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PART ONE

Introduction
CHAPTER 1

Purpose

This research paper is presented to the Honors Committee in fulfillment of the requirements of I. D. 499 and partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation with honors.
CHAPTER 2

Problem

Children's concepts of justice constitute an increasingly important factor in behavior, learning readiness, intrapersonal relations, teaching techniques, and future citizenship. These concepts of justice are derived from some of the basic characteristics and responsibilities unique to man. Created without instincts, man's behavior is dependent upon his choices and choices upon judgment which may be moral, amoral, or immoral. Judgment is based upon the values involved, and justice involves the values one places on his fellow man.

The problem in this thesis and the research involved is to examine the discrepancy between what children really believe (or at least say they believe) and their anticipated behavior.

The subject of an honors thesis must be in one's major area. Much research has been done in the area of elementary education concerning the influence of a child's I. Q. and emotional disturbances upon his learning ability and behavior, but comparatively little has been done to find out the influence that values might have on a child's learning ability and behavior.

A child's first contact with justice is encountered in his home in his relations with parents and siblings. Here the opportunity to form his own concept of justice is limited because the child usually has little choice. His evaluation
is influenced by his love for and dependence upon his parents. By the time he reaches school age his range of relationships has grown extensively, as has his awareness of the two-dimensional aspects (give and take) of these relationships. In school he is subjected to the discipline of organization, rigors of a schedule, and role negotiation with many others as self-centered as himself, and the expectations of teachers. As Peck and Havighurst have put it:

It is temptingly easy and insidiously gratifying to "mold" children, or to "whip them into line" by exercising one's superior status and authority as an adult. It is often personally inconvenient to allow children time to debate alternatives, and it may be personally frustrating if their choice contradicts one's own preferences. If there is any selfish, sensitive "pride" at stake, it is very hard for most adults to refrain from controlling children in an autocratic manner. Then, too, like any dictatorship, it looks "more efficient" -- to the dictator, at least. However, the effect on character is to arrest the development of rational judgment and to create such resentments as prevent the growth of genuine altruistic impulses. For thousands of years, the long-term effects have been ignored and sacrificed to short-term adult advantages, most of the time. Probably it is no accident that there are relatively few people who are, or ever will become, psychologically and ethically mature.  

My purpose in choosing this topic is three-fold: to learn about children's concepts of justice, to see how their stated values or choices correspond to their behavior, and to become more aware of the responsibilities and role I

1 As quoted by Louis E. Raths, Values and Teaching (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966), p. 45.
will have as an elementary teacher. I believe the main burden in this confused and confusing world can be borne by the classroom teachers of America.
Definition of Terms

In discussing the process of valuing and children's resultant concept of justice some terms must be defined in their application to this context:

Choice---a deliberate choice and decision on the basis of the understanding of alternatives and their consequences which results in some control over the future.2

Responsibility---is a quality belonging to those who must, in virtue of rule, be chosen as the subjects of a punishment. To be responsible is to be justly punishable.3

Irresponsible---to live entirely in the present, taking no account of the relation between ends and means after recognizing their relevance to human life.4

Value-neutrality---a state of mind deemed necessary to achieve a desired goal and still avoid the mental conflict that comes with an awareness of knowing the difference between what is and what ought to be.5

---

2George E. Axtelle, "The Humanizing of Knowledge and the Education of Values," Educational Theory, 16: 101-9, April, 1966


5Eugene E. Dawson, "Utility and the Crisis in Values," Christian Scholar, 49: 3-6, Spring, 1966
Autonomy---when mutual respect is strong enough to make the individual feel from within the desire to treat others as himself and regards as necessary an ideal that is independent of all external pressure.6

Heteronomy---a state of lacking self-determination.7

Moral realism---is a concept of justice at one extreme end of the continuum of ideas. It is concept based on a child's spontaneous realism and reinforced by adult constraint, resulting in a justice characterized by obedience, duty, and respect for the law which is independent of the mind.8

Moral education---to learn to accept the necessity of taking one's own responsibilities upon oneself;9 not the education for values but education of values—understanding their consequences, significance, and relations to other values; learning our potentialities as human beings and that this includes concern for the welfare of mankind—to join to learning the art of addressing humanity.11


7Ibid

8Ibid


Cooperation---a state of feeling in tune with the world as it ought to be. A feeling which if everyone had, would eliminate the need for courts, jails, and laws. It is living by the conviction that each individual's efforts to do his small part in contributing to what ought to be will not only make that individual's life more harmonious but add to the peace of the world. \(^{12}\)

Values---imply a discrimination among a number of choices,\(^{13}\) and determine what is given precedence and preference---the ideology for customary or habitual responses.\(^{14}\) In this context it is meant what ought to be valued or axiological values---the desirable rather than the desired, the satisfactory rather than the satisfying.

Justice---is an expression of values, an end or an intrinsic value, worth having for its own sake. Punishment is the usual means of accomplishing this end.\(^{15}\)


\(^{14}\)Eugene E. Dawson, "Utility and the Crisis in Values," Christian Scholar, 49: 3-6, Spring, 1966

\(^{15}\)David H. Newhall, "Ends and Means," The Social Studies, 57: 191, October, 1966
PART TWO

Review of Related Literature
CHAPTER 4

Development of Moral Judgment

Too often we deal with moral issues under cover of adjustment labels which are just ways of making value judgments about children in terms of social norms and acting accordingly. Adjustment is a value-neutral term, and value-neutrality is a concept devised by man to assist him in achieving certain ends. The behavior of many people would indicate that they live by two inconsistent systems of value: one for "our kind of people" and one for any group which seems to threaten their special interests. 16

Three elements of moral thinking are adequate factual information, a set of values, and a perception of the value-meanings in behavior. Such perception involves seeing how social change requires different kinds of behavior to express the same values. It also means seeing how the same behavior may convey different and repugnant values. In other words, value-meanings are not intrinsic to behavior but change with time and context. 17

Social change is taking place at such an accelerating rate that issues never before faced pile up more rapidly

17Ibid
than our ability to evolve appropriate codes of conduct. We cannot wait for rules to evolve; man must learn to think morally for himself. Examples of such social changes which demand a conscious and constant evolution of moral judgment are divorce, contraceptives, abortion, limited war, postponement of death through use of modern medicine, teacher unions, and strikes. These are just a few of the aspects that have changed our world today from the world in which most of our moral rules were evolved.

Moral thinking can be learned and is a systematic process which can and must begin in childhood.\textsuperscript{18} Moral judgment can not be learned with the same conscious effort, rigor, and discipline as the "3 R's", but nevertheless its development follows a systematic pattern and process. We shall examine two studies in the development of moral judgment as it relates to justice, one made by Hartshorne and Mays and one by Jean Piaget.

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid
A. Interpretation of Hartshorne and May Study

1. Moral behavior is purely a matter of immediate situational forces. Influential factors determining resistance to temptation to cheat or disobey were situational rather than fixed individual moral characteristic trait of honesty.
   (a) There is a low predictably of cheating in one situation for cheating in another situation.
   (b) Children are not divisible into two groups, "cheaters" and "honest children".
   (c) Expediency is the important aspect of decision to cheat--degree of risk of detection and effort required.
   (d) Honest behavior determined by immediate situational factors of group approval and example.
   (e) Moral knowledge had little influence on moral conduct. Correlation between verbal tests of moral knowledge and experimental tests of moral conduct were low.
   (f) Moral values seem to be related to conduct and these values were somewhat specific to child's social class or group.\textsuperscript{19}

Moral conduct must be understood in terms of the child's needs, his group values, and the demands of the situation. From the standpoint of the individual behavior is not either

"good" or "bad", it always has some positive value—best solution for conflicting drives. He may be motivated by the need to "do right" or conform to standards, the standards of the group and the great American standard of success.

The failure of conventional moral education in the school, as indicated by Hartshorne and Mays, is probably not the result of the helplessness of the school to influence the child's character, but the result of inadequate concepts of character education such as training through preaching, example, punishment, and reward. These are as ineffective in the home as in the school.

A conception of aims and methods of moral education must focus upon more than the immediate classroom-management concerns. By taking as a goal the stimulation of the development of the individual child's moral judgment and character we aid the child in taking the next step in the direction he is already headed rather than imposing an alien pattern upon him. This means that a sign of growth in the child's moral maturity is his ability to make judgments and form principles of his own, rather than his ability to conform to those of the adults around him. In other words, to be able to use "ought" sentences based on principles he has by his own decision accepted and made his own. The child will listen to what the teacher says about moral matters only if the child first feels a genuine sense of uncertainty as to the right answer to the situation in question.  

---

20 Ibid
2. Moral character is a matter of deep emotions fixed during earliest childhood in the home. This is one reason that moral instruction in the school is ineffective. 

(a) Moral conduct is determined by the level of development of the child's moral judgments or concepts. There are six stages in the growth of developing moral judgment: 21

Level I Premoral
  - Stage 1. Obedience and punishment orientation
  - Stage 2. Naively egoistic

Level II Conventional Role Conformity
  - Stage 3. Good-boy orientation
  - Stage 4. Authority and social-order-maintain.

Level III Self-accepted Moral Principles
  - Stage 5. Contractual legalistic orientation
  - Stage 6. Conscience or principle orientation

These stages are more than age-related. They imply sequence, universality of sequence, personality consistency. What does this in turn imply about the curriculum of moral education? It must be based on the teacher's observation and listening to the judgments and ideas expressed by individual children. Such a "curriculum" must then be aimed at a level which is one stage above the child's own stage of development of moral judgment. 22

---

21 Ibid
22 Ibid
The first step in developing moral character is the ability to make a decision conscious of the alternatives, their motivations and consequences. The ability to apply this judgment in the guiding and criticizing of one's own actions and to that of other's must follow the act of judging in order to develop moral character. Thus the teacher must stimulate not only the judgmental capacities, but also stimulate the child's application of his own principles to his actions. To prepare the child to examine the pros and cons of his own conduct in his own terms is a difficult but vital goal. 23

In order to achieve any carry over of the application of his values to his behavior, the behavior demanded by teachers must have some positive relation to his already existing moral values. The teacher must not moralize trivial classroom routines which have no moral meaning outside the classroom, or the child will assume his values are not relevant to his conduct in the classroom. To minimize the child's perceiving such a contradiction, the teacher must communicate some of his own values to broader and more genuinely moral issues and must treat classroom administrative trivia as such so as to distinguish conformity demands from basic principles involving moral judgment of the child's worth. 24

Not all behavior values progress or mature in the same

23 Ibid
24 Ibid
stages of moral judgment at the same time. The motive to cheat is the motive to succeed and do well. The motive to resist cheating is also the motive to achieve and be approved of, but in more long-range and internal terms. The gap of moral maturity between these two values, the gap between the child's and the teacher's stage of moral judgment must be realized by the teacher. A less mature moral development must be encouraged to grow but must not be treated as the absence of such values. The teacher's most important and basic concern and awareness in moral education must be the relation of the child's behavior to his own moral judgments rather than the conformity of the child's behavior to the teacher's judgments.

---

25 Ibid
B. Piaget's Continuum from Moral Realism to Cooperation

Piaget divides a child's growth from early individualism to progressive cooperation into three processes: the unconscious egocentrism belonging to the individual as such, adult constraint, and cooperation. Complicating matters is the fact that cooperation alone can shake the child out of the initial state of unconscious egocentrism, but constraint just strengthens egocentric traits until cooperation relieves the child of both this initial spontaneity and the effects of constraint. 26

Out of this growth process there seems to stem two separate moralities: a conventional morality of doing what one is told and a rational moral code which has to be reflected about frequently. Between the two is a transitional stage in which rules are internalized and generalized. 27

The conventional morality or moral constraint is characterized by unilateral respect—respect in the sense of obligation and duty. These obligations the child feels deeply, but they do not come from his own mind. The commands come from the adult and are accepted by the child. This conventional morality is heteronomous. The relationship between the adult and child is not only one of constraint, but one of mutual affection from which stems unprescribed generosity and self-sacrifice. This may be the beginning of cooperation which may develop along side the sense of duty and which may eventually


27 Ibid
replace it. But the relationship of constraint irregardless of how much self-sacrifice that may accompany it generates only duty, obligation, and moral realism.\footnote{Ibid}

Moral realism is an abstract state of mind at the opposite end of Piaget's continuum from cooperation. In order to understand the severity and danger of continuing to use constraint or external pressures as our only means of transmitting our society, let's explain moral realism. In order to define it, we must develop and question the concept of human thought processes.

Moral realism is a product of the socially inevitable combination of two factors--the realism of a child and the constraint exercised by adults. This combination is not limited to moral considerations but occurs in the intellectual as well. A fundamental of human psychology is that society, instead of remaining inside organisms, being prompted by instincts and passed on by heredity, becomes constituted outside individuals by the external pressure they put upon each other. Rules are not innate facts to the child but are imposed upon him by adult constraint to which he conforms and adapts.\footnote{Ibid}

This term moral realism can be verified by two aspects. One is that the child is a realist--that is, he considers abstractions as something material or real. He associates the name of an object as having always been a part of the nature of it.
His notion of law is simultaneously moral and physical. He perceives the physical world to be subject, like human beings, to rules determined by their will. Responsibility and thus justice is simply a matter of respecting a law. Intent does not even enter the picture until the ability to cooperate (or maybe the freedom to cooperate) is established—that is forcing or allowing the individual to be constantly occupied with the point of view of other people so he can compare it with his own.\textsuperscript{30}

The second aspect of moral realism is adult constraint. This double origin or interplay of factors is not as contradictory as may first appear. The adult and his constraint are part of the child's universe which he views in childish realism. There are two aspects of adult constraint. One is that adult commands remain external to the young child. Some remain external out of necessity (basic needs, etc.) others are later internalized. The second and unfortunate aspect of adult constraint is the lack of psychological insight on the part of many adults which leads the child to the idea of objective responsibility or rather prolongs childish realism.\textsuperscript{31}

Is it innate in human society that our society itself must be constituted outside individuals by the external pressures they put on each other or is it rather that the trait of cooperation is innate? This whole idea of moral realism poses the question: Is adult constraint a necessary crutch to cooperation

\textsuperscript{30}Ibid

\textsuperscript{31}Ibid
because of the child's moral and intellectual immaturity? Is the development of moral judgment really as systematically and sequentially structured as Piaget himself hypothesizes?

The transitional or intermediate stage between constraint and cooperation comes when the child no longer merely obeys the commands of the adult but the rule itself. He has internalized the rule, generalized and applied it in an original way. He views something as bad even if there will be no punishment connected. But this is still only half way to Piaget's hoped for rational moral code of autonomy when it is not the already learned rule which deemed necessary but a code which is a product of the mind itself. 32 This seems ultra-idealistic because our moral judgment is pervaded and surrounded by already existing rules. Even mindful of Piaget's theory of autonomy, try as we will the products of our mind seem to be a new application of an old and internalized rule. We are so involved in social change that we are unable to step back and see the ever increasing opportunity to evolve new codes of moral judgment which we may apply to these never-before-faced situations. In this light autonomy is not just a never-to-be-reached ideal by which we measure our growth, but a necessity to be faced and a challenge to be accepted by our family relations, schools, and society in general. By scoffing at such seemingly unattainable ideals we forfeit our right to lean on the ideals we inherit, however feebly they maybe transmitted.

But how can we, as individuals and society, programmed and conditioned for transmission by constraint, ever hope to

---

32 Ibid
attain autonomy or a morality of cooperation? The first step is in discovering that which is necessary to the relations of sympathy and mutual respect. Reciprocity seems to be the determining factor of autonomy. Moral autonomy is achieved when the mind regards as necessary an ideal that is independent of all external pressure. This ideal must be in our relations to other people for apart there is no need. Autonomy, determined by reciprocity, is achieved when mutual respect is strong enough to create within the individual the desire to treat others as he himself would wish to be treated.33

Then Piaget is saying that we must discover the need for and originate in our own individual minds the same "Golden Rule" that we have been preaching for centuries; that justice, even though reinforced by the precepts and examples of adults, is independent of such influences and requires for its development only the mutual respect which holds among children themselves.34 To Piaget justice is a sort of immanent condition of social relationships in contrast to a given rule which has been imposed upon the child from the outside and which he fails to understand.

It is on this concept of justice that Piaget bases his analysis of children's ideas about justice and punishment. He has defined two types of respect and thus two types of moralities: a morality of constraint or heteronomy and a morality of cooperation or autonomy.35

33 Ibid
34 Ibid
There are also two distinct ideas of justice. Something is unjust when it penalizes the innocent, rewards the guilty, or is not in proportion to the guilt in question. This concept is based on reward and punishment and the correlation between the act and its retribution. The second idea of justice recognizes something as unjust when it favors some at the expense of others. This justice implies only the idea of equality. 36

Piaget's method of study consisted of having children compare pairs of stories where children are punished and stories where parents simply explain to the child the consequences of his actions. In this way it is possible to contrast with expiatory punishment (retributive justice) a punishment of reciprocity. Expiation implies a means of atonement, as external force; whereas reciprocity implies an internal force derived from the feeling of breaking a trust. 37

Both types of reaction in the concern of justice are found in all ages but reciprocity seems to be predominate. In the choice of punishments, younger children recommend the most severe in order to emphasize the necessity of punishment. Older children are more in favor of measures of reciprocity meaning punishment in the sense of self-imposed guilt—feel that they have broken a mutual trust or let someone down and things must be put right again. 38

36 Ibid
37 Ibid
38 Ibid
The young ones think a rightly punished child will not repeat the offense because he has realized the authority of the rule, while the older children believe that if the consequences of the action in question is explained to their initiator that he will be less likely to repeat the act then if he had been punished per se.

The research concerning children's attitudes on the usefulness and soundness of punishment showed that younger children's answers all implied expiatory punishment. On this point the older ones justify punishment by its preventive value. This contradiction of their concern for reciprocity may be due to the need they feel to defend the views on punishments of the adults around them.39

The punishments of retributive justice are more concrete and thus more easily evaluated as being just or unjust. "A child is quicker to discover adult mistakes in the realm of retributive than in distributive justice: a wrongly applied punishment seems to them more unjust than inequality of treatment." This may be due in part to the fact that a child's concept of distributive justice is dependent upon the strength of the bonds between himself and his peers, while retributive justice stems from relations between children and adults.40

This accounts for the lessening of unilateral respect with the growth of the child. As his identification with adults

39 Ibid
40 Ibid
and their authority grows (partly due to the application of his own authority on those younger than himself and partly due to the growth of mutual respect), his desire for equalitarian justice and reciprocity grows with age.

But while the judgment of one's own conduct on the basis of egocentric realism tends to dwindle, it may remain as a basis for the evaluation of other people's actions. The fact that this immature attitude exists even in adults and remains as a means of judging other people shows that a danger of the function of constraint in passing from individualism to progressive cooperation is the establishment of an affected cooperation.

A cooperation in spite of judgments of other people cannot last long and is not transmitted to succeeding generations as cooperation, but rather adds to the list of discrepancies becoming another inconsistency for children to rationalize and create a realism-truth.

The term indecent is one example of a realism-truth created in such an affected cooperation to describe a person deemed guilty of not conforming to the standards of socially accepted behavior. He may know better or he may be unfamiliar with the standards of a certain locale.

The counterpart of the term indecent is immoral, and is often used synomously without realizing that the difference between what is and what should be, between the desired and the

---

41 Ibid
desirable, and between constraint and cooperation. People are often thought to be immoral by onlookers when really their judgment is that of indecency. Of one another we may judge only conformity to social standards. In order to evaluate another's morality or degree of conformity to standards of good and right, we would have to conceive such norms with a common conscience which can only evolve in a society of complete cooperation—not affected cooperation. To be immoral is to be deceitful and dishonest to oneself and others.

M. Bovet sums up the only essential point in debate of constraint versus cooperation. "The unique contribution of cooperation to the development of moral consciousness is precisely that it implies the distinction between what is and what ought to be, between effective obedience and an ideal independent of any real command." If unilateral respect and social constraint alone determined moral good it would be determined by the duties and regulations of existing society. But cooperation and mutual respect, as they involve indwelling norms unaffected by rules, act as catalytists and give to moral evolution a definite direction. This direction is more important than stages of conjunction and divergence in the development of moral consciousness.42

42 Ibid
CHAPTER 5

Factors Contributing to Value-Neutrality

A. Home

Since the first association of a child with other people, a condition necessary for the development of moral judgment, begins at home, let's first examine the factors contributing to the inconsistency and confusion a child faces at home.

Many parents are poor psychologists and give their children the most questionable of moral training—a unexamined morality of unquestionability. In this light one realizes "how immoral it can be to believe too much in morality, and how much more precious is a little humanity than all the rules in the world." Instead of giving children real and meaningful choices, adults most often give only the choice of to do or not to do, to obey or disobey. This fosters the growth of objective responsibility, value-neutrality or adjustment, and stifles the child's mental growth from his childish realism to conscious cooperation. It is no wonder that the teenage years have come to be known as trying and awkward. The mal-adjusted child or delinquent may be one who is only trying to assert his desire for a real choice, his only choice being to disobey. Prior to adolescence his choice has been only this type, and when all at once faced with so many meaningful de-

\[43\text{Ibid}\]
cisions about his own welfare and future, he knows not where to turn. He knows he is expected to choose but knows not how because the decision is no longer simply to do or not to do the prescribed but a whole continuum of opportunities of which he cannot anticipate the consequences. In the face of such confusion he seeks release of pressure and frustration by ignoring the continuum and seeing only the old extremes---in the form of to choose or not to choose. Since he is expected to choose, his only free decision is not to choose at all but just drift from fad to fad and follow the crowd.

How much more valuable it would be for parents in the rearing of their children to guide them with the advantage of their own foresight by helping the child himself to anticipate consequences and thus preventing an ensuing line of conduct which the child's pride will make him stick to.\(^{43}\) By catching and judging the wrong-doings of children, adults retard and make more painful the evolvement of the child's own foresight by focusing and thus basing the development upon the hindsight of the child which he is bound to defend.

This not only leads to a perpetual state of tension between child and parents, but also to feelings of frustration in the child as he is inwardly defeated in his efforts to be objective by the love and respect he has for his parents. As he grows up and away from his parents and his sense of pride

\(^{43}\)Ibid
slowly diminishes, remembering and seeing the advantages of their foresight, he inwardly concedes their right of authority over him and will, in light of this growing conviction, will be as stupid in the wielding of authority with his own children as his parents were with him.44

But even this hierarchy for the transmission of authority has been altered due to the changing family structure. Working fathers and mothers find it almost impossible to adequately fulfill their dual roles as members of a workday world and as members of a family. Something just must be slighted and since it cannot be the time-clock, it is the relations between the members of the family.45 The father's job is no longer of primary importance, and in many cases far removed from anything the child can identify with. With this means of identification gone, and the mother not at home when the child returns home from school to share his world, the child is left to seek and find his own purpose for doing. There is less and less involvement in more and more.46

The nature of our mechanized way of living and making a living makes the frequent moving of residence from one com-
munity to another not only easy but often necessary. The home is no longer a permanent and sentimental abode but a between

44Ibid


46Ibid
jobs dwelling. The task of becoming oriented to new communities, new neighbors and friends gets old after a time, and it is easier to not bother with the chore of establishing lasting relations. Thus the family instead of becoming a part of the community is a refuge from it, a place to escape the pressures of society. Father and mother may commute through several miles of tangling traffic each day. They leave too early in the mornings and come home too tired at night to discuss the meaning of either their own or the child's activities of the day. So progresses the disappearing of opportunities to help the child see any purpose in such survival methods.  

The invention of television has exposed the child to many, many different ways of life. Without any stable family life of his own with which to compare, contrast and evaluate these new ways of living and without any help in questioning the reasonableness and meaning of the actions he sees, the child is left with no ideas but just absorbed confusion. His confusion about what actually is consumes and renders meaningless any effort to decide what ought to be.

A child's efforts in thinking about the oughtness of behavior and values have by tradition been taught by the family as a unit through their religion. The same influences which have changed the family unit have also changed the impact of the church, and a way of life represented by religious

48 Ibid
tradition is becoming neglected. This decrease in the quantity and thus quality of religious teachings of the church is a definite contributing factor of today's growing confusion.\textsuperscript{49}

B. School

As the child's contacts with the world outside of home become more extensive both in relationships of cooperation with his peers and unilateral constraint with adults, he sees more inconsistencies between what is preached by their words and what is taught by their actions, and feels more confusion in trying to make his behavior acceptable.

Acceptable to whom or more important, to what? In order to be satisfying as well as satisfactory, acceptable in this sense must involve purpose. It is with this in mind that we examine the inconsistencies inflicted upon the child in his first extensive social contact—school. The growing tragedy is that these inconsistencies are felt more and more by the child and seen less and less by their prosecutors.

The most inescapable influence upon a child's role in school is the teacher. Due to the impact of mobility, the teacher is in many cases not a local girl. If she were, she would know what it is like to grow up in the local community, the problems they face, and the local standard of life. She would know the policemen, the storekeepers, and most of all, her student's parents as people with whom she grew up. But more important, the policemen, storekeepers, and others in
the community also should know the teachers, and parents, and their children. Children are aware that they are noticed; their behavior is personal in the sense that each is a member of a family known by the teacher, minister, storkeeper, and neighbors. It would be easier for the child to know what society expected of him both now and as an adult. This kind of society is not totally desirable but at least it serves as a means of identification for the child; he knows one kind of life, and it serves as a basis for comparing other ways of living.

Teachers are not a special breed of people who have escaped our growing confusion, yet they are expected to clarify for children the choices to be made and how to make them. The easiest way to attempt this is to condense the task to a method of conveying facts, and building skills. In communities of people with many backgrounds, it is easier for schools and administrators, if teachers do not raise issues. It is easier to teach verbalizations of concepts of justice such as "lying gets you nowhere", "all men are created equal", "war is evil", "we must cooperate to get along", "our democracy was founded on the freedom to choose", "government of, by, and for the people", and justice and liberty for all. To teach children to apply these concepts in their own relations in school while they are surrounded by and aware of the contradicting examples made for

---

50 Ibid
51 Ibid
them by adults is the gap that our schools are supposed to fill—a gap between what is and what should be. It is only widened by our teaching methods based on the "what was" of many years ago and the "what must be" in order to maintain a climate conducive to learning.

Some of the attempts to rationalize children's inability to learn are to deem it lack of motivation, poor home background, or culturally deprivation.

In the field of education we have all kinds of labels to describe the degree to which children may be physically or mentally handicapped, and now we have a new label for those children who have the capacity, do not seem emotionally disturbed, and have the traditional motivation at home, but still are not able to use their abilities to achieve in school. We call this affliction a learning disability. It may be that a child "handicapped" in such a way is really the student who has the insight to see the futility of learning facts and proving his ability to memorize. Thus we hypothesize that the nature of a learning disability is really the existence of a child's ability rather than disability—ability to see the conflict between the facts which he is presented and the confusion with which he is confronted. The essence of education puts this ability to use in teaching children to see and question this discrepancy, to overcome the feeling of insecurity in the absence

---

of ready-made answers, and still be able to relate to other human beings and to the whole in a cooperative manner.

C. Society

As the child's relations with other people broaden in scope to include more of society he finds that the practical application of his ideals make them depreciate even more as a measure of success. As he is faced with more inconsistencies not only does he see that these tools he was given to live by are judged useless and quaint by modern necessity but that the same people who gave him his ideals are now showing him examples of practices which are entirely contradictory.

When the child repeats to his mother what his friend the storekeeper said about a product, his mother lets him know that you can't believe what storekeepers say. He wonders if most people in the adult world regularly lie for money. Why isn't something done about it?53

He has studied in school about the lasting and disasterous effects of total war yet the consequences of the limited war and the cold war of today seem just as hideous. It had been preached to him that he would have to learn to cooperate if he intended to get along in this world, but now as he gets his first
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job, he finds the same people telling him to look out for himself because if he doesn't, nobody else will. He learned in school about the greatness of our founding fathers who had the courage and conviction to stand up and speak their mind. Now he is advised to be careful of what he says, go along with the authorities, or at best to feel out the consequences of a situation before he commits himself.\textsuperscript{54}

He thought the purpose of education was to help in business world of job selection and would be a "key to success", but now he sees that it's not always "what you know but who you know".

The idea is communicated that we must be an informed public, keep up on current events and voting issues, and be concerned about the happenings of the world. Yet as he attempts to believe what he reads in newspapers and magazines, and sees on television, he is cautioned to be suspicious. Is it so difficult for our "freedom of press and speech" to be used to convey a true picture or is there any truth to state?

In this age of anxiety and adventure we still seek security and attempt to "play it safe". But even this sense of security is deceiving. It is based on the acquisition of material things acquired by "solve-all" credit card.

This insecurity is felt by parents who play a new role in the social class structure based on their ability to acquire "things". Children find that the best way to get whatever they want is to argue that "everyone else does."\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{54}Ibid

\textsuperscript{55}Ibid
In the growing emphasis upon commodities as symbols of status, we are producing humans for the use of goods instead of goods for the use of humans, and we end up with a surplus of humans not able to buy our surplus of goods. We fight unemployment and poverty with the same bewilderment while the number of the very poor has changed very little as the result of our various "new deals", "fair deals", "new frontiers", and "wars on poverty".

The only hope of recovery from such production lies in the genuine educational institution which can save the would-be-victims of their technological society by means of the free exchange and examination of ideas.

Many more things could be added to the list of inconsistencies which make it more difficult for a child to see purpose and value in the ideas to which we give verbal praise, but we will add only one more to the list: the standardized role which seems to be assumed by most adults when they are in the presence of children. Assuming that their chief function is to tell children things, adults proceed to tell them what to do, when to do it, how to do it, how often to do it, and when to stop doing it. Even worse is telling them what not to do, etc. This seems to be either the cause or the summation of all other listed influences upon children.

---


57 Ibid

This overview of the growing complexity of our society does not suggest that human beings are more inconsistent than ever before, but that with the advent of mass communication, travel, and movement of residency and the ease with which our physical needs are satisfied by our productive economy, more children are exposed to more of these inconsistencies.59 A child is surrounded by so much confusion with so few people with the time and patience to listen and help him help himself unscramble some of the confusion that he remains confused, not seeing any purpose nor distinguishing one course of action from another as to their desirability for himself. Confronted by so many alternatives they become not alternatives at all but just a maze of neutral responses—one being just as good as another. Even worse than such a state of confusion and frustration is one of accepting, adapting unawareness. It is the defense of the child to alleviate such frustration and compensate for the questions he doesn't get answered. Not only are questions left unanswered but cease to be questioned at all.

"Equipping men for an informed, critical, and responsible role in society is the ultimate goal while moral judgment is the means of social responsibility. Education cannot be morally neutral for to retreat from the challenge of applying our knowledge values is to relinquish our birthright."60

59 Ibid

60 Henry Babcock Adams, "Learning to Think Morally", Adult Education, 15: 172-9, Spring, 1965
CHAPTER 6

The Role of Moral Education in Moral Behavior

The existence of our American heritage is the fact that we have the freedom to choose from so many courses of action in achieving our ideals. But more important than mere existence is the essence of American opportunity—education or the discovery of what such choices mean to the values of our way of life—both the difficulties they impose and the advantages they make possible.

The "process of valuing" or deciding how one shall determine the outcome of his life is a process which does not begin and end with a child's enrollment in and graduation from school, but by the very nature of our society the role of education has a responsible part in influencing how a child will live his life.

The purpose of our investigation of the role of education is to see how schools and teachers can fulfill this responsibility. Since the values of students are not always obvious to the teacher or even to the child himself, there must be something more perceptible and concrete upon which to build our teaching, evaluate its effectiveness, and still teach in a way that will be "education of values not education for values."61

---

61 George E. Axtelle, "The Humanizing of Knowledge and the Education of Values," Educational Theory, 16: 101-9, April, 1966
Raths calls this "something" value indicators or things that indicate the presence of a value but that are different from values. These are goals or purposes, aspirations, attitudes, interests, feelings, beliefs or convictions, activities and worries, problems, obstacles. These are categories of behavior often revealed in the classroom. The responsibility of the teacher is to create opportunities for these kinds of behavior to be freely expressed. If the child feels free enough from the pressure of the teacher's judgment or in his eyes, censorship, then he will drop his defenses and be able to ask of himself some questions about how and why he behaves just so and of what consequence are such actions. Thus he will be beginning to raise these value indicators to values because his choice has been a personal one and has involved alternatives which he prizes, understands the consequences of, and are actually available for him to choose.

The teaching approach based on the above description we will call clarifying approach to distinguish it from the traditional. It is a process for helping children make some sense out of the confusion around them. Since we have already examined the inconsistencies which stem from the traditional approach, we will just briefly outline some procedures that are characteristic of the traditional approach.


\footnote{Ibid}
A. Shortcomings of Traditional Approach

1. Setting examples or pointing to good models of the past and present. 2. Persuading and convincing. 3. Limiting choices to only those among values "we" accept. 4. Inspiring by emotional pleas. 5. Rules and regulations intended to mold and make spontaneous "right" behavior. 6. Cultural or religious dogma assumed to be unquestionable. 7. Appeals to conscience by arousing feelings of guilt.64

One reason that adults try to impose their values on children, and it is perhaps an underlying generalization of all the other excuses they give: they see no other more promising alternative with which they will still feel secure.65 They too have been taught by the "funnel and spout method" and even as adults can see no other way to teach their children than the way they themselves were taught.

B. Characteristics of New Approach

The innovation of the new clarifying approach must begin with the conscious efforts of those rigid in the ways of the traditional so that future generations may not struggle blindly with the constraint of one succeeding generation over another.

64 Raths, Harmon, Simon, Values and Teaching (Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966) p. 16
65 Ibid
The methods of this new clarifying approach are simple in structure but complex in the thinking, questioning, and awareness it stimulates in its students. The meaning of this process for schools and more specifically, the classroom teacher is not a method which she alone learns to use but also helps her students to use in their relations with each other. That is, one must help children: (1) make choices and make them freely, (2) search for alternatives in choice making situations, (3) weigh the consequences of each available alternative, (4) consider what it is that they prize and cherish, (5) make public affirmations of their choices, (6) act, behave, and live in accordance with their choices, (7) examine repeated behaviors or patterns in their life.66

The basic strategy of this approach is a specific method of responding to things a student says or does in a way that results in his considering what he has chosen, what he prizes, or what he is doing.67

Operating under this value theory, it is entirely possible that children will choose not to develop values. It is the teacher's responsibility to support this choice also, while maintaining an atmosphere which will enable the child to remain objective about his decision rather than sensing a feeling of hostility and discrimination which will only reinforce his defensive resentment to questioning his own choices.
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By making this new atmosphere a regular experience we can help raise to the value level the beliefs, feelings, interests, and activities which children bring with them to school. 68

There are purposes and outcomes of this approach that are more concrete, observable, testable, and of immediate function in the maintaining the organizational structure of the school room. The children who were apathetic, overconforming, flighty, indecisive, inconsistent, drifters, overconformers, overdissenters, or role players will show more meaningful behavior while their former actions will be less acute and less frequent. This approach also helps those we labeled earlier as underachievers or as having a learning disability. They improve in their attitudes toward learning, raising questions and alternatives, initiation and self-direction of classroom activity, perserverance, and active participation. 69

Ralph Ellison has summarized and added insight to the seeming impossibility stated above. He says, "If you can show me how I can cling to that which is real to me, while teaching me a way into the larger society, then I will not only drop my defenses and my hostility, but I will sing your praises and I will help you to make the desert bear fruit."

68 Ibid
69 Ibid
PART III

Original Research
Chapter 7

Purpose and Procedure

The concern of this thesis is not so much with what the child says he believes to be just nor why he believes as he does but with how he acquired his view as stated and if, in fact, his actual behavior bears out his declared view.

Not knowing exactly how the children of my sample acquired their notions about justice, the studies of Hartshorne and May and of Jean Piaget in Chapter 4 explored the possibilities and characteristics of the development of moral judgment.

Since natural and spontaneous behavior is virtually impossible to measure and record for a large sample, my constructed test attempted to measure anticipated behavior. My interest in the responses to my sampling device is in the what aspect of justice as it correlates, either positively or negatively, to the child's anticipated application of his verbalized idea.

Six stories, each about a situation involving a decision on the part of the listener were read to children. The decisions involved were based on one of the following aspects of justice in each story: (1) Intent-Consequence, (2) Greatest Good for Greatest Number vs. Differential Treatment, (3) Vengeance-Forgiveness, (4) Moral Equality-Moral Inequality, (5) Objective or Subjective—Expiation or reciprocity, (6) Virtue of Authority—Equal Responsibility. The ending of the story depended on
the answer each child gave of his own judgment of guilt or innocence of the people involved.

For each story there were three possible choices: two of these choices represent very definite but contradictory value judgments about the behavior of the main character in the story. The third choice reflects indecision. There was also a personal involvement question about each story. This was for the purpose of recording each child's anticipated behavior in the situation.

The stories were read to each class by myself in their own classroom atmosphere. It was made clear to each child that the content of their answers would be seen by no one but myself, and was involved no grade of any kind. They could put their name on their paper if they wished, mark the selection of their answers in any manner with any kind of pen or pencil. They did not need to spell all the words of their answers correctly. Ample time was provided. Children did not have to answer any questions if they did not wish.
A. Stories and Response Sheet

The following six stories were read to the children tested:

Intent---Consequence

In a small Tennessee town Jane Davis was the only nurse, and the nearest doctor was forty miles away. Jane received a telephone call late one night from a worried mother who lived far out in the country. Her baby boy was so sick that he needed medicine immediately or he might die. Nurse Jane decided that it would take too long for the doctor to come so she hurriedly picked up the medicine she thought would help the boy and drove to the boy's house. She did all she could for the boy and thought the medicine would help him get well. The next day the mother called to say that her son had gotten worse during the night and died. The nurse was sure he would recover and was so shocked to hear he had died that she immediately checked to see what medicine she had given him. She was horrified to find that she had given him the wrong and harmful medicine.

Greatest Good for Greatest Number---Differential Treatment

Mr. Brown was the basketball coach for Central Jr. High School. The Central team had made it to the city championship game. They only had seven boys on the team---5 starting players and 2 substitutes. Greg was one of the substitutes, and he loved to play basketball even though he was clumsy and hadn't
been put in to play one game the whole year. Basketball meant a lot to Greg because he thought he wasn't good in anything, even school work. He was so proud when Mr. Brown chose him for the team at the first of the year. Greg tried not to be disappointed and kept hoping he would get to play at least one game.

This was the last game of the year. Next year Greg would be in high school and probably wouldn't even make the team even for a substitute. Everyone was excited and nervous the night of the game but not as much as Greg because he felt this was really his last chance. The last quarter of the game the score was tied with 3 minutes left to play. One of Central's starting players fouled out so Mr. Brown had to send either Greg or the other substitute into the game. The other substitute was only a 7th grader and had played several games during the year---but not Greg.

Vengeance---Forgiveness

Janice had loaned her bicycle to Mindy one Saturday because Mindy's new bicycle had not come in to the store yet. Janice's bike was not new, but she had just painted it and was very proud of it. To Mindy it was just an old bicycle. She was not careful with Janice's bike and scratched the new paint and dented a fender. This made Janice sad and angry.

Finally Mindy got her new bicycle and the girls decided to take a bicycle trip together. As they rode along, Janice saw a sharp piece of wire on the road in front of Mindy.
Thinking about how Mindy had messed-up her bike, Janice did not tell Mindy about the wire in the road. Mindy ran over it and punctured her tire and broke some spokes. Janice figured she had gotten even now.

Moral Equality—Moral Inequality

In this day and age we don't have many epidemics because the rapid spreading of disease has been eliminated by modern medicine. But once in Chicago where people live in crowded apartment buildings there was an epidemic of a serious disease. Hundreds of people were catching the disease and many died or were left in poor health for the rest of their lives. Everyone was in danger—brilliant scientists, doctors, teachers, talented artists and musicians, government officials, and policemen. The people who lived in rundown, crowded apartment buildings were very much in danger, too, because they lived so close together that the germs spread very fast. The doctors and health officials had a very difficult decision to make. You see, there was not enough medicine to give everyone two shots. One shot for everyone would mean that all were helped only a little, and no one would be completely safe. But if only part of the people were given two shots then these people would probably not get the disease.

Justice—Objective or Subjective

John was a very lonely and unhappy sixth grade boy. He had moved to several different schools each year and
every place it was the same for him. The girls always laughed and giggled at him, and the boys called him names. He disliked going to school because of all this trouble. Walking home after school was the worst part of each day. This is when the boys rode very fast and close to him on their bicycles, called him names, and sometimes threw rocks at him. John's parents told him to ignore the boys and pretend they weren't there. One day John was tired of pretending, tired of jumping out of the way of their bicycles, tired of trying to dodge their rocks, and tired of sometimes getting hit. This day he carried a rock in his pocket to throw at the first person who bothered him. Joe started teasing him again, today, and as he had planned, John let him have it with the rock from his pocket. He didn't take time to look where he threw. He just knew he was tired of pretending and tired of being tormented everyday. When John saw that the rock had hit Joe in the eye he was so scared he ran home. Joe's mother called that night and was very upset and angry because Joe's eye was severely damaged. The doctor feared he might be blind in that eye.

Virtue of Authority—Equal Responsibility

Officer O'Day was a careful and considerate policeman. He enjoyed being a policeman most of the time. He liked helping people and helping them avoid trouble before it started. Arresting people made him very unhappy and disappointed in his friends.

Mr. O'Day enjoyed his job much more in the daytime because there were always lots of friends to talk to—especially the
children of the neighborhood. They were all his special friends because he told them stories, helped them find a place to play, and he talked seriously with them sometimes, too. He warned of the dangers and disappointments of breaking the law and the harm it did to other people.

The streets of the neighborhood were very dark and dreary at night. In the section of town there weren't many street lights and not many cars whose lights brightened the night. One night Officer O'Dsy came upon some trouble. A man's voice yelling for help and for the police came from a dark store. Mr. O'Day went forward slowly and carefully thinking that the criminal might still be around. Just then he saw in the darkness what looked like a man coming out of the store carrying something. The man saw the policeman and started to run. Officer O'Day yelled to the man three times to stop running, but the man ran on down the street. As he had been trained, Mr. O'Day drew his gun and fired. The run-away man who looked like a robber, fell to the sidewalk, dead. By this time other policemen were there and when they investigated what had happened, they found that the store had been robbed an hour ago. The owner had just come to and began to yell when Mr. O'Day and the man just both happened to come along. The man who ran and was shot was not carrying any loot, so he had evidently been trying to help and instead had gotten scared.
This is the response sheet I used:

Check just one box for each story.
Write your answer to the last question in each story.

1. Nurse Jane and the sick little boy:
   - Nurse Jane should be held responsible for the boy's death.
   - I don't know.
   - She is not responsible since she was trying to help.
   If you were the boy's mother would you tell the police that she killed your son?

2. The basketball coach and Greg:
   - A good coach lets everybody play.
   - I don't know.
   - A good coach tries most of all to win the game.
   What would you do if you were the coach?

3. Janice, Mindy, and their bicycles:
   - Janice should get even with Mindy or she will never learn.
   - I don't know.
   - Janice should forgive her and maybe Mindy will learn to be more careful.
   What would you do if you were Janice?

4. Not enough medicine to cure all of the people:
   - Everyone should take the same chances of getting sick.
   - I don't know.
   - Some people are more valuable because of their important work.
   What would you do?
5. John fights back and Joe is blind:
   □ John should be excused for fighting back.
   □ I don't know.
   □ John should be held completely responsible for Joe's injury.

If you were the school principal or the law officer, what would you do?

6. Officer O'Day and the man who ran away:
   □ Officer O'Day should be held responsible for killing the man.
   □ I don't know.
   □ He is not responsible since it is his job to protect the people.

If you lived in that neighborhood what would you think?
B. Pilot Study---Purpose and Results

As a pilot study I gave this story-type questionnaire to a class at Burris to determine the credibility of my stories, suitability of choices, and the degree of identity or involvement expected with each essay-response question. I also hoped to learn just how I, as the reader, could by my tone of voice, facial expressions, and word emphasis be objective yet interesting. From their responses I planned to judge the effectiveness and validity of the specific wording of each choice of answers---find if there were any loaded words or phrases. By loaded I mean those over-used or very familiar in the context of justice.

Also to be learned from this pilot study was how willing a class of children would be to do this, how adequate were my instructions---clear and uninhibiting---to the class, and how the class reacted to being left with no ready-made answers. Since there were no grades to be given, would they make the effort to think and take stock of their feelings? Were the stories written at a level of sophistication so as to be of interest to the age of children in my sample?

The class at Burris was of great help and encouragement. I learned from their verbal reactions and comments that I needed to make it clear that there was no ending to each story except the one they made by the answer they chose.

The wording of the choices in number three---the story about Janice, Mindy, and their bicycles---at the time of the pilot study read: We should treat others as they treat us.
We should treat others as we want to be treated ourselves. I realized from their responses that both extreme choices resembled too closely the "Golden Rule." All but one of the children checked the latter response and then answered the question with a contradictory response. Evidently it was asking too much to disregard outrightly the "Golden Rule" by checking the other choice which corresponded more often with their written response. This was a loaded choice so I changed the choices to read: Janice should get even with Mindy or she will never learn. Janice should forgive her and maybe Mindy will learn to be more careful.

The choice to be made in story number four about the epidemic and lack of medicine was evidently so weighty that they looked for an out and wrote it into their response to the open question. As a result, I incorporated into the next readings of the stories the fact that no additional medicine could possibly be obtained, sent for, made, substituted nor invented.

From the justification given for choosing the last extreme choice as they stated in their written answers for number six about Officer O'Day, I knew I had evidently emphasized with my *voice* the word "trained" as I read the story: "As he had been trained, Officer O'Day drew and fired." Almost all the children gave his training as justification for his innocence.
1. Nurse Jane and the sick little boy:
24% Nurse Jane should be held responsible.
28% I don't know.
48% She is not responsible.
28%* If you were the boy's mother would you tell the police that she killed your son?

2. The basketball coach and Greg:
48% A good coach lets everybody play.
16% I don't know.
36% A good coach tries most of all to win the game.
12% What would you do if you were the coach?

3. Janice, Mindy, and their bicycles:
4% Treat others as they treat us.
8% I don't know.
88% Treat others as we want to be treated ourselves.
44% What would you do if you were Janice?

4. Not enough medicine to cure all of the people:
72% Everyone should be treated equally.
20% I don't know.
8% Some people are more valuable because of their work.
36% What would you do?

* The percentage recorded beside the essay question in each story denotes the percentage of responses which contradicted the response checked above.
5. John fights back and Joe is blind:

48% John should be excused.
28% I don't know.
24% John should be held completely responsible.
32% If you were the school principal or the law officier, what would you do?

6. Officier O'Day and the man who ran away:

12% Officier O'Day should be held responsible.
4% I don't know.
84% He is not responsible.
24% If you lived in that neighborhood, what would you think?
7. Description of Sample Tested and Results

My sample included 100 children, of ages 9-10. I interviewed two fourth grades and two fifth grades. Each of the two fourth grade classes was from different parts of Muncie—one class from an upper socio-economic area and the other class from a lower socio-economic area, and likewise for both fifth grade classes.

Comparing the fathers’ occupations of my sample to the spread of occupations in the United States, my sample is a representative one.

Let us examine some influences on the validity of my recorded responses: I conducted this research in the actual classroom of each class. The influences of this atmosphere on the freedom they felt to put what they really thought and would really do may have had some influence on the validity of their responses. Even though none of the children had known me previously, and their teachers were, in most cases, out of the picture completely during this time, the carry-over influence of our presence may have had a stifling effect upon their freedom to respond spontaneously.

In many cases the decisions involved too many consequences and were too sophisticated for some of the children to comprehend all the implications at once. The result was that they were more greatly influenced by the implication presented in the latter parts of each story.

Another influence on the reliability of the children's responses is the fact that there was a time lag between what
would actually be their practical or spontaneous response to the situation and their theoretical or thought-out response. In other words, they were asked to make two separate responses, and they had time to consider the relation between their responses to the structured response and their ordinarily spontaneous action or thought. If the child were actually confronted with a similar situation, his response would be only one---either based upon his moral training or in spite of it. His reflection and response would in actuality be simultaneous.
Percent Distribution of Employed Persons by Major Occupation Group according to 1960 Census and to April 1960 Current Population Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Occupation Group</th>
<th>Census Sample</th>
<th>My Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employed</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical, &amp; kindred wkrs.</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers &amp; farm managers</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, off'ls &amp; propr's, exc. farm</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; kindred workers</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen, foremen, &amp; kindred workers</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives &amp; kindred workers</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household workers</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers, exc. priv. household</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm laborers &amp; foremen</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers, exc. farm &amp; mine</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses of Total Group Sampled

1. Nurse Jane and the sick little boy:
   31% Nurse Jane should be held responsible.
   3% I don't know.
   66% She is not responsible.
   33% If you were the boy's mother would you tell the police that she killed your son?

2. The basketball coach and Greg:
   50% A good coach lets everybody play.
   9% I don't know.
   41% A good coach tries most of all to win the game.
   26% What would you do if you were the coach?

3. Janice, Mindy, and their bicycles:
   13% Janice should get even with Mindy.
   10% I don't know.
   77% Janice should forgive her and maybe Mindy will learn.
   29% What would you do if you were Janice?

4. Not enough medicine to cure all of the people?
   38% Everyone should be treated equally.
   10% I don't know.
   52% Some people are more valuable because of their work.
   13% What would you do?

* The percentage recorded beside the essay question in each story denotes the percentage of responses which contradicted the response checked above.
5. John fights back and Joe is blind:
   23% John should be excused.
   12% I don't know.
   65% John should be held completely responsible.
   30% If you were the school principal of the law officier, what would you do?

6. Officier O'Day and the man who ran away:
   15% Officier O'Day should be held responsible.
   8% I don't know.
   77% He is not responsible.
   23% If you lived in that neighborhood, what would you think?
Chapter 8

Generalizations from Research Data

In relating the responses of the total sample to children's concept of justice, we can only generalize about what the responses of such a limited cross-section appear to mean.

In comparing the distribution of responses to stories #1, #4, and #6 (all dealing with the actions of adults) to stories #3 and #5, it appears that children of this age tend to be "more lenient" in their ideas of just punishment for adults than they are with children considered their peers.

Piaget would say that this is because in children's relations with each other they naturally assume and demand moral judgment based on cooperation, while in their dealings with adults they justify constraint due to their adjustment to external pressures and the affection and unilateral respect children have for adults.

Hartshorne and May would justify my assumptions on the basis of their findings that moral behavior is purely a matter of situational forces and that a child's moral judgment is based on emotions fixed in the home.

From the distribution of responses to story #2, it appears that this situation (the basketball coach and Greg) may suggest a conflict between the adult's right of authority and the cooperative idea among children that all deserve an equal chance. This may be saying that it is all right for
adults not to behave in a purely cooperative manner in their dealings with children if "necessity" demands it. This assumption would also be deemed valid by Piaget and Hartshorne and May.
A. Meaning of Contradictions in General

For the purposes of this study, a contradiction will mean one of two things: a written response by the child which contradicts the structured response he checked, or a written response by the child suggesting some judgment of guilt or innocence when he checked "I don't know". The purpose of recording such contradictions was to attempt to show the differences between the child's moral judgment as learned in school, from parents, and/or church and the child's moral behavior as he anticipates such action.

We cannot assume without exception that a contradiction between structured response and written response was always a sign of discrepancy or conflict between judgment and behavior on the part of the child. In some cases the contradictory responses may have been due to a lack of understanding of the relation of the two questions. However; in the administration of the test, I purposely tried to direct the children's attention immediately from the structured to the personal response in an attempt to reduce the stifling influence of the former on the spontaneity of the latter. By doing this I hoped to minimize the effect of the time lag which is automatically existant between two related questions.

This time lag, perceived by the child or not, may be of important consequence in seeing whether the child, after reflecting upon his moral judgment, regards it as applicable to his behavior.
Another possible cause for the contradictions between the child's responses may be the very nature of the choice offered him. In life, things are not always all black or all white as is implied by the two extremes of the choices offered him.
B. Hypothesized Meaning of Contradictions

A comparison between the percent of contradictions shown by each socio-economic group both by responses to individual stories and by responses in total yields no consistent pattern or basis for hypotheses. By examining some of the kinds of contradictions for the whole group, we may get some further insight into children's ideas of justice and punishment:

1. Nurse Jane and the sick boy:

The contradiction most often made by both socio-economic groups was between the structured response---Nurse Jane should be held responsible---and their written comment---"No, I would not tell the police." If we can assume that this was their intended response, based upon conscious thought, it would seem to indicate that children favor, at least in this situation, a punishment based on reciprocity rather than expiation.

2. The basketball coach and Greg:

The contradictions between responses in this situation were attempts to temper the extreme nature of the choices. The children's personal responses included: Coach should have let Greg play earlier in the season; Try Greg for a minute then if they start to lose, put the other guy in.
3. Janice, Mindy, and their bicycles:

The responses to this situation were in most cases completely contradictory. The largest percent checked the "Golden Rule" concept and then wrote responses such as: Get even and then apologize; Not let Mindy ride her bicycle again; Not speak to Mindy; Forgive Mindy so she would let her ride her new bicycle; Wait awhile and then get even; or Wait awhile and then forgive her. This implies that many children find the "Golden Rule" idea either impossible or inadequate to apply.

4. Not enough medicine for all:

This situation was the one in which many children showed by their personal comments that they refused to accept only the two extreme alternatives. In many cases they wrote: get more or invent new medicine. To the equality of treatment idea, they added: give it to children or pregnant mothers first.

5. John fights back and Joe is blind:

Some of the children who thought John should be excused also wrote that he should get talked to or paddled. Many who answered that John was completely responsible wrote that both boys should be talked to; Joe should apologize; or Joe should be paddled.

6. Officier O'Day and the man who ran:

Accompanying the checked response that the Officier is responsible were written statements such as: It wasn't his fault because it was dark; Someone should have given him a
flaslight; or He felt sorry for both the policeman and the innocent man. Those who checked the opposite response wrote contradictions like: He should have been more careful; He should have run after him; Should aim not to kill; or The policeman should move away from that community so he won't feel guilty.
C. Responses of Socio-economic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Nurse Jane and the sick boy:</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurse is responsible.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is not responsible.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictions</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The basketball coach and Greg:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good coach lets everyone play.</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good coach tries to win.</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictions</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Janice, Mindy, and bicycle:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janice should get even.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice should forgive.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictions</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Not enough medicine for all:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treat everyone equally.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people are more valuable.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictions</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **John gets even—Joe is blind:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John should be excused.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John is completely responsible.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictions</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Officier O'Day & the man who ran:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officier is responsible.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is not responsible--his job.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictions</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Significance of Responses of Socio-economic Levels

If we separate our responses by socio-economic levels, some further tendencies appear, and some assumptions may be made. By looking at each separate group of responses, our generalizations may be even less valid, since our samples become even more limited and the division is made on the assumption that the socio-economic level of a child's family influences the development of his moral judgment—an assumption not investigated in my study of related literature. With this in mind, let's examine the distribution of responses for each division.

Two of the classes I tested were from schools located in an upper socio-economic residential area, while the other two classes were from schools in a lower socio-economic industrial, residential area.

Comparing the percentage distribution of responses of both socio-economic levels, we find:

In stories #1 and #6 where the decision concerned the degree of responsibility of adults who are supposed to be professionals, it appears that the lower socio-economic children are more demanding and punitive towards these professional people than the other children.

From the comparisons made in stories #2 and #4, it seems that the upper socio-economic group tend to look out for the other guy's welfare more often. The lower group tends to justify special treatment to those with superior abilities.
Comparing the group responses to stories #3 and #5, we might infer that the lower socio-economic demand a more cooperative behavior from their peers.

From the comparisons of responses to stories #2, #4, and #6, we might hypothesize that children of lower socio-economic families appear to be more concerned with achieving some ends rather than with the means by which they are achieved.
PART FOUR

Conclusion
Conclusion

When children are faced with so many interrelated choices, the task of examining all the alternatives and anticipating all the consequences seems unformidable. The easiest way for the child to dissolve the ensuing frustration is to ignore his own confusion; he becomes apathetic. The easiest and most immediate way for a teacher to ease the frustration of the child and that of his own, is to forego the task of teaching the child to value by questioning, evaluating, being aware of alternatives and transmit to the child preconceived values.

The ability to look the shackles of the traditional approach does not come guaranteed with a teacher's license nor is a teacher licensed to perpetuate existing values. Rather each teacher represents the hope of recovery from and the re-evaluation of our education for moral judgment.
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