THE RELATIONSHIP OF GENDER AND JUDICIAL BOARD MEMBERSHIP

TO MODES OF SELF DESCRIPTION AND MORAL REASONING

By

Nancy Jean Stiller

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1988

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP OF GENDER AND JUDICIAL BOARD MEMBERSHIP
TO MODES OF SELF DESCRIPTION AND MORAL REASONING

By

Nancy Jean Stiller

Few studies have examined the impact of student involvement in the judicial system upon the development of moral decision-making (Caruso, 1977; Smith, 1978). To this date, no studies have been found that include an analysis of gender-different conceptions of decision-making and service on a university judicial board.

The purposes of this study were, (a) to examine differences in self identity and decision-making, as defined by Gilligan (1982), between the undergraduate residence hall complex judiciary members at Michigan State University and a sample of undergraduate students who were not judicial board members; (b) to examine differences in self identity and decision-making between males and females; and (c) to determine whether there was a relationship between use of self description mode and use of moral reasoning mode.

The sample was drawn from the 53 student members of the four undergraduate residence hall area judicial boards at Michigan State University, and 106 non-board members randomly selected from the undergraduate residence halls. Participants were asked to complete an essay-type questionnaire entitled, "Student Perceptions of Themselves and a Real-life Moral Dilemma."

T-test procedures revealed that there were no significant differences between judicial board members and non-board members for

use of the separate/objective mode, the connected mode, the rights-predominating mode, or the response-predominating mode. T-test procedures also revealed that there were no significant differences between male and female use of the separate/objective mode, but that there were significant differences between male and female use of the connected mode, the rights-predominating mode, and the response-predominating mode. Women used predominantly the connected mode and the response-predominating mode more frequently than men. Men used predominantly the rights-predominating mode more frequently than women. Chi-square procedures revealed that there was a positive relationship between use of the separate/objective mode and the rights-predominating mode, and between the connected mode and response-predominating mode.

This dissertation is dedicated to

My parents

Marilyn and Harold Stiller

For their ever-constant love and support, contagious good
humor, and genuine belief that integrity and compassion are
worth striving for.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Several faculty members, colleagues, friends, and family members were instrumental contributors to the completion of this dissertation. First, I would like to thank the members of my doctoral guidance committee for their consistent support throughout my doctoral program. A special thanks to Dr. Linda Forrest, Director of the Dissertation, for introducing me to a conception of women's psychological development that guided not only this study, but influenced my life as well. Your consummate example of scholarship, research skill, and professionalism will be with me always. I am grateful to Dr. Louis C. Stamatakos, the Chair of my Guidance Committee, for the challenging and growthful discussions about college student development and the student affairs profession. Your assistance with organization and writing style made an immeasurable impact on this dissertation and will continue to influence future projects as well. My appreciation to Dr. James D. Studer for challenging me to look at both the theoretical and practical applications of this research. Your faith in my ability to complete the dissertation made an important difference. My thanks to Dr. Stanley Stark for contributing his experience and knowledge during the early stages of the study.

The assistance and support of the following individuals is also greatly appreciated. I wish to thank Dr. Leslie Jones for having the

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Theoretical Foundation

Many theorists who have studied moral development and
decision-making have focused their research on delineating the stages
through which the individual progresses toward psychological maturity
(Erickson, 1963; Loevinger, 1966, 1976; Perry, 1970; Kohlberg, 1969,
1978, 1981). For example, Lawrence Kohlberg, building his theory of
moral reasoning on the research of Dewey and Piaget, identified six
stages of moral development. He contended that, "moral situations are
ones of conflict of perspectives or interest; justice principles are
concepts for resolving these conflicts" (Kohlberg, 1976, p.40).
According to this established theory, moral reasoning can be defined as
the process of decision-making about an event that involves adherence
to established standards or principles. Hierarchical
conceptualizations, such as Kohlberg's, categorized this process into
stages or "... structures of thought" (Smith, 1978, p.54) that were
identified according to how the individual decision or judgement was
formulated.

The participants in the research studies of many developmental
theorists have been exclusively male. When the basic decision-making
concepts gleaned from this work were applied to females, the females
tended to fall into the earlier stages of moral development as compared
with their male counterparts of the same age (Holstein, 1976; Piaget,
1965). For example, Piaget, whose work serves as a foundation for
Kohlberg's conceptualization of moral development, suggested that

1

females either have a less developed sense of justice or that perhaps the theories do not serve to explain the moral development of females (1965). In a published reply to critics of his work who claim gender bias, Kohlberg stated that his early work on moral reasoning, " ... began with an acceptance of Piaget's conception of morality as justice" (Kohlberg, 1984, p.339). He continued, "Unlike Freud and Piaget, however, I have never directly stated that males have a more developed sense of justice than do females" (Kohlberg, 1984, p.340). Kohlberg (1984) admitted that in his early work, a respondent was scored in Stage 3 (Interpersonal Conformity), on a six stage scale, if the viewpoint was largely defined by caring and affiliation and in Stage 4 (Law and Order) if the concern was with the norms of law.

Although this effort to include females in the established studies of moral reasoning has been apparent, critics of traditional developmental theory believe that females have generally been considered by traditional theorists to be deficient or less complex in their moral decision-making ability. Recently, some theorists have sought to demonstrate differences in the ways that males and females develop and reason (Miller, 1976; Dinnerstein, 1976; Chodorow, 1978; Gilligan, 1982). Their purposes are to examine the deficiencies in traditional developmental theory and to construct theory that includes what is considered to be the female mode of development. For example, Chodorow contends that because generally, the mother is the primary care-giver, identity formation is understood from the child's relationship with her. Because females, in their childhood years, liken themselves to their mothers, they begin their lives in dependence and attachment. This relationship forms the foundation upon which they

2

develop toward adulthood. That is, they continue to perceive themselves as functioning in a contextual sense and in relationship to others. On the other hand, males begin their lives differentiating themselves from their mothers. Males differ from females in that their identity formation is defined through separation from their mothers. Their progress into adulthood is characterized by independence and separation from others. When the development of each sex is viewed from this gender-specific perspective, one can understand that neither is necessarily deficient. Rather, the concepts of attachment and separation, as operative in females and males, contribute to a more complete picture of the developmental process.

The work of developmental psychologist, Carol Gilligan (1977, 1981, 1982; Gilligan and Murphy, 1979) focused on these differences between male and female experiences of themselves in relation to others with regard to separation and attachment. She expanded Erickson's life-cycle stage theory by stating that, "While for men, identity precedes intimacy and generativity in the optimal cycle of human separation and attachment, for women these tasks seem instead to be fused. Intimacy goes along with identity, as the female comes to know herself as she is known, through her relationships with others" (Gilligan, 1982, p.12).

Through interviews with men and women in which they were asked to present a self-description and construct a real-life moral dilemma, Gilligan explored significant differences between female and male preceptions of morality, relationships, and responsibility. She identified two themes or "voices" within human development (Gilligan, 1977, 1982). The female voice is defined as that which speaks from the

3

context of attachment and relationships in developing a sense of responsibility. In contrast, the male voice is defined as emanating from a need to separate from others, becoming an independent and therefore, responsible individual. Whereas the female voice expresses itself through an "ethic of care", the male voice conveys an "ethic of fairness" (Gilligan, 1982, p.63). Further illuminating these two modes of self description, Lyons called them, "the connected self" and "the separate/objective self" (Lyons, 1983, p.125). Correspondingly, Lyons identified the two modes of moral reasoning as "response-predominating" and "rights-predominating" (Lyons, 1983, p.139).

Although these two concepts are presented dichotomously, they are not cleanly differentiated by gender. Rather, one hallmark of becoming an adult is to incorporate both developmental perspectives into one's identity (Brabeck, 1983; Forrest and Hotelling, 1984; Gilligan, 1982). Although Gilligan's work demonstrated that there are gender differences in conceptions of self and moral decision-making, her contention was that recognizing these differences helps enlarge the scope of developmental choices for both sexes.

To summarize, "Gilligan changes the basic constructs for developmental theory ... Identity development now includes both individuation and interconnectedness. The moral domain now includes both fairness, and responsibility and care in relationships" (Gelwick, 1985, p.33). From the perspective of established theory, moral development has been defined traditionally in the context of principled and justice-oriented decision-making. It is hypothesized that as the theory becomes gender-inclusive, moral development must be defined in relation to both justice and care.

4

One of Gilligan's significant pieces of research, described in The College Student Study, examined the moral decision-making of college students relative to their life-planning choices. Gilligan interviewed twenty-five seniors who were selected in their sophomore year while enrolled in a course on moral and political choice. The research questions in the study asked for a self description, and the construction, resolution, and evaluation of a real-life moral dilemma (Gilligan, 1981). Participants were also asked to discuss and resolve Kohlberg's "Heinz Dilemma" (Kohlberg, 1978; Rest, 1973). Some disturbing inconsistencies in Kohlberg's application of his six stages of moral development were discovered. Gilligan found that, "Prominent among those who repeatedly fell outside the scale of Kohlberg's stages were women ... whose reliance on context for interpretation resisted assimilation to the categories of the coding scheme." (Gilligan, 1981, p.148). What appeared to be the problem was the concept of relativism. Moral decisions were not only based on accepted ethical principles and one's concept of justice; decision-making was also contextual in its focus on the particular situation rather than a dependence on principles and standards. Gilligan stated that, "Moral values are human constructions" and therefore, " ... an ethic of intimacy ... which derives from knowledge and understanding of people, replaces the moral abstraction of justice and the judgements that stemmed from an ideology of right and wrong" (Gilligan, 1981, p.151).

Kohlberg has rejected the concept of relativism in his conceptualization of moral development. When one participant in his research responded to the "Heinz Dilemma" in a contextual way, he referred to this relativistic thinking as "confusion" (Kohlberg, 1981,

5

p.107). Relativism, however, has not been ignored in all of the established theories. Perry's scheme identified knowledge as contextual and relativistic and defined a decision-making approach that is not relativistic as "dualistic thinking" (Perry, 1970). Gilligan and Perry shared this belief in the concept of relativism and each viewed the college years as a time when this relativistic component of moral reasoning emerges. "The convergence of developmental themes in late adolescence around questions of morality, together with the intellectual capacity of the adolescent mind ... points to adolescence as a critical time for moral development in the human life cycle" and, " ... the crisis of this time is that of moral relativism" (Gilligan, 1981, p. 141).

Within this perception that late adolescence is a critical period of moral development and decision-making, one might conjecture that for those who choose to attend college, the situations they confront and the activities in which they become involved will have an impact on their moral reasoning ability. For example, when students enter college, they are confronted with a myriad of rules and regulations and one purpose of enforcement of these standards is, "to assist individual students in personal growth and development" (Greenleaf, 1978, p.34). The importance of this educational purpose of enforcement is highlighted by Caruso when he states, "If student discipline professionals wish to keep the 'student personnel point of view' alive, they must establish some balance between the legal aspects of the system required by the courts and the humanistic aspects necessary to foster student development" (Caruso, 1978, p.116). One could define an educational judicial process that emphasizes this humanistic component

6

as one conducive to helping students develop their moral reasoning
ability. Further, one could reason that both modes of moral reasoning,
one identified as response-predominating and the other as
rights-predominating (Lyons, 1983) are necessary components of this
educational judicial process. As such, this emphasis on student
discipline as an educational process gives rise to the need for
research that helps the practitioner understand the role of the
judicial process in student development and specifically, moral
decision-making. Such is the foundation for this study.

Need for the Study

The theory-based research on student judiciaries has generally
utilized Kohlberg's stage concept of moral development as a foundation
(Smith, 1978). Other research on judicial systems has focused on the
importance of due process in the discipline setting, descriptive
analyses of the composition of judicial boards, and studies of the
students who come before the boards (Caruso, 1977; Ostroth and
Campbell, 1978; Schuh and Oblander, 1984; Roberts and Brown, 1972). To
date, there appears to be no published research applying Gilligan's
moral development theory to judicial systems.

Within the context of university judicial affairs, one might
wonder how Gilligan's conception of moral decision-making in college
students applies to the manner in which undergraduate student judicial
board members deliberate and adjudicate the cases that come before
them. Because the role that judicial board members assume is largely
focused on decision-making and because cases usually involve rights,

7

rules, and a behavioral impact on others, one's moral development is likely to influence one's decision-making on a student judiciary. In relation to Gilligan's conception of moral reasoning, one could conjecture that students would perceive and resolve cases from either a viewpoint of attachment and care or one concerned with rights and rules.

The need for this study is evident when one considers that, "In those systems which are largely self-perpetuating, i.e., where judicial boards select members themselves, it is reasonable to expect that board members will select students who are similar to themselves in values, attitudes, and personal orientations ..." (Caruso, 1977, p.339). From the perspective of gender-inclusive moral development theory, a judicial board comprised largely of individuals whose decision-making is motivated by one mode may tend to perpetuate itself and exclude members who operate in the opposite mode. This may mean that the process of judicial board selection would preclude a board that is gender balanced or that is not appropriately representative of students from varied backgrounds. It may also mean that cases are adjudicated from a single perspective. Were this to happen, the important educational purpose of the judicial process may not be fully realized.

Therefore, it is important to determine whether or not there are differences in decision-making modes between members of a judiciary and non-members and between males and females. Should these differences be identified, the selection and training processes can be analyzed to determine their role in creating a balance between both modes of moral reasoning and in adequately representing a wide diversity of students. Although this study does not purport to advocate either mode of moral

8

reasoning, i.e., response-predominating or rights-predominating, it is important to understand and identify both modes in judiciary members so that the judicial system can effectively respond to a variety of student concerns.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine differences in self identity and moral decision-making, as defined by Gilligan, between the undergraduate residence hall area judicial board members at Michigan State University and a sample of undergraduate students who were not judicial board members.

Comparisons between (a) males and females, and (b) board members and a sample of non-board members were examined to determine whether gender and membership on a judicial board were associated with one's prevalent self description and moral decision-making modes. Another purpose of the study was to determine whether there was a relationship between use of self description mode and use of moral reasoning mode. The research questions listed below served to guide the development of the design and methodology of the study. Several hypotheses related to identity and moral decision-making differences between males and females, between judiciary members and non-board members, and between modes of self description and moral reasoning evolved from the research questions. Dependent upon the findings, the implications of the study could be used to improve methods of selection and training of college judicial boards.

9

Research Questions

1. What are the similarities and differences between the ways judicial board members and non-board members conceive of their self identity, as expressed through self descriptions?

2. What are the similarities and differences between the ways judicial board members and non-board members construct, resolve, and evaluate real-life moral dilemmas in their lives?

3. What are the similarities and differences between the ways men and women conceive of their self identity, as expressed through self descriptions?

4. What are the similarities and differences between the ways men and women construct, resolve, and evaluate real-life moral dilemmas in their lives?

5. Is there a relationship between the mode used in the self description and the mode of moral reasoning used to construct, resolve, and evaluate a moral dilemma?

Hypotheses

1. As a group, judicial board members will use the separate/objective mode to describe themselves more frequently than non-board members.

2. As a group, non-board members will use the connected mode to describe themselves more frequently than judicial board members.

3. As a group, judicial board members will use the rights-predominating mode to resolve a moral dilemma more frequently than non-board members.

4. As a group, non-board members will use the response-predominating mode to resolve a moral dilemma more frequently than judicial board members.

5. As a group, men will use the separate/objective mode in their self description more frequently than women.

6. As a group, women will use the connected mode in their self description more frequently than men.

7. As a group, men will use the rights-predominating mode to resolve a real-life moral dilemma more frequently than women.

8. As a group, women will use the response-predominating mode to resolve a real-life moral dilemma more frequently than men.

11

9. There will be a positive relationship between the moral reasoning mode used to construct and resolve a moral dilemma, and the mode used in the self description.

Methodology

Subjects

The sample was drawn from the 53 student members of the four undergraduate residence hall area judicial boards and 106 non-board members randomly selected from the undergraduate residence halls.

The four area judicial boards were the Brody Complex Area Judiciary, the North Complex Area Judiciary, the South Complex Area Judiciary, and the East Complex Area Judiciary. Generally, judicial board members are selected annually either in the spring to serve the following academic year or early in the fall of the academic year of service. The judicial board member selection process is developed and implemented by staff members of the Division of Student Affairs and Services including the Area Director of each residence hall complex and the Assistant to the Area Director who serve as judicial board advisors. After the selection process, the new board members are then approved during a voting session of each residence hall's elected student government. The judicial board advisors identified their respective judicial board members (n = 53) for potential inclusion in the study.

The sample of non-board members was randomly selected from the approximately 16,000 students living in undergraduate residence halls. The Michigan State University Student Directory published in November,

1986 was used to select the sample. The systematic sampling procedure was used to arrive at the names and addresses of the research participants to be contacted. For this study, the sampling interval was 150. Using the student directory, the investigator counted every 150th person to arrive at the list of individuals who were contacted to participate (n = 106).

Instrumentation

The instrument for this study was designed by the investigator and represents a written modification of the interview format developed by Gilligan (1977, 1980, 1982) and Lyons (1983). The instrument is comprised of two parts. The first part is a demographic data sheet that required the research participants to provide information about their age, class in school, grade point average, sex, religion, ethnic origin, place of birth, parent's place of birth, current family income, family income while growing up, and major course of study (See Appendix A).

The second part of the instrument is a questionnaire designed to elicit information about the mode of choice utilized by each participant for a self description and for a description of how they constructed, resolved, and evaluated a real-life moral dilemma that they had experienced. The essay-type questionnaire, entitled "Student Descriptions of Themselves and a Real-life Moral Dilemma", consists of four questions with one question per page leaving adequate space for the participant's written response. The questions were modelled after Gilligan's (1980, 1982) open-ended interview format that included questions in four areas: (a) a self description, (b) the construction

13

of a real-life moral dilemma experienced by the participant, (c) the resolution of that dilemma, and (d) an evaluation of the resolution (See Appendix B).

A pilot study was conducted to determine whether the questions were clear, understandable, and unambiguous. The pre-test questionnaire was administered to eight students who were asked to complete it and identify the meaning of each question. Next, the questionnaire was sent to two student affairs professionals who have conducted similar research. Both parts of the pilot study elicited a number of suggestions that were incorporated into the design of the questionnaire used in the study.

Data Collection Procedures

The consent form, a letter outlining the purpose and nature of participating in the study, and the questionnaire were distributed to the judicial board members at one of their weekly meetings (See Appendix C). Each student was asked to seal and return the completed consent form and questionnaire in the envelopes provided. Of the 53 judicial board members, 27 were male and 26 were female. Sixty eight percent of the board members (n — 36) returned useable response sheets. Of those board members who returned useable responses, 17 were male and 19 were female.

Each of the 106 non-board members was contacted by telephone. Ninety three students agreed to participate and each was sent a consent form, letter, and questionnaire (See Appendix D). Forty three of the non-board members who agreed to participate were male and 50 were

female. Of the 93 students, 44% (n = 41) returned useable response sheets. Of the non-board members, 15 were male and 26 were female.

Scoring the Data

The response sheets were scored independently by two scorers and an inter-rater reliability coefficient was calculated for each component. First, the responses to question 1, the self description question were categorized or "chunked" into component parts. A chunk was defined as any idea expressed by the respondent. Responses to questions 2, 3, and 4, the moral dilemma questions, were then chunked. Each of the following components was chunked separately: the situation, the moral conflict, the decision, alternatives considered, methods of weighing each alternative, evaluative statements about the decision, reasons for evaluating a decision, regrets about the decision, and descriptions of what was learned from the decision.

Second, each self description chunk was scored by determining whether it was nonrelational or relational. Descriptions of physical characteristics, identifying activities and possessions, and social status were scored as nonrelational. Descriptions that focused on abilities, interests, and beliefs were also considered nonrelational. Descriptions of self in relation to others were considered relational. Each relational chunk was scored as either separate/objective or connected. The moral dilemma questions were then scored by determining whether each chunk was indicative of a justice/rights-predominating mode or a response/care-predominating mode.

15

<u>Data Analysis</u>

The design of this study was "The Static Group Comparison". That is, one group was involved in the "experimental treatment" (judicial board membership) and then tested. The other group (non-board members) was tested, but did not experience the treatment. This is a "quasi-experimental" design meaning that, "random assignment of subjects to treatment groups was not accomplished" (Borg and Gall, 1983, p.680). Students could not be randomly assigned to each group because judicial board members were pre-selected in a competitive selection process.

The data were analyzed to determine the relationship, if any of gender and judicial board membership to modes of self description and moral reasoning. Borg and Gall state that, "The data ... can be analyzed simply by doing a T-test comparison of the posttest mean scores" (p.682). As such, judgments regarding hypotheses were determined as follows. The data from the independent variables (gender and judicial board membership) and the dependent variables (self description and moral reasoning modes) were analyzed using T-test procedures for each dependent variable to determine whether mean scores on each factor differed significantly from each other. Analysis of variance procedures were also used to determine interaction effect, if any. The chi-square statistical test was used to determine whether mode of self description was related to mode of moral reasoning.

Descriptive data were compiled for judicial board membership and gender. These data are presented to describe self description and moral reasoning modes of judicial board members and non-board members, and males and females.

16

The data were analyzed qualitatively as well as statistically. Exemplary passages from some of the participants' responses are presented to illustrate the modes of self description and moral reasoning.

Definition of Terms

Judicial board; Judiciary: these two terms are used synonymously to identify designated groups selected by staff of the Division of Student Affairs and Services of Michigan State University to hear and adjudicate both disciplinary and nondisciplinary cases.

Selection: The process of choosing members to serve on judiciaries.

Training: The process of preparing members of judiciaries to conduct hearings and adjudicate cases. Generally, training involves skill development and the dissemination of information deemed important to the judiciary's ability to carry out its responsibilities.

Cognitive developmental theory: conceptualizations of how people reason, think, or make meaning of their experiences (Creamer, 1980).

Moral development theory: a category of cognitive developmental theory that involves conceptualizations of how people reason, think, or make meaning of situations that require a course of action or behavior having ethical implications (Creamer, 1980).

<u>Stages of moral development</u>: the basic structures of moral reasoning.

<u>Ethic of care</u>: a conception of morality that is defined by an understanding of relationships and responsibility in the context of relationships (Gilligan, 1982).

<u>Ethic of fairness</u>: a conception of morality that is defined by an understanding of rights and rules (Gilligan, 1982).

<u>The connected self</u>: an individual's self perception that is defined through relationships with others, the activity of care, and interdependence (Lyons, 1983).

<u>The separate/objective self</u>: an individual's self perception that is defined through objectivity, fairness, and independence (Lyons, 1983).

<u>Response-predominating mode</u>: a moral decision-making mode in which care of others is the important consideration (Lyons, 1983).

<u>Rights-predominating mode</u>: a moral decision-making mode in which justice is the important consideration (Lyons, 1983).

<u>Female voice</u>: the manner in which one expresses one's self from the perspective of the connected self; not necessarily gender-specific to women (Gilligan, 1982).

<u>Male voice</u>: the manner in which one expresses one's self from the perspective of the separate/objective self; not necessarily gender-specific to men (Gilligan, 1982).

<center>Limitations of the Study</center>

In regard to the implications of the results of this study, there are some inherent limitations within the scope of concept and design. First, Gilligan's theory of moral development is relatively new and untested in the field of college student affairs. There appears to be virtually no published research that applies her work to college judicial affairs. Although an application of her theory to judicial affairs is a viable one, for reasons as stated in the theoretical foundations section of this chapter, the fact that this area is new implies that the investigator cannot benefit from methodological advances developed by previous investigators. This research, in effect, represents a starting point for other researchers to develop and refine methodology.

Secondly, because the sample of students selected as participants came from the Michigan State University campus, the issue of generalizability may be affected. It is hoped that future investigators will attempt similar research in other types of college judicial settings.

It is not the purpose of this study to determine whether one mode of moral reasoning is more effective than another. Rather, the investigator sought to identify the operative mode(s) in students' expressions of their experiences as a way of moving toward a fuller

<center>19</center>

comprehension of students' moral development. Further discussion of the limitations of the study can be found in Chapter 5, Discussion and Conclusions.

Organization of the Study

This chapter delineates the theoretical foundation for the study, the need for and purpose of the study, the methodology, and the limitations of the investigation.

Chapter II is a literature review pertaining to the theoretical foundation for the study; a description of the concepts of separate and connected knowing, and gender differences in moral reasoning; an exploration of related literature on sex role development, real v. hypothetical dilemmas, effects of training on moral reasoning, the concept of relativism, and effects of the college experience on moral development. The next section of the literature review is an examination of a judicial system context including due process, university judicial boards, and student involvement in the disciplinary process.

Chapter III contains a description of the methodology. It includes a description of the research subjects, instrumentation, data collection procedures, scoring the data, and data analysis.

Chapter IV contains the presentation and analysis of the data. This chapter includes examinations of the demographic description of the samples, a qualitative analysis, an empirical analysis, a descriptive analysis, and an explanation of sex evident responses.

Chapter V provides for a summary of the findings, an examination of the limitations of the study, a discussion of the major findings, and an analysis of the conclusions, including implications and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature pertaining to the theoretical
foundation of the study including the moral development theories of
Kohlberg and Gilligan; the concepts of separate and connected knowing;
gender differences in moral reasoning; related literature on sex role
development; real v. hypothetical dilemmas; effects of training on
moral reasoning; relativism; and the effects of the college experience
on moral reasoning. Further, this review explores literature from a
judicial system context including the concept of due process, the
structure and function of university judicial boards, and the issue of
student involvement in the disciplinary process.

Theoretical Foundation

The college years, or the seventeen to twenty five year age range,
represent a particulary dynamic period in the personality development
of an individual. Many researchers have studied these transitional
years and have organized their conceptions of student development
according to stages or levels of growth (Chickering, 1969; Gilligan,
1981; Heath, 1968, 1977; Kohlberg, 1969, 1976; Kohlberg and Gilligan,
1971; Perry, 1970; Sheehy, 1974).

Moral development is an important aspect of a student's growth.
Theorists have written extensively on the moral reasoning of college
students perhaps because the major components of moral reasoning

22

including the development of values, decision-making skills, and relationships with others are changing rapidly as the individual moves from childhood to adulthood.

One characteristic of traditional moral development theory is that the developmental process is perceived to occur in stages, levels or "structures of thought" (Smith, 1978, p.54) that are identified according to how the individual decision or judgment was formulated. To understand the developmental process, it is important to comprehend this hierarchical conceptualization of stages. Stages are characterized as levels related to structure rather than the content of the particular moral judgment situation and they do not necessarily vary on the basis of personality differences (Kohlberg and Gilligan, 1971; Kohlberg, 1977). "... the stages are said to be hierarchically related: a new stage does not simply replace a previous stage, nor is added to it, but rather the new stage is a transformation of elements of the old along with new elements into a new emergent structure" (Rest, 1973, p.86). Rest concluded that the stages identified by Kohlberg are, in fact, hierarchical; that is, "... each succeeding stage is more cognitively differentiated and integrated than the preceding one ..." (p.105).

The theoretical framework developed by Kohlberg has served as the foundation for many student affairs practitioners' understanding of moral reasoning in college students. Kohlberg defines several significant aspects of moral development that share the common threads of justice and fairness. This justice-oriented theme is identified in his definitions of the terms moral situation, moral reasoning, morality, and moral thought.

Kohlberg asserts that, "Moral situations are ones of conflict of perspectives or interest; justice principles are concepts for resolving these conflicts" (Kohlberg, 1976, p.40). Accordingly, moral reasoning can be conceptualized as the process of decision-making about an event that involves adherence to established principles or standards. This reliance on principles and standards characterizes the justice perspective. Kohlberg's perception of morality, then, revolves around the concept of justice as a process of judgment or decision-making about a situation, rather than justice as the particular content or subject matter of a decision (Kohlberg, 1981, p.170). Justice refers to a system of thought that is principled, but it does not necessarily connote a particular set of principles.

Further, in an article that examines Kohlberg's theory of moral development and applies it to the moral education of college students, the author delineates the components of moral thought. "The structure of moral thought includes such components as the rule or decision-making system, the problem-solving strategy, the social perspective, and the underlying logic employed in making a moral choice" (Smith, 1978, p.54). Although the social perspective may imply that there is a relational and contextual component to moral development, Kohlberg identifies moral thought in terms of its focus on rules and logic.

Both Piaget and Kohlberg do, however, allude to a relationship component of moral development. "... Piaget's view of morality makes short shrift of important intuitionist theories of the moral life, which claim that persons mistakenly identify morality with rules, and mistakenly think that certain patterns of principled reasoning are

superior to others" (Orr, 1974, p.366). According to Turiel, Piaget

implies that there may be a relationship component that transcends the

various levels of moral reasoning. In one of his definitive works,

Turiel (1983) writes that, "Piaget's explanation of moral development

revolved around the idea that morality can take two qualitatively

different forms, one based on constraint and the other on cooperation"

(p.136). The term cooperation implies that one aspect of morality

involves collaborating with others and therefore, considering their

perspectives.

In an interpretation of Kohlberg's work, Smith identifies the

relationship component as a construct of moral reasoning. "Two major

concepts or themes are reflected in Kohlberg's description of the

stages of moral judgment. These are the concept of empathy or role

taking and the concept of justice" (Smith, 1978, p.56). However,

Kohlberg does not place equal emphasis on these two concepts and, in

fact, perceives an empathy focus as an inferior method of moral

reasoning. For example, Kohlberg identifies the third stage of

development as "Interpersonal Conformity." At this stage, the

individual perceives a moral decision in terms of the potential for

gaining approval from those affected by the decision (Kohlberg, 1984,

p.343). This third stage of growth is considered only adequate in his

six stage model.

Gilligan, however, lends credence to the relational component by

conceiving of moral development as concerned with either care of self

and others or the application of principles of fairness.

Distinguishing "morality as care" from the justice perspective, she

writes, "In this conception, the moral problem arises from conflicting

responsibilities rather than from competing rights and requires for its resolution a mode of thinking that is contextual and narrative rather than formal and abstract. This conception of morality as concerned with the activity of care centers moral development around the understanding of responsibility and relationships" (Gilligan, 1982, p.19). While these two definitions of morality are presented dichotomously, one is not necessarily judged to be superior to the other. Rather, one hallmark of becoming an adult is to incorporate both developmental perspectives into one's identity (Gilligan, 1982, p.74). One could conclude that the moral reasoning theories of Piaget and Kohlberg represent the traditional or established perceptions of moral development whereas Gilligan's conception is a response to their work, designed because her research findings indicated that there are inadequacies in their theories.

Separate and Connected Knowing

Gilligan (1981) contends that the fundamental moral question concerns the relationship between self and others. If one concurs that this central question serves as a framework for the moral reasoning process, it becomes evident that individuals perceive knowledge, make decisions, and understand their lives from one of two perspectives. "The perspective of the separate/objective self - labeled 'reciprocity' - is based on impartiality, objectivity, and the distancing of the self from others ... The perspective of the connected self - labeled 'response' - is based on interdependence and concern for another's well-being" (Lyons, 1983, p.134). While traditional psychological

26

theory (Erickson, 1950; Piaget, 1965; Kohlberg, 1969) has generally given credence to the concept of separate/objective self by emphasizing individual identity through achievement and autonomy, it has become increasingly clear that connection with others and relational development play an important role in the development of self and the ability to make moral decisions (Gilligan, 1982; Miller, 1984).

These two conceptions of self influence the way students acquire and assimilate knowledge. "The separate knower learns through explicit formal instruction how to adopt a different perspective ... The connected knower learns through empathy, through secondhand-firsthand experience" (Clinchy and Zimmerman, 1985, p.9). Clinchy and Zimmerman, describing the intellectual development of college women, illustrate the learning processes of both separate and connected knowers by describing the questions each type of student would ask while studying a poem. The separate knower would analyze the poem by learning a prescribed set of standards, guidelines, and techniques that serve as tools for critical analysis. The connected knower would question the poet and aspire to understand what he/she is trying to communicate as if listening to the poet in a live setting. "Although there are differences between these two intellectual modes, they share an important characteristic: they both involve conscious, deliberate, systematic reasoning" (p.4).

A recent book on the topic of separate and connected knowing has an important recommendation relevant to the way this reasoning process is taught and understood. "So long as teachers hide the imperfect processes of their thinking, allowing their students to glimpse only the polished products, students will remain convinced that only

27

Einstein - or a professor - could think up a theory" (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986, p.215). This attention to the learning process and as such, the decision making process, implies that educators are responsible for helping students understand the ways that they know, learn, and make decisions as opposed to teaching students to simply accept knowledge as truth. The idea of two conceptions of knowing and two perspectives on decision making also implies that educators are obligated to teach students to recognize and implement their own decision-making mode in the appropriate situations rather than teaching that there is only one correct process for making decisions.

It is important to understand how, from a psychological context, these two conceptions of self have been differentiated. Chodorow (1978) contends that because generally, the mother is the primary care-giver, identity formation is understood from the child's relationship with her. Because females, in their childhood years, liken themselves to their mothers, they begin their lives in dependence and attachment. This relationship forms the foundation upon which they develop toward adulthood. That is, they continue to perceive themselves as functioning in a contextual sense and in relationship to others. On the other hand, males begin their lives differentiating themselves from their mothers. Males differ from females in that their identity formation is defined through separation from their mothers. Their progress into adulthood is characterized by independence and separation from others.

As a result of these developmental patterns, psychological theory which has traditionally been conceptualized by men has emphasized the

28

precepts of individuation and separation as it sought to define the mature adult (Gilligan, 1982; Kaplan, Klein, and Gleason 1985; Miller, 1976). In essence, traditional psychology has "... neglected the intricacies of human connection" (Miller, 1984, p.1). If psychological theory were to be conceived from a framework of connection and interdependence, and if development was considered "complete" or "advanced" when one understood one's connection to others rather than one's separateness from others, then human development would be defined with very different terms than it is presently. For example, the relationship between mother and daughter would be viewed not simply as a framework for explaining the differences between male and female development, but as a place where mature and effective developmental patterns begin. "The mother-daughter relationship represents only the beginning of a process which can be developed through important relationships with other significant people in childhood, and throughout life if relational contexts are available" (Surrey, 1985, p.4). How would human development be defined if these relational contexts were available? Empathy would be an expectation in relationships and heightened psychological development would be characterized by a sense of "mutual empowerment" (Surrey, 1985, p.5) and the sharing of experiences. Psychologists who recognize the two conceptions of self do not contend that one is better than the other. One analysis of Gilligan's work holds that, "She developed a theory to the effect that each sex holds part of the overall truth and that as individuals pass into young adulthood, they discover the limitations of their current developmental paths and become open to the possibility of the other's truth" (Hotelling and Forrest, 1985, p.184). In essence,

practitioners are calling for a reformulation of the generalized
conception of human development that characterizes the growth of both
men and women so that each may incorporate the beneficial skills,
attitudes, and perspectives of the other to move toward a more complete
sense of self.

Gender Differences in Moral Reasoning

In one of Gilligan's significant studies, she hypothesized that
there would be a significant relationship between gender and moral
reasoning (Gilligan, 1980, p.13). The results of this theory building
research "... show that in real-life moral conflict individuals call
upon and think about considerations predominantly within one mode which
is related to, but not defined by a person's gender" (Gilligan, 1980,
p.13).

This dissertation study was based on the work of Lyons (1983)
whose study of male and female differences in the use of self
description and moral reasoning modes was an empirical analysis of
Gilligan's theory. Lyons' sample consisted of 36 individuals from
across the life cycle. She developed a scoring system to examine data
from in-person interviews and found that men used predominantly the
separate/objective mode of self description and the
rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning, whereas women used
predominantly the connected mode of self description and the
response-predominating mode of moral reasoning. She also found that
there was a positive relationship between use of the separate/objective

mode and the rights-predominating mode, and between the connected mode and the response-predominating mode.

Lyons' study was different from the current study in its sampling technique and in its use of the in-person interview. The sample in Lyons study consisted of individuals across the life cycle, whereas the sample in this study consisted of college-aged students. In this study, the in-person interview was modified in the form of a written, essay-type questionnaire. Another major difference between the two studies involved the statistical analysis of male and female differences in the use of each mode of self description and moral reasoning. Lyons determined predominant use of a mode by the higher percentage of the use of that mode. She then categorized the individual as either separate/objective or connected, and rights-predominating or response-predominating. Because the data were categorical, she used the chi-square statistic to determine whether there were significant differences between males and females. In the current study, T-tests were used to determine significant differences in the mean use of each mode. The data were not converted into categories. Although there are differences in these two studies, Lyons work served as an important foundation for the design of this study.

The relationship between gender and moral reasoning has been explored by other theorists and researchers, as well. There appear to be conflicting findings on whether or not there are differences in the moral development of males and females. This apparent inconsistency in the findings may be the result of any number of factors. For example, sample size as well as differences in the demographic composition of subject samples may account for the variation in results across similar

studies. Also, confusion regarding terminology may have an impact on the consistency of research results. Further, there are discrepencies among researchers as to the definitions of such terms as moral judgment, moral behavior, and moral decision and some disagreement as to whether or not any or all of these concepts can be measured (Kohlberg, 1981; Loevinger, 1978; Turiel, 1983). Another factor is examined as an explanation for the divergency in research results. "Often the major aim of research is not directed at assessing sex differences, so that such analyses are done as an afterthought, and when sex differences are found, the results are not tied to any theoretical explanation" (Brabeck, 1983, p.280).

Based on the work of Lyons (1983), one recent study did empirically examine sex differences in moral reasoning (Rothbart, Hanley, and Albert, 1986). Fifty college-aged students were interviewed and asked questions about three different moral dilemmas. One dilemma was Kohlberg's classic Heinz Dilemma, a second was a hypothetical dilemma about intimate relationships, and the third dilemma was a real-life moral dilemma chosen by the research participant. The purpose of choosing three dilemmas was to determine whether there are situational factors that relate to the implementation of a justice orientation and/or a care orientation as defined by Lyons (1983). The results demonstrated that college-aged people use both moral reasoning modes, but that, "... the balance of women's arguments tends to be more care oriented than men's" (Rothbart, et al., 1986, p.651). The authors conclude that both gender and situational context influence moral reasoning and should be included in the framework for developing more inclusive theories of moral development.

Brabeck (1983) reviewed several important studies on the
differences between male and female moral judgment comparing Gilligan's
and Kohlberg's conceptions of moral development. Through the
comparative analysis of these studies, the author sought to demonstrate
whether or not there are, in fact, two moralities - a "morality of
responsibility" and a "morality of justice" (p.277) - and whether or
not there is a relationship between gender and moral development.

Several studies, according to Brabeck, found that there are no
significant differences in moral development between males and
females. Brabeck refers to a study by Walker (1984), in press at the
time of Brabeck's article, which reviewed seventy-two Kolbergian
studies and found that only four reported gender differences in moral
reasoning. Turiel (1976) examined both cultural perspective and gender
in his study of stage sequence and found that neither represents a
"developmental dimension" (Turiel, 1976, p.195). In other words,
gender does not correlate with any particular stage of moral
development. Haan's (1968) study tested for Kohlbergian stage and
found that 41% of the females were at Stage 3 (Interpersonal
Conformity) and 39% of them were at Stage 4 (Social System and
Conscience) while 22% of the males were at Stage 3 and 43% of them were
at Stage 4. Although Holstein (1976) concluded that sex bias was
evident in Kohlberg's conception of hierarchical stage development, she
also found no significant differences in the moral reasoning stages
acquired by males and females in her study. Rest (1979) reviewed
twenty-two similar studies and reported that only two studies found a
correlation between gender and moral reasoning. In those two studies,
females scored higher than males. Freeman and Giebink (1979) who also

33

examined the literature on gender differences in moral reasoning

contend that, "When differences between the sexes in the moral judgment

interview scores are found, females seem to be advanced in the early

years and males in late adolescent and adult years" (Brabeck, 1983,

p.282). Brabeck suggests that there may be methodological factors to

which this phenomenon of similarity between male and female moral

reasoning can be attributed. These factors pertain to the development

of a precise definition of what skill, trait, or ability is being

measured. The seminal question is the extent to which Kohlbergian

stage correlates with actual behavior in a real-life moral situation.

Brabeck asks, "Are there other ways in which the sexes express

differences in morality" (p.283)?

Other researchers have examined the related psychological

constructs of empathy and altruism (Brabeck, 1983). This research does

not offer any alternative claims regarding sex differences in moral

development and reinforces the findings of empirical studies on moral

reasoning. Hoffman (1977) distinguishes between "cognitive empathy"

and "affective empathy" and does find that there are differences

between males and females in the latter category. However, Brabeck

asserts that the concept of affective empathy may be a stereotypical

notion which is being reinforced in Hoffman's claim of sex differences

(Brabeck, 1983). A study by Macoby and Jacklin (1974) that did not

differentiate between two kinds of empathy is confirming of the finding

that there are no sex differences in empathy.

Although confounding methodological factors may influence the

validity of the research findings in the areas of moral development and

related psychological constructs, some prominent authors continue to

contend that there are fundamental differences between the ways males and females understand themselves and their world (Gilligan, 1977; 1980; 1982; Miller, 1976; 1984; 1986). Brabeck offers a compelling perspective on why the issue of gender difference in moral development continues to generate significant research. "There is an intuitive appeal to these claims which speaks to an essential truth in the assertions, a truth that persists even when the evidence contradicts it. Why does it persist? It may be that the truth about the different moral orientations of the sexes is a mythic truth rather than an empirical one" (p.286). While an explanation for this "mythic truth" may not be quantifiable, it appears to be no less credible. This implies that perhaps qualitative methodology may be more suitable for research that examines issues in which terminology, i.e., moral behavior v. moral reasoning, may not be easily definable. Work of this nature (Belenky, et al., 1986; Clinchy and Zimmerman, 1985; Kaplan, et al., 1985) offers information that is gathered ethnographically using descriptive and observational research tools. While this type of research may not necessarily be correlational in that it does not statistically support or reject hypotheses about the relationship between gender and other variables such as moral reasoning, it allows the practitioner to extrapolate potential explanations for observed sex differences in his/her own setting.

Although most of the studies conducted on gender differences in moral development do not support a claim that males and females differ in moral reasoning scores, the concept of gender differentiation may still offer a rich conceptualization of morality in general. Brabeck agrees when she concludes that by giving credence to both modes of

35

moral reasoning, "Justice and care are then joined, the demands of universal principles and specific moral choices are bridged and the need for autonomy and for interconnection are united in an enlarged and more adequate conception of morality" (p.289).

One common theme in the studies that examine gender differences in moral reasoning is a comparison between Gilligan's and Kohlberg's conceptualizations of care and justice respectively. A number of articles have been published that discuss this comparative analysis, as well as critical analyses of the theorists' work (Flanagan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1982, 1984). Much of the criticism of Kohlberg's work centers on the fact that the longitudinal studies that form the foundation for his stage theory were conducted with all-male samples. "The essential theme of Gilligan's work on female moral development is that the stage sequence described by Kohlberg ... mirrors the moral developmental patterns of males and ignores, indeed denies, the possibility of a different developmental schema for females" (Flanagan, 1982, p.503). For example, the attainment of higher Kohlbergian stages of moral development connotes advanced levels of proficiency in principled reasoning whereas the lower stages of development are more contextual and relational in structure. In many studies, women's moral reasoning is scored at these lower levels (Flanagan, 1982). Although Kohlberg claims that he does not conclude that women are deficient in moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1984), one could argue that such a conclusion is evident.

On the other hand, one significant criticism of Gilligan's work is that she, "... does not refute Kohlberg's conception of stages progressively being more adequate ..." (Flanagan, 1982, p.506).

Kohlberg cites two studies by Snarey (1982) and Erickson (1980) who reported that the same results with regard to stage structure and sequence were evident with both females and males (Kohlberg, 1984). As with the research on gender differences in moral reasoning, perhaps one conclusion is that both the justice and care perspectives are important frameworks necessary for understanding moral development theory. Kohlberg summarized his own current ideas on the state of moral theory when he writes that, "... Gilligan's emphasis on the care and response orientation has broadened the moral domain beyond our focus on justice reasoning..." (Kohlberg, 1984, p.358).

In an important article that challenges theorists and practitioners to end the debate on gender differences in moral reasoning and create this broader moral domain, Tronto (1987) creates the setting in which this more complete conceptualization of morality might occur. "... an ethic of care is just a set of sensibilities that every morally mature person should develop, alongside the sensibilities of justice morality. Rather than rethinking the nature of moral philosophy, then, we need to change the educational or familial institutions that are responsible for making the differences between justice and care gender specific. We should endorse the development of two equal moralities for everyone and leave it to individuals to decide when to apply either morality" (p.663). While Tronto perceives this as an important task, she also challenges the reader to look beyond this conception of justice and care as complementary to one another and recognize the importance of being "... attentive to the place of caring both in concrete daily experience and in our patterns of moral thought ..." (p.663).

To understand the relationship between gender difference and moral development, it is important to also understand the general concept of sex role development. The vast amount of literature on this aspect of psychology offers information that helps the practitioner to define, from a behavioral context, the terms masculinity, femininity, and androgyny (Bem, 1974; Spence and Sawin, 1985; Trebilcot, 1974) and apply that terminology to various psychological issues including career development, achievement, interpersonal relationships and other contexts, as well.

Femininity can be understood as referring to "the personality traits, interests, and behaviors that either are, or are believed to be, more characteristic of females than of males," whereas masculinity refers to "the personality traits, interests, and behaviors that either are, or are believed to be, more characteristic of males than of females," and androgyny refers to "both masculinity and femininity" (Beere, 1979, p.19). Some authors call for a "theoretical reconceptualization" of what is typically considered masculine and feminine (Spence and Sawin, 1985; Trebilcot, 1974).

Trebilcot (1974) has defined two concepts for consideration as behavioral roles that are an alternative to traditional masculine and feminine roles. She calls these concepts monoandrogynism and polyandrogynism. The former refers to the idea that, "... both feminine and masculine characteristics should exist 'side by side' in every individual" (p.162). Although the concept of polyandrogynism also calls for a sharing of roles between men and women, it is a

38

broader term which implies that, "... all alternatives with respect to gender should be equally available to and equally approved for everyone, regardless of sex" (p.163). Whereas monoandrogynism advocates that each individual should cultivate both masculine and feminine behavioral characteristics within themselves, polyandrogynism suggests that there are many options from which individuals might choose including traditional role-taking behaviors and various combinations of shared role-taking, as well. Trebilcot concludes that whatever type of androgynism is assumed by an individual, the act of defining one's role-taking behavior begins to break down the stereotyping effect of connecting each sex with certain prescribed roles.

Bem (1974) and others have advocated the abolition of a gender differentiated conceptualization of role-taking and have included in their definitions of a mentally healthy individual the idea that gender identity need not be strongly associated with prescribed role-taking. Spence and Sawin (1985) interviewed 42 men and 41 women who represented a range of demographic factors about their conceptions of masculinity and femininity in themselves and others. The authors concluded that, "The theory of gender identity ... allows gender as a psychological construction to retain its paramount importance in human affairs and, at the same time, encompasses the evidence showing that gender-related phenomena are multidimensional and often independent of each other" (p.63). The authors state that although some radical conceptualizations recommend an end to gender identity, including that of Bem, their acceptance of the concept as fundamental to developing a

sense of self does not preclude and in fact, enhances the individual's ability to explore and accept many roles.

One could formulate various hypotheses about the relationship between an individual's role-taking choices and his/her predominant mode or level of moral reasoning. While this question may be worthy of future research, one potentially important implication is that the concept of sex role development, including the differentiation of masculine, feminine, and androgynous characteristics, not be confused with the concepts of self identity and morality as defined by Gilligan (1982) and Lyons (1983). It could be that sex role development is primarily a behavioral concern, while self identity and morality may or may not be directly related to an individual's actual behavior in a situation involving moral conflict.

One recent study compared responses to an open-ended questionnaire asking the participant to list responses to the phrase, "I am", with responses to the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). When responses to the open-ended questionnaire were coded in regard to gender identification, it was found that "... respondents ... defined themselves more in relation to their social milieu than in relation to cultural stereotypes about the appropriate personality and behavioral characteristics of males and females" (Jackson, 1985, p.563). In other words, individuals did not often define their self identities from a gender perspective. They were more likely to think of themselves in comparison to others or in relation to their environments. The investigator did find however that among those who did define their self identities from a gender perspective, there was a significant positive correlation between these self descriptive statements and

40

gender-role categorization as measured by the BSRI. This seems to indicate a relationship between self-identity and sex role. Whether sex role development is linked to behaviors more obviously than are self identity and morality remains a question. It does appear, however, that self identity and sex role categorization are linked.

Real v. Hypothetical Dilemmas

Determining the method for measuring the moral development stage, level, or mode of an individual is an important research issue. Kohlberg and Gilligan differ on whether real or hypothetical dilemmas serve best as methods for assessing various aspects of the research participant's moral development. Many of Kohlberg's research studies required subjects to discuss a hypothetical dilemma called "The Heinz Dilemma." The apparent moral conflict involved a decision to either allow a spouse to die, or steal a life-saving drug. Gilligan, on the other hand asks her research participants to examine a dilemma that has actually occurred in their lives. The construction, as well as the resolution of the moral conflict, is perceived as an important component in determining moral reasoning mode.

In Gilligan's study of the moral reasoning of college students, she analyzed the relationship between students' responses in both hypothetical and real-life dilemmas. She found that two-thirds of the students used a different level of moral reasoning for the real-life dilemma than for the hypothetical dilemma (Gilligan, 1981). Although this may not necessarily imply that one instrument is better than the

other, it does raise questions about the particular aspects of moral reasoning measured by each type of instrument.

One author offers insight into these questions. He states that, " ... while using hypothetical moral dilemmas may engage student interest and stimulate development of moral judgment capacities, it does not direct student attention toward moral issues that arise from everyday life. This is better accomplished by discussing real-life dilemmas" (Reimer, 1981, p.486). Although in this context, dilemmas were used to educate students rather than to measure levels of moral reasoning, one might conclude that an individual's own involvement in a dilemma affects his/her conception of how to resolve it.

One philosopher, comparing both philosophical and psychological perspectives on moral development, discusses the limitations of using either hypothetical or actual dilemma situations. Regarding the use of hypothetical dilemmas, she contends that, " ... even if a fully worked out fictional narrative were given ... there is still no reason to think that one's response to a fictional situation is a good indicator of what one's own response would be, were one actually in a predicament ..." (Baier, 1987, p.49). The author also asserts that discussing an actual dilemma that occurred in a person's life has its research flaws, as well. She posits that perhaps individuals interpret their experiences through too many filters. She writes that, "We glaze our own pasts over with the pale cast of self-excusing, or in some cases self-accusing, self-denigrating, self-dramatizing thought" (Baier, 1987, p.49).

Summarily, there is no conclusive evidence, according to the literature examined, that suggests that using one type of dilemma is

more precise or accurate than using the other. However, it appears that when determining whether to use real-life or hypothetical dilemmas, researchers should be careful about considering and defining the components of moral reasoning they plan to study.

Effects of Training on Moral Reasoning

Whether an individual can be taught to progress from stage to stage is an interesting question studied by theorists and researchers. In an article written collaboratively, Kohlberg and Gilligan considered this question and concluded that, "... experiential factors heavily influence the rate of cognitive-structural development. The kind of experience which stimulates cognitive stage development is, however, very different from the direct academic teaching of information and skills ..." (Kohlberg and Gilligan, 1971, p.1059). They explain that, "Cultural teaching and experience can speed up or slow down development, but it cannot change its order or sequence" (Kohlberg and Gilligan, 1971, p.1058). The effect that teaching or training has on moral development seems to vary depending on its form and purpose. Apparently, teaching the student to move through the stages of moral development should be experiential in nature.

The concept of "developmental match" refers to the individual's readiness to move on to the next stage of development (Mackey, 1975, p.28). This readiness idea has been supported by a study conducted by Rest who reported that, "...subjects comprehended reasoning up to one stage above their own level of reasoning" (Smith, 1978, p.61). One author prescribes three necessary components of facilitating moral

development based on Rest's conception of readiness. "They are: (1) the trainer must determine the individual's present level of moral functioning; (2) the individual must experience genuine cognitive conflict involving disagreement about a problematic situation; and (3) the trainer must present a mode of thinking one level above the individual's present level" (Mackey, 1975, p.28).

The kind of setting that is conducive to establishing these components is an important concern. Kohlberg contends that "... moral concepts are essentially concepts of social relationships as manifested in social institutions" (Kohlberg, 1981, p.141). Were one to identify the classroom setting as such a social institution, it would be apparent that educators can influence the moral development of students. One researcher agrees when he hypothesizes that "If students were given the opportunity to discuss moral dilemmas in a classroom context and were exposed through discussion to moral reasoning one stage above their own, the resulting cognitive conflict would help stimulate movement toward the next higher stage of development" (Reimer, 1981, p.485). An author, critical of Kohlberg's work, concluded in his own research that, "... subjects generally did not understand the orientation (stage) above their own unless they were using that orientation in some instances" (Gibbs, 1977, p.50). He continues, however, stating that, "Findings of positive correlations between role-taking opportunities and moral-judgment development are consistent with the expectation that facilitated development of moral judgment should be found in rich social environments" (Gibbs, 1977, p.61).

Another approach to moral education de-emphasizes the importance of assisting the student's transition through the stages of moral development. The student is viewed not only in terms of his/her own individual development, but as a member of a functioning community, as well. One researcher identifies this as the "just community approach" (Reimer, 1981). Progression through stages based on the individual's ability to conceptualize standards, principles, and a set of guiding ethics is viewed in the context of "communal attachment" (Reimer, 1981, p.487). The individual's actions within a community are the indicators of moral development, rather than his/her ability to cognitively apply skills in a hypothetical situation.

The authors of another article delineate two different types of programs designed to facilitate moral reasoning. One program called the "moral education program" focuses on discussing various moral dilemmas so that moral reasoning skills can be directly learned and enhanced. The other type of program is termed a "psychological education program" and tends to be more broadly-based (Whiteley, Bertin, and Berry, 1980). That is, moral development is studied and experienced from the point of view of the experiences during which students might confront moral conflict such as, "... establishing relationships, developing communication skills, and recognizing and analyzing moral and ethical dilemmas" (p.40). Evans (1987) believes that both types of programs should be used by educators working toward influencing students' moral development. She states that, "Both explicit and implicit approaches addressing moral issues would need to be implemented" (p.192).

To summarize, many researchers agree that moral development can be facilitated if an environment is established that affords individuals an opportunity to experience conflict between their present method of moral decision-making and the next higher level. The necessary elements of that teaching environment are unclear.

Relativism

Teaching moral development has been an important aspect of Kohlberg's work, as well. During the 1960's, he took a special interest in the moral development of college students. At Harvard University in 1970, Kohlberg taught a Freshman course on moral and political choice. The purpose of the course was "education for justice" and the "... course differed from previous efforts in moral instruction in that its approach was not doctrinaire but rather developmental" (Gilligan, 1981, p.146). Kohlberg's students demonstrated that the concept of relativism created an obstacle for his contention that moral development follows an invariant sequence (Kohlberg, 1969; Craig, 1976). Relativism refers to the idea that moral principles are not fixed concepts, but rather they vary depending on cultural values and the context of the particular situation (Gilligan, 1981; Kohlberg, 1981; Perry, 1970). In both Kohlberg's longitudinal study and his course on moral and political choice, relativisitic thinking became evident in students' responses to situations involving a moral concern. When the students in Kohlberg's study and in his course offered contextual interpretations of moral dilemmas, "the phenomenon was that of moral relativism - the claim that

in the face of individual difference and cultural heterogeneity, nonarbitrary or objective moral judgment was impossible and that therefore one 'should' do whatever one thinks is right" (Gilligan, 1981, p.144). He interpreted this as a regressive tendency rather than as a legitimate mode of moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1981; Gilligan, 1981). Kohlberg ignores the idea that a relativistic approach to moral reasoning is valid when he calls for a doctrine of "methodological nonrelativism" which "means that, even if there are observed cultural divergences of moral standards, there are rational principles and methods that can reconcile these divergences or lead to agreement" (Kohlberg, 1981, p.98).

Others posit that relativism is more than an aberration of moral development that is principled and justice-oriented. In Gilligan's analysis of Kohlberg's research related to college students, she contends that, "... relativism appeared not as an impediment to moral development but rather as a necessary transitional step ..." (Gilligan, 1981, p.145). Relativistic thinking is understood as a developmental phase that represents a time of cognitive dissonance, of questioning "truths", rather than as a regression to less complex modes of reasoning. An article describing adolescent development aptly identifies this sometimes confusing period: "... in the course of human development when adolescents discover that the categories of their reason cannot encompass the facts of their experience" (Gilligan and Murphy, 1979, p.86). In effect, as a transitional step, relativistic thinking facilitates movement toward more advanced moral reasoning because the individual begins to consider the myriad of potential

ramifications of his/her moral decision and no longer relies solely on an applicable standard of behavior or a rule.

Another proponent of relativism is Perry (1970). Perry's scheme identifies knowledge as contextual and relativistic, and defines a decision-making approach that is not relativistic as "dualistic thinking", an elementary form of cognition based on a belief that there is only one interpretation or one "truth" (Perry, 1970). In a description of his developmental theory, one author examines Perry's conception of relativism as a necessary and, in fact, higher order of the cognitive process. She expounds on Perry's perception of relativism when she writes that, "The merits of alternative perspectives are so clear that it becomes nearly impossible to choose among them, fearing that to do so would sacrifice the appreciation for the other views" (King, 1978, p.39). She continues, explaining that, "By the time students reach Position Six (on Perry's scale), they are beginning to realize the need to evolve and endorse their own choices from the multiple 'truths' that exist in a relativistic world" (King, 1978, p.39).

"The convergence of developmental themes in late adolescence around questions of morality, together with the intellectual capacity of the adolescent mind ... points to adolescence as a critical time for moral development in the human life cycle ... the crisis of this time is that of moral relativism" (Gilligan, 1981, p.141). Regardless of the theorist's perspective on relativism, it is clear that relativistic thinking plays an important role in the development of moral reasoning in college students.

Effects of the College Experience on Moral Development

Various authors have emphasized the part that experience has on moral development (Craig, 1976; Gilligan, 1981; Kohlberg, 1981; Reimer, 1981; Turiel, 1983). One cannot easily mature and grow without a context in which to test new precepts and modes of reasoning. The college experience offers the individual this context -- a social environment with a set of rules, both explicit and implied, that forces the student to continually face dissonance, moral conflict and, as a result, develop toward a fully functioning moral self. Although other contexts at other transitional times in a person's life influence moral development, the college experience is perceived as pivotal. "When higher education stimulates the activity of the mind and develops its capacity for reflection and judgment, it inevitably becomes entangled with the process of moral development" (Gilligan, 1981, p.140).

Perry's work focuses extensively on the intellectual development of college students (1970). He emphasized the role that students' values have on their development both intellectually and psychologically when he writes that, "For the college student, the confrontation with pluralism of values has become inescapable, not only in his courses but in his daily life with his peers" (p.6). While intellectual development may not necessarily be linked with moral development in terms of a direct positive correlation between the two, one might conclude that the development of one is complementary to the other. What, then, are the particular settings within the college environment that have an impact on moral development?

49

The college experience offers the student many opportunities to become involved with others in a group setting. For example, extracurricular activities such as various clubs, intramural and intercollegiate athletics, student government, and other organizations create opportunities for students to function collaboratively with others in both leadership and participant roles. One study examined the impact that group leaders have on the moral development of the group members. The results of the study imply that students choose as their leaders those whose level of moral reasoning is considered advanced. The findings suggest that effective leaders also facilitate moral development of other students (Hult and Clark, 1983).

In another study, the researcher interviewed students and asked them to discuss the most significant experiences that occurred during their freshman year in college related to their moral development. "... almost all students mentioned experiences involving their immediate peer group and dealt with exposure to more mature thinking, a relationship with a person of the opposite sex, or personal spiritual experiences" (Whiteley, 1980, p.49). Apparently, experiences that expose the student to new values, new perspectives, new information, and new people are some of the important contributing factors to enhanced moral development.

The experiential context upon which this dissertation is focused is the university judicial process. Very few studies have been conducted that examine the impact of involvement in the judicial system on the development of moral reasoning in college students. Whether a student becomes involved as a judicial board member or as an individual

confronted with a discipline situation, the experience offers a setting ripe with moral implications (Smith, 1978).

A Judicial System Context

The professional literature in the area of university judicial affairs generally revolves around one of three perspectives. First, a substantial body of literature is focused on the legal interpretation and educational application of due process (Arndt, 1971; Bakken, 1968; Barr, 1983; El-Khawas, 1979; Fowler, 1984; Gehring; 1983; Gordon, 1971; Hammond, 1978; Jackson and Richardson, 1975; Kaplan, 1983; Leslie and Satryb, 1974; Roberts, Brown, and Clemens, 1972; Shubert and Folger, 1980; Young, 1971). Perhaps this emphasis can be attributed to some of the landmark court cases of the 1960's that resulted in the demise of "in loco parentis" and a restructuring of judicial systems to comply with the now applicable due process doctrine (Kaplan, 1983). Authors have been concerned with offering ideas to practitioners to help them incorporate this new legal perspective into the manner in which they manage the judicial function.

Other important articles have focused attention on the student who becomes involved either as a complainant or a respondent in the judicial system. Some articles examine demographic issues related to the student offender (Biggs and Brown, 1977; Lester and Leach, 1984; Tracey, Foster, Perkins, and Hillman, 1979; Work, 1969) whereas other literature explores attitudes of students toward the judicial process (Janosick, Spencer, and Davis, 1985; Jenison, 1972; Shuh, 1984). This attempt to assist practitioners in understanding the student dimension

51

in a judicial context can be perceived as a transition toward a less legalistic and a more educational perspective.

Thirdly, another important focus in the related literature has been a descriptive analysis of the structure and function of university judicial boards (ACUHO, 1984; Caruso, 1977; Ostroth, Armstrong, and Campbell, 1978; Steele, Johnson, and Rickard, 1984). As practitioners have developed a sophisticated understanding of both the legal and developmental ramifications of student discipline they have sought more effective means for carrying out the judicial function. As a result, the issue of appropriately selecting and training judicial boards has received attention in the literature.

Due Process

"The worse the society, the more law there will be. In
hell there will be nothing but law, and due process
will be meticulously observed" (Fowler, 1984, p.414)

A recent trend in student affairs administration is for practitioners to become adept at applying legal constructs to the disciplinary setting. This quotation from a philosopher and law professor cited in Fowler's article examining legal considerations in higher education, gives rise to the importance of understanding the concept of due process and concurrently keeping it within an educational perspective that seeks to promulgate a positive and healthy environment for students. The purpose of the following examination of due process is to present both a legal and an educational perspective to an issue that is fundamental for the effective operation of a university judicial system.

Two occurrences influenced current conceptions and applications of the legal doctrine of due process in higher education. First, in 1966, a joint commission comprised of representatives from the five major associations of the student affairs profession met and drafted The Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students, the idea for which was conceived by the American Association of University Professors in 1960 (Tautfest, 1969). The Joint Statement was important because it identified, (a) students' civil rights in relation to the sanctions and punishments typically imposed on them in discipline situations, and (b) how an institution's mission statement is expressed to the public through the kinds of offenses the institution considers necessary to confront and prevent (Tautfest, 1969).

Second, the landmark court case, Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 F.2d 150 (5th Cir. 1961), was a turning point in the evolution of fair and consistent judicial processes in higher education (Bakken, 1968). The outcome of the case established several requirements regarding discipline hearings that serve as the foundation for the procedural statements of most institutions' judicial systems. The case set forth that the accused student must be provided a notice that specifies the charges, both sides will present their information in a hearing, the accused should be able to face his/her accusors or be provided a list of the names of witnesses, the student should be allowed to present both oral and written information, and should be advised of the results of the hearing (Bakken, 1968).

The Fifth Amendment of the Constitution provides that, "No person ... shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." Prior to the late 1960's, college students seemed to

53

be exempt from this important right. However, as the due process precept became applicable to university judicial systems through changes in the law it became increasingly necessary for judicial administrators to understand the concept.

There is no standardized definition of due process. However, several authors have identified the important components of the right so that educators could understand and implement it. "Generally, due process is met when principles of fair play are invoked and when actions are reasonable and just, not arbitrary" (Young, 1971, p.102). "Due process is a general concept with no precise, operational definition, although it implies fair practice and fair law" (Arndt, 1971, p.84). Although these conceptualizations have several important implications, they do not spell out the conditions necessary for implementation of due process. Arndt's definition alludes to the distinction between the concepts of procedural due process and substantive due process. The former refers to the procedures and methods used in the judicial system, itself and the latter is specific to the actual law or regulation in question (Young, 1971). Every institution, then, must examine both its statement of rules and regulations, and the judicial process. To further specify the definition, one author writes, "... even the courts have termed due process an elusive concept but suggest that at the very least due process requires: notice of the charge or complaint and the facts which support it; nonprejudicial time intervals; a hearing at which there is an opportunity to answer the charges or explain a position; impartial decision making" (Shubert and Folger, 1980, p.47). Although a definition of due process is probably called into question in many

discipline cases both at the campus and court levels, it is evident that the fields of law and education have progressed significantly in the past twenty years in their understanding of this construct.

How, then, does due process specifically manifest itself in the university judicial process? The advent of due process on the college campus has raised two procedural issues that affect student discipline. First, it is clear that a university must have a specific rule or statute upon which to base a disciplinary action that is made known to students through the university's various publications such as catalogues and student handbooks. Second, although university officials do have the responsibility and the power to discipline students, they are inherently accountable to both the law and to the educational mission of the institution. A university can no longer live by vague phrases such as "general misconduct", nor is a university expected to disengage itself from having standards of conduct, at all (Gordon, 1971).

Due process has affected other procedural concerns, as well. In recent years, many institutions have hired legal consultants to provide advice to judicial administrators. As the legal implications of the discipline process have become more complicated, students have followed suit and gone outside of the university for legal advice. The findings of one study imply that, "The only apparent requirement ... of essential fairness is that the student should not be placed under the double handicap of having to prepare a substantive defense while having to learn the procedural system under which he is to be prosecuted. The availability of competent advice would be sufficient" (Leslie and Satryb, 1974, p.344). To balance the need for a legally sound process

55

with the implementation of an educationally justifiable system, many universities are now considering the importance of ombudsmen and other advisors as they restructure their judicial systems (Habecker, 1980; Larson, 1974). Hopefully, students will receive advice that both educates for growth and protects against infringement of rights.

This trend toward balancing legal and educational aspects of the judicial system is an important outcome of this emphasis on due process rights. "Sound student development need not be antithetical to lawful institutional and professional conduct" (Greenleaf, 1978, p.46). With this in mind, some practitioners advocate a programmatic approach to student discipline for a judicial process grounded in the need for both due process and growthful educational outcome. For example, such an approach would define the judicial system as a process that helps students examine their ability to make sound decisions. As they work with students, judicial administrators would keep in mind the fact that developing sound decision-making skills has an impact on the student's ability to establish career goals and form interpersonal relationships. Thus, the system is programmatic in that it educates the student to function effectively in a variety of contexts (Caruso, 1978).

University Judicial Boards

Judicial systems have changed significantly since the late 1960's. One study conducted in the mid-1970's surveyed judicial systems and asked judicial administrators to indicate what factors have influenced changes in their programs during the early to middle

1970's. Fifty nine percent of the respondents indicated that the decline of the "in loco parentis" doctrine served as a factor. Fifty six percent mentioned that more rigorous due process requirements affected changes in their systems and fifty one percent said that new administrators working within their programs had an impact (Ostroth, Armstrong, and Campbell, 1978). These factors are indicative of the influence that legal changes can have on a system.

The purpose of one particular study conducted by the Association of College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO) was to "determine the extent of college and university residence hall involvement in student discipline" (p.10). The study examined many aspects of the typical judicial system including hearings, judicial advisors, decision-making, policies and rules, appeal procedures, and selection and training of board members. Some significant structural commonalities exist among many judicial systems in the country, according to the study. For example, most disciplinary hearings are closed to the public and are conducted by administrative officers. Although hearings are also conducted by judicial boards, it is interesting to note that a large number of hearings do not reach the judicial board level. Also, the sanctions that are most often imposed are reprimands, disciplinary probation, suspension from residence halls, and restitution. The study recommends that, "... the most effective sanctions, in terms of student reaction, are those that are tangible" (p.10). Methods for selecting judicial board members ranged from student elections, to appointment by a student governing

committee, to appointment by residence hall staff. Most judicial

systems do have a training program for their board members (ACUHO,

1984).

Another national survey conducted during the year prior to the

ACUHO Study presented a somewhat different perspective on the sanctions

issue. "Depending on the severity of the disciplinary case, creative,

alternative sanctioning is a possible consideration" (Steele, Johnson,

and Rickard, 1984, p.340). The researchers go on to explain that the

creative sanction can have a "developmental impact" (p.340) that is

perceived as more humanistic than the traditional sanctions. The

results of this study are in concurrence with the ACUHO Study with

regard to the administrative handling of most cases. The investigators

found that 70% of the hearings were conducted by a judicial officer

(Steele, et al, 1984).

Although judicial boards hear only a small percentage of

discipline cases, the boards play an important role in the judicial

process. In many institutions, they offer students an opportunity to

be heard by an unbiased group of peers who may share their perspectives

on being a university student. As a result, many judicial systems are

continually assessing the manner in which they select, train, and

advise their student judicial boards. One interesting study examined

faculty and student perceptions of how each would adjudicate a series

of hypothetical discipline situations. "Faculty generally adjudicated

academic dishonesty cases more severely than students ... Students

generally were more severe on the other on-campus offenses than were

faculty" (Jenison, 1972).

Another important study presents a descriptive analysis of student judicial board members at a large state university with regard to decision-making skills as compared with a group of students not serving on judicial boards. "Results showed some individual differences in dogmatism, self-students discrepency, and moral judgment for the criterion variables of responsibility attribution, sanction assignment, and decision-making appropriateness" (Caruso, 1977, p.339). Judicial board members had more definite career goals than non-board members and more frequently represented the areas of psychology, government, and politics with regard to academic major than non-board members. Generally, judicial board members who appeared to be close-minded tended to favor harsher sanctions for students (Caruso, 1977). The study has important implications for the manner in which judicial board members are selected and trained. The results also imply that certain personality traits and characteristics are conducive to certain decision-making styles that may or may not be appropriate in the judicial setting.

Student Involvement in the Disciplinary Process

The manner in which students respond to the disciplinary process has been the subject of three significant articles (Dollar, 1969; Janosick, Spencer and Davis, 1985; Schuh and Oblander, 1984). Dollar's perspective assumes an educational stance, when he writes that in the particular institution studied, "Emphasis was given to formulating understandings of the causes of each discipline problem and, in appropriate cases, to defining ways of modifying the student's

59

behavior" (p.219). With this as a framework, the study concluded that a majority of the students, "... rated the administration of discipline as sound and fair; felt that hearings had been conducted in a courteous, understanding, and professional manner; and reported rapport and an understanding relationship with the discipline coordinator" (p.220). Another study concurs when it concludes that students generally perceived the judicial process as a positive program (Janosick, Spencer and Davis, 1985).

Another interesting aspect of student involvement in the disciplinary process is the manner in which students are perceived by their peers when they file a judicial complaint. Schuh and Oblander (1984) report, in their study, that frequently, students who filed complaints were subjected to either verbal or physical abuse from other students. Verbal abuse was more common and, "... involved either being intentionally embarrassed in front of others or receiving harassing telephone calls" (p.344). The authors recommend that residence hall staff and judicial administrators strive to develop a solid sense of community within the living units so that behavior which results in student complaints against each other will decline.

Some significant articles have been written in recent years that describe from, both a personality and a demographic perspective, the characteristics of the typical student offender (Biggs and Brown, 1977; Tracey, Foster, Perkins, and Hillman, 1979; Work, 1969; Lester and Leach, 1983). One study examined the relationship between the causes of student misconduct as reported by students, and their attitudes toward various disciplinary actions. The findings suggest that students distinguish between misconduct caused by some personality

factor and misconduct caused by an environmental influence such as peer pressure or stress related to academic performance. Generally, students are accepting of the disciplinary system when it punishes those students whose misconduct is a result of a personality trait. However, their perception of causal factors is influenced by their perspective as either the "actor" or the "observer" (Biggs and Brown, 1977). Although this study does not offer particular descriptive information about the student offender, it does strongly imply that the manner in which the student attributes the cause of the misconduct (trait v. environment) influences the way in which the judicial administrator will be able to work with that student to affect behavioral change. Essentially, the student who takes responsibility for his/her actions will be more amenable to change than the student who blames the environment.

Studies that do describe specific characteristics of the typical student offender generally concur that there are differences in value orientation, maturity level, and ability to handle stress (Lester and Leach, 1983; Tracey, et al, 1979; Work, 1969). Using the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), one study compared significant personality characteristics between a discipline group and a non-discipline group. The study concluded that compared with non-disciplined male and female students, disciplined male students are spontanteous, expressive, and ebullient; are deficient with regard to maturity, socialization, and responsibility, are disorganized under stress, pessimistic about the future, and lacking in

self-understanding. The discipline group also scored higher than the non-discipline group in flexibility, concern for personal pleasure, and assertiveness (Work, 1969).

There are some gender differences in the findings of other studies that included male and female subjects. One study found that 74% of the student offenders at a large state university were male and 26% were female (Tracey, et al, 1979). It is interesting to note, however, that there were no significant differences in the type of offense committed by either sex and no differences in offense rates among the undergraduate classes. Another study in which data was collected from a sample of undergraduates in 1970 and then again in 1980 from a sample at the same institution, found that the 1980 results demonstrate a "closing of the gap" between male and female behavior (Lester and Leach, 1983). Although there are similarities in behavior patterns between male and female student offenders, it is significant that such a large percentage of student offenders are male. This has several implications regarding the ways that males and females perceive misconduct, decision-making, and responsibility.

Summary: Implications for Student Affairs

"A reluctance to judge remains a reluctance to hurt, but one that stems now not from a sense of personal vulnerabilty but rather from a recognition of the limitations of judgment itself" (Gilligan, 1977, p.513).

The literature on the judicial function in student affairs focuses on the concept of due process, the student involved in judicial matters, and university judicial boards, themselves. In recent years,

the latter emphasis has received an increasing amount of attention in the literature. However, it appears that the influence of gender on the decision-making perspective of the judicial board member has not been a published topic of examination. One could surmise that an understanding of the moral reasoning of college students is related to how practitioners perceive the judicial affairs function because issues that arise in a judicial matter typically involve conflicts between student behavior and student rights. Judicial conflicts usually involve rules as well as discussions about the impact of student behavior on other students. These components of the typical judicial situation can also be defined as moral situations. As recent conceptualizations of morality have become increasingly gender inclusive, an analysis of gender and moral decision-making as a function of judicial boards is necessary. In an article discussing the implications of Gilligan's work for student affairs, the authors ask, "What types of opportunities and supports can be designed to include attention to the ethics of care, to focus on relationship as motivator and reward" (Delworth, Seeman, 1984, p.491)? Perhaps one area is the judicial affairs program that is reconceptualized to include both the care perspective and the rights perspective.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purposes of this study were as follows: (1) To examine self identity and moral decision-making differences between the undergraduate residence hall area judicial board members at Michigan State University and a sample of undergraduate students who were not judicial board members; (2) To examine differences in self identity and moral decision-making between male and female participants in the study; and (3) To determine whether there was a relationship between use of self description mode and use of moral reasoning mode.

Gilligan's (1982) theoretical conception of identity and moral reasoning serves as the foundation for the study. Her theory holds that there are differences between the ways men and women (a) conceive of their self identity and (b) construct, resolve, and evaluate the moral dilemmas in their lives. These differences are characterized by gender, but are not necessarily defined by it.

This chapter presents a discussion of the sample groups analyzed in the study, the development of the instrument, procedures for collecting and scoring the data, and the statistical and qualitative analyses applied to these data.

Subjects

There were two sample groups in the study. The first sample group was drawn from the total population of 53 student members of the four

undergraduate residence hall area judicial boards at Michigan State University. These four area judicial boards are the Brody Complex Area Judiciary, the North Complex Area Judiciary, the South Complex Area Judiciary, and the East Complex Area Judiciary. Judicial board members are selected annually either in the spring to serve during the following academic year or early in the fall of the academic year of service. The judicial board member selection process is developed and implemented by staff members of the Division of Student Affairs and Services including the Area Director of each residence hall complex and the Assistant to the Area Director who serve as judicial board advisors. After the selection process, the new board members are then approved during a voting session of each residence hall's elected student government. The judicial board advisors identified the members of their respective judicial boards for inclusion in the study.

The four undergraduate residence hall area judicial boards were chosen for this study because they form a large group of participants who are similar in age and residence, and whose tasks and responsibilities as judicial board members are defined similarly. Statistical comparison of sample groups requires a sample large enough to make these comparisons. According to Borg and Gall (1983), this kind of research generally requires a sample size of at least 30 cases. Since no one judicial board had that many members, it was necessary to combine the four judicial boards.

The comparison group consisted of a randomly selected group of 106 students who resided in the undergraduate residence halls that are served by each of the four undergraduate area judicial boards. Since judicial board members are selected, in part, because of their sense of

responsibility the investigator reasoned that the return rate of useable responses would be different for the judicial board member group and the non-board member group. Judicial board members might tend to return a questionnaire because of a perceived obligation to do so. The non-board members' perceived sense of responsibility or obligation might be varied and less predictable than the attitude of the judicial board members, because the non-board members might have represented a broader range of experiences in positions of responsibility. Therefore, it was assumed that the non-board member return rate would be lower than the return rate of the judicial board member group. Since there were a possible 53 returned responses from the judicial board member group, the number was doubled to 106 as an estimated appropriate size of the non-board member group.

The sample group of non-board members was drawn from the total population of approximately 16,000 students living in undergraduate residence halls. The Michigan State University Student Directory published in November, 1986 was used to select the sample in May, 1987. The directory lists the names and addresses of both residence hall and off-campus students. It was used because it was the most comprehensive list of students available to the investigator. The systematic sampling procedure was used to arrive at the names and addresses of the research participants to be contacted. Systematic sampling requires the investigator to divide the population (n = 16,000) by the number needed for the sample (n = 106) to compute the sampling interval. For this study, the sampling interval was 150. Using the student directory, the investigator counted every 150th

residence hall student to arrive at the sample. Students living off-campus were not counted.

The systematic sampling procedure was used because there was an available list of students (the student directory) that was compiled independently from the research and that was not defined by any particular demographic characteristics. Therefore, there was little chance of investigator bias using this procedure. An alternative sampling procedure would have been to use a table of random numbers. However, this would have been a cumbersome and probably less accurate procedure because of the large population size. According to Borg and Gall (1983), there is little difference between the two procedures if the population list is not compiled according to any shared characteristics of the members of the population. For example, if the only available list had been compiled by residence it would have been inappropriate to use because the sample list may have reflected a bias toward students from the most heavily populated residence halls.

Instrumentation

At the time this study was undertaken, there were no predeveloped, standardized, written instruments that assessed modes of self description and moral reasoning as defined by Gilligan (1982) and Lyons (1983). The instrument for this study was designed by the investigator and represents a written modification of the in-person interview format developed by Gilligan (1977, 1980, 1982) and Lyons (1983). A similar written modification was developed by Wood (1986) to assess moral

reasoning modes with a sample of college-aged students. However, her study did not include the self description question.

The instrument designed for this study was comprised of two parts. The first part was a demographic data sheet that required the research participants to provide information about their age, class in school, grade point average, sex, religion, ethnic origin, place of birth, parent's place of birth, current family income, family income while growing up, and major course of study. This part of the instrument was designed with the assistance of Kenneth Marvin, a Staff Associate in the Educational and Support Services Department of the Division of Student Affairs and Services at Michigan State University (See Appendix A for the Demographic Data Sheet).

The second part of the instrument was a questionnaire designed by the investigator. The purpose of the questionnaire was to elicit information about, (1) the mode of self description utilized by each participant and, (2) the mode of moral reasoning used by each participant to construct, resolve, and evaluate a real-life moral dilemma that they had experienced. The essay-type questionnaire, entitled "Student Descriptions of Themselves and a Real-Life Moral Dilemma", consisted of four questions with one question per page leaving adequate space for the participant's written response (See Appendix B for the questionnaire). The questions were modelled after Gilligan's (1980, 1982) open-ended interview format that included four questions on: (a) a self description, (b) the construction of a real-life moral dilemma experienced by the participant, (c) the resolution of that dilemma, and (d) an evaluation of the resolution. Modification of the in-person interview format to a written, essay-type

questionnaire was warranted based on the successful research of Wood (1986) who designed a written questionnaire consisting of three real-life moral dilemma questions that was administered to college-aged students in a study exploring participants' perceptions of problems in interpersonal relationships.

In February, 1987, a pilot study was conducted to determine whether the questions were clear, understandable, and unambiguous. First, the pre-test questionnaire was administered to eight students who demographically represented a range of ages, classes, and major fields of study similar to the anticipated sample groups. The participants were asked to complete the questionnaire, write a two to three sentence synopsis of their perception of the meaning of each of the four questions, and indicate how long it took them to complete the questionnaire. The purpose of requesting that the pilot study participants answer the four questions was to determine whether the questions elicited the kinds of responses that could be appropriately analyzed. The students were asked to provide their perception of the meaning of each question so the investigator could assure that the intended meaning of each question was understood. Requesting that each pilot study participant indicate the amount of time the study took to complete assured that the investigator could inform research participants in the actual study of the approximate amount of time they would need to spend on the questionnaire.

In a second part of the pilot study, two student affairs professionals who had conducted similar research utilizing Gilligan's theoretical foundation were asked to assess the questionnaire and provide suggestions for improvement. Assistance in the design of the

questionnaire was provided by Dr. Linda Forrest, Associate Professor, Division of Counseling Psychology, Michigan State University and Dr. Barbara Stonewater, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Leadership, Miami University of Ohio. Both the pre-test and this assessment elicited a number of suggestions that were incorporated into the design of the questionnaire used in the study.

An open-ended, written, essay-type format was used for a number of reasons. First, this format allowed the investigator to conduct the study with a relatively large sample of students. Other similar studies (Gilligan, 1980; Lyons, 1983) employing an interview format have used a sample size of 36 individuals. The investigator's study used a sample size of 129 participants. Given this large sample, a written format was a more expedient way of collecting data in a short time span. Second, a written questionnaire assured that the sex of each participant need not necessarily be known by the investigator since the questionnaires were sent out with a number code and returned anonymously. Had the investigator conducted interviews, she would have known the sex of each participant perhaps influencing on the scoring of the data. Thirdly, the written format meant that oral responses did not have to be transcribed which was both time and cost efficient. One potential limitation of the written format is that it precludes the use of probing questions by an interviewer. However, the investigator found that most students wrote lengthy and detailed responses to the questions.

Data Collection Procedures

Judicial Board Members:

Each judicial board advisor was contacted by telephone to discuss the study and determine an appropriate time to distribute questionnaires to judicial board members. A memo was then sent to the advisors on April 21, 1987 requesting that they indicate a time during the week of May 4, 1987 for the investigator to meet with their judicial boards. A written reminder served to confirm each meeting time. During the week of May 4, the consent form, a letter outlining the purpose and nature of participating in the study, and the questionnaire were distributed to the judicial board members by the investigator at the designated meeting time (See Appendix C for the consent form and letter). Participants were asked to seal and return the completed consent form and questionnaire in the envelopes provided. At judicial board meetings during the week of May 11, advisors reminded members verbally that those who had not returned the completed questionnaire should do so by the following meeting.

Of the 53 judicial board members, 27 were male and 26 were female. By May 25, 1987, 68% of the board members (n = 36) returned useable response sheets. Of those board members who returned useable responses, 17 were male and 19 were female.

Non-Board Members:

During the week of May 4, 1987 each of the 106 non-board members was contacted by telephone. The purpose of the study was briefly explained. The prospective participants were told that the questionnaire would take about 30 minutes to complete and that it was

comprised of four questions requiring essay-type responses. It was
further explained that the questions asked participants to describe
themselves and discuss a dilemma in their lives that had caused
internal conflict. Participants were assured that confidentiality
would be strictly maintained. Ninety three students (85.1%) agreed to
participate and each was sent a consent form, a letter outlining the
nature and purpose of the study, and a questionnaire (See Appendix D).
Forty three of the non-board members who agreed to participate were
male and 50 were female. By May 18, 1987, 38.7% (n - 36) of the
participants had returned useable response sheets. On May 20, a
reminder letter was sent to each non-respondent restating the nature
and purpose of the study, assuring confidentiality, and requesting that
completed responses be returned to the investigator within one week.
The questionnaire was also included with the reminder letter (See
Appendix E). By May 27, 44% (n - 41) returned useable response
sheets. Of the 41 non-board member respondents, 15 were male and 26
were female. Of the judicial board member sample and the non-board
member sample combined, 32 participants were male and 45 were female.
Useable response sheets are those that had answers for all four
questions. Of the judicial board members and non-board members
combined, three participants returned response sheets with only one
question answered. These incomplete responses were discarded. There
were no other incomplete response sheets.

The investigator chose to establish slightly different data
collection methods for each of the sample groups for the following
reason. It was anticipated that although the judicial board member
sample would return useable response sheets at a higher return rate

72

than the non-board member sample, a relatively high return rate was required so that the appropriate statistical analyses could be performed. Borg and Gall (1983) state that it is generally desirable to have a minimum of 15 cases in each group to be compared. Since each sample group would be divided into a male group and a female group for purposes of the analysis, at least 30 cases would be required in each of the two sample groups. The judicial board member sample which was comprised of 53 members would then require at least a 56.6% return rate. The investigator reasoned that attending judicial board meetings to present the nature and purpose of the study in person might positively influence the return rate.

It was not feasible to present the study at a meeting of the non-board members since they did not readily form an identifiable group. In fact, it was reasoned that requesting the non-board members to meet for the purposes of the study might lower the return rate. There is no evidence to suggest that the different data collection methods influenced the length, form, or content of the responses from each of the two sample groups.

Scoring the Data

The response sheets were scored independently by two scorers and an inter-rater reliability coefficient was calculated for each component of each response (See Table 1 for inter-rater reliability). The investigator served as one of the scorers. The other scorer was Amy Stoffelmayr, a doctoral candidate in the Michigan State University Counseling Psychology program.

Table 1

Inter-rater Reliability Between Two Scorers

	% of Agreememt		
	Step 1: Chunking	Step 2: Scoring	
Question			
Self Description	94%	Non-relational	– 93%
		Relational	– 95%
		Separate/Objective	– 91%
		Connected	– 93%
Moral Dilemmas	97%	Justice/Rights	– 96%
		Response/Care	– 97%

First, the responses to question 1, the self description question, were categorized or "chunked" into component parts. A chunk was defined as any idea expressed by the respondent. A chunk could be a word, a sentence, or a paragraph depending on whether it represented a complete idea expressed by the respondent. The purpose of categorizing or chunking each response was to account for the fact that a participant might choose to use either or both modes of self description in his/her answer to question 1. Chunking allowed the scorers to score the various ideas expressed by the participant as either separate/objective or connected. The degree of agreement for total number of chunks was 94% (See Appendix F for chunking instructions).

Responses to questions 2, 3, and 4, the moral dilemma questions, were then similarly chunked. Each of the following components was chunked separately: the situation, the moral conflict, the decision,

alternatives considered, methods of weighing each alternative, evaluative statements about the decision, reasons for evaluating a decision, regrets about the decision, and descriptions of what was learned from the decision. For instance, the word(s), sentence, or group of sentences that represented the situation, were considered one chunk. This same counting procedure was followed for each of the components listed above. The degree of agreement for total number of chunks was 97% (See Appendix G for the chunking instructions).

Second, each self description chunk was scored by determining whether it was nonrelational or relational. Descriptions of physical characteristics, identifying activities and possessions, and social status were scored as nonrelational. Descriptions that focused on abilities, interests, and beliefs were also considered nonrelational. Descriptions of self in relation to others were considered relational. Each relational chunk was scored as either separate/objective or connected. Degree of agreement for data as nonrelational, relational, separate/objective, or connected ranged from 91% to 95% (See Appendix H for scoring instructions).

The moral dilemma questions were then scored by determining whether each chunk was indicative of a justice/rights predominating mode or a response/care predominating mode. The degree of agreement between the scorers for each mode was 96% and 97% respectively (See Appendix I for scoring instructions).

This scoring system was developed by the two scorers and represents a modification of the scoring system developed by Lyons (1983). During the development of the scoring system, the scorers met on a weekly basis. At each meeting they discussed the particular

categorizations in the step to be scored for the following week. The investigator then compiled an instructions sheet based on the discussion that would be modified depending on an estimated inter-rater reliability calculated for each scoring step. For instance, if there was little agreement for a particular step, the instructions would be discussed and modified so they were being similarly interpreted. This process was followed for each scoring step.

Data Analysis

The design of this study was "The Static Group Comparison" (Stanley and Campbell, 1963). That is, one group was involved in the "experimental treatment" (judicial board membership) and then tested. The other group was tested, but did not experience the treatment. This is a "quasi-experimental" design meaning that, "random assignment of subjects to treatment groups was not accomplished" (Borg and Gall, 1983, p.680). Students could not be randomly assigned to each group because judicial board members were pre-selected in a competitive judicial board member selection process, as described in the description of the subjects earlier in this chapter.

The data were analyzed to determine the relationship, if any, of gender and judicial board membership to modes of self description and moral reasoning. For each participant's response sheet, frequency of the use of each mode was determined by counting each chunk scored as either separate/objective, connected, rights-predominating, or response-predominating. Next, the mean use of each mode was calculated. T-tests were used to determine whether there were

significant differences between these means for judicial board members and non-board members, and for males and females. In their discussion of the Static Group Comparison design, Borg and Gall state that, "The data ... can be analyzed simply by doing a T-test comparison of the posttest mean scores" (p.682). As such, judgments regarding hypotheses were determined as follows. The data from the independent variables (gender and judicial board membership) and the dependent variables (self description and moral reasoning modes) were analyzed using T-test procedures for each dependent variable to determine whether mean scores on each factor differed significantly from each other. Analysis of variance procedures were also used to determine interaction effect, if any. The chi-square statistical test was used to determine whether mode of self description was related to mode of moral reasoning.

Descriptive data were compiled for the variables of judicial board membership and gender. These data are presented to describe self description and moral reasoning modes of judicial board members and non-board members, and males and females.

The .05 level of significance was employed in this study. That is, a hypothesis was supported if the T-test procedure yielded a level of significance (p) of .05 or less. According to Borg and Gall, the .05 significance level is usually employed in similar studies. The two-tailed test of significance was used in this study because it assumes that a significant difference between the means could occur in either direction (Borg and Gall, 1983). Although directional hypotheses were formulated in this study, the investigator could not rule out the possibility that differences might occur in either direction. For instance, although it was hypothesized that women would

77

use the connected mode of self description more frequently than men, it was possible that men would use it more than women. This possibility exists because there has not been a great deal of research that tests male and female differences in self description modes.

The data were analyzed qualitatively as well as statistically. Exemplary passages from some participants' responses are presented to illustrate the modes of self description and moral reasoning. Passages are presented that demonstrate the sole use of one mode or the other to underscore the contrasting meanings inherent in using each mode. Variations in the use of these modes are also illustrated. For instance, the equal use of both modes in a particular passage may be more demonstratively presented by quoting the passages that represent this variation than by showing statistically that each mode was used with equal frequency.

Data will also be presented qualitatively when there are patterns apparent in the content of some responses. For instance, if a number of participants chose to discuss dilemmas related to the topic of choosing a career, a description of those responses may demonstrate the use of moral reasoning modes more clearly because the topic is similar and the contrasting moral perspectives may be more readily apparent.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

<u>Introduction</u>

As stated, the following objectives have defined and guided the study:

1. To examine differences in self identity and moral decision-making, as defined by Gilligan, between the undergraduate residence hall area judicial board members at Michigan State University and a sample of undergraduate students who were not judicial board members.

2. To examine differences in self identity and moral decision-making between male and female participants in the study.

3. To determine whether there was a relationship between use of self description mode and use of moral reasoning mode.

Data, in the form of written responses to a four-question, essay-type questionnaire, were obtained and analyzed as outlined in chapter three. The results of this analysis of data are presented in this chapter.

A presentation of the demographic characteristics of the two sample groups is presented that includes descriptive information about age, class in school, grade point average, religion, ethnic origin, family income while growing up, and current family income. T-test procedures were used to determine significant differences between (a) judicial board members and non-board members, and (b) males and females for age and grade point average. Chi-square procedures were used to determine significant differences between (a) judicial board members and non-board members, and (b) males and females for class standing,

religion, ethnic origin, family income while growing up, and current family income.

Data were also collected on place of birth, parent's place of birth, and major course of study. However, these demographic characteristics are not presented statistically because any differences between the sample groups would not be easily explained from the perspective of Gilligan's theoretical framework. For instance, Gilligan (1982) discussed the level of moral reasoning that defines a mature person. She believed that as individuals develop, they begin to incorporate both moral perspectives into their moral reasoning. This discussion of maturity connotes a need to demographically describe the sample in terms of age and class standing. If one accepts Gilligan's premise that as individuals mature, they incorporate both modes, it could be reasoned that age and perhaps class standing would influence predominant use of the modes of moral reasoning.

Gilligan (1982) also discusses how one's "participation in society" (p.67) influences choice of moral reasoning modes. Those who have traditionally been denied access to society's benefits (minorities, the poor) tend to be deferential and non-judgmental, according to Gilligan. Therefore, an understanding of religious background, ethnic origin, and income -- characteristics that are sometimes used to define societal status -- is necessary. If there were significant differences in these characterstics, these differences might have affected choice of moral reasoning modes.

Next, the data from the questionnaire are qualitatively analyzed by presenting excerpts from responses that exemplify, (a) use of each mode of self description and moral reasoning, (b) combined use of the two

modes of self description, (c) combined use of the two modes of moral reasoning, and (d) a comparison of the two moral reasoning modes as used by more than one participant in discussing a similar moral dilemma.

Hypotheses 1 - 9 are empirically analyzed by presenting results from statistical tests. For hypotheses 1 - 8, these statistical analyses demonstrate the use of self description and moral reasoning modes by judicial board members and non-board members, and by males and females. Hypothesis 9 is analyzed by presenting data that indicates the relationship between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning. Responses in which the sex of the participant is evident are then compared with responses in which the sex is not evident to determine whether there were differences in the scoring of sex-evident responses and sex non-evident responses.

The data from the questionnaire are then presented descriptively. First, the frequency of use of the separate/objective mode is compared with the frequency of use of the connected mode to determine predominant mode of self description used by judicial board members and non-board members. Next, the frequency of use of the rights-predominating mode is compared with the frequency of use of the response-predominating mode to determine predominant mode of moral reasoning used by judicial board members and non-board members. Third, the frequency of use of the separate/objective mode is compared with the frequency of use of the connected mode to determine predominant mode of self description used by males and females. Lastly, the frequency of use of the rights-predominating mode is compared with the

frequency of use of the response-predominating mode to determine

predominant mode of moral reasoning used by males and females.

Demographic Characteristics

Age

Moral development is understood in terms of its relationship to

identity formation. Therefore, it can be assumed that the research

participants' age -- given age's obvious relationship to the

developmental process -- is an important factor when considering the

potential implications of the results of this study.

The Demographic Data Sheet, as described in chapter three, asked

the research subjects to indicate their age in years and number of

months since the last birthday. Table 2 presents a comparison of the

ages of (a) judicial board members and non-board members and (b) males

and females. This table indicates that there were no significant

differences between judicial board members and non-board members (t

(75) = .50, p < .616), nor were there any significant differences

between males and females in age (t (75) = 1.28, p < .204).

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Age

Judicial Board Members n = 36		Non-Board Members n = 41		Males n = 32		Females n = 45	
M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
20.06	1.05	19.94	1.14	20.1	1.19	19.88	1.01

The age of the participants in the study is congruent with what is generally considered to be the "traditional" age of college students. The results of The Student Profile, 1987 (Marvin, 1987), a survey of Michigan State University students administered during the same year as data collection for the study, indicates that the participants in this dissertation study are representative of the Michigan State University student population in terms of age. However, the study described in this dissertation did not include "non-traditionally" aged students who, according to Marvin, comprised 7.2% of the Michigan State University undergraduate population.

Class Standing

The distribution of the participants year or class in school is an important aspect to consider when examining the demographic characteristics of the participants. As with age, if one assumes that this status has an impact on the development of moral reasoning, it becomes a necessary factor to examine.

Table 3 presents a comparison of class standing between judicial board members and non-board members. Table 4 presents a comparison of class standing between males and females. The tables indicate that there was no significant difference between judicial board members and non-board members in class standing (X^2 (df = 3, n =77) = 1.80, p < .613), but that there was a significant difference between males and females in class standing (X^2 (df = 3, n = 77) = 7.88, p < .048).

Insert Tables 3 and 4 Here

83

Table 3

The Relationship Between Judicial Board Membership and Class Standing

	Judicial Board Members n - 36	Non-Board Members n - 41	Total n - 77
Class			
Freshmen	10	13	23
Sophomores	16	16	32
Juniors	4	8	12
Seniors	6	4	10

Table 4

The Relationship Between Gender and Class Standing

	Males n - 32	Females n - 45	Total n - 77
Class			
Freshmen	8	15	23
Sophomores	13	19	32
Juniors	3	9	12
Seniors	8	2	10

x^2(df - 3, n - 77) - 7.88, $\underline{p}$ < .048

According to The Student Profile, 1987, the Michigan State University

student population is distributed among the four classes in the

following way. The Spring Term, 1987 enrollment figures which

correspond with the academic term in which the data for this

dissertation study were collected, reveal that the freshmen class was

comprised of 21% (n - 6502) of the students, the sophomore class

enrolled 23% (n - 6920) of the students, 26% (n - 7955) were enrolled

in the junior class, and 30% (n - 9079) made up the senior class.

Religion

One could reason that an individual's religious upbringing is

related to the development of moral reasoning because, generally, the

term, religion connotes adherence to a set of beliefs and values. This

perception of religion is similar to some aspects of moral development

as defined in chapter one of the dissertation. Therefore, the

Demographic Data Sheet asked participants to indicate the religious

setting in which they grew up. The item asked students to check the

appropriate religion from the following list: Roman Catholic,

Protestant, Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, Moslem, Atheist/Agnostic, or

Other. Space was provided for participants who chose the "Other"

category to indicate their specific religious upbringing.

Table 5 presents a comparison of judicial board members and

non-board members for religious upbringing. Table 6 presents a

comparison of males and females for religious upbringing. These tables

indicate that there were no significant differences between judicial

board members and non-board members for religious upbringing (X^2 (df

$- 4$, n $-$ 77) $-$ 3.10, $\underline{p} < .540$), nor were there any significant differences between males and females (X^2 (df $-$ 4, n $-$ 77) $-$ 1.72, $\underline{p} < .785$).

Table 5

The Relationship Between Judicial Board Membership and Religion

	Judicial Board Members n − 36	Non-Board Members n − 41	Total n − 77
Religion			
Roman Catholic	17	17	34
Protestant	11	16	27
Jewish	3	1	4
Buddhist	-	-	-
Hindu	-	-	-
Moslem	-	-	-
Atheist/Agnostic	1	-	1
Other	4	7	11

Table 6

The Relationship Between Gender and Religion

	Males n − 32	Females n − 45	Total n − 77
Religion			
Roman Catholic	13	20	33
Protestant	12	16	28
Jewish	2	2	4
Buddhist	-	-	-
Hindu	-	-	-
Moslem	-	-	-
Atheist/Agnostic	1	-	1
Other	4	7	11

It should be noted that the similar question in The Student Profile. 1987 asked students to indicate their current religious preference rather than their religious upbringing.

Of the students who responded in The Student Profile. 1987, 36% indicated a preference for the Roman Catholic religion, 40% indicated a preference for a Protestant denomination, and 3% indicated a preference for the Jewish religion. The Buddhist, Hindu, and Moslem faiths were not listed among the choices, but 19% indicated either "none", "other", "prefer not to respond", or "not given".

Ethnic Origin

According to Astin (1977), ethnicity is related to the development of a student's sense of identity, values, and interests. Therefore, one could reason that ethnicity influenced the self description and moral reasoning modes chosen by students in this study in response to the instrument. Table 7 presents a comparison of judicial board members and non-board members for ethnic origin. Table 8 presents a comparison of males and females for ethnic origin. These tables indicate that there were no significant differences between judicial board members and non-board members for ethnic origin (X^2 (df = 3, n =77) = 5.53, p < .137), nor were there any significant differences between males and females for ethnic origin (X^2 (df = 3, n = 77) = 3.00, p < .391).

Insert Tables 7 and 8 Here

87

Table 7

The Relationship Between Judicial Board Membership and Ethnic Origin

	Judicial Board Members n — 36	Non-Board Members n — 41	Total n — 77
Ethnic Origin			
White - not of Hispanic Origin	30	36	66
Black - not of Hispanic Origin	2	5	7
Hispanic	2	-	2
Asian Pacific American	2	-	2
Native American	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-

Table 8

The Relationship Between Gender and Ethnic Origin

	Males n — 32	Females n — 45	Total n — 77
Ethnic Origin			
White - not of Hispanic origin	26	40	66
Black - not of Hispanic origin	3	4	7
Hispanic	1	1	2
Asian Pacific American	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-

According to The Student Profile, 1987, 10% of the undergraduate

Fall Term, 1986 enrollment at Michigan State University were minority

students. Minorities included Blacks (6.5%), Hispanics (1.08%), Asian

Pacific Americans (2.09%), and Native Americans (.29%).

Family Income

In Astin's (1977) study, family income was not a demographic

characteristic examined as a correlate that influenced student

development during the college years. Therefore, there may not be a

direct or measurable relationship between family income and the

development of self identity or moral reasoning in college students.

However, family income was included in the demographic segment of this

study because the investigator reasoned that it is a factor considered

important when discussing the diversity of a sample. As discussed in

the introduction to this chapter, the investigator also reasoned that

income is a characteristic often associated with one's "participation

in society" as discussed by Gilligan (1982).

The Student Profile, 1987 does not include an analysis of family

income, but given the Land Grant mission of Michigan State University,

one could conclude that the student population represents a broad range

of socioeconomic backgrounds. Thus, the investigator included family

income to determine whether the sample was similar to the population

with regard to this factor.

Family income was examined in two ways. First, participants were

asked to indicate family income while growing up. The subsequent

question asked them to indicate current family income. Both questions

asked them to check the category that includes family income from the

following list: Less than $15,000; $15,000 to $24,999; $25,000 to $34,999; $35,000 to 49,000; and $50,000 or more. Table 9 indicates a comparison between judicial board members and non-board members for family income while growing up. Table 10 indicates a comparison between males and females for family income while growing up. Table 11 indicates a comparison between judicial board members and non-board members for current income. Table 12 indicates a comparison between males and females for current income. Tables 9 and 10 indicate that there were no significant differences between judicial board members and non-board members for family income while growing up (X^2 (df — 5, n — 76) — 7.55, p < .182), nor were there any significant differences between males and females X^2 (df — 4, n — 76) — 9.20, p < .056. Tables 11 and 12 indicate that there were no significant differences between judicial board members and non-board members for current family income (X^2 (df — 4, n — 76) — 3.03, p < .551), nor were there significant differences between males and females (X^2 (df — 4, n — 77) — 1.84, p < .765).

Insert Tables 9, 10, 11, & 12 Here

Table 9

The Relationship Between Judicial Board Membership and
Family Income While Growing Up

	Judicial Board Members n - 35	Non-Board Members n - 41	Total n - 76
Income Level			
Less than $15,000	-	2	2
$15,000 - $24,999	6	3	9
$25,000 - $34,999	10	16	26
$35,000 - $49,000	7	13	20
$50,000 or more	12	7	19

Note. One Judicial Board member did not answer this item.

Table 10

The Relationship Between Gender and Family Income While Growing Up

	Males n - 32	Females n - 44	Total n - 76
Income Level			
Less than $15,000	0	3	3
$15,000 - $24,999	7	2	9
$25,000 - $34,999	8	17	25
$35,000 - $49,000	7	13	20
$50,000 or more	10	9	19

Note. One female did not answer this item.

Table 11

The Relationship Between Judicial Board Membership and
Current Family Income

	Judicial Board Members n = 36	Non-Board Members n = 41	Total n = 77
Income Level			
Less than $15,000	2	1	3
$15,000 - $24,999	2	4	6
$25,000 - $34,999	6	6	12
$35,000 - $49,000	4	11	15
$50,000 or more	22	19	41

Table 12

The Relationship Between Gender and Current Family Income

	Males n = 32	Females n = 45	Total n = 77
Income Level			
Less than $15,000	1	2	3
$15,000 - $24,999	1	5	6
$25,000 - $34,999	5	7	12
$35,000 - $49,000	7	9	16
$50,000 or more	18	22	40

Grade Point Average

According to Astin (1977), there is a positive correlation between high self esteem and high grades. Assuming a relationship between self identity, moral reasoning, and self esteem it is possible that grade point average might have influenced the results of this study.

The relevant question on the Demographic Data Sheet asked the respondents to report their current grade point average. Table 13 presents comparisons between (a) judicial board members and non-board members and (b) males and females for grade point average. The table indicates that there were no significant differences between judicial board members and non-board members for grade point average (t (75) = 1.14, p < .257), nor were there any significant differences between males and females (t (75) = .862, p < .392).

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations for G.P.A.

Judicial Board Members n = 36		Non-Board Members n = 41		Males n = 32		Females n = 45	
M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
2.96	.45	2.84	.48	2.95	.37	2.86	.53

The Student Profile, 1987 collected data on grade point averages from the registrar's office and indicates that the mean grade point average for the student population was 2.7 at the end of both Winter and Spring Terms, 1987.

Summary

This presentation of the demographic characteristics of the sample used in this study revealed that judicial board members and non-board members were similar in age, class standing, religion, ethnic origin, family income while growing up, current family income, and grade point average. Males and females are similar in all reported demographic characteristics except for class standing.

This analysis of the demographic characteristics of judicial board members and non-board members, and males and females was necessary to determine whether there might have been confounding variables that influenced the use of self description and moral reasoning modes by the respondents in the study. Many of the demographic characteristics that were examined do have an impact on the development of self identity, as noted in Astin (1977), and it could be conjectured that these factors affect modes of self description and moral reasoning. The demographic characteristics presented from The Student Profile, 1987 give some indication of how the sample groups compared with the Michigan State University population. Statistical comparisons between the sample and the population were not possible because instruments used to gather the data were different. However, The Student Profile, 1987 offers the reader a general conception of the demographic composition of the population.

Qualitative Analysis

In this section, exemplary passages are presented from some participants' responses to give the reader a sense of the experiential

nature of the data. The purpose of this qualitative analysis of some of the written responses to the questionnaire used in this study is to define and explain the two modes of self description and the two modes of moral reasoning. A qualitative analysis demonstrates the contrasting perspectives that are evident in the use of each mode. It also demonstrates how the two modes are sometimes used in concert with one another. Excerpts from 3 participants' self descriptions and 7 participants' moral dilemmas are presented. This represents 12.9% of the 77 participants. These excerpts are presented as examples and should not necessarily be viewed as typical or average responses.

Self Description Modes

The two modes of self description or self identity are called the separate/objective self and the connected self (Lyons, 1983). The separate/objective self is defined through objectivity, fairness, and independence from others. Individuals defining themselves in this manner may think of relationships as obligations or commitments rather than as an aspect of life that contributes to a fuller sense of self. They may think of relationships as reciprocal agreements rather than as elements of their lives that connote a caring response to others. For the separate/objective self, the relationship to others is "mediated through rules" and "grounded in roles" (Lyons, 1983, p.134). The separate/objective self views him/herself apart from others. The following excerpt from a response to question 1 of the questionnaire used in this study illustrates the separate/objective self:

95

> I believe that I can be too domineering or too
> overbearing. I tend to think that my ways are always
> the right ways. This aspect of myself is dominant
> mostly in my relationships with family or friends. I
> would also describe myself as a perfectionist. I
> always want to do what's right. That in itself creates
> numerous dilemmas. I feel that if I don't do things
> right then I won't be happy later in life. I
> constantly worry if I'm doing the right things and
> making the right decisions.

This individual, a male participant in the study, is concerned about doing what is right. He might be showing some concern for how his manner affects others when he says, "This aspect of myself is dominant mostly in my relationships with family or friends." However, he does not expound on this thought. Rather, he continues by labelling himself as a perfectionist, seeking to do the right things and make the right decisions. This principled perspective -- defining what is right and wrong -- is a hallmark of the separate/objective self.

In contrast, the connected self is defined through relationships with others, the activity of care, and interdependence (Lyons, 1983). Relationships are experienced by the connected self as, "... a concern for the good of others or for the alleviation of their burdens, hurt, or suffering" (Lyons, 1983, p.134). The connected self defines him/herself in attachment to others rather than in objective detachment from others. Further, the connected self is focused on initiating, sustaining, and helping in relation to others. The following excerpt illustrates the connected self:

> Beyond my personal faith, people are the most important
> in my life. Part of the reason for this is just
> because I care a lot about things that go on around me.
> I tune in to people with problems who need a friend to
> listen to them. But another reason is just that people
> and the way they relate to each other fascinates me ...
> I hope people's lives will be better in some way for

> having met me. I know my life is usually made better
> for every person I truly get to know. That doesn't
> mean I'm a social butterfly. I'm not really
> comfortable in large group social activities. I'm
> better at focusing on a very few people and getting
> close to them.

For this individual, a female participant in the study,

relationships with others define her sense of self. She identifies

herself by talking about her ability to care for others. For instance,

when she mentions not being a "social butterfly", she seeks to clarify

her attachment to others by explaining that she is "...better at

focusing on a very few people and getting close to them." She also

talks about the idea that other people "fascinate" her. Although she

may mean this in an intellectual or vocational sense, she expands by

stating that she strives for the betterment of other's lives rather

than by discussing her own skills or goal of working in a setting

congruent with her skills of relating to others. This definition of

self in relation to others is a seminal characteristic of the connected

self.

Some participants in the study combined the two modes of self

description in response to question 1. The following excerpt

illustrates this use of both modes of self identity as a way of

defining self:

> I feel the best education one can learn is hands-on
> rather than from a text. I think friendship is the
> most important aspect in life. It's not only how far
> you go ... it's also who you meet along the way. I
> consider everyone to by my friend until they show me
> differently -- I'm not a cynic and I think everyone has
> something to offer. I am efficient and see no point in
> wasting time. I get annoyed easily with people who are
> constantly late. After all, their time is no more
> valuable than mine.

This individual, a female participant in the study, defined herself in relation to others as demonstrated by her emphasis on friendship as "the most important aspect in life." With this connected self mode, she shows concern that meeting and knowing others is at least as important as "how far you go" in life. However, there is also a set of standards and a desire for fairness that are indicative of the separate/objective self. This is evidenced in her labelling of herself as efficient and her subsequent assertion about other's tardiness, "... their time is no more valuable than mine." This concern with reciprocity is a part of her separate/objective self.

Moral Reasoning Modes

The two modes of moral reasoning that individuals use to construct, resolve, and evaluate the moral dilemmas in their lives, as defined by Lyons (1983), are the justice/rights-predominating mode and the response/care-predominating mode. The rights-predominating mode is characterized by an adherence to principles of fairness as standards upon which to judge actions and moral choices. Moral problems are viewed as, "conflicting claims between self and others" (Lyons, 1983, p.136). Obligation, commitment, and justification, as well as fairness, are important to the person who chooses this mode of moral reasoning. The following excerpt from a participant's response to questions 2, 3, and 4 of the questionnaire illustrates the use of the rights-predominating mode:

> A dilemma in my life happened to me recently. About
> two months age, I made a decision that changed one
> facet of my life. I asked a close friend to stay out
> of my life ... I realized things that I had never seen
> in her. Elements of manipulation, infidelity,
> selfishness, you name it. With the things I saw in

her, I realized she was somebody I just didn't want in
my life. The struggle came from how I was going to
tell her. The moral conflict for me in this situation
was not only what I was going to say but how --
maliciously, nicely, or not at all -- and try to save
the friendship. I decided to go ahead and write her
and just express my feelings honestly no matter how it
sounded. It was only fair for her to know how I truly
felt. The way I weighed each alternative was -- I
tried to see which one would alleviate the pain I was
feeling and which one would truly translate the emotion
I felt at the time.

The author of this moral dilemma is a male participant in the

study. Although one could argue that there is an element of care in

his concern for how he was going to inform his friend that he did not

want to continue his friendship with her, his main concern is that the

relationship is not good for him. For instance, he states, "... I

realized she was somebody I just didn't want in my life." Although his

moral conflict involved writing the letter "maliciously or nicely, or

not at all", he based his decision on the fairness standard saying, "It

was only fair for her to know how I truly felt." This reliance on

fairness as a principle upon which to make decisions and assess those

descisions is the definitive characteristic of the rights-predominating

mode.

Use of the response-predominating mode is characterized by a

concern for maintaining the relationship throughout the conflict within

the context of interdependence. Moral problems are viewed as "issues

of relationship or of response" (Lyons, 1983, p.136). The individual

using this mode of moral reasoning generally considers the importance

of "promoting the welfare of others" and evaluates the moral decision

based on whether the relationship has been maintained or restored. The

following excerpt illustrates the use of the response-predominating

mode:
99

> In high school, a close friend of mine confided in me
> that she was contemplating suicide. She expected me to
> keep her plans in strictest confidence. It may sound
> silly now that I even considered keeping her secret,
> but when you're young there is a childish code of
> confidence that is difficult to break. I cared about
> her a lot. I didn't want to hurt her by talking to
> somebody else about her problem, but I didn't want her
> to hurt herself either. It was difficult because she
> wasn't definitely planning to do it, but she was
> thinking about committing suicide. I was scared
> because I felt responsible for something I couldn't
> control. I felt sad and helpless to do anything to
> ease her pain. I also think I remember being a little
> angry that she put me in the position she did and
> guilty for feeling angry. I decided to tell somebody
> about the situation. I confided in a coach I was close
> to. I did talk to her parents about her plans and
> about why I thought she was contemplating suicide. I
> decided it was important that her family know about her
> feelings and I thought it would be easier for her and
> her family if the news came from a friend.

The individual who wrote about this moral dilemma was a female participant in the study. Use of the response-predominating mode is evidenced by her primary concern that her friend not be hurt either by the participant "talking to someone else about her problem" or by the friend hurting herself. Although the participant admits to her own anger at being placed in the situation, her tentativeness about that feeling -- "I remember being a little angry ... and guilty for feeling angry" -- is indicative of how important the care of her friend was to her. The moral conflict involved how to tell someone else about her friend's intention so that the suffering could be minimized. This focus on the alleviation of another's pain is a key characteristic of the response-predominating mode.

Other respondents in the study, constructed, resolved, and evaluated moral dilemmas using both modes of moral reasoning. The following excerpt demonstrates the use the two moral reasoning modes.

100

The situation involves a student and his suitemate deciding on who to
ask to join the suite of rooms, the best friend of the respondent or
his suitemate's best friend. The respondent had already told his
suitemate that he could ask his friend, but was changing his mind.

> Inside myself I felt like I had to decide between my
> friend and my given word. This moral conflict had
> upset me for a short period of time. After reasoning
> through the facts with myself, and by thinking of all
> the consequences that could arise, I did the right
> thing. After all of the considerations were cultivated
> in my mind, I decided to choose my best friend over my
> suitemate's best friend. This decision was made
> through consultation with my present roommate and my
> suitemates. They helped me see the outcome of each
> alternative. One alternative was that of my best
> friend feeling alientated by himself. Another is the
> the other person might not see all the facts and jump
> to conclusions that I was a terrible liar. The
> decision was the right choice. The second friend
> understood, and my best friend is still my best friend.

This example of the use of both modes of moral reasoning defines
the moral conflict of the situation from two different perspectives.
First, the respondent is in internal conflict because he believes that
he should not go back on his word. He states, "I felt like I had to
decide between my friend and my given word" and later, "... the other
person might not see all the facts and jump to conclusions that I was a
terrible liar." Secondly, although a standard of behavior -- keeping
one's word -- is operating in this example, there is also a clear
concern with maintaining a long standing relationship. The fact that
this relationship is, in fact, maintained is the criteria upon which
the decision is judged to be a good one. He states, "... my best
friend is still my best friend."

Another way to clarify the two moral reasoning modes is to examine
their use in constructing, resolving, and evaluating moral dilemmas

that are similar in content. Because the topic is similar, the contrasting moral perspectives may be more readily apparent than is so when examining moral dilemmas on a variety of topics.

A number of participants in the study chose to discuss dilemmas that occurred around the issue of an unwanted pregnancy. Both men and women discussed this kind of dilemma as it had occurred in their lives. The following excerpts illustrate the various moral perspectives that operated for these participants in their discussions of abortion. Both the rights-predominating and the response-predominating modes of moral reasoning were evident. For some, one mode dominated their decision making and for others, both modes were operative in their decision making process.

In this excerpt, a female participant discusses her experience helping a friend decide what to do about an unwanted pregnancy. The participant's decision making is dominated by a justice/rights perspective as is evident by her concern for doing the right thing.

> One experience which I still wonder whether I did the right thing involved an unmarried friend of mine who became pregnant. She came to me and wanted me to help her get an abortion. I was very upset and although I was honored because she trusted me so much, I really wish she hadn't depended on me in this situation. I tried to talk her out of this, because I feel abortion is wrong in most cases. I even found a couple that would be willing to adopt her baby and pay for all the expenses involved. Unfortunately, she couldn't (or didn't feel she could) go through the 9 months of pregnancy and an illegitmate birth. So, I set up an appointment for her and went with her to the clinic. Now I wish I could have done something to have prevented this. I still believe it was wrong and I guess I played a role in killing her child. I don't think I made the best choice. I don't know if there was a best choice. My big regret is that I couldn't talk her out of the abortion. I've learned that the world isn't black and white -- that there isn't a clear, right answer.

The rights-predominating mode is evident in this situation with its focus on what is right and wrong. The respondent shows concern for her friend by following through on her friend's wishes to have an abortion, but the overriding concern is with an assessment of the outcome as "wrong." She writes, "I still believe it was wrong and I guess I played a role in killing her child." However, there is also some questioning by the participant of her own decision making when she says, "I learned that the world isn't black and white -- that there isn't always a clear, right answer." The guiding principle for this student was that abortion is wrong and it is that reliance on guiding principle that defines this mode of moral reasoning.

Another female participant in the study wrote about her own potential unwanted pregnancy. Her assessment of the resolution, which was to tell her mother that she was having sexual relations with her boyfriend, emphasizes the impact of her decision on her relationship with her mother. This excerpt illustrates the use of the response-predominating mode:

> It was very hard at first, but I'm glad I didn't have
> to lie anymore. I regret that she was angry and hurt
> ... My father gave me a "lecture", but told me he still
> loved me and that although he didn't approve he wasn't
> me and wouldn't judge me. Today, my parents and I get
> along much better. My mother and I share many feelings
> even. Two weeks ago, I even told her about how I cared
> about a man and my trust was in vain. She sympathized
> and after telling her how I had dealt with one
> particular situation, she said, "I'm really proud of
> you. You handled that very maturely. I would have
> done about the same thing. That's great." It's been
> four years since I stopped lying -- keeping a major
> wall between us. Because I finally stopped lying I
> started wanting to trust my parents more. Now, we are
> becoming very good friends.

In contrast to the first unwanted pregnancy situation, there is no mention of what is right or wrong. The focus is on how the dilemma affected the relationship between the participant and her mother. She offers evidence that her relationship with her mother had survived the experience by relating a current event that involved sharing feelings and confiding with her mother. The response-predominating mode defines the moral problem in terms of the maintenance and sustainment of a relationship such as that between mother and daughter described by this participant.

The unwanted pregnancy issue was also discussed and resolved by two participants, a male and a female, through the use of both the rights-predominating and the response-predominating modes. This excerpt, written by a male, demonstrates the interplay between the two modes of moral reasoning.

> When my girlfriend told me that she might be pregnant, not by me, but by her ex-boyfriend ... I didn't know what to do, I wanted to throw or hit something. I did not know what would happen if she was pregnant. It was not mine, yet I cared about her. I decided that all I could do was be there for her emotionally to support her. I would support whatever decision she made, but how could I give advice? I did not know because I felt I did not have the right because the child would not have been mine, that attitude hurt. If it turned out she was pregnant I would have helped her make the decision that would be the best she could make for herself. I kept her confidence and would have no matter the course of action. If she kept the child, or aborted, I would have stayed right there beside her. I think I was in control of the situation and my emotions. I think Sue and I became closer because of sharing the burden of waiting until we found out.

Although the response-predominating mode is evident, the rights-predominating mode manifests itself through the participant's own perplexity. He states, "It was not mine, yet I cared about her."

104

He tries to set aside the fact that the child is not his and in doing so may be trying to set aside his own belief system about that issue as his care for his girlfriend becomes a significant issue. He struggles again about what role he should play as a confidant and advisor. He writes, "... but how could I give advice? I felt I did not have the right ..." Again his own belief that the fact that he would not be the father precludes his "right" to give advice is confronted by his concern and care. He assesses the outcome both by stating that he was "in control of the situation" and by concluding that "Sue and I became closer."

This interplay between both modes of moral reasoning is also illustrated in a female participant's discussion of her role in her younger sister's unwanted pregnancy. The issue of right and wrong again is evident in this student's struggle between her concern for her sister and her belief that abortion is wrong.

> I really don't believe in abortions as a method of birth control, but I do think it should be the woman's choice. My dilemma was giving the money to my sister for the abortion and not telling my mother. This is not a decision I would wish on my worst enemy. All the feelings of self-hatred and self-disgust came, I believe because deep down I feel abortion is murder. But I also believe the abortion spared my sister, myself, my mother and father, especially, and of course the unborn child a life time of shame, grief, and struggle. Sometimes when I think about what I did I know God will punish me somehow for what I did. That's because I knowingly did something wrong. But I hope that God understands that it was also love that helped me make that decision. I'll never forget the terror and fear I saw in my sister's eyes when she told me her problem. The only thing I could think to do was love and protect her.

The rights-predominating and response-predominating modes are combined in this student's statement of her dilemma, her decision, and her assessment of the decision. The use of both modes is especially evident in the student's concluding statement. "... I knowingly did something wrong. But I hope that God understands that it was also love that helped me make that decision." Her strong belief that abortion is wrong is challenged by her equally strong desire to alleviate the "terror and fear I saw in my sister's eyes."

In summary, this presentation of excerpts from students' responses to the self description and moral dilemma questions was meant to define and clarify the meaning and perspectives evident in the modes of self description and moral reasoning. It was not meant to demonstrate that one mode is more effective than another, nor was the choice of any one excerpt meant to represent a number of other students who answered the question in a similar way. The reader should see these excerpts as examples, but not as indications of other responses by other students. As this qualitative analysis has described and defined the modes of self description and moral reasoning, the following statistical analysis empirally examines the use of the modes of self description and moral reasoning by the sample groups in comparison with one another.

Empirical Analysis

The data from the independent variables (gender and judicial board membership) and the dependent variables (self description and moral reasoning modes) were analyzed using T-test procedures for each dependent variable to determine whether mean scores on each factor differed

significantly from each other (Hypotheses 1 - 8). Frequency counts were calculated for each board member and non-board member, and for each male and female that indicated the number of times each mode of self description and moral reasoning was used by each participant. A mean score for each group (board members, non-board members, males and females) was then calculated. If the difference between the means for judicial board members and non-board members or for males and females was statistically significant at the .05 level, the hypothesis was supported by the results. Analysis of variance procedures were also used to determine interaction effects, if any. Hypothesis 9 was analyzed using the chi-square statistic to determine whether there was a relationship between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning.

Table 14 reveals the results of the T-test procedure for determining differences between judicial board member and non-board member use of self description and moral reasoning modes. The results indicate that there were no significant differences between judicial board members and non-board members in their use of the separate/objective mode, the connected mode, the rights-predominating mode, and the response-predominating mode.

Insert Table 14 Here

Table 14

Mean Scale Scores for Judicial Board Member and Non-Board Member
Use of Self Description and Moral Reasoning Modes

	Judicial Board Members n = 36		Non-Board Members n = 41	
	$\underline{M}$	$\underline{SD}$	$\underline{M}$	$\underline{SD}$
Mode				
Separate/Objective	2.56	1.90	2.41	1.99
Connected	1.70	2.14	1.70	1.91
Justice/Rights	8.80	4.45	7.36	4.53
Care/Response	5.34	5.68	5.39	4.33

Hypothesis #1

Hypothesis #1 states that as a group, judicial board members will use the separate/objective mode more frequently than non-board members. The T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between board member and non-board member use of the separate/objective mode of self description ($\underline{t}$ (75) = 1.09, $\underline{p}$ < .730). Therefore, hypothesis #1 was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis #2

Hypothesis #2 states that as a group, non-board members, will use the connected mode more frequently than judicial board members. The T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between board member and non-board member use of the

108

connected mode of self description ($\underline{t}$ (75) = 1.25, $\underline{p}$ < .998).
Therefore, hypothesis #2 was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis #3

Hypothesis #3 states that as a group, judicial board members will use the rights-predominating mode to resolve a moral dilemma more frequently than non-board members. The T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between board member and non-board member use of the rights-predominating mode ($\underline{t}$ (75) = 1.04, $\underline{p}$ < .165). Therefore, hypothesis #3 was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis #4

Hypothesis #4 states that as a group, non-board members will use the response-predominating mode to resolve a moral dilemma more frequently than judicial board members. The T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between judicial board member and non-board member use of the response-predominating mode ($\underline{t}$ (75) = 1.72, $\underline{p}$ < .970). Therefore, hypothesis #4 was not supported by the results.

Table 15 reveals the results of the T-test procedure for determining male and female differences in the use of self description and moral reasoning modes. The results indicate that there were significant differences between males and females in their use of the connected mode of self description, the rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning, and the response-predominating mode. There were no

significant differences between male and female use of the separate/objective mode of self description.

Table 15

Mean Scale Scores for Male and Female Use of
Self Description and Moral Reasoning Modes

	Males n = 32		Females n = 45	
	M	SD	M	SD
Mode				
Separate/Objective	2.75	1.95	2.30	1.93
Connected	0.85^a	1.37	2.31^a	2.20
Justice/Rights	9.73^b	4.53	6.83^b	4.16
Care/Response	2.51^c	2.55	7.40^c	5.30

$^a p < .001$
$^b p < .005$
$^c p < .000$

Hypothesis #5

Hypothesis #5 states that as a group, men will use the separate/objective mode in their self description more frequently than women. The T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between male and female use of the separate/objective mode (t (75) = 1.02, $p < .320$). Therefore, hypothesis #5 was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis #6

Hypothesis #6 states that as a group, women will use the connected mode in their self description more frequently than men. The T-test procedure revealed that there was a significant difference between men and women with regard to their use of the connected mode of self description (t (73.30 = 2.75, p < .001). Therefore, hypothesis #6 was supported by the results.

Hypothesis #7

Hypothesis #7 states that as a group, men will use the rights-predominating mode to resolve a moral dilemma more frequently than women. The T-test procedure revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between male and female use of the rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning (t (75) = 1.18, p < .005). Therefore, hypothesis #7 was supported by the results.

Hypothesis #8

Hypothesis #8 states that as a group, women will use the response-predominating mode to resolve a moral dilemma more frequently men. The T-test procedure revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between male and female use of the response-predominating mode (t 67.24) = 4.31, p < .000). Therefore, hypothesis #8 was supported by the results.

The T-test procedure was used in this analysis because the investigator hypothesized about one factor at a time. That is, two groups, either males and females or judicial board members and non-board members were compared with regard to their use of either the

111

separate/objective mode of self description, the connected mode of self description, the rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning, or the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning. Borg and Gall (1983) state that the T-test should be used when the researcher, "... is interested in comparing the mean scores of two samples to determine whether they are significantly different from each other" (p.548). Given the manner in which the hypotheses were stated in this study, the use of the T-test procedure is appropriate.

However, because two variations (male or female) of one factor, gender, and two variations (board member or non-board member) of another factor, judicial board membership, are examined in this study, it is necessary to determine interaction effect between gender and judicial board membership, if any. The interaction effect, according to Borg and Gall (1983) is, "The effect of the interaction of two or more independent variables on the dependent variable" (p.685). The interaction effect was determined in this study by an analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Table 16 presents the ANOVA results. An analysis of variance was used to determine any interaction effects between gender and judicial board membership for each dependent variable.

Insert Table 16 Here

Table 16

**Analysis of Variance for Modes of Self Description and
Moral Reasoning by Judicial Board Membership and Gender**

	df	MS	F	p
Modes				
Separate/Objective	1	.417	.108	.744
Connected	1	3.7	1.02	.314
Justice/Rights	1	1.24	.06	.798
Care/Response	1	.003	.000	.991

For the separate/objective mode, no interaction effects were found ($F = .108$, df $= 1$, $p < .74$). For the connected mode, no interaction effects were found ($F = 1.02$, df $= 1$, $p < .31$). For the rights-predominating mode, no interaction effects were found ($F = .06$, df $= 1$, $p < .79$). Lastly, for the response-predominating mode, no interaction effects were found ($F = .00$, df $= 1$, $p < .99$).

Hypothesis #9

Hypothesis #9 states that there will be a positive relationship between the moral reasoning mode used to construct and resolve a moral dilemma, and the mode used in the self description.

The chi-square statistic is used when the data are in the form of frequency counts that can be placed into two or more categories as is the case when considering hypothesis #9 (Borg and Gall, 1983). The chi-square statistic was used in this study to determine whether participants who used the separate/objective mode of self description

113

also used the rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning, and whether those who used the connected mode of self description also used the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning. Table 17 presents the relationship between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning.

Table 17

Modes of Self Description
Related to Modes of Moral Reasoning

Predominant Modes of Moral Reasoning:	Predominant Modes of Self Description:		
	Connected	Separate/ Objective	Equally Separate/ Objective Connected
Care/Response	$n = 12$	$n = 9$	$n = 4$
$n = 25$			
Justice/Rights	$n = 7$	$n = 31$	$n = 8$
$n = 46$			
Equally Care/Rights			
$n = 6$	$n = 1$	$n = 4$	$n = 1$

x^2 (df = 4, N = 77) = 9.83, p < .043

The chi-square revealed that there was a significant relationship between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning (x^2 (df = 4, N = 77) = 9.83, p < .043). Of the 25 participants who used the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning more frequently than the

114

rights-predominating mode, 12 used the connected mode of self description more frequently than the separate/objective mode, 9 used the separate/objective mode more frequently than the connected mode, and 4 students used each self description mode equally. Of the 46 students who used the rights-predominating mode more frequently than the response-predominating mode, 7 used the connected mode more frequently than the separate/objective mode, 31 used the separate/objective mode more frequently than the connected mode, and 8 used each self description mode equally. Of the 6 students who used each moral reasoning mode equally, 1 used the connected mode more frequently than the separate/objective mode, 4 used the separate/objective mode more frequently than the connected mode, and 1 used each self description mode equally. Therefore, hypothesis #9 was supported by the results.

Sex Evident Responses

In this section of the analysis, responses in which the sex of the participant is evident are compared with responses in which the sex is not evident to determine whether scorer knowledge of sex influenced the scoring of the data. A response was defined as sex evident if the participant, in his/her response to the question offered an indication of sex such as name, use of the term boyfriend or girlfriend, or explicit reference to self as a girl, boy, man, or woman. The response sheets that were numerically coded as male were divided into a sex evident group and a sex non-evident group. The same was done for those response sheets that were numerically coded as female. T-tests were calculated to determine whether the mean scores for the sex evident

115

group were statistically different from the sex non-evident group for the modes of self description and the modes of moral reasoning. A statistical difference between the groups may have suggested scorer bias. Table 18 indicates the results of the T-test procedure to determine differences between sex-evident responses and sex non-evident responses for males. Table 19 indicates the results of the T-test procedure to determine differences between sex-evident and sex non-evident responses for females.

Table 18

Mean Scores of Sex-evident and Sex non-evident
Responses for Males

	Sex-evident Responses		Sex non-evident Responses	
	M	SD	M	SD
Mode				
Separate/Objective	2.86	1.92	2.62	2.10
Connected	1.06	1.65	0.65	0.99
Justice/Rights	8.20	5.05	10.57	4.26
Care/Response	4.45[a]	3.20	1.54[a]	1.61

[a]$p < .01$

Table 19

Mean Scores of Sex-evident and Sex non-evident
Responses for Females

	Sex-evident Responses		Sex non-evident Responses	
	M	SD	M	SD
Mode				
Separate/Objective	1.91	1.98	2.45	1.90
Connected	2.91	2.72	2.05	1.95
Justice/Rights	6.22	3.68	7.91	4.69
Care/Response	7.93	4.77	6.26	6.03

On the self description question, out of 32 males, there were 15 responses that were sex evident and 17 responses that were not. The T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between the sex evident and sex non-evident groups with regard to use of the separate/objective mode (t (29) = 1.20, p < .74). There were no statistically significant differences between the sex evident and sex non-evident groups with regard to use of the connected mode (t (29) = 2.77, p < .059).

On the moral reasoning questions, out of 32 males, there were 10 responses that were sex evident and 22 that were not. There were no statistically significant differences between the sex evident and the sex non-evident groups with regard to use of the rights-predominating mode (t (29) = 1.40, p < .50). Lastly, there was a significant difference between the sex evident group and the sex non-evident group

117

with regard to use of the response-predominating mode (t (11.23) = 3.94, p < .01). The sex evident males used the response-predominating mode more than the sex non-evident males.

On the self description question, out of 45 females, there were 12 responses that were sex evident and 33 responses that were not. The T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between the sex evident and sex non-evident groups with regard to use of the separate/objective mode (t (44) = 1.11, p < .40). There were no statistically significant differences between the sex evident and sex non-evident groups with regard to use of the connected mode (t (44) = 1.94, p < .24).

On the moral reasoning questions, out of 45 females, there were 29 responses that were sex evident and 16 that were not. There were no statistically significant differences between the sex evident and the sex non-evident groups with regard to use of the rights-predominating mode (t (44) = 1.62, p < .18). Lastly, there were no statistically significant differences between the sex evident group and the sex non-evident group with regard to use of the response-predominating mode (t (44) = 1.60, p < .30).

Descriptive Analysis

Table 20 presents a comparison of the predominant modes of self description used by judicial board members and non-board members. The results indicate that both judicial board members and non-board members

used the separate/objective mode more frequently than the connected mode.

Table 20

Modes of Self Description:
Judicial Board Members v. Non-Board Members

	Predominantly Separate/Objective	Predominantly Connected	Equally Separate & Connected
Judicial Board Members	(23) 63.9%	(8) 22.2%	(5) 13.9%
n = 36			
Non-Board Members	(21) 51.2%	(12) 29.3%	(8) 19.5%
n = 41			

Note. The frequency of separate/objective responses was compared with the frequency of connected responses to determine predominant mode of self description.

Table 21 presents a comparison of the predominant modes of moral reasoning used by judicial board members and non-board members. The results indicate that both judicial board members and non-board members used the rights-predominating mode more frequently than the response-predominating mode.

Insert Table 21 Here

119

Table 21

Modes of Moral Reasoning:
Judicial Board Members v. Non-Board Members

	Predominantly Justice/Rights	Predominantly Response/Care	Equally Rights & Response
Judicial Board Members	(24) 66.7%	(10) 27.8%	(2) 5.6%
n = 36			
Non-Board Members	(22) 53.7%	(15) 36.6%	(4) 9.8%
n = 41			

Note. The frequency of justice/rights responses was compared with the frequency of response/care responses to determine predominant mode of moral resoning.

Table 22 presents a comparison of the predominant modes of self description used by males and females. The results indicate that males used the separate/objective mode more frequently than the connected mode. Females used the separate/objective mode just slightly more frequently than the connected mode.

Insert Table 22 Here

Table 22

Modes of Self Descriptions: Males v. Females

_____

	Predominantly Separate/Objective	Predominantly Connected	Equally Separate/Objective and Connected
Males	(24) 75%	(2) 6.3%	(6) 18.8%
n - 32			
Females	(20) 44.4%	(18) 40%	(7) 15.6%
n - 45			

_____

Note. The frequency of separate/objective responses was compared with the frequency of connected responses to determine predominant mode of self description.

_____

Table 23 presents a comparison of the predominant modes of moral

reasoning used by males and females. The results indicate that males

used the rights-predominating mode more frequently than the

response-predominating mode and females used the response-predominating

mode just slightly more frequently than the rights-predominating mode.

Insert Table 23 Here

Table 23

Modes of Moral Reasoning: Males v. Females

	Predominantly Justice/Rights	Predominantly Response/Care	Equally Rights & Response
Males	(27) 84.4%	(3) 9.4%	(2) 6.3%
n - 32			
Females	(19) 42.2%	(22) 48.9%	(2) 8.9%
n - 45			

Note. The frequency of justice/rights responses was compared with the frequency of response/care responses to determine predominant mode of moral reasoning.

Summary

This section presented analyses of the data that included the demographic characteristics of judicial board members, non-board members, males, and females; a qualitative analysis of some excerpts from the data, a statistical analysis of the hypotheses; an analysis of sex evident responses and sex non-evident responses; and a descriptive analysis of the data.

The presentation of the demographic characteristics of the sample used in this study revealed that judicial board members and non-board members were similar in age, class standing, religion, ethnic origin, family income while growing up, current family income, and grade point average. Males and females were similar in all reported demographic characteristics except for class standing.

122

The presentation of excerpts from students' responses to the self description and moral dilemma questions was meant to define and clarify the meaning and perspectives evident in the modes of self description and moral reasoning. It was not meant to demonstrate that one mode is more effective than another, nor was the choice of any one excerpt meant to represent a number of other students who answered the question in a similar way. Excerpts were presented that illustrated use of the separate/objective mode, the connected mode, combinations of the separate/objective and connected modes, the rights-predominating mode, the response-predominating mode, and combinations of the rights-predominating and response-predominating modes.

The following is a summary of the results for each of the nine hypotheses:

Hypothesis #1: The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between board member and non-board member use of the separate/objective mode of self description. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis #2: The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between board member and non-board member use of the connected mode of self description. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis #3: The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between board member and non-board member use of the rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis #4: The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between board member and non-board member use of the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis #5: The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between male and female use of the separate/objective mode of self description. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis #6: The results indicated that there was a significant difference between male and female use of the connected mode of self description. Females used the connected mode more than males. Therefore, the hypothesis was supported by the results.

Hypothesis #7: The results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between male and female use of the rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning. Males used the rights-predominating mode more than females. Therefore, the hypothesis was supported by the results.

Hypothesis #8: The results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between male and female use of the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning. Females used the response-predominating mode more than males. Therefore, the hypothesis was supported by the results.

Hypothesis #9: The results indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between the moral reasoning mode used to construct and resolve a moral dilemma, and the mode used in the self description. Those who used the separate/objective mode more frequently used the rights-predominating mode and those who used the

124

connected mode more frequently used the response-predominating mode. Therefore, the hypothesis was supported by the results.

The results also indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the scores of the responses for which the sex of the participant was evident and those scores for which sex was not evident with one exception. The sex evident males used the response-predominating mode more than the sex non-evident males.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the theoretical foundations of the study; purposes; research methodology; major findings of the analysis including hypotheses, and sex evident responses; limitations of the study including the design of the study, use of real-life moral dilemmas, generalizability, and instrumentation; discussion of the major findings including hypotheses, and sex-evident responses; and conclusions including implications and recommendations for further research.

The Theoretical Foundation

Very few studies have examined the impact of student involvement in the judicial system upon the development of moral decision-making (Caruso, 1977; Smith, 1978). To this date, no studies have been found that include an analysis of gender-different conceptions of decision-making and service on a judicial board. As noted in chapter two of this dissertation, most of the literature on university judicial systems is focused on the following three areas: due process concerns, the student as a complainant in the judicial process, and the structure and function of judicial boards.

Theory-based discussions of university judicial systems generally utilize Kohlberg's (1969, 1978, 1981) stage concept of moral

development as a foundation (Smith, 1978). However, critics of traditional developmental theory, such as Kohlberg's theory, believe that females have generally been considered by traditional theorists to be deficient or less complex in their moral decision-making ability than males. Recently, some theorists have sought to demonstrate differences in the ways that males and females develop and reason (Miller, 1976; Dinnerstein, 1976; Chodorow, 1978; Gilligan, 1982). Because examinations of judicial systems have not used these gender-inclusive theoretical conceptualizations of moral reasoning as a foundation for studying judicial systems, this study examined Gilligan's theory of moral development within the context of judicial board membership.

Gilligan's research establishes that there are gender differences that influence both self identity, as expressed through descriptions of the self, and moral decision-making. Through interviews with men and women in which they were asked to present a self description, and construct and resolve a real-life moral dilemma, Gilligan identified two themes or "voices" within human development. The female voice speaks from the context of attachment and connectedness to others, whereas the male voice is expressed through independence and individuality. Lyons (1983) defined these "voices" as modes of self description and called them the "connected self" and the "separate/objective self", respectively. Correspondingly, Lyons identified the two modes of moral reasoning as "response-predominating" and "rights-predominating." Gilligan and Lyons contended that individuals construct and resolve moral dilemmas utilizing these two

modes, with the manner in which they make moral decisions related to, but not necessarily defined by gender.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of the study were (a) to examine differences in self identity and decision-making, as defined by Gilligan, between the undergraduate residence hall complex judicial board members at Michigan State University and a sample of undergraduate students who were not judicial board members; (b) to examine differences in self identity and moral decision-making between male and female participants in the study; and (c) to determine whether there was a relationship between use of self description mode and use of moral reasoning mode.

Research Methodology

The sample was drawn from the 53 student members of the four undergraduate residence hall area judicial boards at Michigan State University, and 106 non-board members randomly selected from the undergraduate residence halls. Participants were asked to complete a "Demographic Data Sheet" which asked them to indicate age, class in school, grade point average, sex, religion, ethnic origin, place of birth, parent's place of birth, current family income, family income while growing up, and major course of study. Self description and moral reasoning modes were evaluated by utilizing a four-question, essay-type questionnaire entitled, "Student Perceptions of Themselves and a Real-life Moral Dilemma." The questionnaire was developed by the investigator and is a modification of the interview format developed by Gilligan (1977, 1980, 1982) and Lyons (1983). The data were collected

128

during May, 1987 and were scored separately by two raters. The scoring system was developed by the two scorers and represented a modification of the scoring system developed by Lyons (1983).

The data were analyzed to determine the relationship, if any, of gender and judicial board membership to modes of self description and moral reasoning. The data from the independent variables (gender and judicial board membership) and the dependent variables (self description and moral reasoning modes) were analyzed using T-test procedures for each dependent variable to determine whether mean scores on each factor differed significantly from each other. Analysis of variance procedures were also used to determine interaction effect, if any. The chi-square statistical test was used to determine whether mode of self description was related to mode of moral reasoning. The level of significance was set at $p = .05$. The data were examined qualitatively, as well. Exemplary passages from some participants' responses were presented to illustrate the modes of self description and moral reasoning.

Demographic data including age, class standing, religion, ethnic origin, family income while growing up, current family income, and grade point average were analyzed to determine whether there were any differences between judicial board members and non-board members or between males and females that could have influenced the results of the study. The results revealed that there were no significant demographic differences between judicial board members and non-board members for age, class standing, religion, ethnic origin, family income while growing up, current family income, or grade point average. There were no significant demographic differences between males and females for

129

any of the characteristics examined except class standing. There were more males who represented the senior class, whereas there were more females who represented the freshmen, sophomore, and junior classes.

The results revealed that there were no significant differences between the way judicial board members and non-board members described themselves nor were there any significant differences for use of moral reasoning mode between judicial board members and non-board members. The data did, however, reveal some significant differences in both self description and moral reasoning modes used by men and women. A chi-square analysis revealed that there was a relationship between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning. Regarding the issue of sex evident and sex non-evident responses, the results indicated that although the scorers could tell the sex of some respondents, this did not influence their scoring. This analysis was included because if the scorers had been influenced by knowing the sex of the respondents, this influence could have presented a major limitation to the study.

Major Findings

The demographic data were tested using T-test and chi-square procedures to determine whether there were any demographic differences between judicial board members and non-board members, and between males and females. Analyses of relevant demographic differences is included in the discussion of the hypotheses. Nine directional hypotheses were formulated and tested at the p - .05 level of significance to determine whether there was any relationship between, (a) judicial board membership, and modes of self description and moral reasoning;

(b) between gender, and modes of self description and moral reasoning; and (c) between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning. Further, although there was no hypothesis formulated about whether sex evident responses influenced the scorers, this concern was addressed and tested because the issue of scorer bias presented a potential limitation of the study. The major findings that resulted from these analyses are presented below.

Hypothesis 1

Stated in the directional form, it was hypothesized that as a group, judiciary members would use the separate/objective mode more frequently than non-board members to describe themselves.

The T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between judicial board member and non-board member use of the separate/objective mode of self description (t (75) = 1.09, p < .73). Therefore, hypothesis #1 was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis 2

Stated in the directional form, it was hypothesized that non-board members would use the connected mode more frequently than judicial board members to describe themselves.

The T-test procedure revealed that the difference between board member and non-board member use of the connected mode of self description was not statistically significant (t (75) = 1.25, p < .998). Therefore, hypothesis #2 was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis 3

Stated in the directional form, it was hypothesized that judiciary members would use the rights-predominating mode to resolve a moral dilemma more frequently than non-board members.

The T-test procedure revealed that the difference between board member and non-board member use of the rights-predominating mode was not statistically significant (t (75) - 1.04, p < .165). Therefore, hypothesis #3 was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis 4

Stated in the directional form, it was hypothesized that non-board members would use the response-predominating mode to resolve a moral dilemma more frequently than judicial board members.

The T-test procedure revealed that the difference between judicial board member and non-board member use of the response-predominating mode was not statistically significant (t (75) - 1.72, p < .97). Therefore, hypothesis #4 was not supported by the results.

Hypothesis 5

Stated in the directional form, it was hypothesized that men would use the separate/objective mode in their self description more frequently than women.

The T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant differences betweeen male and female use of the separate/objective mode (t (75) - 1.02, p < .320). Therefore, hypothesis #5 was not supported by the results.

132

Hypothesis 6

Stated in the directional form, it was hypothesized that women would use the conected mode in their self description more frequently than men.

The T-test procedure revealed that there was a significant difference between men and women with regard to their use of the connected mode of self description ($\underline{t}$ (73.30) = 2.75, $\underline{p}$ < .001). Therefore, hypothesis #6 was supported by the results.

Hypothesis 7

Stated in the directional form, it was hypothesized that men would use the rights-predominating mode to resolve a moral dilemma more frequently than the women.

The T-test procedure revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between male and female use of the rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning ($\underline{t}$ (75) = 1.18, $\underline{p}$ < .005). Therefore, hypothesis #7 was supported by the results.

Hypothesis 8

Stated in the directional form, it was hypothesized that women would use the response-predominating mode to resolve a moral dilemma more frequently than men.

The T-test procedure revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between male and female use of the response-predominating mode ($\underline{t}$ (67.24) = 4.31, $\underline{p}$ < .000). Therefore, hypothesis #8 was supported by the results.

Further analysis of the relationship of gender and judicial board membership to modes of self description and moral reasoning was necessary to determine interaction effects between gender and judicial membership for each dependent variable. For the separate/objective mode, no interaction effects were found ($F = .108$, df $= 1$, $p < .74$). For the connected mode, no interaction effects were found ($F = 1.02$, df $= 1$, $p < .31$). For the rights-predominating mode, no interaction effects were found ($F = .06$, df $= 1$, $p < .79$). For the response-predominating mode, no interaction effects were found ($F = .00$, df $= 1$, $p < .99$).

Hypothesis 9

Stated in the directional form, it was hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between the moral reasoning mode used to construct and resolve a moral dilemma, and the mode used in the self description.

The chi-square statistic revealed that there was a significant relationship between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning (X^2 (df $= 4$, N $= 77$) $= 9.83$, $p < .043$). Of the 25 participants who used the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning more frequently than the rights-predominating mode, 12 used the connected mode of self description more frequently than the separate/objective mode, 9 used the separate/objective mode more frequently than the connected mode, and 4 students used each self description mode equally. Of the 46 students who used the rights-predominating mode more frequently than the response-predominating mode, 7 used the connected mode more frequently

134

than the separate/objective mode, 31 used the separate/objective mode more frequently than the connected mode, and 8 used each self description mode equally. Of the 6 students who used each moral reasoning mode equally, 1 used the connected mode more frequently than the separate/objective mode, 4 used the separate/objective mode more frequently than the connected mode, and 1 used each self description mode equally. Therefore, hypothesis #9 was supported by the results.

Sex Evident Responses

The T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between the sex evident group and the sex non-evident group with the exception of male use of the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning. On the self description question, out of 32 males, there were 15 responses that were sex evident and 17 responses that were not. The T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between the sex evident and sex non-evident groups with regard to use of the separate/objective mode (t (29) $-$ 1.20, p < .74). There were no statistically significant differences between the sex evident and sex non-evident groups with regard to use of the connected mode (t (29) $-$ 2.77, p < .059).

On the moral reasoning questions, out of 32 males, there were 10 responses that were sex evident and 22 that were not. There were no statistically significant differences between the sex evident and the sex non-evident groups with regard to use of the rights-predominating mode (t (29) $-$ 1.40, p < .50). Lastly, there was a significant difference between the sex evident group and the sex non-evident group

135

with regard to use of the response-predominating mode (t (11.23) −
3.94, p < .01). The sex evident males used the response-predominating
mode with greater frequency than the non-evident males.

On the self description question, out of 45 females, there were 12
responses that were sex evident and 33 responses that were not. The
T-test procedure revealed that there were no statistically significant
differences between the sex evident and sex non-evident groups with
regard to use of the separate/objective mode (t (44) − 1.11, p < .40).
There were no statistically significant differences between the sex
evident and non-evident groups with regard to use of the connected mode
(t (44) − 1.94, p < .24).

On the moral reasoning questions, out of 45 females, there were 29
responses that were sex evident and 16 that were not. There were no
statistically significant differences between the sex evident and the
sex non-evident groups with regard to use of the rights-predominating
mode (t (44) − 1.62, p < .18). Lastly, there were no statistically
significant differences between the sex evident group and the sex
non-evident group with regard to use of the response-predominating mode
(t (44) − 1.60, p < .30).

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study discussed in this section include
factors which may be considered inherent weaknesses in the design or
scope of the study that are not within the investigator's ability to
control. These limitations include, the design of the study,

136

generalizability, the use of real-life moral dilemmas, instrumentation, and the scoring system.

Limitations Associated With the Design

This section of the chapter applies the research design explanations formulated by Campbell and Stanley (1963) to the design of this study. Campbell and Stanley examine several research designs and report on the strengths and weaknesses of each design. Their explanation of the inherent weaknesses of the static group comparison design is applied as follows.

The design of this study is the "static group comparison." That is, "... a group which has experienced X is compared with one which has not ..." (Campbell and Stanley, 1963, p.12). In this study, a group which has experienced membership on a judicial board is compared with a group which has not. According to Campbell and Stanley, there are four inherent weaknesses in the static group comparison design.

First, selection of the sample groups is one weakness of the research design. Factors that are a part of the process of judicial board selection such as criteria for selection, i.e., interpersonal and analytical skills, may preclude the assumption that the groups were the same prior to selection. Campbell and Stanley state that if the sample groups differ, "...this difference could well have come about through the differential recruitment of persons making up the groups: the groups might have differed anyway, without the occurrence of X" (p. 12). There were two different selction mechanisms for each group. The judicial board members were selected by their judicial board advisors in a competitive process, whereas the non-board member group was

137

selected by the investigator using the random sampling procedure. The fact that there were no statistical differences between judicial board members and non-board members on this set of demographic and experimental variables will be discussed in the next section of this chapter, Discussion of the Major Findings.

A second factor that is considered a weakness of the research design is mortality. Mortality is defined as "differential drop-out of persons from the groups" (Campbell and Stanley, 1963, p.12). Between the time the two sample groups were formed -- when the non-board member sample was selected from the student directory and the judicial board members were selected to serve -- there may have been a change in the composition of those two groups. Some students in the non-board sample may have moved out of the residence halls becoming unavailable to participate in the study and some judicial board members may have stopped serving as board members. This may have changed the nature of the two sample groups being studied. For instance, the groups may have differed had this mortality not taken place, but the changed nature of the groups may have meant that that they no longer differed. This explanation of mortality for the results could be eliminated in a similar study if it were possible to study a group of students prior to judicial board membership and then study the same group during or after service on a judicial board.

The interaction of selection and maturation is the third factor to be considered as an inherent weakness of the research design. Maturation refers to "processes within the respondents operating as a function of the passage of time" (p.5). The interaction of selection and maturation refers to the idea that, "the results may be specific to

this given age level, fatigue level, etc." (p.20). For instance, there may have been changes in cognitive level that occurred between the time of selection and the time of data collection that influenced participants' responses to the questionnaire. Since judicial board members were selected seven months to a year before the study and non-board members were selected one week prior to data collection, this time difference that may have affected the groups' cognitive development from the time they were selected to the time of the study thus affecting the results.

A fourth inherent weakness of the study is the "interaction of selection and X" (p.19). The interaction of selection and X means that, "there remains the possibility that the effects validly demonstrated hold only for that unique population from which the ... groups were jointly selected" (p.19). That "unique population" in this case is the Michigan State University student population. There may be special factors about Michigan State University that influenced the ability of either the judicial board sample or the non-board member sample to respond to the questionnaire. For instance, the judicial board members may have received special training in moral decision-making. Or, some students in the non-board member sample may have gone to special programs that offered them similar training. In other words, Michigan State University may represent a special anomaly that is different from other colleges and universities so as to preclude generalization of the results to other places.

In summary, the four inherent weaknesses of the static group research design, as described by Campbell and Stanley (1963) are selection, mortality, interaction of selection and maturation, and

139

interaction of selection and X (judicial board membership). These

factors may affect the "interpretability" of the results of this

study. The next section of this discussion of limitations of the study

also concerns generalizability of the results to other settings.

Generalizability of the Results

The previous discussion of inherent weaknesses in research design

has implications for the generalizability of the results to student

populations outside of Michigan State University. However, there are

also issues of concern with regard to the generalizability of the

results to the Michigan State University population, itself.

First, the size of the undergraduate residence hall population at

Michigan State University, from which the sample of non-board members

was drawn, numbered approximately 16,000 students. The non-board

member sample size for this study was 106 students. One could argue

that even if there had been a 100% return rate of responses, these

students may not necessarily be representative of the undergraduate

residence hall population. Further, the questionnaire yielded only a

44% return rate of non-board member respondents. Although this sample

of respondents (n - 41) was sufficient to apply the necessary

statistical tests, as discussed on chapter 3 of this dissertation, the

representativeness of this small sample group is questionable.

Upon further analysis of this issue of representativeness of the

non-board member sample, one might ask, "Is the non-board member sample

different from the judicial board member sample? That is, have the

judicial board member sample and the non-board member sample been

involved in experiences, as a result of whether or not they have served

on student judiciaries, that could have influenced their use of the modes of self description and moral reasoning? The low return rate of non-board member responses may indicate that the two sample groups were not different. For instance, it could be that the non-board members who chose to return useable responses have also been involved in various committees, student governing boards, and other organizations that are trained, as are judicial boards, to make decisions, follow standards and rules, and lead others. As a result, the non-board member group may be a unique subsample of undergraduate students rather than a representative group of non-board members that is different from the judicial board member group. This questionable representativeness of the non-board member sample may be one reason for the fact that there were no statistical differences between judicial board members and non-board members in their use of modes of self description and moral reasoning. These results of the study will be further discussed in the next section of this chapter, Discussion of the Major Findings.

The Use of Real-life Moral Dilemmas

Research on moral development has generally used either hypothetical or real-life moral dilemmas as part of the instrumentation to determine stages, levels, or modes of moral reasoning. For instance, as discussed in chapter 2 of this dissertation, many of Kohlberg's research studies required subjects to discuss a hypothetical dilemma called "The Heinz Dilemma." The apparent moral conflict involved a decision to either allow a spouse to die, or steal a life saving drug. Gilligan and Lyons, on the other hand added a second component, asking their research participants to examine a dilemma that

141

had actually occurred in their lives. Although use of the hypothetical dilemma elicits information about the resolution of a conflict, the real-life moral dilemma asks the respondent to construct the dilemma, as well. According to Gilligan (1982), this construction of the moral dilemma is an important component in determining moral reasoning perspectives.

This study used an instrument that was a written modification of the Gilligan and Lyons interview format. The instrument asked the research participants to construct, resolve, and evaluate an actual dilemma that had occured in their lives. The literature on the use of hypothetical vs. real-life moral dilemmas offers an examination of the strengths and weaknesses of each type of dilemma. A comparison of the use of actual dilemmas and real-life moral dilemmas is discussed by Baier (1987). Comparing both philosophical and psychological perspectives on moral development, she discusses the limitations of using either hypothetical or actual dilemma situations. Regarding the use of hypothetical dilemmas, Baier contends that, "...even if a fully worked out fictional narrative were given ... there is still no reason to think that one's response to a fictional situation is a good indicator of what one's own response would be, were one actually in a predicament ..." (p.49). Baier also asserts that discussing an actual dilemma that occurred in a person's life has its research flaws, as well. She posits that perhaps individuals interpret their experiences through too many filters. She writes that, "We glaze our own pasts over with the pale cast of self-excusing, or in some cases self-accusing, self-denigrating, self-dramatizing thought" (p.49). As such, the limitations of using real-life moral dilemmas to determine

mode of moral reasoning are evident in Baier's contention that an individual's self report of an actual dilemma may not necessarily represent the actual event.

Another limitation of the use of real-life moral dilemmas may be that each research participant chose a different life experience to discuss. Therefore, it may have been difficult to compare responses because of this lack of constancy in the content or topic of the dilemmas. For instance, an individual's use of the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning may have different connotations in his/her discussion of choosing a career than another individual's use of that mode when discussing an unwanted pregnancy. Each kind of dilemma may present conflicts of varying magnitude to the individual that may influence his/her choice of moral reasoning mode.

In summary, the limitations of the use of real-life moral dilemmas are that they may not be accurate representations of the research participant's experience, and comparison of responses may have been difficult because of the range and variety of content areas that were dicussed in the student responses.

Instrumentation

Other limitations of the study are inherent in the instrument used to determine modes of self description and moral reasoning aside from the use of real-life moral dilemmas. By using a written essay-type questionnaire, the investigator may have assumed that a certain level of writing ability was necessary on the part of the participants to respond to the questionnaire. Students who were not capable writers or who did not enjoy writing may have chosen not to respond to the

143

investigator's request to participate in the study. This lack of writing interest or ability may have influenced the return rate of responses and as has been discussed, the low return rate of non-board members may have affected the results of the study. Consequently, the results of the study may not be generalizaable to college students who are not capable writers.

Another limitation of the written, essay-type questionnaire as compared with an interview format is that it precludes the possibility of asking probing questions that would allow the investigator to clarify certain statements or receive more information that could help determine which mode of self description or moral reasoning the respondent is using. In a discussion of the interview format in comparison with the mailed questionnaire, Borg and Gall (1983) state that, "it appears that under favorable conditions the interview tends to yield more complete data and also more data regarding negative aspects of the self" (p.437). However, it should be noted that according to Borg and Gall, one significant limitation of the interview format is that it lends itself to subjectivity and bias on the part of the researcher. In this study, use of the written instrument allowed for the potential of the study to be gender-blind. That is, because the responses were coded so that the scorers did not automatically know the sex of the respondent, there was a greater probability that the scoring would not be biased as a result of the scorers' knowing the sex of the respondent than would have been the case had the investigator interviewed the respondents. The related issue of sex-evident responses is discussed in the next section of this chapter, Discussion of the Major Findings.

In summary, the written questionnaire was limited in its use in this study because students who were poor writers may not have responded, and because the investigator was not able to ask probing questions for clarification as would have been possible with an interview format. However, the issue of subjectivity on the part of the investigator may not have been as significant as it could have been had an interview format been used.

The Scoring System

Lyons' own dissertation work focused on the development of the scoring system that was modified for use in this current dissertation study. Lyons stated in her dissertation that, "The processes of data analysis and the construction of a reliable coding scheme are intricately linked ... both inform one another in a pattern of constant interaction" (Lyons, 1982, p.88). The process of modifying Lyons' coding scheme was a continual discussion, between the current study's two scorers, of the meanings and constructs that are central to Gilligan's theoretical conceptualization of moral development. Although this discussion process served to refine the scoring system, it also had elements of subjectivity that may have presented limitations. The scorers coded the data independently, but met regularly to discuss general problems and questions about the scoring guidelines. This interactive process was a necessary element in developing an applicable scoring system, but it may raise questions as to the objectivity of each scorer. However, the scorers functioned with full knowledge that the question of objectivity was evident. For instance, it was through a discussion of the objectivity issue that

145

the decision was made to analyze sex evident and sex non-evident responses to check for scorer bias.

It is also important to note that the theoretical foundation, itself, as developed by Gilligan calls upon those who apply it in their work to question the subjective and detached nature of the traditional research process. The nature of Gilligan's concept of human development confronts the researcher's requirement for objectivity because she calls for recognition of a developmental process that is relationship-focused and defined by subjectivity, a subjectivity that is based on interdependence and contextual thinking. As such, Gilligan's work challenged the scorers to carefully define the interactive discussion process through which the scoring system was developed, and to allow this interactive process to be a part of the research process. This is not to say that objectivity was disregarded by the scorers. Although a subjective process was allowed because of its congruence with the theory upon which this work is based, the issue of subjectivity could be perceived as a limitation of this work.

One particular aspect of the scoring system presented a significant limitation that may influence interpretation of the findings of this study. The scoring system required each scorer to count each categorization, idea, or "chunk" in a response as one. This counting does not consider the magnitude of the meaning of each idea. For instance, a sentence could be perceived by the scorer as more impactful, genuine, or profound than another sentence, but both are scored with equal weight because each "chunk" is counted rather than rated. The fact that a one-word idea may represent one chunk, just as a full sentence may represent one chunk, also raises questions about

the inability of the scoring system to account for the magnitude of responses.

In summary, the scoring system presents two limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings of this study. First, the issue of a subjective scoring system may raise concerns about scorer bias. Secondly, the fact that the scoring system did not account for the magnitude of responses suggests that the results may not accurately reflect the quality of the individual response to a question or the attribute being measured.

Discussion of the Major Findings

The previous section of this chapter contained discussion of several aspects of the design and scope of the study that the investigator perceives as limitations that may affect the interpretation of the results. Some of these limitations will again be presented in this section because they are applicable to drawing conclusions about the study's major findings. The purpose of this discussion of the major findings is to offer speculations and potential conclusions that offer the reader some guidelines when interpreting the results of this study. Speculations are thoughts about the various possible meanings that one could draw from the results. Although the findings may hint at these speculative ideas, they should be viewed only as potential conclusions.

H1 and H2. Judicial Board Member/Non-board Member Use of Self Description Modes

Hypothesis #1 stated that as a group, judiciary members would use the separate/objective mode to describe themselves more frequently than would non-board members. Hypotheses #2 stated that as a group, non-board members would use the connected mode to describe themselves more frequently than would judiciary members. As presented in chapter 4, the results revealed no significant differences between the way judicial board members and non-board members described themselves. Neither hypothesis was supported by the results.

One speculation about why the data revealed no significant differences between judicial board member and non-board member use of each self description mode concerns the low rate of return of the non-board member responses. As discussed in the limitations section of this chapter, the questionnaire yielded only a 44% return rate of non-board member respondents. Although this group of respondents (n = 41) was sufficient to apply the necessary statistical tests, as discussed in chapter 3 of this dissertation, the low return rate may have had an influence on the results.

As a result of the low return rate, one could speculate that the non-board member group was not representative of the larger population of undergraduate residence hall students. Exploring possible reasons for the low return rate, one could reason that the students who chose to return their completed questionnaires were students who felt a sense of responsibility and obligation to do so or who were students who wanted to help the investigator succeed with her project. This sense of responsibility may not be characteristic of the larger student

population. These characteristics might also be traits found in students who were involved in student groups that were similar to judicial boards. Thus, the non-board member respondents might have been a unique sub-sample of the non-board member group, a sub-sample that was not significantly different from the judicial board member respondents. Because the non-board member respondents may not be representative of the non-board member sample, one could reason that the judicial board member sample and the non-board member sample have been involved in similar experiences that could have similarly influenced their use of the modes of self description and moral reasoning. The low return rate of non-board member responses may indicate that the two sample groups were not substantially different. Thus, the board members and non-board members did not differentially respond to the self description question.

Another speculation is that there were no confounding variables that might influence the interpretation of these results. It could be that there are, in fact, no differences between the way judicial board members and non-board members describe themselves. One could reason that the results accurately reflect the fact that judicial board members are selected from among their peers and that, therefore, there were no significant differences in self identity as demonstrated in a self description. One could also reason that experience on a judicial board did not encourage separate/objective thinking as hypothesized. The influence of serving on a judicial board may not have encouraged either mode of self description any differently than other experiences in which students participate.

In summary, the possible explanations for the fact that the T-test procedures revealed no differences between judicial board members and non-board members in either the use of the separate/objective mode of self description or the connected mode are as follows. The low return rate of non-board member responses might mean that the non-board member respondents were different from the larger student population from which the sample was drawn. The non-board members who responded to the questionnaire may have had more sense of responsibility than both the larger population and the students who did not respond. The low return rate may also mean that the non-board respondents were similar to the non-board member respondents and they did not respond differently to the self description question. Another potential explanation for the results is that there were no confounding variables such as low return rate that influenced the results. The results may be a reflection of the fact that there were no differences between the way judicial board members and non-board members described themselves. No significant differences between judicial board members and non-board members may be a reflection of the idea that the judicial board experience did not influence use of self description modes.

H3 and H4. Judicial Board Member/Non-Board Member Use of Moral Reasoning Modes

Hypothesis #3 stated that judiciary members would use the rights-predominating mode to resolve a moral dilemma more frequently than would non-board members. Hypothesis #4 stated that non-board members would use the response-predominating mode more frequently than would judicial board members. As presented in chapter 4, the results

150

revealed that there were no significant differences in the use of either moral reasoning mode between judicial board members and non-board members. Therefore, the results did not support the hypotheses.

The previous discussion of hypotheses 1 and 2 presented speculations and potential explanations about the results that are applicable to the findings related to judicial board respondent and non-board respondent use of moral reasoning modes, as well. Additionally, however, the judicial board member respondents and non-board respondents may have been similar in another respect. If one assumes, as was previously discussed, that the non-board respondents may have been involved in similar student leadership experiences as the judicial board respondents, one could reason that the non-board respondents may have also experienced similar training programs to develop and improve their decision-making, interpersonal, or analytical skills. These programs may have influenced the non-board respondents' moral reasoning ability thus offering an explanation for the similar use of each moral reasoning modes. Even if it is not true that the non-board respondents were similarly involved in student groups and other leadership experiences, the non-board respondents may have attended classes, discussions, lectures, or residence hall programs that offered them ideas that influenced their moral reasoning skills in a way similar to the training and experience of the judicial board respondents. This exposure to similar settings that may have influenced moral reasoning ability is another potential explanation for

151

the finding that there were no statistically significant differences between judicial board member and non-board member use of moral reasoning modes.

H5 and H6, Male/Female Use of Self Description Modes

Hypothesis #5 stated that men would use the separate/objective mode to describe themselves more frequently than would women. Hypothesis #6 stated that women would use the connected mode to describe themselves more frequently than would men. The results revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between male and female use of the separate/objective mode. Hypothesis #5 was not supported by the results. However, there was a significant difference between male and female use of the connected mode. Women used the connected mode more frequently than men to describe themselves. Hypothesis #6 was supported by the results.

It appears that the results support Gilligan's assertion that there are two conceptions of self and two conceptions of morality, with these conceptions of self and morality related to gender. However, the women's use of the self description modes in this study is inconsistent with Lyons (1983) findings indicating that women almost exclusively used the connected mode to describe themselves. Of the women in the dissertation study, 40% used the connected mode of self description more frequently than the separate/objective mode. However, 44% of the women used the separate/objective mode more frequently than the connected mode. The dissertation findings for male use of self description mode are consistent with Lyons findings that men almost exclusively used the separate/objective mode. Of the men in the

152

dissertation study, 75% used the separate/objective mode more frequently than the connected mode and only 6.3% of the men used the connected mode more frequently than the separate/objective mode. There are a number of speculations and potential explanations for the results.

There were no demographic differences between males and females in age, religion, ethnic origin, current family income, family income while growing up, or grade point average. However, there were differences in class standing. More women were in the freshmen, sophomore, and junior classes than were men, and 80% of the seniors were men, whereas only 20% of the seniors were women. This difference in class standing probably did not influence the results. Gilligan (1982) contends that as individuals mature, they tend to use both modes of self description and both modes of moral reasoning. However, even though the men represented the senior class, thus having more experience as a college student than the women, the men used predominantly one mode of self description, the separate/objective mode. Gilligan states that there is more crossover use of each mode as the individual matures, but this crossover to the connected mode is not evident for the males. Had it been evident, there may have been no significant differences between males and female use of the self description modes because this crossover use of both modes was evident for females (See table 22). One speculation about why women, as a group, used both modes of self description and men almost exclusively used the separate/objective mode is that there are differences in the way men and women are socialized. Although some women view themselves and their world through connection to others more frequently than they

view they view themselves and their world through individuation and separateness from others, some women did use the "other" mode -- that is, the separate/objective mode. Most men, on the other hand, did not use the "other" mode -- for them, the connected mode of self description. One could speculate that women are socialized, either informally or in more overt ways, to function both from a perspective of attachment to others, and from one of separateness and independent reasoning. Men, on the other hand, may be socialized to rely on the separate/objective mode when thinking about themselves and others.

The literature supports this concept of socialization. There are two different patterns of socialization that may be influencing women as they mature, but the patterns of socialization that influence men are similar to each other. First, Chodorow (1978) contends that because generally, the mother is the primary care-giver, identity formation is understood from the child's relationship with her. Because females, in their childhood years, liken themselves to their mothers, they begin their lives in dependence and attachment. This relationship characteristic forms the foundation upon which they develop toward adulthood. That is, they continue to perceive themselves as functioning in a contextual sense and in relationship to others. On the other hand, males begin their lives differentiating themselves from their mothers. Males differ from females in that their identity formation is defined through separation from their mothers. Their progress into adulthood is characterized by independence and separation from others.

Secondly, socialization influences on male adolescents and adults confirm the developmental patterns of their early years, whereas

154

females are confronted with a conflict between their inherent sense of attachment and connectedness and the positive value society places on independence and self sufficiency. Belenky, Clinchy, et al (1986) contend that society is largely predicated on male values. They assert that, "Drawing on their own perspective and visions, men have constructed the prevailing theories, written history, and set values that have become the guiding principles for men and women alike" (p.5). The socialization patterns for the young male child and the adult man are alike in that these patterns are characterized by separation and independence, but the socialization patterns for the young female and the adult woman are different. She begins her life in a connected mode, but becomes cognizant of the value society places on a sense of separate/objective self. Thus, it could be reasoned that men are taught to think about themselves from the separate/objective self, but women are influenced by both the separate/objective and the connected modes of perceiving themselves and their worlds.

In summary, of the demographic variables measured, only class standing differences between males and females presented a potentially confounding factor that may have influenced the findings. The findings indicated that there were differences between male and female use of the connected mode of self description, but no differences between male and female use of the separate/objective mode. Although these results support Gilligan and Lyons' contention that there are two modes of self description, the idea that women, as a group, used both modes of self description and men almost exclusively used the separate/objective mode indicates a discrepency between the findings of this study and Lyons' findings.

155

H7 and H8, Male/Female Use of Moral Reasoning Modes

Hypothesis #7 stated that men would use the rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning more frequently than would women. Hypothesis #8 stated that women would use the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning more frequently than would men. The results indicated that there were statistically significant differences between male and female use of the rights-predominating mode. Men used the rights-predominating mode more frequently than women. Thus, the results supported hypothesis #7. The results revealed that there were statistically significant differences between male and female use of the response-predominating mode. Women used the response-predominating mode more frequently than men. Thus, the results supported hypothesis #8. The descriptive analysis of the results indicated that men relied almost exclusively on the rights-predominating mode, but women, as a group, used each mode of moral reasoning.

The previous discussion of hypotheses 5 and 6 presented speculations and potential explanations about the results that are applicable to the findings related to male and female member use of moral reasoning modes, as well. Additionally, there are other perspectives about the results that are salient to this discussion of the major findings.

One might ask why men are so strongly oriented toward a rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning. Gilligan (1982) cites Piaget's (1932) descriptions of children's behavior while playing games in her own discussion of moral development. Her analysis of what happens when disputes arise in children's games is indicative of the moral development process as it differentially occurs in girls and

156

boys. She states that, "... it seemed that the boys enjoyed the legal debates as much as they did the game itself, and even marginal players of lesser size or skill participated equally in these recurrent squabbles. In contrast, the eruption of disputes among girls tended to end the game" (p.9). She continues, reflecting that boys become, "...increasingly fascinated with the legal elaboration of rules and the development of fair procedures for adjudicating conflicts" (p.10). One could speculate that this difference between male and female behaviors in children's games might be related to the strong influence that the peer group has on a child's perceptions. Boys are positively reinforced by their peers to develop analytical debating skills, whereas girls are reinforced by their peers to protect their friendships at the cost of the game. One could reason further that as the child develops toward adulthood, the concept of peer group influence is broadened to include societal influence, as well. Again, Chodorow's conceptualization of the child's development in relation to the mother and Gilligan's perspective on the child's behavior in game playing activities come to light. As the boy, different from his mother, learns to consider the principle of fairness in conflict resolution, and becomes influenced by a society that values independent thinking, he tends strongly to rely on the rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning to confront dilemmas in his life. As the young girl, like her mother, learns to consider the care of others in conflict resolution, but is influenced by the same society that values independent thinking, she may become capable of using both the rights-predominating and the response-predominating modes of moral reasoning to confront dilemmas in her life.

These tendencies of males to rely almost exclusively on the rights-predominating mode and females to use either mode of moral reasoning are congruent with the results of this study which show that although there are differences between male and female use of each mode of moral reasoning, females, as a group, used both the rights-predominating mode and the response-predominating mode.

H9. Modes of Self Description Related to Modes of Moral Reasoning

Hypothesis #9 stated that there would be a positive relationship between the moral reasoning mode used to construct and resolve a moral dilemma, and the mode used in the self description. That is, individuals who used the separate/objective mode of self description would use the rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning, and those who used the connected mode of self description would use the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning. The results revealed that there was a positive relationship between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning, as described. Hypothesis #9 was supported by the results.

Lyons (1983) also found this relationship between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning. In her discussion of this finding, she cautioned the reader against assuming a causal relationship between the self description modes and the moral reasoning modes. Rather, she explained, "... we can say an important relationship exists" (p.141). This important though not causal relationship offers support for conceptualizations of student development in which the individual's development in areas such as relationship building, sense of integrity, emotional maturity, sense of

158

purpose, personal competence, and social skills emanates from his/her identity development (Chickering, 1969). The dissertation results demonstrate empirically the relationship between self identity, as expressed through self descriptions, and moral reasoning which is another facet of development. Given the existence of this relationship, one could reason, as Chickering (1969) did, that identity development is central to many aspects of development.

Although the results of this study support Lyons finding that there is a relationship between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning, there appears to be a less evident relationship between use of the connected mode and use of the response-predominating mode than Lyons found (See Table 17). One speculation about this discrepency between this study and Lyons' study is that the sample of individuals in Lyons study came solely from an advantaged socioeconomic class, and represented ages from across the life span. The sample group in the dissertation study came from a somewhat broader background, as measured by family income, and were all college-aged individuals. These demographic differences may be related to the socialization factors that were discussed in the previous section of this discussion of the major findings. That is, those college-aged women who used the connected mode of self description may have experienced greater internal conflict between how they were raised as a child, i.e., like mother, and the positive value society places on separate/objective thinking than would the individuals in Lyons study who were in the younger or older ends of the developmental continuum.

Gilligan (1982) also alludes to an explanation of why some people who describe themselves in the connected mode might use the

rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning. She refers to the, "... diffidence prevalent among women, their reluctance to speak publicly in their own voice, given the constraints imposed on them by their lack of power ..." (p.70). Again, women may be reluctant to speak from the connected self because society places a higher value on separate/objective thinking. They may be discouraged from speaking in their own voice.

One could further speculate that college-aged women, at a developmental cross-road into adulthood, are experiencing a transition toward what Gilligan calls, "a conflict between integrity and care" (p.164). Although these women may identify themselves from the perspective of connection to others, when resolving moral dilemmas they may be speaking from their sense of developing integrity and fairness.

In summary, the results support the findings of Gilligan by demonstrating the relationship between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning. However, there appears to be a less evident relationship between use of the connected self and use of the response-predominating mode than Lyons found. This discrepency may be due to differences in some demographic factors or it may be related to the societal influences that reinforce women to learn to function independently from the separate/objective or rights-predominating modes. The results of this study on the relationship between modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning may also support Gilligan's contention that maturity is signaled through the individual's ability to incorporate both care and integrity into his/her sense of self.

Sex Evident and Sex Non-evident Responses

During the scoring of the data, the two scorers became concerned that there may have been a difference between the scores for responses which explicitly indicated the respondent's sex and the scores for responses which did not indicate the sex of the respondent. Because the study was an examination, in part, of gender differences in the use of self description and moral reasoning modes, it became imperative that the investigator determine whether the fact that the scorers knew the sex of some respondents influenced the scoring. Had there been differences in the scoring of sex evident and sex non-evident responses, this may have been an indication that the scorers were biased and that the differences they found between male and female use of modes of self description and moral reasoning were attributable to their knowledge of the respondents' sex.

The results revealed that for the males, there were no differences between the scores of sex evident and sex non-evident responses for the separate/objective mode, the connected mode, or the rights-predominating mode. However, there was a statistically significant difference between sex evident and sex non-evident males for the response-predominating mode. For those male responses that were sex evident, there was a higher frequency of using the response-predominating mode than for those male responses that were non-sex evident. This statistical difference is not what one would expect if the scorers had been influenced by the respondents' sex. The scorers would have scored the sex evident males lower for the response-predominating mode because it was hypothesized that females would score higher than males in the use of the response-predominating

161

mode. Therefore, one could argue that the scorers were not biased because their scoring, in fact, differentiated in the opposite direction of what one might expect regarding male use of the response-predominating mode. Therefore, one could conclude that these results supported the contention of the investigator that scorer knowledge of the sex of some of the male participants did not influence the scoring.

The results revealed that for the females, there were no significant differences between the scores of sex evident and sex non-evident responses for the separate/objective mode, the connected mode, the rights-predominating mode, or the response-predominating mode. Therefore, one could conclude that these results supported the contention of the investigator that scorer knowledge of the sex of some of the female participants did not influence the scoring.

In summary, one could conclude from these findings that scorer knowledge of the sex of some of the participants did not influence the scoring of either male or female respondents and that therefore, the scorer's knowledge of gender is not the most likely explanation for the differences between male and female use of the modes of self description and moral reasoning.

Conclusions

Introduction

The following three conclusions can be drawn from the results of the study. As indicated in the discussion of the major findings, these conclusions are not irrefutable, but they are relatively conclusive

statements derived after considering the limitations of the study and the discussion of the major findings.

(1) The results of this study support the theoretical concept of moral development conceived by Gilligan as it takes place in both men and women. There are two modes of self description, one defined by connectedness and attachment to others, and the other defined by separation and individuation. There are also two modes of moral reasoning, one defined through care of self and others, and the other defined through rights and rules. These modes of self description and moral reasoning are as Gilligan (1980) stated, " ... significantly related but not absolutely confined to gender" (p.2).

This relationship of modes to gender is evidenced by the dissertation findings that demonstrated the differences between male and female use of the connected mode of self description, the rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning, and the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning. The fact that the modes are not "confined" to gender is evident in the empirical analysis of these results which shows that there was no difference between male and female use of the separate/objective mode and in the descriptive analysis of the results which shows that some of the women used modes of self description and moral reasoning that most of the men used.

(2) Another related conclusion of the study is that there was more variability in the female use of modes of self description and modes of moral reasoning and less variability among men. This is evident in the descriptive analysis of the results which showed that although 40% of the women used predominantly the connected mode of self description, 44% used predominantly the separate/objective mode and

163

that although 48.9% of the women used predominantly the response-predominating mode, 42.2% used predominantly the rights-predominating mode. This variability suggests that women learn to choose from both modes of self description and both modes of moral reasoning. It also suggests that men are taught and socialized to use one mode of self description, the separate/objective mode and one mode of moral reasoning, the rights-predominating mode.

(3) Another conclusion that can be drawn from the results is that modes of self description are related to modes of moral reasoning. Those who used a separate/objective mode of self description tended also to use a rights-predominating mode of moral reasoning, and those who used a connected mode of self description tended to use a response-predominating mode of moral reasoning. However, there appears to be a less evident relationship between the use of the connected mode of self description and the response-predominating mode of moral reasoning. This relationship may be due to various aspects of the socialization process which may reinforce women to identify themselves in connection with others, but teach them to think independently and with a high regard for rights and rules.

Practical Implications

Although there were no differences between the ways judicial board members and non-board members described themselves nor were there any differences between judicial board member and non-board member use of moral reasoning modes, the differences between male and female self identity and moral reasoning has implications for the administration of the judicial function in the university setting.

164

Of the judicial board members, both male and female, 66.7% used the rights-predominating mode more frequently than the response-predominating mode to construct, resolve, and evaluate moral dilemmas. Although this predominance of the justice perspective is not very different for the non-board member respondents, the findings on male and female use of moral reasoning modes offer a challenge to college student affairs practitioners to consider the importance of both the care perspective and the justice perspective as they select, train, and advise judicial boards. The idea that there are gender-different, though not gender-defined, modes of self identity and moral reasoning suggests that programs, services, and judicial systems should be designed to incorporate both decision-making perspectives. The results of this study indicate that women show variability in their choice of mode. Therefore, it is not enough to assure that a judicial board will be gender-balanced. In the interest of developing judicial programs that represent both a demographically diverse population and a developmentally diverse population, the judicial administrator should consider how the selection, training, and advising processes support student implementation of both modes of moral reasoning. For instance, in designing a selection process for new board members, judicial administrators could consider the following questions as they seek to attract students who function from a response-predominating perspective and those who may lend a justice/rights orientation.

(1) What messages are communicated through the various advertising materials which publicize the selection process? These materials may characterize the judicial board member as an enforcer, interpreter of rules, listener, or helper. It may be important to

determine which message or messages are congruent with the educational

goals of the judicial system and the facilitation of both modes of

moral reasoning.

(2) What qualifications are considered important to the

successful functioning of a judicial board member? Judicial

administrators may be seeking students who understand the rules, are

able to uphold standards, are empathetic, or offer sound listening

skills. Determining important qualifications may have an impact upon

whether the selection process attracts students who operate in a

rights-predominating mode, a response-predominating mode or both modes

of moral reasoning.

(3) What kinds of questions comprise the candidate interviews?

Questions can be characterized as those that are focused on the meaning

and intent of the rules and those that focus on the impact that the

candidate's involvement in the judicial system may have on others.

These types of questions may be differentially answered by students who

operate from either mode of moral reasoning.

(4) Does the selection process itself involve unilateral or

participative decision-making on the part of those administrators who

are choosing judicial board members? These two types of

decision-making may be indicative of either mode of moral reasoning and

may influence the use of modes of moral reasoning by judicial board

members.

The judicial administrator's own predominant mode of

decision-making may influence his/her training and advising style. In

turn, the manner in which the practitioner trains and advises the

judicial board may have an impact on the board's use of one or both

166

decision-making modes when adjudicating cases. Training and advising in both the response-predominating and rights-predominating modes may help judicial board members to understand and utilize both care and fairness in their work. Teaching listening skills as well as questioning skills, encouraging empathy as well as objectivity, and focusing on influence and impact as well as rules and regulations may help incorporate both developmental perspectives. As a result, the judicial system could become fully representative of the diverse population of college students.

Theoretical Implications

The results of this study generally support the theoretical constructs of Gilligan's work. However, there are three theoretical implications that can be drawn from this study.

(1) The results indicate that there is more diversity among the women in the study in their use of the modes of self description and the modes of moral reasoning, whereas the men demonstrated almost exclusively a preference for the separate/objective mode and the rights-predominating mode. Gilligan and Lyons' conception of male and female differences in self identity and moral reasoning implies that neither males nor females show any diversity in their choice of modes. The results of this study show that there are differences between male and female use of the modes of self description and moral reasoning, and imply that there are also differences in males' and females' conceptions of their choices of modes. Men may perceive separate/objective and rights-predominating thinking as the only

167

choice, whereas women may recognize that they can choose either approach to self identity and moral reasoning.

(2) The implication that men do not show diversity in their choice of modes further implies that although Gilligan's theoretical concepts apply to men and women, the traditional conceptions of moral reasoning apply only to men. If one agrees that the traditional theories emphasize maturity as independence, self sufficiency, and principled thinking, it can be conjectured that most of the men in this study seem to be following a developmental path that leads to that conception of maturity. Gilligan's work, however, accounts for another developmental path -- one that is marked by interdependence, connectedness, and care for self and others. The development of many of the women in the study can be understood from Gilligan's conception of maturity and not from the concepts established by traditional theories.

(3) Since moral development theory has been conceptually applied to university judicial systems, it may be important to consider how a new conception of moral development can be developed that applies to the purposes and goals of a judicial system. Moral development theory that includes both fairness and care as important characteristics of the mature student would help the judicial administrator design and implement a program that has a theoretical foundation applicable to both men and women.

Recommendations for Further Research

The findings, implications, and conclusions of this study, as well as the related literature, suggest several areas in which further

168

research could contribute to the understanding of the relationship of gender and judicial board membership to modes of self description and moral reasoning. The following are suggested as recommendations for further research:

(1) One suggestion for further research is to modify the design of the study to include a pre-test and a post-test. Campbell and Stanley (1963) recommend this design so that the interaction of the selection process and the treatment (judicial board experience) will not be a limiting factor. The non-board member group could be selected prior to the judicial board selection process and tested. The judicial board members could be tested prior to their service on the board. The effect that training experiences may have on the sample could then be analyzed to determine whether any changes occur as a result of whether the respondents served on a judicial board.

This study is based on a theory of moral development that contends that there is more than one definition of highly developed moral reasoning. The idea that both modes of decision-making contribute to a richer conceptualization of moral development implies that training may influence an individual's ability to expand his/her use of moral reasoning modes and utilize both modes of moral reasoning. By modifying the research design, it becomes possible to determine the impact of training on the individual's ability to learn and use the mode of moral reasoning not initially predominant. One might ask whether an individual's choice of mode can be influenced through training and if so, what are the necessary components of that training?

(2) A longitudinal study of self description and moral reasoning modes in college students should be considered as a topic for further

169

research. Gilligan (1982) contends that as individuals mature, they begin to incorporate both the care and fairness perspectives. She states, "Thus in the transition from adolescence to adulthood, the dilemma itself is the same for both sexes, a conflict between integrity and care. But approached from different perspectives, this dilemma generates the recognition of opposite truths" (p.164). A study, assessing use of self description and moral reasoning modes used by students in their Freshman year and again in their senior year, would test Gilligan's contention that as an individual matures, there is a recognition of both perspectives.

(3) Although no differences were found between judicial board member and non-board member use of self description and moral reasoning modes, the low return rate may have been the confounding variable that influenced these results. As discussed in the limitations of the study section of this chapter, the low return rate of the non-board member sample may have affected the representativeness of the sample. The non-board members who responded to the questionnaire may have been a unique subsample of the non-board members who were not very different from the judicial board member respondents. The judicial board members and the non-board members may have experienced similar involvement in student groups and leadership experiences. In this context, one recommendation for further research would be to require that the non-board member sample also be a "non-involved" sample. That is, the researcher could select students who indicate that they have not been involved in student groups, governing boards, or other leadership positions. This sampling strategy might create a non-board member group that is different from the judicial board member group.

(4)   Further research is necessary to determine whether
particularcollege or university settings have an impact on the
development of moral reasoning. One might ask whether students from
same-sex institutions would be more likely to use one mode of moral
reasoning over another as compared with students from coeducational
institutions who might be influenced by their peers of the opposite sex
because of regular interaction. Assessing use of moral reasoning modes
in other settings could complement this study and lend support to the
idea that there are two modes of moral reasoning characterized but not
necessarily defined by gender.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

Please complete this form and return with the questionnaire. This information will be used for research purposes only and individual responses will not be reported.

Student number _____

Age: Years _____, Months _____

Sex (Circle one) M   F

Categorize the religious setting in which you grew up (Check one)
_____ Roman Catholic
_____ Protestant
_____ Jewish
_____ Buddhist
_____ Hindu
_____ Moslem
_____ Atheist, Agnostic
_____ Other _____

Ethnic Origin (Check one)
_____ White, not of Hispanic origin
_____ Black, not of Hispanic origin
_____ Hispanic
_____ Asian Pacific American
_____ Native American
_____ Other

Where were you born? _____

Where were your parents born? mother _____

father _____

Estimate of yearly total family income while you were growing up (Check one)
_____ Less than $15,000
_____ $15,000 - $24,999
_____ $25,000 - $34,999
_____ $35,000 - $49,000
_____ $50,000 or more

Estimate of current yearly total family income (Check one)
_____ Less than $15,000
_____ $15,000 - $24,999
_____ $25,000 - $34,999
_____ $35,000 - $49,000
_____ $50,000 or more

Class (Circle one) F   So.   Jr.   Sr.

Grade Point Average _____

Major _____

APPENDIX B

STUDENT DESCRIPTIONS OF THEMSELVES AND A REAL-LIFE MORAL DILEMMA

STUDENT DESCRIPTIONS OF THEMSELVES AND A REAL-LIFE MORAL DILEMMA

Please complete the following four questions as fully and completely as you can. In each answer, include your thoughts and feelings describing not only your actions, but your own perceptions and emotions, as well.

Please notice that there is one question per page. If you need more space, please continue on the back of the page.

* *

1. How would you describe yourself to yourself? If you would tell yourself who you really are, what would you say?

2. Often, people experience extremely difficult problems and issues in their lives that call upon them to make decisions even though they are uncertain of what may be the best thing to do. Please describe as fully as possible one such dilemma in your life in which you were in great internal conflict. Describe your thoughts and feelings at the time. What was the moral conflict for you in the situation?

3. What did you decide to do? Describe the various alternatives that
   you thought of in trying to make the decision. How did you weigh
   each alternative?

4. Looking back on it now, did you make the best choice? Why or why not? Describe what feels good about the decision. Describe any regrets that you have. Describe what you have learned from the situation.

APPENDIX C

LETTER AND CONSENT FORM - JUDICIAL BOARD MEMBERS

Dear Student,

Your participation in this research project is sincerely appreciated. The purpose of this project is to study the ways that college students make decisions about the moral dilemmas they experience.

You were selected to complete a 30 minute questionnaire about issues in your life that may have involved some ethical conflict. You are asked to provide your student number and some information about your background. Be assured that this identifying information will be used for research purposes only. All results will be treated with strict confidence and you, as a participant, will remain anonymous.

Please place the completed demographic data sheet and questionnaire in the envelope provided and return to either your judiciary advisor or to me.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Nancy J. Stiller
Ph.D Candidate
Department of Educational Administration

*

CONSENT FORM

I understand that by signing this consent form, I agree to serve as a participant in a research project on decision-making by completing these materials as fully and completely as possible.

I understand that I am free to discontinue my participation at any time if I so choose.

Further, I can obtain a copy of the results of this study by contacting the researcher at any time after the conclusion of my participation.

_____

APPENDIX D

LETTER AND CONSENT FORM - NON-BOARD MEMBERS

Dear Student,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this doctoral research project. The purpose of this project is to study the ways that college students make decisions about the moral dilemmas they experience.

You were randomly selected to complete a 30 minute questionnaire about issues in your life that may have involved some inner ethical conflict. You are asked to provide your student number and some information about your background. Be assured that this identifying information will be used for research purposes only. All results will be treated with strict confidence and you, as a participant, will remain anonymous.

Please place the completed demographic data sheet and questionnaire in the stamped envelope provided and drop in U.S. Mail.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Nancy J. Stiller
Ph.D Candidate
Department of Educational Administration

*

CONSENT FORM

I understand that by signing this consent form, I agree to serve as a participant in a research project on decision-making by completing these materials as fully and completely as possible.

I understand that I am free to discontinue my participation at any time if I so choose.

Further, I can obtain a copy of the results of this study by contacting the researcher at any time after the conclusion of my participation.

_____
    (signature)

APPENDIX E

REMINDER LETTER

May 20, 1987

Dear Student,

Recently, I sent you a questionnaire entitled, "Student Perceptions of
Themselves and a Real-life Moral Dilemma." This questionnaire is a part of my
doctoral dissertation which is a study of the way college students perceive
themselves and make decisions about issues in their lives that involve inner
conflict. Your response is extremely important so that I can begin analysis of
the results.

Your response will be held in the strictest confidence. The study has been
approved by MSU's University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects
which requires high standards regarding confidentiality. Identifying
information will be used for research purposes only and all results will be
reported anonymously.

It will be appreciated if you would complete the questionnaire by Wednesday,
May 27 and return it in the stamped envelope provided.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Nancy J. Stiller
Ph.D Candidate, Department of Educational Administration
355 South Case Hall
Michigan State University
353-6757

APPENDIX F

CHUNKING INSTRUCTIONS FOR SELF DESCRIPTION QUESTION

CHUNKING INSTRUCTIONS FOR SELF DESCRIPTION QUESTION

1. Chunk each idea separately even if it means splitting a sentence into more than one chunk.

2. If a string of ideas such as "I am caring, considerate of others, and giving" connotes one perspective then chunk it as one chunk.

3. If a string of ideas such as "I live by my own standards, care deeply about those around me, and always play fair" connotes different perspectives, then chunk it as more than one chunk.

4. If a student assesses what they say such as, "Boy, I can't believe I said something so stupid" then chunk the assessment separately from the concept they are assessing.

5. Read the whole response first before chunking it.

6. More than one sentence may comprise a chunk if a sentence does not stand alone and make sense without the other sentence.

APPENDIX G

CHUNKING INSTRUCTIONS FOR MORAL DILEMMA QUESTIONS

CHUNKING INSTRUCTIONS FOR MORAL DILEMMA QUESTIONS (2, 3, 4)

1. Chunk each question separately. Your data sheet should indicate the total number of chunks per question as well as the total number of chunks for all three questions.

2. For question #2 (Construction of the problem):

   Chunk the <u>situation</u> described as one chunk including any elaboration. If you can pick out more than one situation, count each situation as a chunk.

   Chunk the <u>moral conflict</u> described as one chunk including any elaboration. If there is more than one conflict, count each as a chunk.

   If the student indicates <u>thoughts and/or feelings</u> about the situation or the conflict, chunk each of them as one chunk.

3. For question #3 (Resolution of the conflict):

   Chunk each <u>decision</u> as one chunk.

   Chunk each <u>alternative</u> as one chunk.

   Chunk descriptions of <u>how the student weighed each alternative</u> - one chunk per idea.

4. For question #4 (Evaluation of the resolution):

   Chunk each <u>evaluative statement</u> as one chunk. (i.e. I made the right/wrong decision)

   Chunk each <u>reason</u> a decision was "good or bad".

   Chunk each <u>regret</u> described as one chunk.

   Chunk each indication of <u>something learned</u> as one chunk.

5. If a sentence or idea seems unscorable and is not just part of an elaboration, such as a transitional sentence (i.e., Now, I'll move on to talking about _____), chunk it as one chunk.

6. If a student does a list of pros/cons (probably in Q.#3) as a way of illustrating a decision making system, count the whole thing as one chunk.

APPENDIX H

GUIDELINES FOR SCORING - SELF DESCRIPTION

GUIDELINES FOR SCORING

Self Description

For each chunk, determine which of the following categories is applicable: General and factual - GF; Abilities and Agency - A; Psychological - P; or Relational - R (see attached description of the GF, A, and P components). For each chunk that is relational, determine whether it is separate/objective - S or connected - C using the guidelines listed below.

CONNECTED SELF	SEPARATE/OBJECTIVE SELF
Self in relation to others	Relationships as obligations or no relationships
Abilities in relationships - (initiate, sustain, care)	Abilities in relationship - (skills in interacting with others)
Helping others	Fairness, reciprocity, obligation, commitment, principle
Concern for the good of another in his/her own terms	Concern for others based on principles, beliefs, values, good of society
Doing good for others	Doing good for society
Not hurting others	Commitment to independence
Concern about quality of beliefs relationships	Whether standards and are being met
Relational concerns being discussed negatively (i.e., not being good at responding to others)	Relationships mentioned in a competitive sense
	Discussing others without acknowledging relationship (i.e., "I like girls/boys")
	Self-serving conception of a relationship
	Complying/not complying to external standards

APPENDIX I

GUIDELINES FOR SCORING - MORAL DILEMMAS

GUIDELINES FOR SCORING
Moral Dilemmas

Construction of the Problem

RESPONSE/CARE	JUSTICE/RIGHTS
Effects on others	Effects on self
Maintaining relationships; interdependence	Obligation, duty, commitment
Well-being of another; avoidance of conflict; alleviate other's burden, hurt, suffering	Standards, rules, principles, fairness
Situation	Principle
Care of self, care of others	Others have their own contexts
	Absence of relationship

Resolution of the Problem

RESPONSE/CARE	JUSTICE/RIGHTS
Effects on others	Effects on self
Maintaining relationships; interdependence	Obligation, duty, commitment
Well-being of another; avoidance of conflict; alleviate other's burden, hurt, suffering	Standards, rules, principles, fairness
Situation	Principle
Care of self, care of others	Others have their own contexts

Evaluation of the Resolution

RESPONSE/CARE	JUSTICE/RIGHTS
What happened; how it worked out	How decided, thought about, justified
Relationships maintained, restored	Values, standards, principles maintained, restored

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Arndt, J. R. (1971). "Substantive Due Process in Public Higher
    Education: 1959-1969." Journal of College Student Personnel, 2,
    83-94.

Association of College and University Housing Officers (1984).
    Residence Hall Judicial Systems." Talking Stick, Magazine of the
    ACUHO, 7, 10-12.

Astin, A. W. (1979). Four Critical Years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
    Publishers.

Baier, A. C. (1987). "Hume: The Women's Moral Theorist?" In, Kittay,
    E. F. and Meyers, D. T. Women and Moral Theory. New Jersey:
    Rowman and Littlefield.

Bakken, C. J. (1968). "The Legal Basis for College Student Personnel
    Work." Monograph #2, Student Personnel Series. American College
    Personnel Association.

Barr, M. J. (1983). "Legal Constraints on Colleges and Universities."
    In, Barr, M., ed. New Directions for Student Services; Student
    Affairs and the Law. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Beere, C. A. (1979) Women and Women's Issues; A Handbook of Tests and
    Measures. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Belenky, M. F.; Clinchy, B. M.; Goldberger, N. R.; Tarule, J. M.
    (1986). Women's Ways of Knowing. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc.

Bem, S. L. (1974). "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny."
    Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Biggs, D. A.; Brown, J. M. (1977). "Student Causal Attributions and
    Disciplining University Students." Journal of College Student
    Personnel, 2, 105-109.

Borg, W. R. and Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational Research: An
    Introduction. New York: Longman Publishers.

Brabeck, M. (1983). "Moral Judgment: Theory and Research on
    Differences Between Males and Females." Developmental Review, 3,
    274-291.

Campbell, D. T. and Stanley, J. C. (1963). Experimental and
    Quasi-experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally
    and Co.

186

Caruso, R. G. (1977). "Characteristics of Student Judicial Board
    Members: Their Relationship to Disciplinary Decision Making."
    Journal of College Student Personnel, 5, 339-344.

Caruso, R. (1978). "The Professional Approach to Student Discipline in
    the Years Ahead." In, Hammond, E.; Shaffer, R., eds., The Legal
    Foundations of Student Personnel Services in Higher Education.
    Washington, DC: The American College Personnel Association.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). Education and Identity. San Francisco:
    Jossey-Bass.

Chodorow, N. (1978). The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis
    and the Sociology of Gender. Berkeley: University of California
    Press.

Clinchy, B. and Zimmerman, C. (1985). "Growing Up Intellectually:
    Issues for College Women." Work in Progress Series. Wellesley
    College, Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies.

Craig, R. P. (1976). "Form, Content, and Justice in Moral Reasoning."
    Educational Theory, 2, 154-157.

Creamer, D. G. (1980). Student Development in Higher Education.
    American College Personnel Association.

Delworth, U. and Seeman, D. (1984). "The Ethics of Care: Implications
    of Gilligan for the Student Services Profession." Journal of
    College Student Personnel, 6, 489-492.

Dinnerstein, D. (1976). The Mermaid and Minotaur: Sexual Arrangements
    and Human Malaise. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

Dollar, R. J. (1969). "Disciplined College Students' Opinions of the
    Discipline Process." Journal of College Student Personnel, 4,
    219-222.

El-Khawas, E. (1979). "To Assure Fair Practice Toward Students."
    Educational Record, 3, 282-294.

Erikson, E. H. (1950). Childhood and Society. New York: W. W.
    Norton.

Evans, N. J. (1987). "A Framework for Assisting Student Affairs Staff
    in Fostering Moral Development." Journal of Counseling and
    Development, 4, 191-194.

Flanagan, O. J. Jr. (1982). "A Reply to Lawrence Kohlberg." Ethics:
    An International Journal of Social, Political, and Legal
    Philosophy, 3, 529-532.

Fowler, G. A. (1984). "The Legal Relationship Between the American
    College Student and the College: An Historical Perspective and the
    Renewal of a Proposal." Journal of Law and Education, 3, 401-416.

187

Gehring, D. D. (1983). Administering College and University Housing: A Legal Perspective. College Administration Publications, Inc.

Gelwick, B. P. (1985). "Cognitive Development of Women." In, Evans, N., ed., New Directions for Student Services: Facilitating the Development of Women, 29, 29-44.

Gibbs, J. A. (1977). "Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Judgment: A Constructive Critique." Harvard Educational Review, 1, 43-61.

Gilligan, C. (1977). "In a Different Voice: Women's Conceptions of Self and of Morality." Harvard Educational Review, 4, 481-517.

Gilligan, C.; Murphy, J. M. (1979). "Development from Adolescence to Adulthood: The Philosopher and the Dilemma of the Fact." In, Kuhn, D., ed., New Directions for Child Development, 5, 85-101.

Gilligan, C. (1980). "The Contribution of Women's Thought to Developmental Theory: The Elimination of Sex Bias in Moral Development Research and Education." Final Report Submitted to the National Institute of Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Gilligan, C. (1981). "Moral Development." In, Chickering, A., ed., The Modern American College, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Greenleaf, E. A. (1978). "The Relationship of Legal Issues and Procedures to Student Development." In, Hammond, E.; Shaffer, R., eds., The Legal Foundations of Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. Washington, DC: The American College Personnel Association.

Gordon, K. W. (1971). "Due Process: A Swing Toward Student Rights." Journal of College Student Personnel, 2, 95-101.

Habecker, E. (Aug. 1980). "The Student Disciplinary Process in the Private College and University: Is the Music Beginning to Change?" ERIC-ED190018.

Hammond, E. H.; Shaffer, R. H. (1978). The Legal Foundations of Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. American College Personnel Association.

Heath, D. H. (1968). Growing Up in College: Liberal Education and Maturity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Heath, D. H. (1977). Maturity and Competence: A Transcultural View. New York: Gardner Press.

Holstein, C. B. (March 1976). "Irreversible Stepwise Sequence in the Development of Moral Judgement: A Longitudinal Study of Males and Females." Child Development, 1.

188

Hotelling, K. and Forrest, L. (1985). "Gilligan's Theory of Sex-Role Development: A Perspective for Counseling." _Journal of Counseling and Development_, 11, 183-186.

Hult, R. E. Jr. and Clark, G. (1983). "Leadership Characteristics and Leader Effects in Moral Education Settings." _Journal of Instructional Psychology_, 10, 83-88.

Jackson, B. L.; Richardson, R. L. (1975). "Legal Issues in Higher Education: A Look Toward the Future." _Journal of College Student Personnel_, 6, 514-519.

Jackson, L. A. (1985, 9/10). "Self Conceptions and Gender Role: The Correspondence Between Gender-Role Categorization and Open-ended Self Descriptions." _Sex Roles_, 549-566.

Janosick, S. M.; Spencer, E. F. D.; Davis, M. B. (1985). "Student Perceptions of a New Residence Life Judicial System." _Journal of College and University Housing_, 1, 21-25.

Jenison, L. M. (1972). "Attitudes of Students and Faculty Toward Selected Disciplinary Situations." _NASPA Journal_, 4, 291-294.

Kaplan, A.; Klein, R.; Gleason, N. (1985). "Women's Self Development in Late Adolescence." _Work in Progress Series_. Wellesley College, Stone Center for Developmental Studies and Services.

Kaplan, W. A. (1983). _The Law of Higher Education_. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

King, P. M. (1978). "William Perry's Theory of Intellectual and Ethical Development." In, Knefelkamp, Widick, Parker, eds., _New Directions for Student Services: Applying Developmmental Findings_. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). _Stage and Sequence: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Socialization Theory and Research_. New York: Rand McNally, 347-480.

Kohlberg, L. (1976). "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach." In, Lickona, T., ed., _Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research and Social Issues_. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). _The Psychology of Moral Development_ (Vol. I), San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row Publishers.

Kohlberg, L. (1982). "A Reply to Owen Flanagan and Some Comments on the Puka-Goodpaster Exchange." _Ethics: An International Journal of Social, Political, and Legal Philosophy_, 3, 513-528.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). _The Psychology of Moral Development_ (Vol. II). San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row Publishers.

189

Kohlberg, L.; Colby, A.; Gibbs, J.; Speiccher-Dubin, B.; and Power, C. (1978). Assessing Moral Stages: A Manual. Cambridge, MA: Center for Moral Education, Harvard University.

Kohlberg, L. and Gilligan, C. (1971, Fall). "The Adolescent as a Philosopher: The Discovery of the Self in a Postconvential World." Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1051-1086.

Larson, A. W. (July 1974). "A Comprehensive Approach to Institutional Justice in Education." New Jersey State Department of Education, Division of Research, Planning, and Evaluation. ERIC-EA 006 462.

Leslie, D. A.; Satryb, R. P. (1974). "Due Process on Due Process? Some Observations." Journal of College Student Personnel, 5, 340-345.

Lester, L. F.; Leach, J. H. (1983). "College Student Behavior: A Ten-Year Look." Journal of American College Health, 4, 209-213.

Loevinger, J. (1966). "The Meaning and Measurement of Ego Development." American Psychologist, 21, 195-206.

Loevinger, J. (1976). Ego Development. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Loevinger, J. (1978). Scientific Ways In the Study of Ego Development. Heintz Werner Lecture Series, Vol. XII, Clark University Press.

Lyons, N. (1982). "Conceptions of Self and Morality and Modes of Moral Choice: Identifying Justice and Care in Judgments of Actual Moral Dilemmas." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Lyons, N. P. (1983). "Two Perspectives: On Self, Relations, and Morality." Harvard Educational Review, 2, 125-145.

Mackey, J. (1975). "Discussing Moral Dilemmas in the Classroom." English Journal, 9, 28-30.

Marvin, K. (Fall 1987). "Student Profile 1987." Michigan State University: Educational and Support Services, Division of Student Affairs and Services.

Miller, J. B. (1976). Toward a New Psychology of Women. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Miller, J. B. (1984). "The Development of Women's Sense of Self." Work in Progress Series. Wellesley College, Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies.

Miller, J. B. (1986). "What do We Mean by Relationships?" Work in Progress Series. Wellesley College, Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies.

Orr, J. B. (1974). "Cognitive-Developmental Approaches to Moral Education: A Social Ethical Analysis." Educational Theory, 4, 365-373.

Ostroth, D. D.; Armstrong, M. R.; Campbell, T. J. III (1978). "A Nationwide Survey of Judicial Systems in Large Institutions of Higher Education." Journal of College Student Personnel, 1, 21-27.

Ostroth, D. D.; Hill, D. E. (1978). "The Helping Relationship in Student Discipline." NASPA Journal, 2, 33-39.

Perry, W. Jr. (1970). Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Developmental in the College Years: A Scheme. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston Inc.

Piaget, J. (1965) The Moral Judgement of the Child. New York: The Free Press.

Reimer, J. (1981). "Moral Education: The Just Community Approach." Phi Delta Kappan, 7, 485-487.

Rest, J. R. (1973). the Hierarchical Nature of Moral Judgement: A Study of Patterns of Comprehension and Preference of Moral Stages." Journal of Personality, 1, 86-109.

Roberts, O. D.; Brown, C. W.; Clemens, B. T. (1972). "Procedural Due Process: One Institutions Plan and How it is Working." Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 9, 207-214.

Rothbart, M. K.; Hanley, D.; Albert, M. (1986, 11/12). "Gender Differences in Moral Reasoning." Sex Roles, 645-653.

Schuh, J. H.; Oblander, D. (1984). "Abuses Students Experience After Filing Judicial Complaints." Journal of College Student Personnel, 4, 343-346.

Sheehy, G. (1974). Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life. New York: Dutton.

Shubert, J.; Folger, J. (1980). "Handling Student Grievances in Higher Education." In, McCarthy, J. E., ed., New Directions for Higher Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Smith, A. F. (1978). "Lawrence Kohlberg's Cognitive Stage Theory of the Development of Moral Judgment." In Knefelkamp, Widick, P., eds., New Directions for Student Services: Applying Developmental Findings. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Spence, J. T. and Sawin, L. L. (1985). "Images of Masculinity and Femininity: A Reconceptualization." In, O'Leary, V. E.; Unger, R. K.; Wallston, B. S. Women, Gender, and Social Psychology, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Steele, B. H.; Johnson, D. H.; Rickard, S. T. (1984). "Managing the Judicial Function in Student Affairs." Journal of College Student Personnel, 4, 337-342.

Surrey, J. L. (1985). "Self-In-Relation: A Theory of Women's Development." Work in Progress Series. Wellesley College, Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies.

Tautfest, P. B. (1969). "The Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1, 27-30.

Tracey, T. J.; Foster, M. E.; Perkins, D. C.; Hillman, L. P. (1979). "Characteristics of Student Offenders: Some New Findings and Suggested Improvements in Research Methodology." Journal of College Student Personnel, 6, 492-497.

Trebilcot, J. (1982). "Two Forms of Androgynism." In, Vetterling-Braggin, M. Femininity, Masculinity, and Androgyny: A Modern Philosophical Discussion, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams, and Co.

Tronto, J. C. (1987). "Beyond Gender Difference to a Theory of Care." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 4, 644-663.

Turiel, E. (1983). The Development of Social Knowledge: Morality and Convention. Cambridge University Press.

Young, P. D. (1971). "Due Process Standards and Guidelines for Student Discipline in Higher Education." Journal of College Student Personnel, 2, 102-106.

Walker, L. J. (1984). "Sex Differences in the Development of Moral Reasoning: A Critical Review." Child Development, 55, 677-691.

Whiteley, J. M. (1980) "Extracurricular Influences on the Moral Development of College Students." New Directions for Higher Education, 31, 45-49.

Whiteley, J. M.; Bertin, B. D.; Berry, B. A. (1980). "Research on the Development of Moral Reasoning of College Students." New Directions for Higher Education, 31, 35-44.

Wood, J. T. (1986). "Different Voices in Relationship Crises: An Extension of Gilligan's Theory." American Behavioral Scientist, 3, 273-301.

Work, G. G. (1969). "CPI Patterns of College Male Disciplinary Cases and a Comparison Group." Journal of College Student Personnel, 4, 223-226.