

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 177

SO 032 884

AUTHOR Pearson, Frances C.; Bruess, Brian J.
TITLE The Gender Debate about Identity and Moral Development
Continues: What about the Men?
PUB DATE 2001-03-00
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National
Association of Student Personnel Administrators (83rd,
Seattle, WA, March 17-21, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Science Research; *Gender Issues; Higher
Education; *Moral Development; Psychological Studies; *Sex
Differences; *Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS Cognitive Research; Defining Issues Test; *Identity
Formation; Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle
Inventory

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to help determine whether there are gender differences in the psychological and moral development of traditional-age college students. Two hundred thirty-three first-year and graduating students were given the Student Development Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI) and the Defining Issues Test (DIT) to determine whether these gender differences exist. Results show that men scored lower than women in Principled Moral reasoning, Davidson's moral index, Academic Autonomy, and Purpose. Recommendations for practice and for research are discussed. Contains 6 tables and 57 references. (Author/BT)

Running Head: GENDER DEBATE

The Gender Debate about Identity and Moral Development Continues:

What about the Men?

Frances C. Pearson, Northwestern State University

Brian J. Bruess, College of St. Catherine

SO 032 884

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frances C. Pearson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



Gender Debate 2

Two hundred and thirty three first-year and graduating students were given the Student Development Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI) and Defining Issues Test (DIT) to determine whether gender differences exist in identity and moral development. The results showed men scored lower than women in Principled Moral Reasoning, Davidson's moral index, Academic Autonomy, and Purpose. Recommendations for practice are discussed.

Gender Debate 3

The Gender Debate About Identity and Moral Development Continues:

What About the Men?

Kohlberg's (1984) theory of moral reasoning and Chickering's (1978) theory of identity development in college students have been used extensively to guide practice and research in student affairs (Evans, 1996; Pacarella & Terenzini, 1991; Rodgers, 1980). Both have been criticized, however, for being biased against women (Evans, 1996; Moore & Upcraft, 1990).

One of the primary concerns about Chickering's original (1978) theory relates to the assumption that separation from parents and others is a necessary part of the process of identity formation. Much of the literature on women suggests that they form a sense of identity within the context of relationships rather than through separation (eg. Enns, 1991; Gilligan, 1982; Josselson, 1987; Kuk, 1990, Levinson & Levinson, 1996; Marcia, 1980, 1993; Straub & Rodgers, 1986) and that interdependence is the hallmark of a mature identity (Josselson, 1992). Consequently, the theory was reconceptualized in 1993 by Chickering and Reisser to incorporate theories and research about women.

The concern about gender bias in Kohlberg's (1984) theory began with Gilligan's (1979; 1982) assertion that women scored lower on Kohlberg's measures of moral development than men and were therefore considered to be deficient in moral reasoning. Her research revealed that men and women had different ways of thinking about moral issues - men used the justice-oriented reasoning described by Kohlberg and women used a reasoning based on care and relationships. She proposed that Kohlberg's theory did not adequately describe women's moral development because it devalued the care voice .

There is still a question as to whether Chickering & Reissers (1993) theory can be generalized to groups other than white males in a Eurocentric culture (Taub, 1997), so efforts to validate and refine the theory continue (Mather & Winston, 1998; Taub, 1995, 1997; Thieke, 1996). Similarly, the research and debate about gender differences in the moral domain continues

(Garmen, Bassinger, Gregg, & Gibbs, 1996; Stiller & Forrest, 1990; Wark & Krebs, 1996). Therefore, this study was designed to help determine whether there are gender differences in psychosocial and moral development of traditional-age college students.

Theoretical Background

Kohlberg's Theory

Building on the work of Piaget (1948), Kohlberg (1984) developed a theory that describes cognitive-structural stages of moral reasoning. It is based on a justice-orientation, the belief that people resolve a moral dilemma by weighing the rights of competing parties and making a decision about what is just and fair. He identified three levels and six stages of moral reasoning. Level I, Preconventional Moral Reasoning, is divided into two stages which are characterized by a responsiveness to cultural rules and notions of right and wrong. The reasoning at stage one, Punishment and Obedience Orientation, is to avoid breaking rules which result in punishment. Individuals at this stage have no internal standard for judging moral issues and are incapable of understanding another person's point of view. At stage two, Instrumental-relativist Orientation, right is viewed as what is equal or fair and there is concern about reciprocity and fair exchange.

Conventional, or Level II, reasoning is based on conforming to personal and social expectations, and loyalty to the social order. Stage three, Interpersonal Concordance Orientation, is the stage in which individuals think good behavior is pleasing or helping others and being "nice." Stage four, Law and Order, is characterized by concern for authority, rules, and enforcement of social duties (Kohlberg, 1984).

Postconventional, or Level III, moral reasoning is Kohlberg's (1984) highest level. It is characterized by "moral values and principles that have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles and apart from the individual's own identification with these groups" (Smith, 1978, p. 56). At stage five, Social Contract and Legalistic Orientation, individuals view right in terms of individual rights which are supported by society and

they are aware of the relativism of personal rules and opinions. Stage six, Universal-ethical-principled Orientation, is defined as following abstract ethical principles which are universal (Kohlberg, 1984).

According to Gilligan (1979; 1982), Kohlberg's (1984) theory has a masculine bias. She believed that women base their moral decisions on an ethic of care, rather than the justice orientation proposed by Kohlberg and that their concern for relationships places them at a disadvantage in Kohlberg's system where being nice is less advanced than following rules. Most gender research using Kohlberg's measure has showed no differences, however (Gibbs, Arnold, & Burkhart, 1984; Jadack, Hyde, Moore, & Keller, 1995; Pratt, Golding, Hunter, & Sampson, 1988; Rest, 1979, 1986; Thoma, 1984; Walker, 1984, 1989; Walker, deVries, & Trevethon, 1987) but some studies revealed women scored higher than men. In one study, Loxley and Whiteley (1986) found women scored higher in the first year while men scored higher in the senior year. In a meta analysis of 56 studies with more than 6000 subjects, there were no gender differences except in two studies where women scored higher than men (Rest, 1986). Rest concluded that "less than one-half of 1 percent of the variance in DIT scores is attributable to gender" (Rest, 1986, p. 113). Walker's (1984) review of studies which examined sex differences showed women scored lower than men, but not if educational level was controlled. A longitudinal study of Greek men and women showed no differences, except that non-Greek women scored higher on Principled Moral Reasoning than non-Greek men, Greek men, and Greek women (Kilgannon & Erwin, 1992). A recent study of 543 individuals showed women were more advanced in moral reasoning in early adolescence (6th and 8th grades), but there were no differences in the 4th grade, 10th grade, college, or adulthood (Garmen et al, 1996). The authors argued the higher levels in early adolescence reflected the normal early development of females. In a study by Wark & Krebs (1996) men scored lower than women because they gave more stage 2

responses and women gave more stage 3 responses - men were more concerned about reciprocity, while women were more concerned about being "nice".

Recent research on gender differences has focused on moral orientation. Several studies have shown that women use a care orientation more often than men (Garmen et al, 1996; Stiller & Forrest, 1990; Walker, 1997), but others have shown no differences (Liddell, Halpin, U Halpin, 1993; Wark & Krebs, 1996). The conclusion has been that men consistently use a justice orientation, while women use both orientations.

Identity Development

Chickering's (1978) theory describes seven vectors, or developmental tasks which are essential to identity development. The first vector, Developing Competence, includes the development of competence in intellectual, physical and manual, and social skills. The second vector, Managing Emotions, involves an awareness of emotions and the development of self-control. Vector three, Developing Autonomy, includes the development of both emotional and instrumental independence and the recognition of the importance of interdependence. Although the entire model describes the development of identity, the vector of Identity refers to a solid sense of self, a realistic understanding of one's psychological image, and self-acceptance. As individuals develop a strong sense of identity, their relationships are characterized by greater trust, independence, and individuality. This is the vector of Freeing Interpersonal Relationships. The sixth vector, Developing Purpose, involves making plans for the future that integrate vocational interests, relationships, and lifestyle choices and moving toward the implementation of those plans. Developing Integrity, the last vector, includes the clarification of a personal value system and behaving consistently with that value system.

In the revised version of the model, Chickering and Reisser (1993) attempted to eliminate a white male bias by considering how identity forms within the context of relationships. They reconceptualized the Autonomy vector to emphasize interdependence and community and renamed

it Moving through Autonomy Toward Interdependence. In order to recognize the importance of relationships in defining a core sense of self, the 5th vector was renamed Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationships and moved ahead of Identity in the scheme. That vector emphasizes the capacity for intimacy, tolerance, and acceptance of differences. The Identity vector was expanded to include issues faced by women and minorities, such as comfort with gender and sexual orientation.

Most of the research on Chickering's theory has been done on the development of Autonomy, Mature Relationships, and Purpose, as measured by the Student Developmental Task Inventory (Winston, Miller, & Prince, 1979) and Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory (Winston & Miller, 1987). The studies demonstrate that both women and men make significant progress on identity issues during the college years and that there are very few gender differences (Winston & Miller, 1987). For example, the research has shown that students become more autonomous during their college years (Greeley & Tinsley, 1988; Jodan-Cox, 1987; Winston & Miller, 1987; Winston, Miller, & Prince, 1979). In terms of autonomy, it has been shown that women became less autonomous during the first year of college (Hatch, 1970), their attachment to parents does not decline significantly during college, and they delay autonomy until their senior year (Taub, 1997). There is evidence that women develop mature relationships prior to developing autonomy (Straub & Rodgers, 1986; Straub, 1987). Many studies have shown students develop the capacity to engage in open and trusting relationships (eg. Greeley & Tinsely, 1988; Taub & McEwen, 1991; Winston, 1990), but according to Winston & Miller (1987) men and women do not differ significantly on this task when all studies using the Student Development Task and Lifestyle Inventory were combined. Similarly, both men and women appear to develop a sense of purpose during college (Polkosnik & Winston, 1989; Greeley & Tinsley, 1988, Winston & Miller, 1987; Winston & Polkosnik, 1986), but there are no gender differences (Winston & Miller, 1987).

Other gender research on identity development has been conducted using Marcia's (1980, 1993) Identity Status model. In early studies, showed women scored lower on identity development than men; but, later studies revealed they score the same or even higher than men. Marcia (1993) suggested this could be due to society being more accepting of women exploring options in recent years. Studies using the identity status model do show that women reflect on and make decisions regarding identity issues in a relational context to a greater extent than men (Archer, 1989; Pearson & Rodgers, 1998).

Method

Sample

A cross-sectional sample of traditional-aged first-year and graduating students at a selective admission mid-sized university in the midwest was used in this study. First-year students were defined as having earned less than 45 quarter credit hours and being between the ages of 17 and 20. Graduating students were defined as having earned at least 135 quarter credit hours and being between the ages of 21 and 24. Responses of students who did not meet these criteria were not included in the analysis. The first-year students were enrolled in a large introductory course and the seniors were in four upper-level interdisciplinary courses which were selected based upon similarity of prerequisites, size, and having an equal proportion of women and men. Forty-three of the respondents were eliminated for violating either the age criteria, failure to complete the instrument, or failure on the consistency and internal reliability checks of the Defining Issues Test (see description of instrument). Of the 233 students in the final analysis, 121 (52%) were first year students and 112 (48%) were graduating students. Eighty-six (71%) of the first-year students were women and 35 (29%) were men. Of the graduating students, 58 (52%) were women and 54 (48%) were men.

Data Collection

Data were collected during Spring Quarter, 1994. During class sessions, the students were provided with an introduction and instructions, as well as informed that participation was voluntary. Each participating student was given the Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Rest, 1990), the Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI) (Winston & Miller, 1987), and a brief demographic sheet to fill out and return within one week. All instruments were collected within two weeks.

Instruments

Defining Issues Test. The Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Rest, 1990) was developed from Kohlberg's theory and the stage descriptions are essentially the same as Kohlberg's. It differs from Kohlberg's interviews and other measures of Kohlberg's theory in that it can be scored objectively and places an individual on a developmental continuum, rather than at a specific stage. The DIT is designed for use with individuals aged fourteen and older.

The full DIT consists of six hypothetical dilemmas, but this study utilized the short form which consists of three dilemmas. For both versions, respondents are asked to make a decision about the dilemmas, rate the importance of 12 questions related to the decision, and to rank the four most important questions. For example, one of the dilemmas asks the respondents to decide whether a man should steal a drug to save his wife who has cancer. The respondents select from three choices: "should steal it", "can't decide", and "should not steal it". They are then asked to rate 12 questions on a 5-point scale of "no importance" to "great importance". The questions correspond to Kohlberg's stages and ask about the importance of upholding the law, whether it's natural for a loving husband to steal, whether stealing in this case is good for the society, etc. Respondents then rank the four questions they consider to be the most important.

The DIT generates two main scores: Principled moral reasoning score (P score) and a composite stage score, Davison's moral index (D score). The P score is generated by summing the

weighted scores of stage 5 and 6 items and converting the raw score to a percentage. The D score, a weighted average all stage scores, is higher for respondents who give high rankings to high stage items, and lower for respondents who give high rankings to lower stage items.

In addition to the two main indexes, DIT results include six stage scores (Stage 2, Stage 3, Stage 4, Stage 5A (societal perspective), Stage 5B (personal perspective), and Stage 6), and an internal reliability check (M Score). The stage scores provide an estimation of the extent a particular stage is utilized. The M Score measures a respondent's tendency to select lofty sounding but meaningless items and is used to eliminate invalid tests from the sample.

Numerous researchers have utilized the DIT and established and supported its reliability and validity. Rest (1990) reported that hundreds of studies, utilizing tens of thousands of subjects, have used the DIT.

Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory. The SDTLI is a revision of the Student Developmental Task Inventory, second edition (Winston, Miller, & Prince, 1979). It is based on Chickering's (1978) model, but also contains modifications (Winston & Miller, 1987).

The three main Tasks on the SDTLI are Establishing and Clarifying Purpose (PUR), Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationships (MIR), and Developing Academic Autonomy (AA). PUR measures the extent to which students have clearly defined educational goals, are self-directed, and have identified plans for their future which are consistent with their values and vocational and educational objectives. MIR measures student's achievement of peer relationships that are based on independence, frankness, and trust and their appreciation of differences among peers. AA assesses whether students perform well academically, are self-directed and working toward their potential. Two of the three tasks, PUR and MIR, are further defined by Subtasks. PUR includes Educational Involvement (EI), Career Planning (CAR), Lifestyle Planning (PLAN), Life Management (LM), and Cultural Participation (CUP). MIR consists of Tolerance (TOL), Peer

Relationships (PR), and Emotional Autonomy (EA). According to Winston and Miller (1987) the Tasks are more reliable than the Subtasks.

There are also three scales, including the Salubrious Lifestyle Scale (SL), Intimacy Scale (INT), and Response Bias Scale (RB) (Winston & Miller, 1987). The SL scale measures the extent to which individuals engage in a healthy lifestyle and the INT is an optional scales to be used only for individuals in relationships with a significant other. The RB scale is designed as an indicator of how honestly the participants respond and is used to eliminate invalid tests. The SL and INT scales were not used in this study because they do not directly measure the developmental tasks defined by Chickering.

Students respond to the items on the SDTLI by identifying true or false as it pertains to them. The score for each task is the sum of the responses which correspond with the key for the instrument (Winston & Miller, 1987).

The reliability and validity of the SDTLI are well established, but the scores on the Tasks are more reliable than the scores on the Subtasks and the tasks vary somewhat from Chickering's theory. For example, autonomy is measured by the Task of Academic Autonomy and Emotional Autonomy is a Subtask of Mature Interpersonal Relationships (Winston & Miller, 1987).

Data Analysis

This study was designed to answer the following questions: 1) Are there significant differences on Principled Moral Reasoning and Davison's moral index by class rank and gender? and 2) Are there significant differences on the Tasks of the SDTLI by class rank and gender? The data were analyzed using multivariate and univariate analyses of variance with a significance level set at .05.

Results

The means and standard deviations for the P and D scores of the DIT by class and gender are shown in Table One.

Insert Table One about Here

On the P Score, all the women outscored all the men. Graduating women had the highest mean score ($M = 41.17$), followed by first-year women (34.32), first-year men ($M = 33.81$), and graduating men ($M = 32.51$). On the D Score, graduating students outscored first-year students and women outscored men in their class. Graduating women were highest ($M = 22.98$), followed by graduating men ($M = 21.4$), first-year women ($M = 21.21$), and first-year men ($M = 19.99$).

The results of the multivariate analysis of variance of P & D scores by class rank and gender are shown in Table Two. The multivariate analysis of variance revealed significant effects by gender ($F=3.99$, $1,229df$, $p=.02$) and class rank ($F=5.38$, $1,299df$, $p=.038$).

Insert Table Two about Here

The univariate analyses of variance by gender and class rank are shown in Table 3.

Insert Table Three about Here

An examination of Table 3 shows that gender contributed significantly to the variation of both P Scores ($F = 4.34$, $1df$, $p = .038$) and D Scores ($F = 7.82$, $1df$, $p = .006$); women scored significantly higher than men on both. Class rank did not significantly contribute to the variation of the P score ($F = 1.60$, $1df$, $p = .208$), but did contribute to the variation of the D score ($F = 10.03$, $1df$, $p = .002$).

The means and standard deviations on the Tasks of the SDTLI by class rank and gender are shown in Table 4.

Insert Table Four about Here

On all the Tasks, graduating students scored higher than first-year students. Within classes, women scored higher than men. On AA, graduating women scored highest ($M=6.64$), followed by graduating men ($M=5.02$), first-year women ($M=4.79$) and first-year men ($M=3.93$). Graduating women also scored the highest ($M=46.24$) on Establishing and Clarifying Purpose, followed by graduating men ($M=38.53$), first-year women ($M=32.40$), and first-year men ($M=26.66$). The same pattern existed on Mature Interpersonal Relationships; graduating women scored highest ($M=20.14$), followed by graduating men ($M=19.28$), first-year women ($M=18.60$), and first year men ($M=18.42$).

The results of the multivariate analysis of variance are shown in table 5. The multivariate analysis revealed no significant interaction effects; however there were main effects for gender ($F=9.83$, $1,240df$, $p=.00$) and class rank ($F=32.32$, $1,240df$, $p=.000$).

Insert Table Five about Here

The results of the univariate analyses on the Tasks of the SDTLI by gender and class rank are shown in Table 6.

Insert Table Six about Here

An examination of Table 4 shows there were significant gender differences on AA ($F=13.14$, $1df$, $p=.000$) and PUR ($F=26.73$, $1df$, $p=.000$). Women scored significantly higher than men on both Academic Autonomy and Purpose. The results for MIR were not significant.

The analysis of variance with class rank as the independent variable showed a similar pattern. There were significant differences by class rank on AA ($F=18.53$, $1df$, $p=.00$) and PUR ($F=97.54$, $1df$, $p=.00$), but no significant differences on MIR. Seniors scored significantly higher than first-year students on Academic Autonomy and Purpose, but not on Mature Interpersonal Relationships.

Discussion

Limitations

As with any study, this one contained certain limitations which need to be considered when interpreting the results. Although the sample size was sufficiently large, the representation by first-year men was considerably less than first-year women or graduating students. The sample was not randomly produced and relied on voluntary participation by the students. It is possible developmental level was related to whether an individual chose to volunteer. Furthermore, the students were all from one selective admissions institution and relatively homogeneous in terms of socioeconomic background, cultural heritage, and age.

Another limitation is related to the instruments used in the study. Although the DIT is one of the most commonly used and valid instruments for measuring Kohlberg's theory, it is an objective measure rather than an interview and is dependent upon accurate reporting by the respondents. By definition, objective measures ask respondents to select from predetermined responses rather than requiring them to generate their own responses, so less information is obtained about the underlying thought processes of the individuals. According to Rest (1990), respondents are more advanced on the DIT than Kohlberg's interview because they only have to recognize a response rather than produce one. Although the SDTLI is one of the most commonly used instruments for measuring Chickering's vectors, it deviates from the theory in some respects and also relies on accurate self-report by the students.

This study used only the justice-orientation defined by Kohlberg to measure students' moral maturity. No attempt was made to measure other aspects of the moral domain such as care-based reasoning, the relationship between moral reasoning and moral behavior, or antecedents to moral development.

Discussion

The results of this study are interesting in light of the debate about whether there are gender differences in identity and moral development. Previous dialogue has focused on whether Chickering's (1978) and Kohlberg's (1984) theories are biased against women and much of the research has been done to determine whether women are deficient when measured against male models. In this study, it was the men who scored lower than the women in moral development, academic autonomy, and purpose. Furthermore, there were no gender differences on mature interpersonal relationships, despite all the literature on the importance of relationships to women's development of identity.

One of the primary findings of this study was that men scored significantly lower than women on both principled moral reasoning (P score) and composite scores (D score) on the Defining Issues Test. This is particularly interesting since numerous studies have shown no gender differences and Gilligan (1979) asserted that Kohlberg's measures favor men. It is consistent, however, with the few studies where women have scored higher than men in justice reasoning (Rest, 1986). The lower stage scores for men can be understood if moral orientation is considered. Research on moral orientation has shown women use a care-orientation more than men, but they also use a justice-orientation to the same extent as men (Liddell et al, 1993; Wark & Krebs, 1996). Furthermore, contrary to Gilligan's assertion that Kohlberg's measures are biased in favor of men, it has been shown that individuals with a justice-orientation scored lower on Kohlberg's measures than those with a care-orientation and that both orientations are used at the highest levels of moral reasoning (Walker et al, 1987). Therefore, women may have an advantage

over men at the principled levels of moral reasoning and men may be at a disadvantage if they are socialized to be independent and use the justice-orientation exclusively.

Another major finding was that men scored significantly lower than women on academic autonomy, which was surprising given that research suggests women are less autonomous than men (Hatch, 1970; Taub, 1997), that academic autonomy is not descriptive of women's development (Taub & McEwen, 1991), and women's learning style is less autonomous than men's (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger & Tarule, 1986). It is important to note that the SDTLI defines Academic Autonomy differently from how Chickering defines the vector of Developing Autonomy. Academic Autonomy includes performing well academically, being self-directed, and working toward one's potential. Based on these results, it appears that men aren't as motivated and involved in the learning process as women.

The fact that men's scores on Establishing and Clarifying Purpose were significantly lower than women's raises interesting questions. If developing purpose involves vocational, avocational, life-style, and relationship decisions, as Chickering (1978) suggested, it is possible that women score higher because of the complexity of decisions they have to make. As noted by Archer (1989) and Pearson and Rodgers (1998), women work on all these issues at once, while men focus on one dimension at a time. If that is the case, men could achieve a sense of purpose in one area of their lives, such as career, and still measure lower than women on total sense of purpose. On the SDTLI, purpose is defined as the degree to which students educational and vocational goals and are self-directed. Since most of the men in the sample were graduating students, their lower scores on this Task should be of concern. It would appear they are graduating without well-defined plans for the future or the personal qualities to develop and implement goals in their lives.

The question of why men scored lower than women on moral reasoning and identity issues is difficult to answer. Perhaps, as many people argue, women and minorities have to work twice

Gender Debate 17

as hard to succeed and men can expect things to work out for them. But, it is also possible that they aren't receiving the support they need in the college environment (Lucas, 1997). They are encouraged to be independent and self-reliant, so they may not get or seek help when they need it. Some research has shown that they less likely to develop male friendships and intimacy (Chickering & Reisser, 1993), which could cause them to think about moral issues from an impersonal rather than an interpersonal point of view

Recommendations

Recommendations for Practice

There has been a lot of attention in recent years on the experiences of girls and women in the educational environment, but very little attention has been paid to how well the boys and men are succeeding or how well the environment supports their growth and development. Based on the results of this study, it appears that faculty, staff, and student affairs practitioners need to pay some attention to the experiences of the men on their campuses.

Kohlberg (1984) maintained that the development of high levels of moral reasoning is enhanced in an educational setting that is democratic and where students have opportunities to engage in discussions about moral issues. In today's society, there are many political and social issues which could be discussed in various forums to encourage students to think about moral issues. The literature suggests that men may be more interested in discussions of a philosophical or impersonal nature (Walker et al, 1987), but that care-based responses are elicited by discussions of interpersonal dilemmas. At a personal level, men could participate in discussions about alcohol use, acquaintance rape, safe sex practices, and other topics which are relevant to their lives. They could also be included in decision making on campus, such as helping to set policies for building

community in the residence halls, judicial affairs, and greek life. Since the ability to understand a societal point of view is critical to the development of the highest levels of moral reasoning, service learning, volunteerism, and interaction with individuals from different backgrounds should be encouraged.

Men need support and encouragement to form a sense of identity (Lucas, 1997), so developing a community of peers and faculty which is supportive is critical to their development. Programs which promote the development of academic skills, interaction with faculty, and assistance in defining career and life-style goals are appropriate for both men and women, but men may need more encouragement to participate in those types of activities. Furthermore, they may need more assistance than women in developing friendships in their living environments, their classes, and co-curricular activities.

Recommendations for Research

The following recommendations are made for further research:

1. This study should be replicated using other institutions to determine whether this data is generalizable. Since the study occurred at a selective admission public research institution, it would be helpful to replicate it at private schools, 2-year schools, and other types of 4-year institutions.
2. Since this study used traditional-aged college students, further research should be done on the development of older adults. This would be particularly helpful to those who work with non-traditional students on college campuses.
3. Research needs to be done to further clarify the process by which students develop identity and moral reasoning. Qualitative studies would be helpful in that regard.
4. More research should be conducted on the types of programs which are effective in promoting both identity and moral development on college campuses, especially for men.

References

- Archer, S. L. (1989). Gender differences in identity development: Issues of process, domain and timing. Journal of Adolescence, 12, 117-138.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R. & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing. New York: Basic Books.
- Carpendale, J., I. & Krebs, D. L. (1995). Variations in level of moral judgment as a function of type of dilemma and moral choice. Journal of Personality, 63, 289-313.
- Chickering, A. W. (1978). Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). Education and identity (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Enns, C. Z. (1991). The "new" relationship models of women's identity: A review and critique for counselors. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69, 209-217.
- Evans, N. J. (1996). Theories of student development. In S. R. Komives & D. B. Woodard (Eds.). Student services: A handbook for the profession (pp. 164-187). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Garmen, L. C., Bassinger, K. S., Gregg, V. R., & Gibbs, J. C. (1996). Gender differences in stage and expression of moral judgment. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 42, 418-437.
- Gibbs, J. C., Arnold, K. D., & Burkhart, J. E. (1984). Sex differences in the expression of moral judgment. Child Development, 55, 1040-1043.
- Gilligan, C. (1979). Woman's place in man's lifecycle. Harvard Educational Review, 49, 431-446.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Greeley, a. T., & Tinsley, H. E. (1988). Autonomy and intimacy development in college students: Sex differences and predictors. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 512-520.

Hatch, D. (1970). Differential impact of college on males and females. In Women on Campus: 1970 a Symposium. (pp. 12-21). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Center for Continuing Education for Women.

Jaddack, R. A., Hyde, J. S., Moore, C. F., & Keller, M. L. (1995). Moral reasoning about sexually transmitted diseases. Child Development, 66, 167-177.

Jordan-Cox, C. (1987). Psychosocial development of students in traditionally black institutions. Journal of College Student Development, 28, 504-512.

Josselson, R. (1987). Finding herself: Pathways to identity development in women. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Josselson, R. (1992). The space between us: Exploring the dimensions of human relationships. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kilgannon, S. M. & Erwin, T. D. (1992). A longitudinal study about the identity and moral development of greek students. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 253-259.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). Essays on moral development: Vol. 2. The psychology of moral development. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kuk, L. (1990). Perspectives on gender differences. In L. V. Moore (Ed.). Evolving theoretical perspectives on students. (pp. 3-24). New Directions for Students Services, No. 51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levinson, D. J., & Levinson, J. D. (1996). The seasons of a woman's life. New York: Ballantine Books.

Lidell, D., L., Halpin, G., & Halpin, W. G. (1993). The measure of moral orientation: Measuring the ethics of care and justice. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 325-330.

Loxley, J., & Whiteley, J. (1986). Character development in college students, Vol. 2. Schenectady, NY: Character Research Press.

Lucas, M. (1997). Identity development, career development, and psychological separation from parents: Similarities and differences between men and women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44, 123-132.

Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.). Handbook of adolescent psychology (pp. 159-187). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Marcia, J. E. (1993). the status of the statuses: Research review. In J. E. Marcia, A. J. Waterman, D. AR. Matteson, S. L. Archer, & J. L. Orlofsky (Eds.). Ego identity (pp. 22-41). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Mather, P. G., & Winston, R. B. (1998). Autonomy development of traditional-aged students: Themes and processes. Journal of College Student Development, 39, 33-50.

Moore & Keller. (1995).

Moore, L. V., & Upcraft, M. L. (1990). Theory in student affairs: Evolving perspectives. In L. V. Moore (Ed.). Evolving theoretical perspectives on students (pp. 3-24). New Directions for Students Services, No. 51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pearson, F. C., & Rodgers, R. F. (1998). Cognitive and identity development: Gender effects. Initiatives, 58, 17-34.

Piaget, J. (1948). The moral judgement of the child. New York: Free Press.

Polkosnik, M. C., & Winston, R. B. (1989). Relationships between students' intellectual and psychosocial development: An exploratory investigation. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 10-19.

Pratt, M. W., Golding, G., & Hunter, W. J. (1984). Does morality have a gender? Sex, sex role, and moral judgment relationships across the adult lifespan. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 30, 321-340.

Pratt, M. W., Golding, G., Hunter, W., & Sampson, R. (1988). Sex differences in adult moral orientations. Journal of Personality, *56*, 373-391.

Rest, J. (1979). Development in judging moral issues. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rest, J. (1986). Moral development: Advances in theory and research. New York: Praeger.

Rest, J. (1990). Manual for the defining issues test. 3rd. Edition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rest, J., & Thoma, S. J. (1985). Relation of moral judgement development to formal education. Developmental Psychology, *21*, 709-714.

Rogers, R. F. (1980). Theories underlying student development. In D. Creamer (Ed.). Student Development in Higher Education: Theories, Practices, and Future Directions. (pp. 10-96) Cincinnati, OH: American College Personnel Association.

Smith, A. (1978). Lawrence Kohlberg's cognitive stage theory of the development of moral judgment. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C. Parker (Eds.). Applying New Developmental Findings. New Directions for Student Services, No. 4 (pp. 53-68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stiller, N. J. & Forrest, L. (1990). An extension of Gilligan and Lyons's investigation of morality: Gender differences in college students. Journal of College Student Development, *31*, 54-63.

Straub, C. A. (1987). Women's development of autonomy and Chickering's theory. Journal of College Student Personnel, *28*, 198-205.

Straub, C. A., & Rodgers, R. F. (1986). An exploration of Chickering's theory and women's development. Journal of College Student Development, *27*, 216-224.

Taub, D. J. (1995). The relationship of selected factors to tradition-age undergraduate women's development of autonomy. Journal of College Student Development, *36*, 141-151.

Taub, D. J. (1997). Autonomy and parental attachment in traditional-age undergraduate women. Journal of College Student Development, 38, 645-654.

Taub, D. J., & McEwen, M. K. (1991). Patterns of development of autonomy and mature interpersonal relationships in Black and White undergraduate women. Journal of College Student Development, 32, 502-508.

Thieke, W. S. (1996). developmental change in freshman students: Validating Chickering's theory of student development. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American College Personnel Association. Baltimore, MD.

Thoma, S. J. (1984). Estimating gender differences in comprehension and preference of moral issues. Unpublished manuscript. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Walker, L. J. (1984). Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: A critical review. Child Development, 55, 677-691.

Walker, L. J. (1989). A longitudinal study of moral reasoning. Child Development, 60, 157-166.

Walker, L. J. (1997). Is morality gendered in early parent-child relationships? A commentary on the Lollis, Ross, and Leroux study. Merril-Palmer Quarterly, 43, 148-159.

Walker, L. J., deVries, B., & Trevethon, S. D. (1987). Moral stages and moral orientations in real-life and hypothetical dilemmas. Child Development, 58, 842-858.

Wark, G. R., & Krebs, D. L. (1996). Gender and dilemma differences in real-life moral judgment. Developmental Psychology, 32, 220-230.

Winston, R. B. (1990). The student developmental task and lifestyle inventory: An approach to measuring students' psychosocial development. Journal of College Student Development, 31, 108-120.

Winston, R. B., & Miller, T. K. (1987). Student development task and lifestyle inventory. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates.

Winston, R. B., Miller, T. K., & Prince, J. (1979). Assessing student development: A preliminary manual for the student development task inventory (revised, second edition) and the student developmental profile and planning record. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates.

Winston, R. B., & Polkosnik, M. C. (1986). Student developmental task inventory (2nd edition): Summary of selected findings. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 548-559.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of P and D by Class and Gender

Variable	Class Rank	Female		Male	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
P score	First year	34.32	15.58	33.81	15.96
	Graduating	41.17	17.55	32.51	14.69
D score	First year	21.21	3.54	19.98	3.59
	Graduating	22.98	4.01	21.40	3.42

Table 2. Multivariate Analysis of P and D Scores by Class Rank and Gender

Source	Wilks' Lambda	DF	F	p
Gender	.966	1,229	3.99	.020*
Class Rank	.955	1,229	5.38	.005*
Gender X Class Rank	.981	1,229	2.22	.111

* $p < .05$

Table 3. Univariate Analyses of P and D Scores by Class Rank and Gender

Variable	Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Gender						
P Score	Between Groups	1104.81	1	1104.81	4.34	.038*
	Within Groups	58291.93	229	254.55		
D Score	Between Groups	103.79	1	103.79	7.81	.0006*
	Within Groups	3039.95	229	13.27		
Class Rank						
P Score	Between Groups	406.47	1	406.47	1.160	.208
	Within Groups	58291.93	229	254.55		
D Score	Between Groups	133.14	1	133.14	10.02	.022*
	Within Groups	3039.95	229	13.27		

* $p < .05$

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of AA, MIR, and PUR by Class and Gender

Variable	Class Rank	Female		Male	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
AA	First year	4.79	2.59	3.93	2.47
	Graduating	6.64	3.63	5.02	2.45
MIR	First year	32.40	9.21	26.66	9.29
	Graduating	46.24	9.35	38.53	11.23
PUR	First year	18.60	4.78	18.42	4.69
	Graduating	20.14	5.57	19.28	4.87

Table 2. Multivariate Analysis of AA, MIR, and PUR Scores by Class Rank and Gender

Source	Wilks' Lambda	DF	F	p
Gender	.890	1,240	9.83	.000*
Class Rank	.711	1,240	22.32	.000*
Gender X Class Rank	.9994	1,240	.459	.711

* $p < .05$

Table 3. Univariate Analyses of AA, MIR, and PUR Scores by Gender and Class Rank

Variable	Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Gender						
AA	Between Groups	85.48	1	85.48	13.14	.000*
	Within Groups	1560.90	240	6.50		
PUR	Between Groups	2519.68	1	2519.68	26.73	.000*
	Within Groups	3039.95	240	13.27		
MIR	Between Groups	15.18	1	15.18	.61	.435
	Within Groups	5955.64	240	24.82		
Class Rank						
AA	Between Groups	120.54	1	120.54	18.53	.000*
	Within Groups	1560.90	240	6.50		
PUR	Between Groups	9194.79	1	9194.79	97.54	.000*
	Within Groups	22625.18	240	94.27		
MIR	Between Groups	80.27	1	80.27	3.23	.073
	Within Groups	5955.64	240	24.82		

* $p < .05$



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>The Gender Debate about Identity and Moral Development Continues: What About the Men?</i>	
Author(s): <i>Frances C. Pearson, Brian J. Bullas</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frances C. Pearson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 1

Level 2A

Level 2B

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: <i>Frances C. Pearson</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Frances C. Pearson Associate Professor</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>Northwestern State Univ. Natchitoches, LA 71497</i>	Telephone: <i>(318) 357-6915</i>	FAX:
	E-Mail Address: <i>pearson@nsula.edu</i>	Date: <i>6/23/01</i>

NASPA 2001

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: ERIC Counseling and Student Services University of North Carolina at Greensboro 201 Ferguson Building, PO Box 26171 Greensboro, NC 27402-6171
--

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200

Toll Free: 800-799-3742

FAX: 301-552-4700

e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>