1991

Moral orientation and decision-making: Ethnic and gender differences

Janice Lee Rank

MORAL ORIENTATION AND DECISION-MAKING: ETHNIC AND GENDER DIFFERENCES

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Psychology

---

by
Janice Lee Rank
July 1991

MORAL ORIENTATION AND DECISION-MAKING: ETHNIC AND GENDER DIFFERENCES

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Janice Lee Rank

July 1991

Approved by:

[redacted]

Joanna Worthley, Chair, Psychology — 7/17/91 Date

[redacted]

Gloria Cowan

[redacted]

Laura Kamptner

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there would be gender and ethnic differences in moral orientation--care versus justice--as described by Carol Gilligan (1977, 1982). The study was conducted in three phases as a study in decision-making. Subjects were asked to read four moral dilemmas and a list of considerations following each dilemma. Their task was to indicate how important each of the considerations was in the resolution of the dilemma. Each item was representative of either the care or the justice orientation. There was evidence to support the hypothesis that females score higher on care items than males; however, there were no gender differences on justice reasoning. There was considerable evidence to support the hypothesis that ethnic minority members (Non-Caucasians) rate care items higher than the ethnic majority (Caucasians). Ethnic minority subjects also rated justice items higher that did Caucasians. In addition, there was evidence that females and ethnic minorities rated care items higher than justice items.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Joanna Worthley for her time, her enthusiasm, and her guidance through this thesis and Gloria Cowan and Laura Kamptner for their excellent instruction that got me interested in this research in the first place. To all three I offer thanks for their patience, criticism, and support.

I also want to thank my friend and colleague, and my husband, Jack Mitchell, for his support including reading the literature, suggesting possibilities, and being patient when my entire world centered around this project.

And to all the students and colleagues at Victor Valley College and San Bernardino Valley College who offered their time and their ideas, thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Moral development and moral orientation have been a major focus of research and debate in psychology since Lawrence Kohlberg's doctoral dissertation in 1958 (cited in Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969). As the first comprehensive theory of moral development in psychology, Kohlberg's theory has become the yardstick against which all other psychological inquiries in the field have been measured. Kohlberg, drawing from the field of philosophy and the writings of John Locke, Immanuel Kant, and John Rawls, placed justice at the highest level of morality (Meyers & Kittay, 1987).

Although early research confirming Kohlberg's developmental theory was done with middle-class males of European descent, the theory was often applied to non-European males and females. In 1977, Carol Gilligan, a student of Kohlberg's, attacked her mentor's theory for its inadequate treatment of females. According to Gilligan, female moral development follows a pattern in which care for self and others is the highest stage.

Although the issue has not been settled conclusively, considerable research and debate since then has focused on the "justice versus care" issue and its application along gender lines (e.g. Friedman, 1985). In 1986, Stack extended Gilligan's model to include both Black

women and men who share the experience of class resulting from economic deprivation. Tronto (1987) considers the ethic of care to be created by the condition of subordination in society and applies it to other minority groups as well.

This study examines prevailing theories of moral development and moral orientation with special attention to their application to females and ethnic minorities.

Moral Development and Moral Maturity

Kohlberg was one of the first psychologists to clearly postulate a theory of moral development (e.g. Kohlberg, 1971, 1981, 1987; Kohlberg & Kauffman, 1987; Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969). His work was patterned on traditional developmental stage theory which attempts to explain relatively permanent changes in behavior in terms of development from relatively simple stages through progressively more complex stages to a final state of maturity. Stage theories include several basic assumptions: 1) Each stage arises out of the preceding stage; a stage cannot be "skipped," nor can an individual return to an earlier stage. 2) Fixation at a particular stage or delayed progression from one stage to another is considered an abnormality, as are any deviant characteristics not evidenced by the majority of individuals at any particular stage. 3) All humans follow the same universal patterns of development.

Kohlberg's original hierarchy specifically postulated six stages of moral development beginning with an obedience and punishment orientation (Stage One), to instrumental hedonism (Stage Two), interpersonal concordance (Stage Three), law and order (Stage Four), social contract (Stage Five), and universal ethical principles (Stage 6). In this last stage moral decisions are based not only on ordained social rules (as in the lower stages) but also on a logic of justice that is universal and consistent, grounded in a belief in the equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons. The six moral stages are grouped into three levels: the Preconventional Level (Stages 1-2), the Conventional Level (Stages 3-4), and the principled or Postconventional Level (Stages 5-6).

The critical question concerns the definition of moral maturity and its application to all individuals and groups. Kohlberg has clearly indicated that the higher the level, the "better" (1981), that one should continue the upward progression toward the final stage of maturity in early adulthood. Continued research in cognitive and moral development indicates that not all individuals reach maturity, however. Kohlberg's theory of moral development closely follows Piaget's pattern of cognitive development upon which it was modeled. Piaget's highest level is that of formal operations in which one reasons from an abstract

mode, manipulating symbols, and reasoning from alternative perspectives. Although ideally everyone would reach the level of formal operations, in fact, many adults never do (Piaget, 1972). And since there is evidence that moral development may be dependent upon attainment of prerequisite levels of Piagetian cognitive development (Faust & Arbuthnot, 1978; Greeno & Maccoby, 1986; Walker, 1986a), it follows that not everyone will reach Kohlberg's highest level of moral maturity.

In fact, in a revision of his theory, Kohlberg (1981, 1985; reported in Boyes & Walker, 1988) concedes that most people may not, in fact, reach the Stage 6 of his original theory, or the Postconventional level (which includes Stage 5 as well) (Kohlberg, 1971; Kohlberg & Kauffman, 1987). Other researchers contend that four stages are sufficient to account for the moral development of a large majority of children and adults (Bussey & Maughan, 1982; Greeno & Maccoby, 1986; Rest, 1986b).

Since few people actually reach Stage 6, the final, ideal stage of moral maturity, and many do not reach even Stage 5, it is important to look more closely at stages 3 and 4. Kohlberg (1971; Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969) describes the two stages of the Conventional Level as follows:

> Stage 3: The interpersonal concordance or the "good boy--nice girl" orientation. Good behavior is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them.

> There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or "natural" behavior. Behavior is frequently judged by intention--"he means well" becomes important for the first time. One earns approval by being "nice."
>
> Stage 4: The "law and order" orientation. There is orientation toward authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order. Right behavior consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake. (Kohlberg, 1971, p. 164).

The justice orientation becomes apparent at stage 4 where one maintains a sense of justice out of respect for law and authority and a sense of duty; at stage 5 the emphasis is on justice as respect for individual rights as agreed upon by the society; and at Stage 6 justice arises out of one's own conscience as abstract ethical principles (Kohlberg, 1971; Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969).

Characteristic of traditional theories of development, Kohlberg's theory includes the criterion of universality: the stages and one's progression through them apply equally to all individuals in all cultures (Boyes & Walker, 1988; Snarey, 1985).

Moral Maturity Versus Moral Orientation by Gender

A major exception to Kohlberg's claim of universal application comes from Carol Gilligan. According to

Gilligan, Kohlberg's theory is not universally applicable to women. Gilligan's objection is based on the observation that most of the research used to establish Kohlberg's theory was derived from studies of males only. When judged according to Kohlberg's androcentric model, females are placed at a disadvantage (Gilligan, 1977, 1982; Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988). Kohlberg and Kramer (1969) identified Stage Three as the characteristic mode of women's moral judgments, claiming that since women's lives were interpersonally based, this stage was not only "functional" for them but also adequate for resolving the moral conflicts that they faced. While girls often reached Stage Three sooner than boys, they tended to remain at that stage while boys' development continued further along Kohlberg's scale (Bussey & Maughan, 1982; Gilligan, Kohlberg, Lerner, and Belenky, 1971; Greeno & Maccoby, 1986).

Kohlberg's placing of women at a lower level on the hierarchy of moral maturity has a long history: Freud believed that females were morally inferior to males, especially in their diminished sense of justice (reported in Brabeck, 1983, 1986 and Gilligan, 1982), and Piaget (1932) specifically noted that girls tended to have a far less developed legal sense and used rules less often. For Freud, Piaget, and Kohlberg, the source of the different moral dispositions of men and women is biology; for others, gender is a social construction (Bordo, 1986). According to

Gilligan (1977, 1982) and others (Brabeck, 1983, 1986; Chodorow, 1971, 1978), men and women operate from different perspectives because of their different experiences growing up.

Girls learn very early that it is the primary responsibility of women to care for others. Girls identify with their primary caretaker, usually the mother, and become attached to her, while boys identify with the father and find they must separate from the mother to do so. Boys tend to become aggressive and independent, girls empathetic and interdependent. As explained by Damon (1988) men emphasize rules and fairness because of this orientation toward separateness acquired during development. Rules are necessary when one's primary focus is on potential conflict; they provide the "artificial links" (p. 98) between persons. The emphasis on separation, conflict, and rules is less problematic for girls. They also learn the importance of connections with others, cooperation, and care.

For Gilligan, the problem of the differing moral levels of women and men on Kohlberg's hierarchy is not just in finding women developmentally inadequate, it is placing women in the same developmental model at all. According to Gilligan (1977, 1982), women actually progress along a different developmental path from men.

Gilligan proposes an alternative sequence of stages to describe female moral development based upon the morality of

care and relationships. The first level is an ethic of caring for the self in order to ensure survival. The transition from the first level to the second replaces selfishness with responsibility. At this next level is the "maternal" ethic that assumes responsibility for others' welfare and values care and responsibility. This is the level of the conventional view of women as care-takers and protectors. Concern for others often entails self-sacrifice and the need for approval (typical of Kohlberg's stage three). In the second transition, women begin to see that a morality of care must include care of self as well as others. At the third and highest level the need to take care of oneself includes an emphasis on the interconnection between other and self (Brabeck, 1986; Gilligan, 1977, 1982).

Gilligan's theory of the morality of care and responsibility grew out of her work with young women. By listening to women's discussions of their own real-life moral conflicts, Gilligan recognized that women's concerns centered on care and response to others. This led to the definition of the morality of care as personal and contextual as opposed to the morality of justice which is abstract and absolute. Gilligan's open-ended interview method continued to elicit material supporting her contention of the morality of care as a women's morality.

Her original research involved interviewing women who were facing a decision about whether or not to have an abortion (Gilligan, 1977, 1982; Gilligan & Belenky, 1980). Since then she and her colleagues have expanded and refined the theory by interviewing adolescent girls about their real moral concerns (Gilligan, Lyons & Hanmer, 1990), asking both adolescent boys and girls to explain their moral position using Aesop's fables (Johnston, 1988), interviews of male and female children, adolescents, and adults about the self and morality (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988; Lyons, 1983), analyzing adolescents' journals during a Holocaust awareness class (Bardige, 1988), individual interviews with urban youth about their experiences of unfairness (Bardidge, Ward, Gilligan, Taylor & Cohen, 1988) and urban violence (Ward, 1988), and a study of women lawyers (Jack & Jack, 1988). The findings in each of these studies support the theory that females tend to be more care oriented while males tend to exhibit the justice perspective.

Other research comparing genders on moral orientation show conflicting results (Brabeck, 1989). The research cited above focused on moral orientation and used predominantly interview methods. Some studies have developed methodology attempting to combine Kohlberg's stage development/justice focus model and Gilligan's orientation by gender model. Pratt, Golding and Hunter (1984) used Kohlberg's Moral Judgment instrument, a version of the Bem

Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) and found limited evidence of sex differences in moral orientation only at the principled level of moral judgment and no evidence of overall stage differences by sex. Smetana (1984) criticizes Pratt et al. saying that Gilligan's thesis cannot be adequately tested within Kohlberg's system and that any sex differences found are to some extent an artifact of Kohlberg's scoring system. (For a more comprehensive review of the problems comparing the two systems, methodology and scoring, the reader is referred to Brabeck, 1983, 1986.)

Friedman, Robinson, and Friedman (1987) also attempted to compare moral orientation and gender using items constructed from both Kohlberg's and Gilligan's descriptions of a mature moral response plus the PAQ; they too found no sex differences.

Research on Kohlberg's stage theory has a longer history than research on moral orientation. Some of the earlier studies using the Kohlbergian system support the theory of gender differences in moral reasoning (Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969) including some mentioned in a review of 45 studies (Snarey, 1985). Other studies have found no differences between females and males (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, & Lieberman, 1983; Damon, 1988; Gilligan, 1986; Luria, 1986; Murphy & Gilligan, 1980; Rest, 1975; Rest, 1986a; Rest, Thoma, Moon & Getz, 1986; Snarey, 1985; Walker,

1984; Walker, 1986a; Walker, de Vries & Trevethan, 1987). When differences are cited they usually disappear when class (Luria, 1986), education, and occupation (Walker, 1984) are controlled.

There has been no satisfactory resolution of the debate over gender differences and moral reasoning primarily because serious questions still abound regarding definitions and methodology.

Moral Development and Cross-Cultural Evidence

The criterion of cross-cultural universality of Kohlberg's development stage theory is also consistently debated. Research evidence by Kohlberg and his associates provides consistent support for the hierarchical theory and its applicability to other cultures. For example, Kohlberg and Kramer (1969) report research done on middle-class urban boys in the U.S., Taiwan, and Mexico and village boys in Turkey and Yucatan as evidence supporting their claim of universal application. Other studies provide general support for Kohlberg's theory, though some with reservations (Boyes & Walker, 1988; Kohlberg, 1971; Kohlberg & Kauffman, 1987; Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969; Nisan & Kohlberg, 1982; Rest, 1986b; Snarey, 1985; Snarey, Reimer, & Kohlberg, 1984; Vasudev & Hummel, 1987).

Other theorists, however, dispute the assertion of the universality of Kohlberg's moral stages. Onuf (1987) explains that the structure of rights and duties which

define individuality may be equated with the liberal culture of Western industrial societies. Onuf's highest type of rule is the commitment-rule, with its reciprocative obligations, which he places at the same level as Kohlberg's postconventional level. Although Onuf criticizes Kohlberg for several theoretical inconsistencies, his language of rules is similar to Kohlberg's language of justice, both of which are placed at the highest level of development and both of which have been identified with males.

Still other theorists argue that notions of what is moral depend upon one's social (Damon, 1988), historical (Kerber, 1986), and political (Ruddick, 1987) context. Damon (1988) cites anthropological research from Kenyan and Indian cultures to demonstrate that moral imperatives vary with the culture and the activities necessary to the society's survival. Schweder, Mahapatra, and Miller (1987) note that items of moral concern are so vastly different to Indian children than to their western counterparts that there is little congruence between the moral developmental stages of the two cultures. Vasudev and Hummel (1987), while supporting the cross-cultural generality of Kohlberg's model in their research, also using Indian children, note that there are some issues in morality which are not accounted for in Kohlberg's overly formalized theory of moral reasoning.

Boyes and Walker (1988) challenge the universality claim on the grounds that the theory misses or misconstrues some significant moral concepts from several cultures.

Baumrind (1986) goes even further in criticizing Kohlberg's assertion of universality claiming that his definition is restrictive and cannot be accurately applied to females or citizens of Second and Third World countries. She describes a trait shared by both Buddhists and Marxists, the understanding of the self as embedded in the social structure. This emphasis on the individual as socially embedded rather than as autonomous and self-centered is generally associated with females in Western cultures.

Moody-Adams (1991) criticizes Kohlberg's attempts at the universal application of his theory as an error in the direction of oversimplification, a kind of reductionism that prohibits a plurality of voices necessarily characteristic of a mature society, a plurality of voices from both sexes and various cultures.

Gilligan's criticisms of Kohlberg are echoed by these writers. Her morality of care has been argued to be a valid description of women's morality. The purpose of this study is to extend the investigation of the morality of care to include members of ethnic minorities who may share some of the same characteristics with women that cause them to operate from an ethic of care.

Moral Orientation and Ethnic Minorities

There has been little research on moral orientation and minority culture or class. The cross-cultural research on moral development has usually been done with members of the dominant culture or class and thus cannot be generalized to ethnic minority cultures.

Tronto (1987) argues that the morality Gilligan identified with women might be better identified with subordinate or minority status. "Circumstantial evidence strongly suggests that the moral views of minority group members in the United States are much more likely to be characterized by an ethic of care than by an ethic of justice" (Tronto, 1987, p. 650).

It is usually the dominant cultural group, which in our society would be white males, who make the rules and define the justice that all of society must live by. Females and both men and women of ethnic minorities have historically been allotted positions subordinate to white males. It has been their job to take care of the dominant class (e.g., as wives and servants) while being dependent upon them for economic support. Gilligan (1982) describes it as "a social system of relationships that sustain economic dependence and social subordination" for women and comments on how "class, race, and ethnicity are used to justify and rationalize the continuing inequality of an economic system that benefits some at others' expense" (p. 169). The "others" at whose

expense the majority benefit must also sustain themselves. For many that sustenance resides in their own networks of care established to preserve a sense of self in face of what they may perceive as an oppressive society. For example, gang membership is a social network established by a cultural minority (usually young and often of an ethnic minority group) designed to control both community and person identity. Women's support groups often perform the same function.

It is reasonable to consider that if the same factors which cause women to operate from a care perspective are also functional for both women and men of ethnic minorities, then the care orientation can be generalized beyond the issue of gender to include different minority groups.

Harding (1987) affirms the similarities between Gilligan's theory and Africanist theories. Among both feminists and Africanists, there is a tendency to set one's group apart from the dominant class of white European males. Both gender and race are social and historical categories, and the larger social context can account for these differences--gender and racial--as structured by oppression and exploitation. As Harding says, ". . . we should expect white, bourgeois, European men to have cognitive styles and a world view that is different from the cognitive styles and world views of those whose daily activities permit the direction of social life by those men" (1987, p. 310).

Stack (1974, 1986) comments that in her research with Blacks in both the urban setting and returning migrants to the rural South there is little consistency with Gilligan's theory of care vs. justice orientation by gender differentiation. Rather than differences between women and men, Black women and men have a very similar experience of class, "that is a similar relationship to production, employment, and material and economic rewards" (1986, p. 322). Both women and men emphasize the strength and importance of kinship ties, relationships, and networks of care.

Tronto (1987) discusses the similarities between ethnic minorities' and women's descriptions of moral behavior and the theory of care. She cites researchers such as Robert Coles and his discussions with Chicano, Eskimo, and Native American Indian children and John Langston Gwaltney and his work with Blacks. For these Chicano, Eskimo, Native American children and Blacks, care and respect for others takes precedence over other values.

Tronto also quotes Jackson (1982) who contrasts the "analytical, logical, cognitive, rational, step by step" thinking of Europeans and Euro-Americans with African thinking which relies on "syncretistic reasoning, intuitive, holistic, affective" patterns of thought in which "comprehension comes through sympathy" (Tronto, p. 651). Another theorist, Nobles (cited in Tronto, 1987), relates

this different manner of thinking style to black Americans' concept of the self. According to Nobles this view of self stresses "a sense of 'cooperation,' 'interdependence,' and 'collective responsibility,' as the extended self." Tronto notes the striking similarities between this language and that of Lyons (1983, 1990) in defining women's care perspective (see Table 1).

Tronto explains these differences by referring to social context. White women and minority men and women have primary responsibility for taking care of others in our society. This naturally leads to the development of an ethic of care and the valuing of care activities. According to Tronto, "The dearth of caretaking experiences makes privileged males morally deprived. Their experiences mislead them to think that moral beliefs can be expressed in abstract, universalistic terms as if they were purely cognitive questions, like mathematical formulae" (p. 652).

The question of whether moral perspectives differ by gender or ethnicity is far from answered; much of the existing research on gender presents conflicting evidence. There has been little actual research identifying moral orientation by ethnic group or class. This study continues with the collection of data on differences in moral perspective to determine whether in this sample women's responses differ from men's in placing greater emphasis on care, and whether the responses of people from contemporary

ethnic minority groups in the U.S. show a greater emphasis on care compared to Caucasians, the majority culture.

Methodological Concerns

Because much of the Kohlberg-Gilligan debate centers on their differing methodologies, it is important to examine each one and look at how other researchers have attempted to refine and build upon each system.

To measure moral development Kohlberg and his colleagues developed an elaborate system published in revised form in 1987 in two volumes as The Measurement of Moral Development (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987). Their "Standard Issue Moral Judgment Interview and Scoring System" is based on the developmental sequence postulated in Kohlberg's theory of moral judgment and consists of lengthy interviews with individuals in which each subject reads or is read a moral dilemma and asked to respond. The content of these responses is carefully analyzed to match it to the corresponding level on the hierarchy. One popular Kohlbergian dilemma which is also used in most subsequent research in moral development is the "Heinz" dilemma (see Appendix A). In this dilemma Heinz must decide whether or not to steal in order to save his dying wife.

The development of Kohlberg's system of scoring spanned a 30-year time period during which numerous studies, both cross-sectional and longitudinal, were undertaken to refine and validate the system (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987; Colby,

Kohlberg, Gibbs, & Lieberman, 1983; Gilligan, Kohlberg, Lerner, & Belenky, 1971; Nisan & Kohlberg, 1982; Snarey, Reimer, & Kohlberg, 1984). Although this system remains in wide use, attempts were made to simplify it for researchers and practictioners (e.g. Porter, 1972; West & Bursor, 1984)) and to make it more objective (Rest, 1975, 1986a, 1986b).

James Rest derived his Defining Issues Test (DIT) from Kohlberg's work but differed on methodology (1975; 1986a; 1986b). Rather than an interview procedure, the DIT resembles a multiple-choice test. Rest uses some of the same dilemmas as Kohlberg, including the Heinz dilemma, but each is accompanied by a set of items derived from interview material to which subjects respond. The items are carefully designed to represent the different considerations that are diagnostic of different schemes of fairness (i.e., moral judgment stages) and derived so that subjects focus on the form of argument rather than on the action advocated by the dilemma question. Subjects read each of three or six story dilemmas and are asked to indicate how important (on a five-point scale) each of the twelve decision items is to deciding the dilemma. After more than 500 studies using the DIT, Rest (1986a) concludes that the test is a valid indicator of moral stage.

Gilligan's interview method, based on Piaget's method was initially less structured that Kohlberg's system. Rather than present subjects with hypothetical dilemmas,

Gilligan would ask them about their own personal moral concerns. Gilligan has been criticized for her lack of an objective scoring system; her reliance on subjective content analysis of both literary works and her subjects' own stories make it difficult to establish a data base and replicate her findings (Brabeck, 1986; Luria, 1986; Smetana, 1984; Vasudev, 1988).

Partly to address this problem, Lyons (1983, 1990) developed a system that operationalized the distinction between the care focus and the justice focus as they appeared in subjects' descriptions of real life dilemmas. This system is summarized in Table 1, "The Logic of Two Moral Perspectives." Lyons' scoring system has been the basis for analysis of much of the recent research on moral orientation, including this research investigation.

Other researchers have used combinations of techniques to make comparisons between Gilligan's and Kohlberg's systems more reliable (e.g. comparing moral stages and moral orientations using both real-life and hypothetical dilemmas, Walker, de Vries, & Trevethan, 1987). Friedman, Robinson, and Friedman (1987) developed a system attempting to bridge the gap between Kohlberg and Gilligan which was used as part of the procedures for the current investigation. They constructed their moral reasoning instrument from Rest's DIT using dilemmas (including Heinz) which also appeared in Kohlberg's work. The main difference is that the items in

Table 1 The Logic of Two Moral Perspectives (adapted from Lyons, 1990, pp. 46-47)

The perspective of response (care) in relationships versus The perspective of rights (justice) in relationships	
Perspective toward other--	
care	See others in their own terms; contexts
justice	See others as one would like to be seen; in quality and reciprocity
Conception of self-in-relation to others--	
care	Interdependent in relation to others
justice	Autonomous/equal/independent in relation to others
Ideas and images of relationships--	
care	Attachment through response; interdependence of people in relationships; concern with responsiveness, isolation of people; relationships as webs
justice	Attachment through roles, obligation, duty; concern with equality and fairness in relationships; relationships as hierarchies
Ways of thinking/knowing--	
care	Particularistic; contextual; question posing; suspended judgment; use of dialogue, discussion; goal is understanding; thinking and feeling help together
justice	Objective; generalizing; abstract; ruleseeking; goal is to critique, to analyze, to answer question, to prove; thinking and feeling seen as needing to be separated
Interpersonal ideas and processes--	
care	Interdependent; emphasis on discussion and listening in order to understand others in own contexts
justice	Objective; role-related; in order to maintain fairness and equality in dealing with others

Friedman et al.'s checklist were constructed from Kohlberg's and Gilligan's descriptions of the moral choice. Specifically, items from Kohlberg's 1978 manual (cited in Friedman, Robinson, Friedman, 1987) addressed the issues of moral principles applicable to all individuals, rational standards applicable to a particular situation, the relation of values to each other, the relation of human rights to the law, rights of individuals, and the right of the individual to make autonomous value decisions. Items derived from Gilligan (1982) focused on actual consequences for people involved in the situation, the effects on specific relationships, the particular context and/or nature of the people involved, a person's willingness to sacrifice versus selfishness, the obligation to exercise care in relationships, and the obligation to avoid hurt. Subjects were asked to rate the importance of each item in making a decision about the dilemma.

Worthley (in press) used a similar technique in her research on moral orientation and science persistance but added the step of having subjects generate their own considerations from each dilemma to be rated. The methodology of Friedman, Robinson, and Friedman (1987) and Worthley (in press) provided the basis for the procedures and instruments used in the current study. The present study employs a methodology that operationalizes key terminology from the theories of both Kohlberg and Gilligan

in a format which seeks to reduce subjective experimenter bias inherent in a straight interview format.

Hypotheses

One hypothesis of this study concerns the relationship between moral orientation and gender. Specifically, it was expected that females would score items reflecting the care orientation higher than males and conversely males would score items reflecting the justice orientation higher than females.

The major hypothesis of the study extends the theory of moral orientation to include members of ethnic minority groups. It was hypothesized that members of ethnic minorities (Non-Caucasians) would rate items representing the care orientation higher than would the ethnic majority (Caucasians). Conversely, Caucasians would score items representing the justice orientation more important than would Non-Caucasians.

In addition it was expected that females would tend to use the care orientation more than the justice orientation and that ethnic minorities would use the care orientation more than the justice orientation.

METHOD

Subjects

Student participants were recruited primarily from English classes at Victor Valley College and San Bernardino Valley College. English class students were chosen because all students are required to take English and some degree of self-selection might be avoided by using these students as subjects. One history class was also used. In order to extend the sample beyond students, a small sample of professionals, faculty and administrators from the same two colleges were also invited to participate.

One reason that community college students were used is that community colleges attract a widely diverse population in terms of ethnicity, age, socioeconomic status, and gender. Since most of the previous research was done with middle-class and upper middle-class subjects in adolescence and early adulthood and often exclusively male or female school populations, it seemed appropriate to expand the research base to include a more diverse sample. An advantage of using community college students over public university students is that their very diversity means that their perspectives are not as controlled as students in the more traditional setting. Community college students may have goals other than the traditional four-year degree--

vocational goals, personal enrichment, and basic and/or remedial education--which could translate into alternative perspectives.

There were a total of 211 experimental subjects: Females = 143 (68%), Males = 68 (32%), Non-Caucasians = 92 (44%), Caucasians = 119 (56%). These larger groups included the following subgroups: Female Non-Caucasians = 62 (29%), Female Caucasians = 81 (38%) Male Non-Caucasians = 30 (14%), Male Caucasians = 38 (18%).

Although subjects were asked for their specific ethnic identification, there were not sufficient numbers in any of the subgroups for meaningful analysis. The Non-Caucasian groups representing ethnic minorities included African American/Blacks, Hispanic/Latinos, American Indians, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and Other.

Materials

The project consisted of three phases. In all three phases subjects were informed that the purpose of the study was to find out what criteria people used in making decisions. (The word "moral" was deliberately not used in order to avoid popular meanings of the word which could influence subjects' responses.) The decisions subjects were asked to make involved four moral dilemmas where any decision made had both good and bad aspects. One's values would determine which aspects were more acceptable than others.

Four story dilemmas (See Appendix A) were constructed to be used as the stimuli for the decision-making items. The first dilemma, "HEINZ's Dilemma," was taken from Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview scoring manual (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987) and has been used in much of the subsequent research on moral maturity and moral orientation. It served as the model upon which the other three dilemmas were patterned. "HEINZ's Dilemma" is hypothetical; the other three are real cases but written to sound hypothetical so that the subjects would not readily recognize them and use any previous knowledge they might have of the cases in making their decisions. The dilemmas were written to be approximately the same length and level of difficulty. They were also balanced by the gender of the "decision-maker" and the "victim."

"HEINZ's Dilemma" concerns a man in Europe whose wife is dying. Heinz is unable to buy the drug that might save her life and considers stealing the drug although it means breaking the law.

The second dilemma, "CAROL's Dilemma" is about a teacher who must decide whether or not to give a passing grade to a student, Larry, a star football player unable to master the course, even though he has tried hard. Carol knows that a passing grade may help him become a success in life while a failing grade will end his chances at an

education and good job. This dilemma is based on an actual experience of the author.

"LAURA's Dilemma" was printed in the Los Angeles Times newspaper February 22, 1991, as "The Choice: Her Country or Her Children" (Levine, 1991). This is a true story of a young mother forced to decide whether or not to obey the law and go with her unit to serve in the Persian Gulf or to stay home with her young children who have already lost one parent to the Gulf war.

"DR. JOHNSON'S Dilemma" is actually that of Dr. Timothy Quill as reported in the Los Angeles Times March 8 and March 17, 1991 and elsewhere. Dr. Quill is the doctor who helped the young leukemia victim to overdose on sleeping pills. His story focused national attention on the right of individuals to choose their own death and the right of a doctor to aid in that decision for reasons of compassion. Subjects in all phases were asked to read these four dilemmas. (See Appendix A for the exact presentation of the dilemmas.)

Procedures

The procedures included three phases adapted from similar procedures used by Rest (1986b), Friedman, Robinson, and Friedman (1987), and Worthley (in press). The first two phases were used to generate and label the considerations to be used in the experimental phase. Subjects who were peers of the experimental subjects were used to generate and label

the considerations in an attempt at a compromise between the subjective freely-generated responses of Gilligan and Lyons and the objective formats used by Kohlberg and Rest.

Phase I. Thirty-four students in two English classes were asked to read each of the four experimental dilemmas and articulate the problem in each one. Next they were asked to list six things/ideas they would have to take into consideration in order to resolve the dilemma. They had to list these six "considerations" in order of importance from most important to least important. The packet included a sample page with an example paragraph and list of ranked considerations so students would understand what they were to do (See Appendix A). For this example, Rest's sample dilemma was adapted (1986a).

For each of the four dilemmas, five of the most commonly listed considerations illustrating the care orientation and five of the most commonly listed considerations illustrating the justice orientation were included in Phase II. For this purpose the author used language adapted from Lyons (1990) to match subject responses to the two orientations (see Table 1 and Appendix B).

Phase II. The purpose of Phase II was to verify the assignment of each of the considerations to either the care or the justice orientation. A different group of 38 subjects read each of the same four dilemmas. This time

each dilemma was followed by the ten considerations generated in Phase I, five illustrating the care orientation and five the justice orientation as judged by the author. The order of the considerations was randomly determined by the throw of a die.

The directions for this phase included a description of each orientation and an example but not the justice or care label. Instead they were labeled Patterns (of Response) A and B. Subjects were asked to indicate which pattern, A or B, each consideration matched and how closely they felt it matched by marking one of five places on the line from "definitely A" to "definitely B." The language and examples (from the Heinz dilemma) used as the model for matching the considerations were adapted from Lyons (1990). In order to control for order effects half of the subjects read the care example first and half read the justice example first (See Appendix B).

For each of the four dilemmas, the three considerations judged by this group as most strongly matching the care orientation and the three "considerations" judged most strongly matching the justice orientation were included in Phase III, the experimental phase of the project.

Phase III. The experimental subjects received the four dilemmas, each with the six considerations listed in random order. Subjects had to indicate on a Likert-type scale how important each "consideration" was to them in deciding the

resolution of the dilemma from "Least Important" (value of 1) to "Very Important" (value of 5). They were also asked whether or not the protagonist should execute the decision being considered. (See Appendix C).

Finally, subjects were asked to indicate their ethnicity, gender, income level, and age but were instructed not to include their names in order to assure subject anonymity.

RESULTS

Subjects read four dilemmas and rated six "considerations" for each dilemma according to how important they felt each consideration was to the satisfactory resolution of the problem. For each consideration the range of scores possible was from 1 (Least Important) to 5 (Very Important). The three care scores and the three justice scores for each dilemma were summed and averaged resulting in a mean care score and a mean justice score for each dilemma. Total care and Total justice scores across dilemmas were also calculated. Since the hypotheses called for comparisons between gender and ethnic groups, the mean scores are presented in group comparison tables by dilemma (Tables 2-5) and across dilemmas (Table 6).

Analysis of Variance

Two-way ANOVAs were conducted for care and for justice by gender and ethnic group on each dilemma and for each orientation across dilemmas. The results indicate partial support for the relationship between gender and moral orientation and strong support for the association of ethnic group and moral orientation.

Table 2

Mean Scores on the HEINZ Dilemma care vs. justice Orientation by Gender and Ethnic Group

	Caucasians	Non-Caucasians	Total by Gender
care			
Females	3.82	4.07	3.93*
Males	3.33	3.82	3.54
JUSTICE			
Females	2.89	3.41	3.12
Males	2.69	3.28	2.95
Total by Ethnic Group			
care	3.66	3.99*	
Justice	2.83	3.37*	

*$p < .01$.

Note. Scores range from 1 (Least Important) to 5 (Very Important)

Table 3

Mean Scores on the CAROL Dilemma care vs. justice Orientation by Gender and Ethnic Group

	Caucasians	Non-Caucasians	Total by Gender
care			
Females	3.75	4.00	3.86
Males	3.71	3.67	3.70
JUSTICE			
Females	3.43	3.78	3.58
Males	3.24	3.81	3.50
Total by Ethnic Group			
care	3.74	3.89	
Justice	3.37	3.79*	

*p<.01.

Note. Scores range from 1 (Least Important) to 5 (Very Important)

Table 4

Mean Scores on the LAURA Dilemma care vs. justice Orientation by Gender and Ethnic Group

	Caucasians	Non-Caucasians	Total by Gender
care			
Females	3.50	3.73	3.60
Males	3.26	3.71	3.45
JUSTICE			
Females	2.95	3.15	3.04
Males	2.68	3.27	2.93
Total by Ethnic Group			
care	3.42	3.72*	
Justice	2.86	3.19*	

*$p < .01$.

Note. Scores range from 1 (Least Important) to 5 (Very Important)

Table 5

Mean Scores on the JOHNSON Dilemma care vs. justice Orientation by Gender and Ethnic Group

	Caucasians	Non-Caucasians	Total by Gender
care			
Females	3.88	4.09	3.91*
Males	3.38	3.87	3.60
JUSTICE			
Females	3.65	3.86	3.74
Males	3.38	3.86	3.58
Total by Ethnic Group			
care	3.72	4.02*	
Justice	3.56	3.86	

*p<.01.

Note. Scores range from 1 (Least Important) to 5 (Very Important)

Table 6

Mean Scores on TOTAL of all Dilemmas on care vs. justice Orientation by Gender and Ethnic Group

	Caucasians	Non-Caucasians	Total by Gender
care			
Females	3.73	3.97	3.83*
Males	3.42	3.78	3.57
JUSTICE			
Females	3.20	3.54	3.35
Males	2.98	3.50	3.20
Total by Ethnic Group			
care	3.63	3.91*	
Justice	3.13	3.53*	

*$p<.01$.

Note. Scores range from 1 (Least Important) to 5 (Very Important)

Gender and care. Results indicate significant main effects for gender for care on the HEINZ dilemma, $F(1,204) = 11.53$, $p<.01$; on the JOHNSON dilemma, $F(1,206) = 9.16$, $p<.01$; and on the TOTAL care score across dilemmas, $F(1,203) = 10.76$, $p<.01$. Females scored significantly higher on care than males. There were no significant differences between genders on the CAROL or LAURA dilemmas.

Gender and justice. There were no significant main effects for gender and "Justice." Males and females did not differ significantly in the way they scored justice items on any of the dilemmas.

Ethnic group and care. There were significant main effects for ETHNIC group for care scores on the HEINZ Dilemma, $F(1,204) = 9.14$, $p < .01$; the LAURA dilemma, $F(1,207) = 7.97$, $p < .01$; the JOHNSON dilemma, $F(1,206) = 6.83$, $p < .01$; and on the TOTAL care score, $F(1,203) = 13.27$, $p < .01$ across dilemmas. Only the CAROL dilemma showed non-significant results. Non-Caucasians scored higher than Caucasians in all cases.

Ethnic group and justice. There were significant main effects for ETHNIC group for justice scores on the HEINZ dilemma, $F(1,206) = 16.00$, $p<.01$; the CAROL dilemma, $F(1,204) = 6.65$, $p<.01$; the LAURA dilemma, $F(1,207) = 7.69$, $p<.01$; and the TOTAL justice score across dilemmas, $F(1,200) = 17.40$, $p<.01$. Again, Non-Caucasians scored higher than

Caucasians. There were no significant effects for ETHNIC group and justice on the JOHNSON dilemma.

Interactions between gender and care versus justice. Multiple Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) were conducted on each dilemma plus the total across dilemmas to see if subjects tended to prefer one orientation over the other. The results provide partial support for the hypothesis that females exhibit a preference for the care orientation over the justice orientation. There was a significant interaction between care versus justice and gender, with care preferred by females, on the HEINZ dilemma, $F(1,203) = 5.80$, $p<.05$; on the JOHNSON dilemma, $F(1,204) = 3.96$, $p<.05$; and on the TOTAL care score across dilemmas, $F(1,197) = 6.50$, $p<.05$. There were no significant differences between preference of orientations for the CAROL and LAURA dilemmas.

Interactions between ethnic group and care versus justice. Results on all four dilemmas confirmed the hypothesis that Non-Caucasians use the care more than the justice orientation: the HEINZ dilemma, $F(1,203) = 21.29$, $p < .05$; the CAROL dilemma, $F,(1,204) = 6.41$, $p<.05$; the LAURA dilemma, $F(1,207) = 14.31$, $p<.05$; the JOHNSON dilemma, $F(1,204) = 7.73$, $p<.05$; and the TOTAL across dilemmas, $F,(1,197) = 22.90$, $p<.05$.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study provide some support for the hypothesis linking gender and moral orientation. Females rated care items significantly more important than did males on the HEINZ dilemma and the JOHNSON dilemma. The TOTAL care score across dilemmas also showed a significant bias for females who gave care considerations consistently higher ratings than did males. It is interesting to note that the HEINZ and JOHNSON dilemmas were very similar in that in both cases a woman is dying and depends upon a man to do something illegal and unethical to help her: in the one case, to help her live, in the other to help her die. In both cases, the care ethic works to protect the person from further harm. Women, whose primary responsibility it is to care for others and be concerned with others' wants and needs, may see these issues of life, death, or continued suffering as issues requiring their serious personal consideration. The other two dilemmas, LAURA and CAROL, do not deal with life and death issues, but rather with quality of life: the children's mental well-being in Laura's case, Larry's future in Carol's dilemma. Perhaps, for women especially, life and death issues are more salient care issues than the quality of life.

Another possibility for these different results could be an artifact of the dilemmas themselves. The LAURA and CAROL dilemmas focus on rules (e.g., obedience to authority and giving a grade) while the HEINZ and JOHNSON dilemmas clearly focus on the issue of life versus death.

There was no support for the hypothesis that males would score higher on justice items than females. Males and females both use a justice orientation, including rules, a sense of duty and obligation, about equally. That is to be expected in western society where both males and females are taught to respect and conform to the law and universal principles of justice, where schools teach both males and females to be objective, to analyze and to critique, and where emphasis is placed on being fair.

Males and females internalize the norms of the society regarding rules and justice because both groups are taught them in a formal setting. In addition, females are taught, mostly informally, the ethic of care. It would be expected, therefore, that the greatest divergence between genders would be in the area of care. This proved to be the case.

Considerable support was also found for the hypothesis linking ethnic group and moral orientation; however this was not always in the predicted direction. Non-Caucasians rated both care and justice significantly more important than did Caucasians. The hypothesis predicted that Non-Caucasians would rate care items significantly higher than would

Caucasians. This was found to be true for three of the four dilemmas plus the total across dilemmas. Contrary to expectations, non-Caucasians also rated justice more important than did Caucasians on three of the four dilemmas plus the total. Consistently, Non-Caucasians, representing ethnic minorities, scored both care and justice items as more important than did Caucasians, the ethnic majority.

One possible interpretation is that ethnic minorities are more sensitive to both orientations because of their life experiences. They may believe that ascribing to the values of the majority culture is a way to advance in that culture. After all, the ethic of justice, reciprocal rights, and fairness would lead one to believe that anyone would eventually receive his or her fair share of society's benefits. Along with this, the ethic of care would ensure that one's needs are met in the event of a breakdown in the ethic of justice. Ward (1988) noted this integration of justice and care reasoning in listening to urban adolescents discuss violence.

An alternative interpretation is the one in which the attitude of responsibility with its interpersonal network of care and the focus on rights and its system of justice are integrated into one mature moral perspective (Gilligan 1982, 1987; Muuss, 1988). The moral person is one who uses reason and deliberate judgments to ensure that each person receives

justice at the same time maintaining concern for the well-being and care of each individual (Brabeck, 1986).

Kohlberg, too, comments on the integration of the two perspectives in which members of a group act to care for each other and for the group thus ensuring justice (1985). Flanagan and Jackson (1987) extend the argument to include both forms of reasoning in the same episode: for example, "'Heinz,' after all, should steal the drug because it is his wife; and his wife should get the drug because any human life is more important than any avaricious pharmacist's desire to make some extra money" (Flanagan & Jackson, 1987, p. 626).

Although the two arguments presented above for the presence of both care and justice orientation preferences by ethnic minorities seem reasonable, there is still another possible explanation. It is possible that ethnic minority members (Non-Caucasians) may be susceptible to a response bias which caused them to score consistently at the high end of the range while Caucasians more consistently marked items in the middle of the range.

While it is interesting to compare care and justice scores between groups (e.g., females rate care considerations higher than do males), it is also important to look at the preference of care versus justice within groups. The MANOVA results provide partial support for the hypothesis that females prefer care over justice as

demonstrated on the HEINZ and JOHNSON dilemmas and on the TOTAL score across dilemmas. Again the life and death issue in these two dilemmas may explain why the care response is stronger here than in the CAROL and LAURA dilemmas.

All four dilemmas provided support for the hypothesis that Non-Caucasians, the ethnic minority, have a tendency to focus on care over justice.

It is interesting to consider that while women and ethnic minorities use the care orientation more than do men and the ethnic majority, these latter groups tend to use care and justice equally instead of exhibiting a preference for justice as expected. This could result from an integration of orientations as discussed above. Another possibility is that care is actually as important to males and Caucasians as to females and ethnic minorities but is not expressed publicly. The socialization process requires that males refrain from exhibiting care behaviors. The anonymous nature of this project may have afforded subjects the opportunity express their real preferences rather than that imposed upon them by the culture.

Scoring patterns on the four dilemmas were similar with one exception. On the CAROL dilemma there were no differences between any of the groups by gender and a main effect for ethnic group (Non-Caucasians higher) on justice only. More than for any other dilemma subjects seemed to respond in a similar manner to the story of the football

player passing remedial English when he couldn't read or write. One possibility is that this is not seen as a very serious case so it would not be as harmful to let justice prevail over care. Another interpretation, consistent with Gilligan's theory, is that this is a "real" or potentially real case to college students. It is quite likely that subjects in all groups could place themselves in Larry's place or that they know of someone like Larry. College students share a subculture and corresponding values (e.g. you don't pass a class if you haven't done the work) which for this case may be more salient than gender or ethnicity.

There is another possible reason for why Non-Caucasians rated justice items as more important than did Caucasians on the CAROL dilemma. If the Non-Caucasians surmise that the athlete is also a Non-Caucasian, which is a valid assumption in the world of college football, they may see it as very important that Larry be treated fairly and not pushed into realms where he faces certain defeat. In this case care is best served by justice.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In 1987, Tronto stated that to her knowledge, "No one has examined minority group members using Gilligan's methodology to see if they fit the morality of care better that they fit Kohlberg's categories" (p. 650). In 1991, a review of the literature did not find any systematic studies addressing this problem.

The mixed results of this study indicate that there are differences between ethnic minorities and the ethnic majority and between gender minority and majority on the moral orientation values of care and justice. The nature and significance of these differences is still open to interpretation. The issues have vast social and political implications which cannot be taken lightly. Both women and members of ethnic minority groups may operate primarily from a care perspective when making decisions on moral dilemmas because they share the social experience of functioning in a position subordinate to Caucasian males. The concept of justice, with its concomitant ethic of rules and responsibility works for those who make the rules and are in a position to enforce them. Those who do not make and do not enforce the rules may find that the care ethic with its focus on family and kinship ties, caring for others and being cared for by others is more advantageous to their survival and advancement as a class of people.

Baumrind (1986) warns against an overly simplistic view of moral reasoning reduced to stereotypes. Presented here are two voices: female and male, and the two voices of the ethnic majority and the ethnic minority. Each of these groups is made of numerous other groups each of which deserve their own consideration. Spelman (1991) and Carby (1990) suggest looking beyond differences of gender and ethnicity to comparisons based on other subject variables.

As Scarr (1987) notes, the fear of stereotyping groups and penalizing them on their differences should not interfere with the accumulation of information that would help us understand our differences. One point that both Gilligan and Scarr make is that differences are not the same as deficiencies. Further research should illuminate how our differences can be complementary.

Further analysis by occupation is also warranted. Damon (1988) notes that men and women with similar occupational histories tend to use similar perpectives. For example, notes Damon, women lawyers tend to focus on justice to the same extent as do male lawyers. Jack and Jack (1988) also comment that the success of lawyers depends, to some extent, upon the congruence between their personal orientation (justice focus) and that of their work. Worthley (in press) found similar results with science students. Those who tended to stay in the sciences exhibited a justice focus, while those who quit were less strongly justice oriented. For these students, a justice perspective and the study of science seemed to be related.

Since Gilligan and Kohlberg and their colleagues tended to use primarily middle class subjects, there is a need for studies across socio-economic class. There is also a need to consider moral orientation at different ages across the lifespan; most of the existing research is on adolescents and young adults.

Finally, the issue of methodology needs continuing attention. From her earliest research, Gilligan recommended the use of real situations rather than hypothetical dilemmas in moral orientation research (Gilligan, 1977, 1982; Murphy & Gilligan, 1980). Females' and non-Caucasians' emphasize the context of care as opposed to abstract hypothetical situations; this can put them at a disadvantage when asked to respond to objective hypothetical stimulus materials. Walker (1989) insists that since women's lives are woven in context, any methodology which does not build upon contextual variables is subject to error. She recommends an interview technique that combines forced choice questions with those requiring more open-ended responses.

Gilligan used an interview technique in her famous abortion study (Gilligan & Belenky, 1980) and, although she has been criticized for its lack of objectivity, she has continued to defend and use that method in subsequent research. Most recently, Gilligan and her associates used this approach with adolescents and their concept of self (Gilligan, Lyons, & Hanmer, 1990).

A suggested extension of the current study is to employ an interview or narrative (written response) technique in conjunction with a rating method. Subject responses would be richer for the opportunity to respond freely and not as susceptible to non-contextual constraints, while a Likert-type measure provides quantitative control.

The issues of gender and ethnic group differences and the means to measure them are far from settled. This study provides evidence that there may be differences in moral perspective or orientation aligned by gender and ethnic groups. Continued research using more sensitive instruments, both subjective and objective, is needed to help clarify the use of the two orientations, justice and care, as well as other perspectives which may not be evident in this paradigm.

APPENDIX A

Phase I: Listing the considerations

DECISION MAKING PROJECT

Directions to Students: The purpose of this project is to find out what people think about when they make decisions. What are the things that have to be taken into consideration in order to make a decision?

Read each of the problem stories below. Then state what you think the problem is and list six things that you think are the most important things to take into consideration in making that decision. Put your answers in order from most important (#1) to least important (#6).

Your answers are your opinions. There are no right or wrong answers. You do not need to put your name on your paper, but we would appreciate it if you would indicate your gender/sex and ethnicity on the last page. Thanks for your help with this project.

Use the sample below as a guide.

SAMPLE

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

What do you think is the problem here? What decision needs to be made?

Frank needs to buy a car that will serve the needs of the whole family. He needs to decide what kind of car to buy.

Considerations

1. (most important)--whether a used car would be more economical in the long run than a new car

2. (2nd in importance)--whether a large, roomy car would be better than a compact car

3. (3rd in importance)--what kind of gas mileage the car would get

4. (4th in importance)--whether or not the car had an extended warranty for parts and service

5. (5th in importance)--whether the car was an import or American made car

6. (least important)--whether the color was green, Frank's favorite color

HEINZ's Dilemma

In Europe, a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging 10 times what the drug cost him to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about $1,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So Heinz gets desperate and considers breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife.

What do you think is the problem here? What decision needs to be made?

On scratch paper, list at least six things that you think need to be taken into consideration in making this kind of decision. When you have finished listing them, put your top six in order from most important to least important.**Write your final list on the next page**.

HEINZ's Dilemma Considerations

1. (most important)--

2. (2nd in importance)--

3. (3rd in importance)--

4. (4th in importance)--

5. (5th in importance)--

6. (least important)--

CAROL's Dilemma

Carol was a young college professor in her first year of teaching. As an English teacher she was eager to help her students learn better ways of communicating and expressing themselves. She soon learned that she was also responsible for educating athletes who often had poor English skills. Carol cared about these young athletes and was able to find tutors when they needed extra help. One young man, Larry, was so severely handicapped, that even after two full years of special help, he still could not write or read. But Larry was a star on the college football team. When Carol finally gave him the inevitable failing grade, the coach intervened. The coach explained that if Larry failed he would have to return home to Georgia where he was the youngest of 13 children and he would have no future. If he were allowed to continue college, he might have a chance to escape the cycle of poverty. Carol considers giving Larry a passing grade even though he has not earned it.

What do you think is the problem here? What decision needs to be made?

On scratch paper, list at least six things that you think need to be taken into consideration in making this kind of decision. When you have finished listing them, put your top six in order from most important to least important. **Write your final list on the next page**.

CAROL's Dilemma Considerations

1. (most important)--

2. (2nd in importance)--

3. (3rd in importance)--

4. (4th in importance)--

5. (5th in importance)--

6. (least important)--

LAURA's Dilemma

Laura, a 28-year-old wife and mother of two children, an infant and a 7-year-old, found herself faced with an unusual problem. Laura was also a medical technician in the U.S. Navy and her unit had been called up to serve in the Persian Gulf. Laura's problem was complicated because her husband was already serving in the gulf. Laura felt that her children were already suffering because of their father's absence and they would be damaged further if she left them. Laura explained that each time she had become pregnant she had asked the Navy if she could get out of the military. She was told that in the event of a call up, only one parent would have to go. But when the call up came, both parents got their orders the same day. Laura was reassured that it was a mistake and would be corrected. The day before mobilization, she was told she would have to go the next day anyway. Laura considers refusing to go.

What do you think is the problem here? What decision needs to be made?

On scratch paper, list at least six things that you think need to be taken into consideration in making this kind of decision. When you have finished listing them, put your top six in order from most important to least important. **Write your final list on the next page**.

LAURA's Dilemma Considerations

1. (most important)--

2. (2nd in importance)--

3. (3rd in importance)--

4. (4th in importance)--

5. (5th in importance)--

6. (least important)--

DOCTOR JOHNSON's Dilemma

A young woman had a severe form of leukemia that is rarely curable. Rather than undergo painful treatments that might not work, she decided she would rather die. When her illness became too much to endure, she wanted to be able to say goodby to her friends and family and then take her own life. She asked Dr. Johnson to help her. Dr. Johnson had never considered such a thing before, but he undersood her need. He was considerate and careful. He counseled the young woman and tried to get her into treatment, but she did not change her mind. Dr. Johnson decided he would not abandon her. He considered prescribing sleeping pills for her. He would make sure she knew how to use them to sleep and the amount needed to commit suicide. Although he thought he knew what she would do with the knowledge, he considered yielding to her request.

What do you think is the problem here? What decision needs to be made?

On scratch paper, list at least six things that you think need to be taken into consideration in making this kind of decision. When you have finished listing them, put your top six in order from most important to least important. **Write your final list on the next page**.

DOCTOR JOHNSON's Dilemma Considerations

1. (most important)--

2. (2nd in importance)--

3. (3rd in importance)--

4. (4th in importance)--

5. (5th in importance)--

6. (least important)--

Please circle the correct response. PHASE I

1. What is your gender?
   a. female
   b. male

2. What ethnic group do you consider yourself belonging to?
   a. African American
   b. Hispanic/Latino
   c. American Indian
   d. Asian/Pacific Island
   e. Caucasian (white)
   f. other (please write it in) _____

3. About how far back can you trace your ancestry in the U.S.?
   a. first generation (you yourself came here from another country)
   b. second generation (your parents came here from another country)
   c. third generation (your grandparents came here from another country)
   d. fourth generation or older

3. How old are you? _____

Once again, thank you for helping us with this research.

APPENDIX B

PHASE II--Patterns of Response: Confirming the Orientation of the Considerations

Instructions page, alternate forms--

pages 60-61 care sample first (used with one-half of the subjects)

pages 62-63 justice sample first (used with one-half of the subjects)

pages 64-72 dilemmas with considerations (used with all subjects)

PATTERNS OF RESPONSE: Care Sample (AC)

This is a study of how people make decisions. We are interested in the criteria that people use when making decisions. Below you will find descriptions of two different systems of criteria that might be used when making decisions.

First you need to read carefully the two descriptions for patterns of decision-making criteria and the examples. Keep this sheet handy to refer to as you rate the individual items.

Next you are going to read four dilemmas and a list of items to be taken into consideration in resolving each dilemma. As you read each of these considerations, decide whether it more closely matches Pattern A or Pattern B or neither. Put an X on the line to indicate how strongly you feel the response matches pattern A or pattern B. If you don't feel it fits either, mark the center of the line.

PATTERN A

The most important thing is caring for and about other people. We need to understand the other person's point of view and realize that we all need to work together. Relationships are important. We have a responsiblity to help and protect each other. It is important to look for ways to solve a problem, but sometimes it might mean looking for other alternatives than just one simple answer. Sometimes there is no answer.

EXAMPLE (from the first dilemma): whether if Heinz does steal the drug and gets caught, he might to jail and there would be no one to take care of his wife

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

PATTERN B

The most important thing is what is fair or just. We need to have fair rules and to obey them. In order to maintain a society we need to recognize our obligations, our duty, to society. It is our responsibility to obey both the law and moral principles and respect each other's rights. There is usually a fair, objective answer, you just have to know how to find it.

EXAMPLE: whether if Heinz does steal the drug and gets caught, the judge would be fair and recognize that Heinz was doing what he had to and give him a light sentence

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

PATTERNS OF RESPONSE: Justice Sample (AJ)

This is a study of how people make decisions. We are interested in the criteria that people use when making decisions. Below you will find descriptions of two different systems of criteria that might be used when making decisions.

First you need to read carefully the two descriptions for patterns of decision-making criteria and the examples. Keep this sheet handy to refer to as you rate the individual items.

Next you are going to read four dilemmas and a list of items to be taken into consideration in resolving each dilemma. As you read each of these considerations, decide whether it more closely matches Pattern A or Pattern B or neither. Put an X on the line to indicate how strongly you feel the response matches pattern A or pattern B. If you don't feel it fits either, mark the center of the line.

PATTERN A

The most important thing to consider is what is fair or just. We need to have fair rules and to obey them. In order to maintain a society we need to recognize our obligations, our duty, to society. It is our responsibility to obey both the law and moral principles and respect each other's rights. There is usually a fair, objective answer, you just have to know how to find it.

EXAMPLE (from the first dilemma): whether if Heinz does steal the drug and gets caught, the judge would be fair and recognize that Heinz was doing what he had to and give him a light sentence

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

PATTERN B

The most important thing to consider is caring for and about other people. We need to understand the other person's point of view and realize that we all need to work together. Relationships are important. We have a responsiblity to help and protect each other. It is important to look for ways to solve a problem, but sometimes it might mean looking for other alternatives than just one simple answer. Sometimes there is no answer.

EXAMPLE: whether if Heinz does steal the drug and gets caught, he might go to jail and there would be no one to take care of his wife

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

HEINZ's Dilemma

In Europe, a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging 10 times what the drug cost him to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about $1,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So Heinz gets desperate and considers breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife.

Q: Do you think Heinz should steal the drug? Yes___ No___

Q: Would you steal the drug? Yes___ No___

DIRECTIONS: Mark each consideration according to how strongly you feel it matches either Pattern A or Pattern B.

1. Whether Heinz might go to jail and he wouldn't be able to take care of his wife

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

2. Whether the druggist is being fair in asking to make money from the drug he made

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

3. Whether or not there might be other ways to get the money besides stealing for it

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

4. Whether the wife would want him to steal the money

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

5. Whether Heinz's stealing might cause others to think stealing is OK in some cases

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

6. Whether stealing should ever be permitted even if it is against the law

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

7. Whether the price of the drug is worth the life of his wife

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

8. Whether Heinz's life and future would be ruined if he has a prison record

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

9. Whether spending time in jail is worth saving his wife's life

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

10. Whether or not his wife has a right to the drug

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

CAROL's Dilemma

Carol was a young college professor in her first year of teaching. As an English teacher she was eager to help her students learn better ways of communicating and expressing themselves. She soon learned that she was also responsible for educating athletes who often had poor English skills. Carol cared about these young athletes and was able to find tutors when they needed extra help. One young man, Larry, was so severely handicapped, that even after two full years of special help, he still could not write or read. But Larry was a star on the college football team. When Carol finally gave him the inevitable failing grade, the coach intervened. The coach explained that if Larry failed he would have to return home to Georgia where he was the youngest of 13 children and he would have no future. If he were allowed to continue college, he might have a chance to escape the cycle of poverty. Carol considers giving Larry a passing grade even though he has not earned it.

Q: Do you think Carol should give Larry a passing grade? Yes___ No___

Q: Would you give Larry a passing grade? Yes___ No___

DIRECTIONS: Mark each consideration according to how strongly you feel it matches either Pattern A or Pattern B.

1. Whether Larry will be hurt in the long run if he is passed now but fails later on

   definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

2. Whether the teacher is failing her job as a teacher by giving Larry special favors the other students don't get

   definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

3. Whether Larry's whole future in athletics depends on this grade

   definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

4. Whether other teachers have given passing grades to athletes who did not deserve them

   definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

5. Whether it is illegal to grant an unearned grade

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

6. Whether other athletes will learn of this grade and expect to be treated the same

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

7. Whether there might be another grade Carol could give Larry

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

8. Whether Carol's reputation will be hurt if it is found out that she gave an illegal grade

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

9. Whether Carol could later be sued for not performing her job properly

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

10. Whether Carol's self-esteem will suffer if she is forced to do something she does not believe is right

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

LAURA's Dilemma

Laura, a 28-year-old wife and mother of two children, ages 7 months and 2 years, found herself faced with an unusual problem. Laura was also a medical technician in the U.S. Navy and her unit had been called up to serve in the Persian Gulf. Laura's problem was complicated because her husband was already serving in the gulf. Laura felt that her children were already suffering because of their father's absence and they would be damaged further if she left them. Laura explained that each time she had become pregnant she had asked the Navy if she could get out of the military. She was told that in the event of a call up, only one parent would have to go. But when the call up came, both parents got their orders the same day. Laura was reassured that it was a mistake and would be corrected. The day before mobilization, she was told she would have to go the next day anyway. Laura considers refusing to go.

Q: Do you think Laura should go with her unit to the Persian Gulf?

yes___ no___

Q: Would you go if you were Laura? yes___ no___

DIRECTIONS: Mark each consideration according to how strongly you feel it matches either Pattern A or Pattern B.

1. Whether there is anyone else to care for the children

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

2. Whether others who are called up have the right to refuse to go

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

3. Whether her children would be hurt more if she is court martialed and sent to prison

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

4. Whether her refusal to go would affect her military future and her family

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

5. Whether there might be another way for Laura to fulfill her military duty without leaving her children

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

6. Whether Laura would be a bad mother if she leaves her children to fight in another country

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

7. Whether Laura would be unpatriotic if she refuses to serve her country

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

8. Whether it's fair for the father to go and not the mother

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

9. Whether the military would recognize its error and drop the charges against her for refusing to go

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

10. Whether refusing to help her countrymen with her medical services is fair

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

DOCTOR JOHNSON's Dilemma

A young woman had a severe form of leukemia that is rarely curable. Rather than undergo painful treatments that might not work, she decided she would rather die. When her illness became too much to endure, she wanted to be able to say goodby to her friends and family and then take her own life. She asked Dr. Johnson to help her. Dr. Johnson had never considered such a thing before, but he undersood her need. He was considerate and careful. He counseled the young woman and tried to get her into treatment, but she did not change her mind. Dr. Johnson decided he would not abandon her. He considered prescribing sleeping pills for her. He would make sure she knew how to use them to sleep and the amount needed to commit suicide. Although he thought he knew what she would do with the knowledge, he considered yielding to her request.

Q: Do you think Dr. Johnson should prescribe the sleeping pills for his patient? yes___ no___

Q: Would you prescribe the sleeping pills if you were the doctor? yes___ no___

DIRECTIONS: Mark each consideration according to how strongly you feel it matches either Pattern A or Pattern B.

1. Whether or not it is legal to assist a suicide

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

2. Whether Dr. Johnson's career would be jeopardized by assisting in a suicide

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

3. Whether the young woman has the right to die

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

4. Whether there might be another way of helping the young woman to live comfortably to the end without resorting to suicide

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

5. Whether other doctors have done this before

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

6. Whether she might try something more drastic if she doesn't get the pills

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

7. Whether society has the right to dictate one's own life or death

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

8. Whether her family might be hurt more by her death or her suffering

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

9. Whether the doctor is guilty of violating the Hippocratic oath

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

10. Whether there might be any other therapy or treatment that might help her

definitely A ___/___/___/___/___ definitely B

We would appreciate it if you could give us the following information:

1. What is your gender?
   a. female
   b. male

2. What ethnic group do you consider yourself belong to?
   a. African American
   b. Hispanic/Latino
   c. American Indian
   d. Asian/Pacific Island
   e. Caucasian (white)
   f. Other (please write it in) _____

3. How old are you?

THANKS FOR HELPING WITH THIS RESEARCH ON DECISION-MAKING.

APPENDIX C

Phase III: Rating the Decision Items

DECISION MAKING PROJECT

The purpose of this project is to find out what people think about when they make decisions and how important they think various considerations are. On the following pages you will find four dilemmas or problem stories in which the central character has to make a decision. Following each dilemma is a list of considerations which other students have decided were important to think about in making a decision. We would like you to rate how important you think each consideration is to the resolution of the problem.

On the last page are some standard questions asked in all such research. We would appreciate your answers, but do not put your name on these papers. The results of this research will be made available to you if you are interested. Thank you for your help with this project.

DIRECTIONS: Read each dilemma. Next answer the dilemma question. Then read each of the items that follow and rate how important you think each consideration is in answering the dilemma question.

Circle the appropriate letter from 1 (Least Important) to 5 (Very Important).

HEINZ'S Dilemma

In Europe, a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging 10 times what the drug cost him to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about $1,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So Heinz gets desperate and considers breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife.

Q: Do you think Heinz should steal the drug? Yes___
No___

ITEMS TO CONSIDER:

Whether Heinz might go to jail and not be able to take care of his wife

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether Heinz might be able to find another way of getting the money or the drug without having to steal

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether stealing should ever be permitted even if it is against the law

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether the price of the drug is important compared to the life of his wife

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether the druggist is being fair in asking to make money from the drug he made

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether Heinz's stealing might cause others to think that stealing is OK in some cases

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

CAROL'S Dilemma

Carol was a young college professor in her first year of teaching. As an English teacher she was eager to help her students learn better ways of communicating and expressing themselves. She soon learned that she was also responsible for educating athletes who often had poor English skills. Carol cared about these young athletes and was able to find tutors when they needed extra help. One young man, Larry, was so severely handicapped, that even after two full years of special help, he still could not write or read. But Larry was a star on the college football team. When Carol finally gave him the inevitable failing grade, the coach intervened. The coach explained that if Larry failed he would have to return home to Georgia where he was the youngest of 13 children, and he would have no future. If he were allowed to continue college, he might have a chance to escape the cycle of poverty. Carol considers giving Larry a passing grade even though he has not earned it.

Q: Do you think Carol should give Larry a passing grade?
Yes___ No___

ITEMS TO CONSIDER:

Whether the teacher is failing her job as a teacher by giving Larry special favors the other students don't get

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether Larry's future success depends on this grade

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether it is illegal to grant an unearned grade

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether Carol could later be sued for not performing her job properly

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether Carol's self-esteem will suffer if she is forced to do something she does not believe is right

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether Larry will be hurt in the long run if he is passed now but fails later on

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

LAURA'S Dilemma

Laura, a 28-year-old wife and mother of two children, ages 7 months and 2 years, found herself faced with an unusual problem. Laura was also a medical technician in the U.S. Navy, and her unit had been called up to serve in the Persian Gulf. Laura's problem was complicated because her husband was already serving in the gulf. Laura felt that her children were already suffering because of their father's absence and they would be damaged further if she left them. Laura explained that each time she had become pregnant she had asked the Navy if she could get out of the military. She was told that in the event of a call up, only one parent would have to go. But when the call up came, both parents got their orders the same day. Laura was reassured that it was a mistake and would be corrected. The day before mobilization, she was told she would have to go the next day anyway. Laura considers refusing to go.

Q: Do you think Laura should go with her unit to the Persian Gulf? yes___ no___

ITEMS TO CONSIDER:

Whether Laura would be considered a bad mother if she leaves her children to fight in another country

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether her children would be hurt more if she is court martialed and sent to prison

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether the military might recognize its error and drop the charges against her for refusing to go

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether it would be unpatriotic if Laura refused to serve her country

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether there is anyone else to care for the children

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether others who are called up have the right to refuse to go

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

DOCTOR JOHNSON'S Dilemma

A young woman had a severe form of leukemia that is rarely curable. Rather than undergo painful treatments that might not work, she decided she would rather die. When her illness became too much to endure, she wanted to be able to say goodby to her friends and family and then take her own life. She asked Dr. Johnson to help her. Dr. Johnson had never considered such a thing before, but he undersood her need. He was considerate and careful. He counseled the young woman and tried to get her into treatment, but she did not change her mind. Dr. Johnson decided he would not abandon her. He considered prescribing sleeping pills for her. He would make sure she knew how to use them to sleep and the amount needed to commit suicide. Although he thought he knew what she would do with the knowledge, he considered yielding to her request.

Q: Do you think Dr. Johnson should prescribe the sleeping pills for his patient? yes___ no___

ITEMS TO CONSIDER:

Whether there might be another way of helping the young woman to live comfortably to the end without resorting to suicide

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether Dr. Johnson's career would be jeopardized by assisting in a suicide

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether her family might be hurt more by her death or by her suffering

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether or not it is legal to assist a suicide

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether the doctor is guilty of violating the Hippocratic oath

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

Whether she might try something more drastic if she doesn't get the pills

Least Important 1 2 3 4 5 Very Important

We would appreciate it if you could give us the following information:

1. What is your gender?

   a. female
   b. male

2. To which ethnic group do you belong?

   a. African American/Black
   b. Hispanic/Latino
   c. American Indian
   d. Asian/Pacific Island
   e. Caucasian (white)
   f. Other (please write it in) _____

3. How old are you?

4. About how much yearly income does your household have?

   a. $5,000 or less
   b. $5001- $10,000
   c. $10,001-$15,000
   d. $15,001-$20,000
   e. $20,001-$25,000
   f. $25,000-$50,000
   g. over $50,000

THANKS FOR HELPING WITH THIS RESEARCH ON DECISION-MAKING.

REFERENCES

Bardige, B. (1988). Things so finely human: Moral sensibilities at risk in adolescence. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, & J. M. Taylor (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain, (pp. 87-110). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bardige, B., Ward, J. V., Gilligan, C., Taylor, J., M., & Cohen, G. (1988). Moral concerns and considerations of urban youth. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, & J. M. Taylor (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain, (pp. 159-174). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Baumrind, D. (1986). Sex differences in moral reasoning: Response to Walker's (1984) conclusion that there are none. Child Development, 57, 511-521.

Bordo, S. (1986). The Cartesian masculinization of thought. Signs, 11, 439-456.

Boyes, M. C., & Walker, L. J. (1988). Implications of cultural diversity for the universality claims of Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning. Human Development, 31, 44-59.

Brabeck, M. (1983). Moral judgment: Theory and research on differences between males and females. Developmental Review, 3, 274-291.

Brabeck, M. (1986). Moral orientation: Alternative perspectives of men and women. In R. Knowles & G. McLean (Eds.), Psychological Foundations of Moral Education and Character Development (pp. 65-89). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Brabeck, M. (1989). Comment on Scarr. American Psychologist, 44, 847.

Bussey, K. & Maughan, B. (1982). Gender differnces in moral reasoning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 701-706.

Carby, H. (1990, November). The politics of difference. Ms., 1, 84-85.

Chodorow, N. (1971). Being and doing: A cross-cultural examination of the socialization of males and females. In V. Gornick & B. Moran (Eds.), Woman in sexist society: Studies in power and powerlessness, (pp. 259-291). New York: Basic Books.

Chodorow, N. (1978). The reproduction of mothering. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., Gibbs, J., & Lieberman, M. (1983). A longitudinal study of moral judgment. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 48 (1-2, Serial No. 200).

Colby, A. & Kohlberg, L. (1987). The measurement of moral development (Vols. 1-2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Damon, W. (1988). The moral child: Nurturing children's natural moral growth. New York: The Free Press.

Faust, D. & Arbuthnot, J. (1978). Relationship between moral and Piagetian reasoning and the effectiveness of moral education. Developmental Psychology, 14, 435-436.

Flanagan, O. & Jackson, K. (1987). Justice, care, and gender: The Kohlberg-Gilligan debate revisited. Ethics, 622-637.

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

Friedman, M. (1985). Abraham, Socrates, and Heinz: Where are the women? In C. G. Harding (Ed.), Moral dilemmas: Philosophical and psychological issues in the development of moral reasoning. (pp. 25-41). Chicago: Precedent.

Friedman, W. J., Robinson, A. B., & Friedman, B. L. (1987). Sex differences in moral judgments? A test of Gilligan's theory. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 37-46.

Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: women's conceptions of self and of morality. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 481-517.

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

Gilligan, C. (1986). Reply by Carol Gilligan. In On In a different voice: An interdisciplinary forum. Signs, 11, 324-333.

Gilligan, C. (1987). Moral orientation and moral development. In E. Kittay & D. Meyers (Eds.), Women and moral theory (pp. 19-33). Totowa, NJ: Rowan & Littlefield.

Gilligan, C. (1988). Remapping the moral domain: New images of self in relationship. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, & J. M. Taylor (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain, (pp. 3-19). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

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

Gilligan, C. & Belenky M. (1980). A naturalistic study of abortion decisions. In R. Selman & R. Yando (Eds.), Clinical-developmental Psychology (pp. 69-90). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gilligan, C., Kohlberg, L., Lerner, J., & Belenky, M. (1971). Moral reasoning about sexual dilemmas: The development of an interview and scoring system. Technical Report of the U.S. Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government.

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

Greeno, C. G. & Maccoby, E. E. (1986). How different is the "Different Voice"? In On In a different voice: An interdisciplinary form. Signs, 11, 310-316.

Harding, S. (1987). The curious coincidence of feminine and African moralities: Challenges for feminist theory. In E. F. Kittay & D. T. Meyers (Eds.), Women and moral theory (pp. 296-315). Totowa, NJ: Rowan & Littlefield.

Jack, D. & Jack, R. (1988). Women lawyers: Archetype and alternatives. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, & J. M.

Taylor (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain (pp. 263-288). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Johnston, D. K. (1988). Adolescents' solutions to dilemmas in fables: Two moral orientations--two problem solving strategies. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, & J. M. Taylor (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain (pp. 49-71). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kerber, L. K. (1986). Some cautionary words for historians. In On In a different voice: An interdisciplinary forum. Signs, 11, 304-310.

Kohlberg, L. (1971). From is to ought: How to commit the naturalistic fallacy and get away with it in the study of moral development. In T. Mischel (Ed.), Cognitive development and epistemology (pp. 151-235). New York: Academic Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). The meaning and measurement of moral development. The Heinz Werner Lecture Series, vol. XIII. Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.

Kohlberg. L. (1985). Resolving moral conflicts within the just community. In C. G. Harding (Ed.), Moral dilemmas: Philosophical and psychological issues in the development of moral reasoning (pp. 71-98). Chicago: Precedent.

Kohlberg, L. (1987). Child psychology and childhood education: A cognitive-developmental view. New York: Longman.

Kohlberg, L, & Kauffman, K. (1987). Theoretical introduction to the measurement of moral judgment. In A. Colby & L. Kohlberg (Eds.), The measurement of moral development, vol. 1, (pp. 1-61). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kohlberg, L. & Kramer, R. (1969). Continuities and discontinuities in childhood and adult moral development. Human Development, 12, 93-120.

Levine, B. (1991, February 22). The choice: Her country or her children. The Los Angeles Times, p. E7.

Luria, Z. (1986). A methodological critique. In On In a different voice. Signs, 11, 316-321.

Lyons, N. P. (1983). Two perspectives: On self, relationships, and morality. Harvard Educational Review, 53, 125-145.

Lyons, N. P. (1990). Listening to voices we have not heard: Emma Willard girls' ideas about self, relationships, and morality. In C. Gilligan, N. P. Lyons, & T. J. Hanmer (Eds.), Making connections (pp. 30-72). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moody-Adams, M. (1991). Gender and the complexity of moral voices. In C. Card (Ed.), Feminist ethics (pp. 195-212). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Murphy, J. M. & Gilligan, C. (1980). Moral development in late adolescence and adulthood: A critique and reconstruction of Kohlberg's theory. Human Development, 23, 77-104.

Muuss, R. E. (1988). Carol Gilligan's theory of sex differences in the development of moral reasoning during adolescence. Adolescence, 23, 229-243.

Meyers, D. & Kittay E. (1987). Introduction. In E. Kittay & D. Meyers (Eds.), Women and moral theory (pp. 3-16). Totowa, NJ: Rowan & Littlefield.

Nisan, M. & Kohlberg, L. (1982). Universality and cross-cultural variation in moral development: A longitudinal and cross-sectional study in Turkey. Child Development, 53, 865-876.

Onuf, N. G. (1987). Rules in moral development. Human Development, 30, 257-267.

Piaget, J. (1932). The Moral Judgment of the Child. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Piaget, J. (1972). Intellectual evolution from adolescence to adulthood. Human Development, 15, 1-12.

Piaget, J. & Inhelder, B. (1969). The Psychology of the Child. New York: Basic Books.

Porter, N. (1972). How to assess the moral reasoning of students: A teachers' guide to the use of Lawrence Kohlberg's stage-developmental method. Toronto, Ontario: The Ontario Insitute for Studies in Education.

Pratt, M. W., Golding, G., & Hunter, W. J. (1984). Does morality have a gender? Sex, sex role, and moral judgment relationships across the adult lifespan. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 30, 321-340.

Rest, J. (1975) Longitudinal study of the Defining Issues Test of moral judgment: A strategy for analyzing

developmental change. Developmental Psychology, 11 (6), 738-748.

Rest, J. (1986a). DIT: Manual for the Defining Issues Test. 3rd ed. University of Minnesota: Center for the Study of Ethical Development.

Rest, J. (1986b). Moral development: Advances in research and theory. New York: Praeger.

Rest, J., Thoma, S. J., Moon, Y. L., & Getz, I. (1986). Different cultures, sexes, and religions. In J. Rest (Ed.), Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory. (pp. 89-132). New York: Praeger.

Ruddick, S. (1987). Remarks on the sexual politics of reason. In D. T. Meyers & E. F. Kittay (Eds.) Women and Moral Theory, (pp. 237-260). Totowa, NJ: Rowan & Littlefield.

Scarr, S. (1987). Race and gender as psychological variables: Social and ethical issues. American Psychologist, 43, 56-59.

Schweder, R., Mahapatra, M, & Miller, J. (1987). Culture and moral development. In J. Kagan and S. Lamb (Eds.), The emergence of morality in young children. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smetana, J. G. (1984). Morality and gender: A commentary on Pratt, Golding, and Hunter. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 30, 341-348.

Snarey, J. (1985). Cross-cultural universality of socio-moral development: Critical review of Kohlbergian research. Psychological Bulletin, 97, (2), 202-232.

Snarey, J., Reimer, J. & Kohlberg, L. (1984). The sociomoral development of Kibbutz adolescents: A longitudinal, cross-cultural study. Developmental Psychology, 21, 3-17.

Spelman, E. (1991). Virtue of feeling and feeling of virtue. In C. Card (Ed.) Feminist ethics, (pp. 213-232). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Stack, C. B. (1974). All our kin: Strategies for survival in a black community. New York: Harper & Row.

Stack, C. B. (1986). The culture of gender: Women and men of color. In On In a different voice: An interdisciplinary forum. Signs, 11, 321-324.

Tronto, J. C. (1987). Beyond gender difference to a theory of care. Signs, 12, 644-663.

Vasudev, J. (1988). Sex differences in morality and moral orientation: A discussion of the Gilligan and Attanucci study Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 34, 239-244.

Vasudev, J., & Hummel, R. C. (1987). Moral stage sequence and principled reasoning in an Indian sample. Human Development, 30, 105-118.

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

Walker, L. J. (1986a). Experiential and cognitive sources of moral development in adulthood. Human Development, 29, 112-124.

Walker, L. J. (1986b). Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: A rejoinder to Baumrind. Child Development, 57, 522-526.

Walker, L. J., de Vries, B., & Trevethan, S. D. (1987). Moral stages and moral orientations in real life and hypothetical dilemmas. Child Development, 58, 842-858.

Walker, L. E. A. (1989). Psychology and violence against women. American Psychologist, 44, 695-702.

Ward, J. V. (1988). Urban adolescents' conceptions of violence. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, & J. M. Taylor (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain, (pp. 175-200). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

West, J. D. & Bursor, D. E. (1984). Gilligan and Kohlberg: Gender issue in moral development. Humanistic Education and Development, 22(4), 134-142.

Worthley, J. S. (in press). Is science persistence a matter of values? Psychology of Women Quarterly.