

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Included in this chapter are the descriptions for the definition of values in general, the meaning of moral values and moral development and factors which influence them. Approaches to values education and a summary of related studies on values education are also described.

#### Definition of values

There is virtually no agreement among various authors about the term 'values' but the Oxford dictionary defines it as 'things we hold to be right or just and to which we have emotional commitments'.

The term values has always been confused with such terms as ideals, beliefs and attitudes. According to McKinney (1980), values differ from ideals in that ideals do not always imply a choice. The culture in which a person grows up may hold certain ideals, but the ideals can only become values when they are being used as a personal way of making choices. These choices are usually personally held to be correct and appropriate for the individual. It is with this personal aspect of ideals which McKinney defines as values.

McKinney also regards values as a particular kind of belief which has to do with the appropriateness or acceptability of behaviour. Unlike attitudes, which he regards as more specific, values are more global and may underlie a whole set of attitudes. In other words, a value underlies a whole set of more specific attitudes.

Bohm (1981), defines values as a set of priorities which give order to our lives. The priorities involve not only intellectual contexts, but also physical, emotional and social ones.

Rokeach (1973) defines values as a person's beliefs concerning desirable modes of conduct or desirable end-states of existence. He refers to the former as instrumental values and the latter as terminal values. Instrumental values are further categorized into moral values and competence values. Moral values refer to modes of behaviour that have an interpersonal focus. This means that a person should behave according to some standard rules set by society and a violation of these moral rules will make the person feel guilty. Competence values have a personal rather than interpersonal focus. The violation of these values lead to feelings of shame about personal inadequacy rather than to feelings of guilt about wrongdoing.

Two kinds of terminal values have been identified : personal and social values. Terminal values may be self-centred or society-centred, intrapersonal or interpersonal

in focus. Rokeach anticipates that people may vary reliably from one another in the priorities they place on such personal and social values. Their attitudes and behaviour will differ depending on whether their personal or social values are given priority. An increase in one social value will lead to increases in other social values and decreases in personal values, and vice versa.

Fraenkel (1977) states that the values of people are reflected in what they say and do, but one is never sure whether a statement or action reflects a particular value. The presence of a value can only be inferred based on the frequency and consistency between statements made and actions taken that have been observed over time. This implies that whatever moral actions that we take must be based on some cognitive and affective aspects.

Rokeach (1973) points out that values have three components to it : cognitive, affective and behavioural components. When we say that a person has values, it means that cognitively he or she knows the correct way to behave or the correct end-state to strive for. A value is affective in that a person can feel emotional about something. Hence, he or she will support or oppose some form of behaviour. The behavioural component of a value is the behaviour that is shown once a person has acquired some kind of value.

Thomas (1989, 61) defines values as "opinions which are not publicly verifiable but held as a matter of personal conviction". According to him, values vary in both direction and strength. The term 'direction' refers to whether a person judges something as being good or bad. 'Strength' refers to the degree of the person's judgment, for example, an undesirable happening can be judged as being slightly bad or very bad.

Another definition of values was expressed by Katz (1981, 131). He defines it as "expressions of our preferences, that is, preferences that stem from past experiences and help to guide us to and through new experiences". According to him, different people have different values due to varied experiences ; but nonetheless, values serve as guides to people's conduct.

### Moral Values and Moral Development

There are many kinds of values, and moral values is one of them (Thomas, 1989). Other values include aesthetic values, economic values, religious values, social values, political values, cultural values, scientific values and so forth (Katz, 1981). Most philosophers have assigned different meanings to the term moral values.

Piaget's study on moral values and development, for example, was based on the conviction that all morality depends on a standard system of rules that have been

identified by a particular society (Thomas, 1986).

Kohlberg (1975), on the other hand, contends that the realm of morality concerns issues of justice. Kohlberg suggests that an individual's moral values are founded on different conceptions of justice, with the highest level based on principles of universal equal rights and on the overriding value of human life. The cultural relativist approach suggested by Maccoby (Thomas, 1989) described moral values as beliefs shared in a social group about what is good or right.

Let us now look at factors that influence moral values and development. Although it is agreed by most theorists that both genetic and environmental forces effect moral development, they differ markedly about which aspects of the environment have the most profound effect or how such environmental factors combine with a person's genetic characteristics to produce the observed development (Thomas, 1986).

Kohlberg proposed four principal factors that interact to determine how high in his six-stage moral reasoning hierarchy an individual will progress. The first factor, a genetic component, is the individual's level of logical reasoning as identified in Piaget's cognitive- developmental stages. The second factor, which has both genetic and environmental elements, is the person's desire or motivation. The remaining two factors are entirely

environmental, that is, the individual's opportunities to learn social rules and the form of justice in the social institutions with which he or she is familiar. (Thomas, 1986).

Over the decades, the environmental variables most frequently studied as likely influences on moral development have been factors such as a person's family condition, socio-economic status, ethnic background, religion, peers, and access to mass communication media (Thomas, 1986). For example, the famous Hartshorne and May's study on children's cheating in 1928 concluded that one form of deceit or another is definitely associated with factors such as socio-economic handicaps and cultural limitations.

Environmental influences can be divided into two kinds (Thomas, 1986), namely, (i) child-rearing habits and (ii) situational. The first kind leaves a lasting impression on the individual's personality that influences his or her perception of all future moral incidents. The second kind refers to the nature of the environment during a specific encounter that influences the person's action on that particular occasion, for example, likelihood of detection.

### Approaches to Values Education

In the following sections, a brief review of major approaches to values /moral education and a summary of selected research on values education as perceived by

various groups of people will be described. Three major approaches to values education that have been widely accepted and used in schools are the indoctrinative or character education approach, values clarification approach and the cognitive moral developmental approach (Kohlberg, 1975 ; Wynne, 1985).

### The Indoctrinative Approach

Most adults tend to think of children as minor reflections of themselves. Accordingly, a common view held is that children acquire moral values either by observing adults or by being instructed in moral virtues at the hands of adults. The codes and standards of adult society is being replicated in the behaviour of the developing child. It is believed that the more a child is instructed in moral virtues, the better his or her moral behaviour will be, in the sense that his or her behaviour should increasingly conform to the norms of adult society.

In the indoctrinative approach, teachers preached and imposed rules and values as well as their culture on the child. When this indoctrinative approach was developed in a systematic manner, it was termed 'character education' (Kohlberg, 1975). The programme emphasized techniques that could be used in inculcating values to the students, for example, discipline in school clubs and other extra-curricular activities, rigorous pupil discipline codes,

daily flag salutes and frequent assemblies (Wynne, 1985). Malaysian schools at present also practice this kind of approach.

Moral values are preached or taught using the 'bag of virtues' approach as labelled by Kohlberg. This approach assumes that a child gradually collects discrete moral virtues and accumulates them for future use (Damon, 1980). According to Kohlberg (1975), the detailed definitions used for these virtues or universal values are relative. They are defined by the opinions of the teacher and the conventional culture. Their justification rests on the authority of the teacher.

This approach was deemed morally unjustifiable to apply because of the application of pressures on the students (Wynne, 1985). In Malaysia, although this approach has been used since the time of our forefathers, until today, we cannot really say we have achieved total success. According to Wynne (1985), character cannot be cultivated by a single approach because good conduct appears to be relatively situation specific. This means that good character is not a unified trait. Therefore, there is a need for other approaches to be considered.

The philosophy of John Dewey in the 1930's introduced new ideas which were later to revolutionize the world of values education. It is on the foundation of Dewey's works



that the works of the proponents of values clarification and the cognitive moral development were built.

### Values Clarification Approach

The values clarification approach became very appealing to teachers as the indoctrinative approach gained unpopularity in America. The term 'values clarification' was first coined by Louis Rath during the 1950's. His approach was based on the two most prominent works of Dewey, that is, the 'Moral Principles in Education' in 1909 and 'Theory of Valuation' in 1939. In the values clarification approach, the child's own judgment or opinion about conflicting moral issues or situations was elicited rather than imposing the teacher's opinion on him/her. However, values clarification does not attempt to go further than eliciting awareness of moral values. It is assumed that to become more self-aware of one's values is an end in itself. This is because of the belief held by value clarifiers in ethical relativity (Kohlberg, 1975).

According to Rath et. al. (1966), humans can arrive at values by an intelligent process of choosing, prizing and behaving. In other words, if a person were to develop values, he or she must do so out of personal choices. These choices must include alternatives - one that is prized by the chooser as having meaning to him or her and freely available for selection.

In studies using the values clarification approach, the treatment used is designed to help students obtain values that will provide clear guidelines for their behaviour. It consists of a wide variety of exercises that help students determine what they value. It is recommended that the exercises be carried out in a nonjudgmental, supportive and accepting classroom environment (Lockwood, 1978).

Casteel and Stahl (1975) define one method to values clarification that involved desired patterns of student verbal statements. These statements are used to infer whether the students understand the moral situations presented to them and are able to clarify their values, that is, being actively involved in the process of valuing. Four phases of values clarification have been identified by Casteel and Stahl. They are :

1. Comprehension phase that stresses student's understanding of the situation or resource serving as the focus of the valuing episode.
2. Relational phase that stresses the integration of values clarification episodes with the content of the subject matter being studied in the ongoing classroom lesson.
3. Valuation phase that stresses personal reactions of students to the learning resource and/or the situation presented in the resource. Students express their preferences for and against certain ideas and

decisions, give their criteria for value choices made and may even express their emotional reactions in the form of personal feelings.

4. Reflective phase that is designed to enable students to examine the consistency with which they valued and assigned value ratings to their choices. An exploration of the above three phases will help them reflect upon and reconsider their decisions.

Above all, values clarification is based on the principle that there is no single correct answer in the consideration of values. Children are to discuss moral issues in such a way as to reveal different values among themselves. The teacher needs to stress that people's values differ and one value is no more adequate than others.

Kohlberg (1975) states that if this programme is systematically followed, students will become relativists in the sense of believing that there is no 'right' moral answer. For instance, a student caught cheating might argue that he did nothing wrong because his own hierarchy of values differ from that of the teacher and made it right for him to cheat.

In other words, values clarification does not go beyond self awareness of one's own values and tends to lead to a belief in ethical relativity. The students come to believe that the ways they themselves define a situation, select

values and make value choices within a situation are sufficient to make and justify a value position. Therefore, they think that their personal criteria and values are as good as anyone else's (Stahl, 1979). In fact, of the criticisms made against values clarification, none is made more frequently or more loudly than the charge against its relativism. However, this approach still commands a lot of attention from educationists and researchers.

### Cognitive Moral Developmental Approach

The cognitive moral developmental approach developed by Kohlberg stresses many of the same procedures and methodologies advocated by value clarifiers. However, this approach goes beyond merely making students aware of their own value positions. Its aim is to stimulate the movement towards higher stages of moral reasoning (Stahl, 1979). Kohlberg has contended that values education should not be concerned with developing the way a person analyzes, interpretes and makes decisions about social problems (Rest, 1974). Kohlberg argued that justice is the essential factor in human social life and that human knowledge about social relations and social institutions is organized primarily around conceptions of justice (Damon, 1980).

This cognitive moral developmental approach was introduced for the first time by John Dewey. The approach is called 'cognitive' because the proponents recognized that

values education, like intellectual education, has its basis in stimulating the active thinking of the child about moral issues and decisions. It is called 'developmental' because according to this approach, the aims of values education is movement through moral stages (Kohlberg, 1975).

Dewey postulated three levels of moral development, that is, (i) the preconventional stage where behaviour is motivated by biological and social impulses, (ii) the conventional level in which the individual accepts the standards of his or her group with little critical reflection, and (iii) the autonomous level in which the individual thinks and judges for himself or herself and does not accept the standard of his or her group without reflecting upon it first.

Building upon Dewey's studies on cognitive stages, Jean Piaget made the first effort to define stages of moral reasoning in children. Piaget defined three stages of moral reasoning, that is, (i) the premoral stage, where the individual has no sense of obligation to rules (ii) the heteronomous stage, where the individual obeys rules and equates obligation to rules with submission to power and punishment, and (iii) the autonomous stage, where the individual considers the purpose and consequences of following rules. Rules are usually followed based on reciprocity and exchange.

Kohlberg redefined both Dewey's levels and Piaget's stages which resulted in his three levels of moral development, that is, (i) the preconventional level, (ii) the conventional level, and (iii) the post conventional, autonomous or principled level. Each level contains two stages (Refer to Table 1 in Chapter 1). According to Kohlberg (1975), in the preconventional level, the individual is responsive to cultural rules and labels of good and bad, right or wrong, but interpretes these labels either in terms of the physical or the hedonistic consequences of action (punishment, reward, exchange of favours) or in terms of the physical power of those who enunciate the rules. Stage One shows that avoidance of punishment and the obeying of rules are valued in their own right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order. The second stage shows that elements of fairness, of reciprocity, and of equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in a physical, pragmatic way. Reciprocity is a matter of "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours", not of loyalty, gratitude or justice.

In the conventional level, maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, group or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences. The attitude is not only one of conformity but also loyalty. Stage Three shows that good behaviour is that which pleases or helps others and is

approved by them. Behaviour is frequently judged by intention and one earns approval by being 'nice'. In Stage Four, there is an orientation towards authority, fixed rules, and maintenance of social order. Right behaviour consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority and maintaining the given social order for its own sake.

In the postconventional level, there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles that have validity and application apart from authority of the groups holding these principles. Stage Five shows that right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights and standards which have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society. Apart from what is constitutionally and democratically agreed upon, the right is a matter of personal values and opinions. In Stage Six, conscience plays a part in decision-making based upon ethical principles. These ethical principles are universal principles of justice, of the reciprocity and equality of human rights, and of respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons.

According to Kohlberg's stages, moral reasoning develops in a process that is sequential and invariant. A person must experience one stage before moving on to another, and under all conditions, movement is always forward. A person may revert back to the preceding stages under extreme trauma. Kohlberg states that an individual

progresses from one stage to another through active involvement with moral dilemmas. Kohlberg's moral dilemma is an activity which describes a problem solving situation concerning two or more moral issues or positions. It often involves a situation or story in which a central figure or character is forced to make a decision or has just made a decision. These situations are moral because they confront the rightness or wrongness of various alternatives, actions or judgments (Stahl, 1979).

The moral reasoning used to make a judgment on the moral dilemma posed depends on a person's logical reasoning. In other words, advanced moral reasoning depends upon advanced logical reasoning (Kohlberg, 1975). Piaget has found that after a child learns to speak, he or she goes through three major stages of cognitive reasoning, that is, the intuitive, the concrete operational and the formal operational stages. A person's logical stage puts a limit to the moral stage he or she can attain. For example, a person whose logical stage is only concrete operational is limited to the preconventional moral stages (Kohlberg, 1975). Even though logical development is necessary for moral development and sets a limit to it, most individuals are higher in logical stage than their moral stage. For instance, over 50% of late adolescents and adults are capable of full formal reasoning, but only 10% of them display the principled moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1975).



Having clarified the nature of Kohlberg's stages of moral judgment or moral reasoning, let us consider the relation of moral judgment to moral action or behaviour. Kohlberg argues that moral judgments are a necessary precondition for but not a guarantee of mature moral actions.

The question that needs to be answered is whether a person who reasons at a higher level of moral judgment will in fact behave in accordance with that reasoning. In attempting to answer that question, it is important to compare the individual's behaviour to his or her judgments of right and wrong about a certain situation. How that person will behave in reality will depend upon the situation and how one's rights and duties in that situation are defined. Moral reasoning, according to Kohlberg, influences moral behaviour by providing the individual with concrete definitions of those rights and duties in the behavioural situation (Rothman, 1980).

The cognitive moral developmental approach has focussed on an examination of moral behaviour within the context of the individual's moral judgments. Emphasis is given to the ways in which an individual defines the behavioural situation and his or her choice in that situation. In other words, particular behavioural choices are examined in terms of the mental processes which they reflect. Mental processes refer to the patterns of thinking an individual employs

when confronted with moral events and decisions (Thomas, 1986). For example, let us consider cheating behaviour. Rather than examining cheating as a behaviour in itself, the mental processes underlying the behavioural decision to cheat or not to cheat would be explored and related to the behavioural choices. It may be that a person avoids cheating so as not to get caught, whereas another person may not cheat so as not to break a bond of mutual trust. If there was no surveillance, presumably only the latter would not cheat. Situational influences interact with the mental processes, and the development of moral reasoning would be reflected in behaviour (Rothman, 1980).

Research conducted on stages of moral reasoning and behavioural choices has come to the general conclusion that there is a relationship between an individual's stage of moral reasoning in response to hypothetical moral dilemmas and his or her behavioural choices (Rothman, 1980). For example, studies of sixth graders and college students have shown that those at Stages Five and Six are less likely to cheat than those at the conventional stages. Thus, maturity of moral reasoning corresponds to maturity of moral behaviour in this situation (Rothman, 1980). Even though the findings show a positive relation between stages of moral reasoning and behavioural choices, the relationship is not as clear-cut as it would seem from such studies as cheating. This is because in other situations, behavioural

choices do not reflect stage of moral reasoning so directly. It is not a one-to-one relationship ; it is complex and ambiguous. The complexity in the relationship may be attributed partly to the relationship between meanings assigned to the situation and choices taken by the individual (Rothman, 1980).

### Summary of Related Studies

In this section, various studies that have been conducted using Kohlberg's moral dilemmas in the classroom are examined. These researchers investigated the effects of moral dilemma discussions on variables such as levels of honesty, moral reasoning, social-emotional development, attitudes, affective behaviour, and also looked at indirect effects on academic achievement.

Research using the values clarification and other methods in inculcating values in the classroom are also discussed. Findings of studies on sex differences with regards to moral values is also described.

### Research studies on the moral dilemmas approach

The initial pilot projects using Kohlberg's moral dilemmas in educational programmes were conducted by Blatt (1975). His works were the first step towards building a moral education programme based on the cognitive-

developmental perspective (Rest, 1974). Blatt's curriculum consisted a number of dilemmas and probing questions to initiate discussions. He conducted classroom discussions of conflict-laden hypothetical moral dilemmas with four classes of junior high and high school students for a semester. In each of these classes, students were found to be at three stages. In the course of the discussions among the students, the teacher first supported and clarified those arguments that were one stage above the lowest stage among the children. For example, the teacher supported Stage Three rather than Stage Two. When it seemed that these arguments were understood by the students, the teacher then challenged that stage, using new situations, and clarified the arguments one stage above the previous one, that is, Stage Four rather than Stage Three.

The teacher encouraged class members to take a stand on what ought to be done and to explain why. This is done to encourage confrontation and mutual probing by the class members of each other's reasoning or ideas. Personality clashes are avoided. Students were also encouraged to listen and pay attention to each discussant's points, evaluate the adequacy of the arguments, ask probing questions, and reflect upon and summarize group deliberations.

Blatt assessed the pre-post gains of his students using Kohlberg's instrument and reported that, in general, the experimental group gained more than did the controls. The

results were maintained one year later. In addition, he reported that there was some kind of pattern shown in the gains from the initial pretest stage ; that is, Stage Two subjects tend to move to Stage Three, Stage Three subjects to Stage Four and so on.

To ensure teacher effectiveness, firstly, teachers need to be familiar with stage characteristics so that they are better prepared to understand the intent and meaning of the utterances of students. Secondly, the teacher needs to respond to children with a verbalization that is one step above the level of the child (Rest, 1974).

Studies carried out over the past ten years or so on moral dilemmas have revealed mixed findings. For example, Stahl (1979), conducted a study to determine the impact of values decision making activities on the content-retention and attitudes of high school social studies students. The students were given a content-retention test that consisted two sub-sections, that is, sixteen completion or recall items and sixteen multiple choice or recognition items. The Stahl-Multidimensional Inventory of Values and Attitudes (SMIVA) was developed to gauge the student's attitudes. The findings revealed that eleventh grade American History students from a wide range of socio-economic and ethnic background who interacted with the moral dilemmas did retain more content as well as develop more positive attitudes than those who did not encounter the activities. Hunt (1981) did

a similar study to investigate the effects of the moral dilemma activities on academic performance and attitudes of students in junior high social studies classes. The observed mean scores tested at .05 level of significance showed a significant difference between the experimental and the control groups for the scores on the SMIVA. However, statistically significant differences were not found on the achievement test.

Johnson (1981) and Robinson (1982) used the moral dilemma discussions combined with role play on sixth and seventh graders respectively. The findings indicate that discussion of moral dilemmas and role playing can accelerate moral growth or moral reasoning of the children. McKenzie (1980) also carried out a study on the use of moral dilemma discussions with values clarification strategies. He reported that it did facilitate the moral reasoning in high school juniors within an English curriculum.

Johnson (1979) combined the moral dilemma discussions with creative dramatics which produced significant moral increases for fifth graders in his treatment groups. Okatahi (1985) used the moral dilemma discussions in an attempt to enhance social-emotional development of one hundred and twelve undergraduates in Nigeria. The results indicated that moral dilemma discussions did enhance the subject's principled reasoning and locus of control.

However, as stated above, not all the studies revealed positive results. For example, Van Winkle (1977), Farelly (1980), Tinkler (1981), Purdy (1983) and Knibbe (1985) conducted studies on moral dilemma discussions with various groups of children from sixth to twelfth graders. They did not find any significant difference between the experimental and control groups with regards to the student's moral reasoning, political attitudes, affective behaviour, critical thinking or academic achievement.

#### Research studies on values clarification and other methods

Studies conducted by various researchers using the values clarification approach also revealed mixed findings. Dixon (1978) conducted a study on eighth grade home economics students using Rath's (1966) values clarification strategies. The findings rejected the null hypothesis that the students experiencing the values clarification strategies will not exhibit valuing and non-valuing behaviours associated with values clarity.

Rogers (1983) examined high school students' attitudes towards school, self acceptance of their decision making and acceptance and understanding of their peers. He employed the values clarification strategies and the results indicated that the technique did help the students increase their sense of personal dignity while controlling the effect of

peer dominance on their school life. The students also became more accepting and understand their classmates.

Patrick (1983) conducted a study on terminal and instrumental values of eighth graders. The experimental group was treated with values clarification activities over varying time sequences. The findings displayed a significant difference between the experimental and control groups. She concluded that the approach might be a useful way to enable students to clarify their terminal and instrumental values.

In addition, the study indicated that males ranked the values exciting life, mature love and courageous to be more important while self respect and honesty were more important for females.

Hobstetter (1980), Kurth (1982) and Bramson (1984) did not find any significant difference between their experimental and control groups with regards to the student's values and value systems, valuing process and behaviour of adolescent females respectively when they conducted studies using the values clarification approach.

Mandel (1986) used role-play and modeling with third grade boys and found that affective role taking subjects produced significantly higher levels of cooperation than the modeling or control groups.

Kern (1985) conducted a study using a field-oriented approach versus the traditional approach in teaching Earth



science. He found that it did enhance the student's values, interests, attitudes and their academic achievement.

#### Research studies on sex differences in moral values

Liebert (1982) illustrated how Beaman, Klentz, Diener and Svanum conducted a field experiment on the night of Halloween in 1978 regarding cheating behaviour. The study was conducted to investigate whether a simple tactic to increase self awareness can increase resistance to temptation and to see whether sex differences exist with regards to cheating behaviour.

Participants were children who came to 'trick or treat' at thirteen homes that had been specially arranged to accommodate the investigation. The children were asked to take only one candy from a bowl on a low table near the front door while the owner excused herself to attend to something. In the self awareness condition, a large mirror was placed just behind the table, positioned in such a way that the children could see themselves as they reach for the candy. In the control condition, there was no mirror.

As predicted, boys who could not see themselves in the mirror were far more likely to deviate than boys who were made aware of their actions by the mirror. The introduction of the mirror had no effect on the girls, who adhered to the instruction even in the no-mirror condition.

Apart from the above study, most research concentrated on sex differences in moral reasoning. According to Gilligan's theory, men and women speak different moral languages. Women speak a language of caring and responsibility while men speak a language of rights and justice (Sichel, 1985). The language of caring and responsibility stresses inter-personal relationships and communication.

According to Walker (1984), Gilligan has been the most articulate critic alleging sex bias in Kohlberg's theory. Gilligan contends that Kohlberg's theory and scoring system are insensitive to characteristically feminine concerns for welfare, caring and responsibility. It is possible that sex bias exists in Kohlberg's theory because of his reliance on only male samples. As a consequence of women's focus on issues of caring, they would be over-represented at Stage Three and under-represented at the post-conventional formal level of reasoning in the Kohlberg system (Baumrind, 1986).

Almost all the studies conducted on sex differences in moral reasoning used the Kohlberg interview. Walker (1984) divided the samples in the studies reviewed into three groups : childhood and early adolescence, late adolescence and youth, and adulthood.

There were thirty-one studies conducted on childhood and early adolescence involving 2,879 subjects ranging in age from about five to seventeen years. Five significant

findings were reported by Walker with regards to sex differences in moral reasoning : Biaggio in 1976 conducted studies on Brazilian adolescents of ten, thirteen and sixteen years old. Biaggio found that girls were more advanced in moral reasoning than the boys; Blatt and Garberg in 1975 found pretest differences among fifteen to sixteen year olds that favoured girls; Krebs and Gillmore in 1982 found that the girls in their sample of five to fourteen year olds were more advanced in their moral reasoning than boys; Turiel in 1976 found differences favouring girls in his samples of eleven to fourteen year olds; and lastly, Saltztein, Diamond and Belenky in 1972 found that girls were classified at Stage Three whereas boys were at Stages One or Two and also at Stages Four and Five. To summarize, Walker states that sex differences in moral reasoning apparently are rare early in the lifespan, and when they occur, indicate more mature development for females.

Walker examined thirty-five studies on sex differences in moral reasoning for the second group of samples involving 991 subjects who were mostly high school and university students. He summarized that sex differences in late adolescence and youth are small, with the studies indicating more mature development for males.

Thirteen studies were reviewed by Walker on sex differences in adulthood involving a total of 1223 subjects

who ranged in age from twenty-one years to over sixty-five years. Sex differences in moral reasoning is found to be slightly more frequent in adults than in the early lifespan. In the studies of adults that revealed differences in moral reasoning, sex was often confounded with educational and/or occupational differences. The studies reported by Walker were : Haan's study in 1976 which found that men scored higher than women in both samples of 21-30 years and the 41-50 years old. The older women were mostly housewives while the occupational status of the younger women was not described by Haan; Holstein in 1976 found differences favouring men on the first test but not on the retest. Nearly all the men had careers in business, management or professionals whereas only 6% of the women were employed; Parikh in 1980 also found that men in her Indian sample scored higher than women. The men were all self-employed professionals, whereas most of the women were housewives. When the men and women in the studies were comparable in education and occupational levels, no differences in moral reasoning were found.

Baumrind (1986), however, disagreed with Walker's conclusions that there are no consistent evidence indicating sex differences in moral development. She argues that a general search for sex differences across stages may lead to the conclusion of no sex difference or only minimal sex difference. She states that the possibility remains that a

significant sex difference does exist at a particular stage or level but not across all stages or levels.

Baumrind's conclusions were made using data from the Family Socialization Project which consisted of middle-class, well educated Caucasians (158 mothers, 145 fathers) and 164 nine year old children. The findings showed that when educational level was not controlled, more women were found at Stage Four and more men at the post-conventional level. Educational level and employment status are significantly related to men's but not to women's stage score level. It also shows that postgraduate education appears to be a necessary condition for Stage Six reasoning to occur in men. However, when men and women with two years or less of college education were compared, the stage score level of women was higher.

### Summary

Although there was no agreement among the various authors on the definition of value, we can generally define it as something personal, be it an opinion, an expression, a preference, or a choice; and it is reflected in what a person says or does. It differs from ideals, attitudes and beliefs. There are many kinds of values that have been identified and moral values is one of them. Different people have assigned different meanings to the term moral values. It has been described as standard rules made by a

secular society, or as beliefs of what is right or wrong in a social group. Moral values has also been described as being based on different conceptions of justice.

Two main factors have been agreed upon by most theorists as influencing moral values and development : genetic and environment. Environmental variables such as family background, religion, peer groups, child rearing practices have been found to be the most influencing factors on moral values.

Education also plays an important role in the development of moral values. The three main approaches to values education that have been widely accepted and used in schools during the past ten years or so are the doctrinative approach, the values clarification approach and the cognitive moral developmental approach. The doctrinative approach was not very popular because it was based on the preachings of right and wrong. When the values clarification approach was introduced in the fifties, many schools started using this approach. The students were trained to clarify their values themselves and this lead to relativism. This means that the students were lead to believe that their values are different from others and there is no right moral answer. The cognitive moral developmental approach stressed many of the same procedures as the values clarification approach, but the former approach goes beyond merely making the students aware of

own value positions. Their aim is to stimulate the student's moral reasoning to a higher level based on Kohlberg's moral reasoning stages. According to Kohlberg, justice is the most essential factor in human social life and becomes the highest level in his moral reasoning stages.

Various studies have been conducted over the years on different approaches and methodologies in values education. A number of studies did reveal positive results with regards to student's moral reasoning, attitudes, subjective behaviour and academic performance while others did not find any significant difference between the experimental and control groups.

With regards to sex differences, especially on moral reasoning, men tend to be placed in the post-conventional level of Kohlberg's moral reasoning stages and women in the conventional stages. However, when the studies were conducted on men and women of equal educational and occupational status, there was no significant difference between the two sexes.