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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Justice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of systems of thought...in a just society the liberties of equal citizenship are taken as settled; the rights secured by justice are not subject to political bargaining or to the calculus of social interests...an injustice is tolerable only when it is necessary to avoid an even greater injustice. Being first virtues of human activities, truth and justice are uncompromising. (p. 3-4)

Thus philosopher John Rawls (1971) eloquently described justice in his landmark book A Theory of Justice. Justice in society has occupied the philosophical theory of such noted thinkers as Plato, Mills, and Locke. The importance of these theories is unquestioned. Therefore, the development of justice concepts in children and the implications of these justice concepts within an educational setting seem an appropriate and significant topic for study.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this dissertation are 1) to investigate children's concepts of justice in peer-peer conflict
situations within a cognitive-developmental framework 2) to determine if children's racial perceptions affect their justice concepts and 3) to explore the children's age, race, and sex as they may affect children's justice concepts.

Underpinning the cognitive-developmental approach to moral development are the theoretical roots developed by Jean Piaget in his work, the Moral Judgment of the Child (1932). Therein, Piaget explained his theory of moral development which focuses on how children think about moral issues. Piaget considered many aspects of moral thought and one entire section of the book is devoted to children's development of justice concepts. Lawrence Kohlberg (1963, 1964, 1969, 1976) has refined and extended Piaget's theory.

The cognitive-developmental approach emphasizes the role of cognitive development in children's ability to make moral judgments. Piaget and Kohlberg have delineated various developmental stages, each characterized by a certain type of moral thought, in the child's ability to formulate progressively more mature moral judgments. The cognitive-developmentalists have described how children respond to and judge moral situations and conflicts rather than the children's actual behavior in these situations. While cognitive development appears to be a necessary condition for the moral stages, it is not a sufficient one. Other variables such as the child's social experiences and role taking opportunities are some of the contributing factors to
moral growth.

Both Kohlberg and Piaget emphasized justice as the core of morality. Kohlberg (1967) stated that "moral development in terms of stages is a progressive movement toward basing moral judgment on concepts of justice" (p. 173). It is thus interesting that while other aspects of the cognitive-developmental approach have been consistently investigated (see Table 2, Chapter II), so few studies by comparison have specifically addressed themselves to children's justice concepts (Burns, 1972; Damon, 1975; Durkin, 1959a, 1959b, 1959c; Irwin and Moore, 1971; Johnson, 1972; Zavitz, 1969). Of these only a handful have focused on justice in peer-peer situations (Durkin, 1959a, 1959b, 1959c; Irwin and Moore, 1971; Johnson, 1972).

Most of the studies on moral development have used Piaget's story pairs or Kohlberg's moral dilemmas. The purpose in this investigation was to depict actual moral conflicts that frequently occur in the classroom—name calling, physical aggression and stealing. Rather than verbally describing the dilemmas to the children as done by Piaget, Kohlberg and others, these conflicts were presented by means of videotapes shown to the children on a small portable TV.

The second purpose of this dissertation deals with the influence of children's racial perceptions on their justice concepts. In order to include the racial factor, the race of the children interacting in the tapes was varied. In
some sequences, only white children appeared, in some only black children, and in others an integrated group. As research has quite consistently indicated, (see Table 3, Chapter II) children are racially aware by the age of four. In addition, children also express various racial attitudes at an early age. Thus it was believed that the children would perceive the racial differences in the children interacting in the tapes and that their racial perceptions might also influence the nature of their justice concepts. The relationship of racial perceptions to justice concepts is viewed as a very important purpose of this study since only one published article (Davidson, 1976) explored the relationship of moral development and an aspect of racial perceptions, i.e. prejudice.

The third purpose of this dissertation involves the investigation of potential antecedents of children's moral judgments: age, sex, race. Here again, the role of the subject's age and sex on their moral judgments has been well researched by others (see Table 2, Chapter II). However, far fewer studies have specifically compared the moral judgments of black and white children (Burns, 1972; Harris, 1970).

In light of these three purposes, this dissertation will explore the following specific questions:

1. What are children's concepts of justice in peer-peer conflict situations dealing with name-calling,
property rights, and physical aggression?

2. Within a cognitive-developmental framework, will the justice concepts of six year old children differ from those of ten year olds as predicted by Piaget and Kohlberg?

3. Will children's justice concepts differ as a function of the children's sex and/or race?

4. Will the specific situation that the children judge--name calling, property rights and physical aggression--influence the maturity of children's justice concepts?

5. Will the race of the children interacting in the conflict situation influence the maturity of the children's justice concepts?

Significance of the Study

The previous section has attempted to clarify and delineate the purposes of this study and the rationale for these purposes. Generally, these purposes have resulted from a lack of research in the specific areas considered here. In addition, this dissertation will hopefully contribute significantly to four main areas: research, methodology, implications for education, and implications for society.

The first area of significance, that of research, has already briefly been discussed in conjunction with the
purposes of the study. There are three specific aspects of this dissertation that will fill gaps in the research to date on moral development within a cognitive-developmental framework. As mentioned, although a plethora of research has investigated certain components of moral development such as consequences vs. intentions (see Table 2, Chapter II), fewer studies have dealt with justice concepts (Burns, 1972; Damon, 1975; Durkin, 1959a, 1959b, 1959c; Irwin and Moore, 1971; Johnson, 1962; Zavitz, 1969) and a paucity of studies have focused specifically on justice concepts among peers (Durkin, 1959a, 1959b, 1959c; Irwin and Moore, 1971; Johnson, 1962). Further, only the series of Durkin studies dealt with conflicts that actually occur frequently in the school setting with the others leaning more heavily on Piagetian type stories. Thus, this dissertation, by studying justice in peer-peer conflict situations that actually occur in school, should provide new and relevant research in the area. In addition, the relationship of moral judgment to racial perceptions is as yet a very recent area of investigation with only one piece of research (Davidson, 1976) published to date. By including the racial component in this study of justice concepts, a new realm of research is being charted. With the desegregation of school systems and the increased interracial contact among children, such a relationship between moral judgments and racial perceptions seems a logical and timely one to investigate. Finally,
this study considers race of the subject as a variable, one only seldom considered in the studies on moral development (Harris, 1970; Burns, 1972). This seems a most strange deficiency since so many studies have compared subjects' ages, sex and social class.

Second, this dissertation could make a significant contribution in the type of methodology used to study moral development. The majority of studies conducted thus far have relied on the methods of Piaget or Kohlberg. Piaget verbally told his subjects a story or pair of stories describing a wrongdoing and then questioned the subjects regarding moral aspects of the situation. So, too, Kohlberg has standardized six moral dilemmas which are verbally described to the subjects and which are followed by an open ended interview requiring the subjects to make moral judgments. Only a few studies have used novel means of presenting moral dilemmas. Chandler, Greenspan and Barenboim (1973) studied intentions vs. consequences by varying the medium of presentation: videotaped and verbally presented dilemmas. In a similar type of study, Rybash, et. al. (1975) varied the type of presentation (videotapes vs. verbally told dilemmas) in studying intention vs. consequences in kindergarten children. Both of these researchers found the use of videotapes to be an effective means of eliciting moral responses. Yet, virtually no published study has used videotapes to present peer-peer conflicts aimed at
determining justice concepts. Videotapes are able to present dilemmas more vividly and realistically than a verbally described situation. Because children are familiar with TV and enjoy watching it (Stein, 1972; Stevenson, 1972), employing TV in an interview session should provide children a relaxed and pleasurable experience, one that they can easily relate to and concentrate on. Therefore, it seems that the use of videotapes shown on a TV could be an effective method for younger as well as older children. If this method proves to be effective and practical, it could have ramifications for further research in this area.

Third, this research could have significant implications for education. Because the dilemmas depict actual classroom conflicts, an understanding of children's responses to them could assist a teacher in effectively handling these conflicts when they occur in the classroom. By knowing the children's developmental level of moral judgments, the teacher can proceed to enhance moral growth in the classroom. In addition, with the desegregation of school systems and increased racial contact among elementary aged children, whether or not children's conceptions of fairness are dependent on the race of the children being judged could prove to be valuable information to the teacher.

Fourth, and finally, this dissertation has definite social significance. Kohlberg (1970) has stated that "a genuine concern about the growth of justice in the child
implies a similar concern for the growth of justice in society" (p. 66). The educational institution is only one of the many social institutions in American society. The implications that this study has for education can also be extended to apply to these other institutions. In discussing the importance of stimulating the development of moral reasoning, Kohlberg and Turiel (1971) noted:

The attainment of the structural capacity for principled reasoning means understanding and acceptance of the principles of justice and human welfare which are the foundations of our constitutional democratic society. (p. 461)

**Procedures**

The procedures followed in order to achieve the purposes of this dissertation will be briefly described. First, a series of videotapes were made to portray the three types of moral conflicts—name calling, physical aggression, stealing. For each conflict situation, four different racial pairings were individually filmed: a white boy transgressing against a white boy, a black boy transgressing against a black boy, a black boy transgressing against a white boy, and a white boy transgressing against a black boy. Six boys who attended an integrated public school were selected by their teachers to act in the tapes. Therefore, there were 12 individual sequences—the three situations with the four different racial pairings for each.
The subjects were 32 lower class children who attended integrated public schools. They were equally divided by age (6 and 10 year olds), race (black and white), and sex (male and female). Each subject was individually interviewed on two separate occasions, one month apart. At each session, subjects viewed six of the 12 taped sequences presented in random order. Following the viewing of each sequence, the subjects answered moral judgment questions. The open ended interview was adapted from the format of Piaget and Kohlberg and designed to elicit from the children their concepts of justice in response to the situations presented.

The tape recorded interview was then transcribed and the subject's response sheet was coded to prevent any possibility of experimenter bias. A six point justice concepts scoring system, based on Kohlberg's six stages and adapted for use in this study was developed by the researcher. The scoring system reflected six developmental levels in the maturity of children's justice concepts. Three independent raters were trained to assist with the scoring. After the data were scored, they were analyzed using a mixed analysis of variance design. There were five independent variables: three between variables (race, age and sex of subjects) and two within or repeated variables (nature of the situation in the videotapes and racial pairings of the children in the videotapes). The dependent variable was the child's level of moral maturity as measured by the justice concepts.
scoring system.

**Definition of Terms**

The key terms of this study were defined within the theoretical framework established as follows:

1. **Justice:** "Respect for the rights of others based on considerations of equality and reciprocity" (Kohlberg, 1967, p. 182).

2. **Moral judgment:** "Judgment about the right and the good of an action" (Kohlberg, 1967, p. 178) as verbally expressed by the child.

3. **Racial perceptions:** The interaction of a child's racial awareness and racial attitudes that may influence his/her response to a given situation.

**Limitations of the Study**

Although a researcher attempts to insure all safeguards of internal and external validity, all studies inherently contain limitations which the researcher must recognize.

The major limitation of this study involves the sample. The researcher had hoped to have a randomly selected sample of 128 children. However, human subjects' research guidelines required that written permission be obtained from the subjects' parents. Because of the difficulties involved
with the parents' returning of the signed permission, a repeated measures design was adopted for a sample of 32 subjects. In addition, the mere fact that the subjects had written parental permission may have biased the sample. Thus, any generalizing regarding the findings can only be made tentatively and cautiously.

A second limitation of the study was that the videotapes shown to the subjects were black and white instead of color. Here, too, the researcher was constrained by the realities of the situation. Although the original tapes were filmed in color, they were re-edited in black and white to fit the portable reel-to-reel playback unit. Because neither school that the subjects attended had videotape equipment, the researcher had to transport portable units which only were able to show black and white tapes.

Preview of the Remainder of the Dissertation

Chapter I has presented a basic introduction to this dissertation. There are a total of five chapters in the dissertation. Chapter II has a threefold purpose: to establish the theoretical framework upon which the dissertation is based; to review previous research which pertains to this investigation; and to generate the hypotheses that will guide this study.

Chapter III describes the methodology used in conducting this investigation. It includes a description of the
videotapes, the development of the interview questions and
the scoring system; an analysis of the pilot study, a de-
scription of the subjects and the experimental procedures,
and an explanation of the experimental design.

Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data. It sets
forth the results of the analysis of variance, several cor-
relations, and some descriptive analyses of various aspects
of the data. It examines the hypotheses in terms of the re-
sults of the statistical analysis.

Chapter V discusses the results of the study in terms
of their relationship to the theoretical framework, other
research, and implications for the educational setting. It
also proposes further research that can be conducted and
summarizes general conclusions regarding this study.
The purpose of this chapter is threefold: to establish the theoretical framework upon which this dissertation is based; to review previous research which pertains to this investigation; and to generate the hypotheses that will guide this study.

One must bear in mind that this dissertation adopts a definite theoretical position, that of the cognitive-developmentalists as explicated by Jean Piaget and Lawrence Kohlberg. In addition, this dissertation relates two areas of empirical research, moral development and racial awareness and attitudes.

This chapter is divided into seven sections. Each respective section will describe and discuss the following:

1. The theory of moral development postulated by Jean Piaget
2. The extension and refinement of Piaget's theory by Lawrence Kohlberg
3. The research conducted to substantiate Piaget's
general theory of moral development

4. Those studies dealing specifically with children's concepts of justice within a Piagetian framework

5. The studies that have used Kohlberg's moral dilemmas

6. The theory and research dealing with racial awareness, attitudes and preferences

7. The hypotheses guiding this study

Piaget's Theory of Moral Development

Piaget has elaborated a complex theory of moral development which reflects aspects of his general theory of cognitive growth. Piaget viewed morality as an individual's respect for the rules of the social order and a sense of justice involving reciprocity and equality (Piaget, 1932; McCandless and Evans, 1973; Hoffman, 1970).

Piaget used two basic methods to obtain the data from which he derived his formulations regarding moral development. First, he observed children in order to study in depth their awareness and practice of rules of children's games, specifically the game of marbles. Second, Piaget verbally told the children a story or a pair of stories which described a wrong doing. Following the story or stories, Piaget asked the children various questions which required them to make a moral judgment (see Appendix A).
From these observations, Piaget constructed his theory of moral development which delineates the variables and elements involved in children's moral judgments as verbalized by them (Piaget, 1932). His theory did not concern itself with moral behavior. Piaget delineated two broad stages in a child's moral development with a transitional stage between them. The moral stages are age related and dependent upon the child's stage of cognitive development. The two stages are 1) moral realism (morality of constraint, heteronomous morality) and 2) reciprocity (morality of cooperation, autonomous morality).

The first stage, moral realism, occurring during the preoperational stage of development, is especially evident in 5, 6, and 7 year olds. This stage is characterized by a child's egocentricity and by adult constraint. Because the child feels that rules and standards imposed by adults and/or older children are sacred and unalterable, these rules become moral duties to which the child believes he must adhere. Thus, morality is heteronomous— it results from standards imposed upon the child by another, i.e. adult or older child. In heteronomous duty, the child equates "good" with obedience and conformity. The "letter rather than the spirit of the law" (Piaget, 1932, p. 111) is paramount. At this stage, the child's respect is unilateral, i.e. based on authority and prestige. During this stage, children can not separate objective (amount of damage) and
subjective (intention) aspects of an act, and judge acts in terms of their consequences.

The second stage, reciprocity, begins at about age 9 during concrete operations. Its salient feature is the influence of the child's peer group. The child's thinking and actions are evolving from egocentric to socialized. Through cooperation and solidarity with his/her peers, the child now has developed mutual respect, i.e. based on equality among peers. Morality is now autonomous, based on ideas and values he/she has evolved from social interaction and experiences. Rules are to serve the social good and therefore can be changed through social agreement. Children now differentiate subjective and objective responsibility and judge acts in terms of intentions rather than consequences. In summary, because of cooperation and mutual respect, a child bases moral judgments on reciprocity.

Stages of development are evident in other areas of moral judgments. Regarding lying, children appear to progress through three distinct phases. Before age 6, young children view a lie as a "naughty" word to which adults negatively react. Therefore lying is a verbal utterance in the category of obscenities and other language the family finds objectionable (Duska and Whelan, 1975). Between the ages of 6-10, a lie consists of anything that isn't true including mistakes, and exaggerations. Therefore the farther a lie deviates from the truth, the worse it is considered in
the eyes of the child. Around age 8, however, mistakes are dropped from the category of lies. By the time the child reaches 10, a lie has evolved to become a statement that is intentionally false. Unlike the young child, the older child believes a lie is worse if it closely resembles the truth and can thus easily be believed.

Specifically in the area of justice, Piaget proposed three broad stages which can be superimposed on his general moral development stages. Piaget (1932) described these accordingly:

One period, lasting up to ages of 7-8 during which justice is subordinated to adult authority; a period contained approximately between 8-11, and which is that of progressive equalitarianism, and finally a period which sets in towards 11-12, and during which purely equalitarian justice is tempered by considerations of equity. (p. 315)

Children's judgments in the area of justice progressively change along several dimensions.

1. Immanent Justice

Children in the stage of moral realism believe that all wrongdoing must be punished and that "automatic punishments emanate from things themselves" (Piaget, 1932, p. 251). Therefore if an individual has stolen something, escapes the scene of the crime but two days later falls off a bridge and drowns, immanent justice is operating. Children in the stage of reciprocity, however, understand naturalistic causality, realize that all wrongdoing is not punished,
and abandon the notion of immanent justice.

2. Expiatory punishment to punishment by reciprocity

Young children, influenced by adult constraint and rules of authority, believe in expiatory punishments which are arbitrary in nature in that there is no relationship between the content of the wrongdoing and the content of the subsequent punishment. Piaget (1932) explained that, in the eyes of the child, when someone has transgressed

the only way of putting things right is to bring the individual back to his duty by means of a sufficiently powerful method of coercion and to bring home his guilt to him by means of a painful punishment. (p. 205)

In contrast, older children, influenced by cooperation and rules of equality, base punishments on the principle of reciprocity with a relationship between the content of the wrongdoing and the content of the punishment. Children want the punishment to "serve to make the transgressor feel that the bond of solidarity has been broken and that things must be put right again" (Piaget, 1932, p. 227). Reciprocal punishment can take various forms: exclude the child from the social group; punish the child in accordance with the consequences of the act; deprive the child of the thing he/she has misused; do to the child exactly what he/she has done; make the child pay for or replace what was misused; and censure the child.
3. Retributive justice to distributive justice

When faced with a situation requiring a judgment of fairness or justice, younger children advocate retributive justice, i.e. punishment should follow any wrongdoing. As the child grows older (8-11), he/she puts emphasis on equality of treatment and thus reciprocal punishment. Finally, the child adheres to distributive justice, considering each situation individually and taking into account the factors of both equality and equity.

Piaget (1932) described the differences between retributive and distributive justice as follows:

Children who put retributive justice above distributive are those who adopt the point of view of adult constraint, while those who put equality of treatment above punishment are those who, in their relations with other children, or more rarely, in the relations of mutual respect between themselves and adults, have learnt better to understand psychological situations and to judge according to norms of a new moral type. (p. 268)

Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development

Lawrence Kohlberg, a cognitive-developmentalist, has refined and extended Piaget's theory of moral development. Like Piaget, Kohlberg's work emphasized moral judgments rather than moral behavior or action. Kohlberg interviewed boys ranging in age from 10-16 describing to them 10 hypothetical moral dilemmas. Based on the subjects' responses to questions dealing with these dilemmas, Kohlberg has
formulated a cohesive stage theory of moral development (Kohlberg, 1963, 1964, 1969). Kohlberg proposed that there are six developmental stages in moral judgments which reduce to three levels of moral judgment (see Table 1). Originally each of the stages was further described in terms of 25 universal aspects of moral judgment such as "Value of Human Life" or "Motive." Each of these aspects was defined and applied differently in each of the six stages. Since his earlier research, Kohlberg has further refined his own theory. Presently, moral judgments are defined by 10 moral issues (e.g., punishment and blame, property) and 13 concerns (e.g., sanctions, individual welfare) as they are applied to the issues. An individual's stage of moral development can be determined by using Kohlberg's standardized issue scoring system to evaluate an individual's response to six moral dilemmas (Kohlberg, et. al., 1975; see Appendix B for moral dilemmas).

Although Kohlberg's stages coincide with Piaget's descriptively, Kohlberg's interpretation of these stages contrasts with Piaget's (Kohlberg, 1963). Kohlberg believes that his stages meet the criteria for genuine developmental stages whereas Piaget's moral stages do not. Kohlberg (1976a) described the concept of stages as follows:

1. Stages are "structured wholes," or organized systems of thought. Individuals are consistent in level of moral judgment.
## TABLE 1

THE SIX MORAL STAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level and Stage</th>
<th>Content of Stage</th>
<th>Reasons for Doing Right</th>
<th>Social Perspective of Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL I—PRECONVENTIONAL</strong>&lt;br&gt;Stage 1—Heteronomous Morality</td>
<td>To avoid breaking rules backed by punishment, obedience for its own sake, and avoiding physical damage to persons and property.</td>
<td>Avoidance of punishment, and the superior power of authorities.</td>
<td><strong>Egocentric point of view.</strong> Doesn’t consider the interests of others or recognize that they differ from the actor’s; doesn’t relate two points of view. Actions are considered physically rather than in terms of psychological interests of others. Confusion of authority’s perspective with one’s own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL II—CONVENTIONAL</strong>&lt;br&gt;Stage 2—Individualism, Instrumental Purpose, and Exchange</td>
<td>Following rules only when it is to someone’s immediate interest; acting to meet one’s own interests and needs and letting others do the same. Right is also what’s fair, what’s an equal exchange, a deal, an agreement.</td>
<td>To serve one’s own needs or interests in a world where you have to recognize that other people have their interests, too.</td>
<td><strong>Concrete individualistic perspective.</strong> Aware that everybody has his or her own interest to pursue and these conflict, so that right is relative (in the concrete individualistic sense).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL III—CONVENTIONAL</strong>&lt;br&gt;Stage 3—Mutual Interpersonal Expectations, Relationships, and Interpersonal Conformity</td>
<td>Living up to what is expected by people close to you or what people generally expect of people in your role as son, brother, friend, etc. “Being good” is important and means having good motives, showing concern about others. It also means keeping mutual relationships, such as trust, loyalty, respect and gratitude.</td>
<td>The need to be a good person in your own eyes and those of others. Your caring for others. Belief in the Golden Rule. Desire to maintain rules and authority which support stereotypical good behavior.</td>
<td><strong>Perspective of the individual in relationships with other individuals.</strong> Aware of shared feelings, agreements, and expectations which take primacy over individual interests. Relates points of view through the concrete Golden Rule, putting yourself in the other guy’s shoes. Does not yet consider generalized system perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL IV—CONVENTIONAL</strong>&lt;br&gt;Stage 4—Social System and Conscience</td>
<td>Fulfilling the actual duties to which you have agreed. Laws are made by the institution, and you follow them to avoid being caught and punished.</td>
<td>To keep the institution going as a whole, to avoid the confusion that would reign if authorities couldn’t maintain order.</td>
<td><strong>Differentiates societal point of view from interpersonal agreement and in the concrete individualistic sense.</strong> View from the perspective of society as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL V—EMERGENT</strong>&lt;br&gt;Stage 5—Systemic Interpersonal Morality and Values</td>
<td>Following rules as a way of maintaining a stable, orderly system where people get what is expected of them (in their role, in their society).</td>
<td>To maintain the system.</td>
<td><strong>Systemic perspective.</strong> Does not yet consider generalized system perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL VI—SYSTEMIC</strong>&lt;br&gt;Stage 6—Universalism, Relationships, and Conformity</td>
<td>Fulfilling duties to which one is committed. “It’s the right thing to do,” regardless of institutional expectations.</td>
<td>To maintain the system.</td>
<td><strong>Systemic perspective.</strong> Does not yet consider generalized system perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 4—Social System and Conscience

Fulfilling the actual duties to which you have agreed. Laws are to be upheld except in extreme cases where they conflict with other fixed social duties. Right is also contributing to society, the group, or institution.

To keep the institution going as a whole, to avoid the breakdown in the system "if everyone did it," or the imperative of conscience to meet one's defined obligations (Easily confused with Stage 3 belief in rules and authority; see text.)

LEVEL III—POST-CONVENTIONAL, or PRINCIPLED

Stage 5—Social Contract or Utility and Individual Rights

Being aware that people hold a variety of values and opinions, that most values and rules are relative to your group. These relative rules should usually be upheld, however, in the interest of impartiality and because they are the social contract. Some nonrelative values and rights like life and liberty, however, must be upheld in any society and regardless of majority opinion.

A sense of obligation to law because of one's social contract to make and abide by laws for the welfare of all and for the protection of all people's rights. A feeling of contractual commitment, freely entered upon, to family, friendship, trust, and work obligations. Concern that laws and duties be based on rational calculation of overall utility, "the greatest good for the greatest number."

Prior-to-society perspective.
Perspective of a rational individual aware of values and rights prior to social attachments and contracts. Integrates perspectives by formal mechanisms of agreement, contract, objective impartiality, and due process. Considers moral and legal points of view; recognizes that they sometimes conflict and finds it difficult to integrate them.

Stage 6—Universal Ethical Principles

Following self-chosen ethical principles. Particular laws or social agreements are usually valid because they rest on such principles. When laws violate these principles, one acts in accordance with the principle. Principles are universal principles of justice: the equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons.

The belief as a rational person in the validity of universal moral principles, and a sense of personal commitment to them.

Perspective of a moral point of view from which social arrangements derive. Perspective is that of any rational individual recognizing the nature of morality or the fact that persons are ends in themselves and must be treated as such.

2. Stages form an invariant sequence. Under all conditions except extreme trauma, movement is always forward, never backward. Individuals never skip stages; movement is always to the next stage up.

3. Stages are "hierarchical integrations." Thinking at a higher stage includes or comprehends within it lower-stage thinking. There is a tendency to function at or prefer the highest stage available. (p. 178)

Through empirical cross-cultural research, Kohlberg has validated the invariant sequence of his stages. In addition, they reflect universal age trends, differ qualitatively from each other and require a certain level of cognitive growth.

Kohlberg (1969) explained that:

- his stage definitions assume that Piagetian concrete operations are necessary for conventional (stages 3 and 4) morality and that formal operations are necessary for principled (stages 5 and 6) morality. (p. 391)

An individual progresses to higher stages as a result of many factors such as cognitive growth, role-taking opportunities and participation in social groups. A child's social experiences and interaction with its social environment play a major role in stimulating moral development.

Kohlberg (1976b) has emphasized that:

- In understanding the effects of social environment on moral development, then, we must consider that environment's provision of role-taking opportunities to the child. Variations in role-taking opportunities exist in terms of the child's relation to his family, his
peer group, his school, and his social status vis-a-vis the larger economic and political structure of the society. (p. 49-50)

Kohlberg (1976b) has further noted that "children high in peer participation are more advanced in moral stage than those who are low" (p. 50). Therefore, while the sequence of moral development remains invariant, the rate of progression through the stages varies with each individual. In addition, Kohlberg pointed out that a person's moral development may end at any stage. While the dominant stage for adults is stage 4, many adults will never attain stages 5 and 6.

Kohlberg also found that people are consistent in their use of a single type of moral thinking. Approximately 50% of an individual's moral judgments reflect his/her dominant stage of development while the remaining 50% fall into the stages immediately above or below the dominant stage (Kohlberg, 1969).

Kohlberg, like Piaget, emphasized justice as the core of morality. Kohlberg viewed justice in terms of both the value and equality of all peoples and reciprocity in human relations. Kohlberg (1967) stated that "moral development in terms of stages is a progressive movement toward basing moral judgment on concepts of justice" (p. 173).
Research on Piaget's Theory of
Moral Development

Much research has been conducted within a Piagetian framework on various aspects of moral development. Those selected for review here dealt with variables (age, sex, race) similar to those under investigation in this research.

Piaget's notion that children's judgments regarding a wrongdoing progress from an emphasis on the consequences of the act to one of intentions motivating the act has been well documented.

Peterson, Peterson and Finley (1974) compared the ability of preschoolers, second graders and adults to make judgments based on consequences and intentions. Each subject was exposed to sets of story pairs which presented a well-intentioned act causing high damage in contrast to an ill-intentioned act causing low damage. The characters in the story pairs varied to compare child-child, adult-adult, adult-child, child-adult. For example, the story pair might contrast an ill-intentioned adult causing low damage with a well-intentioned child causing high damage. The researchers substantiated Piaget's claim that as one matures one will consider intentions above consequences. They found that adults made significantly more intentional judgments than second graders, who, in turn, made more intentional judgments than preschoolers. Second graders made significantly more damage based than intention based judgments; however,
they were more likely to pass intention based judgments when comparing a well-intentioned high damage adult with an ill-intentioned low damage child. This trend can be explained in terms of Piaget's belief that children have unilateral respect for adults. The researchers found no significant sex differences among the preschool or second grade sample.

In a series of studies, Boehm (1962a, 1962b) studied consequences vs. intentions and peer reciprocity vs. adult constraint. In the first study (1962a), Boehm compared gifted and average intelligence school aged children (ages 6-9) from upper middle and working class homes. Each subject heard four stories: two involving consequences vs. intentions and two involving adult constraint vs. peer reciprocity. Regarding judgments of damage vs. intention, Boehm found that academically gifted children and upper middle class children matured earlier than their average intelligence or working class counterparts. However, regarding adult constraint vs. peer reciprocity, Boehm discovered that working class children at both IQ levels matured earlier than their upper middle class counterparts.

Boehm (1962b) replicated this study using a different sample and the additional variable of type of school attended by the subjects (Catholic Parochial or public). Regarding damage vs. intent, she found that Catholic students regardless of IQ or social class matured earlier than comparable public school students. However, academically
gifted upper middle class students in both types of schools matured earliest in this regard. Concerning adult constraint vs. peer reciprocity, working class students matured the earliest while academically gifted students scored higher than their average intelligence counterparts.

Boehm and Nass (1962) investigated the relationship of age (6 years-12 years) and social class (working, upper middle) to moral development. The children heard four Piagetian type stories designed to illustrate a certain dimension of moral judgment: intentions vs. consequences, lying, and peer reciprocity vs. adult constraint. The results indicated no significant differences in social class or sex regarding moral development. However, significant age differences were found in the level of moral judgment in the direction predicted by Piaget.

Whiteman and Kosier (1964) studied consequences vs. intentions in moral judgments as it relates to age (7-12), IQ (70-145), and sex by asking subjects to judge Piaget's moral dilemma story pairs. The results indicated no significant sex differences. They did show, however, that mature responses increase as a function of age, and IQ within each age group. In addition, because the researchers found children over 10 who still made immature responses, they concluded that maturity of moral judgment is "a function of increases in mental age rather than advances in chronological age alone" (Whiteman and Kosier, 1964, p. 487).
In research designed to compare moral development in black and white children, Harris (1970) studied 10 year old boys of four different social classes. The researcher interviewed subjects using Piagetian story pairs which dealt with five moral attitudes: consequences vs. intentions, immanent punishment, solutions to transgressions (nonpunitive solutions), solutions to transgressions (physical punishment), and the meaning of rules. An analysis of variance indicated that white boys were significantly more mature on the immanent punishment and physical punishment tests. There was a significant social class effect across all five aspects indicating that "both white and Negro children of higher social class groups are more mature in moral attitudes than children of lower social class groups" (Harris, 1970, p. 370). In addition, moral maturity was significantly related to the WISC vocabulary test.

Several studies have investigated the relationship between moral development and other aspects of development.

Grinder (1964) studied the relationship of moral judgment to moral behavior. Moral judgment in children in grades 2, 4, and 6 was assessed by children's responses to stories; moral behavior was measured by the subject's ability to resist temptation, i.e., cheating during a game situation. While maturity of moral judgment increased significantly for both sexes with age, tests of correlation between moral judgment and resistance to temptation were
nonsignificant.

In a study relating cognitive and affective measures of moral development, Porteus and Johnson (1965) studied 9th grade males and females. The cognitive element of moral development was measured by the use of Piagetian type moral judgment stories. The affective measure of moral development involved a story completion task in which the central character commits or is about to commit an undetected transgression. In addition, each subject completed sociometric instruments. The results showed significant sex differences with girls demonstrating greater moral maturity than boys on both measures. These were the only significant results.

Jensen and Hughston (1973) studied the relationship between story content, type of sanction and children's moral judgment. Subjects (ages 4-5) heard 18 stories describing a situation followed by a sanction (the character rewarded or punished). In six stories, the character performed a socially approved act, in six a neutral act, and in six a socially unaccepted act. Following each story, the subject rated the act as good or bad. All main effects—age, type of sanction, and story content—were significant. The researcher concluded that "the influence of the sanction is affected by the content of the story with negative acts relatively more independent of sanctions than neutral or positive acts" (Jensen and Hughston, 1973, p. 53).
Research Investigating Children's Concepts of Justice

Research has also been conducted, within a Piagetian framework, dealing specifically with children's concepts of justice.

Durkin (1959a, 1959b, 1959c) conducted a series of studies on children's justice concepts. In one (1959b), she presented white middle class subjects of three grade levels (2, 5 and 8) a story in which an act of physical aggression between children occurred. Although the children's responses to the situation indicated that kinds of justice concepts are significantly related to chronological age, they did not support Piaget's contention that reciprocity as a justice principle increases with age. Durkin (1959b) stated that "8th graders like those in grade 2 tend to seek justice in an authority person although the reasoning is different" (p. 64). She did find, however, that the emergence of 'equity' as postulated by Piaget increases with age.

Using the same sample, Durkin conducted a similar study (1959a) dealing with property rights and defamation of character (cheating, name calling). Again she found that reciprocity as a justice principle decreased as chronological age increased (Durkin, 1959a).

In a second investigation, Durkin (1959c) studied black and white lower class children of four grade levels (2, 5,
8, 11). She presented them a story dealing with physical aggression between children. And again she found that "oldest as well as younger children tend to seek justice in an authority person" (Durkin, 1959c, p. 256), a finding contrary to Piaget's claim that reciprocity as a justice principle increases with age. She did again find, however, that "older children show greater concern for possible mitigating factors in the situation being judged" (Durkin, 1959c, p. 256), supporting Piaget's claim that the emergence of equity increases with age.

Johnson (1962) interviewed subjects of various grades (5, 7, 9, 11) using Piagetian type stories dealing with five aspects of moral judgment: immanent justice, moral realism, retribution and expiation vs. restitution and reciprocity, the efficacy of severe punishment, and communicable responsibility. His results demonstrated significant positive correlations both within and between moral judgment areas, generally supporting Piaget's view regarding consistency in response tendencies. Johnson also found that chronological age positively related to mature moral judgments in all five areas.

Irwin and Moore (1971) investigated justice concepts in preschoolers who ranged in age from 3-5. Three categories of social justice: guilt-innocence, apology-restitution, intent-accidental, were measured by means of story completions. The results indicated that although older
subjects gave significantly more just responses than younger subjects, all the children gave more just than unjust story responses. There were no significant sex differences. The authors concluded that "children under six years of age have already developed some conventional notions of social justice" (Irwin and Moore, 1971, p. 410).

Piaget's theory that immanent justice decreases with age has been challenged. In addition, research has indicated that certain variables influence the amount of immanent justice adhered to by children.

Medinnus (1959) interviewed children ages 6, 8, 10, and 12 using Piagetian story situations. Medinnus' findings did not confirm Piaget's theory of a decrease in immanent justice with age. Rather, Medinnus (1959) summarized that:

Present findings indicate that a child's expressed belief in immanent justice is dependent on a number of factors such as meaningfulness of the situation to him, presence or absence of rational alternative explanations, range of experiences, etc. (p. 260)

Similarly, Jensen and Rytting (1972), studying immanent justice in second graders, presented six Piagetian stories including two categories of information (causal information about a misfortune or no causal information) and three categories of relatedness (accident unrelated to misdeed, accident in some way related to misdeed, accident direct result of misdeed). Jensen and Rytting (1972) found that the
Several doctoral dissertations in recent years have addressed the question of children's justice concepts. Zavitz (1969) found that the subjects' age was a factor in the development of justice concepts while their socioeco-
nomic status (lower or middle) did not reveal significant differences. Burns (1972) studied black and white children in grades 2, 4 and 6. He also found age differences but no conclusive racial differences.

**Studies Using Kohlberg's Moral Dilemmas**

Turiel (1966) tested the invariant sequence of moral stages as proposed by Kohlberg. The developmental stage of each of the 7th grade male subjects was determined using Kohlberg's moral judgment interview. The subjects were equally distributed among stages 2, 3 and 4. Within each stage, a subject was randomly assigned to the control or one of three treatments which exposed a subject to moral reasoning differing from the subject's initial dominant stage: a) one stage below, b) one stage above, or c) two stages above. Following the treatment, a post test interview was conducted. The results indicated that while the +1 treatment had the most direct effect on the subject's judgments, the +2 treatment did not produce significantly greater
effect than the control or other treatments. Turiel (1966) concluded that his data "support Kohlberg's schema of stages representing a developmental continuum...subjects assimilated the next higher stage more readily than the lower stage" (p. 616).

Damon (1975) studied the development of positive justice (prosocial interactions) among middle class children aged 4-8 and further explored its relationship to the development of logical operations. The justice interview included a sharing problem and four Kohlberg type dilemmas specifically designed to present positive justice conflicts to young children. To assess the development of logical operations, five tasks dealing with mathematics and physical logic were used. His results indicated a significant positive relationship between children's ages and the maturity of their positive justice concepts. In addition, there were significant positive relations among all five logical operation tasks and the justice stage score. Based on his research, Damon has developed a developmental six substage model of positive justice concepts "labeled to match the existing Kohlberg system, that describes with greater specificity the development of the young child's ability to reason about problems of justice" (Selman and Damon, 1975, p. 58).

Tomlinson-Keasey and Keasey (1974) studied the role of cognitive development in moral judgment by interviewing 6th
grade and college females using Kohlberg's dilemmas. To assess cognitive development, three Piaget and Inhelder formal operational tasks were administered. Results indicated that although a positive relationship existed between formal operations and principled moral reasoning, there was a lag between the attainment of formal operations and its application to moral reasoning. The researchers concluded that "formal operations is not a sufficient condition for the emergence of principled moral reasoning" (Tomlinson-Keasey and Keasey, 1974, p. 292).

Kohlberg believes that opportunities for role-taking and social participation enhance moral growth. Several studies have explored this relationship.

Moir (1974) investigated the relationship between non-moral and moral aspects of role-taking behavior in eleven year old girls. He administered Kohlberg's moral judgment interview and a role taking instrument adapted from several sources. His results indicated a positive association between nonmoral and moral role taking measures.

Regarding the relationship between moral maturity and social participation, Keasey (1971) found that quantity of social participation was positively related to higher levels of moral development. The subjects, 5th and 6th grade males and females, were administered Kohlberg's moral judgment interview and various measures to determine their degree of social participation. Results indicated that moral maturity
was significantly related to extent of social participation, leadership, and popularity, thus substantiating Kohlberg's claim that social participation facilitates moral growth. In addition, some sex differences did emerge with high social participating males having significantly higher moral judgment quotients than their female counterparts.

Selman (1971) conducted a longitudinal study to explore the relationship between role taking ability and moral judgment. Male and female middle class subjects, ages 8, 9, and 10, were administered two role-taking tasks devised by Flavell, Kohlberg's moral judgment scale, and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. "Results indicated that at this age range, with intelligence controlled, the development of reciprocal role-taking skills related to the development of conventional moral judgment" (Selman, 1971, p. 79). In the second phase of the study, Selman studied those subjects from the initial phase who scored low on both the role taking and moral judgment tasks to determine if reciprocal role-taking was a necessary condition for conventional morality. Results showed that while no subject attained conventional moral judgment without reciprocal role taking, some subjects did attain reciprocal role taking without reaching conventional morality. Selman (1971) concluded that "development of the ability to understand the reciprocal nature of interpersonal relations is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the development of conventional
moral thought" (p. 79).

Table 2 presents an overview of the studies discussed here listed in alphabetical order by author. It includes the three types of studies described in this review: those dealing with Piaget's general theory of moral development; those specifically investigating children's concepts of justice; and those using Kohlberg's dilemmas.

**Review of Research on Racial Awareness and Attitudes**

The study of race and ethnicity has been explored from many varied perspectives within several academic disciplines. For instance, a large body of theory from social psychology deals with attitudes toward ethnic groups and causes of prejudice (Allport, 1954; Adorno, et. al., 1950). Sociologists have theorized about such issues as social structure, mobility and subcultural membership in relationship to race and ethnicity. The legal community has been involved in much litigation dealing with such areas as equal opportunity and school desegregation. Developmental psychologists have been concerned with racial membership as it affects ego development and self-esteem (Ausubel and Ausubel, 1960; Passow and Elliot, 1967; Deutsch, 1967). And the educational community is always affected by the theory and research of these other disciplines. For its responsibility is to educate youth and indeed, race and ethnicity have many
### TABLE 2

**AN OVERVIEW OF STUDIES ON MORAL DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Date</th>
<th>Age of Subjects</th>
<th>Sex of Subjects</th>
<th>Race and/or SES of Subjects</th>
<th>Aspect Studied</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boehm, L., 1962a</td>
<td>6-9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper middle and working class white</td>
<td>Consequences vs. intentions, peer reciprocity vs. adult constraint</td>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Intention vs. consequences—upper middle class matured earlier; adult constraint vs. peer reciprocity—working class matured earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boehm, L., 1962b</td>
<td>6-9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper middle and working class white</td>
<td>Consequences vs. intentions, peer reciprocity vs. adult constraint</td>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Intention vs. consequences—Catholic school matured earlier than public school; adult constraint vs. peer reciprocity—working class matured earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subjects</td>
<td>Sex of Subjects</td>
<td>Race and/or SES of Subjects</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boehm &amp; Nass, 1962</td>
<td>6-12 years</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>Working and upper middle class white</td>
<td>Consequences vs. intentions, lying, adult constraint vs. peer reciprocity</td>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>No sex or SES differences; predictable Piagetian age differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, J., Grades 1972</td>
<td>2, 4, 6</td>
<td>Black and white, blue collar</td>
<td>Concepts of justice and political authority</td>
<td>27 item group justice measure</td>
<td>No conclusive racial differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon, W. 1975</td>
<td>Ages 4-8</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>Middle and upper middle class</td>
<td>Relate logical operations to positive justice concepts</td>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>Significant + relationship between justice stage and 5 logical operations; maturity of justice concepts increases with age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subjects</td>
<td>Sex of Subjects</td>
<td>Race and/or SES of Subjects</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durkin, D., 1959a</td>
<td>Grades 2, 5, 8</td>
<td>M &amp; F White</td>
<td>middle class</td>
<td>Justice among peers</td>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Reciprocity as justice principle decreases as chronological age increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durkin, D., 1959b</td>
<td>Grades 2, 5, 8</td>
<td>M &amp; F White</td>
<td>middle class</td>
<td>Justice among peers</td>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Kinds of justice concepts related to age but reciprocity does not increase with age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durkin, D., 1959c</td>
<td>Grades 2, 5, 8, 11</td>
<td>M &amp; F Black and white</td>
<td>lower class</td>
<td>Justice among peers</td>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Reciprocity as justice concept doesn't increase with age; emergence of equity with age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subjects</td>
<td>Sex of Subjects</td>
<td>Race and/or SES of Subjects</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinder, R., 1964</td>
<td>Grades 2, 4, 6</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>Lower middle class</td>
<td>Relate moral behavior to moral judgment</td>
<td>Story completion, resistance to temptation in a game</td>
<td>Maturity of moral judgment increased with age; no significant correlation between moral judgment and resistance to temptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, H., 1970</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black and white of 4 different SES</td>
<td>Consequences vs. intentions, imminent punishment, solutions to transgressions, meaning of rules</td>
<td>Story pairs</td>
<td>White boys more mature on imminent and physical punishment; higher SES W &amp; B more mature on all 5 aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subjects</td>
<td>Sex of Subjects</td>
<td>Race and/or SES of Subjects</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin &amp; Moore, 1971</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>Justice concepts</td>
<td>Story completions</td>
<td>Older children more just responses than younger children but all children more just than unjust story completions; no sex differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen &amp; Hughston, 1973</td>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>White middle class</td>
<td>Relate story content, type of sanction and M.D.</td>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>All main effects—age, type of sanction, story content significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen &amp; Rytting, 1972</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>White middle class</td>
<td>Immanent justice</td>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Amount of immanent justice influenced by naturalistic information in the story x degree of relatedness between misdeed and accident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Date</th>
<th>Age of Subjects</th>
<th>Sex of Subjects</th>
<th>Race and/or SES of Subjects</th>
<th>Aspect Studied</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, R., 1962</td>
<td>Grades 5, 7, 9, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immanent justice, moral realism, expiation vs. reciprocity, severe punishment, collective responsibility</td>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Significant + correlations within and between moral judgment areas; age related to moral judgment in all five areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keasey, C., 1971</td>
<td>Grades M &amp; F 5, 6</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Relate moral maturity and social participation</td>
<td>K's dilemmas, measures of social participation</td>
<td>Moral maturity + related to leadership, popularity and social participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medinnus, G., 1959</td>
<td>Ages 6, 8, 10, 12</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>Lower class</td>
<td>Immanent justice</td>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Immanent justice does not decrease with age; belief in it dependent on several factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subjects</td>
<td>Sex of Subjects</td>
<td>Race and/or SES of Subjects</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moir, D., 1974</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relate moral and non-moral aspects of role-taking</td>
<td>K's dilemma, Role-taking instrument</td>
<td>+ relationship between moral and non moral role taking measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, Pederson &amp; Finley, 1974</td>
<td>Preschool, M &amp; F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consequences vs. intentions</td>
<td>Story pairs</td>
<td>Developmental progression from consequences to intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porteus and Johnson, 1965</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relate cognitive and affective measure of M.D.</td>
<td>Stories, socio-metric instruments</td>
<td>Girls more morally mature than boys; significant + relationship between cognitive and affective measures for boys only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subjects</td>
<td>Sex of Subjects</td>
<td>Race and/or SES of Subjects</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selman, R., 1971</td>
<td>Ages 8, 9, 10</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>Relate role-taking to moral judgment</td>
<td>Kohlberg’s dilemmas, reciprocal role-taking Flavell’s role-taking skills</td>
<td>Development of conventional moral judgment; development of reciprocal role-taking necessary but not sufficient condition for conventional moral thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomlinson- Keasey &amp; College, 1974</td>
<td>Grade 6, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relate formal operations to principled moral reasoning</td>
<td>Piaget’s formal operations and principles moral reasoning</td>
<td>Relationship between formal operations and principled moral reasoning but formal operations not sufficient for principled moral reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subjects</td>
<td>Sex of Subjects</td>
<td>Race and/or SES of Subjects</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turiel, E., 1966</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>Invariant sequence proposed by Kohlberg</td>
<td>K's dilemmas</td>
<td>Subjects assimilated next higher stage more readily than lower stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteman &amp; Kosier, 1964</td>
<td>Ages 7-12</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>Lower middle class</td>
<td>Consequences vs. Intentions</td>
<td>Story pairs</td>
<td>No sex differences; mature responses increase with age and IQ within each age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zavitz, H., 1969</td>
<td>Grades 2, 6, 8</td>
<td>Lower and middle class</td>
<td>Justice concepts</td>
<td>Group test</td>
<td>Developmental age differences in expected direction; no SES differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ramifications for the education institution. As Williams and Morland (1976) pointed out:

> Attitudes toward and ideas about race and color are conveyed to the young American child by parents, teachers, mass media, and other communicators of culture. We, therefore, need to be reminded of the kinds of messages about race and color that American society is giving to its children. (p. 3)

The entire body of theory relating to children's understanding of race is beyond the scope of this dissertation to explicate. Because this study explores the relationship between children's racial perceptions and their concepts of justice, research dealing specifically with racial perceptions will be reviewed here. Although there is overlap, the studies here will be categorized into two broad areas: those dealing with racial awareness and those dealing with racial attitudes. The interaction of a child's racial awareness and racial attitudes constitute that child's racial perceptions. Racial awareness includes 1) the child's recognition of skin color and other physical features which distinguish one race from another and 2) the child's preference for characteristics of one race rather than another. Racial attitudes involve the child's evaluation of racial stimuli as "bad" or "good," "positive" or "negative."

**Studies on Racial Awareness**

In a classic study that provided the framework for many studies on racial awareness, Clark and Clark (1952)
investigated black self-identification and its relationship to racial preferences in black children, aged 3-7. The materials used were four dolls, identical except for color. The experimenter made eight requests of the subject which required the subject to select the appropriate doll. The requests dealt with racial preference, a knowledge of racial differences, and self-identification. The results indicated that the majority of the children preferred the white doll. Although the evaluative rejection of the brown doll was significant, there appeared a tendency for decreased preference of the white doll in ages five through seven.

Hraba and Grant (1970) duplicated the Clark and Clark study but also included white subjects. A significant difference in the results of the two studies occurred. Hraba and Grant discovered that the black children preferred the black doll and that this preference for black increased with age.

Similar results were found in a study by Ward and Braun (1972) who adapted the Clark and Clark doll procedure to determine the relationship between racial preference and self-esteem among school aged black children. Subjects completed the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Test and selected racially different puppets to fit various descriptions. The data revealed a significant positive relationship between high self-esteem and high black preference. The findings also confirmed those of Hraba and Grant that the majority
of middle and lower class black children preferred the black puppet.

Stevenson and Stewart (1958) conducted a developmental study of racial awareness in black and white children ranging in age from three to seven. The investigation consisted of four parts: a recognition of racial differences in pictures, the construction of dolls of different races, a racial preference and self identification task using dolls, and an incomplete story task using racial pictures. The data on racial recognition concurred with previously reported findings that young children are able to discriminate between races and that racial awareness increases with age. Regarding racial preference, the results indicated a significant difference between black and white children in own race choices with whites choosing own race dolls more frequently than blacks. In addition, "black subjects assigned negative roles to black children more frequently than white subjects assigned such roles to white children" (Stevenson and Stewart, 1958, p. 408).

A very comprehensive study conducted by Porter (1971) also used dolls to examine racial preferences. She devised her own test materials, "The TV Story Game," which included two stage sets (school room, living room) and 18 dolls (9 white, 9 brown). The individual interview consisted of the subject using dolls to construct various stories and respond to specific questions. The subjects included boys and girls
of three social classes (middle, working, ADC) and three ages (3, 4 and 5 year olds). Porter's (1971) findings revealed that:

Black children exhibit less preference for Negro dolls than white youngsters do for white dolls... (she attributes the) difference as due to negative attitudes towards blacks for children of both races. (p. 63)

Social class differences by race emerged in children's racial choices. Among the white sample, ADC and working class subjects chose the white doll more frequently than middle class subjects. Among blacks, however, the working class children showed greater preference for their own race dolls than the middle class or ADC sample.

Anthropologist Mary Ellen Goodman (1952) studied race awareness in black and white 4 year old preschoolers. Her data gathering methods included participant and non-participant observations, interviews, and preschool records. To facilitate the observation of children's play and the interviews, four sets of projective materials were developed: jigsaw puzzles, a furnished doll house with miniature doll families, pictures and a collection of dolls. Through the children's use of these materials, the researcher determined the degree of the child's interest in and perception of color and racial attributes (Goodman, 1952). After all the data were collected, Goodman classified the subjects into three groups: low race awareness (15% black, 15% white);
medium race awareness (45% black, 61% white); and high race awareness (40% black, 24% white). She also categorized various aspects of the children's responses as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Black Children</th>
<th>% of White Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) In group preference</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out group preference</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Superiority toward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrality toward</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority toward</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Friendly toward</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent toward</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antagonistic toward</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From Goodman, 1952, p. 62)

Goodman (1952) concluded:

The high degree of race awareness we have seen in many of these children is startling ...it is shocking to find that four year olds, particularly white ones, show unmistakable signs of the onset of racial bigotry. (p. 217)

Several researchers have used pictures as the stimulus materials in studying racial awareness.

Photographs of children were used by Morland (1962) to determine racial acceptance and preference among black and white preschoolers living in segregated environments. The results indicated that both black and white subjects were
more likely to prefer the white children in the pictures. However, with regard to acceptance, Morland (1962) found that the "majority of the subjects of both races 'accepted' both Negro and white playmates, with very few rejecting them for racial reasons" (p. 278). Black subjects, however, did accept white children significantly more often than whites accepted blacks.

In another study, Morland (1966) compared racial awareness in white and black preschoolers from racially segregated (southern) and racially integrated (northern) preschools. He again used a set of photographs depicting children and adults of both races to measure racial acceptance, racial preference, racial self-identification, and racial recognition ability. Morland (1966) concluded that:

In both regions Negroes preferred and identified with the other race; white subjects with their own race. Such preference and identification was accentuated in southern subjects. (p. 22)

Kircher and Furby (1971) investigated black and white preschoolers preference for racial features of skin color, hair color, eye color and hair type by showing the children pairs of drawings of children's faces in which one feature differed. The subjects were asked to point to the child they would rather play with. The results indicated a significant main effect due to type of feature with hair type and skin color eliciting the strongest preference and the white characteristic being the one most typically preferred.
Landreth and Johnson (1953) also used pictures to study the relationship of racial preferences to social class. The subjects included boys and girls, ages three and five, of three racial and social classes: lower class black, lower class white, and upper class white. The subjects chose one of a pair of insets, which differed in the race of the people pictured, to complete a picture of two people eating, playing, walking, etc. The percentage of times a skin color was selected when presented as a member of the pair was calculated. According to Landreth and Johnson (1953):

The choice of white skins by groups shows the following descending order of frequency: lower class Negro, lower class white, upper class white. The choice of black skins shows a reverse order: white upper class, white lower class, Negro lower class. (p. 69)

The percentage of times the children matched the skin color of the picture and inset was also computed with white upper class subjects matching the most and black subjects matching the least. In addition, while upper class whites showed no significant differences in choice of skin colors, black subjects significantly chose white insets more often than black ones.

Rohrer (1977) used color photographs of children to investigate racial identification and preference in white, black and Mexican American preschoolers who attended Head Start. Subjects were shown three pictures of children (one white, one Mexican American, and one black) and asked "Which
one looks most like you?" and "Which one do you like best?"
Regarding own race identification, 73% of the white children,
41.7% of the Mexican American children, and 59.6% of the
black children identified with their own race pictures. Re­
garding identification with the picture of the white child,
73% of the white subjects, 41.7% of the Mexican American and
23.5% of the black subjects identified with this picture.
Regarding preference choice, Rohrer (1977) summarized:

Comparisons of preferences between groups
reached significance only in comparison
with the Mexican-American group (white,
p < .05; black, p < .01). Mexican-Ameri­
can subjects showed highest own group
preference, followed by whites, while the
black subjects preferred both the Mexican­
American and the white to their own-group
choice. (p. 28)

Using methodology quite different from previous re­
search, Banks and Rompf (1973) studied evaluative bias and
racial preference in black and white elementary aged chil­
dren. The children observed two adults (one black, one
white) play a ball tossing game which included five trials.
The subjects received candy with which they rewarded the
players by putting candy in the players' cup. Subjects
could distribute the candy as they chose. At the conclusion
of the game, subjects responded to the question "Which
player won the game?" Banks and Rompf (1973) found that:

White subjects showed preference for the
white player by rewarding him more for
his performance and by more often select­
ing him as overall 'winner.' Although
black children showed preference for the white player in rewarding him more, those same Ss showed preference for the black player by choosing him more often as overall winner. (p. 776)

Studies on Racial Attitudes

In a series of studies, Stabler and his colleagues investigated the evaluative connotations of black and white stimuli as assessed by children. Stabler, Johnson, Berke and Baker (1969) studied the evaluative connotations of black and white stimuli among preschool children of both races. First, the children evaluated familiar objects as either positive or negative. Then each subject sat in front of two boxes—one black and one white. The experimenter showed the subject each of the previously evaluated objects and asked the subject which box contained a duplicate of the item. It was found that both racial groups tended to associate positively evaluated objects with the white box and negatively evaluated objects with the black box.

In a similar study, Stabler, Johnson and Jordan (1971) investigated self concepts as related to racial attitudes. Black and white five year old males and females heard statements dealing with self-concept. The child evaluated each statement by pointing to either a smiling face or a frowning face. Following this task, the child sat in front of two tape recorder speakers—one painted black and one painted white. Each of the self concept statements was rebroadcast
and the child had to decide from which box the statement emanated. The data supported the hypothesis that children "hear" positive self-statements as coming from the white box and negative self statements as coming from the black box. However, while white subjects demonstrated a significantly greater tendency to associate positive rather than negative statements with the white box, black children heard more negative statements from the white box than did white children.

A later study using the same methodology was conducted by Hepler and Stabler (1976). This time the subjects evaluated as positive or negative, statements describing a child made by another person such as "you won; you're a winner." The statements were then broadcast as the child sat in front of a black box and a white box and the children identified from which box the statement came. The results again indicated that "more positive statements than negative statements were guessed to be originating from the white box" (Hepler and Stabler, 1976, p. 27).

Several studies have investigated racial attitudes by administering the Color Meaning Test or the Preschool Racial Attitude Measure both developed by John E. Williams, Deborah L. Best and associates (1975). The PreSchool Racial Attitude Measure (PRAM II) includes 24 photographs of pairs of people--one black and one white. The pairs represent people of all ages and both sexes. An additional 12 photographs
may be used to explore sex role attitudes.

In an individual interview, the experimenter shows the subjects a photograph, tells a story about it, and asks the subject to point to the person in the picture described in the story. Each story contains an evaluative component with 12 stories describing positive characteristics (e.g., kind boy) and 12 describing negative traits (e.g., wrong girl).

The Color Meaning Test (CMT II) resembles PRAM II in format and procedure for administering. However, the CMT II materials contain 12 photographs of animal pairs--one black and one white.

Using an instrument that was the forerunner to the Color Meaning Test, Renninger and Williams (1966) studied the evaluative meanings of white and black and the development of racial awareness in white preschoolers (3-5 years old). In addition to administering the early edition of CMT II, the researchers interviewed the subjects using doll like cut out figures which differed in race. The results indicated that young children were aware of racial terms and that this awareness increased with age. Eighty-two percent of the subjects preferred the white figure. Regarding the results of the Color Meaning Test, the subjects associated the black animals with negative characteristics and the white animals with positive ones.

Williams and Roberson (1967) administered both the Color Meaning Test and the PreSchool Racial Attitude Measure
to white preschoolers. In addition, the racial pictures were used to determine the child's awareness of racial terms. On both the Color Meaning and Racial Attitude measures, subjects showed a significant tendency to view black negatively and white positively. The results on the racial identification task indicated that young children were aware of racial labels and that this awareness increased with age. An item analysis of the evaluative adjectives used in the Color Meaning and Racial Attitude tasks was performed. Clearly, the positive adjectives were identified with white and the negative adjectives with black.

Williams, Boswell, and Best (1975) administered the CMT II to both black and white preschoolers. Their results also showed a tendency by children of both races to evaluate white more positively than black.

Williams et. al. (1975) standardized PRAM II with a large sample of black and white preschoolers. Results revealed a significant main effect for race of subject with white subjects demonstrating a greater pro-Caucasian/anti-Negro bias than black subjects.

Using the PRAM II instrument, Williams, Best and Boswell (1975) conducted a developmental study of black and white children's racial attitudes. The results indicated a significant main effect for race of subject at grades 1, 2 and 3. Williams, Best and Boswell (1975) summarized the developmental trends as follows:
Among Euro-American children, it was found that pro-Euro/anti-Afro bias reached a peak at second grade level and subsequently declined. Afro-American children also were found to display evidence of E+/- bias, but to a lesser degree and with no appreciable age trends being observed. (p. 494)

Other components of racial attitudes have also been investigated. Radke and Trager (1950) studied children's perceptions of racial differences in social roles. The black and white subjects in grades K, 1, and 2 were interviewed using black and white doll materials in a choice situation. For example, the experimenter would show the subject a black and white male doll and ask if they were alike or different. If the children responded that they were different, they were asked to explain their answer. Although the researchers only analyzed their findings in percentages, certain pronounced trends occurred. Ninety-nine per cent of the black subjects and 92% of the white subjects responded that the dolls were different. Of these, 79% of the black subjects and 77% of the white subjects explicitly stated a color difference. In matching the dolls with appropriate houses, the results indicated that the "association of the white doll with good houses and the Negro doll with poor houses was well established among children of both races" (Radke and Trager, 1950, p. 18). The difference between own race preference is striking: 89% of the white children prefer the white doll while 57% of black children prefer the
black doll. In addition, "38% of the white subjects introduced interpretations in which stereotyped and inferior social roles were ascribed to Negroes" (Radke and Trager, 1950, p. 31).

Gough, Harris, Martin and Edwards (1950) examined elementary aged children's ethnic attitudes as they related to certain personality factors. They constructed their own "Attitude Scale" consisting of 18 statements about "Negroes," to which subjects agreed or disagreed. In addition, each subject completed a social distance scale, a general tolerance scale and various items adapted from personality inventories. The data revealed a pattern of characteristics associated with the prejudiced child. The personality inventory items which discriminated between high and low scorers on the Negro Attitude Scale portray the prejudiced child as one who distrusts others, lacks self-confidence, feels guilt, and experiences insecurities.

One final study to be reviewed actually belongs in a category by itself although it is listed under racial attitudes. Davidson (1976) appears to have conducted the only published research that has investigated the relationship between moral development and racial/ethnic prejudice. She studied black, white and Oriental children ranging in age from 7-13 of upper middle class and lower middle class background. Each subject was administered three of Kohlberg's moral dilemmas to determine the subject's stage of moral
development. To assess degree of ethnic/racial prejudice, the researcher developed "The Game of Comments," a board game played by four children which required the children to make statements about various ethnic groups such as Jewish and American Indian. The children's comments during the game were used to form an open ended interview to ascertain racial/ethnic attitudes. The results revealed a highly significant inverse correlation between moral stage and negative attitudes toward racial and ethnic groups for all groups of subjects with lower stage children demonstrating the highest percentage of negative racial comments and higher stage subjects demonstrating a significantly smaller percentage of negative comments. Davidson (1976) concluded that "prejudice is related to moral development and social understanding" (p. 1256).

Table 3 provides an overview of all the studies on racial awareness and racial attitudes reviewed here listed in alphabetical order by author.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Date</th>
<th>Age of Subject</th>
<th>Aspect Studied</th>
<th>Race and/or SES of Subject</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banks &amp; Rompf, 1973</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>B &amp; W</td>
<td>Observation of ball toss game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark &amp; Clark, 1952</td>
<td>Ages 3-7</td>
<td>Self-identification, knowledge of differences, racial preference</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Dolls</td>
<td>Children are racially aware; children prefer white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson, 1976</td>
<td>Ages 7-13</td>
<td>Prejudice and moral development</td>
<td>Upper, Middle, Lower, W, B, Oriental</td>
<td>Interview, Kohlberg's dilemmas</td>
<td>Significant inverse relationship between moral stage and prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subject</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Race and/or SES of Subject</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman, 1952</td>
<td>Preschoolers</td>
<td>Racial awareness</td>
<td>B &amp; W</td>
<td>Dolls, pictures</td>
<td>Young children are racially aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gough, Harris, Martin, Edwards, 1950</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Racial attitudes</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Negro Attitude Scale</td>
<td>Personality characteristics of the prejudiced child were isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepler &amp; Stabler, 1976</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Racial attitudes</td>
<td>B &amp; W</td>
<td>B &amp; W speakers Statements</td>
<td>Children heard positive statements from the white speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hraba &amp; Grant, 1970</td>
<td>Ages 4-8</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>B &amp; W</td>
<td>Dolls</td>
<td>Black preference for black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kircher &amp; Furby, 1971</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Preference for racial features</td>
<td>B &amp; W</td>
<td>Drawings</td>
<td>White characteristic preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subject</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Race and/ or SES of Subject</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landreth &amp; Johnson, 1953</td>
<td>Ages 3 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Racial preference</td>
<td>Lower class B&amp;W, Upper middle W</td>
<td>Picture insets</td>
<td>Black preference for white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morland, 1966</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Awareness, acceptance, and preference</td>
<td>B &amp; W</td>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>White preference; acceptance of both races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morland, 1962</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>Lower and upper class B &amp; W</td>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>White preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter, 1971</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>Middle, working, ADC B &amp; W</td>
<td>TV story game Dolls</td>
<td>White preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radke &amp; Trager, 1950</td>
<td>Grades K, 1, 2</td>
<td>Racial differences and social roles</td>
<td>Middle and lower class B &amp; W</td>
<td>Dolls</td>
<td>Stereotyped inferior social roles ascribed to blacks; children racially aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subject</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Race and/or SES of Subject</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renninger &amp; Williams, 1966</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Evaluative meanings of black and white, racial preference</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Animal pictures, Puzzles of children</td>
<td>White preference; valued white as good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohrer, 1977</td>
<td>4-5 year olds</td>
<td>Racial identification and preference</td>
<td>Lower class W, B, Mexican-American</td>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>White subjects most ethnocentric in identification; Mexican-Americans highest own group preference followed by whites; black preferred both W &amp; MA to their own group choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabler, Johnson, Jordan, 1971</td>
<td>5 year olds</td>
<td>Racial Attitudes</td>
<td>Black and white</td>
<td>B &amp; W speakers Self-concept statements</td>
<td>Children hear positive statements from white box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subject</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Race and/or SES of Subject</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabler, Johnson, Berke, Baker, 1969</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Evaluative meaning of black and white</td>
<td>Lower class B&amp;W</td>
<td>Objects, B &amp; W boxes</td>
<td>Both groups of subjects associated positive objects with white box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson &amp; Stewart, 1958</td>
<td>Ages 3-7</td>
<td>Racial awareness and preference Self identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dolls &amp; pictures</td>
<td>Young children racially aware; increase of racial awareness with age; white preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward &amp; Braun, 1972</td>
<td>Grades 2-3</td>
<td>Racial preference and self-esteem</td>
<td>Lower class black</td>
<td>Puppets</td>
<td>Positive relationship between high black preference and high self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Boswell, Best, 1975</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Racial attitudes</td>
<td>B &amp; W</td>
<td>CMT II</td>
<td>B &amp; W subjects view white more positively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and Date</td>
<td>Age of Subject</td>
<td>Aspect Studied</td>
<td>Race and/or SES of Subject</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, et. al., 1975</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Racial attitudes</td>
<td>B &amp; W</td>
<td>PRAM II</td>
<td>W showed more W bias than blacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Best, Boswell, 1975</td>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>Racial attitudes</td>
<td>B &amp; W</td>
<td>PRAM II</td>
<td>White bias among Blacks and whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams &amp; Roberson, 1967</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Racial attitudes</td>
<td>Middle class W</td>
<td>CMT II</td>
<td>Subjects viewed white positive and black negative on both instruments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3 (continued)
Statement of Hypotheses

As stated previously, the major purposes of this dissertation are 1) to investigate children's concepts of justice in peer-peer conflict situations within a cognitive-developmental framework 2) to determine if children's racial perceptions affect their justice concepts and 3) to explore the children's age, race and sex as they may affect children's justice concepts.

The study has been designed to test five specific hypotheses.

H₁: The justice concepts of 10 year old children will reflect greater moral maturity than the justice concepts of 6 year old children.


H₂: There will be no developmental difference in the justice concepts of males and females of the same age.

Research evidence regarding sex differences in moral development have proven inconclusive. While Porteus and Johnson (1965) found girls to be more morally mature,
Keasey (1971) found that boys had higher moral maturity scores. Most of the studies that have considered sex as a variable in moral maturity have found no significant sex differences (Peterson, Peterson and Finley, 1974; Boehm and Nass, 1962; Whiteman and Kosier, 1964; Jensen and Rytting, 1972; and Irwin and Moore, 1971).

$H_3$: There will be no developmental difference in the justice concepts of black and white children of the same age and social class.

Very little research has explored racial differences in moral development. Durkin's sample (1959c) included both black and white children of low socio-economic status. She stated that the two racial groups could be expected to have similar attitudes toward physical aggression and she conducted no statistical tests to compare the two groups (1959c). Harris (1970) did find the moral maturity of white boys superior to black boys of the same social class but Burns (1972) found no racial differences.

$H_4$: The nature of the situation being judged by the children, i.e. stealing, name calling, physical aggression, will not influence the moral maturity of the children's justice concepts.

Since virtually no previous research has been conducted comparing these types of situations and children's moral judgments of them, it would be unwarranted of this researcher to hypothesize a differential relationship between
the type of situation and the level of moral maturity.

H₅: The race of the children interacting in the videotaped situations will have a differential effect on the moral maturity of the subjects' justice concepts. The racial pairings will produce developmental levels of moral maturity in the following order from most mature to least mature justice concepts:

a. White child transgressing against a white child
b. Black child transgressing against a white child
c. White child transgressing against a black child
d. Black child transgressing against a black child

Virtually all research has indicated that racial awareness develops at an early age (by 3-4). Thus it seems safe to assume that all subjects will recognize the different racial pairings in the videotapes. Further, the majority of studies have indicated that both black and white children show a preference for white and a positive evaluation of white (see Table 3). Some exceptions to these findings have been noted (Banks and Rompf, 1973; Hraba and Grant, 1970; Ward and Braun, 1972). Therefore, this evidence suggests that situations in which white children appear together
would produce more positive (in this case, more mature) moral judgments than those in which only black children appear. Further, situations in which the white child is aggressed upon by a black child would elicit more mature concepts than those in which the white child aggresses against a black.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The major purposes of this dissertation are 1) to investigate children's concepts of justice in peer-peer conflict situations within a cognitive-developmental framework 2) to determine if children's racial perceptions affect their justice concepts and 3) to explore the children's age, race and sex as they may affect children's justice concepts.

Chapter III will describe the methodology used in conducting this investigation. The following hypotheses of the study emerged from the literature review.

$H_1$: The justice concepts of 10 year old children will reflect greater moral maturity than the justice concepts of 6 year old children.

$H_2$: There will be no developmental difference in the justice concepts of males and females of the same age.

$H_3$: There will be no developmental difference in the justice concepts of black and white children of the same age and social class.

$H_4$: The nature of the situation being judged, i.e.
stealing, name-calling, physical aggression, will not influence the moral maturity of the children's justice concepts.

H₅: The race of the children interacting in the videotaped situations will have a differential effect on the moral maturity of the subjects' justice concepts. The racial pairings will produce developmental levels of moral maturity in the following order from most mature to least mature justice concepts:

a. White child transgressing against a white child
b. Black child transgressing against a white child
c. White child transgressing against a black child
d. Black child transgressing against a black child

The chapter is divided into eight sections: a description of the stimulus materials and how they were made; the development of the interview questions; the development of the scoring system; an analysis of the pilot study; a description of the subjects; the procedures followed in conducting the experiment; the transcription and the scoring of the data; and the experimental design.
Stimulus Materials: Justice Measure Tapes

The stimulus materials used in the investigation were a set of sound videotapes in which children actors interacted in three types of peer-peer conflict situations: physical aggression, name calling and stealing. These three situations were selected as representative of actual types of conflicts that occur in elementary school classrooms. As stimulus to elicit moral reasoning in children, they meet the criteria for construct validity as described by Cronbach (1960):

In order to show that a given construct applies to a test, it is necessary to derive hypotheses about test behavior from the theory related to the construct and to verify them experimentally.
(p. 105)

The situations were derived from a theory (cognitive-developmental) and were tested experimentally by others. Piaget (1932) used stories dealing with physical aggression and stealing. Durkin (1959a, 1959b, 1959c) in her study of the development of justice concepts in children used all three types of situations (name calling, physical aggression, stealing).

Although both Piaget and Kohlberg presented moral dilemmas to subjects by verbally telling them a story or situation, there were several reasons why the researcher preferred to illustrate the dilemmas on videotape. First, the use of videotapes has already proven to be an effective
means of studying moral development (Chandler, Greenspan, and Barenboim, 1973; Rybash, et. al., 1975). Second, because the researcher deliberately varied the race of the children interacting in the conflict situations, videotapes facilitated the inclusion of the racial factor without directly mentioning it to the subjects. Third, videotapes can more realistically depict a dilemma than a verbally told story. Finally, it was believed that videotapes would be an interesting stimulus for the subjects, providing them with a multi-sensory experience. It was felt that this approach would hold the children's attention and elicit greater depth of response than merely telling them a story. Indeed, the superiority of videotapes in contrast to the verbal story in eliciting more mature moral responses has already been demonstrated (Chandler, Barenboim and Greenspan, 1973; Rybash, et. al., 1975).

To avoid any confounding effect due to the sex of the children appearing in the tapes, all the actors were male. Six 5th-6th grade boys were selected by their teachers to appear in the tapes. The teachers tried to choose boys who were comparable in size so that none of the boys appeared older, stronger, or larger than the others. A letter of explanation was sent to the boys' parents and their written permission was obtained (see Appendix C).

The experimenter outlined the basic nature of the three situations and asked the boys to assist in developing the
dialogue and details to insure a realistic portrayal. Each sequence was designed to be brief so that even younger children with short attention spans could concentrate on them and so that no extraneous details would distract from the subjects' focus of attention. The script for each situation was as follows.

I. Physical Aggression

Scene: Inside a school classroom

As the scene opens, Child 1 stands in the middle of the room. Child 2 enters and as he walks across the room, Child 1 deliberately pushes him. Child 3, who is sitting at a desk studying, observes the incident and tells Child 1 to stop it. Child 1 pushes Child 2 again; Child 2 then retaliates by pushing back.

II. Name Calling

Scene: Inside a school classroom

As the scene opens, Child 1 and Child 3 are playing scrabble. Child 2 enters the room and asks Child 1 if he can play with them. Child 1 refuses and gives a reason unacceptable to Child 2. Child 2 repeats the request to play and again is rejected by Child 1. Child 2 then calls Child 1 a turkey. Child 1 retorts, "Me, you're the turkey."

III. Violation of Property Rights (Stealing)

Scene: Inside a classroom in the section of the room where the children's tote trays are kept
As the scene opens, Child 1 is sitting at a table studying. Child 2 sneaks into the room and, believing that he is unobserved, takes a pencil from Child 1's tote tray. Child 1 has, however, seen the theft and confronts Child 2 by asking him for his pencil back. Child 2 denies the accusation. After a brief interchange during which Child 2 refuses to admit he took the pencil, Child 1 takes a pencil from Child 2's tote tray.

For each of the three situations, four different racial pairings were taped as separate sequences. These included a white boy transgressing against a white boy, a black boy transgressing against a black boy, a white boy transgressing against a black boy, and a black boy transgressing against a white boy. To prevent any possible effect due to the role that the boys portrayed, each boy appeared in at least one sequence as the aggressor and in at least one sequence as the victim. There were, therefore, 12 separate sequences: three situations with four racial pairings per situation.

The Teacher Education Laboratory of Ohio State University originally filmed the sequences "on location" at a local elementary school. Due, however, to various technical problems resulting from the "on location" taping, the situations were retaped at the studio of the Teacher Education Laboratory. Both the acting performances of the boys and the technical quality of the studio tapes were far superior to those filmed "on location." It must be noted that the
six male actors demonstrated enthusiasm, maturity and cooperation throughout the entire process.

The tapes were filmed in color. However, since the schools that the subjects attended did not possess any videotape equipment, it was necessary for the researcher to transport a portable TV and tape recorder which could only accommodate reel to reel black and white tapes. Therefore, after all 12 sequences were filmed, two black and white tapes each containing all 12 sequences were edited for use in the study. Ideally, the researcher had hoped to present the sequences to the subjects in completely randomized order, thus eliminating the possibility of any effect due to the order of presentation. However, practical constraints prevented this complete randomization. Therefore, as the most viable alternative to obviating an order effect, two random orders of the 12 sequences were determined, one for each tape. Because the children would view six of the 12 sequences in one session and six in a later session by dividing the two tapes in half, the researcher was able to establish four different random orders. Thus, it was possible for an equal number of subjects to view Tape A, Part 1; Tape A, Part 2; Tape B, Part 1; or Tape B, Part 2, during the first session. During the second session, the subject saw the other six sequences of the respective tape.

After three subjects were shown the first six sequences of Tape B, mechanical problems developed which necessitated
a re-editing of that portion of the tape. In addition, because three name-calling sequences appeared consecutively on this portion, it was decided to re-randomize the first six sequences of this portion of the tape to counteract the perceived boredom effect due to the repetition of the name calling incident. The final order of the two tapes is shown below:

**PART 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order A</th>
<th>Order B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stealing-black steals black</td>
<td>Stealing-white steals white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stealing-white steals white</td>
<td>Name-calling-white calls white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pushing-black pushes black</td>
<td>Pushing-white pushes black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Name-calling-white calls white</td>
<td>Name-calling-black calls black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stealing-white steals black</td>
<td>Pushing-black pushes white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Name-calling-black calls black</td>
<td>Name-calling-white calls black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART 2**

| 7. Name-calling-black calls white | Stealing-black steals black |
| 8. Name-calling-white calls black | Pushing-black pushes black |
| 9. Pushing-white pushes white | Stealing-white steals black |
PART 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order A</th>
<th>Order B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Pushing-white pushes black</td>
<td>Name-calling-black calls white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stealing-black steals white</td>
<td>Pushing-white pushes white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Pushing-black pushes white</td>
<td>Stealing-black steals white</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Interview Questions

The interview was modelled on the open ended method developed by Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1963, 1969, 1975, 1976b) in their research on moral development. Although the interview was guided by a series of standard questions, flexibility also existed, permitting the researcher to probe further for clarification and extension of individual subject's responses. In addition, the researcher rephrased questions if the subject appeared to lack understanding of the question as originally stated.

For each of the three situations (name calling, stealing, physical aggression), a separate set of questions was formulated. Seven questions followed each situation. The first question, a basic comprehension question, ascertained if the subject fully understood the videotaped situation. If this question was not answered satisfactorily, the researcher replayed the situation. The last question, dealing with how the subject would behave in the given situation, was not rated for moral maturity. The other five questions
were formulated after extensive study of the theory of Piaget and Kohlberg and of the questions used by these two researchers and by Durkin (1959a, 1959b, 1959c). The interview questions used in this study, therefore, possessed construct validity as defined by Cronbach (1960). The standard questions for each situation are delineated below. Those adapted directly from another source are so marked.

I. Physical Aggression

1. What happened on the TV?
2. Should the boy have pushed back? Why or why not? (Piaget)
3. Is it right (fair) to push back? Why or why not? (Piaget)
4. What should have been done? Why or why not?
5. What should the teacher do when she/he finds out? Why or why not?
6. What if B pushed A back and then hit him. Would that be right? Why or why not? (Durkin)
7. What would you have done? Why or why not?

II. Name-calling

1. What happened on the TV?
2. Should the boy who wanted to play have name called? Why or why not?
3. Should the boy playing have name called? Why or why not?
4. Is it right to name call? Why or why not?
5. What should the teacher do when she/he finds out what happened? Why or why not?

6. Should a child have the right to prevent someone from playing? Why or why not?

7. What do you do when someone calls you a name? Why?

III. Stealing

1. What happened on the TV?

2. Should the boy sitting down have taken the other boy's pencil? Why or why not?

3. Was it right for the first boy to have taken the other boy's pencil? Why or why not?

4. What should the boy sitting down have done? Why or why not?

5. What should the teacher do when she/he finds out what happened? Why or why not?

6. What should the first boy do now? Why or why not?

7. What do you do when someone takes something of yours? Why?

**Justice Concepts Scoring System**

The justice concepts scoring system was developed by the researcher especially for use in this study. The system was derived from the theoretical work in moral judgment of Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1969, 1973, 1975). Several scoring systems served as models for the justice concepts scoring system. These included: Kohlberg's moral stages
(1975), Damon's stages of positive justice concepts (1975), and Selman's Levels of Social-Perspective Taking (Selman and Byrne, 1974; Selman and Damon, 1975). Therefore, the scoring system appears to meet the criteria for construct validity as defined by Cronbach (1960).

The justice concepts scoring system was designed to reflect a developmental sequence in children's judgments regarding justice in peer-peer conflict situations. Each question received a score from 1-6 depending on the nature of the reasoning the subject used in his/her response. Although the system described developmental levels, it did not purport to represent stages of development in the sense used by Kohlberg.

Each of the 12 sequences was considered an individual protocol. Of the seven questions following each sequence, five were designed to derive measures of moral judgment. The subject's response to the Why portion of these five questions was assigned a score from 1-6 based on the criteria described below. The Why portion of the response represented the type of reasoning the child used in formulating his/her moral judgment and followed Kohlberg's format.

The scoring system, as described below, included six levels of response. Levels 4, 5 and 6 closely paralleled Stages 1, 2, and 3 in Kohlberg's scheme. Levels 1, 2, and 3, developed especially for this study, were more applicable
for subjects of an age younger than those studied by Kohlberg. For each protocol, a total raw score ranging from 5-30 was possible, with 30 designating the most mature level of development and 5 designating the least mature level.

The dependent variable of this study, then, was the subject's level of moral maturity on justice concepts as reflected in his/her score on each protocol.

LEVELS OF RESPONSE

Level I:
The subject is unable to give an oral reason or justification for his/her decision or response.

Examples: "I don't know"
Shrugs shoulders
Doesn't answer

Level II:
The child is able to give a response but it is a statement of the child's personal opinion or desires. The child might give a response that does not appear to relate to the incident such as recounting a personal experience. Or the child might give an answer that doesn't seem to make sense indicating that he/she has lost the meaning of the situation. This level is very egocentric in perspective.

Examples: "He shouldn't push back because the boy pushed him."
"Because I said so."
"He didn't have to do that."

"That's stupid."

**Level III:**

The child is able to give a logical reason but it is not a moral judgment and does not address itself to the moral issue depicted in the situation. Instead, the child uses some external or observable feature of the situation as the reason to substantiate his/her response. The subject is still basically expressing a personal opinion but is using some objective criterion to justify his/her judgment. Direct racial references may serve as reasons here.

Examples: "Because he's black."

"Because he's a different color."

"The boy looks mean."

"He shouldn't take his pencil because then he wouldn't have a pencil to write with."

**Level IV:**

This level basically corresponds to Stage 1 in Kohlberg's schema. Kohlberg (1975) described this stage as follows:

Right is blind obedience to rules and authority, avoiding punishment and not doing physical harm. What is right is to avoid breaking rules backed by punishment, obedience for its own sake, and avoiding physical damage to persons and property. Reasons for right are avoidance of punishment and superior power of authorities. (p. 14)
The child's thinking at this level may be characterized by one or more of the following aspects:

a) Fear of authority and avoidance of punishment— the child perceives right and wrong in terms of what those adults in authority have told him/her. The child fears punishment if he/she breaks adult imposed rules and standards.

b) Fear of physical harm— the child perceives right and wrong in terms of the consequences of the act, especially physical harm to persons or things.

c) Labelling of acts without real understanding— the child is able to affix labels to acts or to respond as an adult authority has instructed but without real understanding of the meaning of those labels. The child may say of an act, "It's not fair," but is unable to explain what that means in his/her own terms.

d) Punishment must follow a wrongdoing— according to the child, all wrongdoing must be punished. The child does not concern him/herself with the motives of an act but focuses solely on its consequences.

e) Recognition of right and wrong, fair and unfair— the child is able to recognize an act as right and wrong, fair or unfair by some standard other than his/her own opinion.

Examples: "It's not nice to call people names."

"It's bad to do that."
"You're not supposed to do that."
"You'll get in trouble."
"He shouldn't do that because the teacher will whip him."
"Someone might get hurt."
"It will start a fight."
"Someone might fall and hit their head on the floor."
"They should let him play because you're supposed to share."

Level V:
This level basically corresponds to Stage 2 in Kohlberg's schema which Kohlberg (1975) described as follows:

Right is serving one's own or other's needs and making fair deals in terms of concrete exchange. What is right is following rules but when it is to someone's immediate interest. Right is acting to meet one's own needs and interests and letting others do the same. Right is also what is fair, that is, what is an equal exchange, a deal, an agreement. (p. 14-15)

The child at this level will demonstrate in his/her thinking one or more of the following characteristics:

a) Self-interest--the child judges acts in terms of benefit to self and meeting his/her own needs.

b) Eye for eye orientation--the child views fairness in terms of an eye for an eye, the concrete exchange.
There should be strict reciprocity in actions—an individual should be paid back for doing good or bad deeds.

c) Retaliation and retribution—the child views these as legitimate reasons for action.

d) Anticipation of consequences—the child is able to anticipate possible positive or negative consequences of an act besides for punishment or physical harm and is able to judge an act based on the anticipation of consequences.

e) Punishment as a practical deterrent—the child views punishment as a means for the transgressor to learn a lesson. The child believes if the transgressor isn't punished, he/she will think that they can repeat the offense and "get away with it."

f) Concern for property rights—the subject is concerned with his/her personal property. If something is yours, you can do whatever you want with it.

g) Literal projection of one's own wants and needs into the perspective of another—the child has become a little less egocentric in that he/she is able to literally project his/her own needs and wants into the perspective of another. However, the child is still limited by egocentrism and is unable to appreciate points of view that differ from his/her own.
Examples: "He has to defend himself."
"He should take the other boy's pencil to make it even."
"The boy should push back because you shouldn't let someone push you around."
"You shouldn't call someone names because then they'll want to beat you up."
"It's fair to push back because if you don't, they will tell everyone they could beat you up."
"It's not his property so he has no right telling the boy he can't play."
"He had no business going in someone else's box."
"If he didn't call him a name, they might have let him play."
"He shouldn't be punished because the other kid started it."
"He should be punished to teach him a lesson."

Level VI:

This level basically corresponds to Stage 3 in Kohlberg's schema which Kohlberg (1975) described as follows:

Right is playing a good (nice) role, being concerned about other people and their feelings, keeping loyalty and trust with partners and being motivated to follow rules and expectations...Reasons for doing right are 1) the need to be good in your own eyes and those of others 2) caring for others and 3) because if
you put yourself in the other guy's place you would want good behavior from self. (p. 15-16)

The thinking of this child will appear markedly different from the preceding levels. This thinking enters a new stage of cognitive maturity and will illustrate one or more of these characteristics:

a) Orientation toward expectations--the child is aware of expectations others have for you in various roles and situations. Maintaining expectations of parents, family, friends and teachers are considered valuable in their own right.

b) Desire to maintain relationships--the child desires to maintain relationships which are based on mutual trust and respect.

c) Empathy--the child understands the feelings and thoughts of others and is sensitive to the feelings of others.

d) Ability to see several points of view--the child is able to perceive a variety of perspectives and thus can envision several alternatives to a situation.

e) Consideration of motives and intentions--in judging an act, the child takes into account the motives and intentions of the individuals involved.

f) View of punishment as instructive for reform and rehabilitation--punishment is viewed in terms of rehabilitation and reform or to set an example in terms of
teaching the transgressor and others why the act was wrong.

Examples: "Make them apologize because it would make them friends again not to call each other names."
"He shouldn't push back, because if they were friends it will break their friendship."
"His feelings were hurt."
"They should let him play because if he didn't have anything else to do, it would be the nicest thing to do."
"He shouldn't push back because maybe it was an accident."
"The teacher should talk to them and make them understand why they shouldn't name call."
"He should have ignored it and the other kid would stop pushing."

Pilot Study

In order to ascertain the effectiveness of the interview questions and procedures and to determine initial reliability of the scoring system, a small pilot study was conducted. One 6 year old and two 9 year old girls participated in the pilot study which took place at Ohio State University. At the time of the pilot, only the first set of tapes dealing with name-calling and physical aggression were available. The girls were shown these tapes and then asked
Nine protocols were then transcribed, coded, and scored using the justice concepts scoring system by the researcher and an independent rater (see Appendix D for samples of these transcribed and rated protocols). The inter-rater agreement was very high \( r = .97 \).

Following the pilot study, these conclusions were drawn:

1. The tapes lacked clarity and acting quality. A decision was made to retape them at the Teacher Education Laboratory studio.

2. The interview questions appeared to be clear, easily understood by the children and appropriately sequenced. However, the researcher perceived the need to develop more skill in eliciting responses from the subjects.

3. Although the scoring system was very reliable, input from the independent rater led to further refinement and clarification of it.

4. The basic procedures of the experiment appeared sound and workable.

**Subjects**

The subjects were lower class children who attended two integrated public schools in Central Ohio. To select children for the investigation, class lists were obtained
from school A. The parents of children who were either 5 years 6 months to 7 years old or 10 years old to 11 years 6 months old were sent a letter in the mail explaining the research and a permission form approving their child's participation (see Appendix E). From those children whose parents returned the permission forms, a modified random sample was selected to participate in the study. At school B, which was much larger than school A, the principal and teachers selected the children who met the age and SES criteria. It should be noted that the researcher had intended to have complete random selection of the sample. However, the necessity of written parental permission prevented this from occurring.

Originally 42 children were chosen as subjects. Of these 10 had to be dropped for the following reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mechanical difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unable to attend to the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Randomly selected to be dropped to insure equal n's per cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unavailable at time of second interview (extended illness, withdrawn from school)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final sample included 32 children equally divided by age, sex and race (see Table 4). Twenty-three of the
TABLE 4

AGE, SEX AND RACE OF SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6 year olds</th>
<th>10 year olds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black females</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White females</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

subjects attended school A and 9 attended school B.

The younger group of subjects ranged in age at the time of the interview from 5 years 7 months to 6 years 11 months with a mean age of 6 years 4 months. The older children ranged in age at the time of the interview from 10 years to 11 years 6 months with a mean age of 11 years.

The researcher attempted to gain as much information about each subject as possible (see Appendix F for Subject Information Sheet). The schools provided access to the children's cumulative folders and teachers completed a questionnaire on each subject which dealt with peer relations, academics, and behavior (see Appendix G).

Every attempt was made to select Ss from the lower socioeconomic status. Both schools were Title I schools
although the population of school A was more economically homogeneous than School B. To guarantee a close SES match between the subjects from schools A and B, the principal of school B used his own knowledge of children’s SES in deciding which families should receive letters and permission forms. It was difficult to obtain accurate information regarding parental employment. The researcher was able to learn that seven children had no fathers in the home and that three other families received some form of welfare.

Cumulative records proved to be an incomplete source of data regarding children's intelligence. Based on a questionnaire distributed to the teachers, they rated the subjects' intelligence as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Intelligence</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experimental Procedures**

Each subject was interviewed individually by the researcher in two separate sessions held at least one month apart. The interview occurred during the school day at the subject's school with the times of the interviews arranged
to meet the schedules of individual teachers. The format of the two interview sessions was essentially identical.

The subject and the interviewer were alone in the room and sat close together in front of the TV monitor, reel-to-reel tape recorder, and cassette recorder. The majority of the children were fascinated by the equipment and asked many questions. The researcher, a trained elementary school teacher, who has had extensive experience with children of backgrounds similar to the subjects, made every effort to help the children feel relaxed. The researcher felt that her rapport with the children was very good. One indication of this rapport was the enthusiastic greeting she received when she returned for the second session. Many children in the school not selected for the study eagerly volunteered to participate.

At the first session, one of the four orders of the tapes (Tape A, Part 1; Tape A, Part 2; Tape B, Part 1; Tape B, Part 2) was randomly selected for the subject to view. The researcher explained to the subjects that they would be seeing some situations in which children would be doing various things. She further explained that following the viewing, she would ask several questions. In addition, the researcher stressed that there were no right and wrong answers to the questions—that she just wanted the child to answer honestly. She also assured the children that the interview session was confidential. After this introduction,
the interviewer played the tape of six sequences, and asked the appropriate questions following each sequence. The child's responses were tape-recorded.

Session II was conducted in essentially the same manner as Session I. The second portion of the tape not shown in Session I was shown to the subjects in Session II so that they again saw six sequences. The similarity of the interview procedures did not appear repetitious or boring to the children. They remained enthusiastic throughout both sessions.

The response of the subjects to the interview was very gratifying. Subjects were cooperative and appeared to enjoy the experience. They readily identified with the situations on the tapes and the majority of the subjects believed that the situations were actually occurring rather than being staged. The interviewer tried to remain flexible in managing the data gathering condition. Several of the younger children (7 in the 32 sessions with younger children) exhibited fatigue during a session. The interviewer felt it was best to permit these children to return to their classroom and to complete the interview at a later time. Each session usually lasted between 20-30 minutes. In addition, equipment failure, mechanical problems and temporary interruptions occurred at times. The researcher found that a sense of humor was a great asset in conducting this experiment.
Transcribing and Scoring

Following the completion of the data gathering, the tape recorded interviews were transcribed. Each pair of tapes (Session I and Session II) from an individual child was assigned a random four digit code which precluded the researcher's ability to identify any of the subjects (see Appendix H for examples). This created a blind scoring procedure which guarded against experimenter bias and which also protected the rights of the subjects by insuring their anonymity. Since each of the 12 sequences was treated as a separate protocol and each of the 32 subjects viewed and responded to all 12 sequences, there was a total of 384 protocols to be scored.

Many of the subjects spoke Black English or an Appalachian dialect. To minimize the possibility that the scorers could ascertain and thus be influenced by either the race or ethnicity of the subjects, the researcher transcribed all protocols into so-called Standard English. According to a linguist, a researcher need usually only change the surface forms of a dialect as the meaning intended by the speaker can be the same across dialects; i.e., meaning in this particular context was not dialect bound whereas syntax and phonology could have been.¹ Thus, this Standard English

---

¹Personal communication with Dr. Johanna S. DeStefano
transcription obviated the existence of bias due to the race or ethnicity of the subjects.

Three independent raters were trained on the justice concepts scoring system by the researcher. Over 1/2 of the protocols were rated by these trained raters. Of these, 151 were used to compute rater agreement coefficients. (see Appendix H for examples of rated protocols) Inter-rater agreement was computed using Pearson product moment correlations between the researcher and each independent rater (see Table 5).

TABLE 5
RATER AGREEMENT COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN RESEARCHER AND EACH RATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Number of protocols</th>
<th>Value of r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.9428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.9473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.9416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, eight protocols were randomly selected to be rated by all four raters. Rater agreement coefficients among the four raters was computed using the Pearson product moment correlation (see Table 6).
TABLE 6
RATER AGREEMENT COEFFICIENTS AMONG THE FOUR RATERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>.9251</td>
<td>.7201</td>
<td>.9397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7823</td>
<td>.9879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that all the correlations among the four raters were very high with the exception of Rater C. However, the lower correlations of Rater C were no cause for alarm for several reasons: the sample size of the protocols selected for the correlation was very small; this rater and the researcher independently rated 42 protocols with a very high rater agreement coefficient ($r = .9416$); this rater also rated the pilot study for which she and the researcher also correlated very high ($r = .97$). Therefore, this particular lower coefficient may be considered an anomaly. The scores used in the analysis itself were always those of the researcher.

In addition to inter-rater agreement of the scoring, the reliability of the interview questions was also ascertained. Because the 12 sequences were randomly presented
to the subjects in two separate sessions, it was hypothe-
sized that the total score of the subject from Session I
and the total score of the subject from Session II would be
relatively stable. A Pearson product moment correlation was
computed on the subjects' scores from Session I and Session
II. A relatively high correlation \( r = .83 \) was found, in-
dicating the stability of the scores over time and thus pro-
viding evidence for the reliability of the interview instru-
ment itself.

**Experimental Design**

A design was needed to efficiently and effectively deal
with the five independent and one dependent variable of this
study. The variables are described below.

Independent variables:

1. Age of subjects—There were two levels of age, 6
   year olds and 10 year olds. Age is an assigned,
   fixed and between factors variable.

2. Sex of subjects—There were two levels of sex, boys
   and girls. Sex is an assigned, fixed and between
   factors variable.

3. Race of subjects—There are two levels of race, black
   children and white children. Race is also an
   assigned, fixed and between factors variable.

4. Situation—There were three levels of the situa-
tions shown to the subjects—name calling, physical
aggression and stealing. Situation is an active, fixed variable. It is also a within factors variable since each subject was exposed to all three levels.

5. Race of the children in the tapes—There were four levels of this variable: a black child transgressing against a white child, a black child transgressing against a black child, a white child transgressing against a white child, and a white child transgressing against a black child. This variable is active, fixed and also within factors since each subject was exposed to all its levels.

Dependent Variable:

1. The dependent variable in this study is the child's level of moral maturity as measured by responses to the interview questions. The data resulting from the justice concepts scoring system are interval in nature.

The design appropriate for this investigation is a 3 between-2 within analysis of variance. This 2 x 2 x 2 x 3 x 4 mixed design will reveal main and interactive effects for all five independent variables. Kennedy (1977) described the advantages of such a design as supreme design efficiency, reduction of error variance, and conservation of subjects.
The data matrix with the raw scores appears in Table 7. The nominal data of the matrix include the five independent variables: age, race, and sex of subjects, situation and racial pairings. The interval data, necessary in order to perform the analysis of variance, include the subjects' scores.
TABLE 7

DATA MATRIX FOR 2 X 2 X 2 X 3 X 4 ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D₁ Stealing</th>
<th></th>
<th>D₂ Pushing</th>
<th></th>
<th>D₃ Name Calling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bl</td>
<td>Wh</td>
<td>Bl-Wh</td>
<td>Wh-Bl</td>
<td>Bl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D₁ Stealing</th>
<th></th>
<th>D₂ Pushing</th>
<th></th>
<th>D₃ Name Calling</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bl</td>
<td>Wh</td>
<td>Bl-Wh</td>
<td>Wh-Bl</td>
<td>Bl</td>
<td>Wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E₁</td>
<td>E₂</td>
<td>E₃</td>
<td>E₄</td>
<td>E₁</td>
<td>E₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( D_1 ) Stealing</td>
<td></td>
<td>( D_2 ) Pushing</td>
<td></td>
<td>( D_3 ) Name Calling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( Bl )</td>
<td>( Wh )</td>
<td>( Bl-Wh )</td>
<td>( Wh-Bl )</td>
<td>( Bl )</td>
<td>( Wh )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( E_1 )</td>
<td>( E_2 )</td>
<td>( E_3 )</td>
<td>( E_4 )</td>
<td>( E_1 )</td>
<td>( E_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_1 )</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_2 )</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_3 )</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_4 )</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_1 )</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_2 )</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_3 )</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_4 )</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D₁ Stealing</td>
<td></td>
<td>D₂ Pushing</td>
<td></td>
<td>D₃ Name Calling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bl</td>
<td>Wh</td>
<td>Bl-Wh</td>
<td>Wh-Bl</td>
<td>Bl</td>
<td>Wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₂ S₁</td>
<td>E₁</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>S₂</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ White</td>
<td>S₃</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 yr</td>
<td>S₄</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂ S₁</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>S₂</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₃</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₄</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bl - Black
Wh - White
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The purposes of this dissertation were 1) to investigate children's concepts of justice in peer-peer conflict situations within a cognitive-developmental framework 2) to determine if children's racial perceptions affect their justice concepts and 3) to explore children's age, race, and sex as they may affect children's justice concepts.

This chapter presents the findings of various types of analyses conducted to satisfy these purposes. Results of these analyses will be described and briefly discussed. However, a detailed explication of the results as well as their implications will be found in Chapter V.

The chapter consists of the following six sections:

1. The results of the analysis of variance used to test the hypotheses of the study and a discussion of each of the hypotheses in terms of the analysis
2. The results of t tests conducted to determine any possible confounding school effects
3. The findings of various correlations
4. Some frequency data on selected aspects of the
5. Some descriptive analysis of the children's responses

6. A summary of the results

**Results of the Analysis of Variance**

Means and standard deviations for each level of the five independent variables were calculated. The results appear in Table 8. To determine the existence of any significant differences among the means for both main and interactive effects, a 3 between-2 within analysis of variance was computed using the BALANOVA computer program. The ANOVA summary table appears in Table 9. Each hypothesis of this dissertation will be reviewed and individually discussed in terms of the results of the analysis of variance.

\[ H_1: \text{The justice concepts of 10 year old children will reflect greater moral maturity than the justice concepts of 6 year old children.} \]

This hypothesis was supported. As Table 8 indicates, a substantial difference between the means of 6 year olds and 10 year olds occurred, with 10 year olds demonstrating a higher level of moral maturity than 6 year olds. The analysis of variance substantiated that a highly significant difference did exist in the justice concepts of 6 and 10 year olds in the predicted direction. This finding lends additional support to the theories of Piaget and Kohlberg.
TABLE 8
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE FIVE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A (Age)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 year olds</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year olds</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B (Race)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C (Sex)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D (Situation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Calling</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E (Racial Pairings)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-Black</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-White</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-White</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Black</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand mean and SD</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9

**Analysis of Variance of Moral Maturity of Justice Concepts by Age, Race and Sex of Subjects**  
**and by Situations and Racial Pairings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1, 24</td>
<td>2276.6276</td>
<td>15.8955**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1, 24</td>
<td>14.6484</td>
<td>0.1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1, 24</td>
<td>2.8359</td>
<td>0.0198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>1, 24</td>
<td>251.8776</td>
<td>1.7586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>1, 24</td>
<td>7.3151</td>
<td>0.0511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>1, 24</td>
<td>194.0859</td>
<td>1.3551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>1, 24</td>
<td>5.7526</td>
<td>0.0402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/ABC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>143.2248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2, 48</td>
<td>58.6901</td>
<td>4.2576a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x D</td>
<td>2, 48</td>
<td>15.9401</td>
<td>1.1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x D</td>
<td>2, 48</td>
<td>0.1484</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x D</td>
<td>2, 48</td>
<td>28.0547</td>
<td>2.0352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x D</td>
<td>2, 48</td>
<td>8.0651</td>
<td>0.5851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C x D</td>
<td>2, 48</td>
<td>5.7213</td>
<td>0.4151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C x D</td>
<td>2, 48</td>
<td>22.5234</td>
<td>1.6339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C x D</td>
<td>2, 48</td>
<td>14.6901</td>
<td>1.0657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D x S/ABC</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.7847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3, 72</td>
<td>6.0929</td>
<td>0.7032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 9 (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A x E</td>
<td>3, 72</td>
<td>0.7873</td>
<td>0.0909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x E</td>
<td>3, 72</td>
<td>5.5026</td>
<td>0.6351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x E</td>
<td>3, 72</td>
<td>8.537</td>
<td>0.9853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x E</td>
<td>3, 72</td>
<td>2.0929</td>
<td>0.2415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C x E</td>
<td>3, 72</td>
<td>1.0998</td>
<td>0.1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C x E</td>
<td>3, 72</td>
<td>13.9262</td>
<td>1.6072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C x E</td>
<td>3, 72</td>
<td>8.0929</td>
<td>0.9340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x S/ABC</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8.6646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D x E</td>
<td>6, 144</td>
<td>7.9158</td>
<td>0.9246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x D x E</td>
<td>6, 144</td>
<td>9.4644</td>
<td>1.1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x D x E</td>
<td>6, 144</td>
<td>3.2422</td>
<td>0.3787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x D x E</td>
<td>6, 144</td>
<td>1.4540</td>
<td>0.1698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x D x E</td>
<td>6, 144</td>
<td>2.6658</td>
<td>0.3114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C x D x E</td>
<td>6, 144</td>
<td>3.7665</td>
<td>0.4399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C x D x E</td>
<td>6, 144</td>
<td>3.9991</td>
<td>0.4671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C x D x E</td>
<td>6, 144</td>
<td>11.3533</td>
<td>1.3261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D x E x S/ABC** | 144  | 8.5613 |

---

**Notes:**

- **p < .001**
- **p < .02** However, this F ratio is positively biased. To "correct" this positive bias, one must apply the conservative Geisser-Greenhouse F test which adjusts the degrees of freedom (Kennedy, 1977). When this is done, the F ratio is no longer significant.

**Key:** A-Age of Subjects; B-Race of Subjects; C-Sex of Subjects; D-Situations in videotapes; E-Racial pairings in videotapes; S-Subjects
that moral reasoning is a developmental process.

$H_2$: There will be no developmental difference in the justice concepts of males and females of the same age.

Hypothesis 2 was confirmed. As Table 9 indicates, no significant interaction effect for age x sex was found. The means for males and females of the same age were quite comparable as described in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6 year olds</th>
<th>10 year olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>21.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This finding also supports a large amount of research which indicates that no sex differences in moral development exist.

$H_3$: There will be no developmental difference in the justice concepts of black and white children of the same age and social class.

Hypothesis 3 was also confirmed. Table 9 reveals no significant F ratios for either main or interactive effects due to the race of the subjects. The means of black and white subjects of the same age are described in the following chart:
Very little research has investigated the race of the subject as a factor in moral growth (Harris, 1970; Burns, 1972) with the two studies revealing contradictory results. The finding that no difference among subjects due to their race existed adds new information to the body of research dealing with moral development.

$H_4$: The nature of the situation being judged, i.e. stealing, name calling, physical aggression, will not influence the moral maturity of the children's justice concepts.

Hypothesis 4 was confirmed. As Table 9 indicates, although the analysis of variance found a significant F ratio at the .02 level, this F ratio is positively biased because of the repeated measures design. When the more conservative Geisser-Greenhouse formula is applied, the F ratio no longer meets the requirements for significance. Therefore, one must conclude that the nature of the situation being judged did not significantly influence the moral maturity of the children's justice concepts. Because no previous research has dealt with the type of situation being judged by the subjects as a factor in the maturity of their moral judgments, even a trend towards significance in this
area is a most interesting finding.

\( H_5: \) The race of the children interacting in the videotaped situations will have a differential effect on the moral maturity of the subjects' justice concepts. The racial pairings will produce developmental levels of moral maturity in the following order from most mature to least mature justice concepts:

a. white child transgressing against a white child
b. black child transgressing against a white child
c. white child transgressing against a black child
d. black child transgressing against a black child

This hypothesis was not confirmed. As Table 8 shows, the means for all four racial pairings were closely matched. The results seem to indicate that in the area of formulating justice concepts, children demonstrate no racial bias—a most positive and hopeful finding.

**School Differences**

To insure that no confounding effect occurred due to the school which the subjects attended, \( t \) tests were computed on the subjects' scores by age and school attended.
The results of the t tests appear in Table 10. As the table indicates, there were no significant differences in subjects'

TABLE 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 year olds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 year olds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>200.50</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>210.75</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>-.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>262.64</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>259.00</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

scores due to school attended, thus eliminating the possibility that type of school created a confounding effect.

Correlations

To determine the validity of the stimulus situations in eliciting moral judgments from the subjects, internal correlations were computed between subjects' scores on each of the three types of situations and their total score using Pearson product moment correlations. Cronbach (1960) lists "internal correlations among separate items" (p. 122) as one method to ascertain construct validity. Table 11 presents
these correlations.

TABLE 11

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SUBJECTS SCORES DERIVED FROM THE STIMULUS SITUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stealing</th>
<th>Pushing</th>
<th>Name Calling</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td></td>
<td>.838*</td>
<td>.829*</td>
<td>.951*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.798*</td>
<td>.933*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Calling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.932*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001

As Table 11 reveals, highly significant correlations were found between each situation and between each situation and the subject's total score. This commonality demonstrates that all three situations were consistently eliciting comparable levels of response. The manner in which a subject performed on one situation was quite predictable in terms of how that subject performed on another situation. It appears, then, that the three stimulus situations did in fact measure the same construct. Chapter III discussed the construct validity of the three situations in eliciting moral judgments from children. Assuming that one situation
validly measured moral development, it seems safe to con­clude that all three situations were measures of moral de­velopment. Therefore, the validity of the stimulus situa­tions in eliciting moral responses is established.

Pearson product moment correlations were also computed on aspects of the teacher rating form (see Appendix G). The teachers rated the subjects on 14 items which were collapsed into four general clusters: social development, cognitive development, moral behavior and moral reasoning. Correla­tions were computed both between these four aspects as rated by the teachers and between teachers' ratings and the subjects' scores on the moral judgment situations. The re­sults of these correlations appear in Table 12. A break­down of these correlations by age (6 year olds and 10 year olds) appear in Appendix I.

Several interesting trends emerge from these correla­tions. First, teachers' perceptions of subjects' cognitive development did positively correlate with the subjects' de­velopmental level of moral maturity. Some research evidence does exist to support the relationship between cognitive and moral growth (Damon, 1975; Tomlinson-Keasey and Keasey, 1974). In addition, there has also been documentation of a positive relationship between moral development and vari­ous indices of social development (Keasey, 1971; Moir, 1974; Selman, 1971). The teacher perceptions in this study pro­vide some evidence in support of such a relationship.
**TABLE 12**

**CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUBJECTS AND SUBJECTS' SCORES ON THE STIMULUS SITUATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Moral Maturity</th>
<th>Social Development</th>
<th>Cognitive Development</th>
<th>Moral Behavior</th>
<th>Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Total Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.378*</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.372*</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.357*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Calling</td>
<td>.388*</td>
<td>.515**</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.362*</td>
<td>.480**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Subject</td>
<td>.371*</td>
<td>.448**</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.402*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Development</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Development</td>
<td>.668***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Behavior</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Reasoning</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.393*</td>
<td>.468**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teacher</td>
<td>.758***</td>
<td>.720***</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>.818***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001
Teachers' perceptions of subjects' social development were either significantly correlated with subjects' scores on the moral judgment measures or approached significance. Thus, it appears that teachers' perceptions are relatively good predictors of moral development in terms of subjects' cognitive and social development. However, teachers' predictions of subjects' actual behavior in situations similar to those that the subjects judged were negatively correlated to the subjects' level of moral maturity when reasoning about these situations. Teachers' perceptions of subjects' ability to reason about the three types of situations did not significantly correlate with the subjects' scores on these measures with the exception of name-calling. It appears then, that in the areas of moral behavior and moral reasoning, the perceptions of the teachers in this study had little relationship to the subjects' actual developmental level of moral maturity. It should be noted that the scores of the 6 year old subjects did deflate the strength of the overall correlations (see Appendix I).

**Frequency Data**

Other aspects of the data were of particular interest to the researcher. The data enabled the researcher to explore the relationship between the child's belief regarding appropriate behavior in a conflict situation and the child's belief regarding how he/she would actually behave in such a
situation. In the stealing and physical aggression situations, question 4 asked: "What should have been done? Why?" This question was scored for moral maturity. Question 7, which was not scored for moral maturity, asked the subject: "What would you have done? Why?" A tally was taken to determine the amount of agreement of responses to these two questions for each subject. The reasoning that the subject used to support his/her response was not considered for these purposes. For instance, in response to question 4, a subject might have replied, "Push him back." If the subject also responded to 7, "push back," the two answers were considered in agreement. However, if to question 4, the subject replied, "tell the teacher," and to 7 replied, "push him back," these answers were considered in disagreement. The results of the frequency by age across both situations appear in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6 year olds</th>
<th>10 year olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to respond</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 13

FREQUENCY OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 4 AND 7
A chi-square was computed on the frequency of agreement and disagreement for 6 year olds and 10 year olds (p > .05). This non significant result is quite interesting. If one hypothesizes that a relationship exists between moral reasoning and moral behavior (Kohlberg, 1975; Kohlberg and Turiel, 1971), then one would predict that the frequency of subjects' answers in agreement would significantly surpass the frequency of subjects' answers in disagreement. Although there was a greater number of agrees than disagrees for both 6 and 10 year olds, the differences were non significant. Thirty-two percent of the 6 year old responses were in disagreement while 37% of the 10 year old responses were in disagreement. Although only very tentative conclusions can be drawn, it does appear that a gap may exist between what children think should be done and what they think in actuality they would do when confronted with conflict situations.

The data also enabled the researcher to ascertain the types of action that the children deemed appropriate for the teacher to follow after the conflict situation had occurred. For each protocol, the child's response to the question, "What should the teacher do" was noted. Here again, the reasoning that the child used to support his/her answer was not considered. The types of action and the frequency with which they were suggested appear in Table 14.
### TABLE 14
WHAT SHOULD THE TEACHER DO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Action</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whip or paddle</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send to the principal</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to them</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to respond</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish (unspecified)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make them give the pencil back (for stealing situation only)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss recess</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell them to stop</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make apologize</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell parents</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put in corner</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One immediately notices the amount of corporal punishment advocated by the children. Twenty per cent of the total responses were for the teacher to "whip" or "paddle" the boys. In addition, many of the responses included in the "other" category reflected severe and aggressive types
of punishment such as "wash their mouth out with soap," "put them in the hall." After physical punishment, the children preferred a course of action in which the teacher appealed to another authority figure. If one combines, "send to principal" and "tell parents," the appeal to another authority accounts for 14% of the responses. In contrast, few punishments seem to be reciprocal in nature in that the punishment bears some relationship to the offense. These are included in the "other" category receiving low frequencies such as "put away the game and not be allowed to play" in response to the name calling situation. However, the action "talk to them" did receive 10% of the responses.

**Descriptive Data**

Several of the children's responses were especially original or humorous and seem worthy of mentioning. It is again interesting to note the amount of aggression manifested in the children's statements. The questions posed by the researcher are stated below followed by the responses of the children.

Is it right to name call? Why?

"No. Because boys call their mothers a name, the mother picks them up and takes them in the room and spanks them. And the mother would whip them hard."

"No. I don't call my sister names. Because you're not supposed to call people names. God didn't make you
to call people names."

"No. Cause Jesus doesn't like that."

"No. Because you could go to jail or get a whipping. Big people go to jail."

What do you do when someone calls you a name? Why?

"Hit him and smack him and box him and sick my dog on them. Because they called me a name."

"I'm not chicken to fight them. I fight them."

"I say, 'a turkey, you're the one that's the turkey. You look like a turkey, you smell like a turkey, you act like a turkey.' Well, he thinks I'm a turkey, but I'm not a turkey because he's got a nose shaped like a V."

What should the teacher do when she finds out what happened? Why? (for name calling incident)

"Put the boy in the corner that wouldn't let the boy play the game. Or take him to the principal. (Why should she take him to the principal?) Because she might have too many people in the corner and she might run out of corners."

"Make them apologize and not let the boy play the game anymore. Because Jesus didn't make people to hate each other."

"She should tell the parents. And the parents, if it's their birthday, they shouldn't make them a birthday cake. Because they were going to start
What should the boy have done? Why? (for physical aggression situation)

"Told the principal. Cause most teachers don't do anything about it."

Is it fair to push back? Why?

"Yeh. Because he doesn't want to get all sore and be scraped and get all ripped."

What would you have done? Why? (for physical aggression situation)

"Told the teacher and then I would tell my mommy and daddy and tell my little brother to hit him because he scratches and bites."

"Well, if I couldn't control myself, I would push him."

"Hit him and give him a bloody nose, and a swelled up lip and a black eye. Because if that doesn't teach him a lesson, nothing would."

What do you do when someone takes something of yours? Why?

"Hit him and smack him. I don't want anybody taking my things. Somebody took off with my bike and I said, 'give it back' and they didn't give it back so I let the air out of their tires."

"I say, 'give it back to me.' Because sometimes they take my play wheelbarrow and put dirt in it and water and tore the leg off of it and now I can't
do anything with it."
"I tell my mother, I tell my father, I tell my brother and they come and beat him up."

**Summary of Results**

A 3 between-2 within analysis of variance was computed to determine the main and interactive effects of the five independent variables. The analysis of variance revealed a main effect for age. This was the only significant result. It was found that the justice concepts of 10 year olds reflected greater moral maturity than those of 6 year olds. The sex and race of the subjects had no significant effect on the subjects' moral maturity. The type of situation judged by the subjects and the race of the children interacting in the conflict situations that appeared in the videotapes did not influence the moral maturity of the children's justice concepts.

* t tests were performed to determine any significant effect due to the school which the subjects attended. No differences were found in the subjects' scores related to the school attended.

Internal correlations computed between the subjects' scores for each of the situations revealed a high level of consistency in the subjects' performance for all three situations. This consistency appears to confirm that the three situations are a valid measure of moral judgment.
Correlations computed between subjects' moral maturity and teachers' perceptions of subjects' moral behavior and moral reasoning resulted in a weak relationship, generally indicating that teachers are poor evaluators of students' level of moral maturity.

Frequency data indicated that a gap may exist between what a child believes is appropriate behavior in a conflict situation and what in fact the child thinks he/she would do if confronted with that situation. In addition, frequency data also revealed that children advocate severe punishments for offenders with "whipping" leading the list.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter V serves several functions. First, a discussion of the results of the analysis of variance is presented. Second, the contributions of this study, established in Chapter I, are reviewed regarding 1) enhancement of the research area 2) the need for further research 3) the effectiveness of the research methodology, particularly the employment of videotaped dilemmas 4) implications of this research for education and 5) the importance of this study for society. Third, a summary of this dissertation is furnished together with the general conclusions.

Discussion of the Analysis of Variance

Five hypotheses were tested using a 3 between-2 within analysis of variance. The results regarding each hypothesis will be discussed followed by a general analysis of the results.

\( H_1 \): The justice concepts of 10 year old children will reflect greater moral maturity than the justice concepts of 6 year old children.
This hypothesis was confirmed. Highly significant differences \( p < .001 \) were found in the justice concepts of 6 and 10 year olds, with the moral reasoning verbalized by 10 year olds being more mature than that of 6 year olds. This finding indicates confirmation of the theory of Piaget and Kohlberg that moral reasoning is a developmental process. It also supports previous research on other aspects of moral development where significant age differences have been revealed (see Table 2, Chapter II). Further, the content of the moral reasoning of 6 and 10 year olds generally differed in the manner theorized by Piaget and Kohlberg. The responses of the 6 year olds usually indicated reasoning that focused on adult authority and fear of punishment or physical harm. For example, in response to the question, "Should the boy have pushed back? Why?", 6 year olds responded as follows:

"No. Cause if the teacher finds out, she'll send them both to the office."

"No. You might get in trouble."

"No. That boy could hit his head on the blackboard."

"Yes. My mom told me to push back."

In contrast, a sampling of 10 year old responses to this question showed a greater concern with "eye for eye" justice motivated by self interest as illustrated in the following examples.

"Yes. If he didn't, the boy would think he could just
keep messing with me and get away with it."
"Yes. He should be defending himself. He shouldn't get in trouble for that."
"Yes. Cause if someone pushes me, I push them back."

This concern with one's own needs and interests is reflected in the feelings of 10 year olds regarding the violation of property rights. In response to the question, "Was it right for the boy who walked in the room to have taken the other boy's pencil? Why?," 10 year olds answered as follows.

"No. Because that was somebody else's. He shouldn't have taken it because it belonged to somebody else. Because it was somebody else's property."
"No. Not if it was somebody else's. Because it wasn't his in the first place. He shouldn't have taken it because it wasn't his."
"No. Cause he had no business going in his box."

It is interesting to point out that none of the 6 year old responses and very few of the 10 year old responses received the highest rating, a 6. One boy was the exception with his thinking consistently reflecting Level 6. Thus, it did not appear that among this sample of 10 year old children, with the exception of one child, any of the children were in transition from preconventional to conventional thought as defined by Kohlberg.

In addition, regarding the responses of the 6 year olds, one must note that the measurement of moral reasoning
is dependent on the child's ability to verbalize clearly his/her judgments. Many responses of the younger children such as "I don't know" or shrugged shoulders may have resulted from their lack of verbal skills in adequately expressing their thoughts rather than from a very immature level of moral growth. Perhaps alternatives to measuring moral judgment through verbal responses need to be explored.

\[ H_3: \] There will be no developmental differences in the justice concepts of black and white children of the same age and social class.

Hypothesis 3 was confirmed. This result is viewed as a very important finding in this study, since very little research has dealt with the race of subject as a variable in moral development. Although some research has been conducted comparing moral growth of children of various social classes (Boehm, 1962a, 1962b; Boehm and Nass, 1962; Zavit, 1969; Harris, 1970), less research to date has investigated racial differences (Harris, 1970; Burns, 1972). In addition, the findings regarding the relationship of race and/or socioeconomic status to moral judgment have proven inconclusive. In measuring five aspects of moral growth, Harris (1970) found the moral maturity of white boys superior to black boys on two dimensions. However, she found a significant effect for social class on all five dimensions so that the researcher concluded that "both white and Negro children of higher social class groups are more mature in moral
attitudes than children of lower social class groups" (Harris, 1970, p. 379). Burns (1972), in studying justice concepts in child-adult authority situations, found no consistent racial differences. Regarding social class differences in moral growth, although Boehm (1962a, 1962b) found upper middle class children matured earlier on some aspects of moral development, she also found that working class children matured earlier on other aspects. The other studies dealing with socio-economic status revealed no differences (Boehm and Nass, 1962; Zavitz, 1969).

This dissertation has clearly indicated that when socioeconomic status is held constant, there are no racial differences in children's moral development. It appears, however, that the relationship between race and/or socio-economic status to children's moral judgments is an intricate one which warrants further investigation.

H5: The race of the children interacting in the videotaped situations will have a differential effect on the moral maturity of the subjects' justice concepts. The racial pairings will produce developmental levels of moral maturity in the following order from most mature to least mature justice concepts:

a. White child transgressing against a white child
b. Black child transgressing against a white child
c. White child transgressing against a black child
d. Black child transgressing against a black child

Hypothesis 5 was not confirmed. This is a most revealing and unexpected finding. Previous research has consistently demonstrated that both black and white children prefer white over black and positively evaluate white (see Table 3, Chapter II). But this white preference did not appear to transfer to children's ability to pass judgment on conflict situations. In other words, children's concepts of justice were consistent regardless of the race of the aggressor or victim. Therefore, even if children are racially biased, this bias has no effect on their ability to consistently judge conflict situations.

One might argue that because the videotapes were in black and white instead of color, the children, in fact, didn't recognize racial differences. This argument seems unlikely, however. Many studies have investigated racial awareness and attitudes using black and white photographs or pictures (Morland, 1966; Goodman, 1952; Morland, 1962). In addition, research evidence overwhelmingly supports the belief that racial awareness develops at a young age (3-4 years) and that this awareness increases with age (see
Table 3, Chapter II). Therefore, there is no real evidence to suggest that the subjects of this study, who attended integrated schools, would not recognize the racial differences among children who appeared in the videotapes.

**H2:** There will be no developmental difference in the justice concepts of males and females of the same age.

Hypothesis 2 was confirmed. There were no sex differences in children's justice concepts. This finding is consistent with most of the studies that have considered sex as a variable in moral maturity which found no significant sex differences (Peterson, Peterson and Finley, 1974; Boehm and Nass, 1962; Whiteman and Kosier, 1964; Jensen and Rytting, 1972; Irwin and Moore, 1971).

**H4:** The nature of the situation being judged by the children, i.e. stealing, name calling, physical aggression, will not influence the moral maturity of the children's justice concepts.

This hypothesis was confirmed. Although a main effect for situation approached significance at the .05 level, it was not in fact statistically significant. However, this trend toward significance provokes some interesting observations. The physical aggression (pushing) situation elicited the most mature moral concepts and the name calling situation elicited the least mature concepts. Several factors might account for this trend toward significance. One
explanation rests with the nature of the taped sequences themselves. The aggression situation seemed to provoke an immediate sense of right vs. wrong in the children. They clearly perceived the roles of aggressor and victim. Even some of the younger children who were unable to respond to the other conflicts voiced an opinion regarding this situation. On the other hand, the name calling situation didn't appear to make such an obvious distinction between aggressor and victim in the eyes of the children. Although it was intended by the researcher that the boy who refused to let the other boy play appear as the aggressor, many children in fact, perceived the boy who wanted to play and name called first as the aggressor. Also, several of the younger children were unable to justify their moral judgments in this situation.

A second explanation involves the possibility that children have more opportunity to formulate definite ideas regarding physical aggression as compared to name calling. Physical aggression is one of the earliest forms of behavior with which parents must deal. Physical aggression is more often portrayed on television than name calling. In a study dealing with the amount of violence on TV during 1967-1972, the researchers found that "the most violent programs were cartoons designed exclusively for children" (Liebert and Poulos, 1976, p. 289). According to this same study, in 1972, 75% of network programming contained violence.
A third explanation deals with the word used in the videotapes to name call—"turkey." "Turkey" is not as inflammatory a word as some others. However, because of the experimental situation, i.e., public school, such words as swearing and racial slurs were deemed inappropriate. From the perspective of many of the children, calling someone a "turkey" did not appear to be such a serious offense.

The nearly significant difference between pushing and name calling is also consistent with Kohlberg's theory. Kohlberg (1971) has stated:

It should be noted that any individual is usually not entirely at one stage. Typically, as children develop they are partly in their major stage (about 50% of their ideas), partly in the stage into which they are moving, and partly in the stage they have just left behind. (p. 171)

In general, several observations can be made regarding the results of the study. Although the researcher would like to generalize that among lower class children, no developmental difference in the moral maturity of black and white children exists and that lower class children are not biased by the race of the children in the conflict situation in formulating their judgments, such a generalization must be made with caution. It must be remembered that the sample size was small (N = 32) and that it was not randomly selected. Thus, one can not say with experimental certainty that this sample is representative of all lower class children.
Other factors may have contributed to the results of this study. The race and sex of the experimenter may have effected the children's performance. The fact that the researcher was a white female who resembled a role model similar to that of a teacher could have influenced some children to respond in a manner that they thought would please the researcher.

It must also be remembered that this was the first time that the justice concepts scoring system was used in research. Although levels 4, 5, and 6 of this system closely parallel stages 1, 2, and 3 in Kohlberg's schema, levels 1, 2, and 3 were designed especially for use in this study. Although every attempt was made to insure initial reliability and validity of the scoring system, further use of the system will lend credence to its accuracy and usefulness.

Research Contributions and Recommendations

This study has contributed to the research on moral development by investigating children's concepts of justice in peer-peer conflict situations. Findings of previous studies on other aspects of moral judgment were confirmed regarding the progress of children's justice concepts in a developmental pattern. The moral maturity of the justice concepts of 10 year olds was significantly higher than that of 6 year olds. Six year olds were more inclined to base their judgments on adult authority and fear of punishment and physical
harm while 10 year olds more often used reasoning which
focused on "eye for eye" justice motivated by self interest.
The results of this study also revealed that race of the
subjects did not affect the moral maturity of their justice
concepts. Race of subject as a factor in moral judgment has
been considered by very few researchers (Harris, 1970;
Burns, 1972) with inconclusive results.

A unique feature of this study was the exploration of
children's racial perceptions as they may influence the
moral maturity of justice concepts. Unlike Davidson (1976),
this research did not reveal any significant relationship
between children's racial perceptions and their justice con­
cepts. Children judged conflict situations consistently
regardless of the race of the aggressor or victim.

This study suggests many avenues for further research.
Because of the small sample size (N = 32) which was not
randomly selected, this research can really be considered
exploratory in nature. Hopefully, it can be replicated
using a similar sample which is larger and randomly se­
lected. The researcher would also like to replicate the
study using a middle class sample. In this way, the justice
concepts of children could be compared by social class and
any interactive effects for race, age and sex by social
class could be ascertained. Also, since the children in
this study attended integrated schools, it would be most in­
teresting to investigate justice concepts of black and white
children who attend segregated schools to determine if type of school attended, i.e., integrated vs. segregated affects justice concepts. A set of videotapes in which girls instead of boys interact in the conflict situations has already been filmed. It would be interesting to conduct this study implementing this set of female tapes to compare the subjects' responses to the male and female tapes. This would be especially enlightening in terms of any interactive effect due to sex of subject by sex of children in the videotapes. Still a further extension would be to prepare a set of tapes in which males and females appear, varying the sex of aggressor and victim. This experimenter chose three types of situations, i.e., stealing, pushing and name calling, to portray on the videotapes. But additional types of conflict situations such as cheating, lying and collective responsibility could also be studied.

A direct offshoot of this dissertation concerns a more thorough and extensive investigation of the relationship between moral development and racial attitudes. Many ways exist to measure racial awareness and attitudes as previously described in Chapter II. The precise nature of the relationship between moral judgment and racial attitudes including several dimensions of each variable needs to be explored. Research should be conducted in which the variables are manipulated in some way. Additional means to measure racial perceptions need to be developed and pursued such as
actual behavior during inter-racial contact and observations of inter-racial interaction in natural settings.

Another important area for further study that this dissertation has only touched upon is the relationship between moral judgment and actual moral behavior. The preliminary evidence from this study would seem to indicate that a discrepancy may exist between how a child thinks someone should behave in a given situation and how in fact they think they would behave if confronted with the situation. Such a gap between what a child thinks should happen and what would happen could conceivably be even wider when the child is actually confronted with the given conflict situation.

Brearley (1969) has noted that "a kind of inert knowledge exists in the moral area when a judgment is made about a situation, but the appropriate behaviour does not necessarily follow from the judgment. In other words, there are moral lapses" (p. 139). Grinder (1964) in one of the few experiments exploring the relationship between moral judgment and moral behavior in children, found no significant correlation between moral judgment and moral behavior, i.e. resistance to temptation.

Kohlberg (1976a) has stated that "moral judgment, while only one factor in moral behavior, is the single most important or influential factor yet discovered in moral behavior" (p. 181). Yet this statement would prompt much controversy among other theorists and practitioners. Research
needs to be conducted to substantiate this claim. For instance, in this study, teachers' assessments of students' behavior in various conflict situations revealed a very weak correlation with children's ability to morally reason about such situations.

Another issue raised by this dissertation concerns the possible limiting factor that a child's language skills may have on subsequent performance on a moral judgment task. This directly relates to another issue—how early can we study moral judgment in children? Studies conducted by Kohlberg have focused on preadolescents (10+), adolescents and adults. Both he and Piaget describe children younger than 4 as "premoral" (Kohlberg, 1975). Yet preschool children have been studied on many cognitive and social dimensions and it seems quite possible that they could be studied in terms of moral growth. Racial awareness and attitudes have been extensively documented in young children. And several researchers have successfully studied aspects of moral development in preschool children (Damon, 1975; Irwin and Moore, 1971; Peterson, Peterson and Finley, 1974). As noted previously, because appropriate language to verbalize moral reasoning may not be at the command of all young children, research methodology would need to be developed and refined to study moral judgments in young children.

Other antecedents of moral development need to be probed further. Teacher ratings of subjects' cognitive
development correlated well with subjects' level of moral maturity. There is both theoretical and research evidence to indicate a strong relationship between cognitive and moral growth. Studies have demonstrated that a certain level of cognitive development is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the various levels of moral growth (Damon, 1975; Tomlinson-Keasey and Keasey, 1974). Research exploring all facets of this relationship is warranted. In addition, better ways to measure cognitive development other than standardized intelligence tests, cumulative records, and teacher ratings need to be found such as various Piagetian tasks.

Another antecedent of moral development is social development. Here, too, teachers' ratings of subjects' social development correlated fairly well with subjects' level of moral maturity. Both Piaget and Kohlberg stress the importance of children's social experiences in stimulating moral growth. Keasey (1971) found moral maturity to be positively related to leadership, popularity, and social participation. Selman (1971) discovered that the development of reciprocal role-taking was a necessary but not sufficient condition for conventional moral thought. This entire area which deals with aspects of social development including role-taking and empathy is fertile ground for study.

Another important antecedent of moral development which this dissertation did not deal with focuses on the
relationship of various home factors to moral development. For instance, some studies have indicated that certain types of child-rearing practices are more conducive to moral growth than others. Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) found that among a middle class sample, the use of power assertion as a discipline technique related to weak moral development among children while induction techniques were associated with more advanced levels. Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) defined induction as the "parent points out the painful consequences of the child's act for the parents and others... capitalize on child's capacity for empathy" (p. 46). More research of this kind needs to be conducted as well as research which explores the moral judgment of parents themselves. An interesting study would include presenting parents a task similar to the one in this study and comparing the parental responses to the conflict situations of stealing, aggression and name-calling with those of their children.

Effectiveness of Methodology

As stated previously, one significant contribution of this study is in the area of methodology. By using a novel means of presenting moral dilemmas, i.e. videotaped situations shown to the subjects on a portable TV, this study departed from the traditional approach of verbally describing the dilemmas to the subjects. The use of videotapes proved
to be a very effective method of studying moral development. The subjects responded positively to the videotapes, enjoyed the interview session, and appeared to readily identify with the televised situations. Even the younger subjects demonstrated excellent retention and comprehension of the short, televised sequences.

It seems very logical that children would respond so positively to the use of television in an interview session. Stevenson (1972) pointed out that by 1970 over 95% of American homes had at least one television and that children become active TV watchers at the average age of 2.8 years. He also described television as "an attractive and compelling medium of communication" (Stevenson, 1972, p. 351). Stein (1972) pointed out that preschool children watch TV an average of 4 hours per day while 9 and 10 year olds average 4-6 hours daily. Therefore, the use of television for research purposes appears a legitimate and natural one.

Chandler, Greenspan and Barenboim (1973) compared the use of videotaped and verbally described dilemmas in studying intentions vs. consequences in the moral judgments of first graders. They found that first graders passed more intention based judgments during the videotaped presentation. The videotaped condition, had, in fact, elicited more mature moral judgments than the verbal description condition. The researchers felt that the "choice of stimulus materials may seriously prejudice the moral judgments they
are intended to measure" (Chandler, Greenspan and Barenboim, 1973, p. 318). Therefore, it appears that the use of videotapes can elicit more accurate information regarding children's moral maturity and provide them with the opportunity for maximum performance.

Another argument in support of the use of videotapes in studying moral judgment deals with a criticism levelled against the use of Kohlberg's dilemmas. Kurtines and Grief (1974) feel that the complexity involved in scoring Kohlberg's dilemmas discourages independent research. To facilitate independent investigations of moral judgment within a cognitive-developmental framework, researchers need to develop alternate means of eliciting responses other than Kohlberg's verbally described dilemmas. Certainly, more than one method exists to study any given problem and the wider range of effective stimulus materials that can be used to study moral judgments will serve as positive features adding depth and breadth to this field of knowledge.

**Implications for Education**

There are many aspects of this investigation which have implications for education. First, the data have revealed an extensive amount of aggression in the types of responses given by the subjects. This verbalized aggression was manifested not only in the subjects' feelings regarding how the children should react in the conflict situations but also in
the types of punishments that they deemed appropriate. As indicated in Table 14, children prefer punishments that are either corporal in nature or appeal to a figure in authority greater than the teacher, i.e. parent, principal. They do not consistently advocate reciprocal types of punishment. What then, do these findings mean in terms of "discipline" and classroom management?

Do we, as teachers, confirm children's stage 1 and stage 2 (Kohlberg's stages) type thinking by using physical punishment or appealing to the authority of the principal or do we employ disciplinary procedures representative of higher levels of moral thought? Duska and Whelan (1975) recommend that teachers "choose punishments that relate to the offense, stressing with the child, where possible, the effect of his action on the group" (p. 113). Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) found that parents' use of power assertion as a discipline technique was associated with children's weak moral development while induction was associated with more advanced levels. It seems that this finding could apply to teachers as well.

We must also ask ourselves if teacher conduct promotes more aggression in the classroom or if it provides opportunities for the constructive dispersement of aggression? Teachers need to be aware of the attitudes of children toward moral conflicts. Once they understand how children honestly feel and think, they will be better able to handle
such conflicts in a manner which will maximize moral growth. Administrators need to provide leadership and guidance to teachers in exploring effective types of discipline that will in fact enhance rather than impede moral growth. An interesting type of teacher inservice program might involve showing the video-tapes to teachers, determining their responses to the questions, asking the teachers to predict how they think children at various ages would respond and comparing the kinds of responses. The entire connotation of "discipline" as it is usually applied in schools needs to be reevaluated so that our system of handling conflicts is constructive in nature rather than destructive. The whole area of classroom management is one that needs careful study and revision in light of the theory and research in moral development.

Second, the researcher has previously noted that language ability might limit a child's ability to perform maximally in a moral judgment interview. It seems that the teacher can play an important role in providing opportunities for language use that deals with moral issues. As conflicts and problems occur in the classroom, the teacher can encourage discussion of the conflict and possible solutions. Literature, filmstrips and verbally described dilemmas can all be used to stimulate discussion. The teacher can facilitate the discussion of moral dilemmas and conflicts by focusing on the type of reasoning used by the
parents, by asking probing questions to stimulate further
discussion, and by exposing children to higher levels of
moral reasoning. As Brearley (1969) stated:

Teachers have a vital role to play in
helping children to acquire language which
will aid them in communicating and crystal-
izing their experiences, and in cate-
gorizing various aspects of moral be-
havior. (p. 144)

Third, Kohlberg (1976) has delineated two main aspects
of a social institution that facilitate moral development:
the justice structure of the institution and opportunities
for role-taking. Closely complementing role-taking is em-
pathy, a necessary but not sufficient condition for moral
growth (Duska and Whelan, 1975). Kohlberg (1976a) defined
justice structure accordingly:

The justice structure of an institution
refers to perceived rules or principles
for distributing rewards, punishments,
responsibilities, and privileges among
institutional members. (p. 192)

Therefore, a major implication is that schools be
structured as just institutions. If one thinks of the in-
dividual classroom as the microcosm of an entire school,
there are several kinds of things a teacher can do to create
a "just" classroom, an atmosphere conducive to moral de-
velopment. The teacher should establish trust, respect and
equality of rights between students and the teacher and
among the students themselves. In addition, the teacher
should be warm, receptive and tolerant of student ideas and
attitudes. Brearley (1969) emphasized the importance of the students formulating class rules and guidelines for behavior. In addition, she stressed that the teacher needs to help children understand the justification for rules, so that they do not appear to be arbitrary dictums imposed by adult authority. Many daily opportunities are conducive for student decision making and these can be capitalized upon. When conflicts develop or problems arise, the teacher can facilitate interaction and rational discussion regarding appropriate solutions.

In terms of providing role-taking opportunities, the teacher can arrange situations in which students experience a variety of perspectives. The physical arrangement of a classroom can foster or impede peer interaction. Clusters of desks, tables or a semicircle are more conducive to role-taking experiences than straight rows. Opportunities for cooperation among children such as group projects and activities have been described as an important aspect of moral growth (Brearley, 1969). There are a variety of role playing activities and simulation games that more directly confront children with various perspectives that can be implemented. Children can retell or rewrite stories from the perspective of a character which differs from the original story.

Empathy, the ability to understand the feelings and thoughts of another, has been defined by Kohlberg and
Turiel (1971) as the "concern for the welfare of others" (p. 431). Duska and Whelan (1975) enumerated several ways that a teacher can foster empathy in students which include the following:

1. Quietly sitting with a child to discuss with him the effects on the family or class of some irresponsible action of his
2. Helping a child work through a decision by provoking consideration of the feelings of others who will be affected by the decision
3. Adults sharing with children their feelings about encounters or events that affect them
4. Helping children clarify their feelings about encounters or events that affect them
5. Acknowledging and discussing with the children those times when their action or presence was a source of joy, pleasure, courage or comfort. (p. 107)

In terms of curriculum, teachers can use literature as an effective stimulus to discuss emotions and feelings. Teachers can also develop a learning center on "Feelings and Emotions," encourage children to write prose and poetry describing feelings, or have children make a collage of magazine pictures expressing different emotions.

Finally, it has been suggested that teachers should serve as appropriate models for moral behavior (Brearley, 1969). As our teacher rating data indicate, teachers were poor predictors of children's ability to reason about moral dilemmas and their perceptions of children's behavior had little relationship to children's level of moral maturity.
In fact, we know very little about the level of moral reasoning used by teachers. It seems that a critical place to start is with the teachers themselves—assessing their moral maturity and finding appropriate means of enhancing it. Before we can expect teachers to foster moral maturity in children, we must first educate them in the area of moral development and its importance. We must make them aware of moral reasoning and how it can be enhanced or impeded in the classroom. The role of the teacher should not be underestimated. As Brearley (1969) concluded:

The function of teachers in this area is to help children develop in ways that lead ultimately to a mature, rational morality. Perhaps the subtle interdependence between the education of the emotions and reason, makes this one of the most complex as it is surely one of the most important tasks a teacher has. (p. 157)

Implications for Society

This dissertation also has some implications for society. First, the finding that the race of the children in the conflict situations did not influence the subjects' justice concepts is indeed a hopeful one. Even if children have negative racial attitudes, this racial bias did not interfere with children's ability to consistently judge conflict situations. Such a finding should serve to allay the concerns of many who fear desegregation and possible subsequent interracial conflict. Although these findings can not predict whether or not interracial conflict will occur among
children, it appears that children are not prejudiced in their reasoning about such conflicts. This is an important first step in understanding and resolving such conflicts.

Second, it would seem that our national foreign policy has adopted some of Kohlberg's theory regarding universal, ethical principles. In describing Stage 6, the universal, ethical principle orientation, Kohlberg (1971) stated "these are universal principles of justice, of the reciprocity and equality of human rights, and of respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons" (p. 165). President Carter appears to be, in rhetoric, an advocate of such principles as our government's recent statements toward Soviet dissidents, apartheid in South Africa and conditions in Rhodesia attest.

Third, Kohlberg (1971) has emphasized that "the formation of a mature sense of justice requires participation in just institutions" (p. 193). We have already discussed this in terms of the school but justice can be applied to all social institutions. Kohlberg (1976a) noted a study in which he and others have been engaged for the past four years to create a more just community in a women's prison. According to Kohlberg (1976a), while it is too early to draw conclusive results, "the program has stimulated moral advance in inmates" (p. 192). Hopefully more social institutions can adopt principles of justice, equality and dignity.
Summary and Conclusions

The purposes of this dissertation were 1) to investigate children's concepts of justice in peer-peer conflict situations within a cognitive-developmental framework 2) to determine if children's racial perceptions affect their justice concepts and 3) to explore the children's age, race and sex as they may affect children's justice concepts.

In order to achieve these purposes, 32 lower class children, equally divided by age (6 and 10 year olds), race (black and white) and sex (male and female) were individually interviewed on two separate occasions. The subjects viewed a series of videotaped sequences in which boys interacted in three conflict situations--name calling, physical aggression and stealing. For each situation, there were four different racial pairings: white boy transgressing against a white boy, white boy transgressing against a black boy, black boy transgressing against a white boy, and black boy transgressing against a black boy.

Following the viewing of each sequence, the subjects answered moral judgment questions. The subjects' responses were scored according to the maturity of their justice concepts. A six point justice concepts scoring system, similar to Kohlberg's basic scheme, was designed for use in this study. The data were then analyzed using a 3 between-2 within mixed analysis of variance design (race x sex x age x type of situation x racial pairings). The results of the
analysis led to the following conclusions:

1. The justice concepts of 10 year old children were significantly more mature than the justice concepts of 6 year olds.

2. There were no sex differences in the development of justice concepts.

3. There were no differences between black and white children of lower socio-economic status in the development of justice concepts.

4. The nature of the situation being judged, i.e. stealing, pushing, name calling, did not significantly influence the moral maturity of the children's justice concepts.

5. Children's justice concepts were consistent regardless of the race of the children in the conflict situations being judged.

6. The use of videotapes as a means of presenting moral dilemmas to children was highly effective.

7. In terms of types of punishment, children favored severe forms (whipping) and appeal to authority figures greater than the teacher (principal, parents).

8. The implications for teachers include areas of classroom management, language growth, classroom atmosphere, opportunities for role-taking, development of empathy, and the teacher as a moral model.
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APPENDIX A

SELECTED EXAMPLES OF PIAGET'S STORIES AND QUESTIONS
Selected Examples of Piaget's Stories and Questions

(Piaget, 1932)

I. A. Alfred meets a little friend of his who is very poor. This friend tells him that has had no dinner that day because there was nothing to eat in his home. Then Alfred goes into a baker's shop, and as he has no money, he waits till the baker's back is turned and steals a roll. Then he runs out and gives the roll to his friend.

B. Henriette goes into a shop. She sees a pretty piece of ribbon on a table and thinks to herself that it would look very nice on her dress. So while the shop lady's back is turned (while the shop lady is not looking), she steals the ribbon and runs away at once.

1. Have you understood these two stories? Let me hear you tell them.

2. Is one of them naughtier than the other?

3. Why did the first one steal the roll?

4. Why did the little girl steal the ribbon?

5. Which one would you punish most?

6. Was it naughty to give it?

7. Must one of them be punished more than the other?

II. One afternoon a little boy was playing in his room. His father had only asked him not to play ball for fear of breaking the windows. His father had hardly gone when the boy got his ball out of the cupboard and began to play with it. And bang goes the ball against a window pane and smashes it! When the father comes home and sees what has happened he thinks of three punishments: 1) To leave the window unmended for several days (and then, as it is winter, the boy will not be able to play in his room). 2) Make the boy pay for having broken the window. 3) Not to let him have his toys for a whole week.
1. Are the punishments given to children always fair, or are some fairer than others?
2. How do you think the boy should be punished?
3. The father thought of three punishments. Which is the most fair?
4. Which punishment is the most severe?

III. Once there were two children who were stealing apples in an orchard. Suddenly a policeman comes along and the two children run away. One of them is caught. The other one, going home by a roundabout way, crosses a river on a rotten bridge and falls into the water.
1. What do you think of this story?
2. If he had not stolen the apples and had crossed the river on that rotten bridge all the same, would he also have fallen into the water?
3. Was that fair? Why?
4. Why did he fall in?

IV. There was a big boy in a school once who was beating a smaller boy. The little one couldn't hit back because he wasn't strong enough. So one day during the recreation he hid the big boy's apple and roll in an old cupboard?
1. What do you think of that?
2. If anyone punches you, what do you do?
3. Why did the little chap take his roll?
4. Should he have taken it or not?
5. Should he have let him beat him?
6. Was it fair to take it?
7. What should he have done?

V. Some children are playing ball in a courtyard. When the ball goes out of bounds and rolls down the road one of the boys goes of his own free will to fetch it several
times? After that he is the only one they ask to go and fetch it.

1. What do you think of that?

2. Is it fair? Why?

VI. Two boys, a little one and a big one, once went for a long walk in the mountains. When lunch-time came they were very hungry and took their food out of their bags. But they found that there was not enough for both of them.

1. What should have been done?

2. Give all the food to the big boy or to the little one, or the same to both?

3. If you had been the little boy what would you have done?

4. Who gets most hungry during walks, little boys or big ones?

5. If you were out on a walk with a boy of twelve and there was only one piece of bread between you, what would you do?

VII. A mother had two little girls, one obedient, the other disobedient. The mother liked the obedient one best and gave her the biggest piece of cake.

1. What do you think of that?

2. Was it fair to give more to the one than to the other?

3. Was it fair that the mother should love one better than the other?
APPENDIX B

KOHLBERG'S SIX MORAL DILEMMAS
Kohlberg's Six Moral Dilemmas
(Kohlberg and associates, 1975)

Form A

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

1. Should Heinz steal the drug? Why or why not?

2. If Heinz doesn't love his wife, should he steal the drug for her? Why or why not?

3. Suppose the person dying is not his wife but a stranger. Should Heinz steal the drug for the stranger? Why or why not?

4. What's to be said for obeying the law in this situation or in general?

5. Heinz might think it's important to obey the law and to save his wife, but he can't do both. Is there a way to resolve the conflict between law and life, taking the best arguments for both into account? How or why not?

Story III'. Heinz did break into the store and get the drug. Watching from a distance was an off-duty police officer, Mr. Brown, who lived in the same town as Heinz and knew the situation Heinz was in. Mr. Brown ran over to try to stop Heinz, but
Heinz was gone by the time Mr. Brown reached the store. Mr. Brown wonders whether he should look for Heinz and arrest him.

1. Should Mr. Brown, the off-duty policeman, arrest Heinz? Why or why not?

2. Mr. Brown finds and arrests Heinz. Heinz is brought to court and found guilty. Should the judge sentence Heinz or let him go free? Why?

3. The judge has to think about society. Thinking in terms of society, what is the best reason for the judge to give Heinz a sentence?

3a. If you disagree with this reason, why?

4. Why is it important generally to punish people who break the law?

5. If you had to make the decision about whether to steal the drug, how would your conscience enter into the decision?

6. Is Heinz's problem a moral problem? What makes something a moral problem?

7. Heinz's problem involves the law, it involves his feelings, and it involves his thinking or reasoning about right and wrong. How should these things enter into a decision about moral problems?

8. Some people would say there is a morally right choice in problems like this. Others would say the choice is arbitrary, it's a matter of personal opinion. Can moral decisions like this be more than a matter of personal opinion? If so, how? If not, why not?

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

1. Should Joe refuse to give his father the money? Why or why not?

2. Is the fact that Joe earned the money himself an important consideration here? Why or why not?

3. Joe might consider the money something he earned and that he has property rights in this case. Is it important for a father to respect his son's property? Why or why not?

4. What is the basic value or importance of property rights in general?

5. Not only did Joe earn the money, but his father made a promise. Is that an important consideration here? Why or why not?

6. Why should a promise be kept?

7. Is it important to keep a promise to someone you don't know well or are not close to? Why or why not?

8. Can you say what is the most important thing for a son to consider about his relationship to his father in this or other situations?

8a. Why is that important?

9. What is the most important thing for a father to consider about his relationship to his son in this or other situations?

9a. Why is that important?

Form B

Story IV. There was a woman who had very bad cancer, and there was no treatment known to medicine that could save her. Her doctor, Dr. Jefferson, knew that she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a
good dose of a pain-killer like ether or morphine would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, and in her calm periods she would ask Dr. Jefferson to give her enough ether to kill her. She said she couldn't stand the pain and she was going to die in a few months anyway. Although he knows that mercy-killing is against the law, the doctor thinks about granting her request.

1. Should the doctor give her the drug that would make her die? Why or why not?

2. Should the woman have the right to make the final decision? Why or why not?

3. The woman is married. Should her husband have anything to do with the decision?

4. Is there any sense in which a person has a duty or obligation to live when he or she does not want to, when the person wants to commit suicide? Why or why not?

5. How does the fact that mercy-killing is against the law affect your decision as to whether it is right or wrong for the doctor to give her the drug? Why?

6. What's to be said for obeying the law in this situation or in general?

Story IV'. Dr. Jefferson did perform the mercy-killing by giving the woman the drug. Passing by at the time was another doctor, Dr. Rogers, who knew the situation Dr. Jefferson was in. Dr. Rogers thought of trying to stop Dr. Jefferson, but the drug was already administered. Dr. Rogers wonders whether he should report Dr. Jefferson.

1. Should Dr. Rogers report Dr. Jefferson? Why or why not?

2. The doctor does report Dr. Jefferson. Dr. Jefferson is brought to court and found guilty. Should the judge sentence Dr. Jefferson or let him go free? Why?

3. The judge has to think about society. Thinking in terms of society, what is the best
reason for the judge to give the doctor a sentence?

3a. If you disagree with this reason, why?

4. Why is it important generally to punish people who break the law?

5. If you had to make the decision about whether to perform the mercy-killing, how would your conscience enter into the decision?

6. Is Dr. Jefferson's problem a moral problem? What makes something a moral problem?

7. Dr. Jefferson's problem involves the law, it involves his feelings, and it involves his thinking or reasoning about right and wrong. How should these things enter into a decision about moral problems?

8. Some people would say there is a morally right choice in problems like this. Others would say the choice is arbitrary, it's a matter of personal opinion. Can moral decisions like this be more than a matter of personal opinion? If so, how? If not, why not?

Story II. Judy was a twelve-year-old girl. Her mother promised her that she could go to a special rock concert coming to their town if she saved up from babysitting and lunch money for a long time so she would have enough money to buy a ticket to the concert. She managed to save up the $5 the ticket cost plus another $3. But then her mother changed her mind and told Judy that she had to spend the money on new clothes for school. Judy was disappointed and decided to go to the concert anyway. She bought a ticket and told her mother that she had only been able to save $3. That Saturday she went to the performance and told her mother that she was spending the day with a friend. A week passed without her mother finding out. Judy then told her older sister, Louise, that she had gone to the performance and had lied to her mother about it. Louise wonders whether to tell their mother what Judy did.
1. Should Louise, the older sister, tell their mother that Judy had lied about the money or should she keep quiet? Why?

2. In wondering whether to tell, Louise thinks of the fact that Judy is her sister. Should that make a difference in Louise's decision?

3. Is the fact that Judy earned the money herself an important consideration here? Why or why not?

4. Judy might feel that since she earned the money, it is her property. What is the basic value or importance of property rights here and in general?

5. Do you think that it's especially important for a mother to respect her daughter's property? Why or why not?

6. Not only did Judy earn the money, but her mother made a promise. Is that an important consideration here? Why or why not?

7. Why should a promise be kept?

8. Is it important to keep a promise to someone you don't know well or are not close to? Why or why not?

9. Can you say what is the most important thing for a daughter to consider about her relationship to her mother in this or other situations?

9a. Why is that important?

10. What is the most important thing for a mother to consider about her relationship to her daughter in this or other situations?

10a. Why is that important?
APPENDIX C

PARENT LETTER AND PERMISSION FOR CHILDREN IN THE VIDEOTAPEs
January 5, 1977

Dear ______________________

Your child ________________________ has been selected by his/her teacher to be an actor/actress in a set of videotapes to be used in research conducted by a graduate student at Ohio State University.

The videotapes will be made at your child's school, Linden Park, during the school day. Three situations will be taped: 1) One child pushes another and the child pushes back 2) one child calls another a name (no swearing) and the child calls a name back 3) one child takes something from another and the child takes a similar item from the first.

Before the tapes are made, the researcher, who has had extensive teaching experience, will describe the situations and discuss with the children the "right" or "wrong" of the situation. It will be made clear to the children that pushing, name calling and taking others possessions are not desirable behaviors.

If you would like your child to act in the tapes, please fill out the attached permission form and have your child return it to his/her teacher.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 422-0895 or Linden Park principal, Mrs. Lois Camealy at 268-6131.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

(signature)

Evelyn Freeman
Ohio State University
CONSENT FORM-TEACHER EDUCATION LAB
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION-OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Date ____________________

I give permission to the College of Education of The Ohio State University to record on video and audio tape my child ______________________. The nature (print child's name) of the videotape procedures has been explained to me. I also give permission for the video and audio tapes to be used without limitation for research purposes in the future. I understand that any questions I have concerning the nature of the videotapes or research will be answered.

Signature ___________________________________________

Printed name ________________________________

Home address ________________________________

Home phone ________________________________
APPENDIX D

SAMPLES OF THE TRANSCRIBED AND RATED PILOT STUDY PROTOCOLS
3 2. Should the boy who wanted to play have name called? Why?
   No. Because it wasn't a very nice name to call him.

5 3. Should the boy playing have name called? Why?
   No. Just because the other guy called him a turkey he shouldn't have called him back because then that would start a big fight.

5 4. Is it right to name call? Why?
   No. Because it's not a very nice thing to do. Well other kids don't like it, and then they'll start hitting you and you'll get into a big fight.

6 5. What should the teacher do when she finds out what happened? Why?
   Um, send a note home to their parents, I guess. (Should she send a note home to both of the parents?) Probably. (Why?) So at dinner table and somewhere they could talk it over and maybe the kids wouldn't do it anymore.

6 6. Should a child have the right to prevent someone from playing? Why?
   Not really but sorta. Well, they really should let him play. But like maybe he could start at the beginning or if they were too far they could
go back or if they were playing take back a few words so it would be fair and then they all could play together and that wouldn't be very bad. They wouldn't be exactly starting over. They could just compromise.
PILOT A - Physical Aggression

Date _______3-1-77_____
Rater _______LM_______
Situation Code _______2WB_____
Child Code _______01_____

4 2. Should the boy have pushed back? Why?

No. Because you shouldn't do that. You might get in trouble by the teacher.

4 3. Is it right (fair) to push back? Why?

No. Because it's bad. You shouldn't do that. You might get in trouble.

4 4. What should have been done? Why?

Just say why did you do that? Call the teacher. Because he might not want to get in trouble.

4 or 5 5. What should the teacher do when she finds out? Why?

Put them out the hall again. (Should both boys go out in hall?) No., just the black boy. Because he hit the other one.

3 6. What if B pushed A back and then hit him. Would that be right? Why?

No. Because you shouldn't do that to other people.
PILOT A – Physical Aggression

Date ______3-1-77_____
Rater ______LM______
Situation Code _____3W____
Child Code _______02____

5 2. Should the boy have pushed back? Why?
No. Well, because somebody else might catch on or something. Their friends might be teaming up on the other one, on the one that started pushing him and get him hurt.

4 3. Is it right (fair) to push back? Why?
No. Well he could have gotten tired and said stop and then they wouldn’t stop and they keep on pushing him and might hurt him or something.

4 4. What should have been done? Why?
Gone out again and told somebody like the teacher. Well because she could tell him to stay away or if they sit beside each other move them away from each other like one on the other side of room from the other one.

5 5. What should the teacher do when she finds out? Why?
Send them to the office or something. (Should she send both of the boys to the office?) Yeh. Cuz one boy might think the one that getting punished, the one that got pushed is the one that got punished, he might think it wasn’t fair so sometime when they’re out of school, or playing when they see each other start beating him up.
4 6. What if B pushed A back and then hit him. Would that be right? Why?

No. Because he could have gotten hurt. And the other boy that was his friend might have hit him, too.
APPENDIX E

PARENT LETTER AND PERMISSION FOR SUBJECTS
March 7, 1977

Dear __________________________,

Your child __________________________ has been chosen to participate in a research project being conducted by Evelyn Freeman, a former Southwestern School teacher, who is now a graduate student at Ohio State University. The purpose of the research is to find out how children feel and think about situations that might occur in school. We hope the information obtained in the study will help administrators and teachers better understand and deal with these kinds of situations.

Your child will be interviewed individually at school during the school day by Ms. Freeman. Your child will view videotapes on a TV set in which child actors will be doing things together. Following the situations, Ms. Freeman will ask your child a series of questions. Your child's responses will be coded by number so his/her true identity will not be known.

The interview will be an educational activity for your child. There is no risk to your child in participating in the interview. I think your child will enjoy the session and hope the results will be helpful to administrators and teachers.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 422-1257 or the school principal __________________ at ____________. If you would like your child to participate in the study, please fill out the attached permission form and have your child return it to his/her teacher. If, after you sign the permission, you decide that you do not want your child to participate, you are free to withdraw your permission at any time.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

(signature)

Evelyn Freeman
Graduate Student
Ohio State University
Consent to Serve as a Subject in Research

I give permission for my child ______________________ to serve as a subject in the research being conducted by Evelyn Freeman. The nature and general purpose of the research procedure have been explained to me. I understand that any questions I have concerning this research will be answered. I understand that my child's identity will not be revealed in any publication or in any way related to this research. Finally, I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue my child's participation at any time.

Parent's printed name ______________________________________

Parent's signature _________________________________________

Address _____________________________________________________

Phone _____________________________________________________

Date _____________________________________________________
APPENDIX F

SUBJECT INFORMATION SHEET
SUBJECT INFORMATION SHEET

Name _______________________________________________
Birthdate ________________________ Age during interview ____
Address _____________________________________________
Phone ____________________________________
Mother's Employment ________________________________
Father's Employment ________________________________
Reading Test and Score _____________________________
IQ Test and Score _________________________________
Reading Ability ___________________________________
Other Information:

APPENDIX G

TEACHER RATING FORM
TEACHER RATING FORM

Child _________________________  School ___________________

Teacher _________________________  Grade ___________________

Please circle the response that best describes the child whose name appears above.

1. In relationship with his/her peers, the child appears to be
   a) one of the most popular children in the class
   b) well liked by most of the children
   c) moderately popular
   d) has a small group of friends
   e) very unpopular

2. Regarding the child's leadership abilities, this child is
   a) one of the main class leaders
   b) a leader in many situations
   c) sometimes demonstrates leadership
   d) rarely demonstrates leadership
   e) never demonstrates leadership

3. Regarding empathy, this child's ability to understand the feelings and thoughts of others is
   a) outstanding
   b) above average
   c) average for his/her age
   d) below average
   e) unable to empathize

4. Regarding the child's general intelligence, this child is
   a) superior
   b) above average
   c) average
   d) below average
   e) very low

5. Regarding the child's reading ability, this child reads
   a) well above grade level
   b) above grade level
   c) on grade level
   d) below grade level
   e) very far below grade level

6. Regarding the child's ability to verbalize his/her thoughts, this child is
   a) superior
   b) above average
   c) average
   d) below average
   e) poor
7. How often do you have to punish this child?
   a) constantly  b) very often  c) an average amount
   d) rarely  e) never

8. How often does this child initiate aggression against others?
   a) constantly  b) very often  c) an average amount
   d) rarely  e) never

9. What do you think this child would do if someone pushed him/her first?
   a) walk away  b) tell the teacher  c) push back
   d) other  If other what _________________________________

10. What do you think this child would do if someone called him/her a name?
    a) walk away or ignore it  b) tell the teacher  c) name
call back  d) other  If other what _________________________

11. What do you think the child would do if someone stole something of theirs?
    a) walk away or ignore it  b) tell teacher  c) steal
something of theirs  d) other  If other what _________

12. How would you describe this child's ability to reason about situations regarding stealing?
    a) very mature  b) above average  c) average for age
    d) somewhat immature  e) unable to reason about such
    a situation

13. How would you describe this child's ability to reason about situations regarding name calling?
    a) very mature  b) above average  c) average for age
    d) somewhat immature  e) unable to reason about such
    a situation

14. How would you describe this child's ability to reason about situations regarding physical aggression?
    a) very mature  b) above average  c) average for age
    d) somewhat immature  e) unable to reason about such
    a situation
APPENDIX H

EXAMPLES OF CODED AND RATED PROTOCOLS
SESSION II - NAME CALLING

Rater EBF Date
Child Code 5134 Situation Code 3 bl

_ 5_ 2. Should the boy who wanted to play have name called? Why?

No. Because you know the other boy is going to call him something back.

_ 4____3. Should the boy playing have name called? Why?

No. He should have said, "Well, you can't play and can you wait till we finish playing and then you can play, because we started it already." (Why was it wrong for him to call him a name back?) Because you're not supposed to call names but probably at their school you probably can.

_ 5_ 4. Is it right to name call? Why?

No. Because if you call people names, you know they're going to call you a name back.

_ 5_ 5. What should the teacher do when she finds out what happened? Why?

She shouldn't do anything. She just should say if they call anybody else a name or something like that, they have to stay in and write for her 1000 times. (But she's going to give them a second chance first?) Yes. (Why?) Because you don't know who really started it. Cause she wasn't there to see who started it or anything like that.

_ 3_ 6. Should a child have the right to prevent someone from playing? Why?

If they already had started, he shouldn't play. Because they can all be ahead of him and if he plays, then he might not get to catch up with him and he wouldn't be able to win anyway.
SESSION II - NAME CALLING (continued)

7. What do you do when someone calls you a name? Why?

I just ignore them and walk away. But if they keep calling me a name, I just don't pay any attention to it. Because I don't want to get in trouble. The teacher would probably hear me and not hear him.
SESSION II - STEALING

4 2. Should the boy who was sitting down have taken the other boy's pencil? Why?

No. He should have gone and told the teacher. The teacher would tell him to give the pencil back so there wouldn't be an argument.

5 3. Was it right for the boy who walked in the room to have taken the other boy's pencil? Why?

No. Cause that other boy hadn't done anything to him.

4 4. What should the boy sitting down have done? Why?

Told the teacher. Because the teacher would settle it.

5 5. What should the teacher do when she finds out? Why?

Tell them both to give the pencils back. Because they're not theirs. (Should she do anything else?) No.

5 6. What should the first boy do now? Why?

Give the pencil back to Boy 2. Because the pencil didn't belong to him.

7. What do you do when someone takes something of yours? Why?

I tell. Because they always go around saying, "I got your pencil and I'm not going to give it back."
SESSION II - PHYSICAL AGGRESSION

Rater EBF Date ______________________
Child Code 6225 Situation Code wh pushes bl

5 2. Should the boy have pushed back? Why?
   Yes. Because that other boy had pushed him.

5 3. Is it right (fair) to push back? Why?
   Yes. Because that other person pushed me.

5 4. What should the boy have done? Why?
   Just pushed him back. Because that other boy pushed him.

4 5. What should the teacher do when she finds out? Why?
   She should tell them to stop pushing and all that because you might hurt somebody. So they won't have to do it anymore.

5 6. What if B pushed A back and then hit him. Would that be right? Why?
   No. Because that other boy pushed him not hit him. And that wouldn't be fair. (Why wouldn't that be fair?) Because that other boy didn't even hit him he just pushed him.

7. What would you have done? Why?
   I push them back. Because they pushed me.
6 2. Should the boy who was sitting down have taken the other boy's pencil? Why?

No. Because like they might start getting mad. They wouldn't be friends probably they'd say he took my pencil so I wont be his friend. He's not the right kind of guy. They just might be mad at each other.

6 3. Was it right for the boy who walked in the room to have taken the other boy's pencil? Why?

No. Well, because taking somebody else's pencil is stealing and if you steal, it's not right. It's something that's against the law plus you're taking somebody else's property which belongs to them and they may need it to use.

6 4. What should the boy sitting down have done? Why?

He should have talked a little more quietly and given the boy a warning about telling the teacher. And then if the boy still didn't give the pencil back, he should go tell. (Why would a warning have been good?) Well, because the other boy might not want to get in trouble, and he might feel that he was wrong and put it back.

6 5. What should the teacher do when she finds out? Why?

Their teacher should go and settle the difference and give the boy back his pencil and tell them not to steal and take other people's things and to be nice. Because they might learn not to do it again.

5 6 What should the first boy do now? Why?

Trade it back. Because then they'd be even and they'd be satisfied with what they have.
7. What do you do when someone takes something of yours? Why?

I give them a warning about telling the teacher and if they don't give it back, I tell the teacher. Because if you just go right out and tell the teacher, it's not too fair cause they wouldn't have a chance and they might get punished. But if you did tell them you were going to tell the teacher, they might be nice and give it back.
4 2. Should the boy who wanted to play have name called? Why?

No. If he knows one of the boy's right name, he shouldn't have called him that. (Why, what difference does it make?) Because it's not the boy's name. All it does is start a fight.

3 3. Should the boy playing have name called? Why?

Uhum (no) Because that's not the boys name either. (But that boy called him a turkey?) He still shouldn't have called him that. (Why?) I don't know.

4 4. Is it right to name call? Why?

No. Well yea. Well as long as it's not cuss words, it doesn't matter. (It could be a name but as long as it's not a cuss word, it's ok. Why?) It wouldn't be cussing the teacher couldn't do anything about that.

5 5. What should the teacher do when she finds out what happened? Why?

Send them up to the office. It's the only thing to do because they're not going to stop. You know after school they're going to start again. (So why would sending them to the office be a good idea?) It would stop them from calling each other names the rest of the day in school.

5 6. Should a child have the right to prevent someone from playing? Why?

No. It's not his game. Unless he brought it, then he wouldn't have to let anybody play. (What if it's the teacher's game, it belongs in the classroom, would he have the right?) No, it's not his so he should let the boy play. But if the two boys were there first the boy came in the middle he shouldn't play anyway because they'd have to start the whole game over.
SESSION I - NAME CALLING (continued)

7. What do you do when someone calls you a name? Why?

I go to the teacher. Because I know I'm not supposed to be calling anybody a name.
SESSION I - STEALING

Rater _______ JR _________ Date ________________
Child Code ______ 1066 _______ Situation Code ______ 2 W ______

2. Should the boy who was sitting down have taken the other boy's pencil? Why?
   No. (Don't know—shrugged shoulders)

3. Was it right for the boy who walked in the room to have taken the other boy's pencil? Why?
   No. (shrugged shoulders)

4. What should the boy sitting down have done? Why?
   Took it himself. (shrugged shoulders)

5. What should the teacher do when she finds out? Why?
   I don't know.

6. What should the 1st boy do now? Why?
   (shrugged shoulders)

7. What do you do when someone takes something of yours? Why?
   I don't know.
SESSION I - PHYSICAL AGGRESSION

Rater JR Date
Child Code 1266 Situation Code Bl pu wh

5 2. Should the boy have pushed back? Why?
No. Because they would have been fighting. And one of them might get beat up or something.

4 3. Is it right (fair) to push back? Why?
No. Because if you push them somebody might fall down and hit their head or something. Or bust their head or something.

4 4. What should have been done? Why?
Go tell the teacher. Because if they kept on pushing you one of them might start fighting and get hurt.

4 5. What should the teacher do when she finds out? Why?
Punish them. Both of the boys because both of them were fighting. Because they started to fight so she should punish both of them.

4 6. What if B pushed A back and then hit him. Would that be right? Why?
No. Because he shouldn't have been hitting him or anything. He shouldn't even have been pushing him. They would start a bigger fight.

7. What would you have done? Why?
Tell the teacher. So there wouldn't be a bigger fight and then somebody might get hurt.
APPENDIX I

CORRELATIONS OF TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS
BY AGE OF SUBJECTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Moral Maturity</th>
<th>Social Development</th>
<th>Cognitive Development</th>
<th>Moral Behavior</th>
<th>Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Total Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Calling</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Subject</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Ratings</th>
<th>Social Development</th>
<th>Cognitive Development</th>
<th>Moral Behavior</th>
<th>Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Total Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Development</td>
<td>.753***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Behavior</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Reasoning</td>
<td>.717**</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teacher</td>
<td>.838***</td>
<td>.694**</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.828***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
***p < .001
TABLE 16
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUBJECTS AND SUBJECTS' SCORES ON THE STIMULUS SITUATIONS FOR 10 YEAR OLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Moral Maturity</th>
<th>Social Development</th>
<th>Cognitive Development</th>
<th>Moral Behavior</th>
<th>Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Total Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.528*</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.523*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>.669**</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.616*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Calling</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.570*</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.637**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Subject</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.569*</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.666**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Development</th>
<th>Cognitive Development</th>
<th>Moral Behavior</th>
<th>Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Total Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Development</td>
<td>.571*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Behavior</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Reasoning</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.766***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teacher</td>
<td>.675**</td>
<td>.729**</td>
<td>.578*</td>
<td>.801***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05     **p < .01     ***p < .001