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Problem

Although moral development research has focused extensively on Kohlberg's moral judgment theory and Gilligan's considerations of moral orientation, little has directly addressed the issue of integration of the voices of care and justice. This study proposed that, with maturation, a more integrated moral orientation would guide moral decision making. Integration and the impact of age, gender, ego maturity, and religious commitment were examined from a developmental perspective.
Method

A cross-sectional design was employed, with adults from two age cohorts (25-35 and 50-65). A semi-structured interview (Brown, Debold, Tappan, & Gilligan, 1991) was used to collect data. Each individual also completed a demographic information survey, the Sentence Completion Test for Ego Development (Loevinger, Wessler, & Redmore, 1970), and a Religious Commitment Survey (Anderson, 1995; Dudley, 1992). Data were qualitatively analyzed for moral orientation, religious motivation, definitions of morality, and contextual factors. Hypotheses were tested using Chi-square, the t-test for means of two independent groups, ANOVA, and Multiple Regression Analysis.

Results and Conclusions

In a sample of 82 individuals from a religious (Seventh-day Adventist) population, 28 showed an integrated moral orientation, while 23 were justice-oriented and 31 were care-oriented. The integrated subjects emphasized compassion and forgiveness in their dilemmas. Most participants related current or recent conflicts. Concerns in close relationships were more common than work-related dilemmas.

There were no gender or age differences between younger and older adults who showed integration. Among those non-integrated, males were significantly more justice-oriented and females more care-oriented ($p = .03$). Overall religious commitment differentiated the integrated moral orientation from a justice orientation ($p = .04$). Positive religious experience distinguished the integrated from the non-integrated ($p = .04$). Both the integrated and the care-oriented showed a higher level of devotional practices than did the justice-oriented ($p = .01$). No statistically significant relationship was observed between moral orientation and ego maturity. However, qualitative analysis revealed a steady increase in integration with
ego maturation. No linear combination of age, gender, religious commitment, and ego maturity predicted an integrated moral orientation.

The major contribution of this study highlighted the impact of personal religious commitment on moral maturity. Recommendations were made for further study.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Over recent decades, theories that explain moral development have been the preoccupation of many educators, psychologists, and clinicians. Technological developments advancing human biological research and medical interventions call for moral decisions that have no precedent, but tremendous import in their far-reaching ramifications. The very success of scientific technology has precipitated an urgency in considerations of a moral nature. "The power of human choice and action to impact not only one another, but our total social and ecological environment, has been increased a hundredfold through the application of scientific knowledge" (Weiss, 1979, p. 2). Moral choices and values now impact the lives of individuals with added impetus as emphasis is placed on this aspect in the current political arena. Moral issues reflect the concerns of a majority of voters in the 1994 elections, polled in a recent survey conducted on behalf of the Family Research Council (Dobson, 1995).

The state of the current research interest in the field of moral development underscores its complexity. One paradigm cannot possibly adequately address the myriad issues inherent in this facet of human development. Previous studies in the field support the need to acknowledge that moral development does not occur in isolation, but is a complex product of both environmental and human dynamics and their consequent interaction (Catoe, 1992).
Moral choices made by individuals affect their interactions with others, and also their own psychological well-being. Furthering the understanding of this aspect of human functioning may facilitate interventions for growth, and contribute toward a clearer understanding of individual differences, functioning, and needs. The complexity of the issues surrounding this topic makes it a fruitful area for continuing study.

Statement of the Problem

Much of the debate over moral development has emphasized the assignment of moral stages, rather than how individuals understand morality (Liddell, 1990). Two qualitatively distinct constructs have been defined—Carol Gilligan's interdependent "voice of care" (Gilligan, 1977, 1982; Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988a) and Lawrence Kohlberg's six-stage hierarchy emphasizing the notions of justice and fairness (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987; Kohlberg, 1976, 1981, 1984; Smith, 1978). Gilligan holds that the determinants of moral obligation reside in relationships and connectedness, while Kohlberg outlines a stage progression towards abstract ethical principles of justice. A fuller understanding of moral maturity might best encompass both these theoretical perspectives—an ability to sustain concerns in both justice and caring (Liddell, Halpin, & Halpin, 1992). A caring sense of justice considers a responsibility to others and self equally as important as an obligation to the principles of equality. This concept is rooted also in Scripture: "He has showed you, O man, what is good. What does the Lord require of you? To act justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God (Mic 6:8 NIV).

While past research has examined moral orientation, or mode of moral decision-making (Baumrind, 1986; Brabeck, 1983; Gilligan, 1982; Greeno & Maccoby, 1986; Lantsberger, 1993; Liddell, 1990; Lifton, 1985; Lyons, 1983; Muus, 1988; Pratt,
Golding, & Hunter; 1983; Pratt, Golding, Hunter, & Sampson, 1988; Purkel, 1990; Reimer, 1983; Walker, 1984, 1991, there has been little exploration of an integration of both justice and care orientations, particularly with older men and women.

The first systematic, empirical test of Gilligan's concept of two distinct considerations used by individuals in making moral decisions was reported by Lyons (1983). Her results suggest that developmental issues deserve further study. More recently, Lantsberger (1993, p. 48) suggests that "moral reasoning tends to become more multi-faceted with age, and that few differences exist between the way the genders characterize their own moral reasoning." Another recent study (Fechnay, 1993) also gives some indication that while males may predominantly align themselves with a justice orientation and females with a care orientation, there is an increasing expression, integration, and balanced proportion of orientations as the self or ego matures. This implies that with developing ego maturity, a more integrated use of both the care and justice orientations may result. This study proposes to investigate developmental aspects of this integration in two ways: by comparing the moral orientation of young adults with that demonstrated by middle-age adults, and by examining the relationship between ego development and the mode of moral decision making.

Continuing research is needed in the area of moral development using a qualitative, investigative approach (i.e., asking individuals open-ended questions about what they think is right or wrong and why, and then deriving the categories and central concepts inductively, in the mode of exploration rather than in the mode of hypothesis testing) (Rest, 1986). Furthermore, indications are that decisions made in hypothetical dilemmas do not necessarily translate into choices in real-life issues (Gilligan, Langdale, Lyons, & Murphy, 1982; Vasudev, 1988; Walker, 1991). Thus this
present study could also profitably address moral decisions and choices in real-life situations rather than the hypothetical situations posed by the assessment instruments (Kohlberg’s Moral Judgment Interview and Rest’s Defining Issues Test) that have been extensively used in the body of research in moral development.

The recent development of the "relational" method for reading and interpreting interview narratives provides a means of studying moral dilemmas within the context in which they occur (Brown, DeBold, Tappan, & Gilligan, 1991; Brown, Tappan, Gilligan, Miller, & Argyris, 1989). This method enables a study of moral reasoning and orientation within the living narrative through which it is experienced. Such issues need to be addressed if advances in the understanding and application of moral development are to continue.

The content of the individual’s values or religious belief system has been demonstrated to impact on moral choices (Richards, 1988). An interesting acknowledgment by Kohlberg (as quoted in McLean, Elrod, Schindler, & Mann, 1992) indicates somewhat of a modification of his earlier emphasis on structure, or process, versus content in the matter of moral development. Kohlberg states:

Some years of active involvement with the practice of moral education have led me to realize . . . that the psychologist’s abstract concept ‘moral stage’ is not a sufficient basis for moral education. . . . The educator must be a socializer, teaching value content and behavior, not merely a Socratic facilitator of development. In becoming a socializer and advocate, the teacher moves into ‘indoctrination’, a step that I originally believed to be invalid both philosophically and psychologically.

I no longer hold these negative views of indoctrinative moral education, and I now believe that the concepts guiding moral education must be partly ‘indoctrinative’. . . . Education for moral action, as distinct from reasoning, always presupposes a concern about moral content for its own sake. (p. 23)

Thus, drawing subjects from a conservative religious background and the inclusion of a measure of religious commitment may further enrich an exploratory study.
This proposed developmental study exploring the relationships between the mode of moral choice, ego development, and content or religious commitment could be of interest to educators and psychologists alike. From such an exploration, a new approach to defining moral maturity could emerge, thus broadening the theoretical perspective.

**Purpose of This Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between moral orientation, ego maturity, and religious commitment from a developmental perspective.

**Research Questions**

This study attempts to address the following research questions:

1. How do individuals describe morality?
2. Are there differences in religious motivation between the moral orientation groups?
3. Do contextual factors appear to influence the choice of dilemma shared by the individual?
4. Is level of religious commitment related to integration of moral orientation?
5. Is an integrated moral orientation related to level of ego maturity?
6. Is an integration of moral orientation present in both young adults and middle-aged adults?
7. Is an integration of moral orientation gender related?
8. Does any combination of age, gender, religious commitment, and ego maturity predict integration of moral orientation?
The theoretical underpinnings for this study are found in the contributions of Piaget, Kohlberg, Gilligan, and other researchers following them who have attempted to further and elaborate on their work. The theory tested in this study holds that with ego maturity a more integrated moral orientation will guide moral decision making, and that individuals, regardless of their gender, will use aspects of both justice and care in their moral choices, and further, that this integration may become more evident in older adults.

The theories of Kohlberg and Gilligan both follow the developmental tradition initiated by Piaget (1932). Along with Piaget, they hold that the individual passes through successive stages of moral development, with each stage characterized by a particular means of organizing the social and moral order. Piaget considered both a "morality of right" and a "morality of good" as he described the characteristics of stages of moral development, but discontinued his empirical search for the morality of good (Ford & Lowery, 1986) because of methodological difficulties in defining the affective aspects of reciprocity and cooperation. Kohlberg appears to have followed Piaget's avenue of thought, and subsumed the "ethic of care" in his universal principle of justice.

Kohlberg's (1976, 1981, 1984) theory of moral development is generally considered to have been the dominant approach to the understanding of moral reasoning over the better part of the past several decades. His theory of impartial justice, rights, and obligations arose from his doctoral research and observations drawn from an all-male sample. A central organizing concept of Kohlberg's theory of moral development is the principle of justice, fairness, and equality. He advocated that moral development occurs in a series of fixed, qualitatively distinct stages, with
each stage building upon, reorganizing, and encompassing the preceding ones. This developmental process provided new perspectives and criteria for making moral evaluations (Hoffman, 1980).

Kohlberg's three levels of moral development (premoral, morality of conventional rule-conformity, and morality of self-accepted principles) postulate a forward movement through six stages, and stress two processes—cognitive disequilibrium and role-taking (Kohlberg & Wasserman, 1980). The three-level, six-stage model developed by Kohlberg evolved from observations he made concerning the process individuals employed in working towards resolving hypothetical moral dilemmas.

The ability to take another person's perspective has a special significance in the transition from premoral to conventional morality. Resolving the cognitive conflict engendered by differing perspectives leads to modification of existing moral structures. The thinking and reasoning process underlying choices made on moral dilemmas is of major import to Kohlberg. These stages are constructed by individuals as they try to make sense out of their own experiences, rather than inculcated through socialization.

Gilligan (1977, 1982) expressed the belief that an "ethic of care" is a coherent set of moral concerns that is distinctly different from Kohlberg's "ethic of justice." Her postulates have caused researchers to reconsider how moral reasoning is studied and to reevaluate how results of such studies are interpreted. Gilligan's work has spawned a controversy regarding the presence of gender differences in moral orientation, a controversy that has been a major focus in the field of moral development research. Gilligan's theory (1977), based on her original study with women facing a decision about abortion, also yields stages of moral development.
The central issue in her theory of moral decision making revolves around the process of reconciling the needs of self with the needs of another.

At the first level Gilligan purports that individuals are primarily concerned with their own needs and survival. With a developing sense of responsibility to others, individuals move into the second level of moral development, where moral judgment relies on shared norms and expectations. Moving out of this level, individuals begin to consider the possibility of self-sacrifice in order to address the needs of others. Care at this level is regarded as a "universal obligation" (Gilligan, 1977, p. 504).

Gilligan's theory thus proposes that two separate "voices" are present in the moral reasoning process, with the feminine voice emphasizing an ethic of interpersonal concern and connectedness in contrast to the justice, rights, and obligations accentuated in the moral reasoning of males. Thus moral orientation conceivably encompasses a conceptually distinctive framework or perspective for organizing and understanding the moral domain. Gilligan suggests that males typically demonstrate a justice/rights orientation because of their separate conception of self, detached objectivity, a tendency to base identity on occupation, and their inclination towards abstract and impartial principles. Gilligan maintains that males view morality as involving issues of conflicting rights. On the other hand, she asserts that females typically evidence a care/response orientation based on a perception of self as connected to and interdependent with others. The female identity tends to be based on intimate relationships, a concern for the care and well-being of self and others, and a sensitivity to the needs of others. Morality from the female viewpoint is more an issue of conflicting responsibilities. While not gender-specific, she suggests that these orientations are at least gender related, originating in part from the
socialization experience of the individual (Walker, 1984, 1991). Gilligan holds that an adequate theory of moral development should address the complex interaction between the concerns of impartiality and the concerns of relationship and care.

A detailed comparison of central points of the two orientations central to Kohlberg's and Gilligan's theories was developed by Brabeck (1983), and is outlined in Table 1. While both models are hierarchically ordered, Kohlberg's stages are considered universal and invariantly sequential.

The gender bias suggested by Gilligan appeared to be supported by some researchers who have demonstrated that women do not advance as far as men on Kohlberg's Moral Maturity Scale (Bussey & Maughan, 1982; Holstein, 1976). Stage 3 has appeared as the modal stage for women, with Stage 4 the modal stage for men. This has implied that men are more morally advanced than women in their moral choices. Other researchers (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987; Hoffman, 1975; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Rest, 1979, 1983; Walker, 1984, 1991) suggest that no gender-bias is present in research incorporating Kohlberg's scale. Both Rest (1979) and Walker (1984) conducted comprehensive reviews of the research literature and concurred in their findings of no gender differences. However, more recent research, incorporating a methodology motivated by Gilligan's work, supports the existence of two different "ethics" or "voices" informing the moral reasoning process (Bussey & Maughan, 1982; Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988a; Lyons, 1983; Yacker & Weinberg, 1990). Gilligan describes "two orientations as independent dimensions which should, in theory, increasingly intertwine as the self matures" (Fechnay, 1993, p. 16).

Accumulating evidence demonstrates the importance of including the ethic of care in any comprehensive theory of moral development. Apparently a justice-based orientation may not be fully representative of women's or men's moral reasoning.
### Table 1

**Ethic of Justice and Ethic of Care Compared**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Kohlberg’s theory</th>
<th>Gilligan’s theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral imperative</td>
<td>Justice, respect, rules</td>
<td>Care, compassion, self-sacrifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions to conflicts</td>
<td>Found by way of universal principles</td>
<td>Found in nature of one’s relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of dilemmas</td>
<td>Rights in conflicts</td>
<td>Threats to relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of self</td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>Connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Rational orientation using formal/deductive reasoning to produce principles</td>
<td>Phenomenological orientation using inductive thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic in action</td>
<td>&quot;Voice of Justice&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Voice of Care&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral agent</td>
<td>Able to make decisions as a separate individual outside the context of relationships</td>
<td>Connected or attached to particular other and motivated by feelings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Redirecting research focus to a scientific exploration of both the care and justice "voices" or orientations as integral considerations of both male and female moral reasoning may broaden the understanding of this important aspect of individual development and functioning.

**Importance of the Study**

The focus of much moral development research has been directed towards moral stages, and not on the identification of moral orientation or how individuals conceptualize morality (Liddell, 1990). It is conceivable that if a preference toward one orientation or the other is identified, along with the factors that impact on this orientation, the means may evolve to encourage such individuals to develop their alternative voice, and become less polarized and more integrated in their moral reasoning. Furthermore, demonstrating that factors other than gender offer some explanation of the differences observed among care-oriented and justice-oriented individuals may broaden perspectives and temper the ongoing gender-difference debate that haunts moral development.

Most of the definitive studies in moral development have focused on adolescent or college-age subjects. Few studies have been of a longitudinal or cross-sectional design, drawing on subjects of mature age. Those that have (Lyons, 1983; Pratt et al., 1988) suggest that moral orientation becomes an even more complex issue, with significant differences emerging between different age cohorts. Further research with a sample that compares two age cohorts could conceivably extend the work of researchers (e.g., Lyons), and make a contribution to the field.

The belief that "the formation of character is the work of a lifetime" (White, 1954, p. 162) intimates that life experience, ego development, and content or religious commitment are fibers in the rich tapestry of moral orientation and decision making.
Research that bears in mind the larger developmental context when studying moral orientation and decision making may provide further valuable information in this important domain (De Witt, 1987).

An exploration of the factors impacting on the orientation employed in making moral choices may offer worthwhile information for parents, teachers, and school and church administrators as to ways and means of facilitating growth and integration in this important area of human functioning.

**Definition of Terms**

Terms commonly used throughout this investigation are defined as follows:

**Development:** A progressive change taking place over time; "gradual growth, becoming more mature, advanced or organized" (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 1982, p. 245). Development is thus a process that includes growth, maturation and learning, proceeding in stages, which accounts for behavioral change.

**Ego maturation:** A process characterized by progression through an invariant sequence of stages as the individual internalizes rules of social intercourse, experiences a growth of cognitive complexity, achieves impulse control increasingly based on self-chosen, long-term motives, and an increased respect for individual autonomy and mutuality in interpersonal relations. The ego structure changes as individuals gradually become more differentiated and integrated in their behavior over time, with their inner life becoming more richer and complicated (Helson & Roberts, 1994, p. 911).

**Ethics:** The "science of morals, or moral principles, by which one is guided" (New English Dictionary, p. 312); "the study and philosophy of human conduct, with an emphasis on the determination of right and wrong, or the basic principles of right
action" (Britannica World Language Dictionary, p. 436); the "science of holiness" (White, 1948, p. 276).

**Ethic of care:** A moral orientation characterized by subjectiveness, responsiveness to others, and a concern for doing the least harm to the people involved.

**Ethic of justice:** A moral orientation characterized by objectivity, a concern for rules, principles, and the sanctity of the individual.

**Integration:** A capacity to synthesize apparently conflicting ideas or views into a more coherent whole, rather than feeling compelled to choose between them.

**Middle-age adults:** Individuals between the ages of 50 and 65 years, and at a stage of life where they are more likely to be involved in psychological tasks of generativity and integration (Bee, 1992; Erikson, 1980; Erikson, Erikson, & Kivnick, 1986; Stevens-Long & Commons, 1992).

**Moral:** That which pertains to the distinction made between right and wrong, or good and evil, in relation to actions or character, and thus concerns acting on principles of right and wrong; that which is moral is 'virtuous' and based on principles of right and wrong rather than on law and custom (World Book Dictionary, 1981).

**Moral orientation:** "A conceptually distinctive framework or perspective for organizing or understanding the moral domain" (Walker, 1991, p. 334), or the natural tendency to resolve moral dilemmas by either an ethic of care and/or an ethic of justice; sometimes also referred to as moral "voice," or mode of moral decision making.

**Moral reasoning:** The cognitive processes that one uses "to reflect on moral values and order them in a logical hierarchy" (Hersh, Paolitto, & Reimer, 1979, p. 47).
Morality: A personal set of guidelines with which the individual monitors the legitimacy and appropriateness of thoughts and behaviors within a social context (Lifton, 1985, p. 309), synonymous with values, standards, beliefs, and principles that facilitate effective interaction with other persons; "a broad integrative framework for dealing with a wide range of . . . concerns" (Lickona, 1976, Preface x).

Religious commitment: The importance individuals ascribe to their religious faith, as evidenced by factors such as positive subjective religious experience, intrinsic motivation, and demonstrated by church related behaviors and devotional practices.

Young adults: Individuals between 25 and 35 years of age, who are establishing themselves in careers, committed relationships, and creating their first major life structures (Bee, 1992; Erikson, 1980; Erikson et al., 1986; Levinson, 1986; Stevens-Long & Commons, 1992).

Delimitations

This study is of an exploratory nature, which may later lead to more controlled studies with wider sampling techniques. The sample on which this study is based is from a localized geographical area, and this requires that any generalizations be tempered with caution. The participants in the study were also selected from one religious group, for the purpose of controlling the effect that conservative religious affiliation and values may exert on an individual's moral orientation. Thus the results obtained from this study are realistically only generalizable to others of a similar belief system.
Organization of the Study

This study is composed of five chapters.

Chapter 1 has presented an introductory overview of the study: the background and statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, theoretical framework, and noted the importance of the study. It has included, as well, definitions of key terms and specified delimitations.

Chapter 2 provides a review of conceptual literature as well as current research in the field of moral development and moral orientation as these pertain to the emphasis of this study.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology and the type of research, including the population and sample selection, variables of interest, research techniques, instruments, and procedures in analyzing the data.

Chapter 4 presents the findings, analysis of the data gathered, and the interpretation of the results. Demographic data are discussed where relevant to the major findings.

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, discusses the results, and suggests implications for ongoing research in the area.

Finally, the appendices include samples of the materials used in the data collection process.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Literature in the field of moral development is extensive and covers many aspects of this complex topic. For this reason, it was necessary to narrow this review to highlight some of those publications and studies that have direct bearing on the focus of this study.

Using computer search facilities, the relevant research on moral orientation, moral development, and related issues was located. Programs utilized in the search were Dissertation Abstracts International, back to 1982; PsycLIT of the American Psychiatric Association, back to 1974; ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) back to 1982; and PSYCB BOOKS. Several unpublished dissertations are cited, evidencing ongoing and current research interest in, and the relevance of, this area of human development and functioning.

Moral Development

Central to Kohlberg’s theory is the principle of justice and the framework of structuralism, which assumes movement through a sequence of invariant stages. While claiming that the order of development through the stages is invariant, Kohlberg also predicted variability in rate and eventual end-point of development (Kohlberg, 1976). Each of the invariant, hierarchical stages offers progressively better cognitive structures than the one before it. Each is able to resolve moral dilemmas unresolved by the previous level and each moves toward a more principled form of
dealing with moral issues. Kohlberg holds that the core of each stage is an underlying conception of justice.

Kohlberg's schema is comprised of two stages in each of three levels (see Table 2). Stage 1 individuals consider obedience to authority in order to avoid punishment. The physical consequences of an action determine whether it is right or wrong. Stage 2 individuals obey rules when it is in their best interests to do so. Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. The emphasis in these two stages of Preconventional Level I is on avoiding punishments and receiving rewards.

In the next two stages, at the Conventional Level II, the emphasis falls on conforming to social rules. Good behavior (in Stage 3) is what is pleasing to others and approved of by them. In Stage 4, moral behavior consists of doing one's duty, obeying the rules of those in authority in order to maintain the social order for its own sake. In the last two stages, at Post-conventional Level III, the ability to formulate and accept general moral principles that undergird social rules is emphasized. Stage 5 is characterized by social contracts, where respect for the rights of others is of primary importance, motivated by an "emphasis on equality and mutual obligation within a democratic order" (Rich & DeVitis, 1985, p. 88). Right action tends to be defined in terms of individual rights and standards that have been critically examined and agreed upon by society.

Kohlberg considered Stage 6 the highest level of moral reasoning since it is based on universal moral principles of reciprocity, equality, and respect for the dignity and individuality of the person. Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles appealing to logical comprehensiveness and consistency (Richards, 1988). Interestingly, although Stage 6 was retained by
Table 2
Kohlberg's Six Stages of Moral Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL I</th>
<th>PRECONVENTIONAL</th>
<th>Judgments based on consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on avoiding punishment and getting rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Punishment/obedience</td>
<td>&quot;do what you're told&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Instrumental/realistic</td>
<td>&quot;scratch my back, I'll scratch yours&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL II</th>
<th>CONVENTIONAL</th>
<th>Judgments based on authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on social rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Good boy/nice girl</td>
<td>&quot;be nice and kind&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;let's have an understanding&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(approval important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Law and order</td>
<td>&quot;do your duty&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;respect authority&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(dutiful citizen)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL III</th>
<th>POSTCONVENTIONAL</th>
<th>Judgments based on principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on moral principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Social contract</td>
<td>&quot;adhere to legal rights commonly agreed upon&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>laws subject to change and alteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>Universal ethical principles</td>
<td>&quot;be rational and impartial&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;be fair&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>life is sacred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>do unto others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kohlberg as a theoretical construct, it has been dropped from his scoring system because longitudinal data do not clearly demonstrate a consistent use of Stage 6 reasoning by subjects (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987).

In Kohlberg's schema, the context of relationships or consideration for the welfare of others is not considered to be sufficient for principled reasoning. In Kohlberg's hierarchy, females tend to remain at Stage 3, where relationships shape one's moral judgments. Traditional female qualities such as a sense of responsibility to and for others are qualities that define Stage 3, a stage just above the egocentrism of the pre-conventional level. Thus women appear to be relegated to a somewhat awkward position—while women have often been described as the 'keepers of the religious heritage' or moral tradition, psychological theories and constructs appear to indicate female inferiority in this realm (Bussey & Maughan, 1982; Reimer, 1983). Gilligan (1982, p. 18) calls this an "unfair paradox," for the very traits that have traditionally defined the "goodness" of women are those that mark them deficient in moral development.

Gilligan (1977, 1982) challenged the notion that women appear to remain at a lower stage of moral reasoning than men, purporting that women reason from the vantage point of compassion, rather than of law and order. She also noted that Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview (MJI) was standardized on an entirely male population, possibly skewing his conclusions. Gilligan's alternate model (see Table 3) recognizes what she first designated as a female perspective in moral reasoning.

Moral Orientation

Gilligan's model of moral development thus directly challenged the universality of Kohlberg's theory. She submitted that there appear to be two modes of moral reasoning—one with an orientation based on rights, rules, and justice; and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>Orientation of individual survival</th>
<th>Practical and personal self-interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition 1</td>
<td>From selfishness to responsibility</td>
<td>Recognizes relatedness, responsibility to others, thinks of others' welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL II</td>
<td>Goodness as self-sacrifice</td>
<td>Subordination of own needs to those of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition II</td>
<td>From goodness to truth</td>
<td>Consequences and intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL III</td>
<td>The morality of non-violence</td>
<td>Moral reasoning governed by desire to avoid hurting anyone else; caring for self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the other more concerned with relationships, care, and connectedness. An ethic of justice proceeds from the premise of equality—that everyone should be treated the same. An ethic of care rests on the premise of nonviolence—that no one should be hurt. A justice perspective draws attention to problems of inequality and oppression, and holds up an ideal of reciprocal rights and equal respect for individuals. A care perspective draws attention to problems of detachment or abandonment, and holds up an ideal of attention and response to need.

These two moral visions recur in human experience because everyone is vulnerable to both oppression and to abandonment. The tension between these perspectives is suggested by the fact that detachment, a mark of mature moral judgment in the justice perspective, becomes the moral problem (i.e., failure to attend to need) in the care perspective. Conversely, attention to the particular needs and circumstances of individuals, the mark of mature moral judgment in the care perspective, becomes the moral problem (i.e., failure to treat others fairly, as equals) in the justice perspective. In the movement towards maturity, both perspectives move towards a meeting ground. Just as inequality adversely affects both parties in an unequal relationship, just so violence is destructive for everyone involved.

Gilligan and Attanucci (1988a) stated that "Care Focus and Justice Focus reasoning suggest a tendency to lose sight of one perspective in arriving at moral decisions . . . [and is a] liability shared by both sexes" (p. 233). Concerns about both justice and care are represented in people's thinking about real-life moral dilemmas, but the tendency is to focus on one set of concerns and minimally represent the other. Thus,

the promise of approaching moral development in terms of moral orientation lies in its potential to transform debates over sex differences in moral reasoning into serious questions about moral perspectives. . . . If moral maturity consists in the ability to sustain concerns about justice and care and if the focus phenomenon
indicates a tendency to lose sight of one set of concerns, then the encounter with orientation differences can tend to offset errors in moral perception. Like the moment when the ambiguous figure shifts from a vase to two faces, the recognition that there is another way to look at a problem may expand moral understanding. (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988a, p. 235)

Gilligan thus addresses "the Gordian knot that vexes researchers in the moral development domain" (Fechnay, 1993, p. 16).

**Moral Maturity and Integration**

Gilligan (1982) maintained that "for both sexes the existence of two contexts for moral decisions . . . leads to a new understanding of responsibility and choice" (p. 166). She further indicates that "starting from very different points . . . men and women . . . come, in the course of becoming adult, to a greater understanding of both points of view, and thus to a greater convergence" (p. 167). This suggests a developmental progression towards maturity and integration. The ideal of an integration of these two perspectives is further attested to by Gilligan (1982):

The moral domain is . . . enlarged by the inclusion of responsibility and care. And the underlying epistemology correspondingly shifts from the Greek ideal of knowledge as a correspondence between mind and form to the Biblical conception of knowing as a process of human relationship.

The language of responsibilities [care] provides a weblike imagery of relationships to replace a hierarchical ordering that dissolves with the coming of equality, so the language of rights [justice] underlines the importance of including in the network of care not only the other but also the self. (p. 173)

"This dialogue between fairness and care . . . gives rise to a more comprehensive portrayal of adult [life]" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 174).

In a response to their critics, Kohlberg, Levine, and Hewer (1983) expressed some concurrence with the argument that the orientation of care and response usefully enlarges the moral domain. They conceded that a justice orientation does not fully reflect all that is recognized as part of the moral domain. They cautioned, however, that a clearer picture needs to depict the interdependence of care with
justice, rather than express these two concepts as bipolar or dichotomous. This further supports the notion of a link between moral maturity and an integration of care and justice thinking. The consensus today is that gender is not a significant variable in the debate, but that an integration of the aspects of care and justice is desirable in mature moral development (Clouse, 1985b).

Commenting on the ongoing discussion over moral orientation, Muus (1988) maintained that “only by integrating these complementary (male/justice and female/care) orientations will we be able to realize our full human potential in moral development” (p. 229). Keefer (1995) argued that Gilligan’s contribution to moral theory is not simply that women be included, but that moral theory itself must include the strategy of reasoning that she found to characterize women’s responses to moral conflicts. Muus concluded that “Gilligan’s ultimate contribution may lie . . . in her broadening of our assumptions and her refining of our understanding that the really moral person must integrate the concept of abstract justice and the concern for particular others” (p. 242).

**Research Studies Investigating Moral Orientation**

The debate stimulated by the moral orientation issue has generated research that has moved in the direction of

1. investigating the two considerations—the "voices" of justice and of care
2. addressing/identifying gender differences in moral orientation
3. examining the presence, predominance, and alignment with either or both of these two considerations in moral decision making
4. considering the "pull" of hypothetical vs. real-life dilemmas, or contextual issues as well as the cognitive-structural aspects of moral choice
5. observing that moral maturity may at best be an integration of these two orientations.

Several studies addressing these issues are briefly outlined in this section.

In a study to investigate Gilligan's assertions that there are two distinct modes of describing the self in relation to others (separate or connected) as well as two kinds of considerations used by individuals in making moral decisions (justice and care), Lyons (1983) offered confirming interview data from both female and male children, adolescents and adults. Her sample of 36 persons included two males and two females at each of the following ages: 8, 11, 14, 19, 22, 27, 36, 45, and 60. She found that although females and males used a predominant moral orientation, they raised considerations representing both justice and care thinking. Lyons' data confirmed that "in real-life moral conflicts . . . care and justice considerations . . . [are] related to but not defined by or confined to an individual by virtue of gender" (p. 139). Her study also suggested possible developmental issues. She found that "after age 27, women show increased consideration of rights in their conceptualization of moral problems or conflict, although they still use considerations of response more frequently than rights." She indicates that this may suggest the possibility of an interaction (integration) between rights (justice) and response (care) orientations for women in their late 20s. While she notes a "greater persistence of considerations of response [care] among male adolescents," she observed a greater consistency across the life cycle of men's considerations of rights (p. 139). Lyons concludes that her data support the two different orientations to morality—that "morality is not unitarily justice and rights" and that while usually using one mode predominantly, individuals use both kinds of considerations in the resolution and evaluation of real-life moral dilemmas (p. 140).
In a validation study of the two moral orientations, Rogers (1988) demonstrated that it is possible to measure justice and care moral orientations, using selected items from Loevinger's Sentence Completion Test for Ego Development, in a reliable and valid way. Her study confirmed Gilligan's gender difference hypothesis, but she holds that "the two moral orientations do not represent two separate paths of development, one for females and the other for males. These two orientations, however, are coherent, distinct dimensions of moral development" (p. 93).

Rogers proposed that care thinking will increase as ego level increases in females, and justice thinking will increase as ego level increases for males. She also states that "the ability to align with both moral orientations in the resolution of a moral conflict should be related to ego development—the use of both moral perspectives is an indicator of moral maturity" (p. 40).

Gilligan's claims of the inadequacy of Kohlberg's model were also examined by Ford and Lowery (1986). They used a sample of 202 college students, who rated their own use of both justice and care orientations in resolving self-reported dilemmas. Ford and Lowery state that their findings "suggest some gender differences in the use of justice and care orientations but also raise questions about the strength and nature of these differences" (p. 782). They indicate too that the differing content/context pull of the dilemmas presented by men and women may be difficult to fully disentangle, further contributing to the complexities of research in this area.

In a sample of 31 attorneys (16 women and 15 men), Frankel (1993) found a significant gender difference in the use of care and justice moral orientations. Women used the care orientation more than men, and men the justice orientation more than women. Her data were collected using both the Heinz hypothetical dilemma and a real-life, work-related moral dilemma. Apart from the gender differences, she found
differences in the use of the care and justice orientations between the hypothetical dilemma and the real-life dilemma. The hypothetical dilemma drew a significantly greater use of the care orientation, while the real-life, work-related dilemma evoked a significantly greater use of the justice orientation.

Lollis (1995) asked 18 sets of parents five questions about how they intervene in their pre-school children's disputes. She found that these parents used a combination of justice and care orientations, and that both mothers and fathers expressed more of a justice orientation than care orientation. The parents did not appear to have any influence on each other's moral orientation. She did find, however, that mothers used significantly more care responses than fathers, which lends some support to the relationship between gender and moral orientation.

An examination of the moral development theories of Kohlberg and Gilligan, and the faith development theory of Fowler, was undertaken by Cowden (1992) in order to determine implications for a better understanding of faith development in women. She used an inductive approach in her study of the faith development of 10 American Baptist clergywomen ranging in age from 30-45. An analysis of content, based on adaptations of Gilligan's and Fowler's approaches, sought to determine if there was indeed an underlying ethic of care in women's faith development, and if so, what impact the differing views of morality might have on that development. Cowden's results showed that five women evidenced a predominant moral orientation of care; four, an orientation of justice; and one, an integration of the two, described as a care/justice moral orientation. The women's responses on their current attitudes and beliefs suggested that their different moral orientations resulted in very different faith language. Cowden demonstrated that accommodation of insights from
Gilligan’s theory, as an expansion of Kohlberg’s theory, would contribute to a fuller understanding of the dynamic process of faith development in women.

In a content analysis of statements written by women and men, Purkel (1990) conducted a test of Gilligan’s model of gender-related differences in values and moral reasoning. He also proposed that Gilligan’s model describing two value systems (an autonomy-based justice orientation/male associated and an affiliative ethic of care/female-associated) eventually entails an integration of the two perspectives. With a sample comprised of 147 college sophomores, he matched males and females according to level of ego development, so that any divergence in the nature of their responses could not be attributed to maturational differences. Predictions regarding male-female differences in total autonomy-related content and affiliation-related content were not borne out by the results. Purkel states that males and females generally may be familiar with both value orientations, and tend to operate in similar ways in the absence of conflict or threat to the self. When conflict emerges in a social context, a divergence in gender-related perspectives may become more salient (Purkel, 1990).

Gilligan’s work, in pointing to a need to reassess how existing moral development theory accounts for the impact of relationships on the process of moral reasoning, also calls for a more contextual mode of interpretation of moral conflicts, recognizing the various relationships or contexts in which dilemmas occur (Lantsberger, 1993). Much of past moral development research has focused on personal variables, such as stage or level of moral reasoning as the primary determinant of moral behavior, neglecting the impact of situational or contextual cues on the moral reasoning process. Kurtines (1986) maintains that “moral decisions are influenced by both individual differences in the use of moral rules and principles and
by complex contextual cues associated with the type of moral decision-making situations" (p. 784).

Using Kohlberg's and Gilligan's theories as a conceptual framework, Wilson (1991) explored the effects among age, gender, level of education, and moral reasoning. Four hundred registered nurses were the subjects of her study, in which she used the Defining Issues Test (DIT), Care/Response Orientation Scale (CROS), and the Demographic Information Profile (DIP) as measures of the research variables. Analysis of the data revealed that female nurses were more likely to use a care perspective in moral reasoning than male nurses. Wilson concluded that efforts could well be directed to enhancing a sense of care, nurturing, and attachment in male nurses, recognizing that the orientations of justice and care do not negate each other.

A similar conclusion was reached by Liddell (1990). She developed an objective instrument to measure an individual's moral orientation (the Measure of Moral Orientation) consisting of 12 self-description items, and 10 dilemmas relevant to college students, followed by items to which subjects were asked to respond. Psychometric properties for her instrument were established and found comparable to other assessments of moral development. She used this instrument to examine the relationships between moral orientation, descriptions of self as either just or caring, judgment type (thinking or feeling), and gender. Analyses of covariance revealed that college students showed no significant differences between women's and men's scores on the ethic of justice when their thinking/feeling scores for items from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator were controlled for. However, even after controlling for thinking/feeling scores, women continued to score significantly higher than men on the ethic of care scale. Thus while decision-making modes (thinking/feeling) appear to offer some explanation for the ethic of justice, they did not explain differences...
obtained for the ethic of care. Liddell suggested that women may have more varied social roles than men, providing them with an opportunity to be influenced by activities that also pull for a justice voice. Men may need more opportunities to develop their "care voice." The tendency "to silence one moral voice or to lose sight of one set of moral concerns may, however, be a liability that both sexes share" (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988b, p. 455).

Castor-Scheufler's (1994) study examined the predictive capacity of gender identity and empathy on moral development level and moral orientation. She hypothesized that higher levels of femininity and affective empathy would predict lower levels of moral development and higher levels of care orientation, in line with Gilligan's arguments. Her findings failed to support Gilligan's position, but she observes that her results may be confounded by inadequate measures of moral orientation. She stresses the need for more adequate instrumentation to further research in this important arena.

In a study examining differences in self-identity and moral reasoning between male and female undergraduate residence hall students at a large midwestern university, Stiller and Forrest (1990) also found more diversity among women in their study, as compared to men, in their use of modes of self-description and modes of moral reasoning. Men demonstrated a stronger preference for the separate/objective definition of self, and the justice/rights mode of moral reasoning in dilemmas. In the light of their research, Stiller and Forrest state that "men may perceive the separate/objective and justice/rights as the only choice, whereas women may recognize that they can choose either approach to self-identity and moral reasoning" (p. 61).
Pratt et al.'s (1988) two studies support Gilligan's general point that Kohlberg's system of universal stages in moral reasoning "fails to capture fully important individual differences in moral reasoning, which are at least somewhat linked to gender" (p. 388). In their first study, these researchers interviewed 12 men and 12 women at each of three age levels, chosen to represent different phases of the adult life cycle. Participants were interviewed about both hypothetical and personal moral dilemmas. Although the researchers found that women were more likely than men overall to show Gilligan's care orientation, particularly in dilemmas of a social/personal nature, they state that these sex differences are not as pervasive as Gilligan argues. Subject age, subject stage level on Kohlberg's measure of moral reasoning, and the type of real-life dilemma content recalled by subjects for discussion influenced the sex differences in their sample. In a second study, in which they asked each of 40 adults in their sample to recall and discuss two real-life dilemmas, Pratt et al. (1988) report indications that most individuals use both orientations to a significant degree. The kind of dilemma presented appears to have a marked influence on orientation. Care responses are usually drawn from a situation reflecting obligations to family, friends, and group members. The standard Kohlbergian hypothetical moral dilemmas are framed to probe in terms of justice, while most self-reported dilemmas concern special relationships to family and friends, and generally are framed in care orientations.

Walker (1991) reported the intriguing finding . . . that individuals at a higher level of moral development tended to be split in their orientations—to evidence substantial amounts of both response [care] and rights [justice] reasoning. This suggests that . . . mature moral thinking does entail a coordination or integration of these two orientations. (p. 356)
Religious Commitment

Subjects from a conservative religious background and those committed to their religious beliefs seem to score predominantly on Stages 3 or 4 on Kohlberg's hierarchical stage sequence of moral development. They thus appear to possibly have the same "deficiencies" (according to Kohlbergian stage theory) that have been accorded women. Research studies that have attempted to examine this anomaly are reviewed briefly.

Kohlberg's writings indicate that he believed that moral reasoning development is independent of religious commitment or affiliation (Kohlberg, 1976, 1981). Based on his research with subjects of various ages, cultures, and religions, he stated that no differences in moral development due to religious belief had been found. Following a review of nine studies raising doubts about Kohlberg's claim, Getz (1984) concluded that conservative religious ideology may have negative effects on the moral reasoning development of the individual. A negative relationship is often found between conservative, somewhat inflexible beliefs and principled moral reasoning. She speculates that an emphasis on commitment to a religious ideology "may stifle . . . development or use of higher levels of moral judgment," according to Kohlberg's scale (p. 108).

Aspects related to religiosity and moral development were investigated by Ernsberger and Manaster (1981). They found that "both the degree of intrinsic religious orientation and the moral stages normative for one's religious community are predictive of moral development" (p. 39), and questioned Kohlberg's assertions of irrelevance of religious factors. Blizard (1982) tested adults in nine Protestant denominations, and concluded that members of churches that teach a personal God, an external source of authority, and an evangelical social perspective scored lower
than members of churches that teach an abstract God, an internal source of authority, and a humanitarian social perspective. Both studies demonstrated that adults who were conservative in religious beliefs were less apt to score at higher Kohlbergian stages. However, McNeel (1994) reports "a moderate cross-sectional effect in Bible colleges that may suggest that growth in moral judgment is not incompatible with [the] religiously conservative" (p. 33). He advocates further studies in both university and Bible college settings.

In order to ascertain differences in stage of moral reasoning between those who accept the Christian faith and those who do not, Clouse (1985b) administered a Politics-Religion Attitude Scale and the Defining Issues Test to students at a midwestern state university. She found that students who were conservative in their Christian faith were less apt to score at the higher (Stages 5 and 6) stages of moral reasoning than students more liberal in their religious beliefs. She offered the rationale that possibly "the conservative nature is to conventionalize or to conserve" (p. 195).

Earlier studies by Blackner (1975) and Lawrence (1979) had submitted evidence that conservative religious individuals have the ability to reason at "higher" (principled) levels of moral judgment. Scores obtained by these individuals on the DIT do not adequately reflect their development, possibly because their decision-making process is impacted by their religious beliefs. Lawrence concluded that religious individuals used religious criteria to guide their moral decisions, and "do not always respond to items' stage-related messages" (p. 112). Rest (1986) observed that religious individuals may have the ability to reason at higher levels of moral development, but consciously choose to make moral decisions based on their framework of beliefs, reflecting a supposedly lower level of moral development. This
suggests that the moral decisions made by the religiously committed are as much informed by the content of their value and belief systems as impacted by the structural limitations of their moral reasoning processes. Joy (1983) points out that "cognitive structures are not changed by virtue of conversion, but that there is now a new terminus that governs the content of moral judgments" (p. 127).

A linear negative relation between conservative religious ideology and moral reasoning development reported in the literature indicates that extremely conservative religious individuals tend to score lower than average on the Defining Issues Test (DIT), the most commonly used moral reasoning measure. Because of the controversial nature of this conclusion and because of concerns about the methodological quality of some of the studies indicating this relationship, Richards (1988) reviewed research in this area, giving critical attention to methodological issues. In the major thrust of his research, he argued that explanations proposed to date to account for the low moral reasoning scores of conservative religious individuals are inadequate. He advanced that Kohlberg's theory of moral development and the existing moral reasoning measures (the DIT in particular) may be biased against conservative religious individuals. Religious affiliation, level of commitment to religious beliefs, and the interpersonal value system of individuals all play into the dynamics operative in the exercise of moral choice and of orientation employed (Richards & Davison, 1992).

In a study that compared and correlated a Christian population on ego identity, religious orientation, and moral reasoning, De Witt (1987) showed that an individual who has developed a more mature identity in terms of religion will further show a higher level of religious commitment and moral development. He surveyed 210 Christian college students assessing the following variables: ego identity status
(Achieved, Moratorium, or Foreclosed) using the Dellas Identity Scale, religious orientation (Committed, Consensual, Extrinsic) using Fleck's Attitudes About Religion Scale, and level of moral reasoning, as assessed by the Defining Issues Test (DIT). De Witt's study found that Identity-Achievers tended to endorse more Intrinsic-Committed items than Moratorium and Foreclosed subjects. On moral judgment, a significant difference was found between the Achieved and the Foreclosed subjects, suggesting that a relationship exists between identity status for religion and moral reasoning. The finding that achievement of an ego identity is accompanied by the development of mature moral values supports Erikson's view that moral ideology is a factor in ego identity. De Witt suggested that further research in religious commitment and moral development should bear in mind the larger developmental context.

The relationship of moral reasoning to religious maturity and identity status, while also including such variables as religious vs. non-religious school environment, religious background, religious commitment, age, sex, education, and political affiliation, was further examined in a recent study by Warren (1992). A sample of 183 students from Christian colleges and high schools and 167 students from public high schools and state colleges were administered the Dellas Identity Status Inventory, the Defining Issues Test, a Defining Issues Test addition, and the Age-Universal I/E-Revised Scales. Significant differences were found between three of the four religious orientation variables, the DIT scores, and the identity status for religion. Moratorium Identity subjects were significantly higher than all other statuses except Diffused Identity subjects on scores of principled reasoning. Intrinsic religiosity, however, was not related to principled moral reasoning, and subjects from conservative religious backgrounds and schools did not have lower scores on principled reasoning as
predicted. Religious subjects did not include more religious directives on the DIT addition than non-religious subjects, and women did not include more care and compassion perspectives than men. Subjects from religious environments, as well as female subjects from both groups, generally evidenced consistently higher scores on Intrinsic religiosity. Warren concluded that religious environments do not appear to have a detrimental developmental effect on either moral reasoning or religiosity. Her findings strengthen the support for religious education as it appears to have a positive effect on faith development. However, she cautioned that a religious environment may not encourage growth beyond a Foreclosed Identity status. Religious educators would do well to model a Christianity that challenges and provokes religious belief intellectually as well as emotionally and behaviorally.

Religious commitment is seen as an integrating factor by Hoffman (1971), who observed that one crucial function of religion is to integrate the processes of moral development by providing direction. Dudley and Cruise (1990) define commitment to religious beliefs as both a controlling and integrating force in the human experience. "As a controlling force, religion consists of a set of principles that, when internalized, guide all interactions. As an integrating force, religion guides conduct, and functions as a master motive" (p. 97). A commitment to religious beliefs "provide[s] special reason and resources for leading the moral life" (Ryan & Lickona, 1987, p. 11). Finally, Dirks (1988) concludes that "morality goes beyond cognition to include attitudes, volition, commitment, life-style, and an ever-deepening relationship with God" (p. 324).

**Ego Development**

Moving now to the area of ego maturity, literature relating to definition and developmental processes of the ego is briefly reviewed.
The ego is conceived as "a master trait of personality, with a core organizing function . . . grounded enough to be applicable to life as it is lived in everyday social relations" (Thorne, 1993, p. 53). A basic assumption is that each person has a core level of ego functioning (Redmore & Waldman, 1975). Loevinger's (1976, 1984) theory is developmental, and she conceptualized ego development as a process characterized by progression through an invariant sequence of stages. Loevinger (1979) posits the following definition of ego:

The ego is above all a process, not a thing. The ego is in a way like a gyroscope whose upright position is maintained by its rotation . . . The striving to master, to integrate, to make sense of experience is not one ego function among many, but the essence of ego. (p. 85)

Loevinger's conceptualization and measure of ego development have led to, and continue to underlie, a remarkable variety of research. "The ego development construct clearly intersects with intrapsychic and interpersonal worlds" (Hauser, 1993, p. 28). Loevinger herself stated that "what I have called ego development is, I believe, the closest we can come at present to tracing the developmental sequences of the self, or major aspects of it" (Loevinger, 1984, p. 50).

Ego level, as assessed by Loevinger's Sentence Completion Test, correlates significantly with psychosocial maturity. Loevinger's ego development theory is "comprehensive and includes cognitive, social, psychosexual, and moral strands of development" (Vaillant & McCullough, 1987, p. 1189).

Loevinger (1985) points to four main strands in ego development: (1) impulse control, (2) interpersonal style, (3) conscious preoccupations, and (4) cognitive style. This is where change occurs in the process of ego development, and it is demonstrable change in these areas that differentiate one ego level from another. However, these are not four separate dimensions of ego development, but four complexly interwoven aspects of one integrated experience. The complexity of ego
development is greater than the sum of its parts. Ego (in the Loevinger model) is a very global construct that subsumes most other aspects of personality development.

Ego development is operationalized by Loevinger in seven stages and three transitional phases (displayed in Table 4). These describe a pathway along which she thinks individuals move between birth and adulthood, with the rate of movement and the final stage achieved differing widely from one person to the next. She proposed these stages as sequential and cumulative but not inevitable. Among a group of adults of any given age a wide range of stages of ego development would be apparent. Virtually all adults successfully move through the first three stages, with most adults reaching at least the transition she calls the "Self-aware level," designated I-3/4 (Bee, 1992, p. 72). The Conformist stage (I-3) is characterized by an increasing preoccupation with social acceptance and approval. "Social interactions become less egocentric as individuals adopt conventional values and beliefs" (Cohn, 1991, p. 253).

At the Self-aware level (I-3/4), a transition between the Conformist and Conscientious stages, there is an emerging self-awareness and capacity for introspection, and social norms and rules are no longer viewed as immutable. Greater differentiation and complexity is evidenced at the Conscientious stage (I-4), where there "is recognition that other people have their own interests, problems and opinions, making it possible for one to tolerate and appreciate alternative viewpoints" and where there is "a greater awareness of emotional life" (Cohn, 1991, p. 253). The Individual (I-4/5) and Autonomous (I-5) stages are characterized by an increasing time perspective and increasing respect for individual differences. There is a growing appreciation of psychological causation. . . . [These stages] are also characterized by a preoccupation with issues of identity and emotional dependence and independence. (Cohn, 1991, p. 253)

Loevinger reports that for both men and women the predominant ego level lies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Impulse Control, Character Development</th>
<th>Interpersonal Style</th>
<th>Conscious Preoccupations</th>
<th>Cognitive Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presocial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbiotic 1</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Symbiotic</td>
<td>Self vs. non-self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive 1</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Impulsive, fear of retaliation</td>
<td>Receiving, dependent, exploitive</td>
<td>Bodily feelings, especially sexual and aggressive</td>
<td>Stereotyping, conceptual confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Protective</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Fear of being caught, externalizing blame, opportunistic</td>
<td>Wary, manipulative, exploitive</td>
<td>Self-protection, trouble, wishes, things, advantage, control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformist 1</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Conformity to external rules, shame, guilt for breaking rules</td>
<td>Belonging, superficial niceness</td>
<td>Appearance, social acceptance, banal feelings, behavior</td>
<td>Conceptual simplicity, stereotypes, cliches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious-Conformist (Self-aware)</td>
<td>1-3/4</td>
<td>Differentiation of norms, goals</td>
<td>Awareness of self in relation to group, helping</td>
<td>Adjustment, problems, reasons, opportunities (vague)</td>
<td>Multiplicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4—(Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Impulse Control, Character Development</th>
<th>Interpersonal Style</th>
<th>Conscious Preoccupations</th>
<th>Cognitive Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Self-evaluated standards, self-criticism, guilt for consequences, long-term goals and ideals</td>
<td>Intensive, responsible, mutual, concern for communication</td>
<td>Differentiated feelings, motives for behavior, self-respect, achievements, traits, expression</td>
<td>Conceptual complexity, idea of patterning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>1-4/5</td>
<td>Add: Respect for individuality</td>
<td>Add: Dependence as an emotional problem</td>
<td>Add: Development, social problems, differentiation of inner life from outer</td>
<td>Add: Distinction of process and outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Add: Coping with conflicting inner needs, toleration</td>
<td>Add: Respect for autonomy, interdependence</td>
<td>Vividly conveyed feelings, integration of physiological, psychological causation of behavior, role conception, self-fulfillment, self in social context</td>
<td>Increased conceptual complexity, complex patterns, toleration for ambiguity, broad scope, objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Add: Reconciling inner conflicts, renunciation of unattainable</td>
<td>Add: Cherishing of individuality</td>
<td>Add: Consolidation of sense of identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. “Add” means in addition to the description applying to the previous level.
squarely between level 3/4 (Self-aware), and level 4 (Conscientious) (Loevinger, 1985, p. 423). The middle stages of ego development are "where most people are classed. . . . People in almost any setting will come from a narrow range of ego levels. Most adolescents and adults are in the middle range" (Loevinger, 1994, p. 6). She describes the self-aware stage as being the modal stage for adulthood.

The ego provides a frame of reference that the individual uses to organize and give meaning to experience. Helson and Roberts (1994) state that the modal adult tends
to perceive the world in stereotypical ways but with some awareness of discrepancies between conventions and their own behavior. In subsequent levels are seen further internalization of rules of social intercourse, growth of cognitive complexity, impulse control increasingly based on self-chosen, long-term motives, and an increased respect for individual autonomy and mutuality in interpersonal relations. (p. 911)

As the chief organizer of personality, the ego is said to integrate our morals, values, goals, and cognitive processes. Greater ego development is related to more effective coping strategies at all ages (Blanchard-Fields, 1986; Labouvie-Vief, Hakim-Larson, & Hobart, 1987).

Loevinger suggested there are gradual transitions along a continuum of ego development. During college years, significant gains over high-school ego developmental levels have been reported (Adams & Fitch, 1982; Redmore, 1983). Preliminary findings considering ego developmental change beyond the high-school years in a longitudinal sample revealed significant advances in ego developmental stages over a 10-year period (Hauser, 1993).

Reasoning, perceiving, and ways of conceptualizing feelings and relationships are all included within the domain of ego development (Hauser, 1993, p. 24). Increasing complexity, coherence, and individual differences are aspects of ego development. Cognitive style, cognitive complexity, impulse control, and conscious
preoccupations are components of ego development. These components are
dynamically connected along a continuum of increasing self-integration,
differentiation, and complexity of thought (Browning, 1987; Loevinger, 1979). Higher
levels of ego development are associated with "greater nurturance, trust, interpersonal
sensitivity, valuing of individuality, psychological-mindedness, responsibility, and
inner control" (Hauser, 1993, p. 27).

**Research Studies Linking Ego Development and Moral Orientation or Moral Development**

MacPhail’s (1989) data supported the position that ego development is a
necessary but not sufficient condition for moral reasoning. He further advocated that
moral reasoning is a separate but interrelated subdomain of the ego, whereas ego
development is a more encompassing and global aspect of development. Gfellner
(1986) examined the relation between ego development and moral development, using
Loevinger’s Sentence Completion Test and Rest’s DIT with 517 adolescents ages 12-21
years as subjects. She found major increases in moral capacity at the Conformist and
Conscientious levels of ego development. Fechnay’s (1993) study tested the
hypothesis that males predominantly use and align with a justice orientation, while
females orient around the dimension of care. He proposed that these differences
faded at higher stages of ego development due to a person’s understanding and
valuing of these perspectives as complimentary. His data supported these
hypotheses, demonstrating that ego maturity resulted in an increase in the expression,
integration, and balanced proportion of orientations. This view is shared by Rogers
(1988) who stated that "the combined use of the orientations will increase as ego level
increases for both sexes" (p. 17).
In a validation study of the moral orientations, Rogers (1988) constructed a manual for coding sentence completion data collected using the WUSCTED for justice or care orientations. She holds that the results of her study indicate that justice and care orientations are two different ways of thinking which occur at all levels of ego development. Care is not a substage within the developmental sequence of justice reasoning as Kohlberg argues. If so, care thinking would increase at some stages and decline at others. Instead, increases in both are positively and significantly associated with ego development. (p. 52)

These studies lend weight to the notion that ego development (or maturation) is linked to an increasingly integrated orientation in the resolution of moral dilemmas.

Lifton (1985) hypothesized that gender-related differences are reflective of individual differences in personality between men and women at comparable levels of moral development. From his study with two developmentally distinctive populations (college sophomores and adults), he concluded individual differences in moral development appear to parallel individual differences in personality development. Moral development appeared to be related to the development and integration of self or ego (intrapersonal) and social (interpersonal) identities, and that "these individual differences in personality may offer another explanation for differences in moral orientation between men and women" (p. 330). In a study conducted in the mid-1980s, Colby and Damon (1993) interviewed 23 "moral exemplars" in depth in an attempt to uncover the routes by which they had become the people they were. These were individuals who, along with their enduring moral commitments, had certain personality characteristics that seemed to remain with them, further attesting to the impact of personality or ego factors on moral development.

Because of inconsistencies in previous research regarding the relationship of development in the ego and moral areas, Hatton (1988) investigated the relationships...
between Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview and two measures of ego, Loevinger's Sentence Completion Test, and the Adams and Grotevant Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (a variation of the Marcia measure). She included information on a number of background variables (sex, age, year in college, major socioeconomic status, and home community) in her study. Analyses of variance of her data established a significant positive relationship between moral development and ego development. She also demonstrated a significant positive relationship between moral development and ego identity status, with identity achievement subjects scoring highest, followed by moratorium, foreclosure, and finally diffusion subjects.

These results were not, however, borne out in a later study by Shelton (1991), who investigated the relationships between the constructs of principled moral judgment (measured by Rest's Defining Issues Test) and ego identity status (measured by Bennion & Adams's Revised Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status), with a sample of residential senior-status men and women at a small, 4-year public college in the southeastern United States. Her findings revealed no differences in principled moral judgment among individuals having different ego identity statuses, and no differences in principled moral judgment between men and women with different ego identity statuses. Skoe (1990) studied the relationships among ego identity, care, and justice. She states that an ethic of care plays a role in the ego identity development of men and women. She found that for both genders the ability to care for self as well as others (Level III of Gilligan's model) is related to a solid sense of self.

**Influence of College Education**

The influence of college education on moral decision making has been documented in several studies that have also been directed towards addressing the
gender/moral orientation issue. A moderately strong relationship is reported between moral development and level of education (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, & Lieberman, 1983; McNeel, 1994; Pratt, Diessner, Hunsberger, Pancer, & Savoy, 1991; Pratt et al., 1983; Rest, 1994; Rest & Thoma, 1985; Walker, 1986). Changes in moral understanding occur in both men and women during the 5 years following college (Gilligan & Murphy, 1979; Murphy & Gilligan, 1980).

In her response to Walker's (1984) contention that there are no sex differences in moral reasoning, Baumrind (1986) pointed out that "inconsistency of sex differences across the studies reviewed may be explained by variations in educational level among the samples studied" (p. 517). She stated that "two years of college or less appears to make a difference to moral reasoning," but also held that educational level is also "the best single index of social niche, indicating at its higher levels acculturation into the dominant values of the intelligentsia in Western society, which raises the question of cultural difference versus deficit" (p. 518). Only if Kohlbergian Stages 5 and 6 were equally distributed among both sexes and all peoples could this bias be dismissed.

The assumption that males score higher in moral reasoning than females was not borne out in Denny's (1988) careful study, but her analyses showed significant differences in moral judgment by education level. She used a sample of 180 college students, identified by a stratified selection process and selected by a systematic random selection process, analyzing the data gathered by ANOVA. Her conclusion corroborated Gielen's (1987) observation that "the strongest correlates of moral development (as measured by the DIT) have traditionally been education and age" (p. 30). A similar effect was also established by Shaver (1987) who administered a moral development scale (DIT) to students at a liberal arts college and a Bible college at the
time of entry and after 4 years of college. Students at these two schools were significantly different in their developmental level of moral reasoning at the time of entry to college and after being enrolled for 4 years.

Summary

In this chapter, research and writings focusing on areas of moral development, moral orientation, the impact of religious commitment, ego development, and the influence of education on moral development were reviewed briefly to provide a context and rationale for the proposed study.

The continuing dialogue over moral orientation moves towards consensus regarding the desirability of an integration of care and justice in mature moral development. Contextual and content factors impact this integration, attested to by studies exploring the connection between religious commitment and moral choices. Life experiences and developmental issues, such as college education and ego development, appear to make a significant contribution to moral capacity and moral decision making.

From within this framework then, this study attempted to explore the idea that with ego maturity, developmental maturation, and a commitment to religious beliefs, a more integrated moral orientation will guide moral choices, and that individuals, regardless of their gender, will use aspects of both care and justice in their moral decisions.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter describes the type of research, research objectives, variables of interest, the population and subjects selected, research techniques and instruments, data collection procedures, and data analyses followed in this study.

Type of Research

This research is an exploratory study from a developmental perspective. A cross-sectional design was adopted (Isaac & Michael, 1981; Shaffer, 1993) in an attempt to investigate patterns and sequences in moral orientation that may be related to maturation. While a possible cohort effect is a disadvantage of a cross-sectional design, this approach is a practical one, given time and financial constraints (Isaac & Michael, 1981).

Both interview data and data from two instruments (a semi-projective sentence completion test and a Likert-type self-report questionnaire) were used in this study. Qualitative analyses formed an integral part of the study; Chi-square, ANOVA, the t-test for two independent samples, and Multiple Regression analyses of the data were conducted as appropriate.

Research Objectives

The research objectives of this study were, first, to explore the hypothesis that ego maturity is related to an integration of the voice of care and the voice of justice in
the moral choices made by individuals. Second, it was also hypothesized that the individual’s religious commitment is positively related to the emergence of a more integrated moral orientation in the resolution of moral conflicts and dilemmas.

Variables of Interest

The independent variables in this study are age, gender, ego development, and religious commitment. The dependent variable is mode of moral choice, or moral orientation—a care orientation, a justice orientation, or an integrated care-justice orientation.

Characterization of the Population and Selection of the Sample

Following a developmental paradigm, subjects were selected from two age periods identified in the developmental literature (Bee, 1992; Erikson, 1980; Erikson et al., 1986; Stevens-Long & Commons, 1992) as having specific characteristics, i.e., young adulthood (ages 25 to 35) and middle age (ages 50 to 65). In order to control for certain extraneous variation in the data, religious and educational background, and employment experience were considerations in the selection of a sample. Accessibility delimited the selection of subjects to those individuals who fit the research profile and with whom it was possible to schedule a personal face-to-face interview.

In an attempt to control for the impact that commitment to religious beliefs may have on moral orientation, the sample for this study is comprised of individuals who presumably subscribe to similar religious values because they are members of a specific religious denomination (Seventh-day Adventists). Previous research indicates that conservative religious subjects appear to make moral choices that reflect their commitment to their religious ideology, but may not adequately represent their moral
reasoning capacity (Clouse, 1991; Cowden, 1992; Getz, 1984; Lawrence, 1979; Rest, 1986; Richards, 1988; Richards & Davison, 1992).

Subjects were also individuals who have had some college education. Higher education has been linked with statistically significant increases in moral development from conventional levels of moral thinking to more principled reasoning (Burwell, 1992; Clouse, 1991; Friend, 1992; Hatton, 1988; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Shaver, 1985, 1987; Shelton, 1991).

The women in the study have all at some time been employed in work outside the home, occupying equivalent educational and social positions as do men. This obviates a further possible source of bias (Lyons, 1983; Wallskog, 1992; Wilson, 1991).

Thus, participants for this study were identified as either young (between 25-35 years of age) or mature (between 50-65 years of age) adults who (1) are lifetime Seventh-day Adventists (i.e., who are SDAs and who have grown up in a home with at least one parent an SDA), (2) had some college education, and (3) have lived in the United States for more than half of their lives.

A total of 247 contact letters were sent out, and 115 (46%) replies were received. Eighty-two individuals (33% of the total number contacted) agreed to participate, while 21 (8%) indicated that they were not lifetime SDAs, and 12 (5%) were for some personal reason (i.e., travel, too-busy schedule) not able to participate at this time. All of the individuals who responded were of Caucasian ethnic origin.

**Instrumentation**

A demographic information survey, a semi-structured clinical interview, a sentence completion semi-projective test, the Washington University Sentence Completion Test of Ego Development (WUSCTED), and a short self-report Likert-type
scale, the Religious Commitment Survey (RCS), were used to collect the data. These measures are more fully described below.

Demographic Information Survey

A Demographic Information Survey (DIS) was used to obtain information regarding age, gender, education level, occupation, employment history, religious affiliation, ethnic origin, and citizenship of each subject. In the analyses of data, this information is related to the research variables. A copy of the DIS can be found in Appendix C.

Semi-structured Clinical Interview

The semi-structured clinical interview was the main technique used for data collection (Weiss, 1994). The format followed was that outlined by Brown et al., (1991), in order to provide coherence to a sequence of questions about moral conflict and choice. Additional clarifying or activating questions were asked of a subject about his or her construction of the dilemma, resolution of the problem, and evaluation of the action taken.

The Reading Guide developed by Brown et al. (1991) formed the guiding structure and basis for analysis of the narratives provided by the subjects in the interview. "Construction of the Reading Guide proceeded from evidence that persons know (can recognize, speak in, and respond to) at least two different voices or perspectives in discussing moral conflicts and may indicate a preference for one over the other" (Brown et al., 1991, p. 29; Johnston, 1989). From an analysis of individual narrative responses, each subject was classified as either using predominantly a care, a justice, or an integrated care-justice orientation as the basis for decisions made in
resolving a conflict, problem, or difficult situation. A copy of the semi-structured clinical interview schedule is found in Appendix D.

Data from the WUSCTED and the RCS were used to amplify and augment that obtained in the semi-clinical interview.

Washington University Sentence Completion
Test of Ego Development

The Washington University Sentence Completion Test of Ego Development (WUSCTED) is a 36-item semi-projective technique developed by Loevinger and Wessler (1970), consisting of incomplete sentence stems that the subject is asked to complete in any way he or she chooses. Separate forms have been developed for males and females.


Cohn (1991) states that

Loevinger has portrayed development as encompassing increasingly complex perceptions of the self and others. Conscious preoccupations move from the concrete to the abstract, and time orientation shifts from the immediate to the long-term. The perception of other people, initially organized around simple dichotomies (e.g. nice vs. mean) becomes increasingly complex, encouraging a greater toleration of individual differences. These changes are accompanied by increasing psychological awareness and recognition of one’s own internal motivations. (p. 253)

The process thus results in changes in character, impulse control, conscious preoccupations, interpersonal relations, and cognitive complexity. Ego development is characterized in part by decreasing egocentricity, increasing ability to differentiate inner states, increasing capacity for satisfying relationships, and increasing awareness of and concern for society as a whole. "Coherence is the hallmark of the ego"
In short, its development is distinguished by increasing maturity (Kaplan, 1988).

Loevinger (1976) observes that the semi-projective nature of the sentence completion task is desirable because her "theory of ego development . . . open(s) onto an integrative and structural aspect of personality and character that is not accessible to tests that can be treated with factorial methods" (p. 3).

Loevinger (1976) maintains that "only a projective technique, a technique that requires the subject to project his (her) own frame of reference, will suffice to measure ego development" (p. 8). In Loevinger's model, ego is the customary frame of reference through which individuals structure their world and make sense of their experience. This frame of reference can be assessed by using a projective technique (the WUSCT), and the Loevinger model of ego is based on the development of the measurement device. Her theoretical construct is not only drawn from, but is amenable to, empirical research. Vaillant and McCullough (1987) state that of all developmental theories postulating that important facets of adult personality correspond to developmental stages, Loevinger's scheme for ego development has the best designed and most empirically based measure for its assessment. (p. 1189)

The WUSCTED is used as a measure of the ego maturity variable and to assign each subject to one of nine ego development levels. The WUSCTED is not copyrighted but has been made freely available by its author for research use, and her scoring manual (Loevinger et al., 1970) includes a practical and effective program of self teaching. Using it, researchers can learn to score protocols with good reliability.

Reliability of a projective test has two aspects: reliability as a function of inter-rater agreement, and reliability as a function of subject response to the test. A median inter-rater correlation of .86 has been reported as reliability for the core ego level score (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970). Internal consistency of the WUSCTED is high.
Loevinger reported a value of .91 for Cronbach’s alpha (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970). Holt (1980) administered a 12-item form of the WUSCTED to a national probability sample of 966 adults and obtained almost identical results when corrected for length. Other studies (reported by Redmore & Waldman, 1975) have demonstrated split-half correlations of .74 to .85, and internal consistency coefficients of .86 to .89.

Existing data appear to support the construct validity of ego development such that the WUSCTED may be used with confidence as a research instrument (Browning, 1987; Hauser, 1976, 1993; Holt, 1980; Hoppe & Loevinger, 1977; Loevinger, 1979, 1985). Loevinger’s conceptualization and measure of ego development have been incorporated in over 280 published and unpublished studies and translated into six languages (Cohn, 1991).

The WUSCTED identifies nine stages or ego levels, each of which is designated by a symbol and a name: I-1, Symbiotic; I-2, Impulsive; delta, Self-protective; I-3, Conformist; I-3/4, Self-aware; I-4, Conscientious; I-4/5, Individualistic; I-5, Autonomous; I-6, Integrated. The modal ego level for adults has been found to be I-3/4, Self-aware (Holt, 1980). The last six stages are of particular interest in a study of adults. They indicate an increasing independence, tolerance for the individuality of others, ability to see gradations, exceptions and complexities, reconciliation of conflicts, and integration (Bee, 1992).

Scoring of WUSCTED protocols proceeds by assigning an ego-level rating to each test item and then assigning a total protocol rating (TPR) based on the distribution of item scores (Loevinger et al., 1970; Vaillant & McCullough, 1987). Each sentence answer is scored separately from all other sentence answers (i.e., "out of context rating") and is individually assigned to one of nine ego development levels by matching each sentence completion with response categories provided in an
empirically derived scoring manual. The strategy of scoring is to determine a total protocol rating (TPR), a single composite score based on an individual's score on the 36 sentence stems. The TPRs are derived by following an algorithm or ogive rules, which use the entire distribution of 36 item responses. The ogive rules (cumulative frequency distributions of ego-level rating with specified cutting scores) are provided in the scoring manual (Loevinger, 1993; Loevinger & Wessler, 1970, pp. 126-133).

Final TPRs represent ego development levels on the 9-point ordinal scale. After completing individual item ratings, the protocol may also be read in toto to identify responses that merit either higher or lower ratings when understood in the context of the whole protocol. The final TPR may thus be adjusted for this additional information. A copy of the WUSCTED Form 11/68 for men and for women is contained in Appendix E.

Religious Commitment Survey

The Religious Commitment Survey (RCS) used in this study is one adapted by Anderson (1995), developed initially by Dudley (1992) as a Religion and Public Issues Survey. The form used in this study is composed of 13 Likert-type items and five questions that are answered by circling the relevant response. This instrument was used as a measure of the religious commitment variable.

Four sections are identified in Dudley's (1992) questionnaire—religious experience (questions 7-9), intrinsic/extrinsic motivation (questions 10-19), church-related behaviors (questions 31-34), and devotional practices (questions 60-63). The questionnaire developed by Dudley was randomly distributed to a sample of 800 Seventh-day Adventist subjects, with 419 completed questionnaires being returned.

The intrinsic/extrinsic motivation scale in Dudley's (1992) survey is comprised of 10 items originating from Hoge's (1972) study. Two validation studies on this scale
utilized individuals nominated by clergymen as having either intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. The single scale having the highest validity, reliability, item-to-item correlations, and item-to-scale correlations was extracted from the items in the final validation study. Factor analysis was used in the final item selection. The scale correlated with the ministers' judgments at .585. The intrinsic/extrinsic motivation "scale's reliability as measured by the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 [was] .901" (Hoge, 1972, p. 373). Anderson (1995) reported reliability coefficient alphas of .888, .903, and .807 respectively for the religious experience, intrinsic/extrinsic, and devotional practices scales in her use of this instrument.

As it appears in this study, the RCS is composed of 18 questions, divided into four categories: (1) religious experience (questions 1-3); (2) intrinsic/extrinsic motivation (questions 4-13); (3) church-related behaviors (questions 15-17); and (4) devotional practices (question 18). There are nominally 18 questions in the survey, but the last one (dealing with devotional practices) contains four subsections. This brings the total number of items to 21, and follows the format used in Anderson's (1995) study. Items 1 through 13 on the RCS asked subjects to respond to various statements on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A score of 5 was given for strong agreement with an item, while a score of 1 was given for strong disagreement with the item. Items 7, 12, and 13 were reverse scored. Five questions (14-18) were answered by circling the chosen response, ranging from the first choice being the least desirable, progressing to the more committed response.

In the first category, religious experience (questions 1-3), a high score indicates positive religious experience. A high score in the second category, intrinsic/extrinsic motivation (questions 4-13), indicates an intrinsic motivation. Each item in the third
category, church-related behaviors (questions 14-17—importance of faith, church attendance, service position, financial support), is examined separately. A low score in the devotional practices category (question 18), scored on a scale of 1 to 5, as circled by the respondent, indicates a low degree of devotional practices. A copy of the RCS appears in Appendix F.

Pilot Study

Prior to embarking on the data collection for the study, a pilot study was conducted to test both procedures and instruments. Four individuals participated in this process. Since no changes were indicated in either the procedures or the instrumentation, the data collected from these four subjects were incorporated into the study.

Data Collection Procedures

Efforts were made to contact subjects for possible participation in this study through Seventh-day Adventist churches in the Lake Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, from whom a list of churches was obtained. From among these, 10 churches accessible to the researcher were selected and these were then randomly ordered. Contact was made with the respective pastors and/or church clerks in order to obtain mailing addresses of individuals who: (1) were SDA members of their congregations, (2) belonged to one of the age groups identified (young adults, ages 25 to 35, and middle-age adults, between ages 50 to 65), (3) were U.S. citizens, (4) had some college education.

Initial contact was made with these individuals by letter (see Appendix A) describing the study, its purposes, and parameters. A return slip and stamped self-addressed envelope were provided for the individuals to indicate their willingness to
participate, and asking them if they had grown up in a home with at least one parent an SDA. They were also asked to supply a telephone number at which they might be reached, in order to set up an appointment for the interview and testing process. This process was repeated through the list of randomly ordered churches. Because of the individual manner in which data were gathered, data collection continued over a period of 7 months, and a total of 82 individuals were interviewed.

The data collection procedure took approximately 2 hours for each participant, which included the interview and the administration of the two instruments. After informed consent had been obtained from the subject to proceed with the process, the interview was undertaken. This was followed by the completion of the self-report questionnaire and the sentence completion instrument. No identification of the individual remains with the data, thus ensuring confidentiality.

## Data Analysis

The data gathered for this study were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively.

### Qualitative Analysis of Interview Data

Each audio-taped interview was carefully transcribed and coded, following the Reading Guide proposed by Brown et al., (1991). Qualitative analysis of the interview data provided a general characterization of moral orientation for each subject.

Responses were analyzed for common themes and frequency of citing a particular orientation in the resolution of a moral conflict. Subjects were classified as using a caring orientation, a justice orientation, or an integrated caring/justice orientation. This classification was predicated most specifically on the alignment of
the self with a particular perspective, while the articulation of care and/or justice themes, and the predominance of one perspective over the other were also noted. A random sample from the completed protocols was rated independently by a second qualified professional to establish inter-rater reliability. Minor differences were resolved by discussion, which led to consensus.

To address research questions 1-3, interview data were analyzed qualitatively for common themes and frequency of citing particular aspects in the dialogue and definitions. Contextual features of the dilemmas related were also examined qualitatively.

Research Question 1. How do individuals describe morality?

Research Question 2. Are there differences in religious motivation among the moral orientation groups?

Research Question 3. Do contextual factors appear to influence the choice of dilemma shared by the individual?

Interview data were examined for the way in which individuals defined morality, and for the religious motivation, if any, that appeared to influence them in resolving their dilemmas. Categories were derived for each of these areas from the themes presented in the conversations. Finally, the interview data were scrutinized for contextual considerations in the dilemmas the participants chose to share.

The other measures (WUSCTED and RCS) were scored according to standardized procedures.

Hypotheses and Statistical Analyses

Hypotheses arising out of the research questions that were tested are:

Research Question 4: Is level of religious commitment related to integration of moral orientation?
Hypothesis 1: The mean scores on the overall religious commitment scale of the three moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. This hypothesis was tested by one-way analysis of variance, at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 2: The mean scores on the religious experience scale (questions 1-3 on the RCS) of the integrated and not-integrated moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. A t-test for two independent groups was used to determine the significance of the difference between the means of the two groups at .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 3: The mean scores on the intrinsic/extrinsic motivation scale (questions 4-13 on the RCS) of the integrated and not-integrated moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. A t-test was used to determine the significance of the difference between the means of the two groups at .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 4: There is no statistically significant difference in the church-related behaviors (questions 15-17—church attendance, service position, and financial support—on the RCS) of the integrated and not-integrated groups. This hypothesis was tested by separate Chi-square analyses on each of the three separate items.

Hypothesis 5: The mean scores for devotional practices (pray, read Bible, read religious literature, and family worship) on the RCS of the three moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. This hypothesis was tested by one-way analysis of variance, at the .05 level of significance.

Research Question 5: Is an integrated moral orientation related to level of ego maturity?

Hypothesis 6: There is no statistically significant relationship between an integrated care/justice moral orientation and level of ego maturity. This hypothesis was tested by Chi-square analysis.
Research Question 6. Is an integration of moral orientation present in both young adults and middle-aged adults?

Hypothesis 7: There is no statistically significant relationship between age group and integration of moral orientation. This hypothesis was tested by Chi-square analysis.

Research Question 7. Is an integration of moral orientation gender related?

Hypothesis 8: There is no statistically significant relationship between gender and an integrated care/justice moral orientation. This hypothesis was tested by Chi-square analysis.

Research Question 8. Does any combination of age, gender, religious commitment and ego maturity predict integration of moral orientation?

Hypothesis 9: There is no linear combination of age, gender, religious commitment, and ego maturity which significantly predicts integration of moral orientation. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the best predictors of an integrated moral orientation.

Summary

This chapter dealt with the methodology of this study. The type of research, the research objectives, selection of the sample, techniques and instruments employed, data collection procedures, hypotheses, and analyses were described and discussed.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter initially describes the demographic characteristics of the sample, and then presents a description of religious commitment, including subjective comparisons with the samples of two other recent studies. This is followed by the findings that resulted from a qualitative analysis of the interview and sentence-completion data. Finally, the results of the testing of the hypotheses are reported.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Of the 82 individuals participating in this study, 45 (55%) were young adults and 37 (45%) mature adults (see Table 5). Of the total group, 32 (39%) were men and 50 (61%) were women. This approximates the gender distribution of SDA church membership in the Michigan region, which is currently recorded at 42.4% male and 57.6% female. This gender distribution in the larger population from which the study sample was drawn is more nearly reflected in the young adult group, of which 19 (42.2%) were men and 26 (57.8%) women. In the mature adult group, 13 (35%) were men and 24 (65%) women.

Two-thirds of the participants reported holding at least an undergraduate degree (see Table 6). Nearly a third had completed a graduate degree (doctoral or master's level). Slightly fewer reported a more limited college experience, resulting in a somewhat symmetrical distribution. The time involved in earning an advanced degree may account for the fact that the older adults reported proportionately more
Table 5  
*Profile of Participants*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Groups</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Adults</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6  
*Education Level*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Young Adults</th>
<th>Mature Adults</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s level</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
graduate education (37.8%) than the younger group (26.6%). The older group also included a larger number who had not completed an undergraduate degree (37.8%) than did the younger adults (22.2%). Half of the younger group held a college undergraduate degree. Individuals participating in this study thus demonstrated a fairly high level of education.

Three-quarters of the participants reported that they had been employed full time for at least 5 years (see Table 7). Among the younger adults, more were likely to have been employed full time for less than 5 years, which most likely reflects the fact that they had more recently completed their college education and joined the workforce. The mature adult group included a larger number who were currently employed part time.

### Table 7

**Employment Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Young Adults</th>
<th>Mature Adults</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 5 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From a range of occupations/careers, the medical area was the most highly represented in the total group, with teaching/education and business following second and third, respectively (see Table 8). However, if the business, clerical, and managerial/administrative occupational categories are combined, this new pooled area would account for a third of the occupations indicated by the total participants. The occupational profile varies somewhat when looking at the young adult group. Approximately a quarter of this group were engaged in business/clerical/managerial or administrative types of occupations, but a higher proportion of the younger adults than older adults were in the teaching profession. None of the older participants reported being in the ministry of their church, while this was the full-time occupation of 13% of the younger group.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Young Adults</th>
<th>Mature Adults</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4 (8.9%)</td>
<td>7 (18.9%)</td>
<td>11 (13.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>3 (6.7%)</td>
<td>5 (13.5%)</td>
<td>8 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>3 (6.7%)</td>
<td>3 (8.9%)</td>
<td>6 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Mechanical</td>
<td>3 (6.7%)</td>
<td>2 (5.5%)</td>
<td>5 (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial/Administrative</td>
<td>4 (8.9%)</td>
<td>5 (13.5%)</td>
<td>9 (11.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>10 (22.2%)</td>
<td>11 (29.7%)</td>
<td>21 (25.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>6 (13.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Education</td>
<td>10 (22.2%)</td>
<td>6 (16.2%)</td>
<td>16 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (4.4%)</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>3 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45 (100.0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>37 (100.0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>82 (100.0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description and Comparative Analysis of Religious Commitment

Religious commitment of the participants was measured by the RCS, with attention paid to the subscales it contained. Basic properties of the overall RCS and its four subscales obtained for this sample can be seen in Table 9. Reliability was at an acceptable level for the overall scale, the religious experience, and the intrinsic/extrinsic motivation subscales, but poor for the areas of church-related behaviors and devotional practices. Similar reliabilities were obtained by Anderson (1995). The limited number of items in the subscales, however, increases the possibility of measurement error and interpretation of results must thus be tempered with caution.

Table 9

Basic Properties of Overall RCS and RCS Sub-scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient Alpha</th>
<th>Lowest/Highest Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall RCS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>85.88</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>38-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic/Extrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.57</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church-related Behaviors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devotional Practices</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Overall, the individuals interviewed for this study rated their faith as important to them (Question 14). Two-thirds of them stated that their faith was "extremely important" to them, while one-third categorized their faith as "fairly/quite important." Other aspects of their religious commitment are outlined in Tables 10-17.

Data from this Moral Orientation Study (MOS) were compared with those obtained in two previous studies with similar religious populations. The most recent, a study by Anderson (1995), included a sample of 487 SDA "preachers’ kids." Comparison here is made to her sub-sample of 423, who considered themselves to be SDAs. The second study by Dudley (1992) contacted 800 Adventists, randomly selected from the mailing list of the North American Division edition of the Adventist Review, resulting in 419 participants. These comparisons are made to establish a frame of reference for this somewhat smaller MOS sample. The comparisons that follow suggest that the MOS participants are a slightly more religiously committed group as a whole than either of these two reference groups.

A high rate of church attendance was indicated by the 82 participants of this study, with 92% stating that they normally attend church once a week (see Table 10). This is somewhat higher than that reported by either of the two comparison groups, and possibly signifies a more homogenous and/or religiously committed group. MOS participants also show a slightly higher involvement in service positions in their local churches (see Table 11). This again may reflect a highly committed group overall.
### Table 10

**Comparison of Church Attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Moral Orientation Study ((n = 82))</th>
<th>Anderson’s Study ((n = 423))</th>
<th>Dudley’s Study ((n = 419))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely or never</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once every month or two</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or three times a month</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normally once week</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11

**Comparison of Service Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Held Position</th>
<th>Moral Orientation Study ((n = 82))</th>
<th>Anderson’s Study ((n = 423))</th>
<th>Dudley’s Study ((n = 419))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Across the three studies, just over 40% in each group reported their level of financial support to their church as 10-14% of income (see Table 12). However, 39% of MOS participants, in contrast to 29% of Anderson's and 30% of Dudley's, indicate a pattern of giving that is tilted a little more to the generous side—with these individuals reporting a giving pattern of 15% or more of their income. At the opposite end of the scale, a corresponding smaller group report contributions of less than 9% of their income. Individuals in the two comparison studies report a more even distribution across the different levels of giving.

Table 12

Comparison of Gross Income Contributed to the Church (Financial Support)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Financial Support</th>
<th>Moral Orientation Study (n = 82)</th>
<th>Anderson's Study (n = 423)</th>
<th>Dudley's Study (n = 419)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% to 9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% to 14%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% to 19%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% or more</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The devotional practices reported by participants are outlined in Table 13. A fairly high involvement in each of the devotional practices, at a daily or at least weekly level, is described by the MOS group. The pattern of involvement approximates for the most part that reported in the two comparison studies.

MOS participants reported a high level of religious experience, as defined by subjective feelings of connection with God (92%), joy and peace (82%), and a born-again experience (87%). Table 14 gives the percentages of those who agree (Agr) and disagree (Dis) with the statements in this subscale, and contrasts the MOS sample with the two comparison studies. No figures are shown in the table for those subjects who remained neutral or noncommittal about these three statements. The profile presented here resembles that obtained in Dudley's study, but describes a more positive experience than indicated by Anderson's group.

The Intrinsic/Extrinsic Motivation scale of the RCS is comprised of 10 questions, with a possible score of 1-5 for each question. The possible range of total scores is thus between 10-50, with a midpoint of 30. A low score indicates extrinsic motivation, and a high score, intrinsic motivation. Nearly all (99%) of the MOS participants report motivation on the intrinsic side, above the midpoint score of 30 (see Table 15). A high level of intrinsic motivation is exhibited by just over half of them, who scored 45 and above on this scale. Contrasted with the two comparison studies, the profile obtained from the MOS participants again appears to more closely correspond with that obtained by Dudley than that described by Anderson. A noticeable difference appears, however, at the highest level of intrinsic motivation (those scoring 50 on the scale). A small group (7%) of the MOS participants are at this level, as opposed to nearly a quarter of Dudley's sample.
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Table 13

*Comparison of Devotional Practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Moral Orientation Study $(n = 82)$</th>
<th>Anderson's Study $(n = 423)$</th>
<th>Dudley's Study $(n = 419)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pray privately</td>
<td>Seldom or never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than weekly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least weekly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Bible</td>
<td>Seldom or never</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than weekly</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least weekly</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read religious literature</td>
<td>Seldom or never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than weekly</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least weekly</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family worship</td>
<td>Seldom or never</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than weekly</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least weekly</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Comparison of Religious Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Moral Orientation Study</th>
<th>Anderson's Study</th>
<th>Dudley's Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 82)</td>
<td>(n = 423)</td>
<td>(n = 419)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agr  Dis</td>
<td>Agr  Dis</td>
<td>Agr  Dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I frequently feel very close to God in prayer, during public worship, or at important moments in my life.</td>
<td>92 2</td>
<td>69 15</td>
<td>89 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often experience the joy and peace which comes from knowing my sins have been forgiven.</td>
<td>82 2</td>
<td>70 12</td>
<td>89 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am certain that I have had a conversion or born-again experience.</td>
<td>87 1</td>
<td>63 16</td>
<td>83 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Reported here are the percentages of those who Agree (Agr) or Disagree (Dis) with each of these statements. Those who remained neutral or noncommittal make up the balance.
Table 15

Comparison of Intrinsic/Extrinsic Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Moral Orientation Study (n = 82) %</th>
<th>Anderson's Study (n = 423) %</th>
<th>Dudley's Study (n = 419) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Religious Commitment of Participants

The participants in this study, as a group, show a high level of overall religious commitment that is similar to, but in some respects higher than, that demonstrated by the two comparison studies. Two-thirds of the participants describe their faith as being "extremely important" to them. Behavioral indicators (99% indicate church attendance at least 3 times a month, two-thirds hold service positions in their churches, and three-quarters indicate a pattern of financial support of 10% or more income) are also those of a highly committed group. A high level of intrinsic motivation is exhibited by over half of the participants, with nearly all reporting motivation on the intrinsic side of the scale (over the midpoint score of 30). Most reported positively on their subjective religious experience, describing feelings of connection with God, joy and peace, and a "born-again" experience.
Qualitative Analysis of Interview Data

The audio-taped dialogues of the Structured Clinical Interview (SCI) contain the stories related by participants of moral conflicts they had experienced. Individuals were asked to share how they had resolved their dilemmas, and to evaluate the resolution. A set of standard questions (see Appendix D) was used to guide the interview process, with careful probing of the individual's thinking, particularly the use of moral language and the meanings assigned to the terms employed. The 82 interviews were coded for moral orientation using the coding method developed by Brown et al., (1991).

Coding of the Interviews

The SCIs were carefully transcribed, categorized and analyzed qualitatively, and coded for quantitative analysis. Each entire interview text was first read and interpreted for evidence of a caring orientation. The process was then repeated, this time looking for evidence of justice thinking. Finally, the entire text was read once again, and interpreted for how the narrative self either mediated and chose between the two moral orientations, or integrated them. These sets of interpretations were summarized on a Coding Sheet (see Appendix D), describing whether the individual had articulated either or both of the two orientations, whether one or the other predominated, and whether the self aligned with justice, care, or an integrated justice/care orientation in the dilemma that was shared.

Forty-five of the interviews were randomly selected from the list of respondents. These interviews were then read and coded by an experienced second rater. For the most part, the two codings were in agreement, and consensus was reached on minor differences that occurred.
Each story was carefully read, observing the conflicts described and the choices made or considered by the individual. Every effort was made to tune into the "voice" of the persons telling their stories, to see things through their eyes, and to gain entry into the dilemma they related on their own terms. Specific attention was paid to the relational context, particularly aspects of attachment/detachment and equality/inequality. Contradictions, power differentials, and the use of moral language, such as "the right thing to do," "should," "ought," etc., were also noted. Key images and metaphors conveyed something of the psychological experience of the narrator in the situation. Evidence was sought of intent and a glimpse of the self in moral action, with particular attention paid to action words employed and also to instances where the individual had chosen not to act. Finally, an attempt was made to identify religious motivation guiding the choices made by the individual, and to derive categories from their definitions of the term "morality."

In coding the interviews, three different aspects were considered important: (1) whether the narrator articulated one or the other of the two orientations in the dilemma (presence); (2) the relationship between the two orientations (predominance); and most importantly, (3) with what terms or orientation did the narrator frame alignment in the conflict? Almost without exception, participants in this study were able to articulate both care and justice in their dilemmas. Alignment (or the relationship between the self and moral voice), however, was a key factor in allocating each to a particular or integrated orientation. The question "What was at stake for you in this dilemma?" was particularly helpful in determining how the self was aligned.

Individuals were identified as either justice-oriented, care-oriented, or integrated in their moral orientation (see Table 16). Twenty-eight of the 82
participants showed integration, while 23 exhibited a justice orientation, and 31 a care orientation.

Table 16

Frequencies—Age Group, Gender, and Moral Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Moral Orientation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Adults</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Care Orientation

A care orientation is one that draws attention to the vulnerability of people to carelessness, abandonment, hurt, and to issues of attachment/detachment and empathy. A care orientation was observed where individuals addressed the complexities of creating and sustaining human connection. In a care orientation, feelings and needs of both others and self were attended to. Solutions to dilemmas tended to be inclusive. Metaphors indicated self-in-relation, and communication was considered central.

The following statements are given as examples from interviews coded as care-oriented:

I was torn apart because [    ] didn’t support me. Relationships were at stake here, both with [    ] and with God.

I think more than anything else, I felt like I was betraying those where I worked. I just like felt, though, that they didn’t care.
I don’t know what will happen to me. I will be more vulnerable in this area [but maybe in this new position I can be] more helpful, loyal, and supportive—even mentoring, perhaps?

I do what I would want to have done to me [tears welling up]. That’s what makes it so hard with [ ], ’cause I don’t want to turn him away.

Justice Orientation

A concern for fairness and problems of inequality was dominant in a justice orientation. Impartiality, equal treatment, and respect for principles and standards were important. Visual metaphors were used often ("seeing things differently," "weighing things up," etc.), and disparities in power and aspects of oppression were major considerations.

Examples from selected interviews coded as justice-oriented included:

When he made those comments about [ ], I was just enraged. It offended my sense of justice.

I feel that the moral issue there is—to treat them fairly.

I didn’t like it! It was just another example in my mind—well, it seemed—this involved our business relationship too—it seemed to me, and I still think to this day, and believe that I am right about it—I was doing a lot more work than he was. But he wanted equal partnership—he wanted privileges in the business and all. Just another example of him not really doing his part but yet expecting to get rewarded.

To me, I thought I stood for the principle of the thing. From what I had to go by, I did what I thought was right. I like to see people dealt with fairly. And justly. But if they’ve done something wrong, sure I think they should rectify the situation.

You are rewarded or punished by whether or not you deal ethically with your customers. It is probably much more "doing the right thing" as opposed to the effect on someone else.

An Integrated Orientation in Making Moral Decisions

Integration may be demonstrated on two levels: at times on the level of individual passages or parts of the narrative ("micro" level), but more commonly on
the level of the entire interview ("macro" level). At the micro level, justice and care thinking were identifiable in the same passage of the conflict narrative, where justice (equality, rights) and care (mutuality, responsibility) seemed to be inextricably interwoven. At the macro level, the individual used aspects of justice and care throughout the interview, and articulated and aligned with both in the choices made in resolving his or her dilemma. This macro level was most frequently observed in this sample.

While the following interviews are perhaps best seen as integrated at the macro level, the excerpts quoted to illustrate an integrated moral orientation capture something of the essence of the viewpoints shared by these individuals. Each of the following paragraphs represents the position of a different person.

In my framework, [the 10 Commandments deal with] the rightness of an action in regard to God's laws—but in a larger sense also, I consider them a law of love. And some of these things aren't so specific—each person has to decide for themselves. Something can be right or wrong at least based on the 10 Commandments, if not another aspect of the law of loving your neighbors AND loving God. To my way of thinking [the 10 Commandments] are not arbitrary, rather more a personalization of some of the minimums that would come out of the greater law of love.

We need to be fair with everyone—but I also feel we need to deal with the individual. It is sometimes very difficult when you come to a dilemma, where you [need to] deal with the needs of an individual and you deal over here with certain principles and so on.

Well, I found that the conflict came when I was bull-headed and wanted to go ahead. But I weighed the situation and it wasn't fair. I had to say, 'I'm wrong!' It doesn't fit for me, and it is not doing my family any good either. Simply creating chaos and for no good purpose.

I think the conflict was, could I still be her friend? Maintain my morals, my belief system—stick to what I believe to be right and not shove it down her throat? I value her as a person, and never in my wildest dreams would I ever want to hurt her feelings or reject her in any way. We have an understanding now that we're friends, but she also understands where I come from, my principles and values and so on. She says, "I don't understand you, but because we're friends, I can accept that," and that's really all there is to it!
The conflict in the situation for me was, I sort of felt like I was betraying a friendship, and yet there was this right and wrong thing. I really had to speak up. [Doing what is right and fair] are pretty high motivators for me. I just had to do this—yet, the second thing is the person. Issues of whether it is fair or not are pretty high, but not much further than trying to understand the person and the relationship involved. . . . Both need to be resolved somehow.

I felt I needed to maximize them both [issues of breaking confidentiality, and the need to speak out to a friend]. Principles sometimes seem over-riding. Yet relationships color the picture too. Principles are foundational, but applying the principles will always take place in the context of relationships. It is so hard to separate them really!

[While] I believe in a code, basically the principles of Scripture—and this is the code by which I govern my behavior—I also think there is a subjective element. The letter of the law cannot possibly cover every exigency of life. Therefore, there is an interpretation of the law to a particular situation—particular to the individuals involved. There is a contextual element and I see the two as—you just can't separate them.

The main conflict was, what do we do with our kids? How do you support the church and support what is going on? Protect them without downgrading the church or downgrading the people involved? And yet still uphold your principles? People see things differently too—and that is the other thing—is our opinion always right? We try not to be rigid about things. We don't want to hurt other people, we want to do the kindest thing, the thoughtful thing; but also the right, the fair thing.

I guess for me, a major moral issue is basic honesty—and the willingness to—maybe, tolerance. The ability to differ without being—sort of—what's the word I want? The ability to accept that other people may have another point of view. Without labeling that as bad or—I don't know how to define it as a moral issue, but the issue of tolerance—being willing to recognize uniqueness without evaluating negatively. Willingness to accept that other people are different without feeling that's bad. To me that is pretty close to a moral principle.

And then further in this same interview, when probed more directly for major concerns in making moral choices generally, this individual stated that

Fairness and equality, and responsibility and caring? I guess I'm just not sure how to separate those. I guess partly for me, justice and equality is ABOUT relationships. Relationships among people individually, and in groups.

One individual integrated hurt and abandonment with commitment and fairness, showing understanding and combining of 'letter and spirit' of the law. She defined morality as
Following the 10 Commandments! And all that entails. In the spirit and the letter. It is really treating others like we would like to be treated and treating God like we would like Him to treat us! Not like we treat Him sometimes. I know that is not a regular definition, but I don't think that is legalistic, it is just a part of a person’s being. You don't have to think 'Is this wrong or is this right?' You just know in your inner being.

Discrepancies Between Action and Articulation

Interestingly, several individuals clearly articulated one orientation in defining morality, but acted very much from the other perspective in resolving their dilemmas. In these instances, they were coded according to the orientation their actions (or self) aligned with, following the maxim that 'actions speak louder than words'.

To illustrate, one individual’s dilemma focussed on how best to care for his aging mother, resolving his conflict very much from a care perspective. Yet he stated that, when thinking of morality, "justice, equality for everyone under every circumstance comes to mind. I guess that is what it means for me." Another individual also resolved his dilemma from a care perspective. When probed further, he specified that generally in resolving dilemmas he felt that the relationship aspect held the greatest "pull" for him. Yet he defined morality as "doing what’s right even though it may seem wrong—may not be popular—but just doing what is right and just and fair."

Conversely, another individual who articulated a justice orientation throughout his dilemma, and used justice thinking in its resolution, stated that his tendency "is to be really concerned with relationships." He further explained:

I [used to be more] concerned about fairness, but I’ve kind of come to the conclusion that that doesn’t always have a lot to do with it. Sometimes fair isn’t even right! That’s the impression I have, so I’ve kind of abandoned fairness as a guiding principle. I think it is something to consider, but I think forcing fairness on a situation just doesn't work out! Probably because my goal is to achieve a harmonious conclusion of the situation, that tends to be higher goal to me than seeing to it that the perfect thing prevails. Again it is probably because I question. I know what I think, but I question how sure I am that it is right.
This appears to suggest a developmental process, and a transition progressing from alignment with one dominant perspective, towards integration. But, at least within the scope of the interview, while the two perspectives were clearly articulated at different points, integration was not apparent.

Two other individuals (both males) also observed that they felt they were in transition from previously held "justice-oriented" positions, and that they experienced this as growth:

Probably if you had asked me these questions when I was younger [it would have been different]. I have started to come to understand that, you know, all of us make mistakes, so I have started looking at the grace issue a whole lot more. So probably over the last few years I would have to say that I am starting to become a whole lot more understanding. I am not happy when rules are not being followed. But everyone makes choices. I think now the way that I look at it more is, people who think they have an excuse vs. people who realize that they have made a mistake and know that they may fail again—but at least they know that they are going to try and change the direction.

Where I am now is very different from where I used to be. Whether it is a process of just the normal process of aging, or whether it is in fact spiritual growth and development, I don't know. But I am definitely at the place where people are much more important than policies, rules, and regulations. I will not allow the letter of the law to be the final court of appeal—relational issues are much more important to me now and must be taken into account too.

Diffuse Understanding or Ambiguity Concerning Moral Issues

While for some a transition or developmental process seemed to be evident, a few others seemed to struggle to recall a dilemma dealing with moral choices—not something that might be expected from a religious population. Several situations that were offered were more about career choices rather than a dilemma involved with choosing the morally right thing to do, and one was more of a concern with self-concept issues than a moral dilemma. It was, however, possible to code these according to the justice or care thinking articulated in the discussion of the issues that arose.
Morality as Sexuality

From an ambiguous and diffuse picture of moral decision-making, on the one hand, it was also interesting to note how a number of individuals placed themselves on the other end of the continuum. In a narrower sense, they reflected on morality as sexuality. This is illustrated in the several excerpts that follow:

Of course, I think when you hear the term morality, the very first thing that comes to mind is the opposite—immorality!

Morality? The first thing that comes to mind are things in the sexual area. [But] it has to do with right and wrong, any decision really, although I would say some decisions may not have a right and wrong. But the impact of most decisions do.

Well, there's morality as far as married life is concerned, and there is morality as far as honesty in business relationships.

A moral problem has always had to do with—I guess, couples living together without being married, that type of thing. That's a moral issue.

To me, morality is something that is moral—I would probably link it most closely with principles. The opposite of this is immoral, which is normally connected with sexual issues, but is not limited to that. There can be other ethical issues.

Well, my morals—moral to me means what I believe and what I think is right and wrong and to me those are rather black and white—although they do slide into the grey area too! Now morality means, how do I present myself? Do I wear short, short skirts, etc.? Kind of two different meanings to me—my morality is, do I have my husband and do I have lovers that I go out and meet?

[Interviewer] So morality has sort of sexual overtones, and morals are principles?

My principles yes, everything. All the way from God to whether or not I tell a little fib! So morals are very inclusive, while morality to me is more sexual."

An opposite differentiation was made by another individual who stated that morality is the way I relate to everything around me—morals—we often think those are sexual standards. But morality has a broader sense. How we relate to everybody.

High Level of Emotionality

For the most part, participants shared their stories with deep emotion. One stated that she "didn't realize that this still hurt so badly." Others shed tears over
hard choices they had made and the consequences these had carried, and others grieved over remembered losses. This seems to point to a complex interaction and the strong links between the cognitive domain of moral decision making and motivational, emotional aspects.

Qualitative Analysis—Research Questions 1-3

Research questions 1-3 were addressed by qualitative analysis of the data.

Definitions of Morality

At the close of each interview, the participant was asked: "What does the term morality mean to you? How would you describe this concept in your own words?" Definitions of morality verbalized by participants were categorized according to what they saw as components of morality, or what they felt was a basis for morality. Eleven categories were derived in this manner and are listed in Table 17. Phrases illustrating the categories are contained in Appendix H. Participants placed a marked emphasis on "principles" as being foundational to their moral perspective.

Not surprisingly, biblical or religious aspects (such as the Golden Rule) were mentioned frequently in the definitions offered by this religious population. Relationships were more important among the integrated and care-oriented, but concerns with hurt also featured in the definitions offered by the justice-oriented. Morality in the narrower sense of sexuality appeared equally as frequently across the three moral orientations.

An interesting two-dimensional structure to morality was described by one respondent as follows:

That is how I do the morality scale. Good vs. bad is on the vertical, and the horizontal would be the options—what I see as right or wrong. What makes something a moral problem for me is, is what could hurt me or hurt my family, hurt others.
Table 17

*Categories Derived from Definitions of Morality*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (with God and others)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner sense</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Commandments</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical basis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Rule</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religious Motivation

Each interview protocol was analyzed for the religious motivation demonstrated by participants in approaching or solving the dilemmas they shared. From the short descriptive phrases of the religious motivation indicated in their responses, or concerns with regard to their moral dilemmas, 19 categories were derived (for frequencies of each of the categories and their relation to an integrated, care or justice orientation, see Table 18). Appendix G contains the categories and illustrative phrases that resulted from this procedure.

The most noticeable difference appearing from this procedure was that, for this sample, compassion and forgiveness were religious motives/themes that were present in the dilemmas shared by those who appear to have an integrated moral orientation. These two themes were not reported by those who exhibited the care or the justice orientations.

Strongly present among the integrated group were motives/themes of viewing the 10 Commandments as principles and not prescriptions (the spirit and not only the letter of the law). Honesty and commitment were also two motivations that were noticeably present among those who demonstrated an integrated moral orientation.

Consistency, authenticity, restitution, accountability, and going the second mile were further motivating considerations important to this group. The basic tenet of the Golden Rule ("Do unto others as you would have them do unto you") was emphasized more by those of integrated and care orientations than those of a justice orientation.
### Table 18

**Categories of Religious Motivation (as Derived From Interviews)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Commandments (spirit/principles)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbath</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Rule</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s law (standards/rules)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s leading</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor parents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion, empathy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship (restitution, accountability)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency, authenticity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second mile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfishness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Contextual Influences

A contextual influence on moral choices cannot be ignored, and is one area that calls for closer scrutiny in further research. The particular relationship one may have with the other party in a conflict situation appears to bear some weight on whether care or justice thinking predominates in resolving a dilemma (Lantsberger, 1993). As one individual observed:

[Maybe] the people element is disproportionately out of balance in my life. [When I have to make a decision], if it is a person that I value, then it's towards relationships. If it is a person—let's say it's OJ Simpson—I want justice! I don't want any confection—I want justice! I don't know him.

[Interviewer] So where there is a relationship, relationships count more?

That's what it comes down to for me . . . and so there I am divided!

Another person found himself

pulled towards a contextual relationship side. I can think of numerous instances where I went against certain written policies that I didn’t see as absolutes—that I felt would—if I went by the letter of the law would have affected people adversely.

[Interviewer] So in applying these "absolutes" so to speak . . . do you feel you lean towards taking them as guidelines?

Yes. It is important to take the relationship into consideration. I see that as the primary thing.

The interview data were categorized according to the contextual elements of time frame and relationship to the party or parties in the dilemma related by each participant. The pattern that emerged is outlined in Table 19. For the most part, individuals related dilemmas that were fairly current, with only a few recalling dilemmas from as long ago as 20 years. While individuals from all three orientations reported work-related dilemmas, those of the integrated and care orientations shared more dilemmas that arose from the context of family or close relationships.
Table 19

Frequencies of Contextual Elements in Dilemmas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Orientation</th>
<th>Integrated ($n = 28$)</th>
<th>Care ($n = 31$)</th>
<th>Justice ($n = 23$)</th>
<th>TOTAL ($n = 82$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>Col% (R%)</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>Col% (R%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/ongoing—2 yrs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57 (35)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—5 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32 (41)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6—10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 (17)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7 (25)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100 (34)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship/situation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/close relationship</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64 (38)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/business situation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36 (29)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100 (34)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100 (38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coding for Ego Maturity Levels

The WUSCTED requires the subject to complete 36 sentence stems. Responses were rated for level of ego development according to the scoring manuals, *Measuring Ego Development*, Vols. 1 & 2 (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970; Loevinger et al., 1970).

Ogive rules were applied to the cumulative frequency distribution of item ratings for a given protocol. These rules take into account the total configuration of the distribution of the final item-level ratings for each subject, and are clearly delineated by the authors of the manual. These rules were used to produce a total protocol rating (TPR) for each subject, reflecting the core ego level. An inter-rater reliability check was completed, as detailed in the manual (Loevinger et al., 1970, preface xi), and a reliability coefficient of .91 was obtained.

The WUSCTED assesses nine levels of ego development: Symbiotic, Impulsive, Self-protective, Conformist, Self-aware, Conscientious, Individualistic, Autonomous, and Integrated (as outlined previously in Table 4, chapter 2, pp. 38, 39).

Of the 82 participants, 65 (79%) were placed about equally at the Self-aware (39%) and Conscientious (40%) levels (see Table 20). A small proportion (3%) of the sample was at the lowest level (Conformist level), and these were from the middle-age adult group. Eleven persons (13%) were scored at the Individualistic level and a small number (5%) at the Autonomous level. Young and middle-age adults are equally represented in the Autonomous level, and 64% of those at the Individualistic level were from the young adult group. None of the participants were at the highest level delineated by Loevinger (the Integrated level), and none in this sample were at any of the three levels below Conformist.
Table 20

Frequencies of Ego Maturity Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ego Maturity Level</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Young Adults</th>
<th>Middle Age Adults</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Col % (Row %)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-protective</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformist</td>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-aware</td>
<td>I-3/4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38 (53)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>I-4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42 (58)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>I-4/5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16 (64)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100 (55)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses and Statistical Analyses

This section presents the data and the statistical analyses performed in order to test the hypotheses generated by the research questions.

Hypothesis 1: The mean scores on the overall religious commitment scale of the three moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. Hypothesis 1 was tested by one-way analysis of variance with the grouping variables as justice, integrated, and care orientation. Table 21 gives the means of the three groups on the total RCS, while Table 22 shows the results of the ANOVA. The hypothesis is rejected. There is a difference among the means. The Student-Newman-Keuls test was used to study the differences among the pairs of means. Table 23 gives these results.

Those who have an integrated moral orientation are significantly more positive in their overall religious commitment than those of a justice orientation. There is, however, no significant difference in overall religious commitment between the care-oriented and the justice-oriented, or between the care-oriented and those who demonstrate an integrated moral orientation.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>81.69565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>88.35714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86.74194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85.87805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 22

**Analysis of Variance Table for Overall Religious Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>597.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>298.77</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7,503.23</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>94.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 23

**Student-Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Comparison on Overall Religious Commitment**

Matrix of Contrasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(\bar{X} \text{ Justice} )</th>
<th>(\bar{X} \text{ Care} )</th>
<th>(\bar{X} \text{ Integrated} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{X} \text{ Justice} )</td>
<td>81.696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{X} \text{ Care} )</td>
<td>86.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{X} \text{ Integrated} )</td>
<td>88.357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\bar{X} = 81.696\)

\(s = \sqrt{\frac{94.978}{26.918}} = 1.878\)

Steps: 2, 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(q)</th>
<th>(s)q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>5.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>6.366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Hypothesis 2: The mean scores for overall religious experience (questions 1-3 on the RCS) of the integrated and non-integrated moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. Hypothesis 2 was tested by the \( t \)-test for means of two independent samples. Table 24 gives the means of the two groups and the results of the \( t \)-test. This hypothesis is rejected, as there is a statistically significant difference between the means of these two groups at the .05 confidence level. Those with an integrated moral orientation demonstrate significantly higher religious experience than those not showing integration.

### Table 24

**Means of Integrated and Non-integrated Groups on Religious Experience**  
*(\( t \)-test for Means of Two Independent Samples)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Group</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.53571</td>
<td>2.032</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-integrated</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.57407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12.90244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 3: The mean scores on the intrinsic/extrinsic motivation scale (questions 4-13 on the RCS) of the integrated and non-integrated moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. Hypothesis 3 was tested by the \( t \)-test for means of two independent samples. Table 25 gives the means of the two groups and the results of the \( t \)-test. This hypothesis is retained. There does not appear to be any significant difference in the intrinsic/extrinsic motivation of these two groups.
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Table 25

Means of Integrated and Non-integrated Groups on the Intrinsic/Extrinsic Motivation Scale (t-test for Means of Two Independent Samples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44.75000</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-integrated</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.96296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43.57317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 4: There is no statistically significant difference in the church-related behaviors (questions 15-17—church attendance, service position, and financial support—on the RCS) of the integrated and non-integrated groups. Hypothesis 4 was tested by separate Chi-square analyses on each of the separate items. In each case the two moral orientation levels were used as one dimension, with church attendance, service position, and financial support as the other. Results obtained are given in Table 26. The Yates Corrected Chi-square is given for church attendance, because the minimum expected value obtained was 2.39. These contingency tables appear in Appendix I. This hypothesis is retained as none of the church-related behaviors were significantly related to moral orientation at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 5: The mean scores for devotional practices (questions 18-21—pray, read Bible, read religious literature, and family worship—on the RCS) of the three moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. Hypothesis 5 was tested by one-way analysis of variance, with the grouping variables as justice, integrated, and care orientation. Table 27 gives the means for devotional practices of the three groups, and Table 28 shows the ANOVA. This hypothesis is rejected, as there is a difference among the means at the .01 confidence level. The Student-Newman-Keuls post hoc comparison was used to study the difference among the pairs of means, and Table 29 gives the
Table 26

*Chi-square Table—Relationship Between Church-related Behaviors and Moral Orientation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church-related behaviors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1797</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold service position</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27

*Means of the Three Orientation Groups on Devotional Practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.56522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.60714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.19355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15.87805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28

*Analysis of Variance Table for Devotional Practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>57.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.80</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>469.17</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29

*Student-Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Comparison on Devotional Practice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix of Contrasts</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$ Justice</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$ Care</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$ Integrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$ Justice</td>
<td>14.565</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.629*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.565</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.194</td>
<td>0.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$ Care</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{n} = 26.918 \]
\[ S_{\bar{z}} = \sqrt{\frac{5.93885}{26.918}} = 0.47 \]

Steps

2 \hspace{1cm} 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$q$</th>
<th>2.82</th>
<th>3.39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S_{xq}$</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td>1.593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
results. Individuals with an integrated orientation and those with a care orientation demonstrate a significantly higher level of devotional practices than those with a justice orientation, but there is no significant difference in devotional practices for those of an integrated orientation and those of a care orientation.

Hypothesis 6: There is no statistically significant relationship between an integrated care/justice moral orientation and level of ego maturity. This hypothesis was tested by Chi-square analysis. Table 30 shows the initial contingency table.

Because so many cells would lead to expected frequencies < 5, ego maturity levels were subsequently pooled into three categories: Self-aware and below, Conscientious, and Individualistic/Autonomous. Two categories were constructed for moral orientation: integrated and non-integrated. Chi-square analysis was conducted with these broader categories to further test for significance between integrated moral orientation and level of ego maturity. Table 31 gives the resulting contingency table. The value of Chi-square for these data is 1.394, with \(2 df\) and \(p = 0.4980\). Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained. For this population, there is no statistically significant relationship between moral orientation and level of ego maturity.

A subjective examination of the data, however, does reveal a pattern of positive relationship between ego maturity and integration. In the Self-aware and below group, only 29% were integrated in their moral orientation. This proportion rose to 47% among those at the Individualistic or above ego maturity level.

Hypothesis 7: There is no statistically significant relationship between age group and integration of moral orientation. This hypothesis was tested by Chi-square analysis (see Table 32). The value of Chi-square for these data is 0.126, with \(2 df\) and \(p = 0.9390\). Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained. For this sample, there is no significant relationship between age and moral orientation.
Table 30

Contingency Table—Ego Maturity and Moral Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Orientation</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-protective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-aware</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(31.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(54.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(28.0)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(34.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The numbers in parentheses are percentages of row totals.
### Table 31

**Contingency Table—Three Levels of Ego Maturity and Moral Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ego Maturity Level</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Non-integrated</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-aware and below</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(29.4)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic and above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(46.7)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(34.1)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The numbers in parentheses are percentages of row totals.
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Table 32

Contingency Table—Age Group and Moral Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Orientation</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults</td>
<td>12 (26.7)</td>
<td>16 (35.6)</td>
<td>17 (37.8)</td>
<td>45 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Adults</td>
<td>11 (29.7)</td>
<td>12 (32.4)</td>
<td>14 (37.8)</td>
<td>37 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23 (28.0)</td>
<td>28 (34.1)</td>
<td>31 (37.8)</td>
<td>82 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The numbers in parentheses are percentages of row totals.
Hypothesis 8: There is no statistically significant relationship between gender and an integrated care/justice moral orientation. This hypothesis was tested by two Chi-square analyses. First, a look was taken at the relationship between males and females who evidenced an integrated moral orientation and those who did not. Table 33 contains the contingency table. The value of Chi-square for these data is 0.196, with 1 df and $p = 0.6581$. This null hypothesis is thus retained. No significant relationship is found between gender and moral orientation.

Further analysis along gender lines, however, does reveal a difference. An examination of gender differences across the three different moral orientations indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected (see Table 34). A difference is observed between gender and level of moral orientation with the value of Chi-square for these data at 7.018, with 2 df and $p = 0.0299$. The difference that emerges here, however, indicates that, apart from those who exhibited an integrated moral orientation, as a group the males were significantly more justice-oriented, and the females more care-oriented.

Hypothesis 9: There is no linear combination of age, gender, religious commitment, and ego maturity which significantly predicts integration of moral orientation. All possible subsets of multiple regression analysis were used to determine the best predictors of an integrated moral orientation, where "best" is interpreted as the minimum value of Mallows CP Index. The summary statistics for each variable used in the regression analysis are given in Table 35, and the resulting correlation matrix is shown in Table 36. The "best" subset consists of only one predictor, namely overall RCS (see Table 37). The correlation is 0.17961 ($r^2 = .03226$), with $F = 2.67$ and $p = 0.1064$. The hypothesis is retained. There is no subset that significantly predicts integration of moral orientation.
### Table 33

**Contingency Table—Gender, Integrated and Non-integrated Moral Orientations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Non-integrated</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10 (31.3)</td>
<td>22 (68.7)</td>
<td>32 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18 (36.0)</td>
<td>32 (64.0)</td>
<td>50 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 28 (34.1) 54 (65.9) 82 (100.0)

*Note.* The numbers in parentheses are percentages of row totals.

### Table 34

**Contingency Table—Gender and Moral Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14 (43.7)</td>
<td>10 (31.3)</td>
<td>8 (25.0)</td>
<td>32 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9 (18.0)</td>
<td>18 (36.0)</td>
<td>23 (46.0)</td>
<td>50 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 23 (28.0) 28 (34.1) 31 (37.8) 82 (100.0)

*Note.* The numbers in parentheses are percentages of row totals.
Table 35

Summary Statistics for Each Multiple Regression Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Coefficient of Variation</th>
<th>Smallest Value</th>
<th>Largest Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.451</td>
<td>0.50068</td>
<td>0.345004</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>2.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>0.49081</td>
<td>0.304895</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>2.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Maturity</td>
<td>3.792</td>
<td>0.88524</td>
<td>0.233407</td>
<td>2.00000</td>
<td>6.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS</td>
<td>85.878</td>
<td>10.00048</td>
<td>0.116450</td>
<td>38.00000</td>
<td>99.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Orientation</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>0.47712</td>
<td>0.355670</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>2.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36

Intercorrelation Matrix of Multiple Regression Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ego Maturity</th>
<th>RCS</th>
<th>Moral Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Maturity</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Orientation</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 37

Statistics for "Best" Subset—All Possible Subsets Multiple Regression Analysis

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mallows' CP</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squared Multiple Correlation</td>
<td>0.03226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Correlation</td>
<td>0.17961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Squared Multiple Correlation</td>
<td>0.02016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Mean Square</td>
<td>0.223053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error of Estimate</td>
<td>0.472285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Statistic</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerator Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominator Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (Tail Probability)</td>
<td>0.1064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Standard Coefficient</th>
<th>T-Stat.</th>
<th>2 Tail Significance</th>
<th>Tolerance to R-sq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.605585</td>
<td>0.453641</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS</td>
<td>0.008569</td>
<td>0.005247</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>1.000000 0.03226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

In a sample of 82 individuals who showed a fairly high level of religious commitment, 28 exhibited an integrated moral orientation, while 23 were justice-oriented and 31 were care-oriented in their resolution of moral dilemmas. Categories of religious motivation were derived from the interview protocols and more specifically from the definitions individuals offered of morality. Individuals using an integrated moral orientation emphasized compassion and forgiveness in the dilemmas they shared. Biblical references were frequent in the definitions of morality, and allusions to morality and sexuality were common to all three orientations. Current or
recent issues were referred to by most participants in the dilemmas shared. Concerns in close relationships were more common than work-related dilemmas for the integrated and care-oriented.

Both young and older adults showed integration, as did males and females in both age groups. Among the non-integrated, males were significantly more justice-oriented and females more care-oriented. Overall religious commitment appears to differentiate the integrated moral orientation from a justice orientation. Religious experience distinguishes the integrated from the non-integrated. Both the integrated group and the care-oriented group show a higher level of devotional practices than do the justice-oriented. No statistically significant relationship was observed between moral orientation and ego maturity. However, a subjective inspection of the data reveals a steady increase in integration with ego maturation. It is possible that this may have reached statistical significance with a larger sample. There was no linear combination of age, gender, religious commitment, and ego maturity predictive of an integrated moral orientation.

These findings are discussed in chapter 5.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter presents a summary of the study, discusses the findings, and draws some conclusions. Recommendations are made arising from these conclusions.

Summary of Study

Included in this summary is a statement of the problem researched, a brief overview of the literature reviewed, the purpose of the study, an outline of the methodology employed, and a concise account of the findings.

Problem

Discussion in the field of moral development was expanded with Gilligan's challenge to Kohlberg's six-stage hierarchy. It has become evident that her concerns, prompted by gender-related issues, are valid. The ethic of care that she identified broadens the concept of moral development.

Much moral development research has arisen from Kohlberg's moral judgment theory and Gilligan's considerations of moral orientation. Little has directly addressed the issue of integration of the "voice of care" and the "voice of justice," despite suggestions that such integration may be indicative of a more mature morality.
The theory tested in this study is that with maturation a more integrated moral orientation will guide moral decision making. This integration, and the impact several factors (age, gender, ego maturity and religious commitment) may have on it, was examined from a developmental perspective. An exploration of these factors, as they relate to the moral orientation employed by individuals in the moral choices they make, may provide useful information to those seeking to facilitate growth and positive development in an important area of human interaction.

**Literature Overview**

Several areas of moral development literature were reviewed to provide the background for this study: moral development theory, research in the areas of moral development and moral orientation, and research that has been directed toward the impact of education and religious factors on moral decision making. The literature in the domain of ego development was also considered.

The theoretical bases for this study stem from the formulations of Lawrence Kohlberg and Carol Gilligan. Their theories are schematically contrasted in Table 1 (p. 10) and individually outlined in Table 2 (p. 18) and Table 3 (p. 20). These two theories illustrate the "ethic of justice" and the "ethic of care" represented in an integrated moral orientation (Armstrong, 1991; Colby & Kohlberg, 1987; Gilligan, 1977, 1982; Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988a, 1988b; Gilligan & Murphy, 1979; Kohlberg, 1976, 1981, 1984; Kohlberg et al., 1983; Lyons, 1983; Murphy & Gilligan, 1980; Rogers, 1988).

Research studies examining Kohlberg's and Gilligan's theories, and also those exploring the notion of two moral orientations, attest to the complexity of the issues involved (Cowden, 1992; Lantsberger, 1993; Lifton, 1985; Pratt et al., 1988; Purkel, 1990; Rogers, 1988; Stiller & Forrest, 1990; Walker, 1984, 1991; Wilson, 1991). Methodological challenges and the development of instrumentation necessary for
studying this complex domain have been addressed by a number of researchers (Brown et al., 1991; Colby & Kohlberg, 1987; Lantsberger, 1993; Liddell, 1990; Liddell et al., 1992; Rest, 1976; Rogers, 1988; Yacker & Weinberg, 1990).

From the dialogue and ensuing research arising from Gilligan's challenge, support has mounted for the two orientations, but much debate has surrounded their gender-relatedness (Baumrind, 1986; Brabeck, 1983; Bussey & Maughan, 1982; Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg et al., 1983; Lifton, 1985; Rest, 1986, 1994; Walker, 1984). This debate has evolved into an awareness that the moral domain for both males and females is usefully enlarged by considering the interdependence of care with justice (Kohlberg et al., 1983). Gilligan (1982) suggested a developmental progression, stating that "men and women . . . come, in the course of becoming adult, to a greater understanding of both points of view, and thus to a greater convergence" (p. 167). Muus (1988) succinctly summed up the debate by concluding that "only by integrating the complementary . . . orientations will we be able to realize our full human potential in moral development" (p. 229), and that "the really moral person must integrate the concept of abstract justice and the concern for particular others" (p. 242).

Because of indications that personal growth, maturation, and development may facilitate a more complex and inclusive morality, research literature on ego development was drawn into this study. Loevinger's conceptualization of ego development (refer to Table 4, pp. 38, 39) and her sentence-completion instrument (WUSCTED) have been widely used in research (Cohn, 1991; Hauser, 1993; Loevinger, 1976, 1984; MacPhail, 1989). By using this instrument with adults in two age groups, it was hoped to trace a developmental pattern towards an integrated moral orientation.
Several research studies suggested that both women (Bussey & Maughan, 1982; Gilligan, 1977, 1982; Reimer, 1983) and individuals from a conservative religious background (Blizard, 1982; Clouse, 1985a, 1985b; Ernsberger & Manaster, 1981; Getz, 1984; McNeel, 1994; Rest, 1986) are less apt to score at the higher stages of Kohlberg’s moral judgment hierarchy. Women tend to remain at Stage 3, where relationships shape moral judgments. Religiously committed individuals appear to have the ability to reason at higher levels of moral development, but seem to consciously choose to make moral decisions based on their belief systems. Such decisions may appear to "regress" from abstract, principled reasoning in order to pay closer attention to care for either the particular other, or persons, implicated in the moral choices.

Richards and Davison (1992) pointed out that Kohlberg’s theory of moral development and existing moral reasoning measures (the DIT in particular) may be biased against the religiously committed. Possibly what appears as a deficit in justice reasoning in these two populations may be a tendency to incorporate considerations of care, or to employ a more integrated care-justice orientation in their moral decision making.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships among moral orientation, ego maturity, and religious commitment. It was proposed that maturation would facilitate an integrated care-justice moral orientation impacting the moral choices made by individuals. This maturation may possibly be demonstrated on an ego development measurement instrument, and also be influenced positively by factors such as age and education. An integrated moral orientation may become more evident in older adults.
Gender and the commitment of the individual to his or her religious belief system were additional variables. It was hypothesized that individuals, regardless of gender, would use aspects of both justice and care in their moral choices. An integration of care and justice thinking might provide one explanation for the observations that religiously committed individuals do not commonly demonstrate higher levels of reasoning on Kohlberg's hierarchy.

Methodology

Design and Sample

A cross-sectional design was employed, with adults from two age cohorts as participants. The influence of education and differences in religious denominational perspectives were controlled for by selecting subjects who had at least some college education, and who had belonged to one religious denomination all of their lives. Subjects were drawn from members of 10 randomly ordered churches in the Lake Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Eighty-two individuals participated in the study. All respondents were of American Caucasian ethnic origin.

Techniques and Instruments

The primary means of collecting data was an audio-taped, individual, semi-structured interview (Brown et al., 1991). Participants were invited to describe and evaluate a situation in which they had been faced with a moral conflict. Each individual also completed a demographic information survey, the Washington University Sentence Completion Test for Ego Development (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970; Loevinger et al., 1970), and a Religious Commitment Survey (Anderson, 1995; Dudley, 1992).
Analysis of Data

Qualitative Analysis

The interviews were transcribed and coded, following the Reading Guide proposed by Brown et al., (1991). Subjects were classified as using a caring, a justice, or an integrated care-justice orientation. The alignment of the self with a particular perspective was a key factor in this classification.

Interview data were qualitatively evaluated for the religious motivation demonstrated by participants in their approach to, or the manner in which they had resolved, the dilemmas they shared. The way each participant defined the term "morality" was examined for common themes. Consideration was also given to the contextual aspects of the dilemmas related.

The Sentence Completion Test and the Religious Commitment Survey were scored according to standardized procedures.

Statistical Analyses

Hypotheses arising from the research questions were tested using Chi-square analysis, the t-test for means of two independent groups, ANOVA, and Multiple Regression Analysis.

Summary of Findings

Profile of Participants

Of the total number (82) who participated, 39% were men and 61% were women; 55% were young adults between the ages of 25 and 35, and 45% were older adults between the ages of 50 and 65. A high level of education was reported. One-third had completed an undergraduate degree, and a further third had gone on to complete a graduate degree. Three-quarters of the participants had been in full-time
employment for at least 5 years, and all had worked at least part-time outside the home. Prominent in the range of occupations reported were those falling within the medical, education, and business fields.

**Moral Orientation Groups**

Those individuals who used aspects of both justice and care throughout the interview, and who articulated and aligned with both in their moral choices, were classified as demonstrating an integrated moral orientation. There were 28 (34%) individuals in this group. Twenty-three individuals (28%) exhibited a justice orientation, and 31 (38%) a care orientation. No age or gender differences were evident in the integrated group. There was, however, a gender difference between the non-integrated groups. Males were more likely to use a justice orientation and females a care orientation in resolving moral conflicts, supporting the gender relatedness of these two aspects.

**Ego Maturity Levels**

Five of Loevinger's nine levels of ego development were identified among the participants. None were at the three lowest levels, and none were at the highest level. The largest number of participants were classified at the Self-aware (39%) and Conscientious (40%) levels, while 13% were at the Individualistic level, and 5% at the Autonomous level. Only 3% of the sample were at the Conformist level, the lowest level for this group. Holt (1980) reported the Self-aware level as the modal level for adults. For this sample, however, the Conscientious level was almost equally represented, which may reflect the relatively higher level of education reported.
Religious Commitment

Religious commitment has been defined and measured in many ways. It is not unidimensional, thus multidimensional measurements are necessary (Benner, 1991; Spilka, Kojetin, & McIntosh, 1985). Aspects measured in the Religious Commitment Survey included religious experience, intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivation, church-related behaviors, and devotional practices. The level of commitment reported by the participants was compared to that demonstrated by individuals in two recent studies (Anderson, 1995; Dudley, 1992) that used the Religious Commitment Survey. Overall, participants in this study appear to be a more religiously committed group than either of the two reference groups. The majority indicate that their faith is important to them, actively participate in their church, engage in a high level of devotional practices, and report positively on their personal religious experience. Level of religious commitment appears to differentiate the integrated group from the justice oriented.

Definitions of Morality

The definitions of morality offered by participants were classified into 11 categories (refer to Table 17, p. 82, and Appendix G). Morality was described by many in terms such as "a set of basic principles," "principles of right and wrong," "principles that would guide and inform what you did." Others referred to an inner sense, saying morality for them was "a basic conviction that guides what you do," "[it's] when I'm doing what conflicts with my inner core," and "you have the values there in your head." Acting with integrity was also the concern of some, expressed in statements such as "I see it also as having to do with integrity," and it "means being someone with integrity."
Biblical aspects, such as the 10 Commandments, God’s law, and the Golden Rule were frequently part of the descriptions given, and direct mention was often made of the Bible as a reference point.

Relationships, with God and with others, were important aspects for the integrated and care-oriented, with the integrated group expressing greater regard for concerns about hurt. This consideration was also mentioned by at least one of the justice-oriented. Strangely enough, the equality issue was a consideration that was overlooked by the justice group in defining morality. Reference to morality in a more limited sense, as having to do with sexuality, was made by individuals of all three moral orientations.

Religious Motivation

From a qualitative analysis of the interview transcripts, 19 categories of religious motivation were derived (see Table 18, p. 84, and Appendix H). These categories were derived from the descriptions given by individuals of their moral conflicts and how they chose to resolve them. For this sample, individuals demonstrating an integrated moral orientation were the only subjects who talked of and demonstrated compassion and forgiveness as they struggled with their moral issues. These two themes were not obvious in the conversations of either the justice or care orientation groups. The integrated group were more likely to refer to the 10 Commandments as principles and emphasize the spirit and not the letter of God’s law, as opposed to seeing the commandments merely as rules. Honesty and commitment were also emphasized more by the integrated group. Thus, it appears that there is a qualitative difference in the religious motivations of those who integrate justice and care in their moral choices. Interestingly, guilt was a theme presented only by the justice-oriented.
Contextual Factors

For the most part, individuals (83%) shared dilemmas that were recent occurrences for them (i.e., conflict situations experienced within the last 5 years; refer to Table 19, p. 86). While individuals from all three orientations related moral conflicts stemming from work-related situations, those of the integrated and care orientations talked more about conflicts in family or close relationships than did the justice-oriented.

Other Aspects Noted in the Interview Data

The tenor of each interview and, most particularly, the orientation with which the individual aligned the self were key in the coding process. Almost without exception, participants were able to articulate both care and justice in their dilemmas. Alignment of the self with, and predominance of, a particular orientation guided the differentiation made between orientations.

One anomaly noted in several interviews was that an individual related and resolved a moral dilemma very much from one orientation, but then clearly articulated the other in defining morality. Two individuals observed that they could trace a transition from one perspective to include the other. At least they now had an acute awareness that their previous position was not comprehensive enough to come to a satisfying resolution of moral conflicts. This transition suggests a developmental process towards integration.

Rather surprisingly, for some it was a real struggle to identify a real-life moral conflict. One might have expected a religious population to have a more keenly attuned awareness of right and wrong. In a few instances, the conflict that individuals shared centered around work concerns or career choices. While not
clearly a moral conflict per se, it was possible, however, to code these according to the justice or care thinking that was articulated and the action taken.

While some individuals were looking at decision making in a broad and general way, others were reflecting on morality in a more confined manner. These individuals stated that moral issues for them had to do with matters of a sexual nature.

According to Lickona (1991, p. 52), "much of our creative moral thinking arises from emotionally laden experience." This statement was borne out in the experience of many of the participants. They shared their stories with deep emotion and feeling. For some the more so because the moral conflict they shared was fresh and, in some instances, ongoing. Hard choices had been made and the complexities of the situations they had dealt with were difficult for them to untangle.

Statistical Hypotheses

Nine hypotheses were developed from the research questions and tested statistically. The following findings resulted:

Hypothesis 1: The mean scores on the overall religious commitment scale of the three moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. Results of ANOVA and the Student-Newman-Keuls post hoc comparison show that those who have an integrated moral orientation are significantly more positive in their overall religious commitment than those of a justice orientation. No statistically significant difference was found between the integrated and care orientations, neither was there a difference between the care and the justice orientations in overall religious commitment.

Hypothesis 2: The mean scores on the religious experience scale (questions 1-3 on the RCS) of the integrated and non-integrated moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. Using the t-test for two independent groups, the integrated group demonstrated a
significantly more positive subjective religious experience \((p = .04)\) than the non-integrated group.

**Hypothesis 3:** The mean scores on the intrinsic/extrinsic motivation scale (questions 4-13 on the RCS) of the integrated and non-integrated moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. The two groups do not differ significantly in intrinsic/extrinsic motivation.

**Hypothesis 4:** There is no statistically significant difference in the church-related behaviors (questions 15-17—church attendance, service position, and financial support—on the RCS) of the integrated and non-integrated groups. In this sample, the two groups do not appear to differ in their church-related behaviors.

**Hypothesis 5:** The mean scores for devotional practices (pray, read Bible, read religious literature, and family worship) on the RCS of the three moral orientation groups do not differ significantly. A higher level of devotional practices was exhibited by both the integrated and the care-oriented than the justice oriented (using ANOVA and the Student-Newman-Keuls test). There was not, however, a statistically significant difference between the integrated and the care-oriented groups.

**Hypothesis 6:** There is no statistically significant relationship between an integrated care/justice moral orientation and level of ego maturity. No statistically significant pattern of increase in integration with increasing ego maturity was observed in this sample.

**Hypothesis 7:** There is no statistically significant relationship between age group and integration of moral orientation. An integrated moral orientation was found in both young adults and middle-age adults. There was no statistically significant relationship between age group and moral orientation, as tested by Chi-square.

**Hypothesis 8:** There is no statistically significant relationship between gender and an integrated care/justice moral orientation. No significant difference was noted between
males and females with respect to integration. While integration of moral orientation
does not appear to be gender-related, the gender-relatedness of a justice and a care
orientation was corroborated in this sample \( (p = .03) \). The results of this study
confirm that, aside from those demonstrating the ability to integrate the two
perspectives in their moral choices, males predominantly align with, and morally
reason by, the orientation of justice. Females align with, and morally reason by, the
moral orientation of care.

_Hypothesis 9: There is no linear combination of age, gender, religious commitment,
and ego maturity which significantly predicts integration of moral orientation._ For this
sample, no linear combination of the variables age, gender, religious commitment, and
ego maturity significantly predicts an integrated moral orientation.

_Discussion_

_Differences in Definitions of Morality_

There is little consensus among theorists about the definition of the term
morality. "Theorists agree that morality involves judgments of right and wrong.
Beyond that, there is broad disagreement" (Lifton, 1985, p. 308). From the definitions
of the term morality given by participants in this study, for the most part, a
principled, relational picture emerges, framed as "how we apply principles in our
relationship with Him [God] and with others." Overall, it appears that the language
used by this sample in defining morality was similar, with differences in the emphasis
placed on different aspects. In their definitions of morality, the care and integrated
groups seem more alike, and this may be part of what contributes to the similarities
between them demonstrated in the statistical analysis.

While it was not surprising to find frequent references to biblical concepts in
the definitions offered by a religious population, it was interesting that some
individuals had a very vague sense of the term. In comparing the three orientations in their emphasis on principles, it is the care-oriented who presented this as a major concern. An inner sense and integrity appear to be the factors that are of more consequence to the integrated group. Possibly this represents an internalization of principles on the part of the integrated group.

In the definitions offered, aspects of equality were mentioned only twice—and surprisingly, not by the justice-oriented as might have been expected from the emphasis placed on equality and reciprocity by Kohlberg’s justice model.

For some, the term morality brought to mind at first the opposite of the term—immorality. This constricted view, narrowing the issues down to sexual proscriptions, was common to a small number in each moral orientation. Perhaps the common use of the word moral influenced the definitions presented.

Key Qualitative Differences in Religious Motivation of Integrated Orientation

In considering the religious motivation of the three groups, what stands out is the signal presence of compassion and forgiveness as themes in the dilemmas related by the integrated group. The fact that these individuals were the only ones in this sample to demonstrate compassion and forgiveness in their moral dilemmas suggests that empathy and role-taking ability may be key aspects that facilitate integration, or a move towards moral maturity. This finding may be one that has practical implications—seeking ways of facilitating these characteristics in interpersonal interactions may be a positive means of encouraging moral growth. It is, however, not possible to predict causality, for it may also be that an integrated moral orientation leads an individual to reflect on moral dilemmas with compassion and to more readily extend forgiveness.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Lantsberger (1993) successfully demonstrated that contextual cues bear some weight on moral choices. This has also been suggested by the ongoing discussion in the research literature relating to hypothetical vs. real-life dilemmas. Questions have been raised about whether certain situations/relationships "pull" for one or the other orientation. This has been one criticism of the Kohlbergian hypothetical dilemmas, with the suggestion that they present a pull for justice thinking.

Recency, location, and intensity of the dilemma are contextual cues that have also been discussed in the literature. The real-life dilemmas shared by the participants in this study were largely from their current or recent experiences. While individuals from all three orientations equally related moral conflicts in work situations or concerning business-related issues, the integrated and care groups’ leanings were to choose dilemmas that involved a close or family relationship. As was demonstrated in the interview experience, and by the emotion with which some shared their stories, the dilemma some individuals chose to share was something that struck a deep, resonating chord within them.

Possibly these intense feelings impacted the level of care and/or integration demonstrated by individuals in this study. Pratt et al., (1988) suggested that the type of real-life dilemma content recalled by the subjects for discussion influenced the sex differences found in their sample. Other studies, however, in which both hypothetical and real-life dilemmas have been used have shown consistency in orientation employed by the subject (Barry, 1991; Frankel, 1993; Millikin, 1993). Consistency in moral orientation is an aspect that bears further research consideration.
Age or Gender Differences

A positive outcome of this study is the finding that an integrated moral orientation—suggested to be a "mature" moral orientation—for this sample was not predominantly the domain of one age group or gender. Approximately one-third of the young adults (36%) as well as the middle-age adult group (32%) showed integration in their moral orientation, as did males (31%) and females (36%). Thus age and gender, for this sample, do not appear to be significant variables impacting integration in adulthood. The question remains, however, What facilitated this integration? And, if an integrated moral orientation is, indeed, a more mature one, how can its development be encouraged?

While a major thrust of the study was an attempt to trace an age-related developmental progression in integration, the fact that this was similarly present in both age groups indicates that a more rigorous and/or wider search may be necessary to define the molding factors. Hagar (1991) suggested that a blended (integrated) orientation was related, in her study, to perceptions of more loving than rejecting parental behaviors in childhood. Thus parenting and early socialization may well set the tone, or be foundational to a pathway that leads ultimately to integration and maturity. The fact that integration was similarly present in both younger and older adults in this study does hint that factors encouraging this maturity may stem from much earlier influences. This resonates with one of the conclusions reached by Peck and Havighurst (1960) in their classic longitudinal study. They suggested that character is largely developed before age 10.

The reason that no difference was found between the age groups could, however, also possibly be attributed to cohort factors. Again, generational variations in socialization practices may camouflage the results. Ideally, maturational differences
would best surface in a longitudinal study. It is also possible that a difference might have been more evident if there had been a wider disparity in age between the two groups—perhaps comparing a group of adolescents to older adults.

Formal education appears to play a substantial role in moral development, with years of formal education one of the strongest and most consistent correlates (Burwell, 1992; Clouse, 1991; Friend, 1992; Hatton, 1988; Loevinger et al., 1985; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Rest, 1986; Wallskog, 1992). Colby et al., (1983) pointed out that the effects of education cannot be explained as simple reflections of IQ or socioeconomic status, because correlation between education and moral judgment was still significant with both of these factors partialed out. Individuals participating in this study demonstrated a fairly high level of education.

Wallskog (1992, p. 106) stated that "rather than attributing changes in moral orientation solely to maturational and/or biological processes, one must remember that experiences in the work setting may result in moral conflicts which can precipitate changes in moral development." Her study suggested that women who work outside the home have significantly higher levels of overall moral development than do women who do not work outside the home, possibly as a result of increased opportunities to make decisions and take on different roles. The two groups participating in this study reported a work history that would appear to have controlled for this bias.

Higher status careers are often characterized by increased autonomy and more opportunities for participation in decision making and conflict resolution, resulting in moral growth (Wallskog, 1992). The people-oriented and professional careers reported by most of the participants would indicate fair exposure to these growth-producing factors.
The young adult group demonstrated a fairly high level of education (78% had completed a 4-year college degree and/or graduate school), were all living independently, and just over two-thirds (69%) had worked for at least 5 years. These factors in themselves may have exerted a maturational effect that reduced differences between the younger and the older adults. On the other hand, the theories of Erikson & Erikson (1981), Levinson (1986), Loevinger (1976, 1987), Vaillant (1977), and others, outline developmental changes across the lifespan that suggest maturational differences between these two age cohorts.

It is interesting that the gender-relatedness issue, which gave fuel to the early debate over moral orientation, appears to disappear with the ability to use both justice and care considerations in an integrated manner. Fechnay's (1993) observation that gender differences fade at higher stages of development due to a person's understanding and valuing of these perspectives as complementary is borne out in this study by the lack of gender differences in the integrated group. This suggests that the ability to incorporate the other perspective allows for more adequate and inclusive solutions to moral problems. It also suggests that this expansion is satisfying to both men and women.

Ego Development Levels and Moral Orientation

Although no statistically significant difference was demonstrated for integration of moral orientation with increasing ego maturity, the impact of ego maturity on integration cannot be entirely ruled out. Possibly, with a larger sample this relationship might have held up. While only 29% of individuals at the ego developmental levels of Self-aware and below showed integration, this number rises to 33% of those at the Conscientious level, and 47% at the Individualistic level and above. While not statistically significant with this sample, the increasing progression
does lend intuitive support to the maturational effect of ego development illustrated by other studies (Fechnay, 1993; Rogers, 1988) and advanced by Gilligan (1982).

The overall educational level of this sample is fairly high—40% report at least an undergraduate degree, and a further one-third have completed graduate studies. Loevinger (1985) reported that while the modal ego level for the adult population is at the Self-aware level, a college education tends to raise this to the next stage. This progression is exhibited in the results obtained in this sample, which reflects a bi-modal distribution, Self-aware (39%) and Conscientious (40%).

No expected age/education effect is reported in the literature specifically for the next two ego levels (Individualistic and Autonomous). Only 1% of the population is, however, expected to fall within the highest ego level (Integrated) described by Loevinger. She also stated that "people in almost any setting will come from a narrow range of ego levels" (1994, p. 6). This may afford some explanation as to why, for this sample, there were no individuals in the Integrated level, and the preponderance of individuals were recorded at the Self-Aware and Conscientious levels.

With the high level of education and professional work experience reported by this sample, however, it almost seems as though the higher ego levels should have been better represented. However, 17% of this sample were at the two levels higher than the Conscientious level.

"Conformist" is the name designated for the ego stage that Loevinger describes as that reached by adolescents. Despite the evidence put forward by several researchers (Helson & Roberts, 1994; Loevinger et al., 1985; Snodgrass, 1993), it is not clear how much change (development) in ego level occurs after adolescence. Helson and Roberts (1994) noted that a failure to increase might stem from a tendency to
settle into a niche and to rather assimilate new input into old schema. These researchers also noted that a "press for conformity in [some] adult communities can lead to regression" (p. 912). This raises the question—Does commitment to religious faith perhaps have a 'conforming' influence that may appear to impede ego maturity?

Positive Effect of Religious Commitment

Observations regarding the integrating and directive function of religion (Dirks, 1988; Dudley & Cruise, 1990; Hoffman, 1971; Ryan & Lickona, 1987) were, however, confirmed in this study. Aspects of religious commitment that include a secure, personal religious experience, and consistent, meaningful devotional practices appear to be positively related to the use of an integrated orientation in resolving moral dilemmas. The positive outcome obtained for these factors in this study contradicts Getz's (1984) conclusions concerning the negative "stifling" effects of religious ideology on moral reasoning. Kohlberg's (1976, 1981) assertions of the irrelevance of religious factors are also questioned—for a religiously committed group, these factors appear to be significantly related to the moral maturity characterized by Gilligan's (1982) model.

Overall religious commitment demonstrated significant differences between the integrated and justice orientations, but not the integrated and care orientation. A closer examination of the component subscales of the RCS gives some insight into the origin of these differences. The three orientation groups were fairly similar in behavioral aspects of religious commitment—reporting frequent church attendance, high level of involvement in service positions in their churches, and liberal financial support. In similar fashion, the sample indicated moderate to high levels of intrinsic motivation. The differences among the groups emerge in the subjective, experiential aspects—such as feelings of connection with God, joy and peace, a born-again
experience, and in their personal devotional practices. These are the aspects of religious commitment that appear to differentiate the groups. The fact that these factors appear relevant to an integrated moral orientation falls in line with Larson and Larson's (1991) observation that

when studied with measures designed to assess the depth of a person's faith, such as frequency of worship service attendance, of prayer and scripture reading, or of questions raised about one's relationship with God, religious commitment is associated with clinical benefits. (p. 43)

Further, in two reviews of quantitative studies in the literature (Craigie, Larson Lui, 1990; Larson & Larson, 1991), when measuring religious commitment factors of participation in religious ceremony, social support, prayer and relationship with God, from 89 to 92% of the subjects showed benefit. In this study, "the forgotten factor" of religious commitment (Larson & Larson, 1994) differentiates the integrated from the non-integrated group.

Lack of Variation in Sample

This study attempted to control for factors that have been shown to impact moral development and moral reasoning, in order to more directly address the notion of moral orientation. Among these factors are education, religious values or affiliation, and exposure to the demands of work responsibility outside the home. Hence a sample was sought who had at least some college education, were lifetime members of a particular religious denomination, and who had been employed at some time outside the home. Cultural influences were also incidentally minimized by the participants being of the same nationality and ethnic group. The effect of eliminating "nuisance" variation thus resulted in a fairly homogenous sample. From this rather similar group then, it is significant that the key factors impacting on an integrated moral orientation appear to be certain aspects of religious commitment.
Conclusions

This study investigated eight research questions in the quest to trace factors that might positively impact an integrated moral orientation. The following answers are suggested by the results that were obtained for these research questions:

Research Question 1. How do individuals describe morality? For the most part, a principled, relational description was commonly expressed. Importance was placed on an outside or higher source for these moral principles, with frequent references made to the Bible or the 10 Commandments. The similar perceptions articulated by the integrated and care-oriented may be partly what contributes to the similarities between them. Diffuse or constricted definitions on the part of some individuals indicate possibilities for fruitful discussion in religious education.

Research Question 2. Are there differences in religious motivation among the moral orientation groups? A qualitative difference was demonstrated in this study. Showing compassion and extending forgiveness are either two motivations that facilitate integration, or are religious motivators that are dominant in the repertoires of those who indicate an integrated moral orientation. Thus empathy and role-taking ability, which have been demonstrated to have a positive impact on moral development, may be key factors in development of an integrated, mature moral orientation.

Research Question 3. Do contextual factors appear to influence the choice of dilemma shared by the individual? It does appear as though an integrated or care orientation might lead one to chose to relate a dilemma that reflects a conflict in a close relationship. Consistency of moral orientation across situations, intensity of relationships, real-life vs. hypothetical dilemmas, and other contextual factors bear further investigation.
Research Question 4. Is level of religious commitment related to integration of moral orientation? For this sample, overall religious commitment appeared to be a significant factor related to integration. It can also be specifically concluded that (for individuals similar in their intrinsic motivation and church-related behaviors) positive subjective religious experience and devotional practices impact integration of moral orientation in moral conflict resolution.

Research Question 5. Is an integrated moral orientation related to level of ego maturity? Statistical analysis of the data of this study produced a negative answer to this question. However, a pattern that emerges qualitatively indicates that the possibility of such a relationship cannot be conclusively ruled out. Further investigation in this area might clarify this point.

Research Question 6. Is an integration of moral orientation present in both young adults and middle-age adults? Both age groups in this study demonstrated integration. It can thus be concluded that integration does not increase significantly over the lifespan beyond young adulthood. The question is raised, therefore, as to when in fact does integration take place? The "mature" moral orientation may be one that is quite possibly in place at an earlier age. This bears further investigation.

Research Question 7. Is an integration of moral orientation gender related? The gender-relatedness of the care and the justice orientations were corroborated by this study. It was concluded, however, that there are no such gender differences among those employing an integrated moral orientation. This broader moral orientation appears to be equally satisfying to both men and women.

Research Question 8. Does any combination of age, gender, religious commitment, and ego maturity predict integration of moral orientation? Integration of moral orientation was not significantly or meaningfully predicted by any combination of these factors.
This underscores the complexity of research in the moral development arena. However, a qualitative difference among moral orientations and a positive relationship between religious commitment and an integrated moral orientation were identified in this religious sample.

In conclusion, it would seem that the major contribution of this research has been to highlight the impact of a personal religious commitment on moral maturity. Further, it appears that the foundation for this development occurs before early adulthood. All other things being equal (i.e., when education, work experience, religious background, cultural experience, church-related behaviors are considered), a positive religious experience and meaningful devotional practices may significantly contribute towards implementation of the injunction of Mic 6:8, "to act justly and to love mercy." These are factors that appear to positively impact an integration of the ethic of justice and the ethic of care, and moral maturity.

**Implications for Religious Education**

Implications for religious education that arise from this study are:

1. Encouraging an attitude of compassion and forgiveness appears to be an important task for moral educators.

2. Because conflict resolution begins with a clear definition of the problem, positive efforts may profitably be directed towards helping individuals clarify the concept of morality in their thinking. If a clearer understanding of what is "moral" were fostered, moral thinking, moral reasoning, and moral action might be positively impacted.
Recommendations for Further Research

The following are offered as recommendations for further study:

1. Because of indications that integration may be occurring prior to adulthood, further research could explore the presence of integration of the two moral orientations in a younger age group.

2. A study of parental attachment, parenting style, and integration may yield useful information about the foundational aspects of moral maturity.

3. It would be interesting to conduct a longitudinal study to explore aspects of both Kohlberg's and Gilligan's stage theories, in an attempt to trace at which stage of each model an individual functioned when integration in moral orientation became evident. A developmental process is suggested by the transition evidenced in two subjects in the present study.

4. As has been indicated by others in the field, more work is needed on instrumentation to improve or further refine research in moral development.

5. Examining integration in a more diverse population may yield useful information.

6. A larger group of subjects and a truly randomized sample would enhance the results obtained.

7. Case studies of "moral exemplars," possibly of their early/later writings/views, to investigate possible developmental patterns leading to integration could provide a rich source of information.

8. A study exploring consistency of moral orientation across dilemmas could expand knowledge in this area. Such a study could usefully take into account location, intensity of relationship, and recency of the conflict—comparing hypothetical dilemmas and real-life dilemmas.
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APPENDIX A

LETTERS
Dear Friend,

HOW DO YOU RESOLVE MORAL CONFLICTS? Your opinion is very important and I NEED YOUR HELP!

My name is Penny Webster and I am conducting doctoral research in the Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology at Andrews University, studying the different ways in which people resolve problems and conflict situations. While research has been done in this area before, little has been done with adults from a religious background. I would like to include in my study young adult (25-35 years of age) and older adult (those 50-65 years of age) Seventh-day Adventists. It’s not often that members of both these generations get to speak out in the context of objective research. Won’t you please take the opportunity to contribute valuable information to add to the understanding of how people think about and resolve dilemmas? The findings of this study will be useful to parents, teachers, and counselors in encouraging growth and integration in this important area.

If you choose to take part in this study, you will be asked to complete two short questionnaires and an interview. The whole process will take no more than 1½ hours of your time, at a time convenient to you. Your name will not appear on any of your responses, and everything you share will be kept in the strictest of confidence. I have designed the interview and questionnaires to be straightforward and inoffensive. However, if at any time you are uncomfortable with the questions being asked, you would be free to choose not to answer individual questions. You are also free to withdraw from the study at any time, if you so choose.

I hope you will find it possible to help me with this project. Remember, this is your chance to speak as a representative of your generation and religious group! The first step is to complete and return the form overleaf, so that I can call you and set up a suitable time for us to meet.

Thank you for your help!

With much appreciation,

Penny Webster, M.A.

P.S. Why not complete the form and mail it now while it is on your mind? This important study cannot be done without your help! Many thanks.
Name: _________________________________ Telephone Number: __________
Address: ____________________________
_______________________________
City ___________________________ Zip ______

___ I am willing to participate in a study of the different ways in which people resolve problems and conflict situations.

___ I am a lifetime Seventh-day Adventist (I am an SDA and I grew up in a home with at least one parent an SDA)

___ No, I do not wish to participate
March 15, 1995

Dear Pastor:

This letter is to introduce Penny Webster, a doctoral student in our department, who is conducting a research project which has real potential to help all of us understand how our church members make moral choices in their everyday lives. This project has been approved by our department and Andrews University. Mrs. Webster is an experienced teacher in Adventist higher education and brings a great deal of personal expertise and maturity to this project.

If you have any questions about the material that she will present to you or about the project in general, please feel free to call me at 616-471-3308. Thank you so much for your cooperation. Without it, the research simply could not take place.

Sincerely,

Donna J. Habenicht, Ed.D.
Professor and Chairperson
Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology

/dw
October 4, 1995

Professor Lyn Mikel-Brown
Department of Education and Human Development
Colby College
Waterville, ME 04901

Dear Professor Brown:

I have just left a message on your voice mail, and thought that it might be best to follow up my request with a letter.

I am working on my doctoral research, completing a Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology at Andrews University, Michigan. The focus of my study is on moral orientation, ego maturity and religious commitment, drawing a young adult and a mature adult group into my sample. I would like to use "A guide to reading narratives of conflict and choice for self and moral voice" as the tool for analyzing my interview data, and am wondering if further work has been done on your 1988 Monograph?

I would very much like to purchase a copy of the Monograph—the copy I now have belongs to my dissertation chairperson, who attended a training workshop on the use of the reading guide some time ago. If further work has been done on the guide, I would like to obtain the 'latest' edition, please.

One further point, I note on the cover of the monograph the stipulation "Please do not quote or reproduce without permission." To whom should I direct a request for such permission, to quote from and refer to the text of the monograph in my dissertation?

Thank you so much for your help with this.

Yours sincerely,

Penny Webster
Doctoral Candidate

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Dear Penny Webster,

Thanks for writing and sending your email address; makes life a lot easier.

Re: the Reading Guide. No, there has been no up-dated monograph--the 1988 version is all that's out there, except for a few articles. Carol Gilligan and I did write about our more recent understandings of the method in our book *Meeting at the Crossroads* (Brown & Gilligan, Ballantine, 1993, see chapter 2).

As the editor, you have my permission to use the Guide for your research.

Good luck.

Lyn Mikel Brown.
APPENDIX B

STATEMENT OF CONSENT
CONSENT STATEMENT

I am willing to participate in a study of the different ways in which people resolve problems and conflict situations entitled: "Moral orientation, ego maturity and religious commitment: An exploratory study from a developmental perspective". I understand the purpose of the study, as outlined in the letter requesting my participation.

As a participant in this study, I also understand that if at any time I feel uncomfortable with any questions being asked, I am free to choose not to answer individual questions or may discontinue my entire participation.

I understand that my responses will be kept confidential and that my name will not either directly or indirectly be connected to any of the answers or information I provide. I understand that the interview will be audio-taped only for the purposes of detailed analysis of my contribution, but that my name will not be linked to the tape, and that my identity in this study will not be disclosed in any way.

I understand that I may contact Dr. Donna Habenicht, Chairperson, Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology, Andrews University, (Telephone: (616) 471-3308), if I have additional questions or concerns regarding this research study.

Thus, I am giving my free and informed consent as a voluntary participant in this study. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature of Participant __________________________ Date __________

Witness __________________________ Date __________
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DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SURVEY (DIS)
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SURVEY

Please could you share a little information about yourself. This information will in no way be linked with your name, and is coded for research purposes only. Confidentiality is ensured.

A. Age Group

1. ___ 25 to 35 years old
2. ___ 50 to 65 years old

B. Gender

1. ___ Male
2. ___ Female

C. Highest level of education completed

1. ___ Highschool (Grade)
2. ___ Some College
3. ___ Undergraduate degree
4. ___ Graduate degree (Masters)
5. ___ Graduate degree (Doctoral)

D. I am a lifetime Seventh-day Adventist
   (I am an SDA, and I grew up in a home with at least one parent an SDA)

1. ___ Yes
2. ___ No

E. Major designation of type of work

1. ___ Business
2. ___ Clerical
3. ___ Managerial/Administrative
4. ___ Medical
5. ___ Teaching/Education
6. ___ Ministry/Seminary
7. ___ Other, please specify: __________

F. I have lived in the United States for more than half of my life

1. ___ Yes
2. ___ No

G. Ethnic origin

1. ___ Afr/American
2. ___ Caucasian
3. ___ Hispanic

H. Professional work outside the home

1. ___ Part-time employment
2. ___ Full-time employment, less than five years
3. ___ Full-time career
APPENDIX D

SEMI-STRUCTURED CLINICAL INTERVIEW (SCI) AND CODING SHEET
SEMI-STRUCTURED CLINICAL INTERVIEW

Real-life Conflict and Choice Interview

All people have had the experience of being in a situation where they had to make a decision, but weren't sure what they should do. Would you describe a situation when you faced a moral conflict and you had to try and work out what would be the right or a good thing to do, but weren't sure at first what you should do?

What was the situation? (Full elaboration of the story).
What was the conflict for you in that situation?
Why was it a conflict?
In thinking about what to do, what did you consider? Why?
Anything else you considered?
What did you decide to do? What happened?
Do you think it was the right thing to do? Why/why not?
What was at stake for you in this dilemma?
What was at stake for others?
In general, what was at stake?
How did you feel about it?
How did you feel about the other(s) involved?
When you think back over the conflict you have described, do you think you learned anything from it?
Do you consider the situation you described a moral problem?
Why/Why not?
What does morality mean to you? What makes something a moral problem for you?

(Interviewer may ask the narrator additional clarifying or activating questions about his/her construction of the dilemma, resolution of the problem, and evaluation of his/her action).
SUMMARY CODING SHEET

I. The two moral orientations and how they are represented: (check two)

1. Is the justice orientation articulated? Yes ___ No ___
2. Is the care orientation articulated? Yes ___ No ___

II. The relationship between the two moral orientations: (circle one)
(0 = Not present; 1 = Present; 2 = Weak; 3 = Moderate; 4 = Strong)

1. Justice emphasis 0 1 2 3 4
2. Care emphasis 0 1 2 3 4

III. Narrative Self:

1. Does the narrative self express an "alignment" in the conflict? (Come down on one side of his/her own values—or reject the values of another side?)
   Yes ___ No ___

2. What terms/orientation does the narrator use to frame this "alignment" in the conflict?
   Justice ___ Care ___ Both ___

MAJOR THEMES:

Key images/Metaphors/Repeated phrases?

General moral language?

Relationships?

RELIGIOUS MOTIVATION:
APPENDIX E

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST FOR EGO DEVELOPMENT (WUSCTED)
WU Sentence Completion Test
of Ego Development

(WUSCTED--Form 11/68)

Please would you fill out this sentence completion form.

On the following 2 pages are 36 incomplete sentences.

Please finish each sentence in any way you wish.

THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.

Notice that there are two pages—PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE COMPLETED EACH SENTENCE.
1. Raising a family

2. A girl has a right to

3. When they avoided me

4. If my mother

5. Being with other people

6. The thing I like about myself is

7. My mother and I

8. What gets me into trouble is

9. Education

10. When people are helpless

11. Women are lucky because

12. My father

13. A pregnant woman

14. When my mother spanked me, I

15. A wife should

16. I feel sorry

17. Rules are
18. When I get mad

19. When a child will not join in group activities

20. Men are lucky because

21. When they talked about sex, I

22. At times she worried about

23. I am

24. A woman feels good when

25. The main problem is

26. My husband and I will

27. The worst thing about being a woman

28. A good mother

29. Sometimes she wished that

30. When I am with a man

31. When she thought of her mother, she

32. If I can’t get what I want

33. Usually she felt that sex

34. For a woman a career is

35. My conscience bothers me if

36. A woman should always
SENTENCE COMPLETION FOR MEN (WUSCTED Test--Form 11/68)

1. Raising a family
2. When a child will not join group activities
3. When they avoided me
4. A man's job
5. Being with other people
6. The thing I liked about myself is
7. If my mother
8. Crime and delinquency could be halted if
9. When I am with a woman
10. Education
11. When people are helpless
12. Women are lucky because
13. What gets me into trouble is
14. A good father
15. A man feels good when
16. A wife should
17. I feel sorry
18. A man should always
19. Rules are
20. When they talked about sex, I
21. Men are lucky because
22. My father and I
23. When his wife asked him to help with the housework
24. Usually he felt that sex
25. At times he worried about
26. If I can’t get what I want
27. My main problem is
28. When I am criticized
29. Sometimes he wished that
30. A husband has a right to
31. When he thought of his mother, he
32. The worst thing about being a man
33. If I had more money
34. I just can’t stand people who
35. My conscience bothers me if
36. He felt proud that he
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RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT SURVEY (RCS)
RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT SURVEY

Please respond to the following statements, as they apply to you TODAY.

For items 1-13, circle the letter/s to the right of the statement to give your response. Circling SA would indicate that you strongly agree, A that you somewhat agree, N that you are neutral, D that you somewhat disagree, and SD that you strongly disagree with the statement.

1. I frequently feel very close to God in prayer, during public worship, or at important moments in my daily life.
   SA A N D SD

2. I often experience the joy and peace which comes from knowing my sins have been forgiven.
   SA A N D SD

3. I am certain that I have had a conversion or born-again experience.
   SA A N D SD

4. My faith involves all of my life.
   SA A N D SD

5. One should seek God's guidance when making every important decision.
   SA A N D SD

6. In my life I experience the presence of the Divine.
   SA A N D SD

7. Although I am a religious person, I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.
   SA A N D SD

8. My faith sometimes restricts my action.
   SA A N D SD

9. Nothing is as important to me as serving God as best I know how.
   SA A N D SD

10. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.
    SA A N D SD

11. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.
    SA A N D SD

12. It doesn't matter so much what I believe as long as I lead a moral life.
    SA A N D SD

13. Although I believe in my religion, I feel that there are many more important things in my life.
    SA A N D SD
For statements 14-18, please circle the numbered item that most nearly matches your position on each one.

14. All in all, how important would you say your faith is to you? 
   1. Fairly unimportant 
   2. Not too important 
   3. Fairly important 
   4. Quite important 
   5. Extremely important

15. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church: 
   1. Rarely/never 
   2. Once every month or two 
   3. Two or three times a month 
   4. Normally once a week

16. Do you hold an office or other service position in your local church? 
   1. No 
   2. Yes

17. Last year, approximately what percent of your gross income was contributed to the church or other religious causes? 
   1. Less than 5% 
   2. 5% to 9% 
   3. 10% to 14% 
   4. 15% to 19% 
   5. 20% or more

18. How often do you: 
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>seldom or never</th>
<th>daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pray privately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read the Bible</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read religious literature</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in family worship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Anderson, 1995; Dudley, 1992)
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DESCRIPTIVE PHRASES—DEFINING MORALITY

1. Principles
A system made of up the principles where by you make decisions in your life. Kind of a general principle, encompassing a whole lot of things . . . your whole value system.

[It's] something that is beyond cultural barriers . . . something that determines the rights and wrongs . . . a reality check . . . but I wouldn't say a code of ethics. That can change with time.

Having a basic conviction, not just opinions that you want to live your life by and then working from there on how to live. Principles that would guide and inform what you did.

A set of basic principles, with the foundation being God's word
Morality is being true to what you know is right, and not compromising your principles to get a short term gain.
I think basically to me, principles . . . I think morality is like . . . like a philosophical thing. A philosophical basis from which you operate . . . honesty, integrity, principles of right and wrong

2. Relationships (with God and others)
I also think there is a subjective element . . . the letter of the law cannot possibly cover every exigency of life . . . there are the individuals involved.

[It's] a whole system that interrelates
[What happens] in our relationship with Him and in our relationships with others

[It] means doing the right thing . . . doing what God wants you to . . behaving myself in such a way towards men and women that I can lie down to sleep at night and say 'Lord, thank you for this day!

[It] is the way I relate to others around me
How we apply principles in our relationship with Him and with others

Definitely involved here are people relationships

3. Inner sense
. . . when what I'm doing conflicts with my inner core
It has a personal element there . . I must be comfortable
It is very personal . . .
It would be there regardless of the time frame or place
A basic conviction that guides what you do

You make your decisions based on the best values you know . . you have the values there in your head

Some people feel like there is an innate "Oh, well, this is wrong," there probably is a kernel or that . . . but I think it grows
Kind of goes along with my conscience, my code of ethics and the like
4. **10 Commandments**
Following the 10 Commandments and all that entails!
It all goes back to the 10 Commandments
Something like the 10 Commandments . . . the bigger picture, a good strong basis for morality
Keeping the 10 Commandments . . . being honest, upright
Ultimately I would turn back to the 10 Commandments as a guide for morality
It’s the rightness of an action in regard to God’s laws . . . the 10 Commandments . . . but in a larger sense also, I would consider it the law of love
It’s following the 10 Commandments and what God has outlined as what is right and what’s not

5. **Biblical basis**
Of course, I feel very strongly about biblical principles too. I think that morality should be based on something higher than just ourselves
Anything that goes against the Bible, there’s no question . . maybe for someone else, like a Buddhist, what goes against their Higher Power, what they believe in
My sense of morality is derived from the Bible, and so that is much easier
What is moral is what is written in the Bible
[It] is doing what the bible says, what Christ taught us to do . . . and living it, not just knowing about it . . . it’s an everyday thing
[It] means to me to base your life on Christ
What is defined in the Bible. What is good and right
Decisions or actions that can give glory to God

6. **Integrity**
[It] means being someone with integrity
I see it also as having to do with integrity
Seeing the best good and the values that you have, and actually living them out in your life
As far as character is concerned . . . what you will and what you won’t do

7. **Golden Rule**
[It means] to do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Love your neighbor as yourself . . even if you think they have wronged us
An aspect of the law of loving your neighbors and loving God
It is really treating others like we would like to be treated and treating God like we would like Him to treat us
I believe it’s the Golden Rule

8. **Sexuality**
There’s morality as far as married life is concerned . . . there is morality in as far as honesty in relationships is concerned
The first thing that comes to mind [is the opposite] . . . immorality
The way I relate to others around me, we think those are sexual standards
Being true to my husband . . . I feel like that is a moral situation
9. **Rules**
To me, it is just a set of rules that keeps us from hurting one another in the human race
All the do's and don'ts
A moral code. The code of behavior from which you act
Kind of the laws by which right and wrong work

10. **Hurt**
What I see as right or wrong, or what could hurt me or hurt my family
Not injuring another person . . . those types of things
Something that's right, that is not going to harm, that's good for you . . . values that you have learned

11. **Equality**
Treating others fairly . . . means you will do what you say you would
Equality for everyone under every circumstance comes to mind
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1. Ten commandments (spirit/principles)
   - Something bigger than just ourselves . . . the bigger picture
   - Seen as law of love . . . love towards neighbor and God
   - Principles are involved here . . . this has to be corrected
   - Appeal to higher principles . . . need to weigh each one
   - In spirit and letter . . . treating God like we would like Him to treat us
   - Spirit not letter . . . priorities . . . people come first . . . need to help someone
   - "I will write the law on your hearts" . . . an internalizing, contextualizing of those principles
   - Principles, but people must be taken into account
   - Living like Jesus said . . . following the spirit and not the letter only of His law
   - Not just rules, but a whole system that interrelates . . . have to decide what gets priority
   - A set of basic principles . . . foundation being God’s word
   - Sees break as disconnection from God
   - God’s teachings and Bible principles . . . your conscience tells you when you’re going against that

2. Honesty
   - Really wanted her to know
   - Am I loyal? Putting first things first?
   - When you treat people honestly . . . brings dividends
   - Felt a kind of responsibility for . . . [being honest here]
   - Concerns over dishonesty of colleague, and honest way to confront issues
   - Tension over confidentiality, and need to speak out honestly
   - Wish I could be more upfront . . . honesty is so important here
   - Painful to me to have someone willing to believe I am being dishonest
   - A problem is talking with others rather than the one you have the problem with
   - Being trustworthy . . . honest and upright . . . being loyal
   - Don’t want to be seen as a liar and a cheat
   - It still hurts me to think of it . . . I felt like I was lying all the time
   - Being true to yourself and what you believe . . . being honest
   - Try to be as fair as I can . . . the honest thing to do
   - Honesty in business dealings and with employees very important
   - Honesty . . . I have to live with myself . . . got to be proud of my work, comfortable with that
3. Sabbath

Keeping the Sabbath was more important to me
Observance—to be something that will glorify God
It’s important to have the right attitude towards keeping Sabbath
To keep it holy, that’s an issue here
Observance important in job consideration
Want to share Sabbath as a witness
I didn’t want to rock the boat, or be conspicuous . . . made me wonder what I do put my values on
Didn’t feel comfortable for someone to conduct business on their behalf on Sabbath
Not only about not working . . . need to keep it in spirit also
I felt the Sabbath was terribly important to me
I said, "No, I can’t do that on Sabbath"

4. Golden Rule

Love your neighbor as yourself
Important how you treat the other person too
Didn’t feel comfortable doing that to others, kind of "Golden Rule" thing
Treating others as I would like to be treated
Good faith . . goes back to wanting to be treated the way I treat other people
Allowing someone to pursue something they want . . the give and take
Deep respect for rights of others
I believe in the Golden Rule in the Bible
Wouldn’t do it myself . . wouldn’t do it to anyone else
Accept them the way they are, or learn to deal with it
How I would like to be dealt with . . you know, the Golden Rule and all that

5. Commitment

Commitment to promises made
Commitment to marriage . . . couldn’t just walk away
Commitment to marriage . . . kept trying to meet him half-way
Commitment to marriage . . . didn’t believe in divorce
Even though it hurt a lot, I would have saved it if I could have
This was a commitment I’d made . . . I wasn’t going to just walk away
Don’t like turning back on my promises
Commitment to responsibilities and to caring for children
Commitment to marriage, parenting, to God’s law, to “doing what’s right”

6. God’s law (standards/rules)

Need to uphold your standards
I could feel my values were clearly discarded
Anything that goes against the Bible, there’s no question
A basic standard for deciding . . . also other laws of life
It’s wrong because you’re hurting yourself in the long run
God has outlined what is right and what is not
What’s written in the Bible . . . the 10 Commandments and all that
Kind of going against my standards . . . didn’t think that was appropriate
7. God’s leading
I became convinced that this was what the Lord wanted me to do
Peace . . . evident that I’d gotten back on track with the Lord
Following the Spirit’s leading
God guided in the whole process, even though the outcome was different
I looked to see how God had led me . . . and it gave me peace

8. Forgiveness
Forgave the injustice of situation
There’s no anger . . . I’ve forgiven him
I wanted to give [ ] a chance . . . she was sorry
Forgiveness of others’ wrong towards her
This is something hanging between us . . . this forgiveness issue
How would Jesus treat this person? What would God do here?

9. Honor parents
Believe very much in having parents’ counsel . . . God speaks through them
Taking their views, needs, into consideration . . . respectfully
Heeded their caution, took their counsel
I loved and respected my parents . . . it would have hurt them terribly
Want to take care of [ ] in the best way possible
At stake is, whether or not you are willing to obey your parents or not

10. Compassion, empathy
I wanted to end all this hatred . . . concern for feelings of all parties
Acted out of deep concern for other person
Want to do the kind, thoughtful thing . . . no hurt to others
Would never want to hurt her feelings, or have her feel I rejected her in any way
They cry, laugh, hurt . . . their hearts beat . . . just like everybody else
I saw people treat her upfront kind . . . but behind her back atrociously

11. Prayer
Prayer about issue of concern
Lots of pressure . . . prayed a lot
Asked God to guide me, give me wisdom on this
Everything I have had as a problem . . . I turn over to the Lord . . . pray

12. Service
Felt so good . . . I’d helped somebody . . . with the right attitude
Chose career because of service opportunities
I felt I was doing [ ] a service . . . shows you really want to help them
I wanted to serve in a position like that . . . meet people’s needs . . . our service is to go to the whole world

13. Stewardship (restitution, accountability)
Responsibility to use time and talents to glory of God
Held accountable for way treated others
I never really had a problem with the money issue . . . I felt responsible
14. Trust
We always talked to the Lord about it... it is too easy to make a wrong decision.
I learned to let the Lord take that away from me too.
The question is, do you trust God enough to want to hang out with Him?

15. Consistency, authenticity
I'm really doing this for selfish purposes... it doesn't fit... causing chaos.
It was a moral issue... was this the real me? It became a spiritual decision.
... God, or not God.
Beliefs and actions need to match.

16. Second Mile
Willing to give the benefit of the doubt in hurting situation.
Tolerated difficult work situation, willing to do everything possible to ameliorate.
Treating someone fairly and with care, beyond the call of duty.

17. Witness
Get closer to them, maybe could witness to them... want to give the right message.
Choice would place her where she would have opportunity to witness for God.

18. Guilt
It just built a wall between me and God.
[I feel so] guilty when I can’t keep my word... need to be careful about making a commitment.

19. Selfishness
Realized I should have paid closer attention to her than worrying about myself so.
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CHI-SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLES
### Table 38

**Church Attendance, Integrated and Non-integrated Moral Orientations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Orientation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Non-integrated</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (57.1)</td>
<td>3 (42.9)</td>
<td>7 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (32.0)</td>
<td>51 (68.0)</td>
<td>75 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>54 (65.9)</td>
<td>28 (34.1)</td>
<td>82 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 39

**Service Position, Integrated and Non-integrated Moral Orientations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Orientation</th>
<th>Hold Position</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Non-integrated</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8 (32.0)</td>
<td>17 (68.0)</td>
<td>25 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20 (35.1)</td>
<td>37 (64.9)</td>
<td>57 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 (34.1)</td>
<td>54 (65.9)</td>
<td>82 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 40

Financial Support, Integrated and Non-integrated Moral Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Orientation</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Non-integrated</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 9% of income</td>
<td>5 (35.7)</td>
<td>9 (64.3)</td>
<td>14 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-14% of income</td>
<td>14 (38.9)</td>
<td>22 (61.1)</td>
<td>36 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 15%</td>
<td>9 (28.1)</td>
<td>23 (71.9)</td>
<td>32 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28 (34.1)</td>
<td>54 (65.9)</td>
<td>82 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RAW DATA AND CODING SHEETS
## RAW DATA

### CODING SHEET

**Rows** = Individual response  
**Columns** = Data (1-7 Demographic; 8-28 RCS; 29-35 Interview C/J; 36 Ego Development)

### Variable Names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Var name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Protocol number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1 = 25-35; 2 = 50-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1 = male; 2 = female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>Level of Ed 1=HS; 2=Some Coll; 3=Ugrad; 4=Masters; 5=Doct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Occ</td>
<td>Occupation 1=Bus; 2=Clerical; 3=Man/Admin; 4=Medical; 5=Education; 6=Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Career 1=part time; 2=fulltime (&lt;5yrs); 3=fulltime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Religious Exp Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Var name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>clsgd</td>
<td>Close to God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>joy</td>
<td>Joy and peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>born</td>
<td>Born again</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intrinsic/Extrinsic Motivation Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Var name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>faith</td>
<td>Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>guid</td>
<td>God's guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>divpres</td>
<td>Presence of Divine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>relcon</td>
<td>Religious considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>restrict</td>
<td>Faith restricts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ser</td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>act</td>
<td>Faith in action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>belimp</td>
<td>Beliefs important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>morlife</td>
<td>Moral life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>relimp</td>
<td>Religion important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Church-related Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Var name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>faimp</td>
<td>Importance of faith to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>chatt</td>
<td>Church attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>servpos</td>
<td>Service position in church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>finsup</td>
<td>Financial support (contribution)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Devotional Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Var name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>praypriv</td>
<td>Pray privately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>readbib</td>
<td>Read Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>readrel</td>
<td>Read religious literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>famwor</td>
<td>Family worship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Articulated Justice
Care

Emphasis/Justice 0=abs; 1=pre; 2=weak; 3=mod; 4=strong
Care
(Independent of PREVIOUS TWO) 1 < Justice; 2 = ; 3 >

Alignment: Justice=10; Care=01
(Therefore Integration=11)

Ego Maturity 1 Self-protect Delta
2 Conformist 1-3
3 Self-aware 1 3/4
4 Conscientious 1-4
5 Individualistic 1 4/5
6 Autonomous 1-5
| 0112452 | 4333342444511 | 44233113 | 11 | 321 | 10 | 5 |
| 0222453 | 4355555445554 | 51435432 | 11 | 321 | 10 | 3 |
| 0312453 | 4455245544544 | 54235343 | 11 | 123 | 01 | 4 |
| 0411363 | 4355455555453 | 54235543 | 11 | 133 | 01 | 4 |
| 0512322 | 3244544444444 | 44125245 | 01 | 033 | 01 | 3 |
| 0611453 | 3444435244424 | 44132345 | 11 | 123 | 01 | 3 |
| 0712361 | 5545555555255 | 54215533 | 11 | 321 | 10 | 4 |
| 0811372 | 4455455544555 | 54145442 | 10 | 101 | 10 | 3 |
| 0921473 | 4355454455453 | 54215343 | 11 | 321 | 10 | 4 |
| 1022221 | 5555554255555 | 54255555 | 11 | 233 | 11 | 3 |
| 1122233 | 5444544445545 | 54245535 | 11 | 243 | 11 | 3 |
| 1222243 | 5555555555542 | 54235444 | 11 | 321 | 10 | 4 |
| 1322232 | 4555554555444 | 44244454 | 11 | 133 | 01 | 3 |
| 1421543 | 4443434444444 | 44235343 | 11 | 211 | 10 | 4 |
| 1512232 | 4555554555444 | 44144453 | 11 | 133 | 01 | 3 |
| 1612342 | 4434544444444 | 44134553 | 11 | 311 | 10 | 4 |
| 1711372 | 4434555145544 | 44135344 | 11 | 321 | 11 | 4 |
| 1812273 | 5555555515555 | 54135335 | 11 | 323 | 01 | 3 |
| 1912322 | 4555545255555 | 51435433 | 11 | 322 | 11 | 4 |
| 2011543 | 5555555555555 | 54214442 | 10 | 101 | 10 | 3 |
| 2112342 | 5555545454545 | 54155445 | 11 | 123 | 01 | 3 |
| 2222233 | 4455545555555 | 54255545 | 11 | 133 | 01 | 3 |
| 2321273 | 4445543444444 | 44244454 | 11 | 133 | 01 | 3 |
| 2412352 | 5555555555555 | 54245545 | 11 | 322 | 11 | 3 |
| 2522213 | 5434454344445 | 54244444 | 11 | 133 | 01 | 3 |
| 2611273 | 4434344444444 | 34215243 | 11 | 343 | 11 | 4 |
| 2712273 | 4444454255544 | 54215545 | 11 | 233 | 01 | 3 |
| 2821133 | 4444343344444 | 34112232 | 11 | 311 | 10 | 2 |
| 2922223 | 5555555455555 | 54235555 | 11 | 311 | 10 | 3 |
| 3012243 | 3444434444444 | 43135444 | 01 | 023 | 01 | 6 |
| 3112343 | 4555545555555 | 54245456 | 11 | 311 | 10 | 3 |
| 3222411 | 5554555455555 | 54245545 | 11 | 323 | 01 | 4 |
| 3322242 | 5455545525555 | 54254343 | 11 | 133 | 01 | 4 |
| 3421543 | 5555545434545 | 54245435 | 11 | 332 | 11 | 3 |
| 3512351 | 5445555555555 | 54245554 | 11 | 133 | 11 | 3 |
| 3612243 | 4445543444444 | 33225344 | 11 | 233 | 11 | 4 |
| 3712243 | 4555551555555 | 54255445 | 11 | 343 | 11 | 3 |
| 3811413 | 4344445434444 | 34234434 | 11 | 332 | 11 | 3 |
| 3922341 | 43454454455222 | 44235444 | 11 | 233 | 01 | 3 |
| 4021443 | 3444434444444 | 44235333 | 11 | 321 | 10 | 3 |
| 4112453 | 3344444444444 | 44143234 | 11 | 321 | 10 | 5 |
| 4222253 | 5445545254555 | 54155455 | 11 | 133 | 01 | 4 |
| 4312343 | 5555555555555 | 54135354 | 11 | 133 | 01 | 4 |
| 4411313 | 5455455545555 | 54245553 | 11 | 311 | 10 | 4 |
| 4511363 | 4554544444444 | 54234532 | 11 | 141 | 10 | 4 |
| 4612223 | 4445343444322 | 44224332 | 11 | 133 | 01 | 3 |
| 4711273 | 4444434443444 | 44245431 | 11 | 411 | 10 | 4 |
| 4812353 | 5455555555555 | 54235653 | 11 | 332 | 11 | 4 |
| 4912313 | 455554454534 | 53125333 | 11 | 343 | 11 | 3 |
| 5022453 | 5555555255455 | 53115331 | 11 | 243 | 11 | 3 |
| 5122473 | 5555555555555 | 54255443 | 11 | 133 | 01 | 4 |
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