CONTEXT, MORAL ORIENTATION, AND SELF-ESTEEM:

IMPACTING THE MORAL DEVELOPMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

DONNA LOUISE HIGHT

(Under the Direction of Diane L. Cooper)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare moral orientation and a measure of self-esteem with the degree of consideration given to certain contextual elements of the moral dilemmas presented. Demographic differences (sex, race/ethnicity, and class standing) among respondents were also examined relative to the degree of consideration given to certain contextual elements of the moral dilemmas presented.

The researcher created a 150-item questionnaire, using The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO; Liddell, 1990), the Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), and researcher-developed contextual scales that followed each of the MMO dilemmas. The purpose of these items was to assess the importance of significant relationships; situational factors/circumstances; peer culture and influence; cost-benefit analyses of consequences; institutional values; and religion, faith, and spirituality on moral decision-making and motivation.

Data from participants were collected over a two-week period beginning August 18, 2003, the start of fall classes, and ending August 29, 2003. The research participants (n = 130) in this study were students enrolled in Helping Strategies (total of four sections) or Career and Life Planning (total of six sections), both taught through the Department of Counseling and Human

Development. The researcher gathered completed computer Scantron sheets and instruments from students who elected to participate in the study. These participants included 90 women and 39 men (n = 129 for sex); 110 white/Caucasian students and 17 students of color (n = 127 for race/ethnicity); and 6 sophomores, 18 juniors, 87 seniors, and 18 students who indicated "other" as their response (n = 129 for class standing). While there were 130 participants in this study, not every participant responded to all demographic questions.

Statistically significant findings for the degree of consideration scales (relationships, circumstances, peers, cost-benefit, institutional values, and spirituality) as compared with the MMO's overall care, overall justice, self-care, and self-justice scores were examined. The overall care score was significantly related to peers, cost-benefit, relationships, and circumstances scales. The overall justice score was significantly related to the peers scale and institutional values scale. The self-care score was significantly related to the relationships and peers scales; the self-justice score was significantly related to the institutional values scale. All other comparisons did not reach a level of statistical significance. Additionally, individual contextual items were evaluated for statistical significance by comparing these specific items to response items following each of the MMO's dilemmas.

INDEX WORDS: Moral development, Context, Moral orientation, Self-esteem, College students, Higher education administration

CONTEXT, MORAL ORIENTATION, AND SELF-ESTEEM:

IMPACTING THE MORAL DEVELOPMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

DONNA LOUISE HIGHT

B.A., University of North Carolina at Charlotte, 1987

M.Ed., University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1989

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2004

CONTEXT, MORAL ORIENTATION, AND SELF-ESTEEM:

IMPACTING THE MORAL DEVELOPMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

DONNA LOUISE HIGHT

Approved:

Major Professor: Diane L. Cooper

Committee: Merrily Dunn
Rodney D. Bennett
Thomas Burke

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2004

DEDICATION

This manuscript is dedicated to my parents, Thomas and Louise Hight. My character and strength originate in your belief, love, and support. Everything I am and do, I learned from you. God could have given me no better parents than the two of you! Whenever I have thought I could not walk another step, your encouragement and love have kept me moving towards my goals. Words could never adequately reflect the profound love and respect I have for you both. In the words of a recent Josh Groban (2003) song, "You raise me up, so I can stand on mountains; You raise me up, to walk on stormy seas; I am strong, when I am on your shoulders; You raise me up, to more than I can be." Thank you for always loving and supporting me. Because of you, I am definitely more than I ever dreamed I could be. I love you both so very much!

I would be remiss if I did not give thanks to God for my family, loved ones, friends, and colleagues who have also touched my life and taught me many important lessons along the way. We are all teachers and students, and I am forever grateful for the journey I have made and will continue to make.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"I have walked through many lives, some of them my own, and I am not who I was, though some principle of being abides, from which I struggle not to stray" (Stanley Kunitz, November 2002).

I have been profoundly changed by this journey. My truth when I began this journey has been challenged and reshaped, and I leave the University of Georgia having learned a lot about others and myself. Many of the lessons have not been without consequence, for every day of our lives offers us an education. I am grateful for all I have learned and for all those from whom I have learned.

Hershey, you have been a woman's best friend. You have always provided lots of kisses and love when I needed them most. I love you!

Rachelle Lehner, I do not know what to say that will capture the depth of what I feel, other than I love you and I value your friendship and support on this journey. Words definitely cannot convey the profound respect and love that I have for you and always will. You have been a steadfast and true companion and friend. I could not have made this journey without your careful critique of everything I wrote (and often said and did). You struggled through thousands of pages of paper for me! I love you with all my heart and soul. You will always have a place in my heart and life. I am blessed to have been loved by you and to call you a beloved friend.

Mary Koeninger, thank you for your patience during a very challenging two years. I know this was not an easy journey for you to make being so far away, and I am glad you stuck with me. I have laughed and cried with you, I believe we stand at the beginning of a journey

together, and I look forward to the days to come. I love you very much and feel blessed to have met you.

Adam Goldstein and George Thompson, fate brought us together to make this journey. I know we arrived here because of what we had to offer each other. I am also glad that Diana, Emma, and Noah Goldstein were part of our family. Adam, I also thank you for your honesty, love, and friendship. You always forced me to deeply consider my life and my choices. We often question in others what it takes us longer to acknowledge in ourselves—I believe we have learned a lot about one another and ourselves. I could have asked for no better companion, teacher, and friend. Thank you for your love, support, and friendship. I love you dearly, my friend.

Danielle McDonald, my best friend, and my other close friends, I appreciate the sacrifices you made! Danielle, you allowed me to devote my time to this journey and joined me on the paths I traveled. I always knew I was never traveling alone, whether you were physically in my presence or with me in my heart and mind. I know the strength your love and support have provided me, and I value the times you have joined me to laugh and cry. And in the midst of the birth of this study, your beautiful son, Reece, joined us the day I defended all my hard work. What a blessing for two very important things to have happened on one day. You, too, have contributed much to who I have and will become. I love you!

Tonya and Tom Hight, my sister and brother, thank you for your love, support, and encouragement. You have profoundly shaped my life and character. I look forward to reconnecting with you both, when this is finally over. I love you both more than words can say!

Jan Davis, what would I do without your support and laughter? Thanks for always being there. You kicked me when I needed it and hugged me when I needed it. You constantly

reminded me what is truly important in life and reconnected me to the center when I wandered away. I enjoyed getting to know you, and wherever I am, you always have a place there and in my heart.

Dr. Diane L. Cooper, my first journey with you at UNCG brought me back to you for this one at UGA. I appreciate your support and encouragement. Thank you for staying on me and with me. I have occasionally wondered why I made the decision to do this, but I have never doubted all that I have learned while here. I know you have had your own journey to make during my three years here, and I hope you learned as much from me as I learned from you. I will always value your friendship.

Dr. Merrily Dunn, Dr. Rodney D. Bennett, and Dr. Thomas Burke, thank you for your time, assistance, support, and belief in me. I know that none of us make it through this experience without lots of supporting players. I have valued getting to know each of you, and I appreciate all the work you have done with me and for me. Dr. Jeanette Barker, thank you for your perspective. When I needed some light, you shed it!

Dr. Lorilee Sandmann, many thanks for writing my prelims question and serving as a role model and supporter. Had I met you sooner, I would have invited you on my doctoral journey as well. I appreciate your willingness to assist me. Dr. Joe Wisenbaker, thank God for you and Chris Brandt and Academic Computing. I cannot imagine doing this without the two of you. Dr. Debora Liddell, thank you for the use of The Measure of Moral Orientation and for your many kind words. Ms. Nona Wood, if I could confer a doctorate on you, I would. With or without it, you are a mentor and role model to professionals learning how to construct knowledge through their writing. Thank you for reading my dissertation prospectus and offering feedback. Dr.

Wendy Ruona, I learned a lot in your two classes and I appreciate your continued support as well.

Pam LaSalle, thanks for supporting my journey! I appreciate your smiling face and all the details you attend to on behalf of the students. Jacquee Rosumny, thanks for the big smile, the wonderful attitude, and for always making me laugh and smile. Both of you have been a blessing! It is nice to know I have a place to call home.

The College of Education Student Services Office, Dr. Jamie Lewis, and Dr. Jeri Benson, thank you for the opportunity to serve. I have had a fantastic time working in this office with Jamie, Veronica, Holly, Carolyn, Anita, Kate, Anna, Janice, JJ, Tina, all the other COE advisors, and everyone else with whom we worked during my time here. I have worked hard, laughed often, and learned so much from all of you. I could not have asked for a better assistantship. I am forever grateful for finally finding this niche and support. You are all wonderful and will always have a special place in my heart.

Ms. Betty, Ms. Hattie, Ms. Lavonia, Ms. Lilly, and the rest of the custodial staff in Aderhold, thanks for the smiles and laughs. Some day I will catch a meeting in progress! Ms. Carol and Ms. Adele, thank you for the smiles and laughs and for keeping The Bone running.

Dr. Bobbi Lathrop, Mike Campbell, Jen Lazzo, Tony Waller, Beth Kirsch, Marie Smith, and Robbie Eddins, I enjoyed working with you all during my previous assistantships. Again, we cannot make it through an experience without a lot of support.

My classmates, I have enjoyed getting to know all of you! I have learned so much from each of you personally and professionally. Thank you for accompanying me on my journey. It has been a pleasure to know each of you.

J. Shay Davis, you did not even know you were helping me as much as you were. Thank God for your dissertation! You and I walked this road together in spirit because your work guided me through my journey. They say we go through life on the backs of others, so many thanks for giving me a step up.

Kim Novak, thanks for taking care of me so I could find a job! I appreciate your friendship and love and I feel blessed to have met you.

If I have forgotten to name anyone individually, please forgive me. Stress, age, and brain clutter have wreaked havoc on my mind. While I may have forgotten to thank you by name, I have thanked everyone a million times in my heart and mind. Thank you all for shaping my life and for the indelible influence you have had on me!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Examining the Developmental Context of College Students

Human development is a very complex, interrelated set of systems impacted by the circumstances in which the individual is situated. Student affairs professionals typically address students' psychosocial, ego/identity, cognitive, and moral development because these have informed the foundations of our educational preparation programs. With the exception of psychosocial theories, which typically focus more broadly on behavior and reasoning, an examination of cognitive structural processes enlightens where we place students within the other bodies of developmental theory (ego/identity and moral).

These developmental stage models provide, at best, linear snapshots of human growth and development. If we had the ability to place the same individuals simultaneously in several contexts and watch them develop over time, how would different contexts impact their development? Student affairs researchers cannot know this, because we cannot conduct this type of research. We can certainly examine the temporary impact of a new situation, take a snapshot, and examine it, but this does not shape or inform the permanent reality of the individual.

Statement of Problem

Most research on the moral development of college students has occurred at a certain point in time (again, a snapshot model); has not been longitudinal in nature; did not begin when they were children; and has not compared different children as they mature, make life decisions including the choice to attend college, and then evaluate the differences between those who

attend college and those who do not. Examining single points in students' cognitive and moral development does not offer a sophisticated enough examination of the circumstances impacting development, decision-making, and behavior. Moral development, like human development, occurs within a framework of experiences, decisions, values, and knowledge acquisition unique to the individual. Moral development research has neglected individual and societal contexts in the models currently informing our work.

Past studies on the moral development of college students have provided student affairs researchers and practitioners with potentially oversimplified models for examining moral reasoning and, to a lesser degree, behavior. Kohlberg (1972) offered a cognitive model relying on an ethic of justice, while Gilligan (1977) offered a cognitive, relational model relying on an ethic of care. Both models appear to have inherent sex biases, as males supposedly rely more on an ethic of justice (Kohlberg, 1972) and females on an ethic of care (Gilligan, 1977). Rest (1979b) proposed a more integrated model, utilizing the work of Kohlberg while also acknowledging contextual issues. Liddell (1990) adapted the work of Kohlberg and Gilligan, situating her research in the college context.

Each of these researchers, many working with their current or former students, developed different measures of moral reasoning or development. Kohlberg developed the Moral Judgment Interview (MJI). This structured interview process asked respondents to read a series of dilemmas and then posed questions to assess their stage of moral reasoning (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). Nona Lyons, one of Gilligan's students, first empirically tested Gilligan's work using the Ethic of Care Interview (ECI). This structured interview process asked respondents to describe their responses to real and hypothetical dilemmas. Their responses were then scored by the interviewer, assessing the importance of concern for others and self rather

than the action taken (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). Rest, adapting Kohlberg's work, developed a pencil-and-paper assessment of moral reasoning, the Defining Issues Test (DIT). The DIT evaluates responses by relating them to stages in Rest's model of moral reasoning (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). Liddell developed The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO), a pencil-and-paper instrument measuring the ethics of care and justice, using dilemmas situated in the students' experience (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998).

These and other researchers do not appear to have adequately considered the situational, individual, and societal contexts shaping moral decision-making. Careful examination of models reveals the developmental sequencing of normative and meta-ethical positions, which have not been similarly sequenced in developmental stages within the study of philosophy and ethics. The study of normative ethics and meta-ethics provides many positions of choice, all informed by individual and communal contexts. This study will compare moral orientation, a measure of care versus justice orientation, and a measure of self-esteem with the degree of consideration given to certain contextual elements of the moral dilemmas presented.

In this chapter the researcher will operationally define terms to assist readers in understanding the researcher's view of moral development as a construct. The researcher then will outline six independent variables shaping the context of moral decision-making, which are used to make sense of, and respond to, dilemmas presented to college students. Finally, questions to be answered by this study will be outlined.

Concepts Associated with Moral Development

Exploration of the literature on moral development, ethics, values, and character development reveals that these terms are often inappropriately interchanged, and in many cases, one term may be used to define another, contributing to confusion about their meanings. In order

for educators to grasp their responsibility for moral development and education, these terms require clearer definitions. When working with students, student affairs practitioners should begin their dialogue by understanding how the individual student defines these terms for him or herself. For purposes of this study, the concept definitions utilized by the researcher follow.

Morals

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition (2000) defines moral as

> of or concerned with the judgment of the goodness or badness of human action and character; teaching or exhibiting goodness or correctness of character and behavior; conforming to standards of what is right or just in behavior; or arising from conscience or the sense of right and wrong.

Moral growth occurs as individuals develop the ability to make morally sound decisions, to act on these decisions, and to integrate this understanding into their identity (Blimling, 1990). Morality is therefore evidenced by choices (ethics), action (character), and beliefs (values).

Ethics

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition (2000) defines ethics as "a theory or a system of moral values; the study of the general nature of morals and of the specific moral choices to be made by a person." Ethics describes the cognitive processes of examining and acting on moral values, also referred to as moral decision-making. "Ethics (ethikos) signifies the ethos that is rooted in the community and transmitted through customs" (Eberly, 1995, p. 27). As explored within this research, context serves as an important element of ethical decision-making, so culture and shared values also play roles as defining elements of context.

Character

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition (2000) defines character as "the combination of qualities or features that distinguishes one person, group, or thing from another; moral or ethical strength." Character development is "the growth of those aspects of the individual that represent his or her ethical worth, including behavior, cognition, affect, values, personality, identity, and skills that are not moral themselves but that support moral functioning" (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999, p. 18). Since "a person of character" has come to refer to someone of high integrity or moral functioning, character will be used to describe how all the aspects of morality manifest as outwardly observable positive behaviors.

Values

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition (2000) defines values as "a principle, standard, or quality considered worthwhile or desirable." As Kurtines and Gewirtz (1995, p. 3) observe, "Values is used as a generic term for the normative assumptions that underlie morality." Values signify to others what we deem important and critical as individuals and as participants in relationships with others. Values stir our emotions and allow us to create internal meaning; they motivate us and shape the intentions behind our actions. Values are therefore the affective component of morality.

Moral Development as a Construct

These definitions characterize moral development as an umbrella for the affective (values), cognitive (ethics), and behavioral (character) expressions witnessed during the educational experience of college students. The moral development of college students then becomes a much broader construct that may be addressed through appropriate learning outcomes

directed at holistic development. This view of moral development expands our focus beyond that of exclusively moral reasoning.

Defining Context

The Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2003) defines context as "the parts of a discourse that surround a word or passage and can throw light on its meaning" and "the interrelated conditions in which something exists or occurs." For purposes of this study, context will refer to the many factors that inform how students make meaning of, and respond to, moral or ethical dilemmas within their life experiences.

Shaping the Context of Moral Decision-Making

Fried (2000) observes that "Sound ethical decisions must take at least three analytic dimensions into account: the application of ethical principles, understanding the virtues that the community values, and an examination of the multi-layered context in which the dilemma has arisen" (pp. 423-424). To date, many researchers, as described earlier, have failed to consider the diversity and values of various cultures, the meta-ethical positions and normative ethics of the actor(s), and the richness of the contexts in which these moral dilemmas occur. To serve effectively as student affairs practitioners, we need well-informed research to support our practice.

In order to fully understand moral decision-making, one should examine an individual's cultural values and his or her origins, phenomenology, time frame (historical context), and the dynamics of the situation (Fried, 2000). Phenomenology is described as the individual's value system and perspectives of others involved in the dilemma, and is shaped by the interaction of cultural values and the individual's belief system, created by reflecting on experience (Fried, 2000). These contextual variables described provide a more integrated picture of the influences

that shape college students moral decision-making. Midgley (1993) states, "…beings who reflect much on their own and each others' lives, as we do, need to arbitrate these conflicts somehow in a way that makes their lives feel reasonably coherent and continuous" (p. 9). One aspect of this current study will be to examine how college students arbitrate these conflicts.

The researcher will assess the importance of significant relationships; situational factors; peer culture and influence; a cost-benefit analysis of consequences; institutional values; and religion, faith, and spirituality as contextual elements of moral decision-making. Demographic differences (sex, race, and class standing) among respondents will also be examined for differences in moral decision-making and in evaluating these contextual factors.

Student Diversity

Students reflect the broad diversity of society, with demographics varying greatly from campus to campus. Students vary in sex, age, race, sexual orientation, organizational affiliations (including Greek groups), place of residence, etc. They also bring a range of knowledge, personal biases, personal and family values, and religious and cultural norms and traditions that continue to develop and deepen during college and throughout their lifetimes. This diversity serves as one of the many filters through which moral decision-making takes place. This study will examine sex, race, and class standing as elements of diversity that may impact moral decision-making among college students.

Situational Factors

The situation, context, circumstances, or framework of individual experiences--whatever label we choose to embody the complexity of forces shaping individual beliefs, values, and actions--also shapes an individual's moral decision-making. "The same act will have different shades and degrees of moral value under different circumstances" (Dalai Lama, 1999, p. xii).

The moral context of any given situation rarely lends itself to an obvious decision or one morally unambiguous solution, often placing an individual in a moral "gray area." As student affairs professionals, we stand outside an individual's experience and attempt to separate the decision from its intent/motivation/circumstances to discern his or her stage of moral development. We cannot do this effectively without understanding completely the context in which the decision was made.

We never truly know enough detail to gauge with certainty the moral content of another's actions in any particular situation, so we typically speculate about the intent/motivation, or we examine reasoning separate from the motivation or intent informing this cognitive process. Moral dilemmas vary in the complexity of factors embedded within them, in the extent to which they stretch an individual's capacity to unravel the nuances and arrive at a "morally appropriate" decision and action, and in the degree to which they stir different emotions for each individual actor responding to the dilemma. The "moral value of a given act is to be judged in relation both to time, place, and circumstance and to the interests of the totality of all others in the future as well as now" (Dalai Lama, 1999, p. 153). This interest in others, as well as self, leads to yet another force shaping the context of moral development.

Significant Relationships and Moral Development

Since context serves as a critical component of moral decision-making, and therefore moral development, we must examine the various elements students consider in formulating their decisions and actions. We recognize that peer culture and relationships play a critical role in the life of today's college students. "To reason well is not to step outside of relationships for a private moment, but to participate fully within them" (Gergen, 2001, p. 8).

While students can certainly achieve intellectual success without considering others, the quality of their interpersonal success will be greatly limited, which may significantly impact how they define the quality of their life and how they factor others into moral considerations. Danger exists in decision-making without consideration and empathy for the well-being of others and society. Students, who will serve their communities and society, have to understand the needs of others as they receive training as future leaders, professionals, and scientists.

We must also recognize the importance of familiarity or closeness in relationships and how this drives moral decision-making and action when considering other individuals, organizations (corporations), and society. Students, like most other human beings, feel a strong sense of obligation to family, close friends, and significant others and may closely evaluate and act with these individuals' interests in mind. Again, it is critical to note that moral development is not a strictly cognitive growth process, as our contexts also change throughout our lifetime.

Peer Culture and Influence

"Peer relationships formed within a college environment might be an important factor related to the development of moral judgment" (Derryberry & Thoma, 2000, p. 16). Students who developed close friendships in college demonstrated higher levels of moral judgment than students who reported maintaining close friendships from high school, but did not also develop additional close friends in college. The relationship between social support and development of moral judgment was stronger when the density of students' friendship networks was included in the analysis (Derryberry & Thoma, 2000). Density related to the diversity of friendship groups and the level of social support and interaction within these groups. Students often act with the goal of sustaining their interpersonal relationships, due to the powerful need to feel included.

Cost-Benefit Analysis and Consequences

The ethic of care's emphasis on motivation (a subjective quality) further challenges the primacy of moral reasoning, as the focus becomes not reasoning but sustaining relationships (Noddings, 1992). Fisher (as cited in Sobesky, 1983/1994) determined that individuals look at negative consequences as a situational factor and evaluations are based on a judgment of obligation (what should be done for others) versus a judgment of prediction (what consequences the actor would face). Moral obligation involved avoidance of causing negative consequences for others, unless the consequence became greater for the student assessing the situation than the person being assisted. Even in this situation, moral decisions are being evaluated in the context of relationship and consequences for all actors within the relationship.

Haan (1991) developed a theory of interactional morality based on relations between participants. Morality serves as a particular kind of social agreement that equalizes people's relations with one another, taking into account that all parties share their concerns regarding a moral dilemma (Haan, 1991). Moral solutions have to do with a given group of actors in a specific situation at a given time, and consider what people need and deserve (which shifts over time). The basic form of moral action is dialogue; dialogue involves emotion, particularly if there are conflicting needs, which often results in stress.

Many models of moral development exist for consideration. Those utilized by student affairs practitioners often fail to take into account the interactional nature and cost-benefit analysis of moral decision-making and action.

Values and the Campus Environment

We have seen increasingly self-oriented, materialistic values among high school and college students (Dalton, 1999). At the same time, institutions of higher education appear

willing to do almost anything for grants, endowments, and other monetary gain for the institution. All too often, student development and institutional efforts are at odds with the values student affairs professionals and the institution espouse.

We have to recognize the influence of the institution as a political entity and the consequences for students—in how we order relations among members, how we govern our activities, and how we define our relationship to the environment (Trow, 1975). The institution as an entity serves as a role model and shapes messages sent to students about institutional values and acceptable conduct. It becomes a classic case of reaping what you sow. We perpetuate a campus environment consistent with our real values, not our stated values, and students make decisions and act on the institutional values demonstrated, not those desired.

Religion, Faith, and Spirituality

Some students seek stability and answers from their religious doctrines or faith, since religion and culture often provide the greatest degree of internal guidance in responding to moral dilemmas or challenges. For students, religious or faith groups or doctrines often provide access to others with similar beliefs who help students make sense of the world. Few places and opportunities, other than religious organizations, exist on most college campuses today for solitude and reflection or thoughtful conversation about deeper life issues. Religious doctrine also provides tangible guidelines for individual and communal consideration and, ultimately, moral decision-making and action.

Self-Esteem and Context

In addition to contextual factors, self-esteem may also play a role in a student's ability to act with others' interests in mind. "Moral development, interpersonal development, development of self-concept and inner life proceed together as a single, integrated structure" (Loevinger,

1975, p. 63). Students lacking a strong self-concept may prove more susceptible to peer culture and influence when making moral decisions, since “fitting in” allows the student to form a sense of self and role within the group. Self-esteem may then impact whether students allow internal or external contextual factors to more significantly influence moral decision-making.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to compare moral orientation and a measure of self-esteem with the degree of consideration given to certain contextual elements of the moral dilemmas presented. Using The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO; Liddell, 1990), researcher-developed contextual scales for this instrument's dilemmas, and the Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), the researcher will assess the importance of significant relationships; situational factors; peer culture and influence; a cost-benefit analysis of consequences; institutional values; and religion, faith, and spirituality on moral decision-making and motivation. Demographic differences (sex, race, and class standing) among respondents will also be examined. The researcher hopes to provide student affairs practitioners with useful information regarding how students make meaning of, and ultimately act or fail to act upon, moral dilemmas. This will then allow practitioners to begin to intentionally design campus contexts to impact the moral decision-making of college students.

Research Questions

Given the complexity of the factors outlined, these research questions can be posed.

(1) Do college students with different moral orientations, as measured by the MMO, consider different contextual elements when making moral decisions?

(2) Do college students with differing levels of self-esteem, as measured by the Self-Esteem Scale, consider different contextual elements when making moral decisions?

(3) Does the race of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?

(4) Does the sex of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?

(5) Does the class standing of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?

Limitations

There are several limitations to the generalizability of this study. These include the collection of self-reported data, the use of a convenience sample, aspects of the methodology used in the study, and the varied scales used in the instrument.

This study relied on self-reported data. The data collected may not accurately represent the students' actual beliefs or values. Students may have acted in a socially expected manner, answering to meet the expectations of either the researcher or their peers. Participants may have also lacked the requisite reflective capacity or self-awareness to adequately consider how to respond to the moral dilemmas provided. In several classrooms, students giggled and punched at one another as they considered the scenarios and responses provided.

Additionally, this research utilized a convenience sample provided by the intact classrooms participating in the study. The requisite time to administer the instrument in person was critical to insure completion and return of the instrument. In fact, the researcher had little

success with instruments being returned that were taken from the classroom. Most of the surveys returned (n = 130) were completed during in-class administrations.

Further, the convenience sample consisted of mostly juniors and seniors enrolled in a public institution in the southeastern United States. Given this pre-arranged, non-random sample, it would likely be difficult to generalize this study to all students, as participants would likely differ from students at other types of institutions or of more varied class standing.

Additionally, The Measure of Moral Orientation is not a measure of moral development. It is a measure of care versus justice moral orientation; therefore, the researcher did not assess the participants' level or stage of moral development. This study is also a snapshot approach, utilizing hypothetical dilemmas situated in the students' experience. While the degree of consideration given to various contextual factors was examined, this study still may not allow us to fully understand and appreciate the real contextual nature of moral decision-making.

Finally, The Measure of Moral Orientation and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale used four-point Likert scales. The degree of consideration items created by the researcher used a five-point Likert scale and were interspersed throughout The Measure of Moral Orientation. The use of differing scales created the potential for error in responding to items using the five-bubble computer Scantron sheet. Respondents could confuse the scales, despite being provided a detachable sheet that clearly outlined the scales, since they were rotating between four- and five-point scales throughout most of the instrument.

Significance

The results of this study make significant contributions to our understanding of the moral development of college students. The study contributes to this body of research, by exploring the contextual elements impacting moral decision-making, which few previous studies have

addressed. Many researchers have failed to consider the diversity and values of various cultures, the meta-ethical positions and normative ethics of the actor(s), and the richness of the contexts in which moral dilemmas occur.

To serve effectively as student affairs practitioners, we need well-informed research to help us better understand students and to support our practice. This study will provide student affairs practitioners with useful information regarding how students make meaning of, and ultimately act or fail to act upon, moral dilemmas. This information will then allow practitioners to begin to intentionally shape the contexts within which students make moral meaning.

Chapter Summary

Past studies on the moral development of college students have provided student affairs researchers and practitioners with potentially oversimplified models for examining moral reasoning and, to a lesser degree, moral behavior. Moral development researchers, studying college students and the collegiate experience, do not appear to have adequately considered the situational, individual, and societal contexts shaping moral decision-making. Careful examination of these models reveals the developmental sequencing of normative and meta-ethical positions, which have not been similarly sequenced in developmental stages within the study of philosophy and ethics.

This study will compare moral orientation and a measure of self-esteem with the degree of consideration given to certain contextual elements of the moral dilemmas presented. The researcher hopes to provide student affairs practitioners with useful information regarding how students make meaning of, and ultimately act or fail to act upon, moral dilemmas. The findings of this study will then allow practitioners to begin to intentionally shape the contexts within which students make moral meaning.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Most research on the moral development of college students has occurred at a certain point in time (a snapshot model); has not been longitudinal in nature; did not begin when they were children; and has not compared different children as they mature and make life decisions including the choice to attend college, and then evaluated the differences between those who attend college and those who do not. Examining single points in a student's cognitive and moral development does not offer a sophisticated enough examination of the circumstances impacting development, decision-making, and behavior. Moral development, like human development, occurs within a framework of experiences, decisions, values, and knowledge acquisition unique to the individual. Moral development has individual and societal contexts not well considered in the models currently informing our work.

A number of researchers (Kohlberg, 1972; Gilligan, 1977) do not appear to have adequately considered the integrated nature of situational, individual, and societal contexts shaping moral decision-making. Careful examination of these moral development models reveals the possible developmental sequencing of normative and meta-ethical positions, which have not been similarly sequenced in developmental stages within the study of moral philosophy and ethics. The study of normative ethics and meta-ethics provides many positions of choice, all informed by individual and cultural contexts. This study will compare moral orientation and a measure of self-esteem with the degree of consideration given to certain contextual elements of the moral dilemmas presented.

In this chapter the researcher will examine moral development as a construct. The researcher then will investigate how certain cognitive and moral development theorists have guided student affairs theory and practice. Normative ethics and meta-ethics will be studied for their contributions to work on moral development. Finally, the researcher will explore significant relationships; situational factors; peer culture and influence; a cost-benefit analysis of consequences; institutional values; and religion, faith, and spirituality as contextual elements of moral decision-making. Demographic differences (particularly sex, race, and class standing) as contributing factors in moral development will also be examined.

Moral Development as a Construct

As described in Chapter One, the researcher's definitions of values, ethics, morals, and character distinguish moral development as an umbrella for the affective (values), cognitive (ethics), and behavioral (character) expressions of morality. This study focuses on those expressions witnessed during the educational experience of college students. From the perspective of this study, the moral development of college students becomes a much broader construct to be addressed through appropriate learning outcomes directed at holistic development. This view of moral development moves beyond the current exclusive focus on moral reasoning.

An important issue surrounds whether ethical character/morality is an educable quality, like intellect, and if it is, what learning experiences bring about its development (Perlman, 1982). This would clearly depend on the definition of learning employed. If learning were defined as the acquisition of knowledge, it would look different than if learning were defined as an active search for meaning. If learning requires individuals to make meaning of their experiences,

values, education, etc., our examination and activities to impact learning would look quite different and serve very different purposes.

As a result of the complexity of human development, the product of a person's entire life experience proves extremely difficult to study systematically because it is difficult to disentangle the independent effects of the college experience and other life experience from one another, including the impact of each on an individual's moral development (Trow, 1975). As noted above, we also have to create common definitions regarding learning, as the language surrounding learning as a construct is as confusing as that surrounding moral development. It becomes quite difficult, as an educator and a researcher, to discern how we then affect the moral growth and development of students.

Faris (1929) noted that character traits all relate to behavior, but they are only visible aspects of life and they involve many experiences that external observation can never hope to see or measure. He further noted that you cannot focus on observable behavior to the exclusion of mental or conscious aspects behind the behavior. As noted earlier, moral development has cognitive, affective, and behavioral components, and any one cannot be measured independently of the others, as they are intricately interwoven. The entire process of moral development also interconnects wit many other facets of individual growth and development, from which it cannot easily be extricated.

"Moral development, interpersonal development, development of self-concept and inner life proceed together as a single, integrated structure" (Loevinger, 1975, p. 63). Research on levels of moral development prior to matriculation could serve as a critical starting point for knowing how students progress during their college experience. Hogan proposed five independent elements contributing to moral maturity (a factorial paradigm): moral knowledge,

socialization, empathy, autonomy, and ethics of conscience versus ethics of responsibility (Loevinger, 1975). As this suggests, moral development occurs as a result of both individual development and development of the individuals within the context of their capacity to form and maintain interpersonal relationships.

Additionally, Emile Durkheim (as cited in Kurtines & Gewirtz, 1995, p. 214) proposed three basic elements of the internalization of moral values: (a) a "sense of discipline which includes a respect for authority," meaning the customs, traditions, and rules of one's society; (b) a "feeling of attachment to the social groups of which one is a member"; and (c) "the ability to provide a philosophical justification for one's group membership and obedience to its rules." Durkheim believed these justifications were typically based on religious or political doctrine. A number of contextual factors emerge, which are not accounted for by examining only moral reasoning as the construct of interest.

Moral development is a very complex construct. Depending upon the researcher, countless lenses have been cast upon it from varied angles. Few researchers, however, have incorporated an integrated view, taking into account the complexity of factors that impact moral or ethical decision-making. In order to better understand the construct, the cognitive development work of Perry (1970, 1999) and King and Kitchener (1994) must be examined, since cognitive development informs student affairs' current understanding of moral development.

Cognitive Development Theory and Understanding Moral Development

Perry's Scheme for Intellectual and Ethical Development

Perry's (1970, 1999) scheme addressed a series of positions through which students view knowledge and values. Through a series of interviews with college students at Harvard and

Radcliffe, Perry began to characterize a set of structures that students used to characterize, explicitly or implicitly, how they construed the nature and origins of knowledge, value, and responsibility. Perry and his colleagues developed *A Checklist of Educational Views* (CLEV) that was administered to 313 freshmen in the fall of 1954 and again to the same students in the spring of 1955. Using these scores, the researchers invited 55 students to participate in interviews; 31 students accepted. Students were interviewed annually in late May or early June until they graduated (researchers obtained 17 complete four-year records). Through these first interviews, the researchers came to believe there was some common sequence of challenges that each student addressed in his or her own unique way (Perry, 1970, 1999).

Based on this data, Perry and his colleagues decided to broaden their study to obtain a larger sample of complete four-year reports to describe more accurately the sequence they had begun to detect (a developmental scheme) and then test this scheme for validity (Perry, 1970, 1999). In June 1963, they completed 366 interviews, including 67 complete four-year interviews (Perry, 1970, 1999). Perry then detailed a nine-position developmental scheme that he presented to independent judges along with the student transcripts. These judges were to use the transcripts and the scheme to place students in the position where they believe the student currently resided. The judges were able to agree reliably, using the scheme to place students based on the student self-reports (Perry, 1970, 1999).

In Perry's (1970, 1999) nine positions, he described a developmental scheme to demonstrate how people view knowledge, values, responsibility, and conduct. Before describing the model in detail, he described three positions of deflection: *retreat*, *escape* and *temporizing*. *Retreat* means the individual rejects the opportunity to grow, thereby moving backwards (occurs in Positions 2 to 4 with a defensive entrenchment in either Position 2 or 3). *Escape* refers to a

denial of the opportunity to grow (occurs in Positions 4 to 6 with students settling for Position 4 or 5). *Temporizing* is a suspension of growth without escape (a prolonged pause of at least one year without settling for a position). Perry (1970, 1999) indicates that these deflections provide recourse when individuals decide to conserve their energies instead of progressing developmentally.

Perry's (1970, 1999) nine stages briefly described are:

- Position 1 Basic Duality—Dualistic structures of society or authority are taken for granted. Knowledge, values, and conduct are approached as dichotomies.
- Position 2 Multiplicity Pre-Legitimate—Multiplicity is perceived but still not believed. Recognition of competing views occurs but is not addressed.
- Position 3 Multiplicity Subordinate—Multiplicity is perceived with some implications. Authority and absolutes are no longer viewed as inextricably linked.
- Position 4 Multiplicity Correlate or Relativism Subordinate—People have a right to their own views.
- Position 5 Relativism Correlate, Competing or Diffuse—Relativism is intrinsically grounded; demands personal involvement.
- Position 6 Commitment Foreseen—Knowledge and values are seen as contingent on context. One affirms what is his or her own.
- Position 7 Initial Commitment—First commitments to knowledge are grounded in self-experience and self-definition.
- Position 8 Orientation in Implications of Commitment—Implications of commitment are first realized. Consequences of self-definition and experience surge to the forefront.

- Position 9 Developing Commitment(s)—Commitment made in terms of new and continual growth.

Perry (1970, 1999) noted that no first-year students were in Position 1 at the time of the first interviews. Position 1 was extrapolated using the logic of the scheme, as was Position 9, since no one described this in any interviews conducted. By the time most first-year students were interviewed, they expressed views consistent with Positions 3 to 5. Most seniors expressed views consistent with Positions 6 to 8. Perry further noted that students' first-year position was not predictive of their senior year position within the scheme.

Perry's (1970, 1999) scheme offered a structure for examining how students move from a dichotomous view of knowledge and values to commitment to contextual relativism. He offered a framework for understanding how students view authority and knowledge or truths, and authorities' role in imparting knowledge or truths to students. He stressed the vital importance of recognizing how knowing intertwines with the known, and emphasized that it is our role as educators to make sure students develop the competence to move toward higher positions.

Perry (1970, 1999) suggested the importance of educator role modeling of struggling with commitments, and the educator confirming his or her place as a member of the community with the students. He indicates that such actions have implications for the moral development of students, since we have a responsibility to connect knowledge to competence and action. Perry's work has been used by many student affairs researchers, including King and Kitchener (1994) in their examination of reflective judgment.

Reflective Judgment

King and Kitchener (1994) utilized Dewey's (1933) work on reflective thinking to evaluate how students address problems for which logic alone provides no clear solutions. These

problems required the use of other characteristics of reasoning. As they examined individuals' responses to these ill-structured problems, King and Kitchener (1994) found that reflective judgment begins with an awareness of uncertainty then shifts to how people justify their beliefs when faced with this awareness of uncertainty.

Dewey (1933) indicated that reflective thinking was not necessary in scenarios in which there was no doubt or controversy. He believed people utilized reflective judgment to bring closure to situations that were uncertain or problematic. Reflective thinking, therefore, required "the continual evaluation of beliefs, assumptions, and hypotheses against existing data and against other plausible interpretations of the data. The resulting judgments are offered as reasonable integrations or syntheses of opposing points of view" (King & Kitchener, 1994, p. 7). King and Kitchener (1994) decided to focus their work on examining the resolution of these ill-structured dilemmas to explore the interplay of knowledge and judgment in this process.

King and Kitchener (1994) developed the Reflective Judgment Model to describe the developmental progression through which people process knowledge and justify their beliefs about ill-structured problems. As individuals develop, they become more capable of evaluating knowledge and explaining and defending their points of view on controversial or ill-structured issues (King & Kitchener, 1994). The stages of this model are briefly described as:
Pre-Reflective Thinking (Stages 1, 2, and 3)—Knowledge gained through direct means. Individuals defer to authority for answers.

- Stage 1 Knowledge is absolute and concrete. Beliefs do not need to be justified because what is believed to be true is in fact true.

- Stage 2 Knowledge is absolutely certain or certain but not immediately accessible (directly observable or available from an authority figure). Beliefs are unjustified or justified based on an authority figure's beliefs.
- Stage 3 Knowledge is absolutely certain or temporarily uncertain. Beliefs are justified by reference to an authority or personal opinion if no authoritative stance is available.

Quasi-Reflective Thinking (Stages 4 and 5)—Some elements of uncertainty are present in knowledge. Solutions are individualistic.

- Stage 4 Knowledge is uncertain and subject to situational variables. Beliefs are justified by evidence that best fits beliefs.
- Stage 5 Knowledge is subjective and contextual. Beliefs are justified contextually using rules particular to that context.

Reflective Thinking (Stages 6 and 7)—Knowledge is contextual and solutions are constructed based on complex consideration of the elements of this and related contexts.

- Stage 6 Knowledge is individually constructed based on information from many sources. Beliefs are justified based on many perspectives on an issue or across contexts based on a need for action.
- Stage 7 Knowledge is the outcome of reasonable inquiry "in which solutions to ill structured problems are constructed" (King & Kitchener, 1994, p. 15). The beliefs are justified based on available and compelling evidence and are re-evaluated as new evidence becomes available.

The Reflective Judgment Interview is used to evaluate in what stage an individual is located, and correlations between individual responses to different problems in this protocol are generally

moderate to high (King & Kitchener, 1994). This model "focuses explicitly on the relationship between epistemology and judgment at each point in the developmental sequence" (King & Kitchener, 1994, p. 38). Examining both judgment and epistemology are important components of this interview protocol.

Most moral or ethical dilemmas are ill-structured. King and Kitchener (1994) acknowledge that moral judgments differ from reflective judgments. They recognize that a part of the ill-structured nature of moral problems derives from different notions of good rather than epistemological issues. Both moral and reflective judgments, certainly address ill-structured problems, though "in different domains and with different criteria for evaluation" (King & Kitchener, 1994, p. 206). King and Kitchener (1994) compared reflective judgment and moral judgment (reasoning) to demonstrate similarities in how meaning is made of both ill-structured problems and moral dilemmas, suggesting a relationship between the two. Though more work is needed, their analysis suggests that developing reflective judgment skills might be a necessary precursor to more principled moral reasoning.

Moral Development Theory

Past studies on the moral development of college students have provided student affairs researchers and practitioners with potentially oversimplified models for examining moral reasoning and, to a lesser degree, behavior. Kohlberg (1972) offered a cognitive model, relying on an ethic of justice, while Gilligan (1977) offered a cognitive, relational model, relying on an ethic of care. Both models have inherent sex biases, as males are hypothesized to rely more on an ethic of justice and females on an ethic of care. Rest (1979a, 1979b) proposed a more integrated model acknowledging some of the contextual issues encountered. Liddell (1990)

adapted the work of Kohlberg and Gilligan, situating her scenarios in the college context and focusing on moral orientation, not moral reasoning.

Careful examination of these models reveals the possible developmental sequencing of normative and meta-ethical positions that have not been similarly sequenced in developmental stages within the study of moral philosophy and ethics. The study of normative ethics and meta-ethics provides many positions of choice, all informed by individual and cultural contexts. For purposes of understanding this study, an exploration of moral development theory utilized in student affairs research and practice follows.

Kohlberg and the Ethic of Justice

Kohlberg (1969, 1971a, 1971b) developed a stage theory of moral development that attempted to draw together moral psychology and philosophy. He presented a six-stage model with three levels of development that show a continuum of movement from childhood to adulthood. Kohlberg's (1971b) stages are briefly described as follows:

Level 1 Pre-conventional Level—The child is responsive to cultural labels of good and bad but interprets them based on their associated consequences.

- Stage 1 Punishment and Obedience Orientation—Physical consequences determine response (punishment avoidance).
- Stage 2 Instrumental Relativist Orientation—Right action is determined by what meets one's individual needs and sometimes the needs of others.

Level 2 Conventional Level—The expectations of the individual's family, group, or society take precedence. The goal is the maintenance of social order.

- Stage 3 Interpersonal Concordance—Approval is earned through good behavior.

- Stage 4 Law and Order Orientation—Right behavior consists of doing one's duty and respecting authority.

Level 3 Postconventional Level—The individual makes a concerted effort to define moral principles for him/herself and the ultimate good of society, not based on affiliation or deference to social membership.

- Stage 5 Social Contract/Legalistic Orientation—Right action is defined in terms of individual rights and standards agreed upon by society.
- Stage 6 Universal Ethical Principle Orientation—Right action consist of self-chosen ethical principles that are abstract and ethical (normative ethics, most commonly Kant's categorical imperative), not concrete moral rules like the Ten Commandments.

Kohlberg acknowledged that these stages paralleled normative ethical positioning (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987). Kohlberg developed the Moral Judgment Interview (MJI) to measure moral reasoning. This structured interview process asked respondents to read a series of dilemmas, then posed questions to assess their stage of moral reasoning (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998).

Kohlberg described these stages as an invariant sequence, which could vary in pace but not process. Further, he believed that moral development reflected a universal construct, which transcends culture (Sullivan, 1977). He indicated that these stages would occur in any culture, based on the concept of universalizable intent (Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1983). He acknowledged that while things can have "culturally variable content-based definitions" (Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1983, p. 75), a particular moral norm would be present across all cultures. He believed that while moral behavior or custom varied from culture to culture, there

would be universal kinds of valuing or judging, based on the need for impartiality in moral decision-making (Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1983).

Kohlberg's critics challenged him on numerous issues. Critiques included his unwillingness to accept the moral epistemology of the ethic of care (Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan et al., 1988; Hekman, 1995). Sullivan (1977) criticized Kohlberg for his modified "natural law" approach to moral development, with a focus on the culturally universal nature of moral development. Countless texts and articles have been written criticizing every aspect of Kohlberg's work. During his life, he wrote many responses to these critics, including *Moral Stages: A Current Formulation and a Response to Critics* (Kohlberg et al., 1983). To address the varied critiques of Kohlberg's work completely would subsume this research study and literature review, which does not intend to refute the entirety of Kohlberg's valuable contributions to work on moral reasoning.

Gilligan and the Ethic of Care

Gilligan (1982), in response to Kohlberg's work, believed that women's morality was guided by their relationships with others and their desire to act in a manner that would not cause harm to others. She believed a moral person helped others, with goodness equated to service and meeting one's responsibilities to others, if possible without self-sacrifice. She believed that this conflict between self and others constituted "the central moral problem for women" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 71).

Gilligan interviewed 29 women, ranging in age from 15 to 33 and from diverse ethnic backgrounds, regarding abortion and pregnancy counseling. She examined the relationship between judgment and action rather than the particular issue that brought them to the clinic (Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan et al., 1988). These women considered moral problems as problems of

care and responsibility to others rather than issues of rights and rules. Through these interviews, Gilligan came to believe that women view the moral domain through what she labeled an ethic of care. Gilligan (1982; Gilligan et al., 1988), like Kohlberg, also witnessed three perspectives, with each perspective "representing a more complex understanding between the relationship between self and other and each transition involving a critical reinterpretation of the conflict between selfishness and responsibility" (1982, p. 105).

Gilligan et al. (1988) argued that the values of justice and autonomy present in Kohlberg's work implied a view of the individual as independent of relationships and of relationships as contractual, bound by constraint and cooperation. In contrast, her research indicated that women value care and connection. Perhaps Rest and his colleagues (1999) explanation of macromorality and micromorality (described later in this chapter) provides another lens through which to see the conflicting views of Kohlberg and Gilligan.

Nona Lyons, one of Gilligan's students, used the Ethic of Care Interview (ECI) in the first empirical test of Gilligan's work. This structured interview process asked respondents to describe their responses to real and hypothetical dilemmas. Their responses were then scored by the interviewer, assessing the importance of concern for others and self rather than the action taken (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). The distinguishing element between this protocol and Kohlberg's protocol is the examination of real dilemmas, as well as hypothetical dilemmas. Both used narratives to examine moral reasoning, but Kohlberg looked for a rational construction of meaning or an ethic of justice, and Gilligan saw a different construction that she labeled the ethic of care (Schrader, 1999).

Schrader (1999) argued that college students typically are examined under the lenses of Kohlberg's and Gilligan's research on moral reasoning, when in fact, these student may be

grappling with a number of other contextual and developmental issues, unrelated to their capacity to reason well. She, along with many other critics of Kohlberg and Gilligan, argued that moral reasoning could not adequately be evaluated when separated from the contexts in which moral dilemmas are encountered. Additionally, other critics have argued that their interpretations were very subjective, since both utilized interview protocols (Langford, 1995). Rest (1979; Rest et al., 1999) attempted to address the issues of subjectivity with his development of the Defining Issues Test (DIT).

Rest and the Four-Component Model

Over the last 25 years, Rest and his colleagues at the University of Minnesota Center for the Study of Ethical Development have conducted a great deal of research utilizing the Defining Issues Test (DIT), thereby reshaping their theory of moral development. Rest et al. (1999) responded to criticisms of Kohlberg's earlier work by developing a "neo-Kohlbergian approach" (p. vii) to moral development. In response to criticisms of Kohlberg's focus on deontological theories and his failure to consider the psychology of morality, Rest et al. (1999) have reformulated their theoretical approach to moral development.

Rest indicated that several of Kohlberg's core ideas have continued to shape his work. Kohlberg (1968) focused on cognition as a means of observing how individuals try to make sense of their social experiences. Kohlberg believed that to understand moral behavior, researchers had to understand how individuals made sense of their world. Kohlberg further believed that the individuals constructed their own moral epistemology. He also believed that certain normative ethical positions were better than others as they demonstrated movement from simpler to more complex ideas or meaning making. Finally, he believed the shift to

postconventional reasoning demonstrated a commitment to shared responsibility for acting in a manner that better served society.

As Rest et al. (1999) noted, Kohlberg focused on macromorality, which examined the formal social structures that make cooperation possible at a global level. Rest et al. (1999) defined micromorality as concerned with developing relationships with significant others and acting in a virtuous manner in everyday life. He indicated that macromorality rewards impartiality and acting on principle, while micromorality rewards loyalty and caring for significant others. Kohlberg (1968) believed that conventionality (custom) defined what was moral, and in fact, Kohlberg has been criticized for his focus on abstract, impartial principles as demonstrating higher levels of moral reasoning (Gates, 1998). While Rest et al. (1999) believed Kohlberg adequately addressed issues of macromorality, he believed he did not adequately address issues of micromorality.

Rest et al. (1999) supported Kohlberg's belief that to establish a societal system of cooperation required impartiality and acting on shared values rather than acting on behalf of an individual's relationships with significant others. Rest, however, recognized that there was much more to moral psychology than Kohlberg's focus on moral judgment or reasoning. Rest (1983) created a four-component model with moral sensitivity, moral judgment, moral motivation, and moral character each necessary to produce moral behavior. This model addressed critics' concerns about the diversity of constructs, processes, and phenomena that shape morality, and addressed the larger issue of how these things come together to shape moral development, reasoning, and behavior. Rest's (1999) model briefly follows.

- Component 1 Moral Sensitivity—This is an awareness that a moral problem exists.

- Component 2 Moral Judgment—This is judging which action would make most moral sense.
- Component 3 Moral Motivation—This is the degree of commitment to acting morally.
- Component 4 Moral Character—This is having courage to act in a moral manner.

This model defines four broad constructs necessary to moral action.

Rest's Defining Issues Test (DIT) came into existence in the 1970s as an instrument for measuring moral judgment. It offers a quick multiple-choice alternative to Kohlberg's complex interview protocol (Rest et al., 1999). Rest's pencil-and-paper assessment evaluates responses by stages in his model of moral reasoning, an adaptation of Kohlberg's stages (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). Since the 1970's, more than 400 studies have been published using the DIT (in an earlier work, Rest (1979) cites over 500 studies in the United States and 20 foreign countries). Based on these studies, Rest moved from supporting Kohlberg's hard stage model to the belief that development occurs more gradually. Most of the criticism of Rest's work has been of the DIT and its associated research. Critics argue that it is difficult to establish the validity and reliability of any moral development measure; that much of the DIT research is over 10 to 20 years old; that many studies are unpublished and inaccessible so claims cannot be validated; and that the DIT findings are quite varied (Rest, 1999).

Most of Rest's published work focuses on moral judgment (Component 2) as measured by the DIT. Bebeau, a former student of Rest, has conducted most of the research on moral sensitivity (Component 1), finding that moral sensitivity and moral judgment are only moderately correlated (Baab & Bebeau, 1990; Bebeau, Rest, & Yamoor, 1985; Bebeau, 1994). It is important to note that Rest emphasized that the components do not follow one another in a

logical order; rather, they serve as continual feedback loops to one another. Liddell (1990) has also argued that her work explores Rest's moral sensitivity component.

Liddell and Moral Orientation

Based on the work of Kohlberg and Gilligan that supported the existence of two separate moral voices (orientation)--justice (men) and care (women)--Liddell (1990) developed an objective instrument that measured moral orientation and self-descriptions of whether individuals viewed themselves as care or justice oriented. Liddell (1990) used the instrument, called The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO), to examine the relationships between moral orientation, self-description, judgment type (thinking or feeling) as determined by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), and gender. The original MMO consisted of 12 self-description items and 10 dilemmas situated in the collegiate experience, followed by items, which assessed moral orientation and moral self-description, to which participants responded (Liddell, 1990).

Psychometric properties for the original MMO compared favorably to other assessments of moral development, though there are no other instruments that currently measure the constructs of care and justice as moral voices. Subsequent analyses of covariance revealed that when thinking/feeling scores from the MBTI were controlled, there were no significant differences between college women's and men's scores on the ethic of justice, nor on their self-description scores (n = 366) (Liddell, 1990). After controlling for the MBTI (thinking/feeling) scores, women scored significantly higher than men on the ethic of care scale (Liddell, 1990). While the MBTI scores explained gender differences in the ethic of justice, they failed to account for the differences in the ethic of care (Liddell, 1990). Liddell (1990) indicated that women often have more varied social roles than men, possibly providing them with an opportunity to be influenced by contexts that better develop their justice voice.

The MMO has since been revised to a two-part self-report inventory containing 83 items (69 dilemma response items and 14 self-description items). The first part includes nine moral dilemmas typically encountered by traditional age college students, followed by a series of questions to determine whether the student tends to respond with an ethic of care or justice. The second part of the MMO includes 14 self-description items, allowing students to share perceptions of themselves as just and/or caring people (seven items measure justice and seven measure care) (Liddell, 1990; Liddell, Halpin, & Halpin, 1992; Liddell & Davis, 1996).

Liddell and Davis (1996) noted that more research is needed on students of color, since the students participating in the earlier studies were predominantly white students at institutions in the Midwest (Liddell, 1990; Liddell, Halpin, & Halpin, 1992; Liddell & Davis, 1996). An exhaustive literature search did not yield any other published studies utilizing the MMO.

Understanding Moral Philosophy and Ethics

Moral philosophy provides a very intricate and complex framework for understanding ethics. Moral philosophy may be divided into metaethics and normative ethics. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (Honderich, 1995) defines meta-ethics as follows:

> …meta-ethics is the philosophical study of the nature of moral judgement. So, instead of being concerned with questions of what actually is right or wrong (or good or bad), it is concerned with the meaning or significance of calling something right or wrong (or good or bad). Meta-ethics includes both the meaning of moral terms and also such questions as whether moral judgements are objective or subjective.

T*he Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2003) provides this definition of normative ethics:

> Normative ethics involves arriving at moral standards that regulate right and wrong conduct. In a sense, it is a search for an ideal litmus test of proper behavior. The key

> assumption in normative ethics is that there is only one ultimate criterion of moral conduct, whether it is a single rule or a set of principles.

Given these definitions, metaethics serves as the philosophical or theoretical framework, while normative ethics serves as the practical application of principles to resolve moral or ethical dilemmas.

Metaethics is an umbrella term describing various perspectives that inform the study of Western moral philosophy and ethics. These include realism, intuitionism, naturalism, subjectivism/objectivism, relativism, and prescriptivism. Moral realism "is the view that moral beliefs and judgements can be true or false; that moral values are discovered, not willed into existence nor constituted by emotional reactions" (Honderich, 1995). Intuitionism is an ethical theory that defines things as objectively true or false, based on what is self-evident or known through the faculty of intuition (Blackburn, 1994). Naturalism is the belief that everything is explainable by methods characteristic of the natural or empirical sciences, so moral beliefs emanate from the natural or biological (Blackburn, 1994). Subjectivism and objectivism undergird many of these other perspectives:

> At the subjectivist pole, they are taken to be discrete feeling-responses of individuals to situations actual or imagined. To move towards the objectivist pole is to argue that moral judgements can be rationally defensible, true or false, that there are rational procedural tests for identifying morally impermissible actions, or that moral values exist independently of the feeling-states of individuals at particular times. (Honderich, 1995)

Relativism means that truth or moral judgments are relative to the standpoint of the person doing the judging (Blackburn, 1994). Finally, prescriptivism equates moral commitment with the giving or accepting of commands or a set of prescriptive standards to which all must adhere

(Blackburn, 1994). A careful examination of these brief definitions reveals parallels to components of the cognitive and moral development work discussed above.

Normative ethics utilizes three common strategies, though these take different vantage points depending upon the philosopher interpreting the history behind them. The overarching positions most often discussed in Western studies of moral philosophy and ethics include: (a) virtue theories, (b) deontological theories, and (c) consequentialist (teleological) theories. Virtue ethics (sometimes called care based or character based) views virtue, or acting as a good person would, as the primary goal. Virtue ethics are modeled on the work of Aristotle, who wanted virtue to make clear the way to happiness (Blackburn, 1994). Deontological ethics (rules based) is based on the idea of doing one's duty, doing what is right, or acting based on rights, as opposed to achieving some good state of affairs (consequentialism) or the qualities of character to live well (virtue ethics) (Blackburn, 1994). Finally, consequentialism (ends based) views the value of the action derived from the value of its consequences or end result. Kidder (1993) refers to end-based theories as having the goal of providing the greatest good for the greatest number.

To completely address the linkages between moral development theory and moral philosophy is beyond the scope of this study. It is important to note that the ideas described above transition from ancient Greek philosophy into the work of Western philosophers with strong ties to German thinkers. There are many additional works on moral philosophy that take into account world religions and cultures, many of which are more collectivist (Eastern thought) than the United States (individualistic).

Defining Important Contextual Elements

Fried (2000) observes, "Sound ethical decisions must take at least three analytic dimensions into account: the application of ethical principles, understanding the virtues that the

community values, and an examination of the multi-layered context in which the dilemma has arisen" (pp. 423-424). To date, many researchers have failed to consider the diversity and values of various cultures, the meta-ethical positions and normative ethics of the actor(s), and the richness of the contexts in which these moral dilemmas occur.

In order to understand moral decision-making fully, one should examine an individual's cultural values and origins, phenomenology, time frame, and the dynamics of the situation (Fried, 2000). Phenomenology is described as the individual's value system and perspectives of others involved in the dilemma, and is shaped by the interaction of cultural values and the individual belief system created by reflection on experience (Fried, 2000). Consideration of these influences provides a more integrated picture of what shapes college student moral decision-making. Midgley (1993) states, "…beings who reflect much on their own and each others' lives, as we do, need to arbitrate these conflicts somehow in a way that makes their lives feel reasonably coherent and continuous" (p. 9). One aspect of this study will be to examine how college students arbitrate these conflicts.

The researcher will explore the importance of significant relationships; situational factors; peer culture and influence; a cost-benefit analysis of consequences; institutional values; and religion, faith, and spirituality as contextual elements of moral decision-making. Demographic differences (particularly sex, race, and class standing) among respondents will also be examined for differences in moral decision-making and evaluating these contextual factors.

Student Diversity

Students reflect the wide diversity of society, varying greatly from campus to campus. Students vary in sex, age, race, sexual orientation, organization affiliation (including Greek groups), residence, etc. They also bring a range of knowledge, personal biases, personal and

family values, and religious and cultural norms and traditions that continue to develop and deepen during college and throughout their lifetime. This diversity serves as one of the many filters through which moral decision-making takes place.

This diversity also highlights the controversy between philosophy, psychology, and other social sciences regarding morality and moral development. There are longstanding disagreements as to whether morality has a universal core in terms of content, structure, or process; without some universal core, it becomes difficult to compare moral positions or moral development (Saltzstein, 1997). Various studies have been conducted on many issues surrounding this universal core, though most have been with children and adolescents. For purposes of exploring this issue, studies utilizing adolescents will be examined here and throughout the other contextual areas, when appropriate to set the stage for the impact of context on the moral development of college students.

A number of studies conducted on student diversity focus on race and ethnicity. Arvizu (1995) drew on Gilligan's work to examine how American Indian college students viewed care versus justice orientations. While they believed that a care orientation better represented their worldview, these students utilized both orientations to make moral decisions. Gongre (1981) examined the differences between Native American, Caucasian, and Black American students at Bacone College, finding no differences between the three groups in responses to questions on the DIT. Locke and Tucker (1988) used the DIT to test Black and Caucasian students to see if responses to DIT dilemmas changed if the race of the actors in the dilemma changed. Again, no differences were found between the students. Gump and Baker (2000) studied Mexican American and Caucasian students using Kohlberg and Gilligan's work on care and justice orientations to determine cultural differences. Mexican American students and female students

of both races scored significantly higher on the care orientation, and no significant differences were reported on the justice orientation.

A number of longitudinal studies have also been conducted that explore the relationship between age, class standing, and moral reasoning. College does tend to promote the moral development of students (Whiteley, 1982; Shaver, 1985; Burwell, Butman, & Van Wicklin, 1992), as does increased age or class standing (Shaver, 1985; Burwell, Butman, & Van Wicklin, 1992; Foster & LaForce, 1999; Whiteley, 1982; Rest & Thoma, 1985). Education, however, appears to play a much greater role than age or class standing in moving individuals toward more principled reasoning.

As discussed earlier in the section on moral development theory, sex provides the area of greatest contention, given the belief that men and women differ on the care versus justice orientation. When most studies have been conducted, sex is typically just one measure within a much broader study. Whether significant differences are found between sexes generally depends on the structure of the entire study.

Situational Factors

Since belief, action, and choice confirm morality and morality requires understanding and evaluating alternatives, moral or ethical decision-making then has context. "The same act will have different shades and degrees of moral value under different circumstances" (Dalai Lama, 1999, p. xii). The moral context of any given situation rarely lends itself to an unambiguous decision, often placing us in a "gray area." We then attempt to separate the decision from its motivation to discern whether the decision was morally grounded or not. We never truly know enough to gauge with certainty the moral content of another's actions in any particular situation, so we typically speculate about motivation.

Kidder (1993) proposed that ethical analysis and decision-making does not occur around evaluating right and wrong conduct, as individuals clearly understand the differences between right and wrong. He proposes instead that true ethical decision-making occurs when an individual has to determine and choose the higher right, reflecting a choice between competing right values. He defines four dilemma paradigms into which, he contends, all ethical dilemmas fall: (a) truth versus loyalty, (b) short-term versus long-term consequences or outcomes, (c) justice versus mercy (care), and (d) self versus community interests. He broadens the moral/ethical dilemma paradigm beyond the ethic of justice, as proposed by Kohlberg, and the ethic of care, as proposed by Gilligan.

The decision-making rules for dilemmas he proposes are (a) utilitarianism, or an ends-based model based on consequences (greatest good for the greatest number); (b) categorical imperative, or a rules-based model (your behavior creates a universal maxim for others' behavior); and (c) the golden mean (rule), or a care-based model that suggests a reversibility criterion (do unto others as you would have them do unto you). This model has implications for the situational nature of ethical decision-making, and Kidder's work accounts for varied normative ethics in evaluating dilemmas.

The rationale for the decision becomes a critical element of the context of the ethical decision-making process, as different yet appropriate moral decisions can be reached via any one of the three methods while evaluating competing right values. This also has implications for the theoretical foundation of moral development, which has tended to focus on the cognitive aspect of ethical decision-making with little or no regard for the relational nature of this process or for the contextual considerations that influence how these decisions are made.

The "moral value of a given act is to be judged in relation both to time, place, and circumstance and to the interests of the totality of all others in the future as well as now" (Dalai Lama, 1999, p. 153). Students have to know how to respond to the dilemma at hand, as well as be forward-thinking about the potential implications for society in the future. While studies have been conducted in various contexts, none of these have focused on the many varied situational factors present in moral dilemmas. Rather, they have focused on specific behavioral responses researchers anticipated within these contexts.

Significant Relationships and Moral Development

Research has indicated that adolescents view adults as retaining authority over the moral domain (Smetana, 1989; Smetana, Braeges, & Yau, 1991; Smetana, Yau, Restrepo, & Braeges, 1991). Smetana (1995) found that adolescents view parents as having a duty to regulate moral conduct and they view themselves as obligated to obey this regulation. Within American society, adolescents appear to distinguish between matters of personal and moral choice, with deference given to parents on moral matters. In studies of American and Indian adolescents (Miller & Luther, 1989; Miller & Bersoff, 1992), some matters seen as a personal choice for American adolescents were viewed as moral matters by Indian adolescents. These studies demonstrated that distinguishing moral and personal matters is subject to cultural and contextual variation.

While parental relationships remain important to traditional age college students, "peer relationships formed within a college environment might be an important factor related to the development of moral judgement" (Derryberry & Thoma, 2000, p. 16). Students who developed close friendships in college demonstrated higher levels of moral judgment than did students who reported maintaining close friendships from high school. The relationship between social

support and the development of moral judgment was stronger when the density of students' friendship network was included in the analysis (Derryberry & Thoma, 2000). This study was similar to an earlier study conducted by Thoma and Ladewig (1993), which found that students with close friendships who had multiple independent friendship groups (not all acquainted with one another) had higher DIT scores than other students.

In considering the importance of significant relationships, Haan (1991) developed a theory of interactional morality based on relations between participants. She found that morality serves as a particular kind of social agreement that equalizes people's relations with one another, provided that all parties make their issues known (Haan, 1991). Moral solutions have to do with a given group of actors in a specific situation at a given time, and they consider what people need and deserve (which may shift over time). Movement to moral action occurs through dialogue with others. This dialogue involves emotion, particularly if there are conflicting needs, so stress also plays a critical role in moral decision-making. Many models of moral development exist for consideration, but those utilized by educators often fail to take into account this interactional and relational nature of morality.

Peer Culture and Influence

Again, peer relationships formed during college might be an important consideration in the development of moral judgment (Derryberry & Thoma, 2000). High moral judgment scores were associated with low-density friendship networks (i.e., high levels of social support from different, diverse, and distinct friendship groups). These individuals were more likely to discuss a broad range of topics with friends and to appreciate the diversity of the college campus. Students involved in Greek life tended to have more dense friendship networks, resulting in less

exposure to different people, ideas, and activities. As a result, moral judgment scores among these students were lower (Derryberry & Thoma, 2000).

Additionally, two other studies were conducted on members of Greek organizations. Sanders (1990) found that male freshmen's scores on the DIT on a pre-test and post-test were significantly higher for independents (non-Greeks) than for fraternity members. E. Cohen (1982) did a study on Greek organizations' (sororities and fraternities) leaders. She found no differences in moral judgment scores based on the leader's position, gender, or year in school.

Since context serves as a critical component of ethical decision-making and therefore moral development, we must intentionally shape the contexts students consider in formulating their decisions and actions. Peer culture plays a critical role in the life of today's college student, and student affairs practitioners have countless opportunities to shape the contexts in which these relationships occur.

Students have to learn to trust others and include them in their moral and intellectual pursuits, or they promote a culture of loneliness, distrust, antagonism, and egocentrism (Gergen, 2001). While students can certainly achieve intellectual success under these circumstances, the quality of their interpersonal success will be greatly diminished, which may significantly impact their subsequent quality of life. "Evidence abounds that people can attain high levels of intellectuality and remain insensitive to human beings and other living things" (Noddings, 1992, p. 334).

If students cannot imagine the potential impact of their actions on others, they will be unable to discriminate between right and wrong (Dalai Lama, 1999) or among competing right values (Kidder, 1993). As educators, we help students evaluate the choices they make with respect to their implications for others. These students will join the intellectual and professional

communities and will face many difficult and controversial moral decisions, such as the implications of human cloning, gene mapping, fiscal responsibility, etc.

Cost-Benefit Analysis and Consequences

The ethic of care's emphasis on motivation (a subjective quality) further challenges the primacy of moral reasoning, as the focus becomes not reasoning but sustaining relationships (Noddings, 1992). Fisher (as cited in Sobesky, 1983/1994) determined that individuals look at negative consequences as a situational factor—evaluations are based on a judgment of obligation (what should be done) versus a judgment of prediction (what would be done). Moral obligation involved avoidance of causing negative consequences for others, unless the consequence became greater for the student assessing the situation than the person being assisted. Even in this situation, moral decisions are being evaluated in the context of relationship and with regard to the consequences for all the players within the relationship.

Institutional Values

"Knowledge alone cannot provide the happiness that springs from inner development" (Dalai Lama, 1999, p. 10). In higher education, we have a responsibility to help with the development of the inner dimension of students, as well as their intellectual growth. However, public education has typically avoided this task because it has wrongly equated spirituality with religion. The educational experience should foster the holistic development of students, which includes cognitive, affective, and behavioral growth.

Researchers have documented increasingly self-oriented, materialistic values among high school and college students (Dalton, 1999). At the same time, institutions of higher education appear willing to do almost anything for grants, endowments, and other monetary gain for the institution. We often appear ready to hand the institution to the highest bidder for research and

capital campaigns, or to allow access to our students through marketing efforts of large firms. All too often, our development (financial solicitation) efforts are at odds with some of the other values we espouse.

As practitioners in higher education, we must recognize the influence of the institution as a political entity and the consequences for students—in how we order relations among members, how we govern our activities, and how we define our relation to the environment (Trow, 1975). Institutions of higher education have served as active participants in reinforcing the social competitiveness and materialism of students (Astin, 1993). Also, "more academically selective institutions appear to negatively affect the development of civic values, religious beliefs, and cultural awareness" (Astin & Antonio, 2000, p. 6), as they reinforce competition and intellectual pursuits for economic gain. The institution as an entity serves as a role model, often as much as individual faculty and staff members, so we must be conscious of the messages being sent to students about institutional values and acceptable conduct.

"Instrumental individualism" (Stephens, Colby, Ehrlich, & Beaumont, 2000, p. 2) is when the academy exists for and reinforces the economic development and upward mobility of individuals as goals of the institution. The institution further emphasizes this focus when it pursues the same goals for the institution as a whole, often in conflict with a mission that speaks to the character development and civic responsibility of students. Astin (1993) found, for example, that the "emphasis of the institution on acquisition of resources and enhancement of reputation was the single strongest negative correlate of facilitating student involvement in community service activities" (p. 18). It appears that we reinforce the focus on self to the detriment of our inter-connectedness and capacity to act in the interest of others.

Colleges and universities must also contend with the impersonal processing of large numbers of students, which can result in the absence of close or sustained relationships with faculty or staff members. This denies the students access to a potentially rich avenue for moral development (Trow, 1975). People whom we care about and with whom we have continuing personal relationships have a significant influence on us. Relationships with faculty, staff, and other students create a spirit of connection to the campus community and allow students to utilize these relationships to make meaning in their lives and in their collegiate experience.

Finally, higher education in the United States is provided by a multitude of institutional types. Institutional type has also served as a research variable in examining the moral development of college students (Shaver, 1985; Burwell, Butman, & Van Wicklin, 1992; Good & Cartwright, 1998; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Based on these studies, liberal arts colleges seem to be more conducive to fostering the moral development of college students. In Good and Cartwright's (1998) study examining the moral development of students at a state university, a Christian liberal arts university, and a Bible university, senior students at the state institution and Christian liberal arts institution showed higher levels of post conventional reasoning than students at the Bible institution. Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) found that moral reasoning differed significantly by type of institution, with church-affiliated liberal arts institutions scoring highest, followed by public research universities, two-year institutions, private liberal arts institutions, private institutions, and finally, public comprehensives. None of these studies have taken into account whether the institution has an explicit values statement or community compact or has systems in place that assist students in discussing and exploring their values and justifying their decisions accordingly (King & Mayhew, 2002).

Religion, Faith, and Spirituality

"If connectedness is a primary aspect of spirituality, then what spirituality threatens most is the inherent fragmentation in our educational structures" (Laurence, 1999, p. 14). Most educational structures lack in their physical or relational design a focus on the importance of relational and spiritual development.

As life-changing events unfold in our lives and the lives of our students, we are challenged to make meaning of our lives and the world around us. Regardless of the label we place on the journey (spirituality, moral meaning, etc.), the journey is one inward in search for meaning and outward for connection to those who help us make meaning. Few places and opportunities exist on most college campuses today for solitude and reflection or thoughtful conversation about deeper life issues.

In a study conducted by Wahrman (1981), moral judgment was compared to religious affiliation, degree of orthodoxy of this affiliation, and dogmatism. While the degree of religious affiliation was not significantly related to moral judgment, dogmatism was significantly, though weakly, related. The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale was used to measure dogmatism. Greater dogmatism (a system of ideas based on insufficiently examined premises) was associated with lower levels of moral judgment. In another study conducted by Young, Cashwell, and Woolington (1998), a positive relationship was found to exist between spirituality (individual capacities that help people define the sense of meaning in their lives) and moral development. Global spirituality was measured using the Human Spirituality Scale (HSS) and moral reasoning was examined using the DIT. This study also found no relationship between spirituality and cognitive development, as an inability to reason at higher levels did not seem to inhibit students from developing their spirituality.

Finally, based on 1966 CIRP data, over 88% of first-time freshmen cited the development of a meaningful philosophy of life as essential or very important compared to less than 50% in 1996. In 1996, over 80% of students cited being well off financially as essential or very important, compared with less than 45% in 1966 (Stephens, Colby, Ehrlich, & Beaumont, 2000). Attention is needed to help students begin to find meaning, purpose, and the passions of life and work.

Self-Esteem and Context

The students who grow most in moral reasoning in college appear to be the ones most prepared to do so when they arrive (Derryberry & Thoma, 2000). Self-esteem and moral development may be related to the development of moral reasoning, moral sensitivity, and moral behavior. Therefore, it is beneficial to assess the role that self-esteem has on a student's ability to act with others' interests in mind. "Moral development, interpersonal development, development of self-concept and inner life proceed together as a single, integrated structure" (Loevinger, 1975, p. 63). Students lacking a strong self-esteem may prove more susceptible to peer culture and influence, since "fitting in" allows the student to form a sense of self and role within the group. Self-esteem may impact whether students allow more internal or more external contextual factors to significantly impact moral decision-making. No work could be located on the relationship between self-esteem, college students, and moral development.

Chapter Summary

The development of moral reasoning in college students has been well documented in the literature. Models of moral reasoning have provided student affairs researchers and practitioners with potentially oversimplified frameworks for examining moral reasoning and, to a lesser degree, behavioral and affective components of moral development. Moral development

researchers who have studied college students and the collegiate experience have not adequately considered the countless situational, individual, and societal contexts shaping moral decision-making. Careful examination of the models detailed in this chapter reveals the developmental sequencing of normative and meta-ethical positions, which have not been similarly sequenced in developmental stages within the study of philosophy and ethics. The researcher asserts the importance of significant relationships; situational factors; peer culture and influence; a cost-benefit analysis of consequences; institutional values; and religion, faith, and spirituality as contextual elements that impact moral decision-making and motivation.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to compare moral orientation and self-esteem with the degree of consideration given to certain contextual elements of moral dilemmas. The researcher created a 150-item questionnaire, using The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO; Liddell, 1990), the Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), and researcher-developed contextual scales that followed each of the MMO dilemmas. The purpose of these items was to assess the importance of significant relationships; situational factors/circumstances; peer culture and influence; cost-benefit analysis of consequences; institutional values; and religion, faith, and spirituality on moral decision-making and motivation. Demographic differences among respondents (sex, race, and class standing) were also examined. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and approved the researcher's methodology and provided permission to begin the study. This chapter further explains participant selection, data collection, instrumentation, and data analysis.

Participants

The research participants (n = 130) in this study were students enrolled in Helping Strategies (total of four sections) or Career and Life Planning (total of six sections), both taught through the Department of Counseling and Human Development. Helping Strategies is a special topics helping skills course, which typically has a diverse enrollment of traditional age college students, while Career and Life Planning has a diverse enrollment of primarily junior and senior students. The population of interest was traditional age college students attending a large research-intensive institution in the southeastern region. A convenience sampling technique was utilized.

Data Collection

Data from participants was gathered over a two-week period beginning August 18, 2003, the start of fall classes, and ending August 29, 2003. The researcher contacted instructors of the two courses by email, requesting permission to attend a regularly scheduled class session during the first two weeks of classes. During the class session, the researcher explained the purpose of the study and distributed packets including the implied consent letter, the instrument for the student to complete, and a computer Scantron sheet (see Appendices A, the implied consent letter; B, the instrument; and C, the data collection script). The researcher gathered completed computer Scantron sheets and instruments from students who elected to participate in the study (n = 130; not all participants completed all of the demographic information). Participation was anonymous.

Demographics of the Sample

Table 1 highlights demographic data collected from the sample included in this study. At this large research-intensive institution in the southeastern United States, the Office of Institutional Research (2002) indicates that females comprise 57 percent of the student body and males comprise 43 percent. White students represent 87 percent of the students, while students of color represent the remaining 13 percent (Office of Institutional Research, 2002). Based on this information, the sample of respondents appears relatively representative of the overall student population. As noted earlier in the limitations, most of the respondents were in their junior or senior year.

Table 1

Demographic Data for the Sample Participating in the Study

Variable	*n*	*Percent*
Sex	129	100
Female	90	69.8
Male	39	30.2
Race/Ethnicity	127	100
White/Caucasian	110	86.6
Students of Color	17	13.4
Class Standing	129	100
Freshman	0	0
Sophomore	6	4.7
Junior	18	14.0
Senior	87	67.3
Other	18	14.0

Instrumentation

The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO; Liddell, 1990) was administered to determine the student's moral orientation (care or justice) and self-description of being care or justice oriented. The researcher developed additional contextual scales for the MMO dilemmas to determine the importance of significant relationships; situational factors; peer culture and influence; a cost-benefit analysis of consequences; institutional values; and religion, faith, and spirituality on moral decision-making and motivation. In addition, the Self-Esteem Scale

(Rosenberg, 1965) was also used to measure student self-esteem. Demographic differences (sex, race, and class standing) among respondents were also examined.

Measure of Moral Orientation (Liddell, 1990)

The researcher secured permission from Dr. Liddell to use The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO; Liddell, 1990). Dr. Liddell's only stipulation was that the researcher shares the result of this study when completed. The MMO is a two-part self-report inventory containing 83 items (69 dilemma response items and 14 self-description items). The first part includes nine moral dilemmas possibly encountered by traditional age college students, followed by a series of questions to determine whether the student tends to respond with an ethic of care or justice. The second part of the MMO includes 14 self-description items, allowing the students to share perceptions of themselves as just and/or caring people (seven items measure justice and seven measure care). Students are scored on four scales: Part 1 includes care and justice and Part 2 includes self-care and self-justice.

Four scores are computed, one for each scale. These scores are obtained by adding the particular item responses associated with each scale. A Likert scale is used to rate each of the 83 items. The response scale ranges from 1 to 4 (1-strongly agree, 2-somewhat agree, 3-somewhat disagree, 4-disagree), though Liddell noted in the instrument-scoring key that these items are all reverse scored (4 points for strongly agree, 3 points for somewhat agree, 2 points for somewhat disagree, 1 point for disagree). The MMO was intentionally designed with a four-point Likert scale, rather than the typical five-point scale, which Liddell et al. (1992) noted helps alleviate central tendency errors.

The primary researcher who designed the MMO, Debora Liddell, has conducted three studies (a pilot test, a field test, and a reliability and validity study) to develop reliability and

validity evidence for the MMO (Liddell, Halpin, & Halpin, 1992; Liddell & Davis, 1996). Based on the original study of Liddell, Halpin, and Halpin (1992), the internal consistency, assessed with Cronbach's alpha, for the four MMO scales were care (.59), justice (.73), self-description of care (.59), and self-description of justice (.60). To establish the validity of the MMO, four different methods were used: an intercorrelational analysis with four scales, an examination of the factor structure of the MMO, correlational studies with similar instruments, and a data review of relationships between demographic variables and the care and justice scales.

The intercorrelational analysis showed a correlation between care and self-care ($r = .50$) and justice and self-justice ($r = .39$). These correlations were both statistically significant ($p < .0001$) and indicate convergent validity (Liddell & Davis, 1996). Relationships between unlike scales demonstrated discriminant validity. The correlation between justice and care ($r = -.28$) and self-justice and self-care ($r = -.32$) suggests these scales function independently of one another (Liddell & Davis, 1996).

The factor analysis permits researchers to determine whether the instrument measures the factors (care and justice) in question. The factor loadings for care x dilemma variables ranged from .38 to. 64. The factor loadings for justice x dilemma variables were weaker, with four of the nine variables above .30 and two of the variables below .10. This seems to indicate that justice items within those particular dilemmas did not contribute significantly to the variance common among other justice items (Liddell & Davis, 1996). The correlation between the two factors was .11 (Liddell & Davis, 1996).

The MMO care ($r = -.23$) and justice ($r = -.37$) scales correlated significantly and negatively with the DIT P-Score. The DIT P-Score also correlated negatively with self-care ($r = -.288$; $p = .012$) and with self-justice ($r = -.266$; $p = .020$). A final interesting correlation was

between the MMO justice scare and the DIT Stage 4 ($r = .41$; $p = .0001$), which focuses on maintaining legal order (Liddell & Davis, 1996). Liddell and Davis (1996) indicate that the MMO appears to address Rest's concept of moral sensitivity rather than his stages of moral reasoning, except for the correlation between the justice scale and Stage 4.

In Liddell and Davis' (1996) work, the primary demographic variable of interest was gender. Females scored higher than males on the justice and care scales. The only statistically significant difference was in the care score ($F (1, 379) = 10.78$, $p < .001$) (Liddell & Davis, 1996). Liddell, Halpin, and Halpin (1992) indicate that the MMO was developed to provide an objective instrument to measure the ethics of care and justice, as first described by Gilligan and Kohlberg respectively.

Researcher-Added Contextual Items

I provided additional items to follow each dilemma to assess the importance of significant relationships; situational factors; peer culture and influence; a cost-benefit analysis of consequences; institutional values; and religion, faith, and spirituality on moral decision-making and motivation. Nineteen individuals read these items and offered extensive feedback to clarify these items and the scoring scale and to insure their face validity. These 19 individuals included (with individuals falling into multiple categories): four African-Americans, 11 Caucasians, six student affairs professionals, two law students, one nurse, one administrative assistant, one federal government employee, four undergraduate students, and three masters or doctoral students. These individuals ranged in age from 20-55, with most in the 25-35 age range. They were selected based on their diversity, occupation, or student status, and their ability to provide insight into appropriately revising these items.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)

The Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) is the most widely used self-esteem measure, designed to measure global self-esteem. It was originally designed as a Guttman scale, though it is now commonly scored as a Likert scale. There are 10 items answered on a four-point Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. There are five negatively worded items, which are reverse scored (Strongly Agree=0, Agree=1, Disagree=2, Strongly Disagree=3). There are also five positively worded items, which are scored as follows: Strongly Agree=3, Agree=2, Disagree=1, Strongly Disagree=0 (University of Maryland Department of Sociology, 2003). Scores can range from 0 to 30 using the Likert scale noted.

The original sample used to develop the scale "consisted of 5,024 high school juniors and seniors from 10 randomly selected schools in New York State and was scored as a Guttman scale" (University of Maryland Department of Sociology, 2003, paragraph 9). No other samples were used for the purpose of developing this instrument, though it has been utilized in many subsequent studies (Wylie, 1989). The scale has high reliability: test-retest correlations range from .82 to .88, and Cronbach's alpha ranges from .77 to .88 (University of Maryland Department of Sociology, 2003; Wylie, 1989). Some studies have also demonstrated both a one-dimensional and a two-factor (self-confidence and self-deprecation) structure present in the scale. McCarthy and Hoge (1982) did a study of 1,852 students from grades seven to twelve, summing responses using the four-point Likert scale. This particular study had a Cronbach's alpha of .74; one year later, the alpha was .77.

Research Design

Correlational studies are utilized to predict or explain phenomena. Predictive studies examine the relationship between variables in order to make these predictions. Explanatory

studies allow the researcher to provide insight into the phenomena by determining the degree to which variables are related. The researcher for this study used a correlational study to examine moral development theory broadly in order to determine the degree to which contextual factors impact moral decision-making and motivation.

The dependent variables for this study are significant relationships; situational factors; peer culture and influence; a cost-benefit analysis of consequences; institutional values; and religion, faith, and spirituality as contextual factors in moral decision-making and motivation. The independent variables are moral orientation and self-description, self-esteem, race, sex, and class standing.

Data Analysis Techniques

The analysis of scores on The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO; Liddell, 1990), the Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), and the degree of consideration given to different contextual elements when making moral decisions will utilize various statistical methods. Correlational analysis, with Pearson's product-moment correlation (r), were conducted to look at the relationship between moral orientation, moral self-description, self-esteem, and the degree of consideration given to different contextual elements when making moral decisions (Research Questions 1 and 2). Either independent samples t-tests or ANOVAs were conducted to look at the relationship between race, sex, class standing, and the degree of consideration given to different contextual elements when making moral decisions (Research Questions 3, 4, and 5).

Research Questions

RQ1: Do college students with different moral orientations, as measured by the MMO, consider different contextual elements when making moral decisions?

RQ2: Do college students with differing levels of self-esteem, as measured by the Self-Esteem Scale, consider different contextual elements when making moral decisions?

RQ3: Does the race of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?

RQ4: Does the sex of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?

RQ5: Does the class standing of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Chapter Four presents the findings of the statistical analyses of the data collected using the instrument included in Appendix B. Each research question is addressed separately and presented in order as outlined at the end of Chapter 3. The statistical analyses that reached significance ($p < .05$) are highlighted in the tables and this chapter.

Statistical Power

The sample size ($n = 130$) was large enough to achieve power of greater than .80 with a medium effect size (alpha = .05) for the correlations examining moral orientation, moral self-description, self-esteem, and sex when compared to the degree of consideration given to different contextual elements (J. Cohen, 1992). When the race groups were modified to compare white or Caucasian students with students of color, the power also remained at least .80. When examining race and class standing as separate groups, the power decreased substantially and the likelihood of Type II error increased (J. Cohen, 1992).

Results of Data Analyses

Degree of Consideration Items as Scales

The internal consistency of the degree of consideration items as scales was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Upon examination of each scale and alpha reported, if a particular item was removed, it was noted that removing any particular question from the scale did not significantly impact the overall alpha for the scale. Table 2 indicates the specific items that were utilized to

create each scale and their corresponding alpha coefficient. Each scale had an alpha coefficient greater than .7, which indicates sufficient internal consistency (Huck, 2000).

Table 2

Degree of Consideration Scales and Their Alpha Coefficients

Degree of Consideration Item	*Scale Label*	*Question Numbers*	*Scale Alpha*
My most significant or important relationships (with family, close friends, and/or boyfriend/girlfriend)	Relationships	17, 32, 45, 59, 72, 85, 101, 115, 128	.77
Circumstances unique to this moral dilemma	Circumstances	18, 33, 46, 60, 73, 86, 102, 116, 129	.82
The reaction or influence of my peers	Peers	19, 34, 47, 61, 74, 87, 103, 117, 130	.85
A cost-benefit analysis or weighing of the positive and negative consequences for me and others	Cost-benefit	20, 35, 48, 62, 75, 88, 104, 118, 131	.87
The stated or unstated values or expectations related to my behavior, as determined by my college or university	Institutional values	21, 36, 49, 63, 76, 89, 105, 119, 132	.86
My religious beliefs, spiritual beliefs, or faith, and the direction they provide	Spiritual beliefs	22, 37, 50, 64, 77, 90, 106, 120, 133	.95

Research Question 1

Pearson product-moment correlations were performed to answer the question, "Do college students with different moral orientations, as measured by the MMO, consider different contextual elements when making moral decisions?" Table 3 shows the statistically significant findings for each individual degree of consideration item with the overall care, overall justice,

self-care, and self-justice scores as measured by The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO). Table 3 shows that overall care was significantly related to questions 18 (circumstances), 21 (institutional values), 34 (peers), 35 (cost-benefit), 59 (relationships), 60 (circumstances), 61 (peers), and 74 (peers) ($p < .05$) and questions 32 (relationships), 45 (relationships), 46 (circumstances), 73 (circumstances), 86 (circumstances), 90 (spiritual beliefs), 101 (relationships), 102 (circumstances), 128 (relationships), and 129 (circumstances) ($p < .01$). It also indicates that overall justice was significantly related to questions 20 (cost-benefit), 21 (institutional values), 36 (institutional values), 46 (circumstances), 47 (peers), 62 (cost-benefit), 117 (peers), 119 (institutional values), and 130 (peers) ($p < .05$) and question 48 (cost-benefit) ($p < .01$). Additionally, it indicates that self-care was significantly related to questions 32 (relationships), 59 (relationships), 115 (relationships), 118 (cost-benefit), 129 (circumstances), and 131 (cost-benefit) ($p < .05$) and question 87 (peers) ($p < .01$); and self-justice was significantly related to question 130 (peers) ($p < .05$) and question 117 (peers) ($p < .01$). Other comparisons did not reach a level of statistical significance.

Table 4 shows the statistically significant findings for the degree of consideration scales with the MMO's overall care, overall justice, self-care, and self-justice scores. Table 4 shows that overall care was significantly related to the peers and cost-benefit scales ($p < .05$) and the relationships and circumstances scales ($p < .01$). It also indicates that overall justice was significantly related to the peers scale ($p < .05$) and the institutional values scale ($p < .01$). Additionally, it indicates that self-care was significantly related to the relationships and peers scales ($p < .05$) and self-justice was significantly related to the institutional values scale ($p < .05$). All other comparisons did not reach a level of statistical significance.

Table 3

Correlations Between Degree of Consideration Items and Self-Esteem and MMO Scores

Degrees of Consideration Questions	*Self-Esteem*	*Overall Care*	*Overall Justice*	*Self-Care*	*Self-Justice*
Scenario 1 Student Club					
17	.110	.121	.133	.080	.153
18	.003	.176*	.000	-.010	-.036
19	-.112	.049	.067	.081	.072
20	.052	.094	.195*	.082	.141
21	-.054	.173*	.190*	.092	.149
22	.035	-.002	-.015	-.086	.000
Scenario 2 Plagiarism					
32	.130	.232**	-.023	.219*	-.018
33	.022	.080	.139	-.021	.076
34	-.048	.198*	.114	.145	.105
35	.082	.226*	.022	.160	.102
36	-.002	.072	.218*	.073	.076
37	.076	.100	.130	-.039	.119
Scenario 3 Morgan					
45	-.051	.287**	.075	.053	.006
46	-.044	.228**	.180*	.050	.019

Degrees of Consideration Questions	*Self-Esteem*	*Overall Care*	*Overall Justice*	*Self-Care*	*Self-Justice*
47	.015	.086	.193*	.093	.095
48	.051	.158	.231**	.154	.072
49	-.074	.123	.102	.067	.139
50	.124	.125	.139	.074	.049
Scenario 4 Karen					
59	.043	.195*	.072	.203*	-.067
60	.087	.239*	.165	.082	.067
61	-.088	.205*	.118	.167	.017
62	.058	.081	.179*	.059	.140
63	.016	.052	.172	.043	.164
64	.119	.091	.140	.069	.084
Scenario 5 Administrator					
72	-.003	.138	-.039	.117	-.021
73	-.076	.422**	.093	.078	-.080
74	-.028	.195*	.029	.130	.011
75	.032	.145	.075	.002	.132
76	.016	.146	.122	.090	.010
77	.119	.054	.116	.114	.161
Scenario 6 Car					
85	-.093	.156	-.038	.087	-.092

Degrees of Consideration Questions	*Self-Esteem*	*Overall Care*	*Overall Justice*	*Self-Care*	*Self-Justice*
86	-.032	.446**	.082	.031	-.026
87	-.080	.119	.108	.276**	.075
88	.053	.122	.064	.076	.108
89	.089	.018	.105	.167	.136
90	.114	.231**	.063	.172	.095
Scenario 7 Richard					
101	.102	.262**	.113	.139	.049
102	-.030	.264**	.124	.112	-.058
103	-.100	.170	.104	.143	.167
104	.040	.141	-.012	.107	.105
105	.004	.033	.156	.109	.167
106	.114	.129	.145	.125	.069
Scenario 8 Parents					
115	.152	.153	.072	.179*	-.004
116	.133	.155	.059	.141	.005
117	-.062	.078	.202*	.124	.239**
118	.070	.132	.035	.211*	.073
119	-.022	.056	.180*	.032	.128
120	.153	.039	.103	.008	.152

Degrees of Consideration Questions	*Self-Esteem*	*Overall Care*	*Overall Justice*	*Self-Care*	*Self-Justice*
Scenario 9 Roommate					
128	-.022	.313**	.037	.163	-.058
129	.002	.258**	.117	.192*	-.046
130	.012	.077	.172*	.072	.205*
131	.067	.082	.076	.181*	.145
132	-.026	.123	.182	.094	.126
133	.046	.144	.056	.116	.075

*p < .05 **p < .01

Table 4

Correlations Between Degree of Consideration Scales and Self-Esteem and MMO Scores

Degrees of Consideration Scale	*Self-Esteem*	*Overall Care*	*Overall Justice*	*Self-Care*	*Self-Justice*
Relationships	.039	.308**	.041	.210*	-.028
Circumstances	.010	.400**	.167	.121	-.018
Peers	-.077	.193*	.186*	.201*	.167
Cost-benefit	.087	.183*	.137	.163	.162
Institutional values	-.010	.129	.229**	.125	.179*
Spiritual beliefs	.118	.120	.117	.076	.106

*p < .05 **p < .01

Research Question 2

Pearson product-moment correlations were performed to answer the question, “Do college students with differing levels of self-esteem, as measured by the Self-Esteem Scale, consider different contextual elements when making moral decisions?” Table 3 compares each individual degree of consideration item with the self-esteem score as measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. Table 4 compares the degree of consideration scales with the self-esteem score. There were no significant relationships that emerged between the degree of consideration questions or scales and self-esteem.

Research Question 3

Independent samples t-tests were performed to answer the question, “Does the race of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?” In order to have power greater than .8, students of color have been grouped together into one group and compared to white or Caucasian students as the other group. Table 5 indicates the three specific questions where race was significantly related to the degree of consideration, at $p < .05$. There were no significant relationships present between race and the degree of consideration scales.

Table 5

Race Compared to Significant Individual Degree of Consideration Items

Question	*n*	*df*	*t*	*p*
64 (Spiritual beliefs)	127	125	-2.41	.02
106 (Spiritual beliefs)	127	125	-2.36	.02
119* (Institutional values)	127	125	2.15	.04

*Equal variances not assumed on this one question.

Research Question 4

Independent samples t-tests were performed to answer the question, "Does the sex of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?" Table 6 indicates the specific questions where sex was significantly related to the degree of consideration, at $p < .05$. There were no significant relationships present between sex and the degree of consideration scales.

Table 6

Sex Compared to Significant Individual Degree of Consideration Items

Question	*n*	*df*	*t*	*p*
103 (Peers)	129	127	2.21	.03
105 (Institutional values)	129	127	2.53	.01
130 (Peers)	129	127	2.86	.01

Research Question 5

One-way ANOVAs were performed to answer the question, "Does the class standing of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?" Table 7 indicates the specific questions where class standing was significantly related to the degree of consideration, at $p < .05$. There were no significant relationships present between class standing and the degree of consideration scales.

Table 7

Class Standing Compared to Significant Individual Degree of Consideration Item

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Question 33 (Circumstances)					
Between	3	3.61	1.2	2.73	.047
Within	125	54.95	.44		

Additional Findings

Overall justice was significantly related to self-justice ($r = .496$, $p < .01$) and overall care ($r = .181$, $p < .05$). Overall care was also significantly related to self-care ($r = .335$, $p < .01$). Self-care was significantly related to self-justice ($r = -.220$, $p < .05$).

Sex was significantly related to scores on the overall care scale, assuming unequal variances ($t = -2.33$, $p = .02$), and the self-justice scale, assuming equal variances ($t = 4.31$, $p = .00$). The males ($n = 39$) had a mean score of 101.23 (s.d. = 13.32) on the overall care scale, while females ($n = 90$) had a mean score of 106.73 (s.d. = 9.47). The males ($n = 39$) had a mean score of 19.59 (s.d. = 3.63) on the self-justice scale, while females ($n = 90$) had a mean score of 16.82 (s.d. = 3.23).

Race was significantly related to the score on the self-justice scale, assuming equal variances, ($t = 2.10$, $p = .04$). The students of color ($n = 17$) had a mean score of 19.35 (s.d. = 4.12) and white or Caucasian students had a mean score of 17.41 (s.d. = 3.45).

Chapter Summary

The researcher used a number of statistical analyses to answer five research questions pertaining to moral orientation, moral self-description, self-esteem, race, sex, class standing, and the degree of consideration given to six different contextual elements when making moral decisions. The degree of consideration scales each had good internal consistency. With the exception of self-esteem, each of the independent variables (moral orientation, moral self-description, race, sex, and class standing) had some significant relationships to either individual degree of consideration items or the degree of consideration scales. A discussion of the results follows in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter includes an overall summary of this study, and a summary and discussion of significant research findings. Implications for student affairs practice are presented to assist practitioners in addressing the moral development of college students. Finally, the need for future research is addressed.

Student Learning and Development

The Student Personnel Point of View (American Council on Higher Education, 1949) and the *Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996) both examine education or learning and how they contribute to both individual and community or societal development. The *Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996) makes this assumption about the purpose of higher education and student affairs:

> Hallmarks of a college educated person include: (a) complex cognitive skills such as reflection and critical thinking; (b) an ability to apply knowledge to practical problems encountered in one's vocation, family, or other areas of life; (c) an understanding and appreciation of human differences; (d) practical competence skills (e.g., decision making, conflict resolution); and (e) a coherent integrated sense of identify, self-esteem, confidence, integrity, aesthetic sensibilities, and civic responsibility.

Throughout its history, higher education has been concerned with the intellectual, spiritual, moral, and personal development of college students. Student affairs practitioners today must

continue to focus attention and resources on student development in all these areas, particularly moral development as it intertwines distinctively with development in the other areas noted.

The *Student Learning Imperative* (1996) calls us to be mindful of the academic context in which we as student affairs professionals function, much as we have to be cognizant of the contexts within which student ethical decision-making and moral behavior occurs. It further charges us to frame our interventions, programs, and service delivery in a manner consistent with our institutional mission and the mission of higher education as a learning enterprise. Student affairs professionals serve as partners in the educational enterprise and our vision, mission, goals, and objectives should be focused on demonstrating how we foster both learning and personal development. Our work with the moral development of college students should also follow these principles as a means of designing initiatives with clear, demonstrable, measurable learning objectives.

Summary of the Results

The purpose of this study was to compare moral orientation and a measure of self-esteem with the degree of consideration given to certain contextual elements of the moral dilemmas presented. Demographic differences (sex, race, and class standing) among respondents were also examined relative to the degree of consideration given to certain contextual elements of the moral dilemmas presented. Given this purpose, five research questions were developed for testing.

This study was designed to make significant contributions to our understanding of the moral development of college students. Specifically, a major goal was to contribute to the body of research on moral development, as few studies have explored the impact of contextual elements on ethical decision-making. Many researchers have failed to consider the diversity and

values of various cultures, the meta-ethical positions and normative ethics of the actor(s), and the richness of the contexts in which moral dilemmas occur.

Student affairs practitioners need well-informed research to help them better understand students and to support their practice. An additional goal of this study was to provide student affairs practitioners with useful information regarding how students make meaning of, and ultimately act or fail to act upon, moral dilemmas. This would then allow practitioners to begin to shape intentionally the student contexts through which moral meaning is made.

The researcher created a 150-item questionnaire, using The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO) (Liddell, 1990), the Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), and researcher-developed contextual scales that followed each of the MMO dilemmas. Data from participants were gathered over a two-week period beginning August 18, 2003, the start of fall classes, and ending August 29, 2003. The researcher gathered completed computer Scantron sheets and instruments from students in the two courses, who elected to participate anonymously in the study (n = 130). These participants included 90 women and 39 men (n = 129 for sex); 110 white/Caucasian students and 17 students of color (n = 127 for race); and 6 sophomores, 18 juniors, 87 seniors, and 18 students who indicated other as their response (n = 129 for class standing). While there were 130 participants in this study, not every participant responded to all demographic questions.

Data analyses included descriptive statistics. Additionally, correlational analyses using Pearson's product-moment correlation (r) were conducted to look at the relationship between moral orientation, moral self-description, self-esteem, and the degree of consideration given to different contextual elements when making moral decisions (Research Questions 1-2). Either independent samples t-tests or ANOVAs were conducted to look at the relationship between

race, sex, class standing, and the degree of consideration given to different contextual elements when making moral decisions (Research Questions 3-5).

Summary and Discussion of Significant Findings

Research Question 1

Summary of individual contextual items

Pearson product-moment correlations were performed to answer the question, "Do college students with different moral orientations, as measured by the MMO, consider different contextual elements when making moral decisions?" The care orientation (overall care score) was significantly related to circumstances (questions 18, 46, 60, 73, 86, 102, and 129), institutional values (question 21), peers (questions 34, 61, and 74), cost-benefit (question 35), relationships (questions 32, 45, 59, 101, and 128), and spiritual beliefs (question 90). The justice orientation (overall justice score) was significantly related to cost-benefit (questions 20, 48, and 62), institutional values (questions 21, 36, and 119), circumstances (question 46), and peers (questions 47, 117, and 130). Additionally, the self-care score was significantly related to relationships (questions 32, 59, and 115), cost-benefit (questions 118 and 131), circumstances (question 129), and peers (question 87); the self-justice score was significantly related to peers (questions 117 and 130). Other comparisons did not reach a level of statistical significance.

Discussion of individual contextual items

The researcher used The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO; Liddell, 1990) to determine the student's moral orientation (care or justice) and self-description of being care or justice oriented. The MMO is a two-part self-report inventory. The first part includes nine moral dilemmas that Liddell (1990) indicates are situated in the traditional age college student experience, followed by a series of questions to determine whether the student tends to respond

with an ethic (orientation) of care or justice. The second part of the MMO includes 14 self-description items, allowing the students to share perceptions of themselves as just and/or caring people. The researcher-developed contextual scales for this instrument's dilemmas follow each of these scenarios. In order to better understand the relationship of specific individual contextual items to the overall care, overall justice, self-care, and self-justice scores, these will be described in relationship to the nine dilemmas that comprise the MMO.

Scenario One

Scenario One describes a situation involving a student member of a campus organization. The student's roommate wants to join the organization, but fellow members are making fun of the roommate during a recruitment event.

Results. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of care shared that the circumstances of this situation and the institutional values of their college or university would most influence their response to this dilemma. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of justice shared that a cost-benefit analysis or weighing the consequences for themselves and others, as well as the institutional values of their college or university, would most influence their response to this dilemma.

Discussion. Interestingly, students, regardless of their preference for an ethic of care or justice, indicated that they would look to the institution to guide their response to this particular dilemma. Based on a review of the ethics of care and justice, it seems unusual that respondents with a stronger ethic of care would look to institutional values for guidance, unless they view the institution as an entity with which relationship maintenance is necessary. The responses of students indicating a justice orientation seem understandable if they view the institution as a community that their decision-making impacts.

If we return to Kohlberg's work (Rest, 1999), students moving toward post-conventional reasoning would demonstrate a commitment to shared responsibility for acting in a manner that better served society. The respondents who indicated a justice orientation arguably are not making this movement since the results demonstrate that they weighed their needs against the needs of others in making their decision. Their responses would seem to indicate intrapersonal conflict in their attempt to sort out their needs, their peers' needs, and the values of the institution.

Conclusion. As practitioners, we need to be conscious of how we reinforce the focus on self to the exclusion of inter-connectedness and the need to act in the interest of others. Institutions of higher education have served as active participants in reinforcing the social competitiveness and materialism of students (Astin, 1993), in our construction of program and service delivery that dichotomizes those who have (higher intellectual ability, athletic talent, etc.) from those who have not (the average college student). Students look to the institution as an entity to serve as a role model and to speak to core values that should guide their decision-making. We must be very conscious of the messages being sent to students about institutional values and acceptable conduct.

We must also explain our actions and reasons for these actions to students, as role modeling requires sharing the context for our moral decision-making processes as educators and institutions. We may further be required to explain and explore the conflict between our espoused values and how our values are acted out for student consumption. We can take advantage of student leadership training and advising student organizations as opportunities to have constructive dialogue and teach about, as well as role model, appreciating and valuing

differences and how such differences contribute to improved organizational or societal functioning.

Scenario Two

Scenario Two describes a situation involving a student writer for the campus paper. This individual's roommate has plagiarized a large portion of an upcoming article for use in a class term paper.

Results. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of care shared that their significant relationships, their peers' reactions or influences, and a cost-benefit analysis of the consequences would most influence their response to this dilemma. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of justice shared that the institutional values of their college/university would most influence their response to this dilemma.

Discussion. Students who indicate a preference for an ethic of justice appear to be looking to institutional values to provide guidance. The students with a care orientation seem to be struggling with how their needs contrast with the value placed on their relationships with others. The respondents all appear to be looking to external parties for guidance, whether significant relationships, peers, or the institution, to determine how best to respond to this dilemma.

Conclusion. When an individual's lack of integrity compromises the learning community, students need to be able to look to the institution for guidance in effectively weighing the costs and benefits to themselves, their peers, and society, and in understanding the consequences when lapses of integrity remain unchecked. Colleges and universities should have: (a) an academic honor code, (b) a student conduct code which details the rights and duties of citizenship, and (c) a student compact or creed to confirm the shared values of community

membership (Dalton, 1999). These three documents frame our dialogue with, and peer dialogue among, students about personal and academic integrity. As Pavela (2004) notes, the best moral educators, from Socrates forward, have seen moral development as a "joint enterprise, grounded in personal connection and candid discussion" (p.5).

Here again we have a responsibility to serve as individual and institutional role models for students. We do not pretend to be moral exemplars; rather, we explore our shortcomings, the challenges we face, and the ensuing consequences as companions and partners on this intellectual journey. We demonstrate to students how these breaches of integrity compromise the campus community and explore their implications for greater good of society. Through leadership training, student organization advising, Greek life advising, and class discussions on ethical decision-making, we can develop relationships and create dialogue with students. We can then help students determine how best to respond to academic and personal integrity violations, and we can explore the consequences of doing so or failing to do so, for both the individual and the community.

We additionally have to be mindful of how institutional policies and procedures create barriers to this rich, honest dialogue. Zero tolerance policies that require expulsion for violations of an academic honor code reinforce students electing to compromise academic and personal integrity, because the risks and consequences of reporting violations become too great for the students' peers and friends. As a result, we sacrifice valuable teachable moments with students, because of the extreme consequences our policies mandate.

Scenario Three

Scenario Three describes a married student whose spouse has cancer. The sick spouse does not want his/her parents informed about the cancer. It is important to consider whether a

traditional age (18-24 year old) college student would be married and encountering this type of life experience.

Results. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of care shared that their significant relationships and the circumstances of this situation would most influence their response to this dilemma. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of justice shared that the circumstances of this situation, their peers' reactions or influences, and a cost-benefit analysis of the consequences would most influence their response to this dilemma.

Discussion. Both sets of respondents, regardless of moral orientation, again appear to be looking to others and the circumstances of this dilemma to determine their response. The results seem to indicate student interpersonal and intrapersonal struggles regarding the conflicting needs of all the parties involved in the scenario. As human beings, each of us grapples with making ethical decisions in light of the consequences of these decisions for others and for our continued relationships with these significant others.

Conclusion. As life-changing and challenging events unfold in the lives of students, they are challenged to make meaning of their lives and the world around them. Regardless of the label that we place on the journey (spirituality, moral meaning making, etc.), the journey is one inward in search of meaning and outward in pursuit of connection to those who help students make meaning. Few places and opportunities exist on most college campuses today for solitude and reflection or thoughtful conversation about deeper life issues.

As student affairs practitioners, we have a responsibility to insure that students have access to counselors, campus ministers, and other faculty and staff prepared to help them struggle and cope with life's greatest challenges, such as the death of a loved one or other

profound losses. We can provide campus ministers, counselors, and other faculty and staff office space in the residence halls to facilitate student access to and use of these support systems. In student counseling centers or residence halls, we can also create grief or death and dying support groups facilitated by trained professionals or graduate students. Regardless of how we construct our interventions, our goal is to provide students with opportunities for individual and group reflection and connection to campus support mechanisms.

Scenario Four

Scenario Four describes a friend with whom the student is taking a class. The friend has confided that she has been offered an *A* in the class, if she will spend the night with the professor.

Results. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of care shared that their significant relationships, the circumstances of this situation, and their peers' reactions or influences would most influence their response to this dilemma. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of justice shared that a cost-benefit analysis of the consequences would most influence their response to this dilemma.

Discussion. Those individuals using an ethic of care seem to be making meaning by considering the reactions of others and the circumstances of this dilemma. Those using an ethic of justice are weighing the costs and benefits to themselves and others. Once again, we have to consider that if students are moving toward post-conventional reasoning, they should demonstrate a commitment to shared responsibility for acting in a manner that best serves society. The students' responses seem to indicate intrapersonal conflict in their attempt to sort out their needs, their peers' needs, and the policies of the institution. The interests of students

and the campus community are not well served if a student feels pressured to have sex with a professor or fears for his/her grade if he/she refuses the advances.

Conclusion. Colleges and universities should make sure students understand that faculty and staff, like students, are accountable for poor decision-making and inappropriate conduct. Policies and procedures regarding sexual and racial harassment, as well as those detailing acceptable relationships between faculty or staff and students, should be clearly addressed in classes, student organization meetings, and other appropriate student gatherings at the beginning of each semester. We take time to detail policies and procedures regarding attendance, requesting accommodations for disabilities, and academic integrity. We thereby address the students' responsibilities and expectations as participants in the learning enterprise, but rarely address our responsibilities and expectations as their partners in this enterprise.

When a faculty or staff member's lack of integrity compromises the learning community, students need to know that the institution will appropriately respond to insure the student's well being. Students should be assured that they are not the only members of the learning community who are expected to live by community standards. Students should know to whom complaints regarding inappropriate faculty and staff conduct should be directed and to whom they can turn, if their initial complaints are not addressed in a timely manner. The institution should respond to these complaints as it would to complaints of student misconduct, and act justly and swiftly in resolving allegations of faculty and staff misconduct.

Scenario Five

Scenario Five describes a college administrator who has misappropriated student fees for personal use. During a campus newspaper investigation, the editor of the paper learns the

administrator has a terminally ill child. The editor calls to inform the administrator about the upcoming article on the administrator's actions.

Results. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of care shared that the circumstances of this situation and their peers' reactions or influences would most influence their response to this dilemma. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of justice did not indicate any statistically significant consideration for resolving this dilemma.

Discussion. It is interesting that those students most likely to respond with an ethic of justice did not find a preferred contextual consideration item. It would be interesting to know if they would have shared another contextual item not on the list provided by the researcher, if given the opportunity (i.e., deference to the law or other rules and regulations).

Conclusion. Again, colleges and universities should make sure students understand that faculty and staff, like students, are accountable for poor decision-making and inappropriate conduct. It is, however, also important to help students learn compassion for others and the challenges that bring these individuals to certain points in their lives. As human beings, none of us are ever completely beyond reproach. When we purport to serve as moral beacons, not capable of inappropriate decisions or behavior, we diminish our credibility with the students with whom we work.

When we find ourselves in a moral quagmire, we each deserve compassion and understanding for the complex contextual issues that may have brought us to that place. Dialogue allows us to explore the context, challenges, and consequences of moral decision-making. The classroom, student organizations, career services, and student media all provide opportunities to explore the complexities of adult life, the consequences of poor personal and

professional decisions, and the means through which students might make better personal and professional choices for themselves. This does not mean the inappropriate conduct is excused; rather, as student affairs practitioners, we challenge students to learn from the consequences of their behavior and the behavior of others. We also reinforce the importance of supporting other human beings through the difficulties they face, and that we one day may face.

Scenario Six

Scenario Six describes a student whose car has been stolen. When the student meets the car thief, it is an 18-year-old who has been abused and thrown out of her parents' house. She indicates she took the car to find a job. She has no prior police record.

Results. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of care shared that the circumstances of this situation and their religious or spiritual beliefs would most influence their response to this dilemma. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of justice did not indicate any statistically significant consideration for resolving this dilemma.

Discussion. This is the only dilemma where religious or spiritual beliefs were a significant contextual consideration. Interestingly enough, this is also the only scenario with a principal actor (an unknown 18-year-old girl) with absolutely no relationship to the student respondent. Again, it is important to consider whether other contextual items not provided by the researcher might have guided those with a justice orientation (i.e., rules, laws, etc.).

Conclusion. This scenario illustrates the value of service learning in broadening a student's life experience. Through community service, students gain exposure to others who have had different life experiences than the student. Service learning allows us to connect

students' personal and professional goals to community service opportunities, then provides an opportunity for reflecting on the experience in order to share personal and professional insights.

Through dialogue and action, students begin to develop compassion and concern for others. Through reflecting on these experiences, students learn about others and themselves, as well as the importance of contributing their time, skills, and money to help those less fortunate. This scenario further reinforces the need for students to have access to campus ministers and other adults who can help them explore the issues and concerns that scenarios like this raise for them. Service learning serves as a solid model for connecting academic and co-curricular life.

Scenario Seven

Scenario Seven indicates that Amy, the student's brother's girlfriend, has been seen leaving another man's apartment. The student believes Amy may be cheating on his/her brother.

Results. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of care shared that their significant relationships and the circumstances of this situation would most influence their response to this dilemma. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of justice did not indicate any statistically significant consideration for resolving this dilemma.

Discussion. This scenario offers another instance of the lack of a significant response by those preferring an ethic of justice. This finding is particularly noteworthy since a family member is impacted in this scenario.

Scenario Eight

Scenario Eight describes divorced parents who each want the student to come spend the break with them. The mother has been involved with a man who will be present in her home,

which the student believes will be upsetting to his/her father. The student now has to decide which parent to visit.

Results. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of care did not indicate any statistically significant consideration for resolving this dilemma. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of justice shared that the institutional values of their college/university and their peers' reactions or influences would most influence their response to this dilemma.

Discussion. It is interesting that respondents preferring an ethic of justice are looking to the institution and peers' reactions, when the scenario involves those with whom he/she has significant relationships. It is also surprising that respondents preferring the ethic of care indicated no significantly preferred response to a scenario involving loved ones. I would have expected responses similar to those in Scenario Seven. It appears that when the conflict involves significant relationships that are creating intrapersonal conflict, students may have to determine to whom they can turn for support and assistance, or they may become so conflicted they do not know who to turn to.

Conclusion. In Scenarios Seven and Eight, students appear to struggle most with the situations that involve those closest to them, their families. Too often, student affairs practitioners are so involved in helping students acclimate to college that we fail to recognize the difficulties students may be encountering with their families. As students grow and mature, they may find themselves at odds with closely held family values and beliefs. Students may look to student affairs practitioners to help them determine how to renegotiate these important relationships and conflicting values.

As we develop first-year experience programs and new student programs, we need to help identify the changes and challenges students may face in both their collegiate and personal lives. First-year experience instructors as well as residence hall staff and orientation leaders can provide formal and informal opportunities for students to discuss their concerns and the challenges they face. In the selection of orientation leaders and residence hall advisors, we need to make sure students have good role models and mentors who can help them learn to balance their needs with the demands of their families, peers, and significant others.

Scenario Nine

Scenario Nine describes a student who has opened a roommate's mail. The letter the student read indicates that the student's roommate has AIDS and is being invited to participate in a campus support group. The way this scenario is written does not address the additional ethical issue of how the roommate came to know this (by opening his/her roommate's mail).

Results. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of care shared that their significant relationships and the circumstances of this situation would most influence their response to this dilemma. Respondents who indicated they would most likely respond with an ethic of justice shared that their peers' reactions or influences would most influence their response to this dilemma.

Discussion. The likelihood of respondents preferring an ethic of justice giving greatest consideration to their peers' reactions or influences is interesting. The student in the scenario has gained access to confidential information by violating a roommate's privacy, and now plans to process the confidential information with peers to determine the best response. This seems to be counterintuitive to the idea of behaving in a just manner.

Conclusion. Again the importance of learning compassion for others cannot be stressed too much. Every individual deserves compassion and understanding. Moral dilemmas vary in the complexity of factors embedded within them, stretching an individual's capacity to unravel the nuances and arrive at a "morally appropriate" decision and action, and stirring different emotions for each individual actor responding to the dilemma.

In this case, we also have a responsibility to explore with students the importance of privacy and how the student who read the other student's mail might have felt if the roles were reversed. As we talk with students, we need to know what questions to ask and how to disentangle the complexity of issues embedded in the moral dilemmas which students encounter. If we assume too much, we may not recognize the roles all the principal actors have in contributing to the dilemma. All too often students do not consider the implications and consequences of their actions and how they influence the outcomes of these dilemmas.

Additional thoughts on the individual contextual items

As Rest (1999) noted, Kohlberg focused on macromorality, which examined the formal social structures that make cooperation possible at a global level. Rest (1999) defined micromorality as concerned with developing relationships with significant others and acting in a virtuous manner in everyday life. He indicated that macromorality rewarded impartiality and acting on principle, while micromorality rewarded loyalty and caring for significant others.

The results noted above appear to indicate that students have the greatest capacity to remain impartial and to act on principle when the other actors in the dilemma are unknown to them (the 18-year-old car thief). When the other principal actors are known, traditional age college students demonstrate strong consideration for their significant and peer relationships and the circumstances and consequences surrounding dilemmas involving these individuals. The

greatest challenges to moral decision-making seem to rest in the scenario involving two parties with whom students have their most significant relationship, their parents.

As Fried (2000) indicates, to fully understand moral decision-making, one should fully examine an individual's cultural values and origins, phenomenology, time frame, and the dynamics of the situation. Moral decision-making is contextual and socially constructed with members of the students' community(ies). We assist students in learning how to construct positive community, whether in a residence hall, a student organization, locally, or globally. Our greatest responsibility as student affairs practitioners is to teach and role model compassion for others, whether known well to us or not, and for ourselves. When we teach students to act with consideration for the needs of others, we teach them how to behave in a principled manner.

Results of contextual scales

The researcher used The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO; Liddell, 1990) to determine the student's moral orientation (care or justice) and self-description of being care- or justice-oriented. The researcher developed contextual scales for this instrument's dilemmas, which followed each scenario, and for purposes of this analysis, the individual items were scale scored for comparative analysis with MMO scores.

Statistically significant findings for the degree of consideration scales (relationships, circumstances, peers, cost-benefit, institutional values, and spiritual beliefs) with the MMO's overall care, overall justice, self-care, and self-justice scores were also examined. The overall care score was significantly related to the peers, cost-benefit, relationships, and circumstances scales. The overall justice score was significantly related to the peers scale and institutional values scale. The self-care score was significantly related to the relationships and peers scales;

the self-justice score was significantly related to the institutional values scale. All other comparisons did not reach a level of statistical significance.

Discussion of contextual scales

The overall care score was significantly related to the peers, cost-benefit, relationships, and circumstances scales. Gilligan asserted that people, particularly women, act based on concern for their relationships and the desire not to harm others or to do the least amount of harm (Liddell, 1992). This view of self is not autonomous but connected; the goal is to insure that no one gets hurt (Gilligan, 1982). In this contextual view of moral decision-making, "the decision maker brings to the dilemma a history of experiences and personal truths that make objectivity unlikely" (Liddell & Davis, 1996, p. 486).

Moral philosophy would refer to these types of responses as consequentialist (ends based) ethics, since the value of the action derives from the value of its consequences or end result. The findings noted seem to support this assertion, since students seem to be weighing their relationships with significant others and peers against the circumstances of the scenario or the costs and benefits to the parties involved. These students also demonstrate a high care based ethic, since their relationships with others strongly impact their consideration of these moral dilemmas.

The overall justice score was significantly related to the peers scale and the institutional values scale. It is interesting that students with a justice orientation seem to be looking for an external compass to guide just behavior, as this seems contrary to Kohlberg's work on moral development. As Liddell, Halpin, and Halpin (1992) indicated, Kohlberg's original work was based on the Piagetian view of "morality as justice and (the notion of) moral development as movement toward autonomy" (Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1984, p. 319). Kohlberg asserted

that moral dilemmas were typically framed as issues of rights, where the individual approached the dilemma as an autonomous individual, acting objectively and in a manner that insured fundamental fairness. This type of moral orientation "is characterized by an objective, impersonal juxtaposition between the decision maker and the dilemma" (Liddell & Davis, 1996, p. 486).

Moral philosophy would refer to this as deontological (rules based) ethics, based on the idea of doing one's duty, doing what is right, or acting based on rights (Blackburn, 1994). The findings seem to indicate that these individuals are either looking to external agents, such as the institution or their peers, to serve as a moral compass, or they are looking to these external agents for guidance regarding what constitutes "right" behavior. Either way, this does not seem to support the individual decision maker as an autonomous agent, if students are making meaning through peer relationships or through use of the institution's values or mission statement.

The self-care score was significantly related to the relationships and peers scales. Again, the work of Gilligan (1982) indicated that students would look to their relationships with significant others and peers for moral guidance. The self-justice score was significantly related to the institutional values scale, which again seems counter to how the ethic of justice was described earlier in this section. In all four comparisons, students appear to be making meaning through their relationships with other individuals or institutions, in this case the college or university.

Conclusions about the contextual scales

Schrader (1999) explained that college students typically are examined under the lenses of Kohlberg's and Gilligan's work, when in fact these students may be grappling with a number of other critical, contextual issues not considered in the models they developed. She argued, as

many of both Kohlberg's and Gilligan's critics have, that moral life should not be treated as separate from the many contexts in which issues are encountered. Important components of this context for students are their relationships with the institution, their peers, and significant others.

As educators we have to help students learn how to evaluate the choices they make and the implications of these choices for others. Moral solutions have to do with a given group of actors in a specific situation at a given time, and they consider both what people need and what they deserve (which may shift over time). As practitioners, we can create instructional opportunities that allow students to grapple with different types of moral dilemmas that they might encounter personally and professionally. These classes or programs would allow students to work with others to make meaning of moral dilemmas they would likely encounter and determine how to respond effectively.

The basic form of moral action is dialogue with others; dialogue involves a great deal of emotion, particularly if conflicting needs are present. Learning how to effectively manage the stress created by conflict will also play a critical role in developing effective moral decision-making skills. Our students will leave us to join intellectual and professional communities and will face many difficult, controversial, and stressful decisions, such as the implications of human cloning, gene mapping, fiscal responsibility, etc. Educators must recognize the danger inherent in decision-making without consideration for the well-being of others and society, and we must insure that students recognize and understand these same dangers as they receive training as future leaders, professionals, and scientists.

Research Question 2

Pearson product-moment correlations were performed to answer the question, "Do college students with differing levels of self-esteem, as measured by the Self-Esteem Scale, consider different contextual elements when making moral decisions?"

Results. There were no significant relationships that emerged between the degree of consideration questions or scales and self-esteem.

Conclusion. This area warrants future research, as it was surprising that students with lower self-esteem were not more concerned with, or influenced by, their peers and other significant relationships. Developmentally college students make meaning through others, and this consideration of others seems to have little to do with a student's level of self-esteem. Rather than focusing on student self-esteem, student affairs practitioners should focus on how, where, and what types of community are constructed on campus. As we assess the types of community that currently exist on our campuses, we can use this information to more positively influence community development within residence halls, student organizations, Greek organizations, and classrooms.

Research Question 3

Independent samples t-tests were performed to answer the question, "Does the race of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?"

Results. In order to have power greater than .8, when conducting this analysis, students of color were grouped together into one group and compared to white or Caucasian students as the other group. There were three specific questions where race was significantly related to the degree of consideration items. Two pertained to spiritual beliefs (questions 64 and 106) and one

pertained to institutional values (question 119). There were no significant relationships present between race and the degree of consideration scales.

Discussion. Interestingly, question 64 corresponds to the situation involving the friend having the opportunity to sleep with the professor for an *A* in the class; question 106 corresponds to the scenario involving the brother's girlfriend cheating on him. Both scenarios involve moral indiscretion/turpitude in sexual relationships. Students of color seem to be looking for religious or spiritual guidance when the moral indiscretions are sexual in nature. Question 119 corresponds to the scenario involving the divorced parents. Of great interest is their looking to the institution for support in responding to their parents' divorce and the pressures it places on them.

Conclusion. Students bring a range of knowledge, personal biases, personal and family values, and religious and cultural norms and traditions that continue to develop and deepen during college and throughout their lifetimes. This diversity serves as one of the many filters through which moral decision-making takes place. As student affairs practitioners, we need to know who are our students are and how their differences impact their approach to moral decision-making. We also need to be conscious of how these differences might impact their moral dialogue with us and with one another, as there may be conflicts, which we are called upon to mediate.

Research Question 4

Independent samples t-tests were performed to answer the question, "Does the sex of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?"

Results. There were three specific questions where sex was significantly related to the degree of consideration items. Two pertained to peers (questions 103 and 130) and one pertained to institutional values (question 105). Questions 103 and 105 correspond to the scenario involving the brother's girlfriend who may be cheating, and question 130 corresponds to the roommate with AIDS. There were no significant relationships present between sex and the degree of consideration scales.

Conclusion. Gilligan (1982) believed that women's morality was guided by their relationships with others and their desire to act in a manner not to cause harm to others. The findings in this study do not seem to support her assertions. In dialogue with students, regardless of sex, we need to assess their intentions and what criteria they use to evaluate moral dilemmas.

Research Question 5

One-way ANOVAs were performed to answer the question, "Does the class standing of college students impact the consideration of different contextual elements when making moral decisions?"

Results. There was one specific question where class standing was significantly related to a degree of consideration item. It pertained to the circumstances of the scenario (question 33). Question 33 corresponded to the scenario involving the student newspaper editor whose roommate had plagiarized a class assignment. There were no significant relationships present between class standing and the degree of consideration scales.

Conclusion. This area warrants further research, as the sample in this study was not diverse enough to compare students of varied class standings.

Additional Findings

The overall justice score was significantly related to the self-justice and overall care scores. The overall care score was also significantly related to the self-care score. The self-care score was significantly (negatively) related to the self-justice score. It is interesting to note the significant relationship between the overall care and overall justice scores in this study, given the earlier discussion of the work of both Kohlberg and Gilligan, who indicated these were significantly different constructs. In dialogue with students, we need to assess their intentions and what criteria they use to evaluate moral dilemmas. Without thoroughly understanding how these decisions are being made and acted on, we cannot determine how best to challenge and support students as part of this process.

Sex was significantly related to scores on the overall care scale and the self-justice scale. The males had a lower mean overall care score than the females. The males had a higher mean self-justice score than the females. As discussed in Chapter 2, sex provides the area of greatest contention, given the belief that men and women differ on the care versus justice orientation. In most studies, sex has typically been just one component of a much broader study. Whether significant differences are found between sexes typically depends on the structure of the entire study.

Race was significantly related to the score on the self-justice scale. The students of color had a higher mean self-justice score than the white or Caucasian students. Issues of diversity, such as race and sex, highlight the controversy between philosophy, psychology, and other social sciences regarding morality and moral development. There are long standing disagreements as to whether morality, in fact, has a universal core in terms of content, structure, or process,

because without some universal core, it becomes very difficult to compare moral positions or moral development (Saltzstein, 1997).

Student affairs practitioners would be well served by studying moral development from perspectives other than those of Kohlberg, Gilligan, and Rest typically highlighted in student affairs graduate preparation programs. They would also benefit from a course that examines moral philosophy and how it shapes their approach to decision-making in their personal and professional lives.

Implications for Student Affairs Practice

Dalton (1999) in *Good Practice in Student Affairs: Principles to Foster Student Learning* reminds us of "the importance of teaching students to acquire and utilize knowledge in the context of core values and ethical standards such as justice, equality, civility, freedom, dignity, and responsible citizenship" (p. 45). Institutions of higher education, and in particular student affairs professionals, play an important role in preparing students to act with character and serve as stewards of their communities. Historically, student affairs, as a profession, has been called upon time and time again to partner with academic affairs to create seamless learning experiences for students, most recently in *Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning* (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998).

In order to design and implement program and service delivery that promotes moral development, it seems desirable to role model how a community joins together to construct a response to this dilemma. This would involve learning about and developing the necessary skills for moral decision-making and behavior, which occurs both in and out of the classroom, thereby involving the entire campus community. Student affairs program planning, service delivery, and

evaluation should ultimately provide for shaping ethical decision-making and expectations for community membership, as well as encourage and reward moral action.

Students indicated that they look to the institution as one guide when responding to moral dilemmas. Student affairs practitioners can utilize the results of this study to understand how students make meaning of, and ultimately act or fail to act upon, moral dilemmas. This will then allow practitioners to begin to intentionally shape the student contexts and environments in which moral meaning is made.

Addressing Context

Student responses in this study indicate that ethical decision-making occurs within a contextual frame. Regardless of moral orientation, students often indicated that the same contextual factors impacted their response to the moral dilemmas presented. One of the contextual factors influencing their response was the institutional values of the university.

If the institution's values influence moral decision-making and action, we need to determine as a community what constitutes a framework of community values and educational experiences that guide ethical decision-making and behavior. While we cannot create a set of values that fully captures the richness and diversity of human experiences on a college campus, we can create a guide that helps students appropriately consider the feelings and needs of others when assessing moral dilemmas. We have a responsibility to teach students both how to respond to the dilemma at hand and how to be forward thinking about the potential implications for society in the future.

Responsibility of Higher Education

Institutions of higher education should provide an environment that offers a degree of safety in risk taking and experimentation, but also challenges students' ideas about what is

acceptable conduct. We must challenge students' thinking and behavior through dialogue about how their actions may conflict with their declared values or the community's values, and how they can act to fulfill these values (Winthrop, 1961). People define their character by testing authority—so we need to allow students to test alternative models and values, as we teach discipline and self-restraint through dialogue and "meaning-making" that ultimately leads to self-realization (Pavela, 1997).

To further the character education and moral development of students, the college or university environment should provide:

(a) a mission statement detailing core values and virtues;

(b) a general education curriculum that reinforces these core values and virtues as educational outcomes;

(c) an academic honor code;

(d) a student conduct code which details the rights and duties of citizenship;

(e) a student compact or creed to confirm the shared values of community membership;

(f) opportunities to engage in community service and community building;

(g) a campus ethos of welcoming and caring for students;

(h) new student programs that introduce students to institutional and community values, role models, traditions, and culture;

(i) campus governance structures for students;

(j) role modeling by University leaders;

(k) rewards and recognition for exemplary students, faculty, and staff who model values;

(l) support for spiritual and religious expression and development; and

(m) structured opportunity for public debate on moral issues (Dalton, 1999).

It is important to note that just having these 13 items present in a campus community is not enough. As we examine our written documents, policies and procedures, processes for governance, and program service delivery, we have to ask ourselves (a) How does the community define character, values, ethics, and moral development? (b) What kinds of knowledge and skills are necessary for moral development? (c) What can the institution and student affairs practitioners offer to promote learning related to moral development and decision-making and developing associated skills? and (d) How would we know if we were successful in our efforts?

Often colleges and universities focus on character education, because we equate character with behavior. Our efforts, whether labeled character education or moral development initiatives, should always relate to the educational outcomes that the institution deems important. These 13 items should seamlessly link together. Student affairs program and service delivery should be inextricably linked to the written outcomes detailed in the documents described. Each initiative should have clearly stated and measurable learning objectives that tie into and reinforce community values and the institutional mission as they relate to moral development.

For example, institutions with community values statements can make sure that all student affairs program and service delivery has teaching these values and developing the associated skills at the center of their work. Learning objectives clearly address how these values will be realized in specific terms, whether through information learned or through behavior change. We can then assess how each program or service contributes to promoting the community values. Through these efforts, we teach students about what the community

and individuals within the community value, how to honor what we each value within this context, and how to effectively communicate and act on these values.

Values Higher Education Reinforces

The importance of role modeling cannot be overestimated. Serving as an example to others is "learned not from words but from actions" (Dalai Lama, 1999, p. 182). Campuses and educators must model the values they espouse; they must help students experience society and reflect on their role in it; and they must act on their understanding that matters of the spirit reflect such a profound aspect of the human condition that they cannot be ignored on any campus (Wingspread Group, 1993).

Institutions of higher education have served as active participants in reinforcing the social competitiveness and materialism of students (Astin, 1993) through our construction of programs and service delivery that dichotomize those who have (higher intellectual ability, athletic talent, etc.) and those who have not (the average college student). Also "more academically selective institutions appear to negatively affect the development of civic values, religious beliefs, and cultural awareness" (Astin & Antonio, 2000, p. 6), as they reinforce the ideas of competition and intellectual pursuits for economic gain. We have to be mindful of the messages and values our policies and practices communicate.

As professionals in institutions of higher education, we should indicate that we value respect for truth, community, and commitment to the common good, and we must serve as advisors and mentors in times of moral crisis (Dalton, 1999). We also need to recognize how and when our own values and beliefs may not be congruent with our actions. We must intensely reflect on what prevents the congruence between our values and our actions and what we need

(skills, commitment, and experiences) that would create congruence. Only by understanding ourselves can we effectively serve our students.

Relational Nature of Moral Development

Since context serves as a critical component of ethical decision-making and therefore moral development, we must determine what factors students consider in formulating their decisions and actions. Students have indicated that peer culture and significant relationships play a critical role in their lives. As educators we must help students evaluate the choices they make and their implications for others. To be able to effectively assess the needs of others, we have to work with students to develop relational skills such as listening as well as critical thinking skills and values such as civility, care, and compassion.

Spirituality and Higher Education

Most educational structures do not have inherent in their physical or relational design a focus on the importance of developing relationships or on spiritual development. As life-changing events unfold in our lives and the lives of our students, we are all challenged to make meaning of our lives and the world around us. We must help students begin to find meaning and purpose, and to discover the passions of life and work. Most moral/ethical action becomes habitual eventually occurring with no conscious deliberation or reflection. This requires that students have developed the character and skills that allow these habitual decisions to be made in the best interest of the community rather than the individual.

Daudelin (1996) studied three ways of reflecting: solitary reflection, group reflection, and facilitated reflection. She found that solitary reflection and facilitated reflection both lead to greater intrapersonal learning. Her study also indicated that group reflection leads to enhanced interpersonal and contextual learning. This study reminds us to be mindful of the type of

learning being sought through reflection, to choose the appropriate way to guide reflection, and to carefully evaluate and select potential tools for facilitating reflection. We can intentionally design opportunities for reflection to teach students how to reflect on the critical elements of their contexts in order to make the best decisions and act consistently.

To effectively serve students, we must engage in critical self-examination as part of our student affairs training programs and our daily professional lives. We should work to define who we are as individuals, professionals, and community members; to define meaning, purpose, and passion in our lives; and to act with honesty and vulnerability in disclosing our own personal journeys with students who face the challenges and triumphs of their own journeys. Through sharing, we create connection. Knowledge as an end is not enough; students want and need to know that they have connection to others as they discover themselves and their communities.

Need for Future Research

This study has created many more questions than it has provided answers. A number of issues warrant further research. Only through this research can we determine how moral development occurs, what influences individuals consider in making moral or ethical decisions, and how these findings might further shape student affairs practice.

Defining the Constructs

As noted earlier, Kohlberg and Gilligan (Liddell, Halpin, & Halpin, 1992; Rest, 1999) envisioned two different constructs, care and justice. Rest (1999) further explored his belief that Gilligan was describing micromorality, characterized by attention to the relationships that impact our daily lives, and Kohlberg was describing macromorality, a movement toward an autonomous, impartial consideration of the greater needs of society. Interestingly, care seems to have been equated to external processing, connectedness to others, and relationships; justice

seems to have been equated to internal processing, impartiality, and a consideration for humanity. Arguably, this study seems to demonstrate that regardless of moral orientation, students are moving along continuums that consider these elements as the context of the moral dilemma.

This study did not examine moral reasoning and its associated developmental stages; rather it looked at the relationship of moral orientation to the degree of consideration given to certain contextual factors. Regardless of moral orientation, students often indicated that the same contextual factors would influence their moral decision-making with regard to the scenarios presented. Future research would examine the ideas of micromorality and macromorality.

Additionally, some questions have yet to be answered. Are the ethic of care and the ethic of justice real indicators of cognitive complexity? Have we failed to examine what Rest (1999) refers to as moral sensitivity or what could also be referred to as moral intention? I would argue that these ethics of care and justice do not indicate cognitive complexity. What seems more important is discerning the moral intention of the act and all the elements of context considered in order to arrive at the moral decision. It seems we need to operationally define care; justice; micromorality; macromorality; moral intention; and the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of each of these key concepts.

Moral Intention

Intentionality seems a critical element of moral decision-making. We need to explore with college students (a) What contextual considerations were evaluated? (b) Which consideration had the greatest bearing on the final decision? (c) Was the decision acted on? and (d) How principled were the final decisions and actions? Much of the work on moral

development and moral decision-making addresses the incongruence between cognitive stage development and moral action. An examination of intentionality might help to explain another step between moral thought and moral action.

Student Affairs and Institutional Support Mechanisms

Since students indicated they look to institutional values for guidance in responding to moral dilemmas, it would be interesting to know which programs, services, courses, etc., most impact our work with students. Some questions to answer through future research include (a) Are there particular institutional activities, services, or documents that reinforce what the community values? (b) What do students really want from the institution in terms of moral guidance? (c) How does moral incongruence between institutional behavior and stated values impact student behavior and values? and (d) Institutions of higher education impact student growth and development, but is it occurring in the ways for which we intentionally strive?

Much opportunity exists for research on how institutions intentionally shape the moral development of college students. Additional work is also needed on operationalizing the constructs of care and justice and exploring how students evidence moral growth and development through both their decision-making and their actions.

Self-Assessment Tool

A self-assessment tool and guide (Hight & Goldstein, 2004) for directing the creation of quality educational environments for moral development was prepared for student affairs practitioners [Appendix D]. This tool utilized the work detailed within this study to develop an instrument for assessing the current state of moral education and development on a particular campus. Once the tool is completed, either by an individual or a committee responsible for or interested in the moral development and education of college students, a series of questions

follows which allows for the consideration of critical areas in program planning and evaluation. These include initiating the work, considering the stakeholders, designing and implementing the process of program development and evaluation, assessing institutional politics, marketing and creating awareness of the efforts, and finally, evaluating the efforts in an ongoing manner.

Study Summary

The "most effective strengthening of moral and civic character occurs on campuses where curricular and extracurricular learning experiences are consciously woven into a larger, integrated whole" (Ehrlich, 1999, p. 8). Educational experiences that are limited to the acquisition of only knowledge and skill will, in the end, be detrimental to both the individual and the community. The University of South Carolina's motto, stated on the seal of the University, is "Emollit mores nec sinit esse feros" which translates to "learning humanizes character and does not permit it to be cruel" (Whitely et al., 1999, p. xiii). Student affairs practitioners, partnered with faculty and academic administrators, have a responsibility to insure that learning produces more compassionate and caring human beings. We have a responsibility for cultivating moral citizens who understand the needs of their local, national, and global communities.

As we consider the implication of issues explored within this study, we must recognize the many opportunities that exist for education in the moral, ethical, and character development of college students. Institutions of higher education and their academic and professional staff have a great responsibility for promoting learning and action, in all aspects of the curricular and co-curricular experiences that reinforce moral development. More importantly, we should "see our relationship with students as a revitalized form of voluntary association-- dedicated to fostering the intellectual and moral development of association members, and the good of the larger community" (Pavela, 1996, p. 2).

Chapter Summary

The researcher created a 150-item questionnaire to assess the importance of significant relationships; situational factors/circumstances; peer culture and influence; a cost-benefit analysis of consequences; institutional values; and religion, faith, and spirituality on moral decision-making and motivation. Demographic differences (sex, race, and class standing) among respondents were also examined relative to the degree of consideration given to certain contextual elements of the moral dilemmas presented. Data from participants in two courses were gathered over a two-week period beginning August 18, 2003, the start of fall classes, and ending August 29, 2003.

Implications of this study for student affairs practice include influencing the context of moral decision-making; examining higher education's responsibility for character and moral development; being mindful of the values reinforced by institutions of higher education; appreciating the importance of relationships and their impact on moral decision-making; and examining how institutions of higher education can link together moral life, spiritual life, and meaning making. These considerations impact the work we do and will continue to do so for some time to come.

Finally, areas for future research include better defining the constructs of care and justice; examining moral intention as a critical element of moral development; and exploring which student affairs and institutional support mechanisms most influence and assist students with moral meaning making and action.

REFERENCES

AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA. (1998). *Powerful partnerships: A shared responsibility for learning.* Retrieved May 5, 2003, from http://www.aahe.org/teaching/tsk_frce.htm

ACPA. (1996). *Student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs.* Retrieved May 7, 2003, from www.acpa.nche.edu

American Council on Higher Education. (1949). The student personnel point of view. In E.J. Whitt (Ed.), *College student affairs administration* (pp. 25-35). ASHE Reader Series. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

American heritage dictionary of the English language (4th ed.). (2000). Retrieved on December 3, 2001, from http://www.bartleby.com/61/

Arvizu, D.R. (1995). The care voice and American Indian college students: An alternative perspective for student development perspectives. *Journal of American Indian Education, 34*(3), 1-17.

Astin, A. (1993). Promoting social responsibility: A challenge for higher education. *Proceedings of the Institute for College Student Values,* Tallahassee, FL, 15-21.

Astin, H.S., & Antonio, A.L. (2000, November-December). Building character in college. *About Campus, 5*(5), 3-7.

Baab, D.A, & Bebeau, M.J. (1990). The effect of instruction on ethical sensitivity. *Journal of Dental Education, 54*(1), 44.

Bebeau, M.J. (1994). Influencing the moral dimension of dental practice. In J. Rest & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development in the professions* (pp. 121-146). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bebeau, M.J., Rest, J.R., & Yamoor, C.M. (1985). Measuring the ethical sensitivity of dental students. *Journal of Dental Education, 49*(4), 225-235.

Berkowitz, M.W., & Fekula, M.J. (1999, November-December). Educating for character. *About Campus, 4*(5), 17-22.

Blackburn, S. (1994). *Oxford dictionary of philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Blimling, G.S. (1990). Developing character in college students. *NASPA Journal, 27*, 266-273.

Burwell, R.M., Butman, R.E., & Van Wicklin, J. (1992). Values assessment at three consortium colleges: A longitudinal follow-up study (Houston, Texas, Houghton College). *ERIC Document Reproduction Service*, ED 345-635.

Cohen, E. (1982). Using the Defining Issues Test to assess stage of moral development among sorority and fraternity members. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 23*, 324-328.

Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative methods in psychology: A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155-159.

Colby, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1987). *The measurement of moral judgment, Volume 1: Theoretical foundations and research validation*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Dalai Lama, His Holiness The. (1999). *Ethics for the new millennium*. New York: Riverhead Books.

Dalton, J.C. (1999). Helping students develop coherent values and ethical standards. In G.S. Blimling, E.J. Whitt, & Associates (Eds.), *Good practice in student affairs: Principles to foster student learning* (pp. 45-66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Daudelin, M.W. (1996, Winter). Learning from experience through reflection. *Organizational Dynamics, 24*(3), 36-48.

Derryberry, W.P., & Thoma, S.J. (2000, May-June). The friendship effect: Its role in the development of moral thinking in students. *About Campus, 5*(2), 13-18.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Eberly, D.E. (Ed.). (1995). *The content of America's character: Recovering civic virtue*. Latham, MD: Madison Books.

Ehrlich, T. (1999, September-October). Civic and moral learning. *About Campus, 4*(4), 5-9.

Evans, N.J., Forney, D.S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Faris, E. (1929, February). The implication of behaviorism for character education. *Religious Education*, 117-121.

Foster, J.D., & LaForce, B. (1999). A longitudinal study of moral, religious, and identity development in a Christian liberal arts environment. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 27,* 52-68.

Fried, J. (2000). Maintaining high ethical standards. In M.J. Barr, M.K. Desler, & Associates (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed., pp. 410-424). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gates, H.L. (1998, March 9). The end of loyalty. *The New Yorker*, 34-44.

Gergen, K.J. (2001, Spring). From mind to relationship: The emerging challenge. *Education Canada, 41*(1), 8-11.

Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and 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., Ward, J.V., & Taylor, J.M. (Eds.). (1988). *Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gongre, W.M. (1981). *A study of moral judgment, using the Defining Issues Test, for three ethnic groups at Bacone College*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Good, J.L., & Cartwright, C. (1998). Development of moral judgement among undergraduate university students. *College Student Journal, 32,* 270-276.

Gump, L.S., & Baker, R.C. (2000). Cultural and gender differences in moral judgment: A study of Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 22*(1), 78-93.

Haan, N. (1991). Moral development and action from a social constructivist perspective. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development, Volume 1: Theory* (pp. 251-273). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hekman, S.J. (1995). *Moral voices, moral selves: Carol Gilligan and feminist moral theory*. Oxford, UK: Polity Press.

Hight, D., & Goldstein, A. (2004, February). *Quality educational environment for moral development: A self-assessment tool.* Presentation at the annual meeting of the Association for Student Judicial Affairs (ASJA), Clearwater Beach, FL.

Honderich, T. (1995). *The Oxford companion to philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press. Retrieved on June 6, 2003, from http://www.xrefer.com/entry/552792

Huck, S.W. (2000). *Reading statistics and research* (3rd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

The Internet encyclopedia of philosophy. (2003). Retrieved on June 6, 2003, from http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/e/ethics.htm#Normative%20Ethics

Kidder, R. (1993). *Institute for Global Ethics ethical fitness seminar*. Unpublished manuscript.

King, P. (2003, February). *Transforming communities, transforming ourselves.* Presentation at the annual meeting of the Association for Student Judicial Affairs (ASJA), Clearwater Beach, FL.

King, P.M., & Kitchener, K.S. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

King, P.M., & Mayhew, M.J. (2002). Moral judgement development in higher education: Insights from the Defining Issues Test. *Journal of Moral Education, 31*(3), 247-270.

Kohlberg, L. (1968). The child as moral philosopher. *Psychology Today, 7*, 25-30.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research.* Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Kohlberg, L. (1971a). *Structural issue scoring manual.* Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, Center for Moral Development and Education, Cambridge, MA.

Kohlberg, L. (1971b). Cognitive-developmental theory and the practice of collective moral education. In M. Wolins & M. Gottesman (Eds.), *Group care: An Israeli approach*. New York: Gordon & Breach.

Kohlberg, L. (1972). A cognitive-developmental approach to moral education. *Humanist, 6*, 13-16.

Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1983). *Moral stages: A current formulation and a response to critics*. New York: Karger.

Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1984). Moral stages: A current statement and a response to critics. In L. Kohlberg (Ed.), *The psychology of moral development* (pp. 212-319). San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kurtines, W.M., & Gewirtz, J.L. (1995). *Moral development: An introduction*. Boston: Allyson and Bacon.

Langford, P.E. (1995). *Approaches to the development of moral reasoning.* Hove, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Laurence, P. (1999, November-December). Can religion and spirituality find a place in higher education? *About Campus, 4*(5), 11-16.

Liddell, D. (1990). *Measure of moral orientation: Construction of an objective instrument measuring care and justice, with an investigation of gender differences.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

Liddell, D.L. (1990). *The Measure of Moral Orientation.* (Available from the author, University of Iowa, Division of Counselor Education, Iowa City, IA 52242).

Liddell, D.L., & Davis, T.L. (1996). The Measure of Moral Orientation: Validation and reliability evidence. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(5), 485-493.

Liddell, D.L., Halpin, G., & Halpin, W.G. (1992). The Measure of Moral Orientation: Measuring the ethics of care and justice. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*(4), 325-330.

Locke, D.C., & Tucker, D.O. (1988). Race and moral judgement development scores. *Counseling and Values, 32*, 232-235.

Loevinger, J. (1975). Issues in the measurement of moral development. *Proceedings of the Educational Testing Services Invitational Conference, Princeton, NJ, 35*, 57-68.

Lyons, N. P. (1983). Two perspectives: On self, relationships, and morality. *Harvard Educational Review, 53*, 124-145.

McCarthy, J.D., & Hoge, D.R. (1982). Analysis of age effects in longitudinal studies of adolescent self-esteem. *Developmental Psychology, 18*, 372-379.

Merriam-Webster dictionary. (2003). Retrieved on June 6, 2003, from http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary

Midgley, M. (1993). The origin of ethics. In P. Singer (Ed.), *Blackwell companions to philosophy: A companion to ethics* (pp. 3-13). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Miller, J., & Bersoff, D.M. (1992). Culture and moral judgment: How are conflicts between justice and interpersonal responsibility resolved? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 33-47.

Miller, J., & Luther, S. (1989). Issues of interpersonal responsibility and accountability: A comparison of Indians' and Americans' moral judgments. *Social Cognition, 7*, 237-261.

Noddings, N. (1992). Caring. In E.J. Whitt (Ed.), *College student affairs administration* (pp. 534-541). ASHE Reader Series. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Office of Institutional Research. (2002). *UGA fact book 2002*. Retrieved on October 12, 2003, from http://www.oir.uga.edu/factbks.htm

Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Pavela, G. (1996). The power of association: Defining our relationship with students in the 21st century [Electronic version]. *NASPA White Paper*. Washington, DC: NASPA.

Pavela, G. (1997 Summer). Civility and student life. *Stetson Law Review, Volume XXV11*. Retrieved November 11, 2001, from http://www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Departments/JPO/ethics/

Pavela, G. (2004, January 28). When will students listen? *ASJA Law and Policy Report, Number 128.* College Station, TX: ASJA.

Perlman, D.H. (1982, October 14). *The responsibility of colleges and universities for building ethical and moral character in their students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Council on Education, Minneapolis, MN.

Perry, W.G., Jr. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme.* Troy, MO: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Perry, W.G., Jr. (1999). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A Scheme* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rest, J. (Ed.) (1979a). *Moral development: Advances in research and theory*. New York: Praeger.

Rest, J.R. (1979b). *Development in judging moral issues.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rest, J. (1983). Morality. In P.H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & J. Flavell & E. Markham (Volume Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3, Cognitive development* (4th ed., pp. 556-629). New York: Wiley.

Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M.J., & Thoma, S.J. (1999). *Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kohlbergian approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rest, J., & Thoma, S. (1985). Relationship of moral judgment development to formal education. *Developmental Psychology, 21*, 709-714.

Rogers, J.L., & Dantley, M.E. (2001). Invoking the spiritual in campus life and leadership. *Journal of College Student Development, 42,* 589-603.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Saltzstein, H.D. (Ed.). (1997). Culture as a context for moral development: New perspectives on the particular and universal. *New Directions for Child Development, 76*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sanders, C.E. (1990). Moral reasoning of male freshmen. *Journal of College Student Development, 31*, 5-8.

Schrader, D.E. (1999). Justice and caring: Process in college students' moral reasoning development. In M.S. Katz, N. Noddings, & K.A. Strike, *Justice and caring: The search for common ground in education* (pp. 37-55). New York: Teachers College Press.

Shaver, D.G. (1985). A longitudinal study of moral development at a conservative, religious, liberal arts college. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26*, 400-404.

Smetana, J.G. (1989). Adolescents' and parents' reasoning about actual family conflict. *Child Development, 60*(5), 1052-1067.

Smetana, J.G. (1995). Context, conflict, and constraint in adolescent-parent authority relationships. In M. Killen and D. Hart (Eds.), *Morality in everyday life*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Smetana, J.G., Braeges, J.L., & Yau, J. (1991). Doing what you say and saying what you do: Reasoning about adolescent-parent conflict in interviews and interactions. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 6,* 276-295.

Smetana, J.G., Yau, J., Restrepo, A., & Braeges, J. (1991). Adolescent-parent conflict in divorced families. *Developmental Psychology, 27,* 1000-1010.

Sobesky, W.E. (1983/1994). In B. Puka (Ed.), *New research in moral development* (pp. 299-308). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Stephens, J.M., Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., & Beaumont, E. (2000, April 24-28). *Higher education and the development of moral and civic responsibility: Vision and practice in three contexts*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Sullivan, E.V. (1977). *Kohlberg's structuralism: A critical appraisal*. Ontario, Canada: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Thoma, S.J., & Ladewig, B.H. (1993). *Close friendships, friendship networks, and moral development during the college years.* Paper presented to the Society of Research in Child Development, New Orleans, LA.

Trow, M. (1975). Higher education and moral development. *Proceedings of the Educational Testing Services Invitational Conference, Princeton, NJ, 35,* 15-31.

University of Maryland Department of Sociology. (2003). *The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.* Retrieved on May 31, 2003, from http://www.bsos.umd.edu/socy/rosenberg.html

Wahrman, I.S. (1981). The relationship of dogmatism, religious affiliation, and moral judgement development. *Journal of Psychology, 108*(2), 151-154.

Whiteley, J.M. (1982). Approaches to the evaluation of character development. In J.M.Whiteley (Ed.), *Character development in college students* (pp. 111-172). New York: Character Research Press.

Whiteley, J.M., Mosher, R.L., Connor, D., Kalliel, K.M., Day, J.M., Yokota, N., & Porter, M.R. (1999). *Moral action in young adulthood*. Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for The First Year Experience & Students in Transition.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education. (1993). An American imperative: Higher expectations for higher education. In E.J. Whitt (Ed.), *College student affairs administration* (pp. 180-195). ASHE Reader Series. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Winthrop, H. (1961). Can we educate for a sense of value? *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1*(1), 35-47.

Wylie, R.C. (1989). *Measures of self-concept*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Young, J.S., Cashwell, C.S., & Woolington, V.J. (1998). The relationship of spirituality to cognitive and moral development and purpose in life: An exploratory investigation. *Counseling & Values, 43*(1), 63-69.

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Participation in this research study, entitled "Impacting the moral development of college students," will assist in the exploration of how college students make ethical decisions. The data gathered are related to research that will be published in a doctoral dissertation, as well as may be published in future work by the researcher. The study is being conducted by Donna L. Hight, a doctoral student in Counseling and Student Personnel Services, in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, University of Georgia, 402 Aderhold Hall, Athens, GA 30602; Telephone (706) 542-1812. This research is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Diane L. Cooper, in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, University of Georgia, 402 Aderhold Hall, Athens, GA 30602; Telephone (706) 542-1812.

The reason for conducting this research study is to provide student affairs practitioners with useful information regarding how students make meaning of, and ultimately act or fail to act upon, moral dilemmas. The benefits that you may expect to gain from participating in this study are: 1) knowledge that you contributed toward helping student affairs professionals better understand the moral decision-making of college students and 2) knowledge about yourself that may be helpful in making moral decisions.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may discontinue participation in the study at any time, without penalty. You may also elect not to answer any questions that you may be uncomfortable answering. If you do not volunteer to participate in the study it will not affect your degree completion nor will it affect any of the services that you may currently receive at The University of Georgia.

If you volunteer to participate in the study you will be asked to complete a questionnaire involving your moral orientation, self-esteem, and the impact of context on moral decision-making. This entire survey should not take more than 30 minutes to complete. There are no other foreseeable risks in participation of this study. Since you will not be asked to place your name on the questionnaire, your name/identity will not be attached to the data you provide. Participation in this research is anonymous. The information that you provide will be accessible only to the principal investigator and her dissertation committee members, if necessary, and will be destroyed by December 1, 2005.

If issues of concern arise while you are participating in this study, you can discuss them now or at a later date, with the principal investigator, Donna Hight, at (706) 542-1812 or by email: dlhight@uga.edu. An opportunity to be debriefed about the nature of the study will be offered at the conclusion of the survey. The principal investigator will answer any further questions about the research now or during the course of the project.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Donna L. Hight
Department of Counseling and Human Development Services
University of Georgia
402 Aderhold Hall
Athens, GA 30602
(706) 542-1812
dlhight@uga.edu

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D. Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE INSTRUMENT

You have been provided a computer scantron sheet on which to record your responses. Use the scales listed throughout the instrument. Go with your initial or first response, as it is typically most reflective of your decision-making process, and keep moving through the survey. If completely filling in the correct bubble slows your response time, please carefully mark the bubble with a small x, which corresponds to your response. If you complete the instrument before your classmates, you can then completely fill in the correct bubbles while you wait (if time does not permit, the researcher will fill in the bubbles later).

Please feel free to tear this page off and use the scales noted below to guide your responses. Some questions continue on another page, and this will serve as a handy reference.

Scale for 4 point items

1 Strongly agree
2 Somewhat agree/Agree (Items 1-10 use Agree)
3 Somewhat disagree/Disagree (Items 1-10 use Disagree)
4 Strongly disagree

Scale for 5 point items

1 Very important to making my decision
2 Important to making my decision
3 Would receive minimal consideration in making my decision
4 Not important to making my decision
5 Would not consider in making my decision

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Complete these questions on the computer scantron sheet provided. Your responses will remain completely confidential.

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. If you **strongly agree**, mark number 1 on the computer scantron sheet provided. If you **agree** with the statement, mark number 2 on the computer scantron sheet. If you **disagree**, mark number 3 on the computer scantron sheet. If you **strongly disagree**, mark number 4 on the computer scantron sheet.

		1 STRONGLY AGREE	2 AGREE	3 DISAGREE	4 STRONGLY DISAGREE
1.	I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	SA	A	D	SD
2.	I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	SA	A	D	SD
3.	All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	SA	A	D	SD
4.	I am able to do things as well as most other people.	SA	A	D	SD
5.	I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	SA	A	D	SD
6.	I take a positive attitude toward myself.	SA	A	D	SD
7.	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	SA	A	D	SD
8.	I wish I could have more respect for myself.	SA	A	D	SD
9.	I certainly feel useless at times.	SA	A	D	SD
10.	At times I think I am no good at all.	SA	A	D	SD

Directions for Completion of The Measure of Moral Orientation

Complete these questions on the computer scantron sheet provided. Do not write in your name on the computer scantron sheet. Your responses will remain completely confidential.

Read each dilemma and assume the role of the person in the dilemma. Rate each response which follows the dilemma as to whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with that response. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Your responses to these statements will help us determine how difficult decisions are made.

Read each statement carefully, but don't spend too much time debating your responses. Usually our initial reaction is the most accurate one.

Part 1 Dilemmas

Student Club

It is recruitment time for my student club. All new members must be approved by a vote of 90% of the membership. I have been a member for one year and I am considered being groomed for a leadership position. My roommate wants to join. After the introduction party where members meet those who want to join, I heard several older members making fun of my roommate.

1- Strongly agree
2- Somewhat agree
3- Somewhat disagree
4- Strongly disagree

Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

11. I don't want to do anything that would jeopardize my relationship with my roommate.
12. The members are entitled to their opinions.
13. I should not interfere with the natural course of events.
14. In order to avoid hurting my roommate, I should try to talk my roommate out of joining.
15. I should try to be objective about this situation.
16. I feel conflicted because I care about my friends, but I also care about my roommate.

Rate the following items based on the degree to which they would influence or impact your response to this particular moral dilemma.
1-Very important to making my decision
2-Important to making my decision
3-Would receive minimal consideration in making my decision
4-Not important to making my decision
5-Would not consider in making my decision
If each individual item varies in the level of consideration given to it, weight each of these items differently. If any of these items are of equal importance, you may assign the same degree of importance.

Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

17. My most significant or important relationships (with family, close friends, and/or boyfriend/girlfriend)
18. Circumstances unique to this moral dilemma
19. The reaction or influence of my peers
20. A cost-benefit analysis or weighing of the positive and negative consequences for me and others
21. The stated or unstated values or expectations related to my behavior, as determined by my college or university
22. My religious beliefs, spiritual beliefs, or faith, and the direction they provide

Plagiarism

I work for the student newspaper and have labored for several weeks on a series of articles on violence and the media. My articles are due to be published in two weeks. This morning I saw my roommate's term paper on the kitchen table. As I glanced through the paper, I recognized parts of it and realized that my roommate had copied word for word a sizable portion of my article. If my articles are published, my roommate's plagiarism will be discovered and his/her graduation will be jeopardized.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

23. I am hurt that my roommate did this, but I don't want to make it bad for him/her.
24. Regardless of the consequences the article was mine and I have a right to have it published.
25. I should be objective and rational about this, and not let my relationship cloud my judgement.
26. I know how important graduation is and I don't want to do anything that will keep my roommate from graduating.
27. I would not do anything to harm my friendship with my roommate.
28. My roommate deserves whatever happens to him/her.
29. I would look for a compromise solution so that no one would get hurt.
30. Regardless of the reasons for doing so, my roommate violated principles.
31. I am worried about hurting my friendship with my roommate.

Rate the following items based on the degree to which they would influence or impact your response to this particular moral dilemma.
1-Very important to making my decision
2-Important to making my decision
3-Would receive minimal consideration in making my decision
4-Not important to making my decision

5-Would not consider in making my decision
If each individual item varies in the level of consideration given to it, weight each of these items differently. If any of these items are of equal importance, you may assign the same degree of importance. Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

32. My most significant or important relationships (with family, close friends, and/or boyfriend/girlfriend)
33. Circumstances unique to this moral dilemma
34. The reaction or influence of my peers
35. A cost-benefit analysis or weighing of the positive and negative consequences for me and others
36. The stated or unstated values or expectations related to my behavior, as determined by my college or university
37. My religious beliefs, spiritual beliefs, or faith, and the direction they provide

Morgan

I have been married to Morgan for two years. We are both in college and do not have children. Three months ago Morgan was diagnosed as having cancer. The recommended treatment was intensive chemotherapy. Luckily, our insurance covers the medical bills.

Morgan has asked me to not tell his/her parents about the cancer because Morgan feels that they would interfere with the course of treatment and demand that Morgan come home. I promised not to tell Morgan's parents, but the treatments are creating mood swings that are very hard to deal with. Morgan's parents are hurt by this erratic behavior and blame it on our marriage, of which they were never very supportive.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

38. This is a matter of conflicting rights: Morgan's parents have a right to know, but Morgan also has a right not to tell them.
39. I made a promise and I should not break that promise no matter what.
40. I don't want to hurt Morgan, but we can't continue to overlook Morgan's parents' feelings; they feel hurt, too.
41. I have to think in terms of what is fair regardless of the consequences.
42. The primary issue would be to look for a compromise position, which would keep both Morgan and Morgan's parents from being hurt.
43. I am concerned about maintaining my relationship with Morgan's parents.
44. We all need each other right now; no one should go through this alone.

Rate the following items based on the degree to which they would influence or impact your response to this particular moral dilemma.

1-Very important to making my decision
2-Important to making my decision
3-Would receive minimal consideration in making my decision
4-Not important to making my decision
5-Would not consider in making my decision
If each individual item varies in the level of consideration given to it, weight each of these items differently. If any of these items are of equal importance, you may assign the same degree of importance. Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

45. My most significant or important relationships (with family, close friends, and/or boyfriend/girlfriend)
46. Circumstances unique to this moral dilemma
47. The reaction or influence of my peers
48. A cost-benefit analysis or weighing of the positive and negative consequences for me and others
49. The stated or unstated values or expectations related to my behavior, as determined by my college or university
50. My religious beliefs, spiritual beliefs, or faith, and the direction they provide

Karen

My friend Karen and I are in a class together. This class is required for graduation, and this is the only time it is being offered this year. Karen flunked the first test, but made an "A" on her paper and midterm. I have been working very hard in this class but have made only "Bs" so far. Last night Karen confided in me that the professor had taken a "personal interest" in her and that he had asked her to spend the night with him in exchange for an "A" in the class.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

51. This is none of my business and I should stay out of it.
52. I want to tell the department head, but that would ruin Karen's grade, and I don't want to hurt her.
53. Karen has a right to her own business.
54. The most important thing is that Karen not get hurt.
55. It is against the student code for a professor to do this. Regardless of the consequences, I should turn him in.
56. Going public would ruin Karen's reputation and would hurt both her and her parents.
57. This is really about conflicting rights: Karen and the professor's right to do what they want, and the rights of the other students in the class to not be disadvantaged.
58. I don't want to do anything to jeopardize my relationship with Karen.

Rate the following items based on the degree to which they would influence or impact your response to this particular moral dilemma.
1-Very important to making my decision
2-Important to making my decision
3-Would receive minimal consideration in making my decision
4-Not important to making my decision
5-Would not consider in making my decision
If each individual item varies in the level of consideration given to it, weight each of these items differently. If any of these items are of equal importance, you may assign the same degree of importance. Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

59. My most significant or important relationships (with family, close friends, and/or boyfriend/girlfriend)
60. Circumstances unique to this moral dilemma
61. The reaction or influence of my peers
62. A cost-benefit analysis or weighing of the positive and negative consequences for me and others
63. The stated or unstated values or expectations related to my behavior, as determined by my college or university
64. My religious beliefs, spiritual beliefs, or faith, and the direction they provide

Administrator

As editor of the college newspaper, I decide which stories are published. One of our reporters has just turned in a story about a university administrator who has been diverting student fees for his own personal use. I assume that the story is accurate. I called the administrator's house to speak with him about the discovery and to tell him we were going public with the story. His wife informed me that he was at the hospital with their child who is terminally ill. The deadline to run the story is midnight.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

65. Whatever he did, he probably did so with his child in mind.
66. In order to hurt the least number of people, I should drop the story and tell the administrator what I know and ask him to correct it quietly.
67. In spite of what we know, I just could not ruin his life.
68. Regardless of the consequences, I am concerned about the principles involved.
69. I would treat the administrator like everyone else, regardless of his personal circumstances.
70. I would do what I thought was fair, regardless of the consequences to myself or others.
71. This is an issue about conflicting rights: the students have a right to know about the man's actions, but he has a right to privacy.

Rate the following items based on the degree to which they would influence or impact your response to this particular moral dilemma.
1-Very important to making my decision
2-Important to making my decision
3-Would receive minimal consideration in making my decision
4-Not important to making my decision
5-Would not consider in making my decision
If each individual item varies in the level of consideration given to it, weight each of these items differently. If any of these items are of equal importance, you may assign the same degree of importance. Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

72. My most significant or important relationships (with family, close friends, and/or boyfriend/girlfriend)
73. Circumstances unique to this moral dilemma
74. The reaction or influence of my peers
75. A cost-benefit analysis or weighing of the positive and negative consequences for me and others
76. The stated or unstated values or expectations related to my behavior, as determined by my college or university
77. My religious beliefs, spiritual beliefs, or faith, and the direction they provide

Car

Last week while I was shopping at the mall I accidentally left my keys in my car. When I came out to get into the car, it was gone. The police recovered the car and arrested a suspect. While I was at the police station I met the suspect – an 18-year-old woman who was abused by her parents and kicked out of her parents' house. She told me she was desperate to get a job and was using the car to try to find a job after which would have left the car where she found it. She does not have a police record and apparently has not been in trouble before.

The decision to press charges against her is really up to me.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

78. Even though I don't know her, I think I would want to help this woman.
79. I would want to talk with her and find out more about her life before making a decision.
80. Going to jail would only make life worse and leave her alone in the world.
81. It is my duty to society to press charges.
82. She really needs to learn a lesson. If she doesn't pay for this, she will keep doing it.
83. In spite of what she did, if I sent her to jail I would feel terrible.
84. This is a legal issue. It is simply not my problem.

Rate the following items based on the degree to which they would influence or impact your response to this particular moral dilemma.
1-Very important to making my decision
2-Important to making my decision
3-Would receive minimal consideration in making my decision
4-Not important to making my decision
5-Would not consider in making my decision
If each individual item varies in the level of consideration given to it, weight each of these items differently. If any of these items are of equal importance, you may assign the same degree of importance. Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

85. My most significant or important relationships (with family, close friends, and/or boyfriend/girlfriend)
86. Circumstances unique to this moral dilemma
87. The reaction or influence of my peers
88. A cost-benefit analysis or weighing of the positive and negative consequences for me and others
89. The stated or unstated values or expectations related to my behavior, as determined by my college or university
90. My religious beliefs, spiritual beliefs, or faith, and the direction they provide

Richard

My brother Richard has been going with Amy for two years. We all go to the same college. Early this morning I saw Amy coming out of my neighbor's apartment. Obviously Amy had spent the night at his place.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

91. The most important thing to me is that Richard not get hurt.
92. Amy has a responsibility to tell Richard what is going on.
93. I would tell Richard because if I were in his situation I would want him to tell me.
94. My reaction would depend upon how Richard really feels about Amy.
95. Amy violated the rules of their relationship and Richard should know.
96. I don't want to be the one to hurt Richard with the news.
97. I am afraid that telling Richard would really jeopardize how close Richard and I are.
98. I would do what I thought was fair, regardless of the consequences.
99. Amy has the right to do what she wants, but Richard has rights, too.
100. Richard has a right to know that Amy is cheating.

Rate the following items based on the degree to which they would influence or impact your response to this particular moral dilemma.
1-Very important to making my decision
2-Important to making my decision
3-Would receive minimal consideration in making my decision
4-Not important to making my decision
5-Would not consider in making my decision
If each individual item varies in the level of consideration given to it, weight each of these items differently. If any of these items are of equal importance, you may assign the same degree of importance. Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

101. My most significant or important relationships (with family, close friends, and/or boyfriend/girlfriend)
102. Circumstances unique to this moral dilemma
103. The reaction or influence of my peers
104. A cost-benefit analysis or weighing of the positive and negative consequences for me and others
105. The stated or unstated values or expectations related to my behavior, as determined by my college or university
106. My religious beliefs, spiritual beliefs, or faith, and the direction they provide

Parents

My parents, after 30 years of a somewhat rocky marriage, are going through a divorce. My mother has been involved with another man for several years and has decided to leave the marriage. She seems very happy with her decision.

Each of my parents wants me to spend semester break at his or her particular home, but my father will be very upset if I go to my mother's because her "friend" will be there.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

107. I have the right to spend time with whomever I want.
108. I have an obligation to both my parents right now.
109. What I wish more than anything is to make everyone happy and not hurt them.
110. I don't want anything to come between my parents and me.
111. What I did would depend on how I thought each parent needed me.
112. Everyone has the right to happiness, even if the consequences are sometimes hurtful to others.
113. In spite of what my mother did, I would not do anything to hurt her.
114. I will do the objective thing – split my time between both of them.

Rate the following items based on the degree to which they would influence or impact your response to this particular moral dilemma.
1-Very important to making my decision
2-Important to making my decision
3-Would receive minimal consideration in making my decision
4-Not important to making my decision
5-Would not consider in making my decision
If each individual item varies in the level of consideration given to it, weight each of these items differently. If any of these items are of equal importance, you may assign the same degree of importance. Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

115. My most significant or important relationships (with family, close friends, and/or boyfriend/girlfriend)
116. Circumstances unique to this moral dilemma
117. The reaction or influence of my peers
118. A cost-benefit analysis or weighing of the positive and negative consequences for me and others
119. The stated or unstated values or expectations related to my behavior, as determined by my college or university
120. My religious beliefs, spiritual beliefs, or faith, and the direction they provide

Roommate

I have been living in the residence hall for the whole year. My roommate and I have become very good friends. The other day I was looking through my roommate's desk for a textbook. There on the desk was an envelope from the Student Health Center. I opened the letter and couldn't believe what it said: "The Students with AIDS Support Group will meet on Monday nights this quarter. We hope you will be able to join us." I know that I am not at risk of contracting this disease by casual contact.

1. Strongly agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

121. How I felt would depend on how close I really was to my roommate.
122. This is a terrible disease; my roommate needs me and I will be there.
123. I have to think in terms of what is fair to everyone regardless of the consequences.
124. My roommate should not be abandoned.
125. Everyone deserves what happens to them; this is no exception.
126. My relationship with my roommate is the most important thing; I would not do anything to hurt the relationship.
127. I think I have a right to know about my roommate's condition, although my roommate does have a right to privacy.

Rate the following items based on the degree to which they would influence or impact your response to this particular moral dilemma.
1-Very important to making my decision
2-Important to making my decision
3-Would receive minimal consideration in making my decision
4-Not important to making my decision
5-Would not consider in making my decision
If each individual item varies in the level of consideration given to it, weight each of these items differently. If any of these items are of equal importance, you may assign the same degree of importance. Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

128. My most significant or important relationships (with family, close friends, and/or boyfriend/girlfriend)
129. Circumstances unique to this moral dilemma
130. The reaction or influence of my peers
131. A cost-benefit analysis or weighing of the positive and negative consequences for me and others
132. The stated or unstated values or expectations related to my behavior, as determined by my college or university
133. My religious beliefs, spiritual beliefs, or faith, and the direction they provide

Part 2 Self-Description

Please rate the following statements as to how closely they describe your thought and feelings about yourself most of the time.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Somewhat disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Please use the scale above to indicate your response to each statement. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

134. When solving problems, honoring relationships is more important than honoring rights of individuals.
135. I try to resolve problems in a way that does not violate the rights of any of the people involved.
136. In practically all situations, I make decisions based upon the principles and rules rather than upon who is involved.
137. My decisions would favor those I care about more than those I do not know.
138. When I make decisions, I tend to be more subjective than objective.
139. In solving conflicts, I try to be rational without much regard to feelings.
140. I would not do anything to jeopardize my relationship with someone.
141. In all situations I try to do what I think is fair regardless of the consequences to myself or others.
142. In most situations, I can be impartial and unattached when making decisions.
143. In practically all situations I make decisions based upon who is involved rather than upon principles or rules.
144. I would rather be known as someone who is always objective and just, rather than someone who is sensitive to others' feelings.
145. When I make decisions I tend to be more concerned with how my decisions will affect others, rather than whether I am doing the "right" thing.
146. It is important to me to always be consistent: regardless of the circumstance or context, to live consistently by the "rules" of my life.
147. It is important to me to consider the context or the circumstances when I am making difficult decisions.

Student Demographic Information

Please use the scale below each item to indicate your response. Mark your responses on the computer scantron sheet.

148. Race/Ethnicity
1. Black or African-American
2. Hispanic, Latino, or Mexican-American
3. Asian American or Pacific Islander
4. Native American/Native People
5. White or Caucasian
6. Bi-racial or Multiracial
7. Other

149. Sex
1. Male
2. Female

150. What is your academic class standing?
1. Freshman (1st year)
2. Sophomore (2nd year)
3. Junior (3rd year)
4. Senior (4th year)
5. Other

APPENDIX C

DATA COLLECTION SCRIPT

1. Thank you for taking the time to consider participating in my doctoral dissertation research study. My name is Donna Hight and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services.
2. The title of my research is "Impacting the moral development of college students."
3. Through this research I hope to explore how college students make ethical decisions.
4. There are a few things that I would like to share with you:
    a. You do not have to take part in this study. I do appreciate your assistance and participation because it assists me with reaching my academic goals much as this class assists you.
    b. You can stop participating at any point without penalty.
    c. No discomfort, stress, or risk is associated with this study.
    d. Results of this study will be anonymous. I do not need your name, social security number, or any personal identifiers.
5. If you choose to volunteer for this study, you will be asked to do the following:
    a. Participate by completing the instrument by recording your responses on the computer scantron sheet provided. To speed the completion of the instrument, do not color the bubbles in completely if it slows your response time. I have promised your instructor that this would take no more than 30 minutes
    b. Please read the questions and move quickly through the questions. Trust your first thought and keep moving quickly through the instrument.
    c. Read the consent form provided.
    d. The questionnaires should take no more than 30 minutes to complete.
6. I will shortly hand out the questionnaires, computer scantron sheets, and pencils. Please feel free to tear out or remove the second page with the scales on it. It will allow you to move more quickly through the study if you reference these scales for each question
7. If anyone in the class identifies as biracial, multiracial, etc., these are noted as response numbers 6 and 7. You will see only 5 bubbles. Please write either the number 6 or 7 next to this question so I have your response. I will insure it is correctly recorded.
8. Directions are provided in writing at the beginning of each part of the questionnaire.
9. I will be available to answer any questions as you fill out the survey, raise your hand.
10. Are there any questions?

APPENDIX D

QUALITY EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT FOR MORAL DEVELOPMENT
A SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL
(Hight & Goldstein, 2004)

Does Your College Have an Environment Conducive to Moral Development?

Character development has been defined by Berkowitz & Fekula (1999) as "the growth of those aspects of the individual that represent his or her ethical worth, including behavior, cognition, affect, values, personality, identity, and skills that are not moral themselves but that support moral functioning" (p. 18). Character then describes high moral functioning, manifesting as outwardly observable positive behaviors. Moral development serves as the umbrella for the affective (values), cognitive (ethics), and behavioral (character) expressions witnessed throughout life, as well as during the collegiate experience. The moral development of college students serves as a broad construct to address through appropriate learning outcomes directed at the students' holistic development.

This instrument identifies specific policies, resources, and educational tools a campus can have or put in place to stimulate student involvement in activities associated with moral development. Using the scoring key, an educator can identify specific strengths and areas for improvement. Educators are then encouraged to develop initiatives and incentives for involving members of the campus community in dialogue and action. We believe educational environments that utilize the items below, and have high campus involvement, are more conducive to stimulating moral development.

Does your college/university currently have the policies, resources, or educational tools listed below? Evaluate your campus on the following scale.

(1) Is not in place--Program Development Needed
(2) Is in place but not effectively utilized--Needs Improvement
(3) A strength of our community--Model Program

Environmental Checklist

1. *Teaching about character*—ethics and institutional espoused values are infused across the curriculum (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999)
   ____ A mission statement detailing core values and virtues (Dalton, 1999)
   ____ A general education curriculum that reinforces these as educational outcomes (Dalton, 1999)

2. *Displaying character*—role modeling and mentoring occurs at both the professional and institutional levels (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999)
   ____ A campus ethos of welcoming and caring for students (Dalton, 1999)
   ____ New student programs that introduce students to institutional and community values, role models, traditions, and culture (Dalton, 1999)
   ____ Programs and services that continue to reinforce institutional and community values, role models, traditions, and culture (S. Scott Duex, personal communication, February 6, 2004)
   ____ Role modeling by campus leadership (Dalton, 1999)

3. *Demanding character*—clear, appropriate, and fair standards of both acceptable, expected behavior (student compact or creed) and unacceptable behavior exist in writing (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999)
   ____ An academic honor code (Dalton, 1999)
   ____ A student conduct code which details the rights and duties of citizenship (Dalton, 1999)
   ____ A student compact or creed to confirm the shared values of community membership (Dalton, 1999)

4. *Apprenticeship or practicing character*—active student engagement in self-governance and service (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999)
   ____ Opportunities to engage in community service and community building (Dalton, 1999)
   ____ Campus governance structures for students (Dalton, 1999)

5. *Reflecting on character*—both individual and facilitated examinations of personal and professional thinking and behavior (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999)
   ____ Rewards and recognition for exemplary students, faculty, and staff who model values (Dalton, 1999)
   ____ Support for spiritual and religious expression and development (Dalton, 1999)
   ____ Structured opportunities for public debate on moral issues (Dalton, 1999)

6. *Integrating character into the campus fabric*—elements practiced as mutually reinforcing actions, threading seamlessly together throughout the campus culture (King, 2003)
   ____ Gatekeeper who facilitates the moral development and education of students
   ____ Insuring that codes of conduct, honor codes, and community values statements send consistent messages about expectations for appropriate behavior (S. Scott Duex, personal communication, February 6, 2004)
   ____ Conducting appropriate evaluation and assessment to insure success

Total all scores for the items above, and use the scoring guide below.

44 – 51	Educational environment conducive to moral development. Continue to build on strengths by increasing involvement in existing policies, resources, and educational tools.
34 – 43	Some program development needed. Focus on increasing community involvement in existing policies, resources, and educational tools.
17 - 33	Program development and increased community involvement needed. Seek involvement from stakeholders.

Considerations for Program Planning and Evaluation Addressing Moral Development

Initiation

- How does one initiate change on your campus?
- Who gets the best response when initiating new ideas or change?
- How has the campus reacted to change in the past?
- What steps taken in the past have facilitated the adoption of change?
- What is the reputation of student affairs as a partner in the learning environment and development of students?

Stakeholders

- Who are your partners in the learning enterprise? Consider those internal and external to campus.

Process

- Who will champion the process and/or idea(s)?
- How will you create support?
- How will you insure efforts are consistent with the institutional and student affairs mission, vision, goals, and other significant institutional documents?
- How will you identify core values? How will you differentiate espoused values from values in action?
- Who will become the gatekeeper of efforts and weave them into the campus culture?

Institutional Politics

- How strong is the faculty senate? Staff senate? Student government?
- What role will each of these entities have in your process? Why?
- What institutional policies, procedures, and practices may be inconsistent with moral development and education? How will you respond if these are raised as issues?
- How will you reward and recognize those who support efforts and act consistently with them? How will you support the behavior desired from the entire campus community?

Marketing and Awareness

- What will a strategic plan look like? Who will direct this process? Who will be involved?
- How will you create community awareness—written means, verbal means, and ceremonial activities impacting a culture shift on campus?
- How will you make philosophical values real? How will you relate them to your service and educational efforts? Who will be involved?
- What do students, faculty, and staff need to do to successfully integrate these principles into campus life? Into their personal lives?

Evaluation

- Based on the type of programs you plan to create, what will you need to measure to assess impact?
- Who will be the person(s) or group(s) on your campus most closely involved in measuring the success of your efforts?

- What tools will be used for evaluation?