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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

For the past several decades, people of many nations and creeds have renewed their interest and concern for the mentally retarded. Science, research, and technology point today to a more hopeful future for the young retarded person. However, little has been done, up to the present, regarding adult retarded persons. These have passed the prime of their formative educational years; therefore, it is judged by many, that they need no further training. Nothing could be further from the truth. Scarred psychologically and socially either because of years of indifference, family rejection or over-protection, they need more than others the reassurance of a living faith that an ever-loving Father in Heaven had a purpose for their being as they are.

Concern for their religious education, for the most part, has been negligent. They have truly been the "forgotten person." But religious formation is an ongoing process. Fortunately, today an awakened People of God realize that mentally retarded adults are persons,
children of God with intrinsic worth. Though limited intellectually, they are gifted with an "intuitive direction to the holy." They are, as Bissonnier affirms, persons of "unique and irreplaceable value."

However, mentally retarded adults need repeated assurance of their uniqueness and personal value. They must be given assistance to develop their concrete abilities and their intellectual potential. They need to become more fully aware that they, too, have personal responsibility to improve themselves for their own good and for the good of others.

Growth is a significant part of Christian moral life. The present investigator suspects that mentally retarded adults can further their development of moral judgment, a power vitally necessary to ego-strength. They can achieve, according to their capacity, the human dignity and importance of decision-making with its concomitant personal and social responsibility for purposeful Christian living.

This study has been undertaken to investigate whether some development of moral judgment in mentally retarded adults as to decision-making in personal and social responsibility can be achieved.
Statement of the Problem

Judgments made by mentally retarded adults are generally limited to their immediate environment. The "set" pattern of activity peculiar to residential settings for retarded adults restricts their judgmental stimulation and opportunities for purposeful, positive choice in moral acts.

Piaget's findings on the "rules of the game" reveal "a certain correspondence between the children's judgments about rules and their practice of these same rules." The study aims to explore whether Piaget's findings are true when subjects are mentally retarded adults.

The investigator also questions whether the stage of moral judgment development of mentally retarded adults corresponds to Kohlberg's first two levels of moral judgment. It is assumed that some retarded individuals within a residential setting can attain Kohlberg's third stage of moral judgment and, even in some cases, bridge the intellectual-moral gap between stages three and four.

Since the study does not presume to judge the actions of mentally retarded adults but rather to judge the good and evil of conduct performed by story characters,

A further question is whether growth in decision-making can be transferred from fictional to real life experiences of mentally retarded adults.

The fact that the adults' evaluations are not of their own concrete personal experiences but of stories related to them poses the question as to whether the untested assumption that the stories are appropriate to the individual and to the study is valid.

Justification of the Study

Generally, residential settings tend to lessen opportunities for moral judgment development. Adult retarded persons seem to adapt to their routined and non-stimulating environment. Their limited intellectual capacity, weakened even further by the general degenerative process of aging, needs to be vitalized constantly. Its judgmental faculty, this investigator posits, can be stimulated by questioning the "why" of the goodness or wrongness of actions and of intentional choices. Motivational support for positive values can be found in mentally retarded adults' openness to the Spirit of love.

Mentally retarded adults are persons—-they must keep alive their power of autonomous activity. They must relate daily experiences, so essential to their growth in decision-making, to their personal and social
responsibility. This study tries to show that with purposeful guidance in questioning mentally retarded adults can improve their "person-image" -- one having individual dignity and worth with a purpose to life: to glorify God through giving love and service to others.

Limitations of the Study

The study entailed a limited teaching time of fifteen one-hour lessons. It might be questioned whether the relatively short teaching period was of sufficient length to convey the writer's intent: "Person-image" so valuable to happy, purposeful living necessitates development of moral judgment in mentally retarded adults relative to decision-making in personal and social responsibility.

Was the use of one lesson to one concept (with an aggregate of fifteen concepts) too broad an expanse of material because of the need for repetition of mentally retarded adults?

The sampling of subjects for the study was restricted to a single residential setting. It included ten men and ten women. A wide age variable resulted due to lack of adults within a selected MA and IQ range: MA from 5-0 to 9-6, inclusive; CA from age 25 to age 80, inclusive; IQ from 30 to 59, inclusive.
A fourth limitation was the measurement indicator. Since two weeks of individual testing was required for both the pretesting and the post-testing, was the amount of testing time employed sufficiently important to justify its expenditure? The writer hoped it would be. Measurement by individual base lines was selected to more graphically portray the patterning of growth or lack of growth.

**Definition of Terms**

**Mentally Retarded:**
applies to persons of subaverage general intellectual functioning which originates during the developmental period and is associated with impairment in adaptive behavior. (AAMD)

**Moral Judgment:**
ability to form a reasoned opinion concerning the right or wrong of conduct. It implies a norm of morality. In this study the norm includes the ten positive steps on the way to God; namely, the ten commandments, as well as the natural law of human reason.
| **Decision-Making:** | determination of one's mind to pursue a definite course of action. An essential quality of "person" is this power of making choices. |
| **Person-Image:** | the concept by which one sees himself as an individual endowed with dignity, worth and a purpose in life: to glorify God through giving love and service to others. |
| **Responsibility:** | state of being accountable for one's own moral decisions. Intention is a necessary condition. |
| **Objective:** | deals with the material element, the external results of actions, such as the physical damage. |
| **Personal:** | involves one's obligation for the use of his basic rights to life, bodily integrity, honor and good name, as well as to private ownership. |
| **Social:** | is implied by man's social nature. Man has a duty toward other individuals as related to their life, liberty, possessions, and pursuit of happiness. |
Subjective: strictly individual accountability dependent upon one's intention of doing wrong.

Kohlberg's terms of the first four stages are described in Chapter 2, pages 14-15.

Research Question

It is hypothesized that mentally retarded adults can achieve further development in decision-making relative to personal and social responsibility.

It is likewise hypothesized that mentally retarded adults who have been long-term residents in a religious residential setting (and have, therefore, stabilized religious training and experience) can, with additional experience, attain Kohlberg's third stage of moral judgment and, even in some cases, bridge the intellectual-moral gap between stages three and four.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This study postulates that building a positive "person-image" in mentally retarded adults necessitates the development of moral judgment relative to decision-making in personal and social responsibility. In accepting the uniqueness of each person, one must likewise accept the uniqueness of his moral growth. As there are degrees in deficiency so, too, there are degrees in responsibility. It is a universal truism that an all-wise Maker created no "retarded" soul. Every man's "desire for goodness tells us that finite and weak though we be, we are shaped and destined for an absolute goodness."

Though the moral judgment of a mentally retarded person is generally less mature than that of normal people, this investigator believes that, with further training, it can improve. An adult retarded person needs to realize that, morally as well as intellectually, growth toward maturity demands personal effort and self-mastery. All people who deal with a retarded person need, also, to realize that "To treat him as responsible and eventually

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1A New Catechism: Catholic Faith for Adults (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), p.16.}\]
as a being susceptible of a certain culpability is ... to honor him and give him more stature in his own eyes."¹

Review of Literature

The study of morality has been researched frequently since the 1950's because of renewed interest in Piaget's theory of cognitive development of moral judgment. Piaget postulates a stage-like basis of moral judgment growth parallel to cognitive levels of intellectual development. He affirmed three levels of cognitive progression: sensori-motor; pre-operational and concrete operational; and formal operational. The infancy sensori-motor period is the pre-linguistic phase, prior to thought development. The early childhood phase, ages two to seven, is the time of pre-operational intuitive thought. The middle childhood stage, ages seven to eleven or twelve, initiates concrete intellectual operations. Adolescence, ages eleven-twelve and onward, includes formal, abstract, adult-thought functioning.²


²Inhelder applied Piaget's study to the retarded child. She postulates that Piaget's stages of cognitive development approximate the growth of mental retardates if substitution is made of mental age for chronological age. She affirms that the mentally retarded can think by concrete operations but cannot reach formal thought process. Barbel Inhelder, Diagnosis of Reasoning in the Mentally Retarded (New York: John Day Company, 1968), p. 294.
For Piaget "child morality throws light on adult morality." From his study of social behavior of children among themselves in their reactions to rules of a game, he concluded that two types of morality exist: "a morality of constraint" and a "morality of cooperation." Morality of constraint occurs in early childhood up to ages of seven or eight. The sense of duty in little children is essentially heteronomous since they tend to accept the letter of the law and to react with a very high regard for adult authority. In this phase they confuse rules with things because of their realism and egocentrism. Their attitude of unilateral respect towards adults makes them see rules as sacred without questioning the motive for them. They possess, therefore, an objective concept of responsibility.

For since he takes rules literally and thinks of good only in terms of obedience, the child will at first evaluate acts not in accordance with the motive that has prompted them but in terms of their exact conformity with established rules.¹

An autonomous justice morality, morality of cooperation, develops about age eight to ten and evolves out of peer reciprocal relations. Through their interactions with others and through cooperation they gradually become aware of their own autonomy, begin to make relative judgments of motives and intentions and to acquire a sense of

¹Piaget, op. cit., pp. 111-112.
subjective responsibility.

Piaget's moral developmental stages imply age changes. Kohlberg, in his investigation of the judgmental side of moral development, gives empirical support for six of the eleven phases of Piaget's theory, especially for the first four which seem to show cognitive development since they refer to both age and I.Q. All six aspects propose growth from objective judgment of physical consequences to subjective judgment of internal purposes.

Intentionality in judgment. Young children tend to judge an act as bad mainly in terms of its actual physical consequences, whereas older children judge an act as bad in terms of the intent to do harm....

Relativism in judgment. The young child views an act as either totally right or totally wrong, and thinks everyone views it in the same way.... In contrast, the older child is aware of possible diversity in views of right and wrong....

Independence of sanctions. The young child says an act is bad because it will elicit punishment; the older child says an act is bad because it violates a rule, does harm to others, and so forth....

Use of reciprocity. Four-year-old children do not use reciprocity as a reason for consideration of others, whereas children of seven and older frequently do.... By age eleven to thirteen most children can clearly judge in terms of ideal reciprocity, in terms of putting oneself in the place of someone in a different position, and in terms of sentiments of gratitude for past affection and favors....

Use of punishment as restitution and reform. Young children advocate severe painful punishment after stories of misdeeds; older children
increasingly favor milder punishments leading to re­stitution to the victim and to the reform of the cul­prit....

**Naturalistic view of misfortune.** Six to seven­year-old children have some tendency to view physi­cal accidents and misfortunes occurring after mis­deeds as punishments willed by God or by natural ob­jects ("immanent justice"). Older children do not confuse natural misfortunes with punishments....

Kohlberg's important contribution to the study of moral judgment is his stages of moral judgment develop­ment. He posits three major levels: premoral, mora­lity of conventional role-conformity, and morality of self­accepted moral principles. Within these levels he iden­tifies six different stages of growth. Conformity to rules predominates throughout the first two levels. Added emphasis is given in the second level to support­ing and maintaining law and order. The third level leads to autonomous, principled judgment making. Agreement seems to be present between Kohlberg and Piaget in the first two levels of moral development. Differences be­tween Kohlberg's and Piaget's systems occur at level three.²

---


"The post-conventional level is characterized by a major thrust toward autonomous moral principles which have validity and application apart from authority of the groups or persons who hold them and apart from the individual's identification with those persons or groups."1

Since this study deals with the moral judgment development of mentally retarded persons whose cognitive capacity cannot reach upper formal operational functioning, only the first four stages of Kohlberg's cognitive levels are listed here.

THE MORAL STAGES

Preconventional Level

The level is divided into the following two stages.

Stage 1
The punishment and obedience orientation. The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power are valued in their own right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order supported by punishment and authority (the latter being stage 4).

Stage 2
The instrumental relativist orientation. Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. Human relations are viewed in terms like those of the market place. Elements of fairness, of reciprocity, and of equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in a physical, pragmatic way. Reciprocity is a matter of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," not of loyalty, gratitude, or justice.

Conventional Level
At this level, there are the following two stages.

Stage 3
The interpersonal concordance of "good boy-nice girl" orientation. Good behavior is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or "natural" behavior. Behavior is frequently judged by intention—"he means well" becomes important for the first time. One earns approval by being "nice."

Stage 4
The "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.  

Kohlberg also described the motivational dimensions of each stage. "In types 1 and 2, the child's impulses are modified by rewards and punishments. In types 3 and 4, conduct is controlled largely through praise and blame."  

In his research findings Kohlberg noted that the child's level of moral judgment seems to be a consistent

---


personal characteristic. He postulates that his stages form "an invariant developmental sequence." This implies "that the child's capacity to learn new modes of thought are contingent on their match with his current style of thought."¹

Various investigations have been made of Kohlberg's and Piaget's theories of moral judgment development. Hubbard applied Piaget's developmental psychology to the religious education of the mentally retarded. She noted that mentally retarded persons at the stage of preoperational thought, mental ages of two to seven, are unable to think about their own thinking; they can not reflect or reconstruct in sequence their reasoning. Their understanding remains on a literal level, not on that of intention or motivation. She states, however, that other factors, such as environment and motivation, may vary their attainment.

The retarded child has the benefit of more years of practical experience at each given stage than does the normal child, and therefore may be able to handle more difficult material than expected, particularly at the concrete operational stage where most retarded persons reach their plateau.²

¹Kohlberg, op cit., p. 404.
Hubbard's study recommends that specific religious concepts be adapted to the individual mentally retarded child according to his maturational level and his environmental experiences.¹

Crowley's study of intentionality was approached from the training aspect. His findings show that intentionality admits of degrees. Likewise, the level of moral judgment is partly a function of the specific situation. The general conclusion to be drawn from this study is that training aids the development of intentionality, especially when stories with moral content are employed. Crowley states that his results corroborate the findings on generalizations in transfer-of-training: "the greater the similarity between training stimuli and test stimuli, the greater the amount of positive transfer."²

Johnson's research proposed to test Piaget's developmental changes in moral judgment. His study of intentionality in older children of grades 5, 7, 9, 11, confirms that "parental attitudes are significantly related to moral judgments, especially in the areas of

¹Ibid., p. 46.

Durkin investigated the concept of justice in children. Her findings show agreement with Piaget that a relationship exists between chronological age and justice concepts. But the study does not confirm that acceptance of reciprocity as a justice principle augments with age. She noted that "children tend to be much more certain about what they should not do than they are about what they should do." This bears implications for religious training.

Turiel researched the influence of reasoning on behavioral choices at different stages of moral development. His findings substantiate Kohlberg's principle of sequential-stage progression. They likewise apply to shift in behavioral choices.

Hoffman, presenting a review of literature in moral development, quoted Turiel's findings as well as

---


Bandura and McDonald's contradictory view and noted that further research needs to be done on fixed stages of moral growth.¹

Since this study attempts to show Christian moral judgment development relative to decision-making in personal and social responsibility, it necessitates some review of basic Christian moral principles. Bittle describes the progression of the nature of a human act.² He notes that the fundamental characteristic of man's nature is his seeking of the good and shunning of evil.

Because a person has the use of reason and free will he is held accountable for his moral acts. Connell clarifies some of the difficulties of moral responsibility for mentally retarded adults.³


³Theologians used to consider a seven-year old normal child as having arrived at the age of reason. But a feeble-minded person is not normal... a twenty-four-year-old person with a mental age of seven is in no way on a par with a seven-year-old normal child. Biologically, he is an adult with the full physical strength needed, for instance, to commit certain crimes. Furthermore, he has the emotions of a grown-up man, and the instincts proper to adults—greed, hostility, vengefulness, and sexual tendencies—demand satisfaction when the occasions arise. It can hardly be expected that the feeble-minded individual, with his poor mental equipment
Lindvorsky states that the will can be moved by all that appears to it as valuable. Since one must have a motive for making a decision, the key to morally good acts lies in the choice of motives.\(^1\) Motives should be associated with pleasant sensations and concomitant with a successful act if they are to bear fruit.\(^2\) This applies particularly to mentally retarded persons. Since they are incapable of grasping abstract thought, mentally retarded persons, like children, must have any higher will be in a position to master his instincts and to inhibit his impulses.

A feeble-minded person's most characteristic failing is that he lacks thoughtfulness or advertence ... to an even greater extent than does the child. He cannot reflect; he fails to see the implications of his actions and their consequences, unless they have been drilled into him.... For the feeble-minded, the present is everything and the future is almost meaningless. He shows his "inadvertence" not only with regard to the dangers of the external world, but also with regard to the moral dangers of his internal world, his instincts and passions. Everybody, even the most normal person, may go through moments of "inadvertence" but the whole life of the feeble-minded consists of such moments." James Vander Veldt and Robert Odenwald, Psychiatry and Catholicism (New York: McGraw Hill, 1952), pp. 323-324, cited by Noel A. Kinsella in Moral Orientation of the Mentally Retarded (Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada: St. Thomas University, 1967), pp. 68-69.


\(^2\) Ibid., p. 107.
value presented in "childlike language and concrete form associated with personal values familiar to them."¹ Proper motives for behavior should gradually assist the retarded adults to accept personal and social responsibility as regards such abstract social values as truthfulness, honesty, loyalty and justice through their daily life decision-making experiences.

Bissonnier, in applying Piaget's first level of preoperational moral growth to mentally retarded persons, states the importance of aiding the deficient to grasp the difference between an "unhappy incident" and a "real fault." He stresses that parents and educators should help the deficient child to distinguish between the intention of an act and its material consequences. He affirms, moreover, "a morality well-centered around the great commandment of the Gospel, love of neighbor lived in daily concrete life and humbly practised..."²

Since the retarded individual is a person, he has basic rights and corresponding duties. In order that he may choose rightly what acts to pursue, he needs the positive motivation of the great commandment of love: love of God above all things and love of neighbor as oneself. To realize this right order of love he requires religious guidance and training.

¹Ibid., p. 99.
²Bissonnier, op. cit., p. 80.
Bittle's ordered progression from love to justice was selected as the structure of the training program used in this study. Why Bittle? The choice of this author was due to the personal preference of this investigator. Nothing in her experience has reversed the evaluation stated by Gerald Flynn that the success of Bittle's texts is proof that their fundamental idea is sound.¹

Kohlberg describes morality in terms of judgment, of reasons for conduct rather than conduct itself. His cognitive stage-sequence approach to moral development leads to "autonomous, principled, judgment-making." He affirms "notions of conscience, freedom and responsibility wholly consistent with the Christian tradition."²

For Kohlberg, the "only true moral principle is justice because it alone remains a principle at the highest stage of development."³ In explaining his position, Kohlberg states:

As social psychologists, my colleagues and I have gathered considerable evidence to indicate that

¹Mary Dallman, "Nicholas Bittle," Catholic Authors: Contemporary Biographical Sketches, ed. by Matthew Hoehn (Newark, New Jersey: St. Mary's Abbey, 1952).


³Sholl, op. cit., p. 367.
the concepts of justice inhere in human experience, instead of being the product of a particular world view. In this we follow Piaget who says, "In contrast to a given rule imposed upon the child from outside, the rule of justice is an immanent condition of social relationships or a law governing their equilibrium." All social life necessarily entails assuming a variety of roles, taking other people's perspectives, and participating in reciprocal relationships, so that arriving at the principle of human equality is simply an effect of maturity in interpersonal relations. It is a normal (if not frequent) result of social existence, rather than a quirk of personality or an act of faith.1

Most Christian theologians would prefer the primacy of charity and speak instead of the unity of love and justice. As Joy summarizes: "Love does not do more than justice demands, but love is the ultimate principle of justice....It is the form in which justice does its work."2

"Primacy of justice" is Kohlberg's way of stating the only general principle advanced by philosophers. But on page 63 he looks at "benevolence" (the closest he gets to charity) and dismisses it.3

Sholl feels that Kohlberg's study is incomplete since it takes no account of "moral inspiration and

---


2Joy, op. cit., p. 16.

He believes the answer lies in "spiritual love and faith."¹

The present investigator who follows the Christian theological point of view: "the primacy of love and the unity of love and justice," maintains that further clarification of this point is necessary. Seeing no necessary contradiction between the two views, one religious educator ² affirms that the Christian educator may respect the psychological insights of Kohlberg and, at the same time, may read "creative justice" as none other than charity, the primary moral virtue on which, according to Gospel teaching, all morality is based.

Haring, likewise, asserts that "Justice is love serving God alone and thus ruling all else with reason and right order."³ He also stipulates that the "virtue of justice can unfold itself only in an atmosphere of

¹Sholl, op. cit., p. 372.
²Cf. Abraham Edel, "The Shape of the Moral Domain," Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches (1971), p. 321, criticizes Kohlberg on another point, suggesting that not everything has to have development; maybe only justice has.
³Interview with Sister Coletta Dunn, Religious Studies Department at Cardinal Stritch College, who cited Gospel references, as well as insights of Haring, Gillemann and others to support her view.

selfless love."¹

Summary

In summing up, the investigator found that studies concerning the cognitive theory of moral judgment development by Piaget and Kohlberg substantiate their agreement in part. Upon substitution of mental age for chronological age, Hubbard and Bissonnier likewise give support to their empirical findings as applied to the mentally retarded individual. The works of Bittle and Lindvorsky² provided a structure and content for the decision-making dimension of the present study.

¹Ibid., p. 335.

²V. S. Sexton states in New Catholic Encyclopedia, 1967, VIII, p. 771, that Lindvorsky's theory of will and its elements of motive, values and ideals so essential to will training made him an authority on volition.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Purpose

An awakened sense of social justice among American Christians today has given impetus to concern for mentally retarded persons. Many people involved with working with retarded individuals realize that a more dynamic environment is needed, especially in institutions, both state and private, to lessen the debilitating effects of aging.

This study has focused on decision-making of mentally deficient adults. It has attempted to further the development of their moral judgment, specifically in regard to decision-making in personal and social Christian responsibility. The investigator postulates that in order to retain their integrity of autonomous thought and decision-making mentally handicapped adults need the daily stimulation of their weakened intellectual capacities. Growth in moral judgment, it was hypothesized, can be augmented by consistent use of the varied, practical experiences, found in even the restricted environment of residential settings, for choice-making.
POPOPULATION

Subjects for the study included twenty mentally retarded adults from the Alverno residential cottages at St. Coletta's School for Exceptional Children, Jefferson, Wisconsin. Ten men and ten women were selected as meeting the criteria for the study: IQ between 30-59; MA between 5-10 years. The chronological ages of the men ranged from 25-2 to 49-4, inclusive; of the women from 30-2 to 80-6, inclusive. The mental ages of the men ranged from 5-0 to 9-2, inclusive; of the women from 5-0 to 9-6, inclusive. The IQ of the men ranged from 32 to 57, inclusive; of the women from 30 to 59, inclusive.

Since this was not a comparative study, no mean average of CA, MA, nor IQ was obtained for either the men or the women. No attempt was made to match subjects. Each person was rated individually on his own base line. The intent of the study was to observe whether any perceivable individual improvement in the retarded adults had occurred. Sex was not considered a relevant factor.

DESIGN

A preliminary pilot study was made of the retarded women at the Villa residential cottage of St. Coletta's School to judge the difficulty of the paired-stories,
especially as to length and attention-interest factors. As a consequence, several of the original stories were shortened.

Phase I of the Alverno study involved psychological testing of the twenty selected persons. The school psychometrist administered the Slosson Intelligence Test for Children and Adults.

Phase II of the study was assigned to pre-testing. Each individual was tested orally. This covered fifteen tests of fifteen paired-stories involving objective and subjective responsibility. Each test included: 1) An introduction during which the definition and a short explanation of the concept was given. The length of this portion varied with the comprehension difficulty of the individual. No effort was made to hurry anyone. The investigator was desirous, chiefly, to build rapport and pleasant anticipation of the story-telling. 2) The first of the paired-stories, that dealing with the non-intentional act, generally, was then told by the investigator, in approximately fifteen to thirty seconds.

The following steps of questioning then proceeded:
1) Tell me the story. This insured correct understanding of the story portion. 2) Did you do right or wrong? 3) Why do you think so? 4) If you were , what would you have done? Why?
Then the second story, that of the intentional act, was given. The same questioning process as for story one was repeated.

A final comparative question was then asked. Its purpose was to detect higher level judgment relative to decision-making, according to Kohlberg's stages of development. The question compared the action of the two stories: Did \_\_ who... or did \_\_ who... do more right or wrong? Why do you think so? Ten of the tests had both an objective and a subjective story included; five, however, were subjective in both parts. The questioning was similar in all stories.

The time allotment involved approximately fifteen minutes for each test, an aggregate of seven and one-half hours for the fifteen tests for each individual—a testing time one-half as long as that of teaching. Since the time element was one of the factors researched, its implications are discussed in chapter four.

The number of paired-stories tests presented at a sitting depended upon the subject's capacity to tolerate the amount of material or the length of the attention span required. Those who had more than one group at a sitting had a short rest period between the tests.

In the grading process, no student response was
marked incorrect. Each question, including that asked in the comparative step (number 4) "Which one was more right or wrong?", was given a stage placement according to the apparent moral reasoning response.

The interrogator was intent on holding interest simply through story telling. Purposely, no pictures were used so that the mentally retarded person could adapt the main character (Mary or Jane / or John or Paul) to the character-image of the story incident. However, a simple technique was employed for distinguishing the two main characters in the story. The interrogator would point with the index finger to the right and make a slight body gesture toward the right and say, "N...and relate the incident. Then when shift of character was needed for the second story the same technique would be used, but the position would be to the left. The interrogator would then say, "Now Jane or Paul ...and tell the incident. This simple device was an assist to the retarded person's visualizing the new story setting.

Phase III concerned the teaching portion. Fifteen class days of one hour duration were given to each group of men and women. The procedure for both groups were similar, except that in the story telling the names accommodated the group present. Each hour session was
divided approximately into three periods of twenty minutes: 1) teaching the concept; 2) reinforcing the concept through art or music; and 3) questioning the subject's choice-making ability. During the teaching portion, the technique used was that of a roving reporter with his tape recorder. Through its means interest, attention, and individual response from each one was effectively secured. Art or music followed the instruction, principally, to relieve fatigue and tension usual to prolonged concentrated effort. However, it also served to reinforce the concept presented. In the final questioning period the procedure followed was similar to the pre-testing one. The tests and the lesson plans are contained in Appendixes I and II.

The first half hour of class was held in the chapel, the last half in the occupation-therapy room. This arrangement allowed for greater reverence during the prayer and Bible service and a freer, more relaxed atmosphere during the more creative work and questioning period. A special Eucharistic liturgy culminated the training period.

Phase IV consisted of the post-testing. This was the presentation of identically the same material utilized in the pre-testing phase of the study.
SUMMARY

This chapter presented the purpose of the study, the population employed and the process involved. The investigator hypothesized that decision-making relative to personal and social Christian responsibility could be augmented in retarded adults. The procedure explained, therefore, was designed to test this thesis.
CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to investigate moral judgment relative to person-image strength among mentally retarded adults. The investigator hypothesized that positive person-image, so vital to happy, purposeful living, can be augmented through development of moral judgment in mentally retarded adults, specially as regards decision-making in personal and social Christian responsibility.

The investigator postulated that decision-making growth can be furthered through consistent use of daily-life experiences found in residential settings. The investigator likewise hypothesized that some mentally retarded adults who have been long-term residents in a religious residential setting can, with additional experience, attain Kohlberg's third stage of moral judgment, and even in some cases, bridge the intellectual-moral gap between stages three and four.

Significant data for this inquiry were obtained from the taped student responses to the pre-test / post-test items and to the observed participatory action of each retarded adult in class activities. Figure I indicates the growth pattern of moral judgment as to the
right or wrong of the story-character's action. (See chapter 3, pages 28-29, for the testing design). Figure I graphs the stage placement for the judgment made in response to the question: WHY was Mary or Jane / or John or Paul right or wrong?

Initials "A" through "J" are the code names in alphabetical order for the women participants; initials "K" through "T" represent the men members. Figure I-A shows the results for the women. Figure I-B tabulates the data for the men.

Each individual's progress or lack of progress is indicated by the placement of "X" for pre-test and of "Z" for post-test on his or her moral growth continuum line. The numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 list the four stages of moral judgment assumed attainable by the mentally retarded adults according to Kohlberg's stages of moral judgment development. (See Kohlberg's stages, pages 14-15, for a description of each).

Stages of development are not an arbitrary cut-off point of progression. In many instances one can perceive that the reasoning is leaning more to stage two than to stage one, or to stage three; therefore, in the testing responses allowance was made for this variable by rating Stage 1, Stage 1 (2), Stage 2, Stage 2 (3), Stage 3, Stage 3 (4), Stage 4. This accounts for the approximation of locations on the
continuum line. Kohlberg's moral maturity score scale was used as a reference for some basis of calculation of progress indicated by the responses to the thirty test questions in Figure I, also in Figure II, and of the fifteen test questions in Figure III. No fixed stage location is implied, thereby. The investigator simply used this manner of noting graphically perceivable progress within the stage limits. Table 2, p. 92, shows data concerning CA, MA, IQ, moral maturity score, and per cent of increase over the pre-test score. Table 3, p. 93, gives global stage placement.

Figure I denotes a judgment response to the question, WHY was Mary or Jane / or John or Paul right or wrong? It is to be noted that each individual reflected some growth in judgment.

In Figure II application was made of the judgment given by the retarded adults to their lives. Each person responded to thirty test items on: If you were Mary or Jane / or John or Paul, what would you do? Again a progression was noticed in the ability to reason. "Respect" was a dominant note in the retarded adults' application of judgment. The investigator suspects that such responses indicate a previous amount of moral training.

Figure III gives the results of the challenge in

Which one, Mary or Jane / or John or Paul, did more right or wrong (in numbers 1-10) or was more fair or unfair? (in numbers 11-15). The retarded adult was asked to compare two forms of action and to select the better or worse one, and then to give a reasonable explanation for the choice made. The investigator assumed this aspect would most validly indicate whether decision-making in personal and social responsibility can be maintained in the restricted environment of residential settings.

Appendix IV depicts response samplings of all three areas of questioning to which a stage 3 rating was listed by the investigator. Evidently, decision-making in personal and social responsibility can be attained and maintained by mentally retarded adults. This seems to verify Bissonnier's reflection on person-image.¹

Testing analysis denotes some growth for each subject in all three types of questioning responses.

Hubbard's findings would place subject E on the preconventional stage 1 (p.14) within the MA range of 2-7. She states that these persons are "unable to think about their own thinking, to reflect, or to reconstruct in sequence their reasoning. Their understanding remains on a literal level unmindful of underlying

¹See p. 14.
intentions and motivations. However, she does add that other factors such as environment and motivation may vary their attainment.

The retarded adults whose mental range was 4-8 through 5-11 (five men and five women) demonstrated improved performance on all aspects tested. The investigator suggests that rapport may have been a significant factor supporting this growth. However, the pre-testing scores for these individuals seemed very low as compared to their later improvement. Many factors may have contributed to this: a) Mentally retarded adults of lessened mental capacity may need a "readiness" program to help them begin to think through simple stories and to answer simple questions about them. The investigator proposes that the teaching phase may have been such a readiness for the post-test. b) These retarded adults may require much more repetition of a concept than was given. The investigator had questioned initially whether the telling of two stories in succession and requiring judgment, application of that judgment, and decision-making concerning the story-character's action were too difficult at this mental level, especially at the pre-testing phase. c) Age may have been a contributing factor, also, especially among the women. Seven women were in age between

---

1 Hubbard, op. cit., p. 43
51-6 and 80-6, whereas only one man was advanced in age beyond 49 and that by only four months.

The debilitating effects of aging were noted in particular with two women subjects (MA 5-2 and 5-5). Subject A, age 72-5, had an extremely low listening capacity. This compounded the problem regarding her limited intellectual ability. Though progress is reflected in Figures I, II, III, the investigator suspects that a degenerative mental condition has set in. Subject G, age 80-6, shows a record of growth that is somewhat questionable since her characteristic manner was to parrot most of the responses of the interrogator. Hence, it is uncertain whether the answers given were her own or simply a repetition of the investigator's question.

The most difficult concept in the study was the defaming concept in Story 8-B, that of an innocent person being lied about, being called a thief when he did not steal. The less capable adults' responses give greater support to Kohlberg's discovery that concepts more than one stage above the level of persons' reasoning ability remain incomprehensible to them.

Summing up, the testing phase indicated improved reasoning performance for each of the subjects in each type of questioning.
**FIGURE I-A**

**MORAL JUDGMENT STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT**
(according to Kohlberg)

**Judgment:** WHY was Mary or Jane right or wrong?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-TEST = X</th>
<th>POST-TEST = Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1 X 2 Z 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1 X 2 Z 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 2 X Z 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1 2 X Z 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 2 X Z 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1 2 X Z 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>X Z 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X Z 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>X Z 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>X Z 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE I-B

MORAL JUDGMENT STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT
(according to Kohlberg)

Judgment: WHY was John or Paul right or wrong?

PRE-TEST = X  POST-TEST = Z

K.  . . . .
    1 2 3 4

L.  . X . .
    1 2 3 4

M.  . . X .
    1 2 3 4

N.  . . . Z
    1 2 3 4

O.  . X . .
    1 2 3 4

P.  . X Z .
    1 2 3 4

Q.  . X . .
    1 2 3 4

R.  . X . .
    1 2 3 4

S.  . X . .
    1 2 3 4

T.  . . X Z
    1 2 3 4
MORAL JUDGMENT STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT (according to Kohlberg)

APPLICATION: If you were Mary or Jane, what would you do?

PRE-TEST = X
POST-TEST = Z

A. 

B. 

C. 

D. 

E. 

F. 

G. 

H. 

I. 

J. 
FIGURE II-B

MORAL JUDGMENT STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT
(according to Kohlberg)

APPLICATION: If you were John or Paul, what would you do?

PRE-TEST = X

POST-TEST = Z

K. 1 2 X Z 3 4

L. 1 2 X Z 3 4

M. 1 2 X Z 3 4

N. 1 2 X Z 3 4

O. 1 2 X Z 3 4

P. 1 2 X Z 3 4

Q. 1 2 X Z 3 4

R. 1 2 X Z 3 4

S. 1 2 X Z 3 4

T. 1 2 X Z 3 4
FIGURE III-A

MORAL JUDGMENT STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT
(according to Kohlberg)

DECISION-MAKING: Which one, Mary or Jane, did more right or wrong (No. 1-10), or was more fair or unfair (No. 11-15)?

PRE-TEST = X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POST-TEST = Z

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

PRE-TEST = X

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

POST-TEST = Z

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

PRE-TEST = X

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

POST-TEST = Z

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

PRE-TEST = X

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

POST-TEST = Z

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

PRE-TEST = X

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

POST-TEST = Z

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

PRE-TEST = X

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
FIGURE III-B

MORAL JUDGMENT STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT
(according to Kohlberg)

DECISION-MAKING: Which one, John or Paul, did more right or wrong (No. 1-10), or was more fair or unfair (No. 11-15)?

PRE-TEST = X  POST-TEST = Z

K. 1 2 X 3 Z 4

L. 1 2 X 3 Z 4

M. 1 2 X Z 3

N. 1 2 X Z 4

O. 1 2 X Z 4

P. 1 2 X Z 4

Q. 1 2 X Z 4

R. 1 2 X Z 4

S. 1 2 X Z 4

T. 1 2 X Z 4
however, more valuable than improved response was augmented ego-strength among the subjects. All seemed to show a greater feeling of self-worth. They responded actively, participating in music, art, and discussion. They looked forward eagerly to the next get-together. Their enthusiastic, joyous interpersonal interactions, both with the interrogator and with one another, makes this investigator willing to assert this factor as the greatest impact on the person-image of even the most limited.

Initially, the investigator had postulated that person-image of the retarded can be enhanced. It was noted that improved rapport, an essential element of growth in positive self-image, was discernible as the study progressed. It seemed to stimulate judgment. Demonstrated improved performance by all the subjects in judgment-making showed substantial growth for mentally retarded individuals within such a short space of time. It is suggested, therefore, that further research be done on rapport as an element conducive to growth in reasoning-judgment.

Rosenthal states that seemingly minimal cues unintentionally emitted by the experimenter, may influence the subject's response. (See p.51). Even should this prevail, the investigator notes all the greater urgency
for further research into rapport as an aspect essential to adequate reasoning response among mentally retarded adults. The appalling need for improved rapport and research into rapport-building activities can be seen in any state institution for retarded adults.

The investigator also hypothesized that retarded adults can achieve further development in choice-making relative to personal and social Christian responsibility. The tabulations for the area of decision-making demonstrate that eight women reached a global (overall) stage 3 or $3(4)$, and four of these women attained also a stage 3 moral maturity score. One other subject, D, with an MA of 6-9, approximated stage 3, scoring 293.4. Six men obtained a global stage 3 score as well as a stage 3 moral maturity score in decision-making. Eight women and six men reached a global stage 3 in all three phases of questioning tested. (Table 3, p. 93; Table 4, p. 94). Though some individual responses were of stage 4, no one advanced to stage 4 development.

At the beginning it was stated that the sex factor was irrelevant to the study nor were sex-related differences noticeable. However, due to residential conditions, classes for men and women were held at different periods of the day. As the project continued, it seemed to the investigator that better responses were offered
by the men. Though the men were less mature in mental age, they were younger. The oldest man was forty-nine, whereas seven women were above fifty in age. While observing the life style and supervisory procedures of both groups, the investigator noted that the men seemed to enjoy greater freedom, as well as more outdoor and indoor activities than the women. The investigator suspects that the freer life-style rather than sex may be the factor stimulating the men's greater intellectual alertness to the program. However, the age aspect could likewise account for the difference.

The validity of the story-content was another component questioned by the investigator. Were the stories sufficiently applicable to residential adults? Stephens' findings state that reasoning opportunities in ongoing concrete situations are needed to facilitate the flexibility of the thought process. The examples cited tried to keep this fact in focus. Nevertheless, this factor remains uncertain since only a limited number of individuals were involved in this study.

The investigator posits that one other subjective factor open to question may be the judgments of the rater, and her arbitrary stage-placement scale. Is the

placement, too, open to arbitrary judgments? Though the investigator tried to judge adult responses by the criterion of Kohlberg's stages of development, subjective elements in the rater's judgment may have influenced her choices. Therefore, the investigator suggests that other findings may emerge from her data. Moreover, growth can reveal itself in countless other ways than those registered on this arbitrary stage-placement scale.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate moral judgment relative to person-image strength of the mentally retarded adult. Pertinent data for this inquiry were obtained from taped student responses to pre-test and post-test items and from participation of each adult in class. Kohlberg's moral maturity scale scores and his global stage placement were the criterion used in rating progress. Testing analysis denotes some growth for each subject in all three types of questioning responses. The investigator posits, moreover, that reasoning-judgment response evinces person-image growth and that rapport is an essential contributing factor in that growth process.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY and IMPLICATIONS

Problem

The purpose of this study was to test the hypothesis that person-image improvement in mentally retarded adults requires the development of judgment specifically in regard to decision-making. The investigator likewise attempted to discover whether some mentally retarded adults who have been long-term residents in a religious residential setting can, with additional experiences, attain Kohlberg's third stage of moral judgment and, even in some cases, bridge the intellectual-moral gap between stages three and four.

Population

Subjects for the study included twenty mentally retarded adults, ten men and ten women, from the Alverno residential cottages at St. Coletta's School for Exceptional Children, Jefferson, Wisconsin. Since this was not a comparative study, no attempt was made to match subjects as to CA, MA, nor IQ. Each person's improvement is shown on his own progress scale.

Treatment of Data

Data were obtained from the taped student responses to the pre-test / post-test aspects of judgment,
application of judgment, and decision-making. Assessment of the data was made according to Kohlberg's stages of development. The subjects were mentally retarded adults within an IQ range of 30-59. The material used followed Piaget's paired-stories approach to moral judgment, that of objective and subjective responsibility.

The manual, *How to Assess the Moral Reasoning of Students: A Teacher's Guide to the Use of Lawrence Kohlberg's Stage-Developmental Method* was followed in the scoring procedure. (Appendix III). To secure greater reliability to the interpreter's judgmental rating of stage scores to subjects' responses, the comments were evaluated also by a second person knowledgeable in Kohlberg's stage placement.

In the initial statement of the problem the question was posed as to whether the testing time was justifiable. (p. 6). Restatement of this point seems pertinent here since the time-testing element was the most gruelling dimension of the study. It should be remembered that three and three-fourths hours was the average length of the test. Since the same test was repeated in post-testing, and since twenty individuals were involved in the testing, this meant a direct testing time of approximately seventy-five hours. Then after post-testing came another seventy-five hours of the investigator's
listening to the message of "person" breaking through.

In the responses given by the subjects, the investigator noticed that "on purpose" and "respect" were frequently stated by those adults with greater potential. Since the series of lesson concepts were directed toward positive Christian moral values, the answered statements reflect that some positive growth in moral judgment was attained. However, those adults within the five year old mental range could possibly be parroting the words, having very little comprehension of the concept.

Some psychological experiments have indicated "that minimal cues, unintentionally emitted by the experimenter, might influence the subject's response." Relevant here is Merton's self-fulfilling prophecy, that one acts in such a way as to achieve more likely what is expected of him. Likewise, "current experiments show that an interpersonal style, reflecting a relaxed, personal, interested, and involved approach to human subjects, also tends to maximize the effects of an experimenter's expectancy." Rosenthal concludes "that in some subtle,

---


2 Ibid., xxii.

3 Ibid., xxx.
unintentional way experimenters do communicate their expectations to their human subjects, whose performance is then significantly altered.1

Haskett's2 findings also indicate "that teacher expectancy and pupil performance are closely related variables." She suggests that best results accrue when goals are set on "optimistic teacher aspiration rather than on the pessimistic view of pupil limitation."3

The above studies seem pertinent to the investigator's inquiry. The warm, inter-personal relationship established in the pre-testing sessions with each individual was maintained throughout the entire study. Eager to participate and intent on doing his "best", the adult responded more freely and expressively and seemed to grasp a deeper understanding of the religious concept presented. It might, therefore, be hypothesized that experimenter expectancy may have been a significant factor in the post-tests results.

Implications

The investigator suggests that rapport is a vital element of reasoning-judgment growth. Greater stress should be placed on establishing warm relations

---

1Ibid., xxv.


3Ibid., p. 91.
not only with the individual but also with groups.

The retarded adults' sustained interest in the story selections which were based on familiar concrete experiences similar to their own was observable, in most cases. It provides supporting evidence for the investigator's postulate that growth of moral judgment can be augmented by consistent use of the varied, practical experiences for choice-making found in even the restricted environment of residential settings. There is need for more creative and alert personnel to utilize all elements of experience within the retarded adult's environment.

Stephens'\(^1\) recent findings on "The Development of Reasoning, Moral Judgment, and Moral Conduct in Retarded and Normal," point out that development of reasoning and moral judgment of the retarded persons continues beyond age twenty. The present investigator's findings suggest that the development continues even into old age among mentally retarded adults. These results postulate that greater educational efforts be made among retarded adults, whether or not they are restored to their communities. Further training in decision-making is therefore imperative if society is to aid these retarded adults in maintaining their social and personal responsibility.

\(^1\)Stephens, op. cit., p. 59.
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Lesson 1 Concept: We must love God with all our hearts. We show God we love Him by doing good to others.

Story 1. (Objective responsibility)

Mary (or John) was upstairs. She was hungry. Just then the dinner bell rang. Mary rushed out of the room. She bumped into a lady at the railing. Mary grabbed the railing to keep from falling. She pulled the railing so hard that she tore it loose from the wall.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

Jane (or Paul) was riding her bicycle. She saw another woman riding toward her. Jane said, "I don't want that woman on the road with me." It was an angry Jane that bumped into the lady. She knocked the lady off the bike and broke the handle bar on her bicycle.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who pulled on the railing, or did Jane who bumped into the woman on the bicycle do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?
Lesson 2 Concept: "We must love God with all our heart and we must love our neighbor as ourselves. I show I love myself by respecting myself as a special person.

Story 1. (Objective responsibility)

Mary (or John) was invited to a party. She put on her prettiest dress. Mary looked beautiful! At the party she sat down on a chair that had a nail sticking out. Mary tore her best dress on the nail.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you have done? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

Jane (or Paul) had a bad cold on Friday. She had to go to bed. The nurse told her to stay in bed on Saturday. Jane said to herself, "Saturday is the movie at St. Coletta. I am going to the movie." So Jane went on the bus to the movie. Her cold got worse.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary or Jane do worse? Mary tore her dress on the nail. Jane went to the movie with a cold. Why do you think so?
Lesson 3 Concept: "We must love God with all our heart and love our neighbor as ourself." A neighbor is someone who needs me. When I share with others, I show love.

Story 1. (Subjective responsibility)

Mary (or John) and her friend went to the Snack machine. Mary's friend did not have a dime with her. But Mary had money in her purse. Mary told herself, "My friend always treats me. I will treat her today."

Mary bought a candy bar for her friend.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

Jane (or Paul) and her friend were enjoying their box lunches. Jane saw a woman without a lunch. Jane said, "I will share my lunch with the woman." She went to the woman and said, "You may have half of my lunch."

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who bought a candy bar for her friend, or did Jane who shared her lunch with the woman who had no lunch do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?
Lesson 4 Concept: The neighbor is a person having the same right to love, respect and dignity of a human person as I have. When I show respect for my neighbor, I show my love for God.

Story 1. (Subjective responsibility)
Mary (or John) and her friends were playing ball. A crippled lady wanted to play with them. Mary said, "No, you can't play with us. We don't want a cripple playing with us. You make too many mistakes."

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)
Jane (or Paul) saw a crippled old woman walking across the street. She looked very funny. Her body jerked and twisted as she walked. The old woman almost fell. Jane laughed at how funny the old lady looked as she tried to get up. Jane had a good time laughing at the old woman crossing the street.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who wouldn't let the crippled woman play, or did Jane who laughed at the old lady crossing the street do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?
Lesson 5 Concept: Love of God entails a relationship of creature to Creator. Man has duties to God: worship, reverence, dependence and love.

Story 1. (Subjective responsibility)

John and his friends went fishing. John felt big when he went fishing with the men. Some of the men used bad language. John did as the men did. He used God's name in jokes, and he swore many times.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did John do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were John, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

Jane (or Paul) was on her way to Mass on Sunday morning. She met some of her friends. They were going camping. The women said, "Don't go to Mass. Come with us." Jane said, "I like camping. It's fun. I will come with you." Then everyone went camping together.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did John who used bad language, or did Jane who went camping do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?
Lesson 6 Concept: We are children of God. We must respect our body and soul.

Story 1. (Objective responsibility)

Mary (or John) was arguing with another woman. Soon the two of them were fighting. Mary pushed the woman; the woman pushed her back. Mary got mad. She slapped the woman. The woman got a bloody nose.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

Jane (or Paul) worked in a shop. Jane knew her job well. She did not like people who were slow or clumsy. A new worker needed her help. Jane gave her the directions quickly and only once. But the lady was slow; she did not understand Jane. She made many mistakes. Jane got angry. She said, "Oh, you old stupid thing, get out."

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who gave the woman a bloody nose, or did Jane who told the woman to get out do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?
Lesson 7 Concept: We show God that we love Him by treating our bodies with respect. We must take care of our health. We must not harm any part of our body.

Story 1. (Objective responsibility)

Mary (or John) was sick in bed. She just would not eat. She didn't like the food. The doctor said that Mary could and should eat everything. But Mary would not eat because she didn't like the food.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

Jane (or Paul) went camping with her friends. She liked to boast about the stunts she could do. At the camp Jane found two large rocks. She shouted, "Watch me." Then she jumped from one big rock to the other big rock. She fell and got hurt.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then say: Did Mary who would not eat food she did not like, or did Jane who did risky stunts do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?
Lesson 8 Concept. We show we respect God when we speak good about God and about other people. We must respect our good name. We must respect the name of other men.

Story 1. (Subjective responsibility)

Mary (or John) found a little black dog. The owner came for the dog, but Mary would not give the dog back. She said, "Finders, keepers." The owner cried out, "You are a thief. That dog is mine." But Mary only laughed. She would not give the dog back.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

Jane (or Paul) was walking down the street. She passed a group of women. She heard someone say, "There goes that Jane. She stole the girl's purse." Jane got angry. She walked up to the women. "You are lying," Jane said. "I did not steal that purse."

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who found the dog, or did Jane who got angry at the women do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?
Lesson 9 Concept: We belong to God's family. God is our Father. Jesus is our Brother. All men are brothers.

Story 1. (Objective responsibility)

The Jones family found a little deaf and dumb girl on their porch. The family tried to teach her sign language. But little Elizabeth would not play with her. One day Elizabeth just ran away from home.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Elizabeth do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Elizabeth, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

John and his father were driving in Mississippi. The car ran out of gas. John and his father had to walk a long way in the hot sun. John got sick. His father left him with a black family on a farm. Then he went for gas. A white truckdriver brought the father back. The truckdriver said to John, "Aren't you glad to get away from those dirty, stupid, black people?" They are no good for our land."

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did little Elizabeth who ran away from home, or did the white truckdriver do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?
Lesson 10 Concept: God wants us to tell the truth. People cannot trust us if we lie.

Story 1. (Objective responsibility)
Mary (or John) wanted the new woman at the cottage to like her. She made up stories about how rich she was. But Mary's family was not rich. Mary just wanted the new woman to like her.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)
Jane (or Paul) opened a big can of paint. She was painting a big sign for Sister. Two girls were walking. They passed by and knocked over the paint can. The paint went all over the floor. Sister asked, "Who left the can of paint open?" Jane said, "The girls did."
The girls got punished.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who wanted the new woman for her friend, or did Jane who left the can of paint open do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?
Lesson 11 Concept: Justice means giving to others what belongs to them. Every individual has a right to life. No matter how crippled or sick he may be, he has a right to respect from other people.

Story 1. (Subjective responsibility)

Mary (or John) has a job carrying a dinner tray to the sick in bed. One woman is sick all the time. Mary gets tired of carrying trays to her. She makes up her mind not to speak to the woman when she brings her the tray. She just puts the tray down on a chair and leaves the room immediately.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

Jane (or Paul) sweeps the floor in the lunch room after meals. One of the ladies has trouble eating. Her hand shakes. Often the food falls to the floor. Jane calls her "sloppy" and refuses to give her the food if she won't eat right.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Was Mary who would not speak to the sick woman, or was Jane who refused to give the lady any food, more fair or unfair? Why do you think so?
Lesson 12 Concept: Man is a social human being. He has a duty to respect and treat with care the body of every man.

Story 1. (Objective responsibility)

Mary (or John) enjoys swinging out in the yard. She likes to swing very high. Another lady is just learning how to swing. She goes slowly and swings very low. Mary gave her a push. She said, "You must go high to have fun." The lady got frightened and fell.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

Jane (or Paul) likes to walk very fast. One lady is a polio cripple. Jane has to walk behind her in line. She gets angry at the lady for going so slow. This morning Jane said to her, "You can walk faster; now do it," and she pushed her hard. The woman fell and got hurt.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Was Mary who pushed the woman on the swing, or was Jane who pushed the crippled woman, more fair or unfair? Why do you think so?
PRE-TEST 13 - POST-TEST 13

Lesson 13 Concept: We must treat our neighbor fairly.
We must always respect his good name.

Story 1. (Objective responsibility)

Mike was the winner of a gold medal at the Olympics. The school had a celebration to honor Mike. But John would not go. He said, "Why should we honor him? All he does is run?"

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did John do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were John, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

Jane (or Paul) just doesn't like the new woman at the cottage. She calls her all kinds of names. Jane lies about the things she does. Jane tries to get others not to like her, also.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Was John who would not go to the celebration, or was Jane who did not like the new woman, more fair or unfair? Why do you think so?
Lesson 14 Concept: Every person has a right to have property of his own. We must respect what belongs to other people.

Story 1. (Objective responsibility)

Mary (or John) loves music. One of the women got a new radio for her birthday. One day when she was out working, Mary went into her room to play the radio. She reached for the radio, but it fell out of her hand and broke. Mary said nothing to anyone about it.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

One of the women got a very pretty dress for her birthday. Jane (or Paul) decided to wear the new dress. She just went into the woman's room and put it on. At dinner she spilled tomato juice on it. Jane went upstairs and put the dress back in its place. She said nothing about it to anyone.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Was Mary who broke the radio, or was Jane who ruined the new dress, more fair or unfair? Why do you think so?
Lesson 15 Concept: Every person has a right to own property. But people also have a duty to share their goods with others who are in need. People who have much should use their possessions for the good of all.

Story 1. (Objective responsibility)

Mr. King has opened his large farm as a picnic area for poor people. His one rule is: "Clean up before you leave." Mary (or John) enjoys going to the farm with her friends. But Mary doesn't like to clean up. She just leaves her friends. Then they must do it all.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility)

Mr. Smith lets poor people come into his apple orchard to pick apples for themselves. The apples are free. But the people must leave the orchard in order. Jane (or Paul) was picking apples with her friends. She saw a big branch loaded with apples. She broke the branch and ran away with her friends.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Was Mary who wouldn't help, or was Jane who broke the apple branch, more fair or unfair? Why do you think so?
APPENDIX II

LESSON PLANS
Lesson 1

| Concept:         | We must love God with all our hearts.          |
| Concept:         | We love God by doing good to others.          |
| Objective:       | Having discussed the lesson concept,           |
| Objective:       | adult will respond satisfactorily to a         |
| Objective:       | question in the comprehension check.          |
| Motivation:      | A lawyer asked, "Lord, what must I do to      |
| Motivation:      | get to heaven?" (Love God above all).          |
| Readiness:       | Jesus is my best friends. Jesus wants          |
| Readiness:       | me for His special friend.                    |
| Presentation:    | God is almighty, all-loving, all-good.         |
| Presentation:    | (Elicit gifts: life, mind, will, etc.).        |
| Word of God      | Processional; sing, "Praise Him."             |
| Activity         | Singing: "Praise Him."                        |
| Activity         | "Thank You, God."                             |
| Period:          | Questions from paired-stories. Elicit         |
| Period:          | thinking: Why do you think so?                |
| Comprehension    | Story 1. Mary (or John) was setting the table.|
| Check:           | She carried in three plates at a time.        |
| Objective        | She dropped the plates and broke them.         |
| responsibility:  | 1. Tell me the story.                         |
| responsibility:  | 2. Did Mary do right or wrong?                 |
| responsibility:  | 3. Why do you think so?                       |
| responsibility:  | 4. If you were Mary, what would you            |
| responsibility:  | do? Why?                                      |
| Story 2.         | Jane (or Paul) "makes beds" each day.         |
| (Subjective      | A lady complains. Jane decides to get          |
| responsibility:  | even with her. She tears her picture.         |
| (Subjective      | 1. Repeat the four questions above.            |
| responsibility:  | 2. Then ask: Did Mary who broke the            |
| responsibility:  | plates or Jane who tore the picture do more    |
| responsibility:  | right or wrong? Why?                          |
| Materials:       | Tape recorder, taped songs (cassette)         |
| Materials:       | Microphone (for "Roving Reporter")            |
| Materials:       | Pictures: Jesus, Mary, nature scenes          |
| Materials:       | Bible, two candles, matches                   |
# Lesson 2

**Concept:**
I must love my neighbor as myself. I show love for myself by doing good.

**Objective:**
Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.

**Motivation:**
Jesus came on earth to show me how to be the special person God made me.

**Readiness:**
God made me like Him: with a mind that can think, a heart that can love others.

**Presentation:**
Review: I am wonderfully made. Stress "will", "intention" and "love".

**Word of God**

**Celebration:**
Activity-period: Adults make up verses to song, "Thank You, God." (Tune: "London Bridge").

**Comprehension Check:**
Questions from paired-stories. Elicit thinking: Why do you think so?

**Story 1.**
Mary (or John) was making cookies. She burned herself when taking the cookies from the oven. All the cookies broke.

(Objective responsibility:)
1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do?

**Story 2.**
Jane (or Paul) and her friends were making puppets. Jane grabbed a woman's puppet. She broke it so she'd be first.

(Subjective responsibility:)
1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who broke the cookies or did Jane who broke the puppet do more wrong? Why do you think so?

**Materials:**
Tape recorder
Taped songs (cassette)
Microphone (for "Roving Reporter")
Pictures: cookies, puppets, people
Bible, two candles, matches
Lesson 3

Concept: I must love my neighbor as myself. A neighbor is someone who needs me. When I share with others, I show love.

Objective: Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.

Motivation: I thank God for sharing Jesus with me by helping anyone who needs me.

Readiness: Review Jesus' sharing His gifts of love, mind and will with me.

Presentation: Story of the Good Samaritan. Sharing with those who need me pleases Jesus.


Activity Period:

Comprehension Check:

Story 1. Mary or John likes to play cards. Three women want to play with her. Mary gets her cards. They all enjoy the game.

(Subjective responsibility:)
1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do?

Story 2. Jane or Paul began to watch her favorite TV show. A lady got her knitting yarn tangled. Jane helped her untangle it. The show was over before Jane got done.

(Subjective responsibility:)
1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who played cards or did Jane who helped the woman do better? Why do you think so?

Materials: Tape recorder and taped songs (cassette) Microphone for "Roving Reporter" Bible, two candles, matches Ears of unshelled corn Three dozen cookies
Lesson 4

Concept: The neighbor is a person having a right to love, respect and dignity.

Objective: Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.

Motivation: One day Jesus said, "If you really love Me, then love your neighbor as yourself."

Readiness: God gave everyone a body with power to live, grow, act and love.

Presentation: Jesus tells everyone, "When you respect your neighbor, you respect Me." Elicit acts of sharing, speaking, etc.


Activity Period: Banner making; cut out pictures to fit the song verses the group composed. ("Thank You, God for...")

Comprehension Check: Questions from paired-stories. Elicit thinking: Why do you think so?

Story 1. Mary (or John) works with a lady who cannot speak clearly. "I don't like to talk to her and I won't," Mary says.

   (Subjective responsibility: 1. Tell me the story.
   2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
   3. Why do you think so?
   4. If you were Mary, what would you do?

Story 2. Jane (or Paul) lives with a deaf lady. The lady gets news all mixed up. Jane makes fun of her before other people.

   (Subjective responsibility: 1. Repeat the four questions above.
   2. Then ask: Did Mary who won't talk to the lady or did Jane who laughs at the deaf lady do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?

Materials: Tape recorder and taped songs (cassette)
Microphone for "Roving Reporter"
Bible, two candles, matches
Scissors, paste, pictures, banner paper
Lesson 5

Concept: Man has duties to God: worship, love, reverence and dependence.

Objective: Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.

Motivation: We adore and love God our Father. We want God to be first in our lives.

Readiness: Review our relations with God Who is almighty, all-loving, all-wise, all-good.

Presentation: God told Moses: "I am the Lord, your God. I want you to talk to Me."


Activity Period: Continue work on the banner. Sing the verses as work on each one proceeds.

Comprehension Check:

Story 1.
1. Tell me the story.
2. Did John do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were John, what would you do? Why?

Story 2.
1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did John who doesn't like losing or did Jane who stays in bed on Sunday morning do more wrong? Why do you think so?

Materials: Tape recorder and taped songs (cassette) Microphone for "Roving Reporter" Bible, two candles, matches Scissors, paste, pictures, banner paper
Lesson 6

Concept: We are children of God. We must respect our bodies and souls.

Objective: Adult will renew baptismal promises and take part in a celebration.

Motivation: God made every part of my body and it is good. God wants me to respect my body. God gave me faith and love for my soul.

Readiness: We must respect ourselves because we are children of God and belong to Him.

Presentation: God wants me to be happy with Him forever in heaven. Let us thank God for the gift of faith He has given us.

Paraliturgic-Baptismal Vows

Celebration: Christ is our life. (Light the candle). Christ is the Light of the world. He shows us the way to heaven. Jesus said we must be baptized. We must become a child of God. We will celebrate our baptismal day to thank God for making us His children. (Pass candles).

Processional: sing, "This Little Light of Mine." Gather around the Bible. At our Baptism, the priest poured water on our forehead and said, "I baptize you, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." And right then, we were born into God's family. Think of that wonderful moment.

Ephesians 1: 5. "Think of the love the Father has for us, that we should be called the children of God--and we really are." (Silent thanksgiving).

Profession of Faith: Do you believe in God our Father Who made you? All: I DO BELIEVE.
Do you believe in Jesus Christ Who saved you? All: I DO BELIEVE.
Do you believe in the Holy Spirit Who makes you holy? All: I DO BELIEVE.
Sing: "I Am Special...You...God." (Celebrate--cookies and a cold drink).
Lesson 7

Concept: We must take care of our health. We must not harm any part of our bodies.

Objective: Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.

Motivation: Today many people do not respect life. They harm their own and other people's lives. We must respect our life.

Readiness: We must have respect for our own bodies and souls. We are important people.

Presentation: We must take care of our bodies: keep them clean and healthy; keep them safe.

Word of God

Celebration: Processional; sing, "God Will Take Care of Me." Leviticus 19: 17.

Activity


Comprehension Check:

Mary (or John) has a bad habit of running outside without wraps, even on cold days. Now, she is sick in bed.

Story 1.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why?

Story 2.

Jane (or Paul) is just learning to swim. She must not swim in deep water. But Jane does not listen. She likes deep water. She likes taking risks.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who went outside without a coat or did Jane who wants to swim in deep water do more right or wrong? Why?

Materials: Tape recorder, taped songs (cassette)

Bible, two candles, matches

Pictures: taking care of health
Lesson 8

Concept: We must respect our good name. We must respect the good name of other men.

Objective: Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.

Motivation: One day Jesus said, "If you really love Me, you will speak the truth to others.

Readiness: Some Jews called Jesus names. Jesus told them they must speak good things about the Spirit of God.

Presentation: Some men told lies about Jesus. Jesus defended His good name. We, too, must defend our good name. We must speak well about other people.

Word of God
Celebration: Processional; sing, "Glory to God." John 8: 49. Personal prayer.

Activity

Comprehension
Check: Questions from paired-stories. Elicit thinking: Why do you think so?

Story 1. Mary (or John) found a white kitten. The owner came for it, but Mary kept it. Mary told the woman to go away. She called the woman names.

Story 2. Jane (or Paul) enjoys telling jokes. He makes fun of people in his jokes. He often says things that are not true.

Material responsibility:
1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who called the lady names or did Jane who made up stories about others do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?

Materials: Tape recorder, taped songs (cassette) Telephone Bible, two candles, matches
Pictures: quarreling, name calling
### Lesson 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept:</th>
<th>God is our Father. All men are brothers. All men are children of God.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation:</td>
<td>Song: &quot;Whatsoever You Do.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness:</td>
<td>God our Father gave us Jesus for our Brother to teach us to love each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Discuss each line of the song, &quot;Whatsoever You Do.&quot; Apply to examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration:</td>
<td>Role playing of verses of the song.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Period:</td>
<td>Role playing of verses of the song.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Questions from paired-stories. Elicit thinking: Why do you think so?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Story 1.

(Objective responsibility: One crutch fell and hit the lady's arm.
1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do?

Mary (or John) was visiting in the hospital. She saw a lady trying to walk with crutches. Mary went to help her. One crutch fell and hit the lady's arm.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do?

#### Story 2.

(Subjective responsibility: It was a cold, icy day. An old lady wanted the bus on the other side of the street. Mary helped her get across the icy street. She missed her own bus.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who struck the lady with the crutch or did Jane who helped the woman across the street do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?

Jane (or Paul) was waiting for a bus. It was a cold, icy day. An old lady wanted the bus on the other side of the street. Mary helped her get across the icy street. She missed her own bus.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who struck the lady with the crutch or did Jane who helped the woman across the street do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?

#### Materials:

- Tape recorder and taped songs (cassette)
- Microphone for "Roving Reporter"
- Bible, two candles, matches
- Pictures of people helping others.
Lesson 10

Concept: God wants us to tell the truth. People trust us more if we tell the truth.

Objective: Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.

Motivation: Jesus praised His friend, Nathaniel. "He does not make others think he is better than he is. He is himself."

Readiness: Could Jesus say the same thing about you? about me? Jesus loved truth.

Presentation: Pilate asked Jesus, "What is truth?" What do you think it is? Discuss.


Comprehension Check: Questions from paired-stories. Elicit thinking: Why do you think so?

Story 1. Mary (or John) had a job taking a lady riding in her wheelchair. Mary told funny stories to make the lady laugh. Sometimes the stories were not true.

Story 2. Jane (or Paul) noticed two ladies in the playroom. They kept watching Jane and her friends. Jane said, "Keep away from them. They are out to get us."

Materials: Bible, two candles, matches. Tape recorder, microphone, cassette.
Lesson 11

Concept: Everyone has a right to life. He has a right to be respected and considered.

Objective: Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.

Motivation: Life is God's great gift to us. We live only a little while on earth, but we will live with God forever.

Readiness: Picture study of two scenes of accidents. Did anyone get hurt? Whose fault is it?

Presentation: Discuss why it is wrong to injure deliberately the life or name of another person. How do we act toward the injured?


Activity Period:

Comprehension Check: Questions from paired-stories. Elicit thinking: Why do you think so?

Story 1.

(Objective responsibility: Mary (or John) and her crippled friend were playing on the shuffle board. Mary dropped her stick on the friend's foot. The lady got injured.

1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do?

Story 2.

(Subj ective responsibility: Jane (or Paul) played cards every day with a deaf friend. Jane would scream at the lady to listen to her. She'd often make fun of what the lady said.

1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who dropped the crutch or did Jane who screamed at the lady do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?

Materials: Bible, two candles, matches, microphone Two picture scenes of accidents
## Lesson 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept:</th>
<th>Man is a social human being. He has a duty to treat with care each man's body.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation:</td>
<td>We must do to others what we want them to do to us in protecting our bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness:</td>
<td>It is not right to laugh at a handicapped person. We owe him respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Every person is important. His injured mind or body does not injure his soul. He is a child of God and deserves our respect and help. (Pictures of handicap).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Period:</td>
<td>Begin the banner for the special liturgy. &quot;Praise God.&quot; Cut out pictures of different kinds of people at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension Check:</td>
<td>Questions from paired-stories. Elicit thinking: Why do you think so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 1.</td>
<td>Mary is shoving a heavy basket of wash. She bumps into a lady. The woman falls and breaks her leg. (Objective responsibility: 1. Tell me the story. 2. Did Mary do right or wrong? 3. Why do you think so? 4. If you were Mary, what would you do? Why? (Repeat the questions below).)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 2.</td>
<td>Jane wants a lady to help her carry books to the next room. The lady is not strong; she can't. Jane calls her lazy and good for nothing. (Subjective responsibility:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson 13

Concept: We must treat our neighbor fairly. We must always respect his good name.

Objective: Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.

Motivation: Some of the Pharisees said that Jesus worked by the power of the devil. Jesus said, "You are not showing honor to the Spirit of God in Me. That is wrong."

Readiness: God is love. We honor the Spirit of God when we respect the good name of everyone.

Presentation: One day Jesus cured ten men. Only one man came back to thank Him. Jesus was hurt. "Has no one returned to give God glory but this stranger?" It is right to honor people who do something good.


Activity Period: Singing: "Praise to the Lord." (Mass)

Comprehension Check: Questions from paired-stories. Elicit thinking: Why do you think so?

Story 1. Mary's (or John's) friend won a contest prize in singing. Mary went to her friends and told them the good news.
1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do?

Story 2. Jane saw a lady pick some money from the table. She told her friends to hide their money because that lady was a thief.
1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who praised her friend or did Jane who talked about the lady do more right or wrong? Why do you think so?

Materials: Bible, two candles, matches, microphone.
Lesson 14

Concept: Every person has a right to own property. We respect what belongs to others.

Objective: Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.

Motivation: "What must I do to get to heaven?" "You know the law. Tell it to me," Jesus said to the lawyer.

Readiness: What did Jesus tell the lawyer to do? What do you think Jesus is telling us?

Presentation: God gave us two wonderful powers: the power to think and the power to choose. We know we must respect the property of others; we must choose to do right.


Comprehension Check: Questions from paired-stories. Elicit thinking: Why do you think so?

Story 1. Mary (or John) saw a wrist watch on the table. She picked it up to get the time. The owner grabbed it out of her hand. "You leave my things alone."
1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do?

Story 2. Jane picked up a girl's scarf. It is cold outside so she decided to wear it. She dropped the scarf and got it dirty.
1. Repeat the four questions above.
2. Then ask: Did Mary who picked up the wrist watch or did Jane who wore the scarf do more wrong? Why?

Materials: Bible, two candles, matches, microphone
Lesson 15

Concept: People have a duty to share their goods with others who are in need. They must use riches for the good of all people.

Objective: Adult will respond satisfactorily to a question in the comprehension check.

Motivation: We belong to God's family. All men are brothers. They must be fair in giving each one what belongs to him.

Readiness: Some men use every opportunity to get possessions of their own. Many men can not earn enough to own things. How can we be fair to everyone, both rich and poor?

Presentation: One of the big problems all over the world is this one of sharing possessions. Is money the only wealth people must share? What do you think? Discuss. Jesus said, "Happy are the poor in spirit." What was Jesus trying to tell us?


Comprehension Check: Questions from Paired- Stories. Elicit thinking: Why do you think so?

Story 1. (Objective responsibility:)
Mary (or John) and the women were making the banner for Mass. They got paper on the floor, table, and chairs. The table got paste on it. The girls had to clean up, but Mary would not help. "It's your job," she tells them.

Story 2. (Subjective responsibility:)
Jane (or Paul) received a five pound box of her favorite chocolates. "I shall have enough for a couple of weeks," she says. "No," she decides. "I want every woman here to share my candy with me." The following questions apply to both stories:
1. Tell me the story.
2. Did Mary (or Jane) do right or wrong?
3. Why do you think so?
4. If you were Mary, what would you do?
APPENDIX III

ASSESSMENT OF MORAL REASONING
How to Assess the Moral Reasoning of Students:  
Teacher's Guide to the Use of Lawrence Kohlberg's  
Stage-Developmental Method

How to Score:

The stage assigned to the pupil for each story  
may be pure or mixed, as follows:  
Stage 3--pure stage 3.  
Stage 3(2)--mostly stage 3, some stage 2.  
Stage 3(2)?--can't tell whether it is stage 2  
or 3, but probably 3.  
Stage 3?--likely stage 3, but not sure.  
Using this procedure, all stories answered are  
assigned a score.  
After the teacher has scored each story for a  
given student, an overall, global score for that  
student can be arrived at in the following way:  
1. List the final score for each story.  
2. a) Assign a weight of 3 to a pure score (such  
as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6).  
b) For a mixed score, such as 1(2), 2(3),  
2(4), etc., assign a weight of 2 to the  
major stage and 1 to the minor stage.  
3. Add up the totals for each stage and convert  
to percentages.  
a) If 50% or more of the stories are at a  
given stage, this becomes a major stage in  
the global score.  
b) If 25% or more of the stories are at a  
given stage, this becomes a minor stage in  
the global score.  

An example will illustrate this procedure:  
1. The final scores on each story for student A  
are: 2(3), 3, 3(2), 3.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The assigned weights  
are: 1  2  1  3  3  3

3. The totals are:  
3  9  

The percentages are: 3/12 or 25% for stage 2.  
9/12 or 75% for stage 3.
Therefore, the global score is 3(2). (Note that the major stage always appears first, followed by the minor stage, if there is one, in brackets).

For some students (about 10% to 15% of the class), there will not be any stage that receives at least 50% of the score, in which case it is not possible to assign a global score.

In addition to assigning a student a major stage, Kohlberg assigns a moral maturity score. This score is based on a system of stage weighting, assigning stage 1 a weight of 1, stage 2 a weight of 2, and so on. The weight of each stage shown by a student is multiplied by the percentage of his scores at this stage. Accordingly, moral maturity scores range from 100 (all stage 1) to 600 (all stage 6). Student A in the example above would therefore have a moral maturity score of 275 (25% x 2 plus 75% x 3).  

---

1Porter and Taylor, op. cit., pp. 9-10.
### TABLE 1

**MORAL MATURITY SCORE (SUBJECTS A–J).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>Moral Maturity Score</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>72-5</td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>189.2</td>
<td>231.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>36-3</td>
<td>5-0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>205.8</td>
<td>259.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>67-5</td>
<td>8-4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>260.8</td>
<td>290.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>51-6</td>
<td>8-6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>255.1</td>
<td>297.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>72-2</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>233.1</td>
<td>291.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>53-8</td>
<td>9-6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>240.7</td>
<td>300.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>80-6</td>
<td>5-5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>134.8</td>
<td>215.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>155.5</td>
<td>207.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>44-9</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>176.9</td>
<td>235.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>62-10</td>
<td>8-4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>260.8</td>
<td>295.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2

MORAL MATURITY SCORE (SUBJECTS K-T).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>Moral Maturity Score</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>40-6</td>
<td>5-11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>233.0</td>
<td>287.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>47-2</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>237.2</td>
<td>293.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>28-4</td>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>217.4</td>
<td>261.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>35-3</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>205.6</td>
<td>269.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>34-9</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>216.3</td>
<td>278.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>38-2</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>234.8</td>
<td>283.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>25-2</td>
<td>5-0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>233.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>49-4</td>
<td>9-2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>224.5</td>
<td>283.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>42-1</td>
<td>7-4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>225.5</td>
<td>287.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>44-10</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>228.1</td>
<td>270.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3
MORAL MATURITY SCORES AND GLOBAL (SUBJECTS A-J)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fig. I</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Fig. II</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Fig. III</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>147.8</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
<td>204.3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>215.6</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>189.9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>216.5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>211.1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>232.2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>276.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>273.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>248.9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>267.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>248.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>230.2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>240.1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>225.5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>246.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>155.5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>157.9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>151.0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>157.7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>178.3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>203.3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>243.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>283.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>255.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Post-test</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4
MORAL MATURITY SCORES AND GLOBAL (SUBJECTS K-T)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Fig. I</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Fig. II</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Fig. III</th>
<th>Global</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>211.2</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>243.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>244.4</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>192.3</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>227.9</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>227.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>202.3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>212.2</td>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>237.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>181.1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>226.7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>211.1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>237.9</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>217.7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>237.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>249.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>156.7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>186.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160.1</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>215.7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>223.4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>231.1</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>200.1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>237.7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>224.4</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>221.1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>238.8</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>224.5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Post-test | | | | | | |
| K | 267.9 | 3 | 283.4 | 3 | 311.1 | 3 |
| L | 298.9 | 3 | 267.8 | 3 | 313.4 | 3(4) |
| M | 255.6 | None | 256.8 | 3(2) | 273.3 | 3 |
| N | 247.9 | None | 257.7 | 3(2) | 302.3 | 3 |
| O | 264.5 | 3 | 268.6 | 3 | 302.3 | 3 |
| P | 287.8 | 3 | 273.3 | 3 | 288.9 | 3 |
| Q | 210.0 | 3 | 244.5 | 3(2) | 246.7 | 3 |
| R | 268.9 | 3 | 280.0 | 3 | 300.1 | 3 |
| S | 278.9 | None | 268.9 | 3(2) | 313.3 | 3 |
| T | 260.0 | None | 264.4 | 3(2) | 286.7 | 3 |
APPENDIX IV

STAGE 3 RESPONSE SAMPLINGS
JUDGMENT. STAGE 3 RESPONSE SAMPLINGS (SUBJECTS A-J)

Why was Mary or Jane right or wrong?

Lesson
1. Jane wanted to push the lady off the road. She did it on purpose and broke the bike handle bar.
2. Mary accidently sat on the chair and tore her dress.
3. Jane wasn't stingy. She gave the lady one-half of her lunch.
4. Mary wouldn't let the crippled lady play because she was a cripple and messed up the game.
5. Jane didn't go to Mass on Sunday. She went camping.
6. Mary got angry and gave the lady a nose bleed. She didn't show respect for her.
7. Paul was determined to do the jumping. He was taking a risk to injure his body.
8. Mary kept the dog and won't give it back. That is stealing. The dog isn't hers.
9. The truckdriver said, "Get rid of the black people." He didn't like them. It ain't right.
10. Paul told Sister the girls did it. The girls got punished.
11. Mary just took the tray to the woman. She did not talk to her. She should tell her to eat.
12. Jane got angry and called the lady names and pushed her on purpose.
13. Jane was disrespectful. She told lies.
14. Jane wore the girl's dress and wouldn't get it cleaned.
15. Mary would not help clean up.
JUDGMENT. STAGE 3 RESPONSE SAMPLINGS (SUBJECTS K-T)

Why was John or Paul right or wrong?

Lesson

1. Paul was wrong because he smashed into the man on the bike deliberately.

2. Paul should obey the nurse and stay in bed. He went on purpose and the cold got worse.

3. Paul gave one-half of his lunch to the man. He showed respect for his neighbor.

4. Paul did wrong because he didn't show respect for his neighbor. Old men can't help themselves.

5. Paul was wrong because he didn't go to Mass on Sunday. He listened to his friends instead.

6. Paul did wrong. He should go slow because the man didn't understand.

7. Paul didn't show respect for his own body. He took a chance and got hurt. He did wrong.

8. Paul told the truth to those liars.

9. The truckdriver deliberately called the black people names. He did not like them.

10. Paul left the paint can open. He told a lie.

11. Paul was unfair. He should be kind and give the man his food.

12. Paul called the man names and pushed him on purpose. The man fell down and got hurt.

13. Paul was unfair. He told lies and didn't respect the man.

14. Paul was unfair. He took the jacket on purpose. It didn't belong to him.

15. Paul was unfair. He broke the apple branch on purpose.
APPLICATION. STAGE 3 RESPONSE SAMPLINGS (SUBJECTS A-J)

If you were Mary or Jane, what would you do?

Lesson

1. I wouldn't bump into her. I'd let her pass.

2. I could get my dress torn, too, if I didn't see the nail. It was not wrong.

3. I'd give the lady one-half of my lunch, too.

4. I wouldn't laugh at her. I'd go and help her. I'd do a kind deed for the old lady.

5. I'd go to Mass first and then I would go camping.

6. I would go slow in training the woman, and then I would go faster.

7. I'd eat the food I don't like anyway. It's good for me so I can get good and healthy again.

8. I'd tell the ladies they are liars.

9. I'd help the woman out and be kind to her.

10. I would walk in with the tray, and I would talk to the sick lady.

11. I would feed the girl and help her.

12. I would go slow. I would take her hand and help her.

13. I'd go because I was told to go, but I'd go also because I want to tell Mike he was great.

14. I would go and tell the woman I did it.

15. I'd clean up with the women.
APPLICATION. STAGE 3 RESPONSE SAMPLINGS (SUBJECTS K-T)

If you were John or Paul, what would you do?

Lesson

1. John did right to grab the railing to keep from falling. I'd grab the railing, too.

2. It was an accident. It could happen to me, too.

3. I'd give the man one-half of my lunch. I'd feel sorry because he didn't have any.

4. I'd show the man respect. I wouldn't laugh at him.

5. I'd go to Church and pray, and then I'd go fishing. I'd bring my camera along.

6. I'd help the old man out by going slowly.

7. I'd not do it. You could kill yourself. You are not showing respect for your own life.

8. I wouldn't stand for their lying. I would go and tell the men they are liars.

9. The black people were kind. I would not say mean things about them.

10. I'd take the tray up to the sick man. I'd talk to him and help him out.

11. I'd sweep and I'd treat the man nicely. I'd give him food.

12. I would help him and have patience with him.

13. I'd talk to him and try to be his friend.

14. I would have the jacket cleaned.

15. I wouldn't break the branch. He broke it on purpose.
DECISION-MAKING. STAGE 3 RESPONSE SAMPLINGS (SUBJECTS A-J)

Which one, Mary or Jane, did more right or wrong? (1-10).
Which one was more fair or unfair? (11-15). Why do you think so?

Lesson
1. Jane was more wrong. She smashed into the woman on the bike on the road. She did it on purpose.
2. Jane was wrong. She determined to go to the movie with a bad cold.
3. Jane was more right. She shared her lunch, one-half of it, with the lady because she didn't have any.
4. Jane was more wrong because she made fun of the lady. She didn't show respect for her neighbor.
5. Jane was more wrong because she should go to Mass on the Lord's Day.
6. Jane was more wrong because she didn't want to help the lady learn the work.
7. Mary was showing off and determined to jump from one rock to the other. She took a risk.
8. Mary kept the dog. It belongs to the owner.
9. The truckdriver didn't like black people. He knew better so he did it on purpose, I think.
10. Paul blamed the girls and didn't tell the truth.
11. Jane was unfair to the woman. She made up all those stories and did not respect her.
12. Jane pushed the woman on purpose and didn't show her any respect. That's not fair.
13. Jane was more unfair. She was disrespectful and told lies about the woman.
14. Jane was more unfair. She did wrong to that lady's good name.
15. Paul was more unfair. He destroyed other people's property on purpose.
DECISION-MAKING. STAGE 3 RESPONSE SAMPLINGS (SUBJECTS K-T)

Which one, John or Paul, did more right or wrong? (1-10)
Which one was more fair or unfair? (11-15) Why do you think so?

Lesson

1. Paul did it on purpose and broke the handle bar on the man's bike. He was more wrong.

2. Paul disobeyed the nurse. In doing so, his cold got worse.

3. Paul did better. He shared his lunch with that man. He showed respect for his neighbor.

4. Paul poked fun at the man. He should have helped him across the street. He was more wrong.

5. Paul should go to Mass on Sunday, the Lord's Day. Paul did worse.

6. Paul called the man names. He showed he did not have respect and love for him.

7. Paul did it from his own free will and he got hurt.

8. John wouldn't give the dog back. It wasn't his. If you find something, give it back to the owner.

9. The truckdriver didn't respect black people.

10. Paul lied about the girls. They got punished.

11. Paul was unfair. He should give the man food, but he won't. The man spilled it, but Paul didn't respect him.

12. Paul pushed the man deliberately and then he had the accident. Paul was unfair to him.

13. Paul was more unfair. He told false stories about the man. He didn't respect him.

14. Paul wore the jacket on purpose. He ruined it. He was more unfair.

15. Paul broke the branch on purpose and ran off with it. He was unfair to the owner.