

CHILDREN'S PREFERENCES OF STORY CHARACTERS  
WHO EXHIBIT OBEDIENCE AND  
DISOBEDIENCE

By

HOWARD WESLEY STEWART

Bachelor of Arts

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
December, 1975

Thesis  
1975  
S849c  
cop.2

MAR 24 1976

CHILDREN'S PREFERENCES OF STORY CHARACTERS  
WHO EXHIBIT OBEDIENCE AND  
DISOBEDIENCE

Thesis Approved:

*Althea Wright*

Thesis Adviser

*Judith A. Powell*

*Frances Stromberg*

*N. N. Durbin*

Dean of the Graduate College

935102

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to the many people who have assisted me in the writing of this study. First, I wish to express appreciation to my major adviser, Dr. Althea Wright, whose graciousness and guidance have made the writing of this study a very pleasant experience.

I also wish to express appreciation to the members of my advisory committee, Dr. Frances Stromberg and Dr. Judith Powell, whose constructive remarks proved to be invaluable in the development of the research design and the instrument. Appreciation is also expressed to the remainder of the departmental faculty, including Dr. Nick Stinnett, whose professional competence and personal concern with students have made my association with the department a very valuable and rewarding one.

Appreciation is also extended to the directors of the day care centers and the 31 children whose cooperation was essential in the completion of the study.

Much sincere appreciation is given to Cecil, Lois, and Debbie Ratliff, whose love and hospitality have been such an inspiration during my college experience. Also, special thanks to Ed White, my dear friend, for his help in the research design and analysis of data. My appreciation is also extended to Dr. Eugene Bailey for his friendship and hospitality during my college days.

My college career could never have been begun without the love and

support of my parents, Dorothy and Wayne Whaling. They have been a constant source of strength and wisdom and deserve much appreciation.

To Jeanne, my lovely wife, I extend my sincere appreciation for her love and dedication. Her help with this study, including the art work, has been of immeasurable value.

Finally, I acknowledge God's help in this study. Proverbs 3.6 says ". . . in all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy path." I have found this to be true in a personal way.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS IMPORTANCE . . . . .	1
Need for the Study . . . . .	3
Objective and Design of the Present Study . . . . .	4
Hypotheses . . . . .	5
II. RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	7
Stage Theory of Moral Development . . . . .	7
Application of the Developmental Conception of Moral Development to Moral Education . . . . .	12
Social Learning of Moral Judgments . . . . .	14
III. PROCEDURE . . . . .	19
Subjects . . . . .	19
Instrument . . . . .	19
Description of the Instrument . . . . .	19
Validity of the Instrument . . . . .	22
Reliability of the Instrument . . . . .	23
Administration of the Instrument . . . . .	23
Analysis of Data . . . . .	24
Hypotheses to be Examined . . . . .	25
IV. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS . . . . .	29
Examination of Hypotheses . . . . .	29
Analysis of Justification Responses . . . . .	35
Summary of Results . . . . .	35
V. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS . . . . .	37
Summary of Findings . . . . .	37
Generalizations . . . . .	40
Recommendations for Further Study . . . . .	41
Conclusions . . . . .	43
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	44
APPENDIX A . . . . .	46

CHAPTER	Page
APPENDIX B . . . . .	48
APPENDIX C . . . . .	54



ONTARIO STATE UNIVERSITY  
200% COLLEGE COSTS  
200% COLLEGE COSTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Total Frequencies and Percentages of Preferences of Characters in Each Situation . . . . .	30
II. Preferences for Characters in Each Story by Frequency and Percentage . . . . .	31
III. Results of Hypothesis Testing Utilizing the Binomial Test . . . . .	32



2/26 Illustrations

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND ITS IMPORTANCE

There has been much speculation concerning the many factors that may influence the moral development of children. This speculation has ranged from stage theories of development (Piaget, 1948; Kohlberg, 1958) to modeling theories of social learning (Bandura and McDonald, 1963) and has carried with it the concern of parents and moral educators, especially in light of the widespread notion of moral decay.

First proposed by Baldwin (1906) and expanded by Piaget (1948), the theory that moral development proceeds according to a preset order, or stages, has gained considerable popular support (Kohlberg, 1958; Turiel, 1966). Similar to the stage theory of moral development are the stage theories of other aspects of child development, such as cognitive and physical development, popularized by Piaget (1954), Erikson (1950), and Gesell and Ilg (1943). The basic assumption of such theories is that [growth and development proceed in orderly, predictable progressions] Likewise, children, according to the stage theory of moral development, can be expected to progress in their moral development by predictable stages. Kohlberg (1971) used the term "cognitive-developmental" to refer to a set of assumptions he has posited with regard to moral development and referred to its "cognitive" and "affective" components. Kohlberg's use of this term indicated the influence of the stage theories of cognitive development on the stage theory of moral development.

Modeling theory, or social learning theory (Bandura and Walters, 1963), stated that moral judgments are in fact learned by observing others make moral judgments. One aspect of the theory is that these judgments can be altered by employing appropriate combinations of reward and punishment for acquiring the moral judgment of the person acting as the model. Considerable research has been done concerning the influence that models have on behavior in many realms, including aggression (Bandura, Ross, and Ross, 1963). The underlying basis for all research in modeling theory is that behavior can be altered by observing a model being reinforced (positively or negatively) for behavior desired by the observer. Making the acquisition of the behavior even more likely (or unlikely, depending on which is preferred) is the procedure of reinforcing the observer for matching the behavior of the model. In moral development, therefore, research has shown that children will alter their moral judgments when positively reinforced for matching the moral judgments of a model who expresses a moral judgment characteristic of that in a higher or lower "stage" (Bandura and McDonald, 1963).

The primary difference between the theory of stage development and the theory of social learning is that the latter casts doubt on the major premise of the former. Modeling theory has stated that moral development does not proceed universally according to stages, but rather according to a more complicated series of socially learned events.

Four-year-olds, according to stage theory (Piaget, 1948), perceive authority as absolute and immutable and make their moral judgments in accordance with such perceptions. Social learning theory, on the other hand, states that a child makes his moral judgments in terms of

experience with what he has learned from interacting with others.

The aim of the present study was to investigate some aspects of the moral development issue by using the medium of storytelling. Components of both theories, that is, components that are related to the moral-judgmental level or type of stage theory (Kohlberg, 1958) and the reinforcement of social learning theory (Bandura and McDonald, 1963) were used to construct hypotheses to test the nature of children's preferences of obedient and disobedient story characters. Additional information concerning the nature of these responses could be helpful in demonstrating that children's moral development may be influenced by aspects of both major theories. The aim of the present study was to demonstrate that, although basic differences do exist, some components of the stage theory and the social learning theory of moral development are in fact complementary and serve to influence children's preferences of story characters who exhibit obedience and disobedience.

#### Need for the Study

Some applications of the principles underlying Kohlberg's developmental approach to moral development have been made with regard to assessing the moral reasoning of students in public education (Porter and Taylor, 1974; Kohlberg, 1966). Acceptance by religious education of these principles and applications has also become more widespread (Sholl, 1971). The present study, although not a replication of Kohlberg's work, was needed to examine from a different perspective some of the components of Kohlberg's stages of development that underlie its application to public and religious education. Furthermore, few studies involving the social-learning concepts of reward and punishment

configurations have been done in studies related to moral development (Kohlberg, 1963). The results of the present study may shed more light on the influence that reward and punishment have on children's preferences of obedient and disobedient story characters. The present study was timely because it sought to examine some of the components of the stage and the social learning theories of moral development. That is, the design of the present experiment incorporated aspects of both theories in examining children's moral choices. The social learning concept of sanction was used in the rewards and punishments given; the stage concept of the level of moral development was used in the types of responses given by the subjects. This was useful for two reasons: 1) it sought to reconcile some of the differences between the two theories, and 2) it sought to verify other moral development experiments such as the one done by Kohlberg (1963). Much discussion has been given to Kohlberg's work and the present study was done hoping to gain more information regarding studies done by him, particularly the 1963 study. In light of widespread concern for moral development, considering especially the notion of moral decay, the present study was useful for educators, church leaders, and parents alike, since all are concerned about contributing to the positive moral development of children.

#### Objective and Design of the Present Study

The objective of the present study was to investigate the nature of children's preferences of characters in stories with plots organized around obedience or disobedience to simple moral limits. The stories were further complicated by organizing them around the following reward-punishment design:

Situation A	Obedience was rewarded Disobedience was rewarded
Situation B	Obedience was rewarded Disobedience was punished
Situation C	Obedience was punished Disobedience was rewarded
Situation D	Obedience was punished Disobedience was punished

The design was similar to that of Kohlberg (1963) and reflected some aspects of it. It differed from the Kohlberg study in that the concept of "preference" of characters in situations involving simple moral limits was used rather than "moral judgment" in moral dilemmas.

### Hypotheses

*problems*

The hypotheses of the present study were used to examine these general questions: "Does the way rewards and punishment are given to obedient and disobedient characters influence which character children prefer?" and "Does the way rewards and punishment are given to obedient and disobedient characters influence children to be more likely to prefer an obedient character in one situation over an obedient character in another situation?" In order to expand our knowledge of children's moral development, the following hypotheses were examined:

1. Children prefer an obedient character who is rewarded rather than a disobedient character who is rewarded. *In the case study*
2. Children prefer an obedient character who is rewarded rather than a disobedient character who is punished.
3. Children prefer an obedient character who is punished rather than a disobedient character who is rewarded.
4. Children prefer an obedient character who is punished rather

than a disobedient character who is punished.

5. Children prefer an obedient character in Situation A rather than an obedient character in Situation B. *what situation?*

6. Children prefer an obedient character in Situation A rather than an obedient character in Situation C.

7. Children prefer an obedient character in Situation A rather than an obedient character in Situation D.

8. Children prefer an obedient character in Situation B rather than an obedient character in Situation C.

9. Children prefer an obedient character in Situation B rather than an obedient character in Situation D.

10. Children prefer an obedient character in Situation C rather than an obedient character in Situation D.

## CHAPTER II

### RELATED LITERATURE

#### Stage Theory of Moral Development

According to Piaget's developmental theory (1948), a child passes through successive stages of moral judgment, each stage characterized by its particular mode of organizing the social and moral order. Piaget described the initial stage of the child's moral development as "heteronomous," or the morality of constraint. This moral realism, according to Piaget, gradually gives way to a more relativistic view as the child acquires the cognitive capacities to discriminate social from physical reality.

Johnson (1962) summarized several of the concepts that are central to an understanding of Piaget's theory of moral development. These included:

- a) immanent justice--the belief in the existence of automatic punishments which emanate from things themselves, b) moral realism--a belief that acts should be judged in terms of the consequences, not on the basis of the motive behind the act, c) the belief that punishment should be retributive versus the belief that punishment should be restitutive, d) acceptance or rejection of the idea that the more severe punishment is more efficacious, and e) choice of collective or of individual responsibility for punishable acts (p. 327).

Piaget (1948) outlined three major forces as interacting to produce developmental change in moral judgment. "We have three processes to consider: the spontaneous and unconscious egocentrism belonging to the individual as such, adult constraint, and cooperation" (p. 184).

Piaget's theory holds that younger children accept the concepts of immanent justice and moral realism. In addition, his theory maintains that young children believe that retribution should be the primary basis for punishment and believe in the efficacy of severe punishment. Older children, according to Piaget, reject the concepts of immanent justice and moral realism and believe that less severe, restitutive punishments are more appropriate.

Kohlberg (1958) did an extensive study on Piagetian concepts of moral development and arrived at his own stages or schema of developmental stages. This study, the first of a series of studies and theoretical papers by Kohlberg (1971), opened up the field of moral development to investigation in terms of cognitive development. Important aspects of Kohlberg's stages of moral development were summarized as follows:

#### I. Preconventional Level

At this level the child is responsive to cultural rules and labels of good and bad, right or wrong, but interprets these labels in terms of either the physical or hedonistic consequences of action (punishment, reward, or exchange of favors) or in terms of the physical power of those who enunciate the rules and labels. The level is comprised of the following two stages.

Stage 1. Punishment and obedience orientation. The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences.

Stage 2. Instrumental relativistic orientation. Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others.

#### II. Conventional Level

At this 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. This level comprises the following two stages.

Stage 3. Interpersonal concordance, or 'good boy--nice



girl' orientation. Good behavior is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. One earns approval by being 'nice.'

Stage 4. 'Law and Order' orientation. There is orientation toward authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order. Right behavior consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake.

### III. Post-Conventional, Autonomous, or Principled Level

At this level there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles that have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles and apart from the individual's own identification with these groups.

Stage 5. Social-contract, legalistic orientation. Generally, this stage has utilitarian overtones. Right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights and in terms of standards that have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society.

Stage 6. Universal ethical-principle orientation. Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles appealing to logical comprehensiveness, universality, and consistency (Kohlberg, 1971, pp. 86-88).

Kohlberg (1971) defined moral judgment as ". . . judgments about the right and the good of action. Not all judgments of 'good' or 'right' are moral judgments" (p. 56). He defined the stage concept of moral development as follows:

1. Stages imply invariant sequence.
2. Stages define 'structured wholes,' total ways of thinking, not attitudes towards particular situations.
3. A stage concept implies universality of sequence under varying cultural conditions (p. 36).

Kohlberg (1971) identified two universal moral concepts, values, or principles:

1. Almost all individuals in all cultures use the same basic moral conception principles.
2. All individuals in all cultures go through the same order

or sequence of gross stages of development, although varying in rate and terminal point of development (p. 41).

Kohlberg (1971) outlined the two basic assumptions of his developmental theory of moral development:

1. Moral development has a cognitive core.
2. Moral development has an interactional origin, i.e., a stimulation of the child's restructuring of his experience (p. 43).

Kohlberg (1966) identified two portions of moral character: a) the ability to make genuinely moral judgments, and b) the ability to apply these judgmental capacities to the actual guidance and criticism of action (p. 25).

With regard to the transition from one stage of moral development to the next, Kohlberg (1971) stated that

. . . movement to the next stage involves internal cognitive reorganization rather than the mere addition of more difficult content from the outside. Passive exposure to the next stage of thinking is probably neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for upward movement. Even where the contact is presumably intense, as in the family, passive exposure does not directly account for a child's stage. One reason why exposure is not a sufficient condition for upward movement is because a child at a given stage does not necessarily comprehend messages at the next stage up (p. 49).

Sholl (1971) offered several points of criticism of Kohlberg's stage theory of moral development, namely, the basic problem of accounting for moral inspiration and transformation in his scheme. "Perhaps the most serious problem area is the gradualism implicit in any evolutionary system. From a theoretical perspective, at least, it seems that the possibility of radical conversion from one stage of development to a higher level . . . is impossible according to Kohlberg" (p. 371). Sholl was referring to radical or revolutionary moral transformation to a level several stages beyond the present stage.

Concerning inspiration, Sholl (1971) said that "We would want Kohlberg to account for a motivating dynamic that he has so far overlooked. In Christian terms this dynamic can be called spiritual, based on faith revelation" (p. 371). Sholl suggested that spiritual love and faith, noncognitive elements of education, may account for some explanation in moral judgment and development.

One main difference between Piaget and Kohlberg's positions is that Piaget assumed that there was a "heteronomous respect" for adult authority that served to explain moral judgments of children from four to eight years old. Kohlberg, on the other hand, maintained that children make moral judgments based on a hedonistic view of right and wrong. Kohlberg (1963) attempted to gain more information on this issue by testing 96 children, aged 4, 5, and 7 with stories in which obedience to a rule was followed by punishment, and other stories in which disobedience to a rule was followed by a reward. Kohlberg concluded that

. . . the 4-year-olds defined the story act as good or bad according to the reward or punishment rather than according to the rule or adult command. The older children showed considerable conflict, some of the 7-year-olds defining right and wrong in terms of the rule and showing concern about the 'injustice' of punishing good and rewarding evil. These older children, however, still explained the rightness or wrongness of the act in relation to sanctions, but took a long-range or probabilistic view of this relation. Disobedience might have been rewarded in that situation, the children said, but in general it would still lead to punishment.

These results, while not consistent with Piaget's assumption, should not be used to conclude that the moral decisions of 4- and 5-year-olds are based on crafty hedonism. Only as children reach a level of cognitive development at which the meaning of moral conception can be differentiated from punishment can they attain either a definite hedonism or a degree of disinterested respect for authority (p. 22).

Turiel (1966) exposed children to moral judgments at several levels and found that only children exposed to those judgments one level above their own showed any appreciable acquisition of them. The children exposed to judgments one level below their own showed some acquisition but not nearly as much as those exposed one level above. While children were able to understand moralizing that is talking down beneath their level, they did not seem to accept it nearly as much as if it was comprehensible but somewhat above their level.

Rest, Turiel, and Kohlberg (1969) attempted to replicate Turiel's (1966) study by examining some of the developmental factors that might explain Turiel's results. These authors summarized their basic findings:

1. Children prefer concepts that are above their predominant stage (whether one or two stages up).
2. Children find thinking two stages above their own more difficult to comprehend than thinking one stage above, and thinking one stage above more difficult than thinking one stage below, and accordingly.
3. Children assimilate thinking that is directly above their own stage more readily than thinking that is either one stage below or two stages above their own (p. 237).

Rest, Turiel, and Kohlberg (1969) concluded their study by stating that ". . . the last finding substantiates Turiel's (1966) findings and supports Kohlberg's contention (1963) that his developmental stages form an invariant sequence" (p. 237).

#### Application of the Developmental Conception of Moral Development to Moral Education

Based on the indications of recent research, it has seemed possible to stimulate the development of moral character in the school (Kohlberg,

1966). Such practice makes it necessary to examine the underlying bases for the application in order to accomplish it as accurately as possible.

Kohlberg (1971), in discussing moral education in the schools, made the following statement:

The child will listen to what the teacher says about moral matters only if the child first feels a genuine sense of uncertainty about the right answer to the situation in question. The pat little stories in school readers in which virtue always triumphs or in which everyone is really nice are unlikely to have any value in the stimulation of moral development. Only the presentation of genuine and difficult moral conflicts can have this effect (p. 73).

With regard to teachers' roles in the curriculum of traditional moral education, Kohlberg (1971) further stated the following:

The term 'hidden curriculum' refers to the fact that teachers and schools are engaged in moral education without explicitly and philosophically discussing or formulating its goals and methods. Engaging in moral education without thinking about its goals and methods seems as dubious as it would be in intellectual education (pp. 29, 30).

Kohlberg (1966) proposed that the stimulation of the development of the individual child's moral judgment and character should be the goal of moral education, rather than administrative convenience or satisfying state-defined values. Commenting on this goal, Kohlberg (1966) made the following statement:

The attractiveness of defining the goal of moral education as the stimulation of development rather than as teaching fixed virtues is that it means aiding the child to take the next step in a direction toward which he is already tending, rather than imposing an alien pattern on him (p. 19).

Kohlberg (1971) identified as the sign of the child's moral maturity ". . . his ability to make moral judgments and formulate moral principles of his own, rather than his ability to conform to moral judgments of the adults around him" (p. 20). Kohlberg (1966) summarized

his discussion of the relationship between moral education and school by putting forth these implications of the developmental conception of moral education:

1. That the teacher achieve clarity as to the aspects of moral development he should encourage in children of a given developmental level and as to appropriate methods of moral communication with these children.
2. That the teacher listen carefully to the child in moral communications.
3. That the teacher become concerned about the child's moral judgments rather than about the conformity of the child's behavior or judgments to the teacher's own (p. 27).

Blatt and Kohlberg (1971) applied the concept of stages in moral development to practical moral education. Their work can be summarized into two basic principles: a) arousal of genuine moral conflict, uncertainty, and disagreement about genuinely problematic solutions (in contrast to conventional moral education which has stressed adult "right answers," and reinforcement of the belief that virtue always is rewarded); and b) the presentation of modes of thought one stage above the child's own (in contrast to conventional moral education which tends to shift between appeals to adult abstractions far above the child's level and appeals to punishment and prudence liable to rejection because they are below the child's level).

#### Social Learning of Moral Judgments

According to social learning theory (Bandura and Walters, 1963), a child's acquisition of adult moral standards is a gradual process of imitating the observable values and behavior of others. Better known as modeling theory, social learning theory has as its basis the concept that most learning occurs by the observation and imitation of models.

This theory, while not entirely opposed to the stage theory of moral development, contains several points of difference with regard to how people, primarily children, acquire their moral judgments.

Bandura and McDonald (1963) performed an experiment designed to test the relative efficacy of social reinforcement and modeling procedures in modifying moral judgmental responses considered by Piaget to be at least partially age-specific. The authors found that social reinforcement and modeling procedures did in fact alter the judgments of the subjects, and concluded by stating that the results showed that:

. . . subjective morality increases gradually with age, but fail to substantiate Piaget's theory of demarcated sequential stages in moral development. Children at all age levels exhibited discriminative repertoires of moral judgments in which both objective and subjective classes of responses exist concurrently (p. 280).

Bandura and McDonald (1963) concluded by stating that "the utility of Piaget's stage theory of morality is further limited by the finding that children's judgmental responses are readily modifiable, particularly through the utilization of adult modeling cues" (p. 280).

Cowan, Langer, Heavenrich, and Nathanson (1969) attempted to replicate Bandura and McDonald's (1963) study in order to clarify their results and interpretations. They argued that Bandura and McDonald's interpretation of Piaget is open to question and that their data have little relevance to Piaget's position.

Criticizing Bandura and McDonald's interpretations of the implications of Piaget's stage theory, Cowan et al. (1969) offered several arguments:

1. Age Specific. Piaget has never argued that his stages are age specific . . . Bandura and McDonald's provision of a cross-sectional growth curve of average number of responses, in which the longitudinal discontinuities may cancel each other out, is simply not relevant either to Piaget's

discussion of continuity and discontinuity in development (p. 263).

2. Clear-cut Stages. Bandura and McDonald have constructed a situation to elicit clear-cut responses, but Piaget specifically disclaimed the idea that any given child will consistently perform only at one clear-cut stage (p. 263).

3. Predeterminism. Both Piaget and Bandura and McDonald consider social interaction to be an important factor in the change from lower to higher levels. Piaget, then is not positing a predetermined developmental force in the sense of a maturation theory like that of Gesell (p. 264).

4. Necessary Sequence of Stages. The crucial question raised by Bandura and McDonald's experiment is whether they provide an adequate demonstration of a reversal in the 'necessary sequence' of stages of moral development. Piaget, as well as social learning theory, would expect these children to change in either direction as a result of environmental pressure (p. 264).

Arguing against the theory of social learning with regard to moral development, Cowan et al. (1969) stated that

One of the most cogent arguments against social imitation as the prime variable in the learning of moral judgments is the fact that lower-level judgments predominate at earlier ages. This predominance occurs in spite of the fact that adults presumably do not provide pervasive models of, or reinforcement for, lower-level responses. If it is to be argued that adults do in fact model and reinforce low-level judgments, then it is difficult to explain the observed changes in level of moral judgment with age . . . (p. 263).

Cowan et al. (1969) contend that Bandura and McDonald ". . . have not always stated Piaget's position accurately and have not provided definitive procedures to assess stages or changes in stages of moral development" (p. 264). The study by Cowan et al. (1969) was essentially a replication of the Bandura and McDonald study (1963). The authors generalized their results by stating that

. . . the present results provide a great deal of support for Bandura and McDonald's contention that moral responses of children can be modified in either developmental direction by exposure to adult models (p. 272).



Cowan et al. (1969), after providing considerable criticism of Bandura and McDonald's study, found results similar to theirs and concluded that "the theoretical differences between social learning and Piaget's cognitive theory of moral development remain unresolved" (p. 273).

Bandura (1969), in response to Cowan, discussed several of the relevant issues in order to clarify areas of misunderstanding. With regard to the nature of Piaget's developmental stages, Bandura (1969) maintained that Cowan et al. (1969) conveyed the impression of contradictions that do not exist. He said that the original Bandura and McDonald study (1963) was referring to several general characteristics of stage theories, not necessarily Piaget's.

Bandura (1969) also discussed the applicability of the Bandura and McDonald study (1963) to real life, stating that the Cowan et al. (1969) study was based on the inconsistent use of criteria for determining what stage the subjects were in. Bandura (1969) proceeded to point out several flaws in the experimental design, data, and statistical analysis of Cowan et al. (1969).

With regard to the argument that social learning theory cannot account for the corresponding predominance of lower stages with lower ages, Bandura (1969) maintained that

. . . parents generally behave in a discriminative manner so that under some circumstances they evaluate the reprehensibility of action primarily in terms of their consequences, while under other conditions they may give priority to the offender's intentions. It is no surprise to find that parents are more inclined to take intentions into account in judging their children's behavior as they advance in age (p. 278).

Bandura (1969) concluded his argument by stating that

Results of the two experiments under discussion

consistently demonstrate that moral judgments are more variable both within and between individuals and more modifiable than Piaget's theory would lead one to expect. Furthermore, modeling influences, which receive no mention in Piaget's account of the conditions regulating judgmental behavior, though they are operative in everyday interactions, emerge as significant determinants (p. 279).

Le Furgy and Woloshin (1969) tested 24 morally realistic and 29 morally relativistic 13-year-old children in an attempt to specify the relationship of peer influence to immediate and long-term modifications of the subjects' styles of moral judgment. Using classical social influence procedures, the subjects were exposed to a series of moral dilemmas designed to tap various aspects of Piaget's (1948) autonomous and heteronomous stages of moral development. Children of both sexes and moral orientations evidenced significant yielding to peer influences in their responses to the dilemmas--the morally relativistic children showed a diminishing of these effects over 100 days, while morally realistic subjects showed immediate and long-term shifts in their judgmental styles. The results of this study documented the fact that adolescents of both sexes and moral orientations will respond to ". . . immediate, face-to-face peer pressures with dramatic shifts away from their initial orientation" (p. 107). The differential effectiveness of this influence tended to confirm Turiel's work (1966) who found that children were consistently more susceptible to efforts designed to induce progressive rather than retrogressive change.

The literature points up many differences that exist between the two major theories of moral development. Although basic differences do exist and remain as yet unresolved, it seems clear that both theories hold valid explanations for many aspects of moral development.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE

#### Subjects

Subjects for this study consisted of 17 boys and 14 girls enrolled in three day care centers located in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, and one located in Stillwater, Oklahoma, two communities of approximately the same population and composition. The average age of the subjects was 55.7 months, with the youngest subject being 44 months, and the oldest 63 months. Letters were sent to six day care centers in Bartlesville explaining the project and requesting that the researcher be allowed to interview the children in each center (Appendix A). Of the six centers contacted, three directors consented, two did not consent, and one center had apparently gone out of business. The researcher originally intended to test children in Bartlesville only, but the small number of available children there prompted the researcher to seek additional subjects. Thus, it was deemed appropriate to include children from the Stillwater center. Although close controls on socioeconomic status were not used, the subjects seemed to represent a variety of backgrounds.

#### Instrument

##### Description of the Instrument

The hypotheses of the present study were tested by using an

instrument developed by the investigator. It is similar to the one devised by Kohlberg (1963) in his study of the effect of rewards and punishment on children's moral choices. Kohlberg (1963) used an experimental design consisting of obedient characters being punished and disobedient characters being rewarded, and vice versa. This scheme was adopted in the present instrument in addition to two situations in which both characters were either rewarded or punished. The present instrument consisted of 12 stories with two characters per story, one obedient, the other disobedient. While Kohlberg (1963) used human characters, it was decided to use animal characters in the present study to avoid bias by obvious sex-role stereotyping. A total of ten animals (five pairs)--two dogs playing in the sandpile, two cats playing with balls of string, two birds swimming, two mice painting, and two rabbits eating candy--served as the characters for the entire instrument. Each story consisted of four illustrations drawn by the researcher's wife. All the characters were used more than once, although the accompanying text was changed for each story.

but how  
 about  
 minimal preference  
 re-test  
 bias

The text of the stories was recorded on a cassette tape and was played to correspond with the illustrations of each story. The stories were written according to the following design:

- A. Three stories in which the obedient character was rewarded and the disobedient character was rewarded.
- B. Three stories in which the obedient character was rewarded and the disobedient character was punished.
- C. Three stories in which the obedient character was punished and the disobedient character was rewarded.
- D. Three stories in which the obedient character was punished

and the disobedient character was punished.

By utilizing the five pairs of characters in sequence, pairs 1 and 2 were used in three stories each, and pairs 3, 4, and 5 were used in two stories each, making a total of 12 stories. Each subject heard all 12 stories. Refer to Appendix B for the complete text of the stories.

Each tape-recorded story consisted of the following basic format:

1. Introduction.
2. Body of the Story. The body of the story consisted of the appropriate text, as told by a male storyteller, the recorded voice of the interviewer.

3. Preference Cue. The preference cue occurred after the ending of the body of the story and consisted of the following statement: "Now, point to the picture of the kitty (puppy, rabbit, etc.) that you like the best."

4. Justification. The interviewer then turned off the cassette player and asked the following question: "Why did you pick that one?" After the two responses were recorded, the procedure was repeated for the remaining stories.

*Control:* To provide some control over sequential preference that may have occurred, the first-second position of the characters (in terms of which was described first, the obedient or the disobedient) was interchanged for each story, i.e., the obedient character was mentioned and described first in one story and second in the next story. To provide some control over directional preference in choosing the character, the left-right position of the characters (in terms of the obedient and disobedient character) was interchanged with each successive story at the point the subjects made their preference.

Each subject was scored for the responses he gave to the preference cue and the justification. If the subject preferred the obedient character in the first story, the interviewer placed a "check" in the corresponding square. (The interviewer noted pertinent comments related to the subjects' justification responses or the "why" responses.) A sample scoresheet may be examined in Appendix C.

### Validity of the Instrument

Several factors were included in the design of the instrument to make it as valid as possible for use with young children.

1. In order to avoid character preference influenced by sex-role identification, animals with a minimum of sex-role stereotyping were used to depict the characters, rather than male or female children.

2. In order to avoid character preference influenced by size, color, or other physical characteristics, the pairs of characters were depicted as nearly alike as possible.

3. To obtain some indication of character preference due to extraneous variables, portions of the instrument showing the characters involved in the preliminary stages of the stories (with no indication of obeying or disobeying, and no sanction) were administered to a test group of four four-year-old children. Preference was found to be distributed evenly between pairs of characters.

4. To obtain some indication of the validity of the instrument in terms of the appropriateness of the characters, the rules stated, and the sanction given, the instrument was submitted to a panel of judges for objective evaluation. The panel consisted of the professors on the researcher's advisory committee, persons skilled in the areas of family

relations, child development and early childhood education. The judges were asked to make suggestions regarding the following aspects of the instrument: clarity of the instructions, interest to young children, relevance of the stories to the experimental design, appropriateness of the sanctions, rules, and the illustrations. The judges examined the instrument and suggested that [color be added to the illustrations for added appeal to children, that each subject be exposed to all the experimental treatments, and that the cassette recording be done in a continuous manner. The researcher incorporated these suggestions and the instrument was deemed adequate for testing.]

#### Reliability of the Instrument

In order to establish a measure of reliability for the moral judgment instrument, seven subjects were chosen from the original test group and were re-tested by the researcher on the instrument seven days after their initial test. The re-test sample included five boys and two girls. A Spearman rank correlation coefficient was calculated from the initial test scores and re-test scores in terms of the frequency of preference of obedient characters. A rho of .80, significant at the .05 level of probability, was determined from the tests and re-tests. This correlation was judged to be significant and contributed to establishing the instrument as reliable.

#### Administration of the Instrument

Prior to each interview, each interview, each subject was given a "ticket" with his name written on it which was meant to be his means of entering the "story-telling show." The interviewer then accompanied

each subject into an isolated interviewing area where the instrument was administered individually. A short period of time was used for establishing rapport between the interviewer and the subject before beginning. When the child was seated comfortably, he was asked if he had seen a "story-telling show" before. The interviewer then opened the book of illustrations to the first page which showed drawings of two rabbits, thereafter allowing the subject to turn the pages at the appropriate times. At the end of the story, the interviewer turned off the cassette player and recorded the subject's preference of characters and the reason he chose the one he did. This procedure was repeated until all 12 stories of the instrument had been completed, which usually required a total of 12-15 minutes. Most children played a verbal and active role in responding to the stories. A few subjects, on the other hand, offered little more than pointing a finger at their favorite character. Most of the subjects seemed to enjoy the stories and frequently would relate their own experiences in similar situations.

#### Analysis of Data

A binomial experiment consistently generates an "either-or" result in much the same way a tossed coin produces a "heads-tails" result. The present study was designed to produce such a distribution. That is, the subjects' preferences of characters were determined in an "either-or" manner. This distribution, while not satisfying the definitions of the parametric or nonparametric experiments usually performed in the behavioral sciences, did satisfy the conditions of a binomial distribution. These conditions were listed by Mendenhall and Reinmuth (1971) as follows:



1. The experiment consists of  $n$  identical trials.
2. Each trial results in one of two outcomes.
3. The probability of 'success' on a single trial remains the same from trial to trial.
4. The trials are independent.
5. We are concerned about the number of 'successes' observed during the  $n$  trials (p. 130).

Statistical analysis of a binomial experiment usually is done by means of the binomial test for equal probabilities, much the way in which a nonparametric experiment may be analyzed by means of the Chi square. There exist  $z$  formulas and  $z$  tables such that when a  $z$  value is calculated, the significance level may be determined in a way similar to that of Chi square, for example. This method was employed in the present study and the data were analyzed in three ways: 1) analysis of cumulative frequencies of "obedient" and "disobedient" character preferences within each group, using the binomial test, 2) analysis of cumulative frequencies of "obedient" character preferences among each of the four test situations, also using the binomial test, and 3) analysis and interpretation of the open-ended justification responses. The .01 level of significance was chosen as the level at which the hypotheses would be either accepted or rejected.

#### Hypotheses to be Examined

The objective of the present study was to investigate the nature of children's preferences in moral dilemmas in stories with plots organized around obedience or disobedience to simple moral limits. The stories were further complicated by organizing them around the following reward-punishment design:

Stories in Situation A	Obedience was rewarded Disobedience was rewarded
Stories in Situation B	Obedience was rewarded Disobedience was punished
Stories in Situation C	Obedience was punished Disobedience was rewarded
Stories in Situation D	Obedience was punished Disobedience was punished

Hypotheses 1-4 were examined to determine if the reward-punishment design was responsible for influencing which character children generally preferred in each situation--the obedient one or the disobedient one.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters who are rewarded and disobedient characters who are rewarded.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters who are rewarded and disobedient characters who are punished.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters who are punished and disobedient characters who are rewarded.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters who are punished and disobedient characters who are punished.

Hypotheses 5-10 were examined to determine if the reward-punishment design was responsible for influencing children to be more likely to prefer the obedient character in one situation over the obedient character in another situation. For example, in Situation A, both characters were rewarded, while in Situation B, the obedient character was rewarded

and the disobedient character was punished. The hypothesis for this particular situation sought to determine which character children preferred more often--the obedient one in Situation A, or the obedient one in Situation B. The last six hypotheses were used to determine if children were more likely to prefer the obedient character in one situation over the obedient character in another situation. Six such comparisons were generated by comparing Situation A with B, C, and D; Situation B with C and D; and Situation C with D. For clarity in expressing the hypotheses, the terms "Situation A," "Situation B," "Situation C," and "Situation D" were used, relying on the outline given above for the reward-punishment scheme for each situation.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation A and obedient characters in Situation B.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation A and obedient characters in Situation C.

Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation A and obedient characters in Situation D.

Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation B and obedient characters in Situation C.

Hypothesis 9: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation B and obedient characters in Situation D.

Hypothesis 10: There is no significant difference between the

frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation C and obedient characters in Situation D.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The present study was designed such that the data produced a binomial distribution, characterized by an "either-or" result similar to flipping a coin. The three aspects of the analysis of data which utilized the binomial distribution were 1) analysis of the cumulative frequencies of "obedient" and "disobedient" character preferences within each group, using the binomial test (Hypotheses 1-4), 2) analysis of the cumulative frequencies of "obedient" character preferences among each of the four test situations, using the binomial test also (Hypotheses 5-10), and 3) analysis of the open-ended justification responses. Table I contains the total frequencies and percentages of preferences expressed according to the four reward-punishment situations. Table II reports the preferences expressed according to each of the 12 stories.

#### Examination of Hypotheses

The hypotheses of the present study were tested for significance by the use of the binomial test for equal probabilities. A summary of the hypothesis testing can be found in Table III.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters who are rewarded and disobedient characters who are rewarded. A total of 73 responses (78.5%) preferring the obedient characters and 20 responses (21.5%)

TABLE I  
 TOTAL FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF  
 PREFERENCES<sup>1</sup> OF CHARACTERS  
 IN EACH SITUATION  
 N = 31

Configuration	Freq.	%
<u>Situation A</u>		
Obedience Rewarded	73	78.5
Disobedience Rewarded	20	21.5
Total	93	100.0
<u>Situation B</u>		
Obedience Rewarded	83	89.2
Disobedience Punished	10	10.8
Total	93	100.0
<u>Situation C</u>		
Obedience Punished	48	51.6
Disobedience Rewarded	45	48.4
Total	93	100.0
<u>Situation D</u>		
Obedience Punished	82	88.2
Disobedience Punished	11	11.8
Total	93	100.0

<sup>1</sup>Each subject made three preferences per situation.

TABLE II  
 PREFERENCES<sup>1</sup> FOR CHARACTERS IN EACH  
 STORY BY FREQUENCY  
 AND PERCENTAGE  
 N = 31

Situation	Obedient		Disobedient	
	f	%	f	%
A: Obedience Rewarded Disobedience Rewarded				
Story 1	26	83.9	5	16.1
Story 2	23	74.2	8	25.8
Story 3	24	77.4	7	22.6
B: Obedience Rewarded Disobedience Punished				
Story 4	27	87.1	4	12.9
Story 5	27	87.1	4	12.9
Story 6	28	90.3	3	9.7
C: Obedience Punished Disobedience Rewarded				
Story 7	14	45.2	17	54.8
Story 8	15	48.4	16	51.6
Story 9	19	61.3	12	38.7
D: Obedience Punished Disobedience Punished				
Story 10	28	90.3	3	9.7
Story 11	28	90.3	3	9.7
Story 12	27	87.1	4	12.9

<sup>1</sup>Each subject made three preferences per situation.

TABLE III  
RESULTS OF HYPOTHESIS TESTING UTILIZING  
THE BINOMIAL TEST

Hypothesis	z Value	Level of Probability
No. 1	5.6	.01
No. 2	7.8	.01
No. 3	0.4	N.S.
No. 4	7.6	.01
No. 5	-2.2	N.S.
No. 6	3.9	.01
No. 7	-2.2	N.S.
No. 8	4.2	.01
No. 9	0.25	N.S.
No. 10	4.2	.01



preferring the disobedient characters were recorded in the three Situation A stories. The difference between these two frequencies was determined to be significant at the .01 level, lending evidence for rejecting Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters who are rewarded and disobedient characters who are punished. A total of 83 responses (89.2%) favoring the obedient character and only 10 responses (10.7%) favoring the disobedient character were recorded in Situation B, the greatest difference in all four situations. This result was determined to be significantly different at the .01 level, lending support for rejecting Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters who are punished and disobedient characters who are rewarded. Situation C yielded results quite unlike those in the other three situations. A total of 48 responses (51.6%) preferring the obedient character were recorded, while 45 responses (48.4%) were recorded preferring the disobedient character. Statistical analysis showed no significant difference between the frequency of preference of obedient and disobedient characters. Evidence was not found to reject this null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters who are punished and disobedient characters who are punished. A total of 82 preferences (88.2%) for the obedient characters and only 11 preferences (11.8%) for the disobedient characters were expressed in Situation D. As in Hypothesis 2, analysis showed a significant difference at the .01 level,

tending support to reject Hypothesis 4.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation A and obedient characters in Situation B. Analysis of the results did not reveal a difference significant at the .01 level. Evidence suggested that Hypothesis 5 not be rejected.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation A and obedient characters in Situation C. A comparison of the frequency of preferences for obedience showed a difference significant at the .01 level. Hypothesis 6 was rejected, also.

Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation A and obedient characters in Situation D. Analysis of this hypothesis did not yield a difference significant at the .01 level. As in Hypothesis 5, Hypothesis 7 was not rejected.

Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation B and obedient characters in Situation C. Analysis showed that there was a significant difference between these preferences at the .01 level. This null hypothesis was also rejected.

Hypothesis 9: There is no significant difference between the frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation B and obedient characters in Situation D. Statistical analysis showed no significant difference between the results. Evidence was not found to reject Hypothesis 9.

Hypothesis 10: There is no significant difference between the

frequency of children's preferences of obedient characters in Situation C and obedient characters in Situation D. A comparison of these results yielded a difference significant at the .01 level. Evidence was found for rejecting this null hypothesis.

#### Analysis of Justification Responses

Most subjects commented on why they chose each character, although a few subjects were unwilling to venture a statement. Open-ended questions are generally not easily analyzed, and the present study was no exception. However, responses could be organized into several categories:

"I just do."

"He did what his mommy told him."

"He didn't get a spanking."

"He was nice."

"He didn't get messy."

"He got a kiss."

By far the most prevalent response was "He did what his mommy told him to." It was not uncommon for the subjects to express concern over the welfare of the obedient characters who received spankings. Subjects would frequently ask the question: "But why did he get a spanking?"

#### Summary of Results

The hypotheses were examined using the binomial test and evidence was found to reject Hypotheses 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10. Analysis of the justification showed several categories of responses ranging from "I just do" to the most frequent "He did what his mommy told him." Many

of the subjects expressed concern about the injustice of spanking the obedient character.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

#### Summary of Findings

An instrument designed to assess moral judgment was developed by the investigator and was administered to 31 subjects in an effort to determine how rewards and punishment influence children's preferences of obedient and disobedient story characters. A total of ten hypotheses were presented and analyzed, the results providing evidence for a number of tentative conclusions among the children in the present sample.

1. Children were more likely to prefer an obedient character who was rewarded, rather than a disobedient character who was rewarded. In this case, the rewards given apparently did not influence the children's choices. When both characters were rewarded, the children chose the obedient character.

2. Children were more likely to prefer an obedient character who was rewarded, rather than a disobedient character who was punished. In this case, there was an increase of preference for the obedient character, yielding the greatest difference in any of the four situations. Apparently, the punishment of the disobedient character deterred children from choosing him as often.

3. Children were just as likely to choose an obedient character who was punished as they were to choose a disobedient character who was rewarded. This conclusion was consistent with Kohlberg's (1963) results

who found that four-year-olds defined story acts as good or bad according to the reward or punishment, rather than according to the rule. In this particular situation, which was similar to Kohlberg's (1963), the sanction given did play a significant role in children's preferences of characters. As with Kohlberg, some children in the present study expressed concern over the injustice of punishing the good character, while other subjects were primarily concerned with the sanction.

4. Children were more likely to prefer an obedient character who was punished, rather than a disobedient character who was punished. Even though the obedient characters were punished, the children preferred them by an overwhelming margin, perhaps because there was no other alternative acceptable to them. In any case, the children generally preferred the obedient character in this situation.

5. Children were just as likely to choose an obedient character in Situation A (Obedience rewarded, disobedience rewarded) as an obedient character in Situation B (Obedience rewarded, disobedience punished). In other words, whether the disobedient character was rewarded or punished, children preferred the obedient character, as long as he was rewarded.

6. Children were more likely to choose an obedient character in Situation A (Obedience rewarded, disobedience rewarded) than an obedient character in Situation C (Obedience punished, disobedience rewarded). Two factors in Situation C may have influenced this conclusion: 1) the punishment of obedient characters, and 2) the reward of disobedient characters. Punishing good and rewarding bad might lead children into preferring bad characters. At least in this case, there was a

significant difference in how frequently children chose the obedient character. This finding, consistent with social learning theory (Bandura and Walters, 1963), has definite application in present moral education.

7. Children were just as likely to prefer an obedient character in Situation A (Obedience rewarded, disobedience rewarded) as an obedient character in Situation D (Obedience punished, disobedience punished). Even though both characters in Situation D were punished, the subjects chose the obedient one just as frequently as the obedient characters in Situation A, where both were rewarded.

8. Children were more likely to prefer an obedient character in Situation B (Obedience rewarded, disobedience punished) than an obedient character in Situation C (Obedience punished, disobedience rewarded). The sanctions given in each of these situations were exactly opposite, but the results, though different, were not exactly opposite. Punishing the obedient character and rewarding the disobedient character was less of an influence than doing the opposite. The choice was about 50-50 in Situation C, while in Situation B, the majority favored the obedient character. The sanctions in this case provided a significant influence in the preferences of obedient characters.

9. Children were just as likely to choose an obedient character in Situation B (Obedience rewarded, disobedience punished) as one in Situation D (Obedience punished, disobedience punished). In fact, the almost identical scores for these two situations might lead one to suspect that when disobedience is punished, children prefer obedience no matter what the sanction. This result lends credence to the old belief that swift punishment acted as an encouragement to be good.

10. Children were more likely to choose the obedient character in Situation D (Obedience punished, disobedience punished) than the one in Situation C (Obedience punished, disobedience rewarded). This result was also consistent with the previous result in that when disobedience was rewarded and obedience punished, significantly fewer children chose the obedient character than when both were punished.

### Generalizations

Several generalizations were made with regard to the above findings, keeping in mind the limited scope of the present study.

1. Children consistently preferred the obedient characters rather than the disobedient characters, except in the case in which the obedient characters received punishment and the disobedient characters received rewards. This finding was consistent with both the stage-developmental theory (Kohlberg, 1963) and the social-learning theory of moral development (Bandura and Walters, 1963).

2. No matter which reward-punishment situation was used, children were just as likely to choose the obedient character in any one situation as in another except in Situation C (Obedience punished, disobedience rewarded). This situation proved to be unique among the four situations because of its equal distribution of children's preferences of characters. Significant differences were generated between this and the other situations, pointing up the unusual influence this particular reward-punishment situation had on children's preferences of characters.

In general then, children usually preferred the obedient characters regardless of the reward or punishment given to each. This was true with the exception of the case in which the obedient character was



punished and the disobedient character rewarded. Considering the average age of the subjects, this was not an unusual finding and was consistent with Kohlberg's data (1963). However, one would probably expect older children to be more likely to prefer the obedient characters in all cases, as Kohlberg (1963) also found. Since older children are generally more highly developed morally, they would be less concerned with sanction and more concerned with justice or intent (Kohlberg, 1963).

#### Recommendations for Further Study

The scope of the present study was limited, but it did use both social-learning concepts and stage-developmental concepts in the experimental design. While many studies have been done regarding moral development in children, there have been few studies which have attempted to explore the influence of sanctions in children's choices of characters (Kohlberg, 1963). The purpose of the present study was, therefore, to examine these influences in light of children's preferences of obedient and disobedient characters in order that educators, parents, and church leaders might add to their knowledge of the moral development of children.

Since the present study was limited in scope, several recommendations which would serve to improve and expand the experiment were in order:

1. Re-examination of the instrument for reliability and validity. Although this was attempted in the present study, more rigorous methods would prove beneficial in establishing more certainly the instrument as both reliable and valid.

2. Randomize the order of presentation of situations.
3. Increase sample size.
4. Test hypotheses in terms of age and sex of the subjects.
5. Examine young children's understanding of justice and injustice.
6. Further examine young children's understanding of reward and punishment. Although the present study generated information regarding this question, other factors may influence a child's preference of a rewarded or punished character (e.g.: severity of punishment, which parent does the rewarding or punishing, the seriousness of the infraction, etc.).

Several more general questions follow from those above and can be expressed in concern for moral education at large.

1. "Do storybooks significantly influence children's moral orientations? That is, are there applications in storybooks for influencing children's preferences of characters? Do some stories actually encourage children to model after the bad character? If so, what steps can parents or educators take to control these books without censorship or without limiting valuable educational experience? Do books actually encourage preference of bad characters, or do books simply reflect values and attitudes of society in general?"

2. "Does leniency in court proceedings encourage children to prefer criminals?" It should be noted that in most cases of criminal acts, restitution is not made to the victim of the crime (negative), while the criminal in many cases is allowed to go free (positive). Although many differences exist and other factors enter in, this situation is very much similar to Situation C (Obedience punished, disobedience

rewarded) of the present study, the only situation in which children were just as likely to choose the disobedient characters as the obedient characters. Many leaders and laymen alike may be sensing such a trend in criminal matters and their concern may be fostering the return of capital punishment in many states and a widespread "get-tough" attitude towards crime in general. In any case, further study is recommended before any conclusion can be made.

### Conclusions

The findings of the present study offered several conclusions, namely that certain combinations of rewards and punishment can significantly influence children's choices of story characters. It has also been shown that aspects of both moral development theories can in fact be seen in operation in the same experiment, something that has not generally been argued or presented. Application of these findings, however, will be more difficult mainly because of the greater complexity of moral issues in the real world. It was urged that further studies be made to investigate in greater depth the issues of moral development in children and the implications for everyday life.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baldwin, J. M. Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1906.
- Bandura, A. "Social Learning of Moral Judgments." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 11 (1969), 275-279.
- Bandura, A., and F. McDonald. "Influence of Social Reinforcement and the Behavior of Models in Shaping Children's Moral Judgments." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 67 (1963), 274-281.
- Bandura, A., D. Ross, and S. A. Ross. "Imitation of Film-Mediated Aggressive Models." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 66 (1963), 3-11.
- Bandura, A., and R. H. Walters. Social Learning and Personality Development. New York: Holt, Inc., 1963.
- Blatt, N., and L. Kohlberg. "The Effects of Classroom Moral Discussion Upon Children's Level of Moral Judgment." In Lawrence Kohlberg and Eliot Turiel, Moralization Research: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1971, 104-125.
- Cowan, P. A., J. Langer, J. Heavenrich, and M. Nathanson. "Social Learning and Piaget's Cognitive Theory of Moral Development." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 11 (1969), 261-264.
- Erikson, E. H. Childhood and Society. New York: Norton, 1950.
- Gesell, A., and F. L. Ilg. Infant and Child in the Culture of Today. New York: Harper, 1943.
- Johnson, R. C. "A Study of Children's Moral Judgments." Child Development, Vol. 30 (1962), 327-354.
- Kohlberg, L. "The Development of Modes of Moral Thinking and Choice in the Years 10 to 16." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.)
- Kohlberg, L. "The Development of Children's Orientations Toward a Moral Order." Vita Humana, Vol. 6 (1963), 11-33.

- Kohlberg, L. "Moral Education in the Schools: A Developmental View." The School Review, Vol. 74 (1966), 1-30.
- Kohlberg, L. "Stages of Moral Development as a Basis for Moral Education." In C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden, and E. V. Sullivan, Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971, 49-88.
- Krahn, J. H. "A Comparison of Kohlberg's and Piaget's Type I Morality." Religious Education, Vol. 66 (1971), 373-375.
- Le Furgy, W. G., and G. W. Woloshin. "Immediate and Long-Term Effects of Experimentally-induced Social Influences in the Modification of Adolescents' Moral Judgments." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 12 (1969), 104-110.
- Mendenhall, W., and J. E. Reinmuth. Statistics for Management and Economics. Belmont, California: Duxbury Press, 1971.
- Piaget, J. The Moral Judgment of the Child. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1948.
- Piaget, J. The Construction of Reality in the Child. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1954.
- Porter, N., and N. Taylor. How to Assess the Moral Reasoning of Students. Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1974.
- Rest, J. "Developmental Hierarchy in Preference and Comprehension of Moral Judgment." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1968.)
- Rest, J., E. Turiel, and L. Kohlberg. "Relations Between Level of Moral Judgment and Preference and Comprehension of Moral Judgment of Others." Journal of Personality, Vol. 37 (1969), 223-252.
- Sholl, D. "The Contributions of Lawrence Kohlberg to Religious and Moral Education." Religious Education, Vol. 66 (1971), 364-372.
- Turiel, E. "An Experimental Test of the Sequentiality of Developmental Stages in the Child's Moral Judgments." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 3 (1966), 611-618.

APPENDIX A

April 8, 1975

Dear Director:

I am writing you regarding possible ways you may be able to help me in a simple research project I am doing for my master's thesis.

My research project deals with the way four-year-old children make decisions about right and wrong. I have some children's stories about characters who are either obedient or disobedient. I hope to get some idea which character children prefer. From the findings I hope to make suggestions with regard to how we can give better moral training to our children.

The way the project goes is that I tell the stories to each child individually, which takes about 10 minutes per child. Then I record which character they chose as "liking best." Children so far have been very enthusiastic. I would be glad to show you the stories if you have any questions.

I am asking for your permission to come to your center and give the test to the children in your four-year-old group. Also, do you feel that it would be necessary to get the parents' permission? If so, I can write them a short letter requesting it.

May I call you soon to discuss my project with you? Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Howard W. Stewart  
Ochelata, Oklahoma  
535-2328

APPENDIX B



## Situation A Stories

Story No. 1

*Names  
=> bias* Once upon a time, there were two little rabbits, Shortie and Rootie. One day, Mother Rabbit said, "Shortie and Rootie, would you like to eat some candy today?"

"Oh, yes!" said Shortie.

"Oh, yes!" said Rootie.

"Very well," said Mother Rabbit. "But please be very careful when you eat it and don't get any on your clothes or your face. Ok?"

So Shortie and Rootie began to eat their candy. Shortie was very careful and didn't get any candy on his clothes or face. Mother Rabbit gave him a big kiss. Then Rootie grabbed his candy with both hands and started rubbing it all over his face and clothes as he ate it. Mother Rabbit gave him a big kiss, too.

Story No. 2

Once upon a time, there were two little mice, Smokey and Squeakie. One day, Mother Mouse said, "Smokey and Squeakie, would you like to paint today?"

"Oh, yes!" said Smokey.

"Oh, yes!" said Squeakie.

"Very well," said Mother Mouse. "But please be very careful and paint on the paper and don't get any paint on the wall or the floor or yourself. Ok?"

So Smokey and Squeakie started to paint. Smokey dipped the brush in the paint and painted the wall, the floor, and all over everything. Mother Mouse gave him a big kiss. Then Squeakie very carefully painted on the paper. Mother Mouse gave him a big kiss, too.

Story No. 3

Once upon a time, there were two puppies, Spot and Fido. One day, Mother Dog said, "Spot and Fido, how would you like to play in the sand today?"

"Oh, I would," said Spot.

"So would I," said Fido.

"Very well," said Mother Dog. "But please be very careful and keep the sand all on the ground and don't get any in your hair. Ok?"

So Spot and Fido started to play in the sandpile. Spot was very careful and kept the sand all on the ground and didn't get any in his hair. Mother Dog gave him a big kiss. Then Fido filled his bucket full of sand and poured it all over himself. Mother Dog gave him a big kiss, too.

### Situation B Stories

#### Story No. 4

Once upon a time, there were two little birds, Squawkie and Chirpie. One day, Mother Bird said, "Squawkie and Chirpie, would you like to play in the water today?"

"Oh, yes!" said Squawkie.

"Oh, yes!" said Chirpie.

"Very well," said Mother Bird. "Please be very careful, though, and play in the clean water and don't play in the dirty, muddy water. Ok?"

So Squawkie and Chirpie started to play in the water. Squawkie hopped over to the dirty, muddy water and splashed right in it. Mother Bird gave him a spanking. But Chirpie was very careful and played in the clean water. Mother Bird gave him a big kiss.

#### Story No. 5

Once upon a time, there were two kittens, Fluffy and Tabby. One day, Mother Cat said, "Fluffy and Tabby, would you like to play with the balls of string today?"

"Oh, yes!" said Fluffy.

"Oh, yes!" said Tabby.

"Very well," said Mother Cat. "Please be very careful, though, and keep the string all rolled up in a ball and don't unroll the string."

So Fluffy and Tabby started to play with the balls of string. Fluffy was very careful and kept the ball of string all rolled up in a ball. Mother Cat gave him a big kiss. But Tabby grabbed a ball of string and started unrolling it until he had string all over himself. Mother Cat gave him a spanking.

### Story No. 6

Once upon a time, there were two little rabbits, Shortie and Rootie. One day, Mother Rabbit said, "Shortie and Rootie, would you like to eat some candy today?"

"Oh, yes!" said Shortie.

"Oh, yes!" said Rootie.

"Very well," said Mother Rabbit. "But please be very careful when you eat it and don't get any on your clothes or your face. Ok?"

So Shortie and Rootie began to eat their candy. Shortie was very careful and didn't get any candy on his clothes or face. Mother Rabbit gave him a big kiss. Then Rootie grabbed his candy with both hands and started rubbing it all over his face and clothes as he ate it. But Mother Rabbit gave him a spanking.

## Situation C Stories

### Story No. 7

Once upon a time, there were two little mice, Smokey and Squeakie. One day, Mother Mouse said, "Smokey and Squeakie, would you like to paint today?"

"Oh, yes!" said Smokey.

"Oh, yes!" said Squeakie.

"Very well," said Mother Mouse. "But please be very careful and paint on the paper and don't get any paint on the wall, or the floor, or yourself. Ok?"

So Smokey and Squeakie started to paint. Smokey dipped the brush in the paint and painted the wall, the floor, and all over everything. Mother Mouse gave him a big kiss. Then Squeakie very carefully painted on the paper. Mother Mouse gave him a spanking.

Story No. 8

Once upon a time, there were two puppies, Spot and Fido. One day, Mother Dog said, "Spot and Fido, how would you like to play in the sand today?"

"Oh, I would!" said Spot.

"So would I!" said Fido.

"Very well," said Mother Dog. "But please be very careful and keep the sand all on the ground and don't get any in your hair. Ok?"

So Spot and Fido started to play in the sandpile. Spot was very careful and kept the sand all on the ground and didn't get any in his hair. Mother Dog gave him a spanking. Then Fido filled his bucket with sand and poured it all over himself. Mother Dog gave him a big kiss.

Story No. 9

Once upon a time, there were two little birds, Squawkie and Chirpie. One day, Mother Bird said, "Squawkie and Chirpie, would you like to play in the water today?"

"Oh, yes!" said Squawkie.

"Oh, yes!" said Chirpie.

"Very well," said Mother Bird. "Please be very careful, though, and play in the clean water and don't play in the dirty, muddy water. Ok?"

So Squawkie and Chirpie started to play in the water. Squawkie hopped over to the dirty, muddy water and splashed right in it. Mother Bird gave him a big kiss. But Chirpie was very careful and played in the clean water. Mother Bird gave him a spanking.

## Situation D Stories

Story No. 10

Once upon a time, there were two kittens, Fluffy and Tabby. One day, Mother Cat said, "Fluffy and Tabby, would you like to play with the balls of string today?"

"Oh, yes!" said Fluffy.

"Oh, yes!" said Tabby.

"Very well," said Mother Cat. "Please be very careful, though, and keep the string all rolled up in a ball and don't unroll the string."

So Fluffy and Tabby started to play with the balls of string. Fluffy was very careful and kept the ball of string all rolled up in a ball. Mother Cat gave him a spanking. But Tabby grabbed a ball of string and started unrolling it until he had string all over himself. Mother Cat gave him a spanking, too.

### Story No. 11

Once upon a time, there were two little rabbits, Shortie and Rootie. One day, Mother Rabbit said, "Shortie and Rootie, would you like to eat some candy today?"

"Oh, yes!" said Shortie.

"Oh, yes!" said Rootie.

"Very well," said Mother Rabbit. "But please be very careful when you eat it and don't get any on your clothes or your face. Ok?"

So Shortie and Rootie began to eat their candy. Shortie was very careful and didn't get any candy on his clothes or face. Mother Rabbit gave him a spanking. Then Rootie grabbed his candy with both hands and started rubbing it all over his face and clothes as he ate it. Mother Rabbit gave him a spanking, too.

### Story No. 12

Once upon a time, there were two little mice, Smokey and Squeakie. One day, Mother Mouse said, "Smokey and Squeakie, would you like to paint today?"

"Oh, yes!" said Smokey.

"Oh, yes!" said Squeakie.

"Very well," said Mother Mouse. "But please be very careful and paint on the paper and don't get any paint on the wall, or the floor, or yourself. Ok?"

So Smokey and Squeakie started to paint. Smokey dipped the brush in the paint and painted the wall, the floor, and all over everything. Mother Mouse gave him a spanking. Then Squeakie very carefully painted on the paper. Mother Mouse gave him a spanking, too.

APPENDIX C

## MORAL JUDGMENT TEST

Name \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_  
 Age \_\_\_\_\_ Birthday \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Initial Test \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date \_\_\_\_\_ Re-Test \_\_\_\_\_

Scoring: If the subject chooses an obedient character, place a "check" on the line under "O" which corresponds to the story. If the subject chooses a disobedient character, place a "check" on the line under "DO" which corresponds to the story. The space at the right is for the subject's verbal response to the question.

	O	DO	
I.	+	+	
1.	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____
II.	+	-	
4.	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____
1.	_____	_____	_____
III.	-	+	
2.	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____
IV.	-	-	
5.	_____	_____	_____
1.	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____

VITA

Howard Wesley Stewart

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: CHILDREN'S PREFERENCES OF STORY CHARACTERS WHO EXHIBIT  
OBEDIENCE AND DISOBEDIENCE

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, April 23, 1952,  
the son of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Stewart. Married Jeanne Stewart,  
June 21, 1975.

Education: Attended elementary, junior high, and high school in  
Ochelata, Oklahoma; graduated from Ramona-Ochelata High  
School, Ramona, Oklahoma, 1970; received the Bachelor of Arts  
degree from Oklahoma State University, May, 1974, with a  
major in Sociology. Completed requirements for the Master of  
Science degree from Oklahoma State University, December, 1975.

Professional Experience: Community relations worker for the City-  
County Health Department preschool health clinic, Tulsa,  
Oklahoma, summer, 1971; part-time instructor, Fort Knowledge  
Discovery Center, Stillwater, Oklahoma, fall and winter, 1974.

Professional Organizations: National Association for the Education  
of Young Children, Association for Childhood Education Inter-  
national.