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Abstract

Twenty Midwestern Caucasian college students, ten males and ten females, were tested on justice and care orientations when reasoning about hypothetical moral dilemmas involving the care of elderly family members. A slightly modified version of the dilemma developed in Stack's (1990) study was used along with a new dilemma developed by the author of this study to further clarify the coding process. Lyons' (1983) scoring method and Gilligan's (1982) guidelines were used to code subjects' responses. No sex differences in the type of moral reasoning were found. The results of this study did not support Gilligan's theory that there are two distinct ways of thinking about moral problems, justice reasoning and care reasoning, that are related to gender. They did, however, support Stack's results that the predominate reasoning used in both males and females is a mixture of care and justice reasoning. It was concluded, based on Stack's research and the results of this study, that no sex differences in moral reasoning are present when using the hypothetical dilemmas developed by Stack's subjects and this author.
The Moral Reasoning of Males and Females in Response to Hypothetical Dilemmas Involving the Care of Elderly Family Members

One of the most controversial research areas in psychology has been whether there are gender differences in moral reasoning. The idea that there is a difference in moral reasoning between males and females was discussed long ago by Freud (1925/1961, p.257) when he said, "I cannot evade the notion (though I hesitate to give it expression) that for women the level of what is ethically normal is different from what it is in man." Piaget (1932) also discovered a difference. In his study of the rules of children's games, he observed that girls were "less explicit about agreement [than boys] and less concerned with legal elaboration" (1932, p. 93). However, although Freud and Piaget did discuss gender differences in moral reasoning, the real debate was started by Kohlberg in 1963.

Kohlberg interviewed children over a period of 20 years, presenting them with stories in which the characters faced moral dilemmas, followed by a series of questions. The most commonly used dilemma was the following:

In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was on drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost him to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together $1000 which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I
discovered the drug, and I am going to make money from it." So Heinz got desperate and broke into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife (Kohlberg, 1969, p. 379).

Based on the responses to these interviews, Kohlberg developed three levels of moral reasoning, each with two stages, as shown in table one. According to Nicholson, "as people's moral reasoning progresses through the levels, it becomes influenced less by the consequences of actions on specific people and more by reference to abstract and universal principles" (1993). Kohlberg believed that the levels and stages occur in a sequence and are age related, although few people reach stages five and six (Santrock, 1995). Level one is preconventional reasoning, in which moral reasoning is controlled by rewards and punishments. Included in level one is stage one, in which the child's thinking is based on punishment; they obey to avoid punishment. Stage two, also included in level one, is when moral thinking is based on rewards and the child conforms to obtain rewards. They obey only what they want to obey, when it is in their best interest. Level two of Kohlberg's theory is conventional reasoning, in which the person follows the standards of others. Included in this level are stages three and four. Stage three occurs when the person values trust, caring, and loyalty to others in order to gain approval and meet the expectations of their family and friends. Stage four is when moral judgments are based on understanding the social order, law, justice, and duty in order to maintain a fixed order. Level three, labeled postconventional reasoning, occurs when morality is completely internalized, not based on others' standards. Within this level, stage five consists of the person recognizing that although laws are important for society, some can be changed. The emphasis is upon
equality and mutual obligation in this stage. Finally, stage six is a
exemplified by a person who, when faced with a conflict between law and
conscience, follows conscience.

Although there have been several criticisms of Kohlberg's theory, the
major criticism is based on the fact that he found women, because of their
strong interpersonal orientation, to favor stage three. Early studies have
indicated that females get to stage three earlier and remain there longer,
while males go on to higher stages (Lande & Slade, 1979). According to
Kohlberg, women's moral development will extend beyond stage three
when they solve moral problems that require them to move past the
relationships that have bound their moral experience (as cited in Gilligan,
1977, pp. 484-5). However, Kohlberg's scoring system may be biased
against women because he used exclusively male subjects in his original
longitudinal study.

Carol Gilligan, a colleague of Kohlberg in Harvard's Center for Moral
Education, developed a system of moral reasoning that she felt would
compensate for the gender gap that was present in Kohlberg's stages. She
felt that most women use a different kind of reasoning than men, as
established by interviews with several females. With the emphasis on
nurturing and caring, the women who were interviewed saw personal
relationships as vitally important and to them, morality meant not hurting
others. These interviews established most women as using "care
reasoning," which views people through their connections with others.
Care reasoning emphasizes interpersonal communication and concern for
others as opposed to the "justice reasoning" used by most of the men in
Kohlberg's stages, which emphasizes the rights of the individual. Through
the interviews, Gilligan found that although women do progress through
the preconventional, conventional, and postconventional moral stages, "the conventions that shape women's moral judgments differ from those that apply to men" (1977, p. 492). She felt that there is a distinct moral language for women, one of selfishness, responsibility, avoiding the infliction of hurt, and expressing care as the fulfillment of moral responsibility. The support for this theory came from her study on pregnant women making the decision whether to abort. Gilligan chose to use a real-life dilemma rather than the hypothetical dilemmas used by Kohlberg because "only when substance is given to the skeletal lives of hypothetical people is it possible to consider the social injustices which their moral problems may reflect and to imagine the individual suffering their occurrence may signify or their resolution engender" (1977, p. 511-2). She chose the abortion issue because "when a woman considers whether to continue or abort a pregnancy, she contemplates a decision that affects both self and others and engages directly the critical moral issue of hurting" (1977, p. 491).

The subjects in Gilligan's abortion study were twenty-nine women who were referred by abortion and pregnancy counseling services. The women were given interviews in two parts. The initial part asked them to discuss the decision they were trying to make, the alternatives and reasons for and against each option, how they were dealing with it, the people involved, and how the decision affected their self-concepts and relationships. In the second part of the interview, moral judgment was assessed hypothetically by using three of Kohlberg's dilemmas.

From these interviews, Gilligan formulated her own levels of moral reasoning. In level one, Orientation to Individual Survival, the self is the sole object of concern and the issue is individual survival. During the first
transition: From Selfishness to Responsibility, the words selfishness and responsibility first appear and the self is defined within the attachments or connections to others. In the second level: Goodness as Self-Sacrifice, moral judgments begin to rely on shared norms and expectations. Goodness becomes the predominant concern and worth is based on the ability to care for and protect others. The issue of hurting is also of major concern to people at this level. The second transition: From Goodness to Truth, occurs when the woman realizes that the self as well as others requires care. She "strives to encompass the needs of both self and others, to be responsible to others and thus be 'good' but also to be responsible to herself and thus to be 'honest' and 'real'" (Gilligan 1977, 500). In the third level, The Morality of Nonviolence, the conflict between selfishness and responsibility to self is resolved and she is able to separate out the self's needs when appropriate. Care "becomes a universal obligation, the self-chosen ethic of a postconventional judgment that reconstructs the dilemma in a way that allows the assumption of responsibility for choice" (1977, 504).

There have been many studies in reaction to Gilligan, both supporting and refuting her research. In support of Gilligan, Noddings (1984) wrote a book on the feminine, caring approach to morality. Also, Damon (1988) gives an explanation as to why sex related morality differences have developed. He points out that both boys and girls generally begin their lives feeling closer to their mother. Because of this fact, "boys develop the notion that they are essentially different from significant others in their lives, whereas girls develop a belief in similarity and connectedness between themselves and others" (1988, p. 97). Therefore, girls develop a stronger basis for experiencing other's feelings.
as their own while boys tend to emphasize individuation as predominant over their primary love.

Many researchers have also raised questions about the nature of Gilligan's research. Brabeck (1993) summarizes many of these criticisms. It is hard to find empirical evidence in support of Gilligan's assertions, in part because there is a lack of a published standardized interview. There is also no quantitative data for her studies, because she used quoted excerpts from interviews as evidence. As Brabeck points out, although interviews "may be rich in exploratory data, generalizations from the small number are risky, probe questions may vary from subject to subject, and the representativeness of the excerpts cited by Gilligan is uncertain" (1993, p.38). There also remains the problem that conclusions about sex differences were drawn from an entirely female sample in the abortion study. Gilligan's samples were also "small and nonrepresentative," including mostly upper-middle-class children and Radcliffe-Harvard students (Rich & DeVitis, 1985).

Broughton (1993) raises another criticism of Gilligan's research. He has made the assertion that the subjects that Gilligan said used care reasoning also used justice reasoning, and vice versa. In order to support this claim, he pointed out components of justice reasoning in a specific interview that Gilligan coded as care reasoning. Broughton feels that because Gilligan did not report the kind of results that he found, she was using a selective process in her interview analysis.

Gilligan's choice of an abortion moral dilemma has also been criticized. Kerber (1986) has pointed out that the themes of care and responsibility are an automatic part of the abortion decision. Kerber goes on to say that "...conflicting responsibilities - to oneself, to the fetus, to its
father, to one's own parents and family - are necessarily embedded in a decision on abortion. The theme of care is equally present..." (1986, p. 305). Therefore, Kerber feels that care reasoning may have been present in the subjects not because they were women, but because it was implicit in the nature of the dilemma. Smetana further asserts that many women and men do not think of abortion as a moral issue, but as a personal or social-conventional dilemma (as cited in Colby & Damon, 1983).

There have also been several studies that used Kohlberg's stages to find if there really is a difference between male and female moral development, which was the major criticism by Gilligan of Kohlberg's work. Walker (1993), did a meta-analysis of 79 studies in which sex differences in moral reasoning were examined using Kohlberg's theory. He found that of 41 samples of children and early adolescence, only 6 significant sex differences were reported. Out of 46 samples of late adolescence and youth (high school and college), only 10 samples yielded significant sex differences and out of 21 samples of adults, only 4 significant differences were reported. Walker felt that many of the studies that did find a significant sex difference could be discounted in some way; for example, some were confounded with occupational differences. Walker's conclusion was that very few sex differences in moral reasoning could be found using Kohlberg's stages. However, there have been some criticism of the methods that Walker used in doing his meta-analysis, which may have changed the results of his study (Baumrind, 1993).

Both Gilligan and Kohlberg later responded to the criticism their theories were receiving. Kohlberg (1983) said in respect to justice and care moral reasoning that "many moral situations or dilemmas do not pose a choice between one or the other orientation, but rather call out a
response which integrates both orientations" (1983, pp.134,139). He also stated that the ethic of care cannot supplant a morality of justice because it is "not well adapted to resolve justice problems." However, he has admitted that this statement has not been proven by his research (1983, pp. 93-5).

Gilligan (1993) responded to her critics by saying, "My critics say that this story seems 'intuitively' right to many women but is at odds with the findings of psychological research. This is precisely the point I am making and exactly the difference I was exploring: the dissonance between psychological theory and women's experience" (1993, p 207). Gilligan also said, "...I assume that a psychology literature filled with men's voices exemplifies men's experience. Therefore, in listening to women, I sought to separate their descriptions of their experience from standard forms of psychological interpretation and to rely on a close textual analysis of language and logic to define the terms of women's thinking" (1993, p 219).

One area of the debate on gender differences in moral reasoning that has not been fully examined is whether race and or culture changes the results. Many researchers have criticized Kohlberg's theory as culturally biased (Banks, 1993; Bronstein & Paludi, 1988; Miller, 1991-336-as cited in Santrock, 1995). Snarey (1987) reviewed research on moral development in 27 countries and found that Kohlberg's scoring system does not recognize higher-level moral reasoning in certain cultural groups because the groups do not emphasize the individual's rights and the principle of justice.

One study that examined the effects of race on moral reasoning was conducted by Stack (1990). In the course of her research on African-
American return migrants, who had moved back to rural southern homeplaces, Stack had her subjects develop a moral dilemma that was tailored to their experience. Stack interviewed 87 adolescents using a Dear Abby dilemma that other children in her study had developed. She found that there was no significant difference between the reasoning of boys and girls. 19 boys and 18 girls used justice reasoning only, 14 boys and 13 girls used care reasoning only, and 12 boys and 11 girls used a mixture of the two kinds of reasonings. When she used the moral dilemma developed by the adults in her study to interview other adult return migrants for moral reasoning, she again found that there was no significant difference between the reasoning of men and women. Of the 15 subjects that Stack interviewed, 3 men and 3 women used justice reasoning only, 1 man used care reasoning only, and 3 men and 5 women used a combination. These results contrast with those of Gilligan; however, the results may be confounded by the use of new moral dilemmas that had not been used in previous research or by some other factor.

In my study, I attempted to discover whether using the same moral dilemma developed by Stack's subjects on a white, midwest population changed the results. I hypothesized that there would be no significant differences between males and females in this sample.

Method

Participants

The sample was composed of undergraduate students who received research participation credit as a requirement of their Introduction to Psychology or Introduction to Developmental Psychology class at the University of Northern Iowa. There were 20 white subjects, 10 females and 10 males, with an overall mean age of 22.55. The median age was 21,
the range of ages was 18-36, and the mean ages for females and males was 25.10 and 20.00 respectively. All of the subjects reported their hometown as being located somewhere in Iowa, primarily the northeast section.

Measure

Moral Dilemmas The hypothetical Clyde situation that was developed by the subjects in Stack's (1990) research was used in this study. The dilemma was modified slightly for a white midwestern population:

Mike is very torn over a decision he must make. His two sisters are putting pressure on him to leave Minneapolis and go back home to a small town in Iowa to take care of his parents. His mother is bedridden and his father recently lost a leg from diabetes. One of his sisters has a family and a good job in Minneapolis and the other just moved there recently to get married. Mike's sisters see him as more able to pick up and go back home since he is unmarried and works part time—although he keeps trying to get a better job. What should Mike do?

An additional moral dilemma, with a female in a primary role, was developed to detect any differences in the duties assigned to males and females and to obtain further information in order to clarify the coding procedure:

After his father passed away four years ago, Joe moved home to take care of his ailing mother. This arrangement has worked well because his mother enjoys the companionship and staying in her own home and Joe has a job that he enjoys. However, Joe's mom recently took a turn for the worse and now requires constant care. In order for Joe to do this, he would have to quit the job that he loves. Joe has a
sister, Sara, who also lives in the area. Although she is currently unemployed, Sara is working on developing her career and has a possible job prospect. In order for Sara to care for her mother, she would also need to move home, which would restrict the mobility she may need in pursuing her career. What should they do?

Coding  All of the responses to the dilemmas were coded and analyzed according to the guidelines of Gilligan (1977, 1982) and Lyons (1983). Gilligan's guidelines for coding a response as care reasoning include themes of care and responsibility, relationships as the central moral consideration, a concern not to hurt and to make sure that good will come to others, empathy, compassion, harmony, and responding to those in need. Gilligan also discusses a concept called contextual relativism, consisting of a sensitivity to details and a reluctance to make moral judgments, which is also a part of care reasoning. The guidelines for coding responses as justice reasoning include themes of rights and rules, objective rational reasons, individual rights, liberties, and duties, fairness, stepping back from the situation, obligations, and not violating one's standards.

Lyons' (1983) coding system includes a morality of justice as defined as separate and objective in relation to others and viewing relationships as reciprocity. In contrast, a morality of response and care defines individuals as connected in relation to others with an understanding of relationships as response to another. See table two.

Design and Procedure

This study was intended as pilot research, designed to obtain a general indication of results and to perfect the methods used. The subjects were interviewed individually and all interviews were tape recorded and
later transcribed. Before each interview began, the subjects were asked to fill out an informed consent form and a brief questionnaire, giving their name, age, sex, race, and hometown. At the onset of each interview, questions were asked that were designed to obtain some background information from each subject on their experience with caring for elderly family members. Next, a scenario was read, alternating between the male and the female based scenario in order to create a counterbalanced design. After the first scenario was read, a specific set of questions was asked in order to obtain more information to use when coding. Then the other scenario was read and again questions were asked. There were two key questions asked that were most effective in obtaining a useful response: "Do you feel that the children are responsible for the care of their parents? Why?" and "What are some of the issues that the children should discuss when they're making the decision?" At the conclusion of each interview, the subjects were debriefed and given the opportunity to ask questions.

Results

The results are shown in table three. The "mixed" category was used in accordance with Stack's research. Three males and three males used justice reasoning only, no subjects used only care reasoning, and seven males and seven females used mixed reasoning.

Certain themes were evident in the interviews in this study that were not emphasized in Stack's research, as shown in table four. Many of the subjects spoke of the possibility of bringing in a nurse to help out the parents or placing them in a nursing home. Several subjects also mentioned that finances were an issue that needed to be discussed. A last theme that was evident in many of the interviews in this study was one of reciprocity. When asked why they felt that the children were responsible
for the care of their parents, many subjects answered that because the parents took care of the children when the children were young, the children should take care of the parents when the parents are older.

Discussion

The results of this study generally support Stack's findings that there are no gender differences in moral reasoning and that the primary type of reasoning used is mixed, therefore supporting the generalization of Stack's findings to other populations. However, this study has discovered several problems with this line of research and has also raised several issues that were not discussed in Stack's research. Although these different issues may be due to race, they may also be due to some other factor such as the area of the country the subjects live in, the age of the subjects, or their social economic status.

When coding the responses obtained in this study, it was found that the process of coding is very subjective, although interrater reliability coding can help to make it more objective. Although the coding systems of Gilligan and Lyons were used as a guideline, there were some issues that arose in the present interviews that were not clear and were judged in a subjective way. For example, Gilligan states that a theme that would indicate the presence of care reasoning is that of responsibility while Kohlberg speaks of the theme of obligation as an indication of justice reasoning. However, when examining the interviews done in the present study, it was found that the subjects often spoke of responsibility in terms of obligation. In order to discriminate this finding, it was necessary to examine each statement in the context of the entire interview. If the statement, "I believe it is Mike's responsibility...to take care of his parents" is taken by itself, it would be coded as care reasoning. However,
when it was looked at in the context of the rest of the interview, when the same subject states "I believe it's a natural obligation..." and "...basically they have an obligation...," it seems that "responsibility" should be interpreted to mean "obligation." This decision is left primarily up to the researcher and even when there is some degree of inter-rater reliability, there is still a margin for error. Because this is an issue that was discovered after the study was completed, no techniques were used that could eliminate this confusion. It is possible that asking both "Do you feel that the children are responsible for the care of their parents?" and "Do you feel that they are obligated to take care of their parents?" would clarify the responses.

Another aspect of this study that should be commented on is that some subjects were not able to identify with the situations enough so that they could elaborate on their answers. This raises an issue that has been discussed by several researchers, especially Gilligan; studies such as this one may be inaccurate because the scenarios are too abstract for the subjects to know what they would really do, how they would really reason when presented with the actual dilemma. Gilligan compensated for this problem by interviewing pregnant women who were deciding whether they should have an abortion. Stack's dilemma was also realistic for the subjects in her study, although for most of the subjects in this study the situation became purely hypothetical. However, there are others who feel that subjects are able to place themselves in the particular hypothetical situation. Indeed, many of the subjects in this study spoke not only of the characters in the scenarios, but also of what they themselves would do if there were (or had been) in a similar situation. Others tried to better identify with the characters by asking questions about the situations,
solidifying the story in their minds. The tendency to try to get more information to aid subjects in actually "stepping" into the situation is a characteristic that Gilligan has identified with care reasoning.

This study also attempted to explore whether the sex of the main character of the scenario makes a difference in the way the subjects respond. The scenario that was developed for this study depicted a female, Sara, as a main character. In contrast to the dilemma with Mike as the main character who was working only a part-time job, in the new dilemma, it was the female (Sara) whose career was not stable. By presenting both dilemmas, alternating the order in which they were presented, this study attempted to discover whether subjects were more or less likely to encourage the male main character to give up his job than the female main character. However, there were several problems with the scenario that was developed for this study that prevented accurate results. The design of the Sara dilemma was similar to that of the Mike dilemma in that it created a certain amount of tension between two or more options that was to be resolved by the subjects. However, the female scenario differed from the male scenario in that its wording placed more of the responsibility on both of the siblings, rather than just the female, by asking "What should they do?" instead of "What should Mike do?". Also, because the brother, Joe, was mentioned first in the scenario, before Sara, it may be that the male was still perceived as the main character. This area may merit more research, although it may work better to alternate male and female scenarios between subjects, rather than presenting both dilemmas to the same subject.

While coding the responses obtained in this study, several common themes were detected. One theme was that of reciprocity, the idea that the
children should take care of the parents because the parents took care of the children, which was found in the responses of 75% of the subjects. This theme was coded as one of justice, because of its implication of fairness, in accordance with Lyon's coding system. Although this idea was mentioned in Stack's study, it did not seem to be as prevalent as it was in this study. Therefore, it is possible that this is a characteristic of Caucasians and not so much of African-Americans. However, because Stack did not focus on this issue and because her study consisted of only 15 people and this one of 20 people, an accurate conclusion cannot be made. In future research, this is an issue that can be examined.

The other themes that were present in this study were those of nurses, nursing homes, and finances. 60% of the subjects mentioned the possibility of hiring a nurse or other outside help to bring into the home; 50% of the subjects discussed the option of placing the parents in a nursing home; and 45% of the subjects said that finances were an issue that would have to be discussed when making any decisions. When comparing these results to those of Stack's, it does appear that the Caucasian subjects in this study were much more open to the possibility of outside help in the home and/or nursing homes than the African-American subjects in Stack's study, where the issue was not mentioned. Finances were mentioned briefly in Stack's study when one subject said that "you must love a human being, not a dollar" (1990, p 23). This was in marked contrast to the emphasis in this study on discussing finances before a final decision was made. However, there is again the problems of small sample sizes and the fact that Stack did not focus on these issues.

Many subjects that mentioned the possibility of a nurse or a nursing home may have done so as a way of resolving the tension they felt
between wanting and needing to help out their parents and wanting and needing to continue with their own lives. By suggesting that outside help be used, they were able to ensure that their parents were well cared for while still maintaining their own lives. Another way that many of the subjects resolved this possible tension was to suggest that the children work and take care of their parents. In the Mike scenario, many said that he should look for a job near where his parents lived in order to partially preserve his life while also looking after his parents. However, most did not mention that because the parents lived in a small town, there may be a very small chance that Mike would be able to obtain a job. This may be due in part to the fact that the subjects themselves were not in that particular situation, making it easier for them to give their answers without putting much thought into them. In the Joe and Sara scenario, many subjects again suggested a way for everyone to get what they wanted. They said that it should work out for Joe and Sara to both work and to both take care of their mother, sharing the duties equally, sometimes with the added help of a nurse.

Stack's results and the results of this study both contradict Gilligan's earlier findings, although she has found more "mixed" reasoning recently. It is important to do studies such as this one until the issue of gender differences in moral reasoning becomes clearer, and each study that is conducted brings up new issues to be explored and tested. Despite all of the controversy surrounding Gilligan's initial studies, she has still made a very important contribution. Gilligan has dramatically pointed out that studies based only on males cannot be automatically generalized to females. It is important to study both sexes and all races in order to discover what is true for all humans, not just an elite group.
Table One
Moral Reasoning at Kohlberg's Stages in Response to the "Heinz and the Druggist" Story (Santrock, 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage Description</th>
<th>Examples of Moral Reasoning That Support Heinz’s Theft of the Drug</th>
<th>Examples of Moral Reasoning That Indicate Heinz Should Not Steal the Drug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preconventional morality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Avoid punishment</td>
<td>Heinz should not let his wife die; if he does, he will be in big trouble.</td>
<td>Heinz might get caught and sent to jail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: Seek rewards</td>
<td>If Heinz gets caught, he could give the drug back and maybe they would not give him a long jail sentence.</td>
<td>The druggist is a businessman and needs to make money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional morality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3: Gain approval/avoid disapproval especially with family</td>
<td>Heinz was only doing something that a good husband would do; it shows how much he loves his wife.</td>
<td>If his wife dies, he can’t be blamed for it; it is the druggist’s fault. He is the selfish one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4: Conformity to society’s rules</td>
<td>If you did nothing, you would be letting your wife die; it is your responsibility if she dies. You have to steal it with the idea of paying the druggist later.</td>
<td>It is always wrong to steal; Heinz will always feel guilty if he steals the drug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postconventional morality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5: Principles accepted by the community</td>
<td>The law was not set up for these circumstances; taking the drug is not really right, but Heinz is justified in doing it.</td>
<td>You can’t really blame someone for stealing, but extreme circumstances don’t really justify taking the law in your own hands. You might lose respect for yourself if you let your emotions take over; you have to think about the long-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6: Individualized conscience</td>
<td>By stealing the drug, you would have lived up to society’s rules, but you would have let down your conscience.</td>
<td>Heinz is faced with the decision of whether to consider other people who need the drug as badly as his wife. He needs to act by considering the value of all the lives involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A Morality of Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals defined as separate/objective in relation to others: see others as one would like to be seen by them, in objectivity;</th>
<th>Moral problems are generally construed as issues, especially decisions, of conflicting claims between self and other (including society); resolved by invoking impartial rules, principles, or standards.</th>
<th>Considering:</th>
<th>and evaluated considering:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tend to use a morality of justice as fairness that rests on an understanding of relationships as reciprocity between separate individuals, grounded in the duty and obligation of their roles.</td>
<td>(1) one’s role-related obligations, duty, or commitments; or (2) standards, rules, or principles for self, others, or society, including reciprocity, that is, fairness—how one should treat another considering how one would like to be treated if in their place;</td>
<td>(1) how decisions are thought about and justified; or (2) whether values, principles, or standards were/are maintained, especially fairness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A Morality of Response and Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals defined as connected in relation to others: see others in their own situations and contexts;</th>
<th>Moral problems are generally construed as issues of relationships or of response, that is, how to respond to others in their particular terms; resolved through the activity of care.</th>
<th>Considering:</th>
<th>and evaluated considering:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tend to use a morality of care that rests on an understanding of relationships as response to another in their own terms.</td>
<td>(1) maintaining relationships and response, that is, the connections of interdependent individuals to one another; or (2) promoting the welfare of others or preventing their harm; or relieving the burdens, hurt, or suffering (physical or psychological) of others;</td>
<td>(1) what happened/will happen, or how things worked out; or (2) whether relationships were/are maintained or restored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Type of Moral Reasoning used by Males and Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasoning Type</th>
<th>Males (n=10)</th>
<th>Females (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice Only</td>
<td>30% (3)</td>
<td>30% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>70% (7)</td>
<td>70% (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Common Themes in Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Males (n=10)</th>
<th>Females (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurse/outside help</td>
<td>50% (5)</td>
<td>70% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing home</td>
<td>40% (4)</td>
<td>60% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>40% (4)</td>
<td>50% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>80% (8)</td>
<td>70% (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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