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Moral maturity is understood as the progressive development of more morally adequate forms of moral judgment. Thus one would expect higher levels of moral reasoning from the highly educated. In this study, this assumption is proved to the contrary.

When moral judgments of undergraduates and post graduate students of the University of Zululand were compared in relation to their socio-political beliefs, results proved that education does not play a significant role when it comes to such issues. The level of education did not correlate with all political beliefs as one would expect.

The results of this study showed that a relatively high level of moral reasoning is related to more progressive political ideas, not to a high level of education. Theories of moral reasoning and those in contrary have supported research findings.
Chapter 1

1. Introduction

Moral reasoning seems to bring about differences in views of people who are at different levels of education. In this study the researcher intends to find out how much of the differences can be attributed to socio-political issues or if there will be any differences in the views of the University of Zululand students. Attributable to the discrepancies are the different levels of education (undergraduate and postgraduate), socio-economic background (contributing to the quality of primary and secondary education), race, culture and ethnicity.

A question that arises is in what way is the level of moral reasoning connected to political beliefs and, in particular, how does it relate to the structures of political beliefs? Do individuals with a higher level of moral reasoning have more progressive ideas then subjects who have attained only a moderate or a low level of moral reasoning? If so, do they also hold more progressive economic views, more progressive cultural views or both? (Gallatin, 1980: 344).

1.1 Background to the Problem.

The relation between moral development and political beliefs has become a major research topic since Lawrence Kohlberg’s (1981) pioneering work in this field. Kohlberg (1981) describes moral development through six stages ordered into three levels of moral orientations that reflect the individual’s
growing competence in taking a socio-moral perspective. Studies of the individual’s political beliefs similarly focus on the individual’s conceptual understanding of social, political and economic institutions. Most of these studies describe the development of political thinking as a movement from a personal, individualistic, and authoritarian point of view towards an ability to deal with general principles (Gallatin, 1980: 382).

Over the past decade, social scientists have turned to the question of why there should be this relationship between moral reasoning and political beliefs. In general, their explanations fall into two classes. In the first, which is strictly based on Kohlberg’s (1981) theory, it is claimed that progressive political ideas require a higher level of socio-moral understanding than conservative ideas (Rest, 1994: 26). In the second class of explanation, differences between cognitive and socio-moral development are discounted. Instead, it is argued that the correlation between moral reasoning and political beliefs is the result of related issues. In this view the reasoning and political domain are considered as overlapping domains in terms of moral judgment.

Universities represent a major socializing influence for younger people. All students need to be equipped with the knowledge, attitudes and skills to contribute to and participate in society. Problems related to socio-political issues and moral reasoning are widespread in South African society. Young people should be taught to care for and about other people as well as to make a personal investment in social and civic action, in order to create a more humane and just society.
Students must develop effective citizenship for our present day multicultural society and world. The expectations and requirements for effective citizenship in the 22nd century require an ability to think and use reasoning skills at high levels than one would expect. It is also crucial to compare, contrast, weigh evidence and make reflective decisions when presented with diverse and conflicting perspectives, as well as to think critically about data and information. This should be done in order to avoid contradictions in views on perspectives in a multicultural society.

Pines & Hilliard (1990:599) state that the complexities and contradictions will challenge students in future if they are not morally developed.

1.2 Theoretical assumptions

1.2.1 Moral development

Lawrence Kohlberg (1981) proposes that there are three levels of moral development: preconventional, conventional, and postconventional. Each level consists of two stages. The final stage involves an ideal and rarely achieved form of moral reasoning (Smith, 1998: 368).

1.2.2 Preconventional morality

The first stage on this level of moral reasoning is called ‘punishment orientation’. An individual’s reasoning at this stage complies with rules in order to avoid punishment. The second stage is ‘reward orientation’. The reasoning on this stage is to comply and share in order to get rewards (Smith, 1998:368).
1.2.3 Conventional morality

'Good child orientation' is the third stage of moral reasoning. Reasoning at this stage is characterized by conforming to obtain approval, thus avoiding disapproval. The fourth stage is ‘authority orientation’. This is the ‘Law and Order’ mentality stage. Mental reasoning is to conform to avoid censure.

1.2.4 Post conventional morality

The fifth stage is ‘social contract orientation’. Reasoning at this stage is more flexible and logical. For example, a person understands that rules are necessary for social order. The sixth and the last stage is ‘ethical principle orientation’. The behaviour of the individual reasoning at this stage is based on selected, internalized ethical principles (Smith, 1998: 368).

1.3 Hypothesis

The researcher predicts that there will be a significant difference between the undergraduate and postgraduate students of the University of Zululand, in their views of political beliefs, and that this difference is as a result of the influence of education which in turn impacts on moral reasoning.
1.4 Aims/Objectives of the study

- To explore the university students' attitudes toward political beliefs.
- To determine the impact of education on moral reasoning with reference to socio-political beliefs.

1.5 Sample

The ideal (target) population will include forty undergraduate and forty postgraduate registered students at the University of Zululand in 2006.

1.6 Instrumentation

A structured questionnaire will be used to collect data from the participants. This will help the researcher to make valid conclusions, as the responses are direct responses from the participants.

1.7 Value of the study

Research into moral reasoning will contribute to the insight into political development of individuals, thus influencing students to think as responsible citizens when dealing with socio-political issues on campus.
2.1 An overview of Kohlberg's Theory

Blasi (1993) argues that Kohlberg's (1981) moral reasoning does not emerge spontaneously as a result of environmental evoked hard wired modules or platonic forms, nor is the capacity for moral reasoning the result of the gradual building up of habits, but rather the construction and reconstruction of forms of understanding that emerge through processes of equilibration as outlined within Piaget's (1932) genetic epistemology (Blasi, 1993: pp.99-122).

Blasi (1993) further argues that the brilliance of Kohlberg's (1981) theory is that it offers simultaneous resolution to nearly every conundrum faced by moral psychology. He claims that Kohlberg's structuralism theory accounts for the contextual variation in people's morality through the application of moral reasoning. Moral maturity is understood as the progressive development of more morally adequate forms of moral judgment. The invariance of personal virtue is replaced by the contextual invariance of
cognitive structure, and the telos of eudaimonia or human flourishing is replaced by the telos of equilibration (Blasi, 1993: pp.99-122).

According to Blasi (1993), Kohlberg was not opposing the notion of the development of personal goals and projects as a part of self-actualization. It was that Kohlberg did not see how one could define that aspect of personal development in anyone. However, for most individuals such aspects of personal growth were not in and of themselves aspects of morality.

Blasi (1993) furthermore argues that Kohlberg agreed with the notion that there is but one moral virtue, and that is the virtue of justice. The researcher’s reading of Kohlberg’s early work came to an understanding that he viewed the progression towards stage six as culminating in structures of thought that produces decisions that are morally binding upon people. Thus, he ends up in alignment with a view that to know the good is to do the good.
2.2 The Importance of Moral Reasoning

When we are faced with moral questions in daily life, just as when we are faced with child rearing, agricultural, and business questions, sometimes we act impulsively or instinctively and sometimes we pause to reason about what we ought to do (Gallatin, 1980: 345).

Reasoning, so understood, is an extrinsically normative concept. An important implication of this is that any empirical data that shows that we constantly think in a given odd way about morality can be taken in one of two contrasting lights. It can be taken to show that, since "this is what we do" this is how our moral reasoning is (Pines & Hilliard, 1990:600). Alternatively, it can be taken to show that, in the relevant range of cases, we fail to think responsibly, and hence fail to engage in proper moral reasoning.

One advantage to defining "reasoning" capaciously is that it helps one recognize that the processes whereby we come to be concretely aware of moral issues are integral to moral reasoning more narrowly understood. Recognizing moral issues when they arise requires a highly trained set of capacities and a broad range of emotional attunements.
2.3 Piaget’s influence on Moral Reasoning

Moral development, Piaget theorized, took the form of a progression from heteronomous (subject to external rules) to autonomous (internal) moral reasoning. **Heteronomous moral reasoning** is the reasoning initially adopted by children and is characterized by strictly adherence to rules and duties and obedience to authority. The heteronomous orientation is characterized by the child’s respect for the unquestionable authority of adults and parents (Hook, Watts & Cockcroft, 2002:296).

Rules are regarded as fixed and absolute, deriving from some supreme commandment (adults, parents, or even a deity). One cannot break or amend these commandments, regardless of whether they are inconvenient, or even unfair. This is the reasoning of children younger than the age of ten years (it is also the reasoning of some adolescents: the rules are rules) (Hook, et al. 2002:296). They further argue that reasoning results from three factors. The first factor is due to a problem of ‘realism’ (which is characterized by the difficulty the child experiences in distinguishing rules from real objective phenomena). The second factor is due to the egocentric nature of the young child’s cognitive structure in that he or she cannot take a different
perspective. The third factor results from power relationships between adults and children in that children are subject to adult authority.

The **autonomous moral reasoning** orientation develops out of interaction with other children and is characterized by an ability to consider rules critically. These rules selectively apply to goals of mutual respect and cooperation. For example, if the rules of one's game of marbles are inconvenient or unfair they can be altered with the agreement of the participants (Hook, et al. 2002:297).

### 2.4 The Relationship between Moral Reasoning and Political Beliefs

In a study conducted by Colby & Kohlberg (1987:98) they questioned whether there is a relationship between the level of moral reasoning and political beliefs, especially with reference to the economic and the cultural dimensions. The correlation of level of moral reasoning with political beliefs was questioned with specific reference to both dimensions of political beliefs.

The level of moral reasoning does not correlate with all political beliefs (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987:98). Factor analyses and analyses of varience
showed that there was a correlation between moral reasoning and political beliefs in the cultural domain only; in the economic domain, however, there was no such relation. Colby & Kohlberg (1987), stated that this restriction to the cultural domain was a novel result. On the other hand, it was not a surprising one, because the moral dilemmas in the Defining Issues Test, developed by James Rest (1979), as well as the moral dilemmas in studies using other measures of moral reasoning – mainly refer to cultural issues (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987:92).

With regard to the cultural domain, the results of the study using the Defining Issues Test (which was based on Kohlberg’s theory of moral development) accorded with the results of other studies in one respect. They showed that individuals with a high level of moral reasoning express more progressive ideas than subjects with a mediate or low level of moral reasoning. However, in contrast to other studies, Middendorp (1991:145) demonstrated that on the cultural dimension, the low moral reasoners expressed the most conservative cultural ideas and not the mediate (or conventional) reasoners.
Emler (1987:145), explored the relationship between moral reasoning and political beliefs from a developmental point of view in three different ways: by comparing the results of the respondents who participated in the 1991 survey as well as the 1994 survey. She analyzed the structuring of political beliefs within groups of different age, level of education, and by relating the indices of moral reasoning to the specific structures of political beliefs within these groups. Although respondents in general differentiated between an economic and a cultural dimension of political beliefs, two exceptions were to be noted; one for the young and one for the highly educated.

Colby & Kohlberg (1987:102), argue that at first the political beliefs of adolescents between fifteen and nineteen years of age appeared to be less coherently integrated in the cultural domain. Nevertheless, the indices of moral reasoning correlated significantly with both dimensions of the cultural domain. Secondly, the older and more highly educated respondents showed a far more integrated set of political beliefs.

Increasing age during the period of adolescence and a higher educational level coincided with a more integrated system of political and moral beliefs (Middendorp, 1991:150).
The previous explanation of the relation between higher levels of moral reasoning and progressive political beliefs must be considered when evaluating the results. First, the study using the DIT confirms Emler's claim that moral reasoning and political beliefs cover the same domain with respect to their mental representation in individuals (Emler, 1987:57). Adolescents organize their political ideas into two separate dimensions, an economic and a cultural dimension. The level of moral reasoning is related to the latter only, suggesting a content resemblance of the moral and the political cultural domain. She further argued that the more highly educated young adults apply their moral principles to cultural as well as economic ideas.

Rest (1986:82) claims that within the group of highly educated young adults, a relatively high level of moral reasoning is again related to more progressive political ideas. He further argues that, whether this relation should be attributed to content generalization, more specifically the generalization of progressive or conservative points of view to the economic domain, or to structural integration or not, the cognitive integration of economic beliefs into one structure of political beliefs, remains unclear.
However, a simple one-to-one relationship between high levels of socio­
moral functioning and progressive political beliefs would seem highly
unlikely. It is important to stress the need for alternative measures of moral
reasoning, such as measures that include moral dilemmas in the economic
domain, dealing with dilemmas of freedom, equality, justice, and
responsibility with respect to economic issues.

Middendorp (1991:156) states that if research into moral reasoning is to
contribute to the insight into the political development of individuals,
measures of moral reasoning should contain the economic issues that are of
major importance to the political socialization of the citizens of the 21\textsuperscript{st}
century, such as the responsibility for the poor, the relation between the first
and the third world, and environmental population in relation to economic
growth.

Cognitive development is considered as a necessary factor for the
development of moral reasoning, Hook, et al. (2002) recognises this to be
insufficient by itself. They further argue that research supports the argument
that cognitive abilities alone do not translate into moral reasoning capacities.
Proficiency into cognitive tasks, for instance, does not translate into

2.5 The Relationship between Moral Reasoning and Action

One should be clear from the outset that Kohlberg was far less concerned with moral action. He was concerned with an individual’s deliberations of what he or she ought to do in the circumstances and, more particularly, to his or her reasons for that course of action. Kohlberg’s (1981) theory is but one possible perspective (of how individuals consider what they ought to do) of one possible component (of what is required of individuals ultimately to do what they ought) (Hook, et al. 2002: 307).

Kohlberg’s theory has attracted criticism for having no direct correlate with moral behavior. He did not propose that such a correlation would exist. His assumption in this respect is not that moral judgment will match or be matched by behavior (Hook, et al. 2002: 308).
According to Hook, et al.(2002:308), the prediction from stages or principles to action requires that we take account of intermediary judgments that an individual makes. They further argue that one does not act directly on principles, one acts on specific content judgments engendered by those principles. Researchers have hypothesized that moral principles or 'structures of moral reasoning' lead to two more specific judgments, one a judgment of deontic choice, the other a judgment of responsibility. The first is a deontic decision function, judgment of what is right. The second is a follow-through function, a judgment of responsibility to act on what one has judged to be right.

Kohlberg (1981:126) claims that stages of moral development have to do with moral thinking, not with moral action. As one might assume, people who can talk at a high moral level may not behave accordingly. Consequently, the researcher would not expect perfect correlations between moral judgment and moral action. Still, the assumptions are that there should be some relationship.

As a general hypothesis, Kohlberg (1981) proposes that moral behavior is more consistent, predictable, and responsible at higher stages because the
stages themselves increasingly employ more stable and general standards. For example, stage three bases decisions on others' feelings, which can vary, whereas, stage four refers to set rules and laws. Thus, we can expect that moral behaviour, too, will become more consistent as people move up the sequence (Kohlberg, 1981:126-7).

Hook, et al.(2002), argue that some research has focused on the relationships between particular stages and specific kinds of behavior. For example, one might expect that juvenile delinquents or criminals would typically reason at stages 1 or 2, viewing morality as something imposed from without (stage 1) or as a matter of self-interest (stage 2), rather than identifying with society's conventional expectations: stage 3 and 4 (Hook, et al. 2002:300)

According to Kohlberg (1981:130), several studies have examined the relationship between post-conventional thinking and students' protest. In a landmark study, Haan (1968) examined the moral reasoning of those who participated in the Berkeley Free Speech Movement in 1964. Haan found that their thinking was more strongly post-conventional than that of a matched sample of non-participants, but this finding was replicated for some other protests, apparently because moral principles were not at stake.
2.6 Implications for Education

Kohlberg would like to see people advance to the highest possible stage of moral thought. The best possible society would contain individuals who not only understand the need for social order (stage 4) but can ascertain visions of universal principles such as justice and liberty (stage 6) (Smith, 1998:368).

How, then, can one promote moral development? Kohlberg (1981) found that when children listened to adults’ moral judgments, the resulting change was slight. This is what Kohlberg might have expected, for he believed that if children are to reorganize their thinking, they must be more active (Smith, 1998: 369).

2.7 Inconsistencies, Contradictions, and Heterogeneity.

Colby & Damon (1992:403), acknowledged early that there were certain minor contradictions with Kohlberg’s theory regarding the binding nature of stage six. Kohlberg explains his contradiction as evidence of that people knowing what is morally right may not have the will to act on that knowledge, if they are under great social pressure. They further argue that it
is particularly the case when a person takes a moral stand at variance with generally held social conventions. Kohlberg dealt with this type of contradiction by evoking the construct of "ego-strength," a psychological notion quite divergent from his structuralism.

The problem of social pressure came up again in the results of Milgram studies on authority and social conformity. Blasi (1993:125), found that a portion of subjects judged to be stage six moral reasoners, were nonetheless, willing to go along with social authority and continued to shock the supposed "learner" in the study to the point where the shocks caused great pain and discomfort and posed physical danger to the person supposedly receiving the shocks.

The above study is cited as evidence that moral development might be associated with moral behavior because proportionately more post-conventional reasoners resisted the authority than did the subjects with lower stages of moral judgment.

However, the fact that any post-conventional reasoners went along with the authority would seem to be a problem for the theory. Moreover, the fact that
a considerable number of people at lower developmental stages resisted the authority, suggested that personal features other than moral stage may have been involved in moral judgment.

2.8 Socio-Political Issues

Hook, et al (2001:305), claim that Kohlberg’s theory of moral reasoning is concerned with ‘justice reasoning.’ An individual’s development is traced against her or his progress in considering moral dilemmas from the perspective of what an impartial social contract would demand, based on universal rights and equality.

Gilligan (1982) argues that Kohlberg (1981) ignores the feminine orientation of the ‘morality of care’, a morality of responsibility and caring based on non-violence. She proposes that this alternative ‘morality of care’ predominates in women, whereas justice reasoning predominates in men, and that Kohlberg’s (1981) theory is, therefore, biased in terms of gender in that the thinking of women is often classified with that of children (Gilligan, 1982:70).
According to Gilligan (1982), in respect of whether men and women are differently oriented in terms of moral reasoning, there seems to be little or no evidence to suggest that different genders do actually subscribe to one orientation more than another, as orientations have not been found to be gender specific. She further argues that men and women seem equal to utilize both orientations.

Hook et al (2002:306) claim that the weight of evidence appears not to support the claim that Kohlberg’s (1981) scheme is biased against women. It points to the discrepancy between men and women in terms of moral behavior that men are responsible for the majority of violence and antisocial conduct and that prison populations are overwhelmingly male.
Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Research Population/ The Sample

A sample was drawn from registered students of the University of Zululand in 2006. Forty (40) of these students were undergraduate students and the other forty (40) were post-graduate students. All students (post-graduates and undergraduates) were from various departments of the above mentioned academic institution.

3.2 Instrument

Participants filled in a self administered questionnaire using a Likert Type scale for responses. Some of the items in the questionnaire were adopted from the Defining Issues Test (DIT) developed by James Rest (1979) to assess the respondents’ level of moral reasoning in 1991. The DIT was originally based on Kohlberg’s theory of moral development. It contained dilemmas, originally from Kohlberg’s interview, but it was administered as a multiple choice questionnaire.
3.3 Construction of the questionnaire

The drawing up of the questionnaire is an activity that should not take place in isolation. The researcher should seek advice from specialists at all times during the construction of the questionnaire. Questions to be included in the questionnaire should be tested to eliminate errors. A question may appear correct to the researcher when written down but can be interpreted differently when presented to another person. There should be no hesitation in changing the questions several times before the final formulation but at the same time keeping the original purpose in mind. The important factor to be taken into consideration when designing a questionnaire is that it takes time and effort before being finalized (Bailey, 1987: 189).

Bailey (1987, 201) argues that the use of a questionnaire in a study of this nature has the following advantages:

- It is the most commonly-used research instrument. It is assumed that respondents will not have a problem in filling it in, provided they are fully informed about the purpose of the study;
- It is a useful tool for collecting data from a widely dispersed population as cheaply, rapidly and efficiently as possible;
• Respondents express their views more freely in questionnaires as compared to interviews, where anonymity may be doubtful;
• The questionnaire gives the respondent time to contemplate his or her responses to questions. This is important when investigating sensitive issues such as the reasons for resigning from work;
• The absence of a researcher when the questionnaire is filled in encourages honesty and prevents bias and
• Measurement is enhanced because respondents respond to the same questions.

3.4 Procedure

The proposal for this research was presented to the University of Zululand Department of Psychology research panel, after which permission to conduct research was obtained from the University’s Ethics Committee.

The researcher personally distributed pilot questionnaires to 20 research participants to make sure that the questionnaire was going to make sense to the research sample. Ten (10) of the participants were undergraduate students and the other ten (10) were post-graduate students. On analysis of data from the pilot study, it appeared that all questions were clear, with none
being ambiguous. After this phase, the researcher then distributed the questionnaires to respondents who were participants in the research.

Van Kaam (1969), as cited by Rahilly (1993) recommends six important criteria for participants in the research:

i. Participants must have a capacity to express themselves with relative ease;

ii. They must have the capacity to sense and express their inner feelings and emotions without shame and inhibition;

iii. They must have the ability to sense and to express the real experiences that accompany these feelings;

iv. The participants must have experienced the phenomenon or situation under investigation at a relatively recent date;

v. An atmosphere that the participants find sufficiently relaxing to enable them to put the necessary time and orderly thought into reporting or writing about what was happening to them, should be created and

vi. A spontaneous interest in their experiences ought to be evident.
3.5 Analysis

As the aim of the study was to describe and summarize data for a specific group of individuals (see Huysamen 1998), descriptive statistics are used to analyze the collected data. The software employed is the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 13.0).

3.6 Ethical considerations

The most important ethical consideration that was taken into account when conducting the study is the one of the informed consent. Bailey (1987: 136) states that, means giving a full explanation to respondents and ensuring that the respondents have adequate information regarding the study. They are at liberty to comprehend information and make a choice as to whether they voluntarily consent to participate or to decline participation in the study. The full explanation of the study was given to the prospective respondents and it was emphasized that participation was voluntarily.

This study did not invite participants who were minors or mentally impaired, and it was not expected that any impairment in physical or
psychological functioning would occur as a result of participating in this study.
Chapter 4

Presentation of Findings and Discussion

4.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the presentation of data collected from research participants. Participants were approached at the University of Zululand. Questionnaires were distributed and respondents were asked to fill them in and return them immediately. A total number of 80 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents and all of them were answered and returned to the researcher. Each question presented in the questionnaire was evaluated independently. The data is presented in the form of tables.

1. Differences between high and low levels of income should be smaller than they are now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seventy percent (70%) of post-graduate students agreed that differences between high and low levels of income should be smaller than they are now. Thirty percent (30%) of them disagreed. Thirty five percent (35%) of undergraduate students agreed to the above statement about differences on the levels of income. Sixty five percent (65%) of the undergraduate students disagreed.

2. There should be more equality in society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG 34</td>
<td>PG 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG 38</td>
<td>UD 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty five percent (85%) of post-graduate students said “yes” on the statement about equality in society”. Fifteen percent (15%) disagreed. Ninety five percent (95%) of undergraduate students also agreed to this statement. Five percent (5%) of them disagreed.
3. It is acceptable for a homosexual to live with a steady partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty five percent (35%) of post graduate students said “yes”, it is acceptable for a homosexual to live with a steady partner. Sixty five (65%) disagreed. Fifty percent (50%) of undergraduate students also agreed to this statement whilst the other fifty percent (50%) of them disagreed.

4. Everybody should be free to demonstrate or be against something.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eighty five percent (85%) of post-graduate students felt that everybody should be free to demonstrate or be against something. Fifteen percent (15%) of them disagreed. One hundred percent (100%) of undergraduate students agreed to the statement.

5. People should have a right to end their lives with the help of a physician, if they wish so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty percent (50%) of post graduate students agreed to the statement above whilst the other fifty percent (50%) disagreed. Twenty five percent (25%) of undergraduate students agreed to this statement. Seventy five percent (75%) of them disagreed.
6. Agitators and hooligans should be punished severely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy five percent (75%) of post-graduate students said “yes” Agitators and hooligans should be punished severely. Twenty five percent (25%) of them disagreed. On the other hand, ninety five percent (95%) of undergraduate students also agreed to this statement. Five percent (5%) of them disagreed.

7. Ethnic minorities are a threat to our culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only twenty five percent (25%) of postgraduate students agreed that ethnic minorities are a threat to our culture. Seventy five percent (75%) of them
disagreed. Forty percent (40%) of undergraduate students agreed to the above statement about ethnic minorities. Sixty percent (60%) of them disagreed.

8. You should do what you know is right, even if it causes trouble for others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty percent (30%) of post graduate students agreed to the above statement. Seventy percent (70%) of them disagreed. Sixty percent (60%) of undergraduate students agreed. Forty percent (40%) of them disagreed.
9. What your conscience tells you is more important than what pays off.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty percent (80%) of post graduate students agreed to the above statement about one’s conscience. On the other hand, twenty percent (20%) of them disagreed to the same statement. Eighty five percent (85%) of undergraduate students also agreed to the above statement. Fifteen percent (15%) of them disagreed.

10. You should be obedient, even when it does not pay off.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty five percent (55%) of post graduate students agreed that one should be obedient, even when it does not pay off. Forty five percent (45%) of them
disagreed. On undergraduates, eighty percent (80%) of them agreed to the above statement about obedience, whereas the other twenty percent (20%) disagreed.

11. Discipline is more important than people's feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty percent (60%) of postgraduate students support the above statement about discipline. Whereas, forty percent (40%) of them are of the opposite idea. Seventy percent (70%) of undergraduate students also agreed that discipline is more important than people's feelings. Thirty percent (30%) of those undergraduate students disagreed.
12. You should be always willing to sacrifice your principles to help someone in need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty five percent (65%) of post graduate students said "yes" to the above statement about sacrificing one's principles. Thirty five percent (35%) of them disagreed. It was seventy five percent (75%) of undergraduates who agreed on the same statement. Twenty five percent (25%) of them were of a different view.

13. It is better to do as you are told than to think what is in it for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Forty percent (40%) of post graduate students responded by “yes” on the above statement about decision making. On the other hand, sixty percent (60%) of them disagreed. Seventy five percent (75%) of undergraduate students agree by “yes” on the very same statement. Twenty five percent (25%) of those students thought otherwise.

14. It is silly to put other people’s feelings before your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the above statement, fifty five percent (55%) of post graduate students said yes, “it is silly to put other people’s feelings before one’s own”. Forty five percent (45%) of them disagreed to the statement. On the other hand, one hundred percent (100%) of undergraduate students responded by ‘yes’ on the above statement.
15. You should stick to what you know it is right and not just follow other people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety percent (90%) of post graduate students thought one should stick to what he or she knows to be right not just to follow other people. The very same amount of undergraduate students thought so. Ten percent (10%) of both postgraduates and undergraduate students had a different view.
4.2 EXPLANATION OF SYMBOLS USED IN TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Q15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.325</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Correlational matrix of questions
Table 1 refers to a Pearson’s correlation of the 15 questions asked to all the participants. Results revealed significant correlation at the five percent alpha level between (Q1) and (Q5), (Q2) and (Q12), (Q3) and (Q7), (Q5) and (Q9), (Q5) and (Q11), (Q10) and (Q15), (Q12) and (Q14), (Q12) and (Q15), as well as at the one percent alpha level between Inc(Q1) and (Q2), (Q2) and (Q10), (Q5) and (Q6), (Q6) and (Q13), (Q10) and (Q13).

4.3 Discussion of correlational of matrix (Table 1)

The correlation is one of the most common and most useful statistics. A correlation is a single number that describes the degree of relationship between two variables. A symbol ‘r’ is used to present a correlation. Positive (+) r denotes a positive correlation i.e. variables increase together or decrease together. Negative (-) r denotes a negative correlation. For example, as one variable increases, the other one decreases.

There was a high correlation at one percent alpha level (0.01) between question one and question two. Question one focused on the differences between high and low levels of income, whether they should be smaller then...
they are now. Question two talks about equality in society (there should be more equality in society). Critically thinking, if differences between the levels of income could be smaller, it stands to reason that there would be more equality in society. Income is definitely one of the factors that contributes to inequality in society.

A high correlation (at one percent alpha level) was noted between question two and question ten. Question two focused on equality in society and question ten focused on obedience. This high correlation between these two questions indicates the degree of the relationship between these two questions. If there was more equality in society, would people be obedient or if people were obedient would there be more equality in society. Any of these approaches is definitely true. Since this is a positive (+) correlation, the meaning behind is that variables increase or decrease together. Therefore, if there was an increase or a decrease on the other, i.e. obedience, then the same pattern would definitely apply on the other one as well.

A high negative (-) correlation (at one percent alpha level) was noted between question five and question six. Question five focused on whether people should have a right to end their lives with the help of a physician, if they wish to do so. Question six focused on agitators and hooligans, whether they should be punished severely. As mentioned before, a negative correlation denotes that as the other variable increases, the other one decreases. This correlation possibly means that if people should have a right to end their lives, then agitators and hooligans should not be punished severely, and vice versa.
There was a high positive (+) correlation between question six and question thirteen (at one percent alpha level). Question six talks about agitators and hooligans, whether they should be punished severely. Question thirteen talks about whether it’s better to do as you are told than to think what’s in it for you. This positive (+) correlation denotes that variables increase or decrease together. For example, if agitators and hooligans should be punished severely, then it is better to do as one is told then to think what is in it for one (and vice versa).

A high negative (-) correlation was noted in question ten and question thirteen (at 0.01 alpha levels). This high correlation determines the link between these two questions. Question ten focused on obedient (you should be obedient even if it does not pay off) and question thirteen focused on whether it is better to do as you are told than to think what is in it for you. The researcher looked critically at these two questions, and found that an obedient person would do as he or she is told then to think what is in it for him or her. This simple means that if a person chooses not to be obedient, then he or she would not do as he or she is told. For example, he or she would think on what is in it for him or her.

Other correlations that were significant include those that were at five percent alpha level (0.05). The first one was between question one and question five. Question one focused on the differences between high and low levels of income, whether they should be smaller than they are now. Question five focused on ending one’s life, whether people should have a right to do so with the help of a physician. This was a negative correlation, which means that as the other variable increases, the other one decreases.
For example, if there would be an increase between high and low levels of income, then there would be a decrease on the rights of people in ending their lives (and vice versa).

The second correlations were between question two and question twelve (level of significance, 0.05). Question two focused on equality in society (there should be more equality in society) and question twelve focused on sacrificing one’s principles (you should always be willing to sacrifice your principles to help someone in need). This was a negative (-) correlation (as the other variable increases, the other one decreases). For example, if there would be an increase in equality in society, then there would be a decrease in sacrificing principles (and vice versa).

The third correlations were between question three and question five (level of significance, 0.05). Question three focused on whether it is acceptable for a homosexual to live with a steady partner or not. Question five focused on the right of ending one’s life with the help of a physician. This was a negative correlation (-) meaning that variables interact on the opposite direction (as the other one increase, the other one decrease). For example, if there was an increase in homosexuals living with their steady partners, then there would be a decrease in people ending their lives (and vice versa).

The forth correlations were between question three and question seven (level of significance, 0.05). Question three focused on homosexuals (mentioned above) and question seven focused on ethnic minorities (ethnic minorities are a threat to our culture). This was a negative (-) correlation (as the other one increases, the other one decreases). For example, if there was an
increase in homosexuals living with their steady partners, then there would be a decrease in threat to our culture (and vice versa).

The fifth correlations were between question five and question nine (level of significance, 0.05). Question five focused on the right of ending one’s life (mentioned before) and question nine focused on conscience (what your conscience tells you is more important than what pays off). This was a positive (+) correlation (variables increase or decrease together). For example, if there was an increase in the rights of ending lives, then there would be an increase in judgment from the conscience then to what pays off (and vice versa).

The sixth correlations were between question five and question eleven (level of significance, 0.05). Question five focused on the right of ending one’s life (mentioned before) and question eleven focused on discipline (discipline is more important than people’s feelings. This was a negative (-) correlation (as the other variable increases, the other one decrease). For example, if there was an increase in rights of ending lives, then there would be a decrease in discipline compare to people’s feelings (and vice versa).

The seventh correlations were between question ten and question fifteen (level of significance, 0.05). Question ten focused on obedience (you should be obedient, even when it doesn’t pay off) and question fifteen focused on sticking to what you know is right (you should stick to what you know is right, and not just follow other people). This was a positive (+) correlation (variables increase or decrease together). For example, if there was an
increase in obedience, then there would be an increase in the making of correct decisions (and vice versa).

The eighth correlations were between question twelve and question fourteen (level of significance, 0.05). Question twelve focused on sacrificing one’s principles (mentioned prior) and question fourteen focused on putting other people’s feelings before your own (it is silly to put other people’s feeling before one’s own). This was a negative (-) correlation (meaning that as the other variable increases, the other one decreases and vice versa). For example, if there was an increase in sacrificing principles, then there would be a decrease in putting one’s own feelings before other people (and vice versa).

The ninth correlations were between question twelve and question fifteen (level of significance, 0.05). Both questions were mentioned earlier. This was a negative (-) correlation (one variable increases as the other one decreases). For example, if there was an increase in sacrificing principles, then there would be a decrease in sticking to what one knows to be right (and vice versa).
Table 2 Means of responses based on gender- t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Q15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P < 0.01**, P < 0.05*

Table 2 refers to gender differences on the responses. Whilst no significant results were evident, the differences in responses to question 5 (p < .05, t = 0.050) was almost significant.

The findings of the current study were consistent with the ones for Gilligan (1982) as opposed to Kohlberg. Despite the popularity of Kohlberg’s (1981) theory, it has come under much criticism. Firstly, it has been argued that moral reasoning does not always result in moral behavior, since knowing right and wrong does not guarantee the accordance behavior. Carol Gilligan (1982) questioned the universality of the theory. She found that the application of the Kohlberg’s stages to females unfairly showed them to be functioning at lower developmental levels, and argued that moral reasoning women relate more to their relationships with specific people and willingness to make sacrifices in those relationships, whereas men view morality in broader abstract principles.

Gilligan (1982) argues that Kohlberg (1981) ignores the feminine orientation of the ‘morality of care’ a morality of responsibility and caring based on non-violence. She proposes that this alternative ‘morality of care’ predominates in women, whereas justice reasoning predominates in men, and that Kohlberg’s (1981) theory is, therefore, biased in terms of gender.
and that the thinking of women is often classified with that of children (Gilligan, 1982:70).

She further argues that in respect of whether man and women are differently oriented in terms of moral reasoning, there seems to be little or no evidence to suggest that different genders do actually subscribe to one orientation more than another, as orientations have not been found to be gender specific. She further argues that men and women seem equal to utilize both orientations.

Table 3 Group Statistics based on mean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Level of Ed</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 means of undergrad and post grad responses – *t*-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Q15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.95*</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P < 0.01**, P < 0.05*

Table 4 refers to *t*-test of the undergrad and post grad responses. Results revealed significant differences at percent alpha level on Q2 (p < .05, t = 0.043) and Q8 (p < .05, t = 0.043).

4.4 Discussions of group statistics based on mean (Table 3) and *t*-test (Table 4)

Results revealed significant differences at percent alpha level on Q2 (p < .05, t = 0.043) and Q8 (p < .05, t = 0.043).

The first question focused on the differences between high and low levels of income, whether they should be smaller than they are now. The level of significance between both postgraduates and undergraduates regarding this question was the same (was both 0.65). This equality in the level of moral
reasoning gives an implication that the level of education has no impact when it comes to income related issues. The findings of the study were consistent with those of international research conducted by Middendorp. This question was highly sophisticated as it reflected some aspects that Middendorp argued for in 1991. According to Middendorp (1981), if research into moral reasoning is to contribute to the insight into the political development of individuals, measures of moral reasoning should contain the economic issues that are of major importance to the political socialization of the citizens of the 21st century, such as the responsibility for the poor, the relation between the first and the third world, and environmental population (Middendorp, 1991:156).

The second question deals with the issue of equality in society (there should be more equality in society). The level of significance between postgraduates and undergraduates indicated that undergraduates reasoned at a higher level, that is (0.95 to 0.80) of moral reasoning, compared to postgraduates. Whether or not, there should be more equality in society, should be traced against individual’s progress in considering moral dilemmas from the perspective of what an impartial social contract would demand, based on universal rights and equality (Hook, et al. 2001: 305). This lower level of moral reasoning by postgraduates indicated that the level of education was not significant when it comes to issues related to equality in society.

The third question focused on homosexuality, whether it is acceptable for a homosexual to live with a steady partner. Undergraduates were slightly higher in their level of moral reasoning when they were compared to
postgraduates (0.50 and 0.45). This higher level of moral reasoning indicated that the level of education was not significant when it comes to sexuality related issues. Such questions need one to be well developed cognitively when attacking them. Cognitive development is considered as a necessary factor for the development of moral reasoning but is recognized as insufficient by itself. Hook, at al. (2002) argued that cognitive abilities alone do not translate into moral reasoning capacities. Proficiency into cognitive tasks, for instance, does not translate into moral reasoning. Cognitive development precedes moral development and allows for the subsequent development of moral reasoning with the person’s interaction in social environments.

The forth question focused on freedom of demonstration (everybody should be free to demonstrate for or against something. For Piaget moral development is a form of progression from heteronomous (subject to external rules) to autonomous (internal) moral reasoning. The autonomous moral reasoning orientation develops out of interaction of children with others and is characterized by an ability to consider rules critically. These rules selectively apply to goals of mutual respect and cooperation, for example, if the rules of one’s game of marbles are inconveniencing or unfair they can be altered with the agreement of the participants (Hook, et al. 2002:297). With regard to the above question, the level of significance was higher in favor of undergraduates (0.98 and 0.90) which indicated a higher level of moral reasoning. These findings could be as a result of autonomous moral reasoning hence education did not have an impact on moral reasoning. Whether everybody should be free to demonstrate for or against something should be a matter of agreement based on mutual respect and cooperation.
The fifth question dealt with the right of ending one's life (people should have the right to end their lives with the help of a physician, if they wish so). Kohlberg's (1981) theory has attracted criticism for having no direct correlation with moral behavior. He did not propose that such a correlation would exist. His assumption in this aspect is not that moral judgment will match or be matched by behavior (Hook, et al. 2002:308). This is probably the reason undergraduates were higher in their level of moral reasoning when they were compared to post graduates (0.55 and 0.48). This level of significance indicated that the level of education has no impact when it comes to issues pertaining rights on people's lives.

The sixth question focused on punishment (Agitators and hooligans should be punished severely). The level of significance was equal from both post graduates and undergraduates (0.20 and 0.20). Kohlberg (1981), on the first stage of moral development, proposes that individual's reasoning at this stage complies with rules in order to avoid punishment (Smith, 1998:368). This equality in the level of significance indicated that there is no impact that education has on moral reasoning of post grads compared to undergrads. These results also give an inclination that neither post grads nor undergrads responses were influenced by 'punishment'. These results are not in line with what Rest proposed about political ideas of highly educated young adults. Rest (1986:86) claims that within the group of highly educated young adults, a relatively high level of moral reasoning is again related to more progressive political ideas.
The seventh question focused on ethnic minorities (ethnic minorities are a threat to our culture). In terms of their moral reasoning, post graduates were higher when they were compared to undergraduates (0.83 and 0.70). These results concurred with the results of the study that was done by Rest (1991) using the DIT. With regard to cultural domain, the results of the study using the DIT (which was based on Kohlberg’s theory of moral development) showed that individuals with a high level of moral reasoning express more progressive ideas than subjects with a mediate or low level of moral reasoning. This higher level of moral reasoning by post graduates indicated the impact of education when it comes to issues pertaining to ethnicity and culture.

The eighth question focused on doing what is right even if it causes trouble for others. The level of significance was higher in favor of undergraduates when they were compared to post graduates (0.55 and 0.33). This lower level of moral reasoning by post graduates indicated that education has less impact when it comes to such issues. When we are faced with moral questions in daily life, just as when we are faced with child rearing, agricultural, and business questions, sometimes we act impulsively or instinctively and sometimes we pause to reason about what we ought to do (Gallatin, 1980). According to Gallatin (1980), post graduate students lower level of moral reasoning may reflect that they did not pause to reason, but rather they acted impulsively or instinctively. One should be clear at the outset that Kohlberg was far less concerned with moral action. He was concerned with an individual’s deliberations of what he or she ought to do in the circumstances and, more particularly, his or her reasons for that cause of action. Kohlberg’s theory is but one possible perspective (of how individuals
consider what they ought to do) of one possible component (Hook, et al. 2002:307).

Question nine focused on one’s conscience (what your conscience tells you is more important than what pays off). The level of significance between post graduates and undergrads proved that post graduates were higher in their level of moral reasoning when they were compared to undergrads (0.80 and 0.75). These findings concurred with what Rest proposed about highly educated young adults. Rest (1986) claims that within the group of highly educated young adults, a relatively high level of moral reasoning is again related to more progressive political ideas. The higher level of moral reasoning by post grads indicated the impact of education on issues that touch ones conscience.

The tenth question dealt with obedience (you should be obedient, even when it does not pay off). Being obedient when it does not pay off would cost an individual to reason at the highest level of moral reasoning. Individuals reasoning at this level (post conversional morality) according to Kohlberg, understand that rules are necessary for social order. The behavior of individuals reasoning at this level is based on selected, internalized ethical principles (Smith, 1998:368). Whether or not, the level of education has an impact on moral reasoning, post graduates level of moral reasoning was higher when it was compared to undergraduates’ level of moral reasoning (0.68 and 0.65). These findings could be as a result of the impact of education or could be based on selected, internalized ethical principles.
The eleventh question dealt with discipline and people's feelings (discipline is more important than people's feelings). The level of significance between postgrads and undergrads was suggestive of a higher level of moral reasoning in favor of the undergrads (0.70 and 0.65). In a study done by Milgram on authority and social conformity, Blasi (1993:125) found that a portion of subjects judged to be stage six moral reasoners were nonetheless willing to go along with social authority and continued to shock the supposed 'learner' in the study to the point where the shocks caused great pain and discomfort and posed physical danger to the person supposedly receiving the shocks. In this study, it is where the problem of social pressure came up. With these findings, the level of education does not seem to play an important role when it comes to discipline and people's feelings as it is evident in this situation.

On question twelve, where respondents had to give their opinion on sacrificing one's principles to help someone in need, undergraduates were lower in their level of moral reasoning compared to post graduates. According to Hook, et al. (2002) the prediction from stages or principles to action requires that we take account of intermediary judgments that an individual makes. They further argue that one does not act directly on principles, one acts on specific content judgments endangered by those principles. Researchers have hypothesized that moral principle or 'structures of moral reasoning' lead to two or more specific judgments, one a judgment of deontic choice, the other a judgment of responsibility. The first is a deontic decision function, judgment of what is right. The second is a follow-through function, a judgment of responsibility to act on what one has judged to be right. This level of significance (0.38 and 0.23), implicated that
education plays an important role when it comes to issues that pertain to principles and judgment as post graduates level of moral reasoning was higher compared to undergrads.

The thirteenth question dealt with thinking and action (It’s better to do as you are told than to think what’s in it for you). Undergraduates’ level of moral reasoning was higher than the level of moral reasoning for post graduates (0.55 and 0.50). This level of significance was suggestive of that the level of education does not play an important role when it comes to thinking and acting (as post grads level of moral reasoning was lower when it was compared to undergrads). Colby and Damon (1992) acknowledged early that there were certain minor contradictions with Kohlberg’s theory regarding the binding nature of stage six. Kohlberg (1981) explains his contradiction as evidence of that people knowing what is morally right may not have the will to act on that knowledge if they are under great social pressure. He further argues that it is particularly the case when a person takes a moral stand at variance with generally held social conversion.

Question fourteen dealt with feelings (It is silly to put other people’s feelings before your own). The level of significance between the two (post graduates and undergraduates) was suggestive of a higher level of moral reasoning in favor of undergraduates compared to post graduates (0.55 and 0.40). Kohlberg (1981) proposes that moral behavior is more consistent, predictable, and responsible at higher stages because the stages themselves increasingly employ more stable and general standards. For example, stage three bases decisions on other’s feelings, which can vary, whereas, stage four refers to set rules and laws. Reasoning at this stage (stage three) is
characterized by conforming to obtain approval, thus avoiding disapproval (Smith, 1998:368). According to research results, post graduate students seemed to have put other people’s feelings before their own in order to avoid disapproval. These results were also suggestive of that education has no impact when it comes to issues related to feelings.

The last question (question fifteen) focused on sticking to what one knows to be right, no matter what the consequences are. Post graduate students level of moral reasoning seemed to be higher than that one of undergraduates as it is evident on the level of significance (0.98 and 0.95). Sticking to what one knows to be right despite the consequences has to do with the highest level of moral reasoning (post converisonal morality). This is because reasoning at this stage is more flexible and logical. For example, a person reasoning at this stage understands that rules are necessary for social order. The behavior of individuals reasoning at this stage is based on selected, internalized ethical principles (Smith, 1998:368). Whether education had an impact on moral reasoning of post graduate students, selected, internalized ethical principles must have played a major role that contributed to a higher level of moral reasoning.
Chapter 5

Conclusion, Recommendations, and Limitations

5.1 Conclusion

The researcher surmized that there would be a significant difference between undergraduates and post graduate students in their views of political beliefs, and that this difference is as a result of the influence of education which in turn impacts in moral reasoning. Judging from the results, it is clear that education does not play an important role on how we perceive and make sense of certain things, as is the case with socio-political issues where undergraduates' perceptions were liberal in comparison with post graduates. These results did not concur with what Middendorp argued for in 1991. He argued that increasing age during the period of adolescence and a higher educational level coincides with a more integrated system of political and moral beliefs (Middendorp, 1991:150). Probably this is as a result that his argument was based on a study that was done in a western country, with western values and principles. Thus when it was put into the South African context, with South African values, attitudes, and beliefs, it totally differed.

Schooling in our society has been broadly conceived as developing citizenship. The need for citizenship training is evermore apparent. Social responsibility can be seen as an essential part of citizenship education. The families and schools are currently retreating from the responsibility if teaching students citizenship, morals, and values, leaving a vacuum in our society. Social responsibility is the foundation of a just, peaceful, and united world.
The quality of social responsibility is manifested in several ways such as, through one’s behavior, the expression of one’s attitudes, understanding and commitment to law, authority and democratic principles, demonstrated respect for others, and an awareness of what constitute effective citizenship. Post graduate students of the University of Zululand seemed to be reasoning at lower levels when most of the above mentioned issues were put upfront.

Developing social responsibility is not something that just happens. It entails the development of basic skills, critical thinking, and valuing. By working through this process, students move away from positions of negative attitudes and counterproductive forms of behavior to those which are equated with good citizenship. Pines and Hilliard (1990:599) state that a major goal of socialization should be to promote civic virtue and those qualities that enable children to become productive and dependable citizens in a just society. He further argued that students must develop effective citizenship for our present day multicultural society and world, and that of the 21st century.
5.2 Recommendations

1. Students should be encouraged to develop a spirit of service to the world and a sense of responsibility to their own growth and to the welfare of the community.

2. Young people must be taught to care about other people and to make a personal investment in social and civic action in order to create a more humane and just society and world.

3. Students must be encouraged to acquire the virtues and to weed out the weaknesses. Academic institutions should not only promote academic work, athletic, and artistic excellence, but also moral and social excellence.

5.3 Limitations of the study

1. The size of the sample was small, so generalization of the findings is not possible.

2. The study did not attempt to investigate either the religious and spiritual orientations of the participants.

3. The study did not attempt to include any consideration of political experience on the part of respondents themselves, which can be presupposed would have an effect on their responses.
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This research intends to seek for your views/attitudes toward socio-political beliefs/issues.

Biographical Data

Age ..............

Level of Education: Undergraduate/Postgraduate .................

Gender ..............

Home language .................

Please give your opinion on each of the following statements by placing a cross on "Yes" to indicate that you agree, or by placing a cross to "No" to indicate that you disagree.

Please answer as honestly as possible!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences between high and low levels of income should be smaller than they are now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be more equality in society.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is acceptable for a homosexual to live with a steady partner.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everybody should be free to demonstrate for or against something.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People should have the right to end their lives with the help of a physician, if they wish so.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agitators and hooligans should be punished severely</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minorities are a threat to our culture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You should do what you know is right, even if it causes trouble for others</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What your conscience tells you is more important than what pays off</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You should be obedient, even when it does not pay off</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline is more important than people's feelings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You should always be willing to sacrifice your principles to help someone in need.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is better to do as you are told than to think what is in it for you</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is silly to put other people's feelings before your own</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You should stick to what you know is right, and not just follow other people

| Yes | No |

Please briefly give your opinion in any of the above statements:

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Thank you for your participation!