) Please circle one of the responses for every possibility from a through to f.

   Do not put responses in the boxes marked “Office Use” - leave them blank.
It is important for John to do what his best friend has asked, if it’s to save his best friend:

a) because it’s John’s best friend, and he told John to do it, so John should do what his best friend says.  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

b) because John made a promise (to stand by his best friend). (If John didn’t want to help him, John shouldn’t have promised in the first place.)  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

c) because they may have formed a deep commitment to one another.  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

d) because a best friend is expected to help through thick and thin, good times and bad.  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

e) because John could not recognise him without acceptance.  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

f) because John accepted a responsibility as a best friend.  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

1c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the best reason is:

   a  b  c  d  e  f  (circle one)

Most options on the b components of the SROM questions are representative of a Kolbergian sociomoral stage (1-5; a sixth option consists of a marginally or pseudomeaningful sophisticated-sounding justification; cf. Rest, 1979). For question 1b of the illustration item, option ‘a’ embodies Stage 1; option ‘b’, Stage 2; ‘c’, Stage 5; ‘d’, Stage 3; ‘e’, pseudo; and ‘f’, Stage 4.

Administration

The SROM can be administered with valid results to subjects at least as young as 14 years (ninth grade), and probably as young as 12 years (seventh grade), unless they are deficient in reading skills (as are, for example, many juvenile delinquents). A 30-minute period is usually ample time for most subjects to complete the questions. Subjects typically complete questionnaire without having to ask questions. Occasionally, a subject will ask the meaning of a word; refer the subject to the instruction to circle as “not close” or “not sure” reasons that are “too hard to understand.”
Scoring

The four steps of SROM scoring are: (1) computing the mean stage of the options selected as "close"; (2) computing the mean stage of the options selected as "best"; (3) determining protocol eligibility; and (4) computing the SROM indices.

Step 1: Computing the Mean Stage Of the Options Selected as "Close"

For each question array, circle on the score sheet (attached) the letter(s) of the option or options (among a through t) for which the "close" label has been circled.

Based on the option information, make an entry (dash, pseudo, or stage value) for each question array under the "close" stage selections column. If no options have been designated "close," then just enter a dash. If one of the options circled "close" is the array's "pseudo" option, then enter only a "ps" (for "pseudo")—even if stage-associated options have also been selected as close. (Rationale: If the respondent was careless enough to fall for the pseudo option, then the neighboring selections are of dubious validity. Use of this exclusion rule, like the others stated below, did in fact optimize SROM validity; see Gibbs et al., 1984.) If one option has been selected as close, then enter the stage number corresponding to that option. If more than one option has been selected as close (unless the array includes the pseudo as close), then compute the mean of the stage values corresponding to those options and enter the stage mean.

After making an entry in the "close" column for all 10 questions, you should then compute the grand mean of the "close" stage values and enter it appropriately in the SROMS formulas (see Step 4).

Step 2: Computing the Mean Stage Of the Options Selected as "Best"

For each question array, circle on the score sheet the letter of the option (or, in rare cases, letters of the options) selected as "best".

Based on the option information, make an entry (dash, pseudo, or stage value) for each question array under the "best" stage selection column. Enter a "dash" if: (a) no option has been selected as "best"; (b) more than two stage-associated options have been selected as "best"; (c) the pseudo option in the array was selected as "close" (extension of Step 1 exclusion rule); or (d) none of the options in the array was selected as "close" (rationale: If the respondent has judged none of the options in the array to be self-descriptive, then the "best" selection could not have much validity). Enter a "ps" if the option corresponding to "pseudo" has been selected as "best." Enter a mean stage value in the (rare) event that two stage-associated options have been selected as best.

After making an entry in the "best" column for all 10 questions, you should then compute the grand mean of the "best" stage values and enter it appropriately in the SROMS formulas (see Step 4).
Step 3: Determining Eligibility of the Protocol

The protocol should be dropped if it contains an excess of pseudo or missing data. Consider the protocol ineligible for index computation if 4 or more pseudo's are evident in the "close" column, or if 2 or more pseudo's are evident in the "best" column. Also, valid protocols must contain at least 3 fully valid arrays (i.e., arrays with stage entries in both "close" and "best" columns).

Step 4: Computing the SROMS index

If the protocol meets the eligibility rules, then the SROM indices should be computed. The primary index value is the Sociomoral Reflection Objective Maturity Score (SROMS), which can range from 100 (minimum Stage 1) to 500 (maximum Stage 5). The SROMS represents a weighted average of the "close" column mean (Step 1) with the "closest" column mean (Step 2). The formula is given below.

\[ SROM = 100 \times \frac{1}{3} \times ("close" \text{ stage mean}) + 2 \times ("best" \text{ stage mean}) \]

On the average, SROMS scores exceed production-measure scores by approximately 112 stage (one-third stage for college or adult subjects, two-thirds stage for high school subjects). This information is important for researchers using the SROM to obtain an indirect estimate of a subject's producible moral judgment level. The table below (adapted from Gibbs et al., 1984, p.533) provides guidelines for such inferences, e.g., an 18 year-old is likely to score 55 points lower on a production measure (the Sociomoral Reflection Measure) than on the SROM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Years of Age</th>
<th>Mean SROMS</th>
<th>Mean SRMS</th>
<th>Signed*</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>323.75</td>
<td>254.13</td>
<td>69.63</td>
<td>69.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>354.95</td>
<td>299.72</td>
<td>55.22</td>
<td>55.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>381.88</td>
<td>343.71</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>39.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>350.02</td>
<td>293.85</td>
<td>56.17</td>
<td>57.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All signed discrepancies entail a higher mean SROMS rating.

The other index value from the SROM is Global Stage. Determine Global Stage from SROMS (use Table 2 below).
### Table 2

**Conversion of SROM Moral Maturity Scores to Kohlbergian Moral Stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Maturity Scores</th>
<th>Kohlbergian Global Moral Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 - 125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 - 149</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 - 174</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 - 225</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226 - 249</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 - 274</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275 - 325</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326 - 349</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 - 374</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375 - 425</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426 - 449</td>
<td>4(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450 - 474</td>
<td>5(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475-500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more highly graduated scale of Kohlbergian moral stage has been applied to distinguish the transition between stages. Thus, a stage such as 1(2) means stage 1 with a few elements of stage 2 moral reasoning being presented. A stage represented as 2(1) means stage 1 reasoning is being used with a strong tendency towards stage 2 but insufficiently so to be fully stage 2 moral reasoning.
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Appendix Five: Original & Modified Sociomoral Reflection Objective Measure

Original SROM Social Reflection Questionnaire

Instructions

In this booklet are two social problems with questions for you to answer. We are asking the questions not just to find out your opinions about what should be done in the problems, but also to understand why you have those opinions. Please answer all the questions.

Name: ____________________________
Age: ____________________________
Sex (circle one): male/female
Father's job: ____________________________
                        ____________________________
Mother's job: ____________________________
                        ____________________________
Date: ____________________________

(code#: ____________ )
Problem One

In Europe, a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist wanted people to pay ten times what the drug cost him to make.

The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about half of what the druggist wanted. Heinz told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or to let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No. I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So the only way Heinz could get the drug would be to break into the druggist's store and steal the drug.

Heinz has a problem. He should help his wife and save her life. But, on the other hand, the only way he could get the drug she needs would be to break the law by stealing the drug.

What should Heinz do?

should steal/should not steal/not sure (circle one)

Why?

Let's change things about the problem and see if you still have the opinion you circled above (should steal, should not steal, or not sure). Also, we want to find out about the things you think are important in this and other problems, especially why you think those things are important. Please answer all the questions.
1. What if Heinz's wife asks him to steal the drug for her? Should Heinz:
   steal / not steal / not sure (circle one)?

1a. How important is it for a husband to do what his wife asks, to save
    her by stealing, even when he isn't sure whether that's the best
    thing to do?
    very important / important / not important (circle one)

1b. Let's say you had to give a reason why it is important for a husband
    to do that. What reason would you give? Is any of the following
    reasons close to the one you would give? (If a reason is too hard
    to understand, seems silly, or makes no sense, just circle "not
    close," or "not sure.")
    a. because it's his wife, and she told him to do it, so he should
       do what she says.
       close / not close / not sure (circle one)
    b. because he married her and if he didn't want to help her, why
       did he marry her in the first place?
       close / not close / not sure (circle one)
    c. because they may have formed together a deep mutual commitment.
       close / not close / not sure (circle one)
    d. because the husband is expected to help his wife through sickness
       and health.
       close / not close / not sure (circle one)
    e. because he cannot recognize her without acceptance.
       close / not close / not sure (circle one)
    f. because he has accepted a responsibility as her husband.
       close / not close / not sure (circle one)

1c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the
    reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason
    that you would give) is:
    a b c d e f (circle one)

2. What if the person dying isn't Heinz's wife, but instead is a friend
   (and the friend can get no one else to help)? Should Heinz:
   steal / not steal / not sure (circle one)?

2a. How important is it to do everything you can, even break the law, to
    save the life of a friend?
    very important / important / not important (circle one)

2b. Let's say you had to give a reason why it is important for you to do
    that. What reason would you give? Is any of the following reasons
    close to the one you would give? (Treat these questions just as you
    did the last one. If a reason is too hard to understand, seems silly,
    or makes no sense, just circle "not close," or "not sure.")
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a. because your friend may have done things for you, so you should do a favor for the friend if you want your friend to help you in the future.  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

b. because a friendship must be based on mutual respect and cooperation.  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

c. because it's your friend, who might be an important person.  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

d. because you would feel close to your friend, and would expect that your friend would help you.  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

e. because you and your friend may have developed a total commitment to one another.  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

f. because the first requirement of affiliation is a relationship.  
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

2c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:  
   a  b  c  d  e  f (circle one)

3a. What about for a stranger? How important is it to do everything you can, even break the law, to save the life of a stranger?  
   very important / important / not important (circle one)

3b. Let's say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for you to do that. What reason would you give?  
   a. because you should always be nice.  
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   b. because life is the precondition to existence.  
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   c. because the stranger needs the drug, and anyone wants to live.  
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   d. because other rights or values should not take priority over the right to life.  
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   e. because life is sacred, and should be the basis for laws anyway.  
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   f. because life is precious, and it's inhuman to let anyone suffer when their life can be saved.  
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

3c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:  
   a  b  c  d  e  f (circle one)
4b. Let's say you had to give a second reason why it is important to do everything you can, even break the law, to save the life of a stranger. What reason would you give?
   a. because the stranger should have a chance to live, too, and might save your life some day.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b. because the stranger could be an important person, who owns a lot of property.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c. because a stranger's life should not be judged to be "worth" less than anyone else's life.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d. because the contract of life surpasses that of death.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e. because the right to life transcends the right to property.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f. because how would you feel if you were dying, and a stranger didn't help you?
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

4c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)

5. What if the druggist just wants Heinz to pay what the drug cost to make, and Heinz can't even pay that? Should Heinz?
   steal / not steal / not sure (circle one)

5a. How important is it for people not to take things that belong to other people?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)

5b. Let's say you had to give a reason WHY is it IMPORTANT for people not to do that. What reason would you give?
   a. because stealing is bad, and you will go to jail if you steal.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b. because it is selfish and heartless to steal from others.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c. because stealing gets you nowhere, and you are taking too much of a risk.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d. because character must constitute legal procedure.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e. because living in society means accepting obligations and not only benefits.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f. because acceptance of the property right is fundamental for any society.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

5c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)
6a. How important is it for people to obey the law?
very important / important / not important (circle one)

6b. Let's say you had to give a reason why it is important to obey the law. What reason would you give?
   a. because otherwise everyone will be stealing from everyone else, and nothing will be left. 
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b. because breaking the law would create a hierarchy. close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c. because the law is ideally founded upon universal human rights. close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d. because the law is for you to follow and you should always obey it. close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e. because laws make society possible, and otherwise the system would break down. close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f. because otherwise the world would go crazy, and there would be chaos. close / not close / not sure (circle one)

6c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is: a. b. c. d. e. f. (circle one)

7. What if Heinz does steal the drug? His wife does get better, but in the meantime, the police take Heinz and bring him to court. Should the judge:
   jail Heinz / let Heinz go free / not sure (circle one)

7a. How important is it for judges to go easy on people like Heinz?
very important / important / not important (circle one)

7b. Let's say you had to give a reason why it is important for judges to go easy on people like Heinz. What reason would you give?
   a. because she's his wife, and she told him to do it, so he did what she said. close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b. because the judge should understand that the husband acted out of love, and not out of selfishness, to save her life. close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c. because in any society, the primary function of the law should be to preserve human life. close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d. because the judge would have done it, too, if he needed to get the drug to keep his wife from dying. close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e. because justice should be tempered with mercy, especially where a life is involved. close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f. because the foundation for personal conviction transcends life. close / not close / not sure (circle one)

7c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is: a. b. c. d. e. f. (circle one)
8. What if Heinz tells the judge that he only did what his conscience told him to do? Should the judge:
   jail Heinz / let Heinz go free / not sure (circle one)

8a. How important is it for judges to go easy on people who have acted out of conscience?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)

8b. Let's say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for judges to go easy on people who have acted out of conscience. What reason would you give?
   a. because he couldn't help it, his conscience was too strong for him.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b. because conscience is predicated on leniency.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c. because his conscience told him to do it, so he had to do it.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d. because, in this case, the husband's conscience may be consistent with the common morality.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e. because the act of conscience affirmed a fundamental right.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f. because otherwise he wouldn't have been able to live with himself, knowing that he could have saved her and didn't.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

8c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)

9b. Let's say, instead, that you had to give a reason why it is NOT important for judges to go easy on lawbreakers who have acted out of conscience. What reason would you give for sending lawbreakers who have acted out of conscience to jail?
   a. because your conscience is only your mind, so you don't have to do what it says.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b. because the subjective nature of conscience is one reason why there must be standard laws.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c. because you should be able to handle your conscience.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d. because conscience isn't always right, you could have a warped mind.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e. because although Heinz was right to affirm life as a prior right, he must still see the viewpoint of the courts.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f. because conscience cannot be equated with belief.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

9c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)
10. What if Heinz's wife never had cancer? What if she was only a little sick, and Heinz stole the drug to help her get well a little sooner? Should the judge:

- jail Heinz
- let Heinz go free
- not sure (circle one)

10a. How important is it for judges to send people who break the law to jail?

- very important
- important
- not important (circle one)

10b. Let's say you had to give a reason *WHY* it is IMPORTANT for judges to send people who break the law to jail. What reason would you give?

- a. because if you take a risk and get caught, then you go to jail.
  - close
  - not close
  - not sure (circle one)
- b. because Heinz must have known that what he did was wrong.
  - close
  - not close
  - not sure (circle one)
- c. because Heinz must be prepared to be held accountable for his actions.
  - close
  - not close
  - not sure (circle one)
- d. because Heinz's case is a liability.
  - close
  - not close
  - not sure (circle one)
- e. because if one agrees to have law, one must also agree to have law enforcement.
  - close
  - not close
  - not sure (circle one)
- f. because Heinz stole something and stealing is bad.
  - close
  - not close
  - not sure (circle one)

10c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:

- a
- b
- c
- d
- e
- f (circle one)
Joe is a fourteen-year-old boy who wanted to go to camp very much. His father promised him he could go if he saved up the money for it himself. So Joe worked hard on his paper route and saved up the 40 dollars it cost to go to camp and a little more besides. But just before camp was going to start, his father changed his mind. Some of the father's friends decided to go on a special fishing trip, and Joe's father was short of the money it would cost. So he told Joe to give him the money Joe had saved from the paper route. Joe didn't want to give up going to camp, so he thinks of refusing to give his father the money.

Joe has a problem. Joe's father promised Joe he could go to camp if he earned and saved up the money. But, on the other hand, the only way Joe could go would be by disobeying and not helping his father.

What should Joe do?

should refuse / should not refuse / not sure (circle one)

Why?

Let's change things about the problem and see if you still have the opinion you circled above (should refuse, should not refuse, not sure). Also, we want to find out about the things you think are important in this and other problems, and especially why you think those things are important. Please answer all the questions.
la. How important is it for parents to keep their promises about letting their children keep money? 
very important / important / not important (circle one)

lb. Let's say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for parents to do that. What reason would you give?
   a. because parents should never break promises.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b. because the parents want the children to keep promises, so the parents should keep promises, too.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c. because children, no less than parents, are individuals with the fundamental human rights.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d. because if the parents act selfishly, the children would lose faith in them.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e. because parents who abuse their authority are not worthy of their children's respect.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f. because contracts necessitate promises between parents and children.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

lc. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)

2b. What about keeping a promise to a friend? Let's say you had to give a reason why it is important to keep a promise, if you can, to a friend. What reason would you give?
   a. because your friend may have done things for you, and you need friends.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b. because society must be based on trust.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c. because otherwise that person won't be your friend again.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d. because affiliation is the essence of friendship.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e. because otherwise you would lose trust in each other.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f. because keeping a promise upholds the other person's fundamental value.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

2c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)
b. What about keeping a promise to a stranger? Let's say you had to give a reason why it is important to keep a promise, if you can, to a stranger. What reason would you give?
   a. because otherwise the stranger will find out you were a tattletale and beat you up.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b. because then you can be proud of yourself, and keep from giving the impression that you are a selfish person.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c. because you just might run into that person again some time.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d. because it is important for the sake of your own integrity as well as the respect of others.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e. because the stranger's claims are just as important as those of any other individual.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f. because there is no interaction without affiliation.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

3c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)

4. What if Joe's father did not promise that Joe could keep the money? Should Joe:
   refuse / not refuse / not sure (circle one)

4a. How important is it for parents to let their children keep earned money, even when the children weren't promised that they could keep the money?
   very important / important / not sure (circle one)

4b. Let's say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for parents to do that. What reason would you give?
   a. because the child worked for the money, so it's his and he can do whatever he wants with it.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b. because without the individual there can be no commitment to parents or to children.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c. because the child deserves it after so much sacrifice, and taking the money would be cruel.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d. because the child's moral rights are of equal value to his parents'.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e. because if his money is taken, the child may cry.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f. because the child accepted a responsibility, and has a right to a fair return for his effort.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

4c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)
Let's say you had to give a **SECOND** reason why it is important for parents to let their children keep earned money, even when the children weren't promised that they could keep the money. What **SECOND** reason would you give?

a. because the child will be sad if they take the money.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

b. because without money the child can't have any fun.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

c. because the child's rights are tantamount to promises.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

d. because that way the child can achieve personal development as an individual.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

e. because that way the child can develop a sense of self-sufficiency and responsibility.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

f. because otherwise the child may just become lazy and selfishly take from others.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

5c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)

6. What if the father needs the money not to go on a fishing trip, but instead to pay for food for the family? Should Joe:
   refuse / not refuse / not sure (circle one)

6a. How important is it for children to help their parents—even when it means that the children won't get to do something they want to do?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)

6b. Let's say you had to give a reason **WHY** it is **IMPORTANT** for children to do that. What reason would you give?

a. because the parents may have done lots of favors for their children, and now they need the children to return a favor.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

b. because sometimes a contract between individuals must be broken for the sake of the common good.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

c. because filial relationships transcend the family.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

d. because children should always obey and help their parents.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

e. because the children should realize how much their parents have sacrificed for them.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

f. because the family must come before individual wishes where the family unit is at stake.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

6c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the closest to the reason that you would give (or the least far off from the reason that you would give) is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)
Instructions:
In this booklet is a social problem with questions for you to answer. The questions are being asked not just to find out your opinions about what should be done in the problems but also to understand why you have those opinions.
Please answer ALL the questions.

Name: __________________________
Age: __________________________
Sex: (circle one) male / female
Date: __________________________

Office Use Only
Code: __________________________
Robert and John are best of friends; they have even made a blood pact to stick with each other through thick and thin - right to the end. They arranged to be dropped off in a remote park for a camping weekend. After setting up the camp they began to explore, as Robert looked out over the edge of a low precipice he suddenly slipped and fell to the rocks below. John scrambled down and saw that his friend was seriously injured. Robert looked pleadingly at John and asked him to, "do whatever it takes to save me". Robert was losing consciousness and John knew he had to get help fast to prevent John from dying. The first place John found was a farmhouse with an automatic car parked outside. An old farmer answered John's rapping on the door. The farmer has no telephone and refuses to take John into the town or to go and get help. Even though John has his driver’s license the farmer will not let John use the car. After some persuasion the farmer agrees that he will take John into town for $50 but John only has $5, the farmer won’t go any cheaper and will not let John pay the difference later. John knows it is going to take too long to walk into town to get help and there are no other near neighbours. While talking to the farmer John notices that the car keys are just inside the unlocked door. Should he steal the keys and use the car in order to help his friend?

What should John do?

should steal / should not steal / not sure (circle one)

Why?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Let's change things about the problem and see if you still have the opinion you circled above (should steal, should not steal, or not sure). Also, we want to find out about the things you think are important in this and other problems, especially why you think those things are important. Please answer all the questions.

1. Robert asked John to, "do whatever it takes to save me". Should John steal the car because of what Robert has said?
   
   steal / not steal / not sure (circle one)

1a. How important is it to do what your best friend asks if it's to save your friend by stealing?
   
   very important / important / not important (circle one)

1b. Let's say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT to do what a best friend has asked, if it's to save your friend. What reason would you give? Are any of the following reasons close to the one you would give? (If a reason is too hard to understand, seems silly, or makes no sense, just circle "not close" or "not sure".)

   Please circle one of the responses for every possibility from a through to f.

   Do not put responses in the boxes marked "Office Use" - leave them blank.

   It is important for John to do what his best friend has asked, if it's to save his best friend:

   a) because it's John’s best friend, and he told John to do it, so John should do what his best friend says.
      
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   b) because John made a promise (to stand by his best friend). (If John didn't want to help him, John shouldn't have promised in the first place.)
      
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   c) because they may have formed a deep commitment to one another.
      
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   d) because a best friend is expected to help through thick and thin, good times and bad.
      
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   e) because John could not recognise him without acceptance.
      
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   f) because John accepted a responsibility as a best friend.
      
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

1c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the best reason is:

   a b c d e f (circle one)

   go on to the next page
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2. What if the person dying isn’t John’s best friend but instead is an acquaintance (a person you know well). Should John:

steal / not steal / not sure (circle one)

2a. How important is it to do everything you can, even break the law, to save the life of an acquaintance?

very important / important / not important (circle one)

2b. Let’s say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT to save the life of an acquaintance. What reason would you give? Are any of the following reasons close to the one you would give? (Treat these questions just as you did the last one. If a reason is too hard to understand, seems silly, or makes no sense, just circle “not close” or “not sure”.) Please circle one of the responses for every possibility from a through to f. Do not put responses in the boxes marked “Office Use” - leave them blank.

It is important to save the life of an acquaintance (a person you know well):

a) because your acquaintance may have done things for you, so you should help do a favour for the acquaintance if you want your acquaintance to help you in the future.

close / not close / not sure (circle one)

b) because an acquaintance must be based on respect for each other and co-operation.

close / not close / not sure (circle one)

c) because it’s your acquaintance, who might be an important person.

close / not close / not sure (circle one)

d) because you would feel close to an acquaintance, and would expect that your acquaintance would help you.

close / not close / not sure (circle one)

e) because you and your acquaintance may have developed a commitment to one another.

close / not close / not sure (circle one)

f) because the first requirement of affiliation is a relationship.

close / not close / not sure (circle one)

2c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the best reason is:

a b c d e f (circle one)
3a. What about for a stranger? How important is it to do everything you can, even break the law, to save the life of a stranger?

very important / important / not important  (circle one)

3b. Let’s say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for you to do everything you can to save the life of a stranger. What reason would you give?

a) because you should always be nice.
   close / not close / not sure  (circle one)

b) because you must live your life first before you can exist.
   close / not close / not sure  (circle one)

c) because the stranger needs help, and anyone wants to live.
   close / not close / not sure  (circle one)

d) because other rights are not more important than the right to life.
   close / not close / not sure  (circle one)

e) because life is sacred, and should be the basis for laws anyway.
   close / not close / not sure  (circle one)

f) because life is precious, and it’s inhuman to let anyone suffer when their life can be saved.
   close / not close / not sure  (circle one)

3c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the best reason is:

a b c d e f  (circle one)
Let's say you had to give a second reason why it is important to do everything you can, even break the law, to save the life of a stranger. What reason would you give?

a) because the stranger should have a chance to live too, and might save your life some day.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

b) because the stranger could be an important person who owns a lot of property.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

c) because a stranger's life should not be judged to be 'worth' less than anyone else's life.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

d) because being bound to life comes before death.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

e) because the right to life is more important than the right to property (like the farmer's car).
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

f) because if you were dying you would want a stranger to help you.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the best reason is:

a b c d e f (circle one)
5. What if the farmer just wants John to pay for what it would cost in petrol to go into town and back (about $10), and John can't even pay that? 

steal / not steal / not sure (circle one)

5a. How important is it for people not to take things that belong to other people? 

very important / important / not important (circle one)

5b. Let's say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for people not to take things that belong to other people. What reason would you give?

a) because stealing is bad and you will go to jail if you steal. 

   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

b) because it is selfish and heartless to steal from others. 

   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

c) because stealing gets you nowhere and you are taking too much of a risk. 

   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

d) because character makes up legal procedure. 

   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

e) because living in society means accepting looking after others, not just others looking after your things. 

   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

f) because acceptance of the right to own things is fundamental (essential) for any society. 

   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

5c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the best reason is: 

a b c d e f (circle one)
6a. How important is it for people to obey the law?

very important / important / not important (circle one)

6b. Let's say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT to obey the law. What reason would you give?

a) because otherwise everyone will be stealing from everyone else and nothing will be left.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

b) because breaking the law would create different grades of people.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

c) because the law aims to be founded upon human rights that all humans have.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

d) because the law is for you to follow and should always obey it.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

e) because laws make society possible, otherwise the system would break down.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

f) because the world would go crazy and there would be chaos.
   close / not close / not sure (circle one)

6c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the best reason is:

a b c d e f (circle one)
7. What if John does steal the car? His friend is rescued and gets better, but in the meantime the police take John and bring him to court. Should the judge:
   jail John / let John go free / not sure (circle one)

7a. How important is it for judges to go easy on people like John?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)

7b. Let's say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for judges to go easy on people like John. What reason would you give?
   a) because Robert is his best friend and John just did what Robert told him to.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b) because the judge should understand that John acted out of sacrificial love, not out of selfishness, to save Robert's life.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c) because in any society the first function of the law should be to preserve human life.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d) because the judge would have done it too, if they needed to get help to save their best friend from dying.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e) because justice should be considered alongside mercy, especially where a life is involved.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f) because the foundation for personal conviction is greater than life.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

7c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the best reason is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)
8. What if John tells the judge that he only did what he thought was the right thing to do? Should the judge:

   jail John / let John go free / not sure (circle one)

8a. How important is it for judges to go easy on people who have only done what they thought was right?

   very important / important / not important (circle one)

8b. Let’s say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for judges to go easy on people who only did what they thought was right. What reason would you give?

   a) because he couldn’t help it, his need to do what he thought was right was too strong for him.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   b) because what John thought was right is established on tolerance
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   c) because John felt he knew what was right so he had to do it.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   d) because, in this case, John may have been doing only what others would have thought was right as well.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   e) because the act of doing what he thought was right supported the right to life.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

   f) because otherwise he wouldn’t have been able to live with himself, knowing that he could have saved Robert and didn’t.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

8c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the best reason is:

   a b c d e f (circle one)
9b. Let's say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for judges not to go easy on lawbreakers who did what they thought was right. What reason would you give for sending to jail, lawbreakers who acted on what they thought was right?

- a) because your idea of what is right only comes from your mind, so you don't have to do what it says.
  
  close / not close / not sure (circle one)

- b) because it is only your idea of what is right, which could change, so there has to be standard laws.
  
  close / not close / not sure (circle one)

- c) because you did not have to do it even if you thought it was right.
  
  close / not close / not sure (circle one)

- d) because what you think is right isn't always right, you could have a mind that is not thinking straight.
  
  close / not close / not sure (circle one)

- e) because although John was correct, that life is important, he must still see the viewpoint of the courts.
  
  close / not close / not sure (circle one)

- f) because what you think is right is the same as what you know is wrong.
  
  close / not close / not sure (circle one)

9c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the best reason is:

a b c d e f (circle one)
10. What if Robert was not actually in a life threatening situation but had injured himself and John knew it. Should John steal the car in order to relieve Robert’s pain faster? Should the judge:
   jail John / let John go free / not sure (circle one)

10a. How important is it for judges to send people who break the law to jail?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)

10b. Let’s say you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for judges to send people who break the law to jail. What reason would you give?
   a) because if you take a risk and get caught, then you go to jail.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   b) because John must have known that what he did was wrong.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   c) because John must be prepared to be held accountable for his actions.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   d) because John’s case is a handicap.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   e) because if one agrees to have law, one must also agree to have law enforcement.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)
   f) because John stole something and stealing is bad.
      close / not close / not sure (circle one)

10c. Of all the above reasons, the reason which is the best reason is:
   a b c d e f (circle one)

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
Appendix Six: Analysis of Pilot Sample.

### Pre-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>SROM(Pre)</th>
<th>SROM(Post)</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1.857143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.81746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.27778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Post-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>SROM(Pre)</th>
<th>SROM(Post)</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.666667</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3.666667</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.50417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.65833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- **PS**: (pseudo response)  
- **No response**

### Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>SROM(Pre)</th>
<th>SROM(Post)</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>502.6</td>
<td>311.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>394.8</td>
<td>222.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>308.55</td>
<td>308.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>0.341603</td>
<td>0.341603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>305.55</td>
<td>305.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t-Test: Paired Two-Sample for Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>302.6</td>
<td>311.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>394.8</td>
<td>222.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.341603</td>
<td>0.341603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Variance</td>
<td>308.55</td>
<td>308.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-0.96627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</td>
<td>0.194313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
<td>2.131847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.388625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.776445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wednesday, September 08, 1999

TO: Parents of 8B Students.
RE: Values Appraisal.

Dear Parents of 8B Students,

There has been an increasing awareness of the importance of values in the school curriculum. The *Curriculum Framework* document includes values that all groups in our society consider as important to know and uphold. Christian values have long been an integral part of Rehoboth's distinctive from the state education system. As a part of my post-graduate studies I am exploring values within Rehoboth High School.

During Term 4, 8B students will be considering values as a short unit of work integrated into their English curriculum. I will be involved in this unit and will be undertaking to review the values expressed in the class and the development of values.

Could you please complete the 'Acknowledgement of Notice' slip below and return it to Mr. Fairclough by Wednesday, 15th September. If you have any further inquiries please contact me at the High School.

In Christ's Service,

Kelvin Fairclough

Acknowledgement of Notice

*I acknowledge receipt of the notice regarding the brief unit of work on values in Term 4 and the appraisal of values by Mr. Fairclough.*

Child's name: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________
Parents / Guardian
Wednesday, September 08, 1999

TO: Parents of Year 8 Students.
RE: Values Appraisal.

Dear Parents of Year 8 Students,

There has been an increasing awareness of the importance of values in the school curriculum. The Curriculum Framework document includes values that all groups in our society consider as important to know and uphold. Christian values have long been an integral part of Rehoboth’s distinctive from the state education system. As a part of my post-graduate studies I am exploring values within Rehoboth High School. In conjunction with these studies I will be undertaking to review the values expressed by the Year 8 cohort and the development of these values.

Could you please complete the, ‘Acknowledgement of Notice’ slip below and return it to Mr. Fairclough by Wednesday, 15th September. If you have any further inquiries please contact me at the High School.

In Christ’s Service,

Kelvin Fairclough

Acknowledgement of Notice
PLEASE RETURN TO MR. FAIRCLOUGH BY WEDNESDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER

I acknowledge receipt of the notice regarding the appraisal of values by Mr. Fairclough.

Child’s name: ____________________________

signature parents / guardian
14th October 1999

Mr Kelvin J Fairclough
10 Bernard Street
Kelmscott WA 6111

Dear Mr Fairclough

Code: 99-132
Title of Project: Assessing Moral Reasoning Development through Values Education within a Western Australian Independent School

Thank you for the additional information which you provided following the review of your proposal by the Committee for the Conduct of Ethical Research. This, together with the Principal's letter of support, has been considered by the Committee and I am pleased to advise that the project now complies with the provisions contained in the University's policy for the conduct of ethical research, and has been cleared for implementation.

Period of approval: From 14th October 1999 To 31st December 1999

With best wishes for success in your work.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

ROD CROthers
Executive Officer

Attachment: Conditions of Approval

cc. Dr W. Connell, Supervisor
Ms P. Prideaux, Executive Officer. Research & HD, Faculty of CSESS.
Appendix Eight: Oral Instructions For STROM

Oral Instructions

1. There are no right or wrong answers, therefore there is no point putting down what the person next door has chosen - that is their opinion, you must put down your opinion.

2. It is not a race - most students will finish in 30 minutes.

3. Read through question 1b on page 3. Notice how you must respond by choosing "close, not close or not sure". You must do that for all responses "a" through to "f".

4. In answering questions like 1c, you give your one best response.

5. We are not answering if a statement is right, but is it right in that situation? (this is to emphasized). For example, we are not just answering if it is right to steal, but is it right to steal under these circumstances?

6. Do not be concerned about the code, that will be filled in later. You must be sure to have your name in the space provided, please fill those details in now if you have not already done so.
Appendix Nine: Timetable for Each Session.

Timetable for Moral Development Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 minutes</td>
<td>Present the dilemma in written form. Students read through the dilemma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>Ask questions about the dilemma to ensure the students understand the content of the dilemma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 minutes</td>
<td>Students give options for action. (no lengthy discussions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>I discuss my opinion for action along with the Bible’s principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>Vote on what action to take.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Groups of 5 students that agree on the same action form - students discuss and note reasons for the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Whole group discussion on the reasons noted (Attack arguments not people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>Students add to their sheet any further arguments for and against their choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 minutes</td>
<td>Get students to try and put themselves into the scenario. Can anyone think of examples in real life (no names).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>Which virtue or vice do they think their decision reflects? Discuss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 minutes</td>
<td>What is the value that underscores the moral decision? Choose from a list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>Re-vote for a final decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>Closing comments. Ask, “what have you learnt?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Ten: SROM Results Table - Moral Maturity Scores

### Pre-Test Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>SROM Stage</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>365 4(3)</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.962964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>350 4(3)</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.777778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>364 4(3)</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>370 4(3)</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.777778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>308 3</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>390 4</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>291 3</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>366 4(3)</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>287 3</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>329 3(4)</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>315 3</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>331 3(4)</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>295 3</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>333 3(4)</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>388 4</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- PS (Pseudorandom) = no response
- ■■■■■ = no response

Students coded 26,29,31,33,34,36,43,45 were deleted because they had ineligible protocols - see Appendix 4, Step 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>ROM STAGE</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.146667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.395832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.066667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students coded 11,19,21,22,23 were deleted because they had ineligible protocols - see Appendix 4, Step 3.**

---

**Pre-Test Experimental Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>ROM STAGE</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page 157**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>SRGM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.28125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.77770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.666667</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.574076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.555550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.666667</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.691667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.141516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.666667</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.750559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.656000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.770523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.666667</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.820000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.444444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= PS (pseudo response)  = no response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>SROM</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.666667</td>
<td>3.666667</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.666667</td>
<td>3.666667</td>
<td>2.666667</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.333333</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= PS (pseudo response)  
= no response
### Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Maturity Score</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Maturity Score</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Control Group

**t-Test: Paired Two-Sample for Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>338.88279</td>
<td>354.230453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1202.05267</td>
<td>1199.62643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.54492693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Variance</td>
<td>1200.89355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-1.79800005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</td>
<td>0.04689489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
<td>1.76131014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.05376978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.14478669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experimental Group

**t-Test: Paired Two-Sample for Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>339.894847</td>
<td>344.765518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1032.91834</td>
<td>861.214938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.49426572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Variance</td>
<td>947.36664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-0.6679371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) one-tail</td>
<td>0.2558461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical one-tail</td>
<td>1.7390672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
<td>0.5132922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
<td>2.10931558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Twelve: Week by Week Observations.

Week by Week Observations

Week 1
Boys and girls polarized in their voting. The boys opting for keeping the monetary change and the girls opting to return it. Discussion was limited but there did not seem to be inhibitions in stating that they would be happy to do the wrong action. Deciding on a value from column one of the Core Agreed Values was not as clear cut as I would have thought. Started slowly and rushed more towards the end in terms of the lesson flow. Found it necessary to lengthen the amount of time allocated for the deciding of which value reflected the scenario and then for them to write in a copy. Needed to spend more time in this first lesson explaining the virtues and vices.

Week 2
All students could relate to the dilemma. Discussion was more free and some alternative suggestions were put forward other than the obvious. I found it necessary to list reasons on the board because they were too numerous. Again a fair degree of boy/girl polarization with the boys more opting to 'tell their friend the answers' and the girls going for 'giving some general hints'. Most students, after discussion, preferred to go for giving general hints. One girl changed her mind to 'not giving any information'. Having questioned her after class why she had the change in mind, she replied that it was because she felt it was not Biblically right, after considering the verse on the worksheet, to help her friend cheat. The virtues/vices were not as obvious, not all students went for 'honesty' as the virtue to pursue. Some boys felt that helping their friends showed 'loyalty' and that this was good.
One boy felt at the end he would just tell his friend the questions on the test because he would want his friend to do that for him.

Week 3
Some students, of their own accord, indicated that they had been bullied and others indicated that they had been responsible for bullying another at some time. Students becoming very open to discuss a variety of actions and providing more sound reasoning for those actions. The decision was bilateral. Most of the boys opted to 'do nothing' because of not wanting to lose their friends. More of the girls and a few of the boys opted to 'confront their friends about the wrong behaviour'. Which virtue/vice was unclear to them, in the end we decided that it didn't have to be one of those listed and they could write another under the box if they wished, for example, 'timidity'. The decision for a value in column three of the Core Agreed Values came down to 2 choices. I am finding that I may have to give more direction with this than just asking them to consider the values in a single column. I had to rush towards the end because of good discussion about the reasons for actions.
Week 4
This week I tried having the students stand up for the vote before they moved into groups of 2 instead of five. I had hoped that the students would more freely move to be with another of the same opinion however they looked at each other near them and essentially voted as their friend/s did and so sat back down without moving. The action again polarised into ‘yell back at the teacher’ or ‘get a third party to intervene, like parents or the principal’. Some found it hard to decide and didn’t want to go with any of the offered actions (there were also other actions like ‘just walk out’ to pick from). Even after asking and explaining whether yelling back would actually resolve the situation the three boys wanted to stick with that action. Nobody felt that they would want to talk to the teacher about the problem by themselves and try to resolve the situation. The value in the third column of the Core Agreed Values was again not totally clear but it came down to basically 2, either open learning environment or cooperation/conflict resolution, that they felt was the right action. Even then the ones that wanted to yell still held that belief after talking about peaceful resolutions from the value.

Week 5
Decided to challenge them to ask “What Would Jesus Do?”. The object was to try to get some of the students to see that their options for action on the scenarios would not help the situation and did not bring deeper levels of morality into focus. For example to yell at Mr. Parke for ‘picking on’ Carson (week 4). Little time for discussion so this dilemma was rushed.

Week 6
Students, particularly some of the boys, were very restless. There was not a lot of discussion because they all agreed on the same action. Possibly because I stated my course of action and justified it, after that the students fell into line with what I had said and essentially reiterated the reasons I had already presented. It was not an easy session and I do not think a great deal was accomplished but I am becoming aware that just because a ‘seed’ does not take growth straight away, does not mean it will not grow and blossom in the future.

Week 7
I had thought that this scenario would provoke discussion. I made sure that the dilemma was put into their current context and had them seeing that they would miss their end of year outing to “Wet and Wild”. A number of options presented which splintered the class and good discussion followed with sound reasoning and a desire from most not to ‘get even’ using the letters but did wish to express their feelings to the principal. For the first time students in their normal seating actually got up and shifted into a small group that reflected their similar thinking. Far better thought was given towards what was their base motivation and how to best accomplish expressing their feelings without hurting the principal. Two boys still wished to cause as much harm as possible. I did not get time to adequately finish because of the volume of discussion.
Week 8
Discussion level and quality has picked up. The number of possible actions increased but the class has settled on a narrower range of actions that would be actually chosen. There is more evidence of individual action rather than group consensus. Most ended up agreeing that the offender should not get away with it but what to do about it varied from ‘telling a higher authority’ to ‘getting in and helping the boy’ or ‘guiding him through the difficulty’.

Week 9
There were none that would outright ‘not go with their family’. Some were conditional, eg. ‘I will go if you buy me ...’, others would want to ‘discuss the reasons why they were shifting with their father’, others would ‘simply comply’. To help sharpen the focus we had an impromptu debate. All the class tried to think through both sides of arguments because they did not know who would be selected for the teams and on which side they would be. In the debate, some members found it difficult to relate to the stance they had to take.

Week 10
This was a dilemma that I made up to fit a value in column 5 of the Core Agreed Values from Curriculum Framework. All the students agreed that we should ‘take their own rubbish with them’. The only division was whether to take the other person’s rubbish as well. From this we began to discuss why we would take the rubbish out of the park. For some it was as simple as saying ‘because the sign says no littering’ - this is a low moral stage thinking. Others thought that it would not be right to mess up a park and make it look bad but no-one reasoned that the park was to be kept beautiful for the enjoyment of others. This idea of moral choice because of how our choice affected another was quite beyond the thinking of all in the group - it was simply not a concept that had entered their heads. We then began to apply this idea of ‘moral choice out of respect for others’ to some other situations and they found it difficult at first to follow why consideration of the other person should modify my actions - towards the end some students did seem to glimmer with some understanding. We lastly turned the discussion to whether it was right for the boys to take back the OHP each week. Time ran out and so we didn’t draw a conclusion to the discussion.