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Abstract

In two years, twenty-eight black victims have been found murdered in Atlanta, Georgia. Police report that two black children remain missing. America watches the crisis in Atlanta with concern, fear and for many, rage. The intensity of concern did not develop until half way through the second year. Although thousands of dollars have been poured into solving these murders, the police, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and special task forces have not at this writing been able to solve these crimes. Police have, however, arrested Wayne Williams for the murder of Nathaniel Kater, the twenty-eight victim. With all efforts and concern the major trauma lies within the psychological development of the children of Atlanta.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In two years, twenty-eight black victims have been found murdered in Atlanta, Georgia. Police report that two black children remain missing. America watches the crisis in Atlanta with concern, fear and for many, rage. The intensity of concern did not develop until halfway through the second year.

Although thousands of dollars have been poured into solving these murders, the police, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and special task forces have not at this writing been able to solve these crimes. Police have, however, arrested Wayne Williams for the murder of Nathaniel Kater, the twenty-eight victim.

With all efforts and concern the major trauma lies within the psychological development of the children of Atlanta.

Psychological, emotional and social conflicts have arisen as a result of these murders. Health specialists at Atlanta University have compiled the following behaviors that have surfaced among the children: 1) sleeping with Bibles for protection; 2) bedwetting; 3) fighting in school; 3) nightmares; 4) lowered test scores; 5) abnormal clinging to parents; and arming themselves with billy clubs, broken knives, and other weapons (Langone, John. Discover Magazine. April, 1981). Many of the children are under the treatment of psychologists and other therapists which adds to their anxiety.

The development of this study impinges upon yet another aspect of their resultant behaviors. The purpose was to examine the moral
perspectives of Atlanta's black children. Their moral levels of reasoning have not been thoroughly examined by professionals associated with Atlanta's crisis. The effects of the slayings are numerous, children across the country are being affected as well. This results largely from media coverage.

While administering the questionnaire in northeast Iowa, one child stated, "Boy, I know one thing, those murders in Atlanta sure have my brother shaken up. He is afraid to go to the store or school by himself, when he's alone he will run all the way home."

Just how extensively the Atlanta crisis has affected children across the nation has not been determined.

The focus of this study has been directed toward the effects of threatening situations on children who are directly involved. Kohlberg (1976) maintained that children vary in their levels of moral development. According to Kohlberg the age of the children is a major factor affecting the differences of moral levels.

Kohlberg (1976) supports the theory that younger children score lower on measurements of moral development than older children. His terms preconventional, conventional, and postconventional mark the levels of moral development. Preconventional is the lowest level. Kohlberg believes that children begin at the lowest level and progress upward. Each level contains two substages. Kohlberg discovered that individuals must pass through each stage before reaching the postconventional level which many never reach.

It is the age variant which this study has examined. When children are directly related to threatening or traumatic situations there
may exist an advancing effect of their moral levels.

Researchers Rest (1979), Turiel (1978), and Hoffman (1970) have found that the stages of Kohlberg and Piaget (1965) are not totally consistent. These writers maintain that there exists the possibility of individuals functioning between stages.

Hoffman and Turiel found in their study that if the "right" situation or dilemma is triggered, respondents may advance in their levels of intellectual or moral growth. This possibility has been the concentration of this study.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to investigate the influence of a life threatening or traumatic situation on young and adolescent children. Focus was centered on the moral development of these children.

The results of this study are expected to provide insights for the preparation of materials and teaching strategies. The implications of this study are expected to assist in the disciplines of the social science curriculum.

Hypothesis to be Tested

The major research question was: Is there a difference in the moral development of children who are directly associated with a traumatic or terrorist situation and those who are not in close proximity to the situation?

The Hypothesis derived from this question was:
HO: There is no significant difference in the moral development of children directly associated to traumatic or terrorist situations and those who are not in close proximity to the situation.

Related research questions were:

a. Do older children who are directly associated with a threatening situation function at different moral levels than their counterparts?

HOa: Adolescent children in Atlanta are not functioning at a significantly higher level of moral reasoning than is typical of their age group, as a result of being directly associated with prolonged threatening situations.

b. When directly associated with a prolonged traumatic situation do younger children function at higher levels of moral reasoning than their counterparts?

HOb: Younger children do not function at higher levels as a result of a traumatic situation than their counterparts.

Importance of the Problem

As in any crisis situation the emotional foundations of individuals shift dramatically. The trauma of the murders in Atlanta, Georgia are no different. Obviously much suffering develops through the amount of tension created by the existence of terror in Atlanta. This study is designed to pry beyond the barriers of shock and confusion. The focus has been directed to the child. With acknowledgement of their emotional conflicts during the crisis this study singles out yet
another of their hidden characteristics, their moral development.

An examination of the children's moral levels concerning the crisis provides a better understanding of the extent to which they have been affected. The resultant data are expected to provide insights into the preparation of appropriate materials and teaching strategies for children, within the disciplines of social studies curricula.

Results are also expected to assist future researchers in the area of moral development under traumatic situations. The literature suggests a need for more research in this area.

Implications from this study merit the following considerations:

1. There is a need for more research concerning the moral development of children in traumatic situations.

2. The moral levels of children in crisis will assist theorists in helping children to cope with trauma.

3. Through examination of the results educators may obtain insights regarding appropriate materials and teaching strategies for the social studies curricula.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

The most extensive and influential research on moral judgement has been done by Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1958). Lawrence Kohlberg's interests developed through his studies of Jean Piaget. Piaget, in his exploration of child development, began an investigation of the moral development of children. Both Piaget and Kohlberg theorized that individuals pass through levels of moral development and that these levels contained stages.

The first two of the six stages comprise the preconventional level which characterises the moral development of most children under nine and many adolescents. Stage one is a punishment/obedience orientation in which rules are followed for avoiding punishment. Stage two is an instrumental/obedience stage in which satisfying personal needs and sometimes the needs of others is paramount. Others' needs are recognized only in so far as necessary to fulfill one's personal needs.

The second level is the conventional level, attained by age thirteen. Within this level are stages three and four. Stage three involves pleasing others where approval of peers and relatives are prevalent. Stage four has a law and order orientation, right is doing one's duty and the respect of authority.

Kohlberg's third level of moral development is the postconventional level. Stages five and six comprise this level. Stage five weighs the situation, personal values are implemented and laws are not absolute. Stage six is a universal ethical principle orienta-
tion where right is defined by individual conscience, principles of justice and equality of human rights. Kohlberg found that only a small minority of individuals enter the postconventional level.

To identify levels of moral development Kohlberg developed hypothetical dilemmas. The dilemmas were devised to assess children's moral development. Advancement would be derived by placing individuals in realistic situations where several variables act as conflicts in making decisions.

Researchers Rubin (1977) and Trotter (1977) criticized Kohlberg's stages of moral development. Using Kohlberg's stages of moral development Rubin and Trotter found the stages to be inconsistent. These researchers found only a .44 degree of stability in a two week span of assessing moral stages.

Falvell and Wohlwill (1969) also criticized Lawrence Kohlberg's theory that, "Individuals should be consistent at a stage unless they are in transition to the next stage." (1976, p. 47). Flavell and Wohlwill discovered that subjects are not always in one stage or another.

Justifications for inconsistencies in Kohlberg's stages have been provided by various researchers. Rest (1959) and others maintain that the subject's response may be affected by many factors. These factors include: familiarity with the situation or dilemma, administration of the instrument, and other variables. Piaget (1965) described stress as a necessary factor for learning.

In attempting to improve his stages and investigate the criticism of other researchers Kohlberg (1973) undertook a fifteen year
logitudinal study. From this study Kohlberg concluded that reversals in his stages of moral development could only occur if there were "obvious errors in observation, or...dramatic regression-inducing stress or damage." (Kohlberg 1976, p. 39).

Professor James Rest (1979), a former coworker of Kohlberg in his efforts to improve methods of assessing moral development, designed the Defining Issues Test (DIT). It is a more complex method of assessing moral development. It is basically concerned with the adolescent through adult ages. Rest maintains that the differences in Kohlberg's scheme and the DIT are minor. Rest is one of the few investigators in moral development who has used multiple choice styled questions along with moral dilemmas to assess moral development. This method was implemented for this study, see Appendix D.

Rest's DIT is more concerned with insuring that the subjects respond closest to what they feel is appropriate. To insure the true projections of the sample Rest used several tactics which include:

1. The use of twelve stages.

2. Meaningless but complex sounding items to check subjects who answer for sound rather than meaning (subjects are warned of these items).

3. Deliberately placing low moral staged items first, and mixing items thereafter. The purpose of this was to help less advanced subjects find their answer quickly and reject higher stages.

4. A consistency check for those who answer randomly.

5. DIT includes several items which are on the same level
of moral development, and an examination of the responses in those levels.

6. The use of several dilemmas.

7. The use of different kinds of dilemmas.

Rest maintains that these strategies and others assist in obtaining reliable data. Rest's Defining Issues Test has been very successful in assessing moral development accurately and reliably as researcher Lawrence (1978) concluded after interviewing DIT subjects.

Little empirical data exists in the area of assessing moral development under stressful or traumatic situations. LeHane and Goldman (1977) developed moral dilemmas designed for assessing the moral levels of students who had witnessed the infamous Kent State shooting. These researchers sampled fourth grade students who were at the University's lab school during the shooting. LeHane and Goldman's results were also contrary to Piaget and Kohlberg's age levels for moral development. They discovered that these fourth graders were functioning on higher levels of moral reasoning. LeHane attributes this lead in development primarily to the children's close proximity to the shooting and their detailed knowledge of the shooting.

Moral development researchers, Magowan and Lee (1970), investigated the effects of giving children dilemmas describing familiar and unfamiliar settings. They discovered that familiarity was associated with higher levels of moral judgement. Again, familiarity was cited as an influence on moral judgement.

There exists little literature concerning moral development which documents moral development during stressful situations. Anna Freud and
Burlingham (1943) have extensively investigated children directly associated with traumatic and terrorist situations. Their subjects were comprised of childing during wartime: children continuously subjected to bombings, parental separation and death, destruction, and other related terrors.

Freud and Burlingham discovered, "If these bombing incidents occur when small children are in the care of their own parents or a familiar substitute, they do not seem to be particularly affected by them." (Freud and Burlingham 1943, p. 21). Freud and Burlingham believe that many people have a misunderstanding of young children's exposure to destruction, terror and aggression. They note that young children are passing through a stage where aggression and destruction play one of the leading parts.

Freud and Burlingham maintained that children do have fears but that their prolonged exposure makes them accustomed to the traumatic atmosphere. They observed; children will fight, bite, pull hair, and steal each other's toys with little regard for the other child's happiness. Through this observation they believe young children are normally aggressive and destructive. Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham concluded:

'The real danger is not that the child, caught up all innocently in the whirlpool of the war, will be shocked into illness. The danger lies in the fact that the destruction raging in the outer world may meet the very real aggressive-
ness which rages in the inside of the child.

(Freud and Burlingham, 1943, p. 23).

These data similarly focus on the intent of this study. The literature of moral development is extensive, however little empirical data have been gathered concerning the moral development of children associated with traumatic or terrorist environments. Researchers Freud and Burlingham (1943) studied the affects of war on children in terrorist and destructive war environments. Their observational reports relate to important factors of the study undertaken. However, the related literature indicates a definite need for research within the disciplines of traumatic, terrorist and other stressful affects upon moral development.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The major research question was: Is there a difference in the moral development of children who are directly associated with a traumatic or terrorist situation and those who are not in close proximity to the situation?

To investigate this question cross-sectional samples were used. The cross-sectional comparison of older and younger children were used to show age variances or relationships. Sixty black children were sampled from Atlanta, Georgia. The children ranged in age from seven to fourteen. An additional sample was drawn out of Waterloo, Iowa. Again, sixty children were sampled ranging from ages seven to fourteen. This sample provided a cross-cultural comparison, as well as a sample population with children who were not in close proximity to the Atlanta crisis.

The Atlanta sample was selected from the Friendship Baptist Church. Dr. Addie Mitchell, a professor at Moorehouse College and member of the church assisted with the sampling (see Appendix A). The Iowa sample was composed of members of the Waterloo Boys-Girls Club and the Price Laboratory School at the University of Northern Iowa.

After the administrator read directions (Appendix B) the children were asked to answer a set of general information questions (see Appendix C). These questions were intended to assess the children's knowledge of the Atlanta murders. Next, the samples were read hypothetical situations involving moral dilemmas (Appendixes D and E). After each
dilemma was read, the samples were asked to tell what they would do in each situation. After indicating their reactions, the subjects were asked to circle one of six answers which best described their motivation for their response.

The moral dilemmas (Appendixes D and E) were designed to portray a real life situation concerning the murders in Atlanta. These dilemmas were fashioned after the moral dilemmas pioneered by Dr. Lawrence Kohlberg. Responses given by the subjects were rated on Kohlberg's and Piaget's preconventional, conventional and postconventional levels of moral development.

Administrators of the instruments were also told to ask the subjects where they obtained their information about the murders.

James Rest (1979), in extensive research, has assured that responses given on moral development dilemmas are reliable. While exploring Kohlberg's work, Rest developed the Defining Issues Test, which has been found to be one of the more successful and complicated methods for obtaining valid responses of moral dilemmas. Lawrence (1978) interviewed subjects from the Defining Issues Test and reported that their responses were accurately assessed through the test.

Rest adheres to several guidelines to assure reliability of responses of moral dilemmas. Because of Rest's great success many of his guidelines were applied in the design of the instrument for this study. The Defining Issues Test could not be used as an instrument for this study because it was designed for an older sample.

The statistical technique used in this study were the analysis of variance (see Tables).
Assumptions

This study is based on the assumption that the samples used are representative of all children. Although the sample was derived from two geographically separate groups it is assumed that the responses of these comparative groups are reflective of other groups functioning under similar circumstances.

Dilemmas were designed for the purpose of establishing levels of morality. This design assumes that these dilemmas force the sample into a realistic situation where they are pressured into making difficult decisions. It is also assumed that every child in the sample had the ability to make a selection under the applied pressure.

Both samples were asked to select a rationale for their chosen response. This study assumes that the listed rationale contained a response close or similar to the subject's natural response. Finally, although both samples were asked to reveal their personal projections it is assumed that the samples responded with their own answers rather than attempting to appeal to what they felt the administrator wanted.

Limitations of the Study

The subjects used in this study were not randomized, therefore some difficulties may occur in applying the results to the population. The size of the sample was limited to one hundred twenty children. This sample may not be adequate to reflect the total population. However, this sample does serve the purpose of projecting a generalized
impression.

Finally, the instrument used in this study utilizes a method which is relatively new for measuring morals. A combination of techniques described by Kohlberg (1976) and Rest (1979) were used. Because the method of multiple choice selection has only recently been used for measurement of moral levels little empirical data is available for establishing reliability. The validity of this measurement technique has been detailed in Chapter Three of this study.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The hypothesis of this study was:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the moral development of children who are directly associated with a traumatic or terrorist situation and those who are not in close proximity to the situation.

An analysis of variance was used to investigate the hypothesis. The data analysis indicated that the Atlanta subjects, who are directly associated with the traumatic situation, scored at higher levels of moral development than the Iowa subjects, who were not in close proximity of the situation. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Table 1 below describes the levels of responses for both Iowa and Atlanta subjects in the second, fifth, seventh, and eighth grades.

TABLE ONE

Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
<th></th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7 and 8</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Separate one-way analysis of variance tests were used to determine differences across the grade levels. Significant differences in levels across grades were obtained for the Iowa subjects (F=28.94, p > .001).

There were no significant differences in levels and grades of the Atlanta subjects. As shown in Table 1, the Atlanta subjects functioned on the postconventional level, Lawrence Kohlberg's highest level of moral development. Where Kohlberg theorized that younger subjects functioned on the lowest levels of development, Atlanta subjects demonstrated no significant differences between grades and levels of moral development.

The Iowa subjects showed differences characteristic of their grade levels. The youngest subjects of the Iowa sample functioned on the lowest level of moral development (as opposed to the Atlanta second graders) than the older subjects.

Researchers Rest, Flavell and others maintain that individuals may function on higher levels of moral development if the issue is of emotional significance and familiar to them. To investigate this variable the subjects were tested to assess how informed they were of the murders. Table Two, following, shows the subject's scores on the background information test.
TABLE TWO

Frequency of Scores on Background Information Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores (10 Possible)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Iowa Subjects</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Atlanta Subjects</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table Two indicates that the Atlanta subjects were more informed about the murders than Iowa subjects.

The analysis of data indicates that there is a significant difference in the moral development of children who are directly associated with a traumatic or terrorist situation and those who are not in close proximity to the situation.

The data also indicated that individuals who were in close proximity to the traumatic or terrorist situation were more informed about the situation. The Atlanta subjects, who were closest to the traumatic situation, were more informed about the murders and also functioned on high levels of moral development with no significant differences associated with age.

The Iowa subjects functioned on levels of moral development that were compatible with their ages, while the Atlanta subjects functioned on higher levels of moral development which were uncharacteristic of children their age.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The effects of prolonged subjection to traumatic or terrorist situations on moral development is a relatively new subject field. Kohlberg (1958) and Piaget (1932) have pioneered moral development contributing sequential levels and stages of moral development.

Researchers Rest (1979), Flavell (1969), and Wohlwill, upon examining Kohlberg and Piaget's sequential levels of moral development, have discovered that individuals may not always function in sequential levels of moral development.

These investigators attribute such instances of fluctuation to a number of variables. Familiarity, interest, fear and stress are among the variables which may contribute to the advancement of moral development.

This study was designed to examine this phenomena of advancement in moral development. The question of whether or not there is a difference in the moral development of children who are directly associated with a traumatic or terrorist situation and those who are not in close proximity to the situation was approached.

Researchers LeHane and Goldman (1977), after administering a moral dilemma instrument to children who had witnessed the infamous Kent State shooting, found that the children were functioning on levels of moral development which were advanced for their ages. LeHane attributes this "leap" in moral development to the stress the children experienced in witnessing the shooting and also to their
closeness and awareness of the incident.

Freud and Burlingham (1943) observed children of war, subjected to prolonged destruction, terror, bombings and stress. Whereas the theorists believed children subjected to this type of environment would suffer extreme traumatic shock and other psychological difficulties, Freud and Burlingham discovered that these children were functioning normally and in many instances had erased the danger from their minds. Freud and Burlingham implied that this "calmness" was generated through the children's awareness of the danger. They also found that this "calmness" decreased when the children were not in the presence of their parents.

To assess the moral development of children within traumatic or terrorist situations moral dilemmas, fashioned after those of Lawrence Kohlberg were used (see Appendix D). These dilemmas concerning the Atlanta murders were designed to place the samples in real-life situations. Sixty black children were sampled from Atlanta, Georgia. Sixty children were also sampled from Iowa.

Results of this data indicate that children in Atlanta were more knowledgable about the murders than Iowa children. The Atlanta children functioned on higher levels of moral development than was characteristic of their ages. The Atlanta sample scored significantly higher than the Iowa sample at the .05 level of significance (see Tables One and Two).

This study maintains that children associated with terrorist or traumatic situations are capable of functioning on higher levels of moral development than those who are not in close proximity to
Conclusion and Suggestions for Further Study

The data of this study has indicated that children directly associated to traumatic or terrorist situations are capable of functioning at higher levels of moral judgement. Investigators have found when individuals are subjected to prolonged periods of terror or stress many become accustomed to this atmosphere. As a result a variety of coping tactics are developed. These tactics may be termed survival skills. Many of these skills are naturally learned as with children residing in America's ghettos. A crisis, or a long string of murders is not necessary for the development of these survival tactics. They are normal elements of the ghetto environment. These skills can be noted in the form of rules, secret whistles, walking styles, not to mention the language. These and other "survival skills" are necessary for coping in the world of the ghetto, but they don't guarantee survival.

Individuals develop an overlooked character for obtaining these "survival skills." They build an exaggerated self-confidence in dangerous circumstances where danger is less frightening. The experts of these skills feel prepared for "anything." The relationship between self-confidence and the moral development of a child has not been established. However, many feel that this self-confidence has not only made many of Atlanta's children vulnerable, but it makes ghetto children everywhere vulnerable to their life-threatening
surroundings.

This phenomena of ghetto children's exaggerated self-confidence certainly merits further research.

Finally, the examination of children's moral development, when directly associated with traumatic or terrorist situations, merits the consideration of educators. This study was designed to assist in the development of appropriate teaching strategies and materials in the discipline of the social sciences.
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March 6, 1981

Dr. Addie S. Mitchell
1511 Ezra Church Drive N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dear Dr. Mitchell:

Enclosed is the interview form we discussed on the phone.

The questions are based on the research of Dr. Kohlberg of Harvard University and are used to discover how individuals deal with legal and ethical problems.

When it comes to such problems, apparently people who are close to the victims of a tragedy operate on a much higher moral level than outsiders who tend to "shoot from the hip."

It's my hypotheses that Atlanta kids will be more fair and just when it comes to evaluating situations involving the disappearance of their fellow black "brothers" than would children residing outside the community. This interview will help answer my hypotheses.

Also in the midst of all the media coverage with politicians, police chiefs, and lawyers grabbing the headlines, it's about time we heard from that segment of the community who are at the focal point of this terrifying experience--the children of Atlanta!

Again, thank you for all your help. If you need to contact me please call collect (315/273-2634).

Sincerely yours,

Terry Flowers
Graduate Assistant
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

TF:dt
Appendix B

Directions

Read the stories to familiarize yourself before reading the stories to the children. Ideally we would like a total of 60 children.

20 - second grade 10 boys/10 girls
20 - fifth grade 10 boys/10 girls
20 - eighth grade 10 boys/10 girls

If you can't meet these figures don't worry about it, please try to get as many children at the ages that are available. We also ask that you return the questionnaires as soon as each child completes his/her. Please use the enclosed stamped envelopes provided.

Read the stories to familiarize yourself with them before reading them to the children. Give the children an introduction, tell them "I will be reading you some stories about the disappearances of Atlanta's black children, these stories could happen. After each story I will ask you two questions: the first one you will answer 'yes' or 'no'; and the second one explains why you said 'yes' or 'no'." Tell the children there are no right or wrong answers, that you just want to know how they feel.

Please don't take any comments while the children are answering the questions. They may give comments after you have collected the questions. Please write down separately any interesting comments they make.

Review of Directions

Have the children answer the general questions.

You read the stories to the children.

Tell them to answer by circling 'yes' or 'no'.

You read the six answers to them that explains why they said 'yes' or 'no'.

(The children choose the answer that is closest to their answers).

OPTIONAL: The child may want to comment afterwards, please send the interesting comments.

After the test please mail the materials with the stamped envelopes enclosed.
Appendix C

Grade
Boy _____ Girl _____
Race ____________

How many children have been killed? ____________
How many were boys? ____________
How many were girls? ____________

Is there a reward for the capture of the murderer? ____________
If so, how much? ____________

When did the first child disappear? ____________
When was the last child found? ____________

What is the age of the oldest child killed? ____________
What is the age of the youngest child killed? ____________

What neighborhood were the children from? ____________
### Appendix D

**ADULTS COPY: READ THIS COPY TO THE CHILDREN**

1. Mr. Roberts is a very famous Black lawyer who grew up in the slums of Atlanta. He was dirt poor. But now he is one of the best lawyers around. If he could win one big case this would make him the greatest lawyer of all times. This is something Roberts always dreamed of because he could make a lot of money and save his mother, who is dying of cancer.

   One morning Roberts is called and told he's been picked to be the lawyer for the murderer who killed all those children in Atlanta. Roberts is a good enough lawyer to get the murderer freed even if he's guilty.

   **If you were Mr. Roberts, would you take this case and defend the killer?**

   **Circle One**
   - Yes
   - No

   **If yes, please explain**
   - Circle One
   1. If I didn't defend him I could blow my chance to make it to the top.
   2. I would defend him because as a lawyer this is my professional duty.
   3. I would defend him because whether black or white he deserves a fair trial.
   4. I would defend him because it would put me on the top.
   5. I would defend him even though I am good enough to get him off the hook the jury makes the last decision.
   6. I would defend him because it would make all my friends and relatives proud of me. I would be famous.

   **If no, please explain**
   - Circle One
   1. I won't defend him because even though I am good enough to get him off the hook I don't like what he did.
   2. I wouldn't defend him because my conscience would bother me for getting a guilty man off the hook.
   3. I would not defend him because I don't want the reputation for taking hard cases of guilty men.
   4. I wouldn't defend him because my friends would say I did the right thing in not taking the case.
   5. I won't defend him because I am so good I could get him set free whether he is guilty or not.
   6. I wouldn't defend him because by not taking the case I would become known as a lawyer for Black children.

II. You are outside in Atlanta playing with some friends. While playing you see a man pull up in a car and snatch a little Black boy into the car and take off.

   You have a gun, you step out in front of the car; the man sees you pointing the gun, he yells No! No! This is my son. The child is crying too much to tell whether the man is his father. The man starts coming towards you.

   **Will you shoot?**
   - Circle one
   - Yes
   - No

   **If yes, please explain**
   - Circle One
   1. I would shoot because if I didn't the man could possibly kill me.

   **If no, please explain**
   - Circle One
   1. I would not shoot because I could possibly go to jail for shooting him even if it wasn't his son.
2. I would shoot because it is my duty as a citizen to stop this man.

3. I would shoot because sometimes you have to make quick decisions and act on instinct.

4. I would shoot because it would be the best thing I could do for the family of the little boy.

5. I would shoot because it would make me a hero and everyone would be proud of me.

6. I would shoot because if the little boy was the man's son, he wouldn't be crying hysterically.

II. You see Mr. Jones, (a Black man) drag a Black child down an alley. After asking around you find out that three white men have kidnapped Mr. Jones' family and will kill his family unless he helps them to capture Black children. You also found out that Mr. Jones was being drugged and he did not know that the three men were killing the children. Mr. Jones didn't kill the children. If Jones was turned into the police, the three men will kill his family.

Would you turn Mr. Jones in?

Circle One

If yes, please explain

Circle One

1. Yes I would turn him in because the lives of young children are more important than the lives of Jones' family because they are young and have the chance to do more.

2. I would turn him in because I could get the reward money.

3. I would turn him in because even though his family would be killed it would save the lives of many other Black children.

4. I would turn him in because if I didn't I would be withholding evidence which is against the law.

5. I would turn him in because my family and friends would say that I did the right thing.

6. I would turn him in because this would make the other Black children safe.

If no, please explain

Circle One

1. I would not turn him in because my friends and neighbors would call me a tattle tale.

2. I would not turn him in because the police may catch the killers and that way Black children and Mr. Jones' family could be safe.

3. I would not turn him in because the police may be following him and they may have a plan to catch him. I'm not a cop, I would not get in the way.

4. I would not turn him in because the men would kill his family.

5. I would not turn him in because I wouldn't want to get involved. The three men could come after me.

6. I would not turn him in because you can't sacrifice his families lives for the lives of others.
Table Three
Medium Levels of Three Dilemmas

Iowa Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels (Stages)</th>
<th>Dilemma I</th>
<th>Dilemma II</th>
<th>Dilemma III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Atlanta Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels (Stages)</th>
<th>Dilemma I</th>
<th>Dilemma II</th>
<th>Dilemma III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Four

Yes/No Responses to Dilemmas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dilemma I</th>
<th>Dilemma I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Subjects</td>
<td>Iowa Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0% Would defend</td>
<td>61.0% Would defend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.0% Would not defend</td>
<td>39.0% Would not defend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dilemma II</th>
<th>Dilemma II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Subjects</td>
<td>Iowa Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0% Would turn Jones in</td>
<td>58.3% Would turn Jones in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0% Would not turn Jones in</td>
<td>41.7% Would not turn Jones in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dilemma III</th>
<th>Dilemma III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Subjects</td>
<td>Iowa Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.7% Would shoot</td>
<td>48.3% Would shoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0% Would not shoot</td>
<td>51.7% Would not shoot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Five
Levels Performed on Each Dilemma

**Dilemma I**

*Atlanta Subjects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Subjects</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Stage 5</th>
<th>Stage 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preconventional Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postconventional Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dilemma I**

*Iowa Subjects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Subjects</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Stage 5</th>
<th>Stage 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preconventional Level</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postconventional Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dilemma II**

*Atlanta Subjects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Subjects</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Stage 5</th>
<th>Stage 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preconventional Level</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postconventional Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One subject gave no response -1.7
**Dilemma II**

Iowa Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Stage 5</th>
<th>Stage 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Subjects</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preconventional Level</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>Conventional Level</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>Postconventional Level</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dilemma III**

Atlanta Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Stage 5</th>
<th>Stage 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Subjects</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preconventional Level</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>Conventional Level</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>Postconventional Level</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two subjects did not respond -3.3

**Dilemma III**

Iowa Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Stage 5</th>
<th>Stage 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Subjects</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>18.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preconventional Level</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>Conventional Level</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>Postconventional Level</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Five shows the levels subjects functioned on. Analysis indicates that Atlanta subjects functioned on higher levels than Iowa subjects.