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INTRODUCTION

1.1 Theoretical coordinates of the study

It is one of the great marvels of life that across languages, cultures, and history, it is possible, with sufficient knowledge, effort, and insight, to truly understand the meanings of other people’s emotions and mental states. Yet one must also marvel at one of the great ironies of life – namely, that the process of understanding the consciousness of others can deceptively appear to be far easier than it really is, thereby making it even more difficult to achieve a genuine understanding of “otherness”. (Shweder & Haidt, 2000, 410)

This study explores the relation of religious worldview and moral conceptions and the purpose is to compare Finnish adolescents representing Evangelical Lutheran, Conservative Laestadian and nonreligious worldviews. To place this study on the map of moral psychology, I introduce the theoretical coordinates of this study. First, this study can be characterized as multimethodological and multitheoretical. Second, it questions the traditional union between nonempirical moral philosophy and empirical moral psychology by looking for novel ways to define morality as the object of study. Third, this study explores the constituent elements of a moral judgment, belonging both to structure and content side. To start with, I discuss these points shortly.

The intuitive understanding of the use of the word “morality” in the everyday discourse is obviously variable and it is regarded as trivial to point out that what different persons think of as moral, varies a lot, depending on cultural, religious and other social circumstances. The contrast between this “lay” understanding and currently leading moral psychologists’ view is striking: Piaget (1932), Kohlberg (1984), Turiel (1983) and even Shweder (1987)
hold that morality can be characterized as universal and invariable
domain of knowledge. However, even though these theorists seem
to agree on these general points, their agreement is anything but
clear regarding what aspects exactly are universal and invariable
in morality. These two discrepancies regarding definitions of mo-
rality, the former one between laypersons and current moral psy-
chologists, and the latter between moral psychologists themselves,
has been a major source of inspiration for the present study, both
methodologically and theoretically. Two further questions can be
postulated. First, if the lay understanding holds that moral con-
cepts are apt to vary, why moral psychology contends that moral-
ity is universal – doesn’t the notion phenomenological cognitive-
developmental approach intend to grasp respondents’ own moral
perspective? And second, if it is agreed that morality consists of
some universal and invariable aspects, why different moral psy-
chologists can find more than one scientifically defensible ways to
do it?

The current trend in the presently dominant cognitive-
developmental approach of Piaget, Kohlberg and Turiel to adopt
theoretical definitions of morality from moral philosophy may be
so attractive because the nature of morality as the object of study
is abstract, variable and therefore highly elusive. This kind of un-
ion between non-empirical philosophy and empirical social psy-
chology is, in fact, quite exceptional. If one aspires to carry out
objective social science, adopting the definition from non-
empirical moral philosophy might seem a good solution. Since
morality is an abstract concept, there is a strong need to operation-
alize it in a way that is as objective as possible. One solution has
been to adopt authoritative definitions from non-empirical moral
philosophy and in this way increase the “scientific” quality of the
study.

However, if one is studying something that is assumed to show
variation and change – in the empirical social sciences this usually
is one of the fundamental assumptions – it might be erroneous to
grasp the changing nature of the object of study using static theo-
etical definitions (see Marková, 2000). When exploring persons’
own conceptions of morality, researchers should be wary of using
strict a priori definitions of morality since morality as the object
of study is a strongly abstract construction. The path risks to lead
nowhere from the start, if research methodology is constructed on
strong notions the “proper” kind of morality, especially if the purpose is to study morality from the respondents’ own point of view. It is curious that all three predominant figures in moral development studies, Kohlberg (and also Piaget before him), Turiel, and Shweder, claim to do it. It is perhaps inevitable that researchers are destined to use their own conceptions of morality to interpret respondents’ moral thinking, but researchers should be as aware of it as possible. The solution proposed in the present study is to discuss theoretical definitions of morality held by Kohlberg, Turiel and Shweder the same way as the conceptions held by respondents.

While comparing the studies of Kohlberg, Turiel and Shweder I felt that their results were somehow incompatible with each other while all of them seemed to grasp some aspect of respondents’ moral thinking. The current trend in moral development studies is that researchers are faithful to their own theoretical schools but they have rarely tried to take step towards the integration of various theoretical perspectives. Of exception to the rule is the thorough integrative analysis written by Kegan (1982) but its focus is limited to the integration of developmental theories that are grounded on the shared assumption of the separateness (or separability) of the subject and the object, and the gradual differentiation and integration of these two. All theorists of my study do not share this underlying assumption. Kohlberg and Turiel hold it but Shweder, instead, contends that subject and object cannot be separated (see the discussion in Shweder et al., 1987). It seems, therefore, that the truly integrative studies on studying persons’ moral conceptions, in general, have been missing or are too rare in the current research: instead a significant amount of new theoretical approaches explaining the development and origins of morality have emerged during the last 30 years.

I designed this research project in a way that it enabled me to integrate various theoretical perspectives having genuinely different standpoints and theoretical claims, and analyse the same research subjects at the same time in a multimethodological and multitheoretical way. I did not want to base this study on a strict predefined idea of morality, either. Since the typical empirical study in psychology has so far strived toward a singular truth, I was attracted by the idea of cultural constructionists that multiple theories, methods, and practices can explain social reality in an
equally satisfactory way, and each reflects some tradition or form of life (Gergen & Gergen, 1997).

My dissertation work studies religious and nonreligious Finnish adolescents’ conceptions of morality and rule systems. This work is the continuation of my Master’s thesis (Vainio, 1998). The theoretical aim is to compare, test and integrate the assumptions made by social psychological approaches holding seemingly opposite ideas of the development of moral judgment. The presently dominant cognitive-developmental trend, namely the theories developed by Kohlberg (1984) and Turiel (1983), concentrate on specifying the assumed universal structure of moral judgment that strives for maximal rationality and its gradual differentiation from “irrational” cultural customs and understandings. The critique of this approach by the cultural psychological camp contends that universalistic moral development theories, in fact, ignore individuality. They eliminate the social identity and culture from a person and treat social influence as an irrational restrictive force, which only slows down individuals’ moral development, or the capacity for rational thinking. Shweder’s (1987) cultural psychological approach argues that all social phenomena are rational and that an individual’s thinking is inseparable from social reality. Shweder claims that there is no such thing as culturally neutral morality and has with his colleagues (1997) identified three divergent cultural ethics that are based on different cultural conceptualizations of the person.

Another theoretical starting point of this study needs to be mentioned. For a long time the content of morality has been regarded as less important object of study than the structure. As a contrast, the present study gives equal attention both the content and “structure” of moral judgment. Several theories are devoted to the identification of universal developmental structure of moral judgment and describe its development in a stage-like manner. The reason for this, since the content of morality reflects cultural socialization and cultural assumptions, was that Kohlberg looked for universal laws of development, and since it was obvious that content is not universal, he focused on structure instead, using Piaget’s structural stages of cognitive development. Consequently, Piaget’s (1932) formulation of a heteronomous and an autonomous moral orientation (that he in fact considered as representing the structure of moral judgment) Kohlberg adopted to represent
the content of moral judgment in his theory. However, more recently other researchers have pointed out that the content of morality is an undervalued and understudied issue. Shweder, for example, contends that the content and structure are inseparable from each other and should be studied together. Moreover, White (1996), Henry (1983) and Johnston et al. (1990) argue that the content of morality should get a greater theoretical emphasis than it has recently received. The social representations theory proposed by Moscovici (1976) serves as an integrative metatheory. Also other researchers working with the Kohlbergian and Piagetian frameworks, such as Emler (e.g., 1987, 1999), Leman (1998; Leman & Duveen, 1999) and Bégue (1998), have considered the development of moral conceptions in the social representations framework. In particular, the constant patterns of developmental differences between persons holding different ideological positions or different social statuses have been used as evidence supporting the idea of the social representations framework. Moreover, Pirttilä-Backman (1993) has directed the attention to the neglected domain of the development of people’s implicit assumptions of knowledge and the way their development is grounded in social and cultural contexts.

Even though Moscovici’s theory focuses on the representations that are social, the present study suggests integrating different claims of divergent moral development theories by identifying social representations, individual representations, collective representations and their mutual relation. Even though Moscovici argues that collective, stable representations do not exist any more in a dynamically changing modern society, Farr (1998) holds the contrasting opinion that the division between individualism and collectivism, for example, rooted in relatively unchanging cultural conceptions of the person, are one of the few, but still fundamental shared collective representations that continue to exist in the Western culture(s) and that are necessary for making the maintenance of social order and rule systems rational (see also Oyserman & Markus, 1998). It is argued that Shweder’s three Ethics, grounded on the cultural conceptions of the person, focus on the collective representational aspects of morality. On the other hand, it is claimed that the individual representational aspects of moral development are captured by Kohlberg’s theory. The analysis of
morality as social representations integrates the analysis of individual and collective representational aspects of morality.

The structure of the dissertation work is as follows. Chapter II discusses the theoretical background of the study, in particular, theories of Kohlberg, Turiel and Shweder, and the apparent contrasts between them. Chapter III focuses on the problem of perceived variation in moral and nonmoral judgments and how it has been interpreted in different research traditions. Chapter IV draws together the theoretical map by introducing the meta-analytical approach of social representations to the study of moral conceptions. Chapter V sketches the Finnish rule system as compared to the European rule system. Also the idea to study moral conceptions held by persons together with the ideological conceptions and “external” rule systems of society as the units of “custom complexes”, is discussed. Moreover, the conception of a worldview is defined as well as the worldviews of the respondents are described. Chapter VI provides an overview of the studies that have interpreted the relation of religious beliefs and moral and nonmoral conceptions. The studies related to Kohlberg’s, Turiel’s and Shweder’s research traditions are discussed. Chapter VII introduces the research hypotheses, reports the methods of data collection, defines the variables and describes the empirical data. Chapter VIII presents the results divided into five sections. Chapter IX summarizes the findings of the study and discusses them both from methodological and theoretical points of view.

1.2 Static definitions of morality and the problem of change

Traditionally an empirical social scientific study starts by defining the object of the study. The present study focuses on persons’ conceptions of morality and therefore it ought to be important to make clear what I as a researcher am actually looking for. However, the traditional way to use the method of definition to characterize the object of study is problematic in many ways. As Blasi (1990) points out, a definition simultaneously unifies and separates: it brings certain objects together and separates them from other objects or events. Moreover, the problem of traditional clas-
sificatory approach is that it does not explain what holds the category (of morality, for example) together (Saariluoma, 1997).

In addition, it is a fashion in the mainstream moral psychology that is presently cognitive-developmental, to use theoretical definitions of morality informed by philosophical literature. It has also become evident that these definitions are different from the “lay” understandings of morality. The moral psychologists justify the incompatibility of the definitions with the argument that those behaviors that a “lay” understanding categorizes as moral, are in fact the result of misinterpretation because of the shortcomings characteristic of laypersons’ thinking as opposed to philosophers’ approach. If a researcher defines morality in a strict way beforehand, his/her study will leave a significant part of social judgments unrecognised as “nonmoral” – also when they according to a lay understanding are genuinely moral. Therefore, if the purpose is to grasp persons’ own understandings of morality, researchers’ strict definitions of morality will distort this pursuit and the study will actually measure the degree to which “laypersons” are able to reach the researcher’s definition. Hwang (1998) argues that it is impossible to construct a theory of human moral development without referring to moral philosophies since the content of moral reasoning is very likely to be influenced by a moral philosophy of a given culture, especially in the later stages of development. However, his argument is different from Kohlberg’s and Turiel’s who raise one of the moral philosophies, the moral philosophy of Rawls (1971), as the most universal; Hwang anyhow is conscious of the fact that moral philosophies are grounded in cultural contexts.

What is common to the cognitive-developmental research tradition and the cultural psychological approach is that they define morality as knowledge that does not change. If morality is defined in a static way, the conceptualisation of variation becomes problematic (see Marková, 2000). It means that uniformity in morality research is expected and variation is seen as a problem. Therefore I argue that it is more useful, in the context of moral psychological study, to characterize rather than define what morality is. In the context of social representations theory introduced by Moscovici (1976), Marková (2000) argues that it is better to characterize than define what social representations are since, because of their dynamic nature, they exist only in relation to something else. This
“figure-and-ground” approach applied in moral psychology means that a researcher does not have to use an exact \textit{a priori} definition of morality. This, in turn, gives a genuine space for the respondents to describe their conception of morality defined by its relation to the conceptions that are nonmoral for the respondents. It means that a researcher does not have to start the research project from the act that already classifies certain acts as moral and decides to ignore some other acts as “nonmoral”. When morality is characterized relationally, it becomes essential to consider the relation, rather than the separation, of morality and nonmorality as well as other psychosocial phenomena such as conception of self, social institutions and emotions, put together by cultural psychologists as a “custom complex” (see Whiting & Child, 1953).

Even though I prefer to characterize rather than define morality, I present shortly the definitions used by the theorists relevant for this study: Kohlberg (1969; 1984), Turiel (1983) and Shweder (1990; Shweder et al, 1987; 1998). In general, Kohlberg and Turiel have preferred to use a rather limited definition of morality. Lawrence Kohlberg adopts his moral position from the moral philosopher Rawls (1971). Therefore Kohlberg’s definition of morality is tightly associated with the concept of justice. For him, all moral issues are ultimately the issues of justice. However, what kind of behavioral choices are regarded as moral, is not important in Kohlberg’s definition: the domains of moral and nonmoral are closely interdependent so that many behaviors such as issues involving sexual propriety, are first regarded as moral, but later nonmoral (or conventional). What is moral for Kohlberg, are the principles a person uses to justify his/her moral choice, not the choice to act in a certain way.

Even though Turiel continues the same cognitive-developmental path as Kohlberg, their approaches are slightly different. Turiel (1983; 1996) maintains that all social phenomena can be divided into three distinct domains that are more independent than Kohlberg assumes. The moral domain can be differentiated from the others because of its intrinsic characteristics that the other domains do not have: moral behaviors, according to Turiel, have intrinsic, easily observed features that lead an observer likely to make moral judgments. For example, killing or hitting someone causes an easily observable suffering to the victim. Other moral principles for Turiel are human rights, justice and fairness. More-
over, moral principles are over society in a sense that their quality does not depend on societal approval, authorities or norms. On the other hand, social conventions do not have these inherent characteristics but their meaning, in contrast, is associated with the understanding of social relations and social system. Social conventions include shaking hands, dressing codes or eating habits. They bring uniformity in the social group and their meaning is learned in the socialization process. Their inobservance does not produce suffering to anybody; it only brings confusion into the social interaction. Social conventions vary from culture to culture and their rightness or wrongness is dependent on shared understandings and explicit rules. The third domain is the so-called personal domain and it includes behaviors that are not moral in a sense that they share intrinsic features. Moreover, they are regarded to be outside societal regulation; it is also understood that they bear consequences only to the actor.

The understanding of what is personal or social conventional, for Turiel, depends on cultural understandings and can therefore vary. On the contrast, because of its intrinsic nature, the moral domain does not vary culturally or socially. Moreover, even though Kohlberg and Turiel differentiate between the structure and content in moral judgment, it seems that Turiel, in reality, considers that there is some link between the act (content) and the way (structure) it is judged. I am going to discuss this issue more in detail later in this study.

Shweder (1990; Shweder et al., 1987; 1998) has adopted a broad conception of morality. He, as a contrast to Turiel, argues that all social phenomena are moral and that social convention is a second-order morality or morality of less importance. He has compared the moral judgments of Hindu Indians and nonreligious U.S. citizens and come up with the conclusion that there are three distinct ways to construct morality. He calls them cultural Ethics; all of them are constructed around the core principle that is regarded as the ultimate moral principle. Kohlberg admits that only one ethic that is “noncultural”, the Ethic of Justice. On the other hand, Shweder has discovered that Kohlberg’s Ethic is, in fact, also cultural and reflects Western liberal morality, the Ethic of Autonomy. On the other hand, there are alternative forms of the moral understanding, namely the Ethic of Community and the Ethic of Divinity. However, European and North American moral
psychologists have ignored them. The former focuses on the harmony of the community and the maintenance of the societal order. The Ethic of Divinity considers a person (and sometimes also other living and nonliving beings) as a divine entity and seeks to maintain and nourish this divine quality. Shweder argues that only Western nonreligious persons recognize the domain of social convention in a Turielian sense. Therefore, Shweder argues that morality is not a separate and independent domain with its inherent characteristics: the characteristics and meanings that are associated with “moral” behaviors are cultural constructions.
II
MORAL DEVELOPMENT: TOWARDS INCREASED REFLEXIVITY OR NON-AWARENESS?

The present study discusses three research traditions that explain morality, moral development and, in particular, the perceived variation in moral conceptions and beliefs in different ways. First I briefly introduce Kohlberg who explains the differences as developmental. Then I turn to Turiel who claims that the differences take place because the “objective” social reality is divided into different domains. Finally I present Shweder and his argument that the differences in moral judgments result from cultural differences.

2.1 Change as development of rational thinking: Kohlberg’s cognitive-developmental theory

Kohlberg’s (1969; 1984) theory of moral development has dominated the research carried out in the field during the last two decades. It is still the center of moral research and it still determines the direction and areas of interest of current moral studies. One consequence of its dominant status has been the fact that the studies have restricted their interest only in Kohlberg’s relatively narrow conception of morality and his metaethical assumptions.
Kohlberg’s approach is cognitive-developmental which means that it shares certain fundamental suppositions and research methods with some other theories dealing with social and cognitive development such as the theories of Piaget (1932) and Turiel (1979). The cognitive-developmental approach assumes that the structure and content of cognitive activities are conceptually separate. These theories are particularly concerned with the structure of thinking and have proposed that it develops universally in a stage-like manner whereas the content reflects the personal representations of culture.

Even if Kohlberg’s interest is to study empirically persons’ own conceptions of morality, he has chosen a strong non-empirical ground for his theory: the moral philosophy of Rawls (1971). According to Rawls and Kohlberg, justice is the highest principle of every society, which means that all moral issues are ultimately issues of justice. Moral judgments are prescriptive or normative arguments that require role taking.

The claim of the universal morality is a central idea in Kohlberg’s theory: during the course of moral development, universal moral conceptions gradually differentiate from subjective and culture specific customs. Kohlberg’s theory is also influenced by the evolutionary ideology: he is convinced that sociomoral development resembles the process of biological evolution. Therefore one can identify more or less functional systems of moral thinking; as well as individuals, societies can also be arranged on the continuum of moral evolution. As a contrast to cultural evolutionists and in accord with biological evolutionists, Kohlberg holds that moral evolution does not reverse. Kohlberg assumes that the inherent, universal principle of functionality determines the direction of moral development. In other words, Kohlberg’s theory stands in opposition to moral and ethical relativism that brings evidence from the variability of cultural customs. (Kohlberg 1984, 277, 293.)

Kohlberg’s definition of morality implies the existence of the idea of natural moral law. One way to approach this idea is to imagine that there are certain principles that social practices and personal desires have to adapt to in order to be valid. These ultimate principles are natural at least in two senses: first, it is assumed that commitment to these principles leads to certain fundamental ends such as freedom, equality and safety. Second, it is
thought that moral principles are objective and hence external: just like the form of an object remains the same irrespective of the presence of an observer, moral values of acts remain irrespective of people’s acceptance. (Shweder, Mahapatra & Miller, 1987.)

2.1.1 Piaget’s and Kohlberg’s stages of moral development

Kohlberg’s theory of moral development is based on Piaget’s (1932) theory. According to Piaget, morality can take two developmentally different forms, one based on constraint and the other based on cooperation. Piaget associated social relations based on morality that is confused with convention, and social relations based on cooperation with morality that is independent of convention. He assumed that morality (i.e., what ought to be done) is first such that a child cannot separate it from convention (i.e., what is done) but later new forms of social relations that are based on cooperation with peers enables the emergence of a new kind of morality that makes the differentiation between morality and convention possible. Piaget named the first kind of morality as a heteronomous moral orientation and the second as an autonomous moral orientation. (Piaget, 1932/1972, 350.) For Piaget, morality is only one of the domains of cognitive functioning. In other words, the heteronomous moral orientation functions only inside the moral domain and it is characterized of a realism that Piaget named as moral realism. Piaget has defined the elements of the heteronomous moral orientation, and compared them with the elements of the autonomous moral orientation:

(1) **Obedience to authorities, adaptation to the orders of authorities.** At the heteronomous level, a one-sided respect towards others is the source of moral sense of duty and therefore children accept the orders given by adults automatically. Obedience to authority is regarded as right and disobedience as wrong. At the autonomous level, obedience does not any longer define the good and the right. Conceptions of justice can conflict with the orders of authorities.

(2) **Rules as external, unchangeable and absolute.** From the heteronomous perspective, the authority position of the adults concerns also the rules created by them: a child regards them as absolute and considers their alteration as a serious violation. A child reifies
rules, or in other words, perceives them as unalterable without considering their logical grounds. Since a heteronomous child is not able to put him-/herself into the position of the other person, (s)he does not understand that rules of other persons can diverge from his/hers. (S)he does not understand the purpose of the rules so rules must be followed exactly in the way they are made. At the autonomous level emerges the concept of justice and a new kind of understanding of the origins and aims of rules. Therefore, rules are understood to emerge from social interaction, as contingent on social approval and to vary according to circumstances.

(3) The objective conception of responsibility. Since a heteronomous child does not differentiate social and physical reality, (s)he assesses the rules based on their consequences. Piaget calls it as the objective conception of responsibility: rules have to be followed irrespective of actors’ intentions. At the autonomous level a child is able to differentiate psychological events and external events and for this reason (s)he is able to understand the motives and intentions of the actor. For this subjective conception of responsibility the moral evaluation of intention is more important than the evaluation of the result of the act.

(4) Retributive and distributive justice. The heteronomous conception of retributive justice is accommodated to the conceptions of rules and authority: punishment per se is accepted as just and indispensable irrespective of the quality of the punishment. A punishment is regarded as retribution: its purpose is to produce pain that makes an actor to understand that (s)he has done wrong and thus a punishment assures the obedient behavior in the future. Since the heteronomous level is characterized as the inability to differentiate the social and the physical, children at this level believe in immanent justice: breaking the rules can cause punishments as “natural” events such as accidents. At the autonomous level a child understands that punishment should be related to the nature of wrongdoing and its purpose is to tell about the consequences of wrongdoing. Also distributive justice is understood differently at the heteronomous and autonomous levels. For a heteronomous child, the distribution of rewards and punishments is

---

2 the relation of the act to reward and punishment
3 equality in the distribution of resources
grounded on the obedience of authorities: an adult can reward an obedient child more than a disobedient child. At the autonomous level, equality is regarded as a fairer basis for the distribution of rewards. Also when the concerns of authority and equality are in conflict, a heteronomous child chooses the authority when an autonomous child goes for equality.

Kohlberg, instead, identifies three structurally different kinds of morality: (1) preconventional morality of constraint, (2) conventional morality based on the respect of authorities, rules and convention, and (3) postconventional, principled morality of justice. Each developmental level is further divided into two sub-stages. The levels are supposed to represent three sociomoral perspectives or three different relations between self and the expectations of society. Kohlberg thinks that more developed stages are hierarchically more integrated and differentiated than less developed ones. Developmental stages follow each other in an invariant sequence: cultural or social factors may accelerate, slow down or stop the process of development but they cannot change the order. Each level is a structural whole. Stages form the sequence of differentiating and integrating structures in which higher stages supersede or get integrated with the structures of lower stages. Kohlberg and Turiel share the opinion that an individual’s social judgments can be divided into the domains of moral and nonmoral (conventional) knowledge. However, Kohlberg thinks that moral and nonmoral spheres are conceptually and developmentally interrelated whereas for Turiel the spheres are separate. (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987, 6 – 7, 22 – 31.)

Kohlberg’s model of moral development focuses on the structure of moral judgment that is independent of the content of moral issues. Piaget, too, regarded his theory of the heteronomous and the autonomous orientations as a description of the structure of moral judgments but Kohlberg’s and Piaget’s definitions of the structure of moral judgment are not identical. Kohlberg (1984, 252 – 257, 663 – 678) has formulated a model that captures the content of moral judgment and it is, in fact, based on Piaget’s idea of heteronomous and autonomous morality. Kohlberg has renamed Piaget’s heteronomous morality an A-orientation and autonomous morality a B-orientation; they are not regarded as having a developmental order. Even if Kohlberg argues that the structure of
moral judgment is independent of its content or moral choices, some kind of interrelatedness has been reported; respondents who have reached the fifth stage choose the autonomous option in a moral dilemma in more than 75% of the cases; respondents at lower stages may choose the autonomous option, too, but less often (Colby et al., 1983).

Also lots of Kohlberg’s theory-related criticism has emerged after Kohlberg presented his theory the first time. The stage-like nature of moral development has been questioned. In fact, it has been documented that the post-conventional thinking is rare: only 1 to 2% of responses are purely post-conventional and 6% of the responses are the mix of conventional and post-conventional. A typical child uses a mix of the stages 2 and 3 and an adult the mix of 3 and 4; adults stop discussing personal likes and dislikes and begin to discuss social institutions and social systems. Moreover, people are not on a single stage but use multiple stages contemporarily (about 1/3 of the responses are outside the “main stage” of the respondent). (Shweder et al., 1987; Weber, 1996.) However, the notion that the stages of moral reasoning develop in an invariant hierarchical sequence has been supported by data indicating that respondents prefer, but fail to understand, higher stage reasoning also when the possible effect of vocabulary and syntactic complexity have been taken into account (Walker et al., 1984).

2.1.2 After Kohlberg: Rest’s Neo-Kohlbergian approach

Rest et al. (2000) remind us that Kohlberg’s own ideas were in constant flux. Rest’s and his colleagues’ approach can be called Neo-Kohlbergian since it differs from the traditional Kohlbergian approach in some respects. First, it uses the term moral “schemas”, rather than stages, to emphasize the major difference between these two approaches. Moral schemas, for Rest, are general knowledge structures residing in long-term memory and he has developed the DIT (the Defining Issues Test) method as a device for activating these schemas. The DIT is a questionnaire version of Kohlberg’s MJI and there a respondent has to put moral justifications representing different developmental stages in the order of preference. The difference between “stages” and “schemas” can be
characterized as follows. First, the Neo-Kohlbergian approach differentiates between “hard” and “soft” stages. It regards moral development as shifting distributions or as changes in the frequency of usage, rather than as a staircase of stages.

Second, the Neo-Kohlbergian schemas are more specific and concrete than Kohlberg’s stages. Schemas are conceptions of institutions and role-systems in society whereas Kohlberg regards social institutions as the “content”. Third, instead of Kohlberg’s “justice operations”, Neo-Kohlbergian schemas do not directly or solely claim to assess cognitive operations.

Fourth, there is a different conception of universality. Instead of Kohlberg’s Foundational Principle approach, Neo-Kohlbergians have adopted the approach held by more recent moral philosophers, exemplified, for example, in Walzer’s (e.g., 1983) account of morality as a community enterprise, relative to situation and circumstance (akin to the development of common law, scrutinized by the members of the community and thus not relativistic in a sense that Kohlberg feared).

Fifth, there is a difference in the method to obtain the data. Neo-Kohlbergians differentiate between articulation (interviewing) tasks and tacit knowledge (multiple choice) tasks. They argue that people can report on the products of cognition but not on the mental operations they used to arrive at the product. Criticism of interview data used in the Kohlberg MJI is that it is dependent on conscious understanding. On the other hand, the recognition data are based on implicit understanding and this is captured by the DIT that consists of a questionnaire where respondents have to rate different solutions to a dilemma (representing different developmental schemas) as more or less appropriate.

The Neo-Kohlbergian approach proposes that the sequence of moral development consists of three phases: (1) the Personal Interest Schema (deriving from Kohlberg’s stages 2 and 3), (2) the Maintaining Norms Schema (deriving from Kohlberg’s stage 4) and (3) the Postconventional Schema (deriving from Kohlberg’s stages 5 and 6). The characteristic of the Maintaining Norms schema is that “law” is connected to “order” in a moral sense. Essential in the Postconventional Schema is that moral obligations are to be based on shared ideals, are fully reciprocal and are open to scrutiny. A major difference between the Maintaining Norms schema and the Postconventional schema is how each of them
attempts to establish a moral consensus: the strategy of the Maintaining Norms schema is to gain consensus by appealing to established practice and existing authority. In contrast, the strategy of the Postconventional schema is to gain consensus by appealing to ideals and logical coherence. Rest and his colleagues mention that the problem in the DIT is that by the time participants have sufficient reading ability to take the DIT (i.e., have the reading level of 12-year-olds), the first schema is no longer central in their thinking.

There is also another new line of research that has emerged from Kohlberg’s theory of moral judgment. It focuses on the study of the intermediate level constructs that people use frequently when making decisions about moral dilemmas in their lives such as “due process”, “informed consent”, or “intellectual freedom”. Bebeau and Thoma (1999) identify concepts at the intermediate level of abstraction, and discuss educational programs to instruct students in their use. Moreover, Narvaez (1999) and Narvaez et al. (1998; 1999) have merged traditional moral judgment research strategies with moral text comprehension research methods to illuminate the comprehension of moral themes in stories.

2.2 Variation as intrinsically different kinds of knowledge: Turiel’s domain theory

Turiel (1983) disproves Kohlberg’s idea that conceptual areas of moral and nonmoral have a continuous impact on each other at every stage of development. Turiel claims that social knowledge is divided into three conceptually separate domains that develop independently of each other. According to Turiel, children acquire an internalised concept of universal, prescriptive morality much earlier than Kohlberg assumes. Turiel argues that even 4-year-old children divide social phenomena into three domains:

1. psychological or personal autonomy domain that consists of conceptions of personal or psychological systems,
2. social conventional domain that consists of conceptions of systems of social relations and organizations, and
3. moral domain that refers to prescriptive principles of justice, rights and welfare.
Turiel assumes that in every society there are inherently moral, conventional and personal domains of action and social judgments are made inside these domains:

*Cognitive structures are partial in that they encompass delimited domains of knowledge; thinking is organized within the boundaries of fundamental categories (e.g., logical-mathematical thinking, moral judgment)… One basis for the proposition that concepts are organized within domains rests upon the idea that they are constructed through the individual’s interactions with the environment… It follows, therefore, that interactions with fundamentally different types of objects and events should result in the formation of distinct concepts. (Turiel, 1983, 20 – 21)*

Turiel, following Kohlberg, holds that an empirical theory that intends to study persons’ conceptions of social phenomena stands more firmly when it is built on non-empirical, philosophical cornerstones. Turiel has adopted definitions of morality and convention from philosophers. Therefore, social conventions for Turiel are shared behavioral uniformities that coordinate people’s interaction in society. All members of society possess conventional knowledge that they use to assess what to expect from other persons in various social situations. As such conventions are arbitrary, which means that other ways of behavior can serve the same purposes in a given society. As a result, social conventions vary from culture to culture and in different historical periods.

Moral principles, unlike conventions, are independent of societal contracts, according to Turiel. The moral nature of a behavior lies in its content or meaning since the moral quality of an act is grounded in the inherent features of social relations. Therefore moral principles are a part of society but above societal regulation. Justice, human rights and welfare are examples of moral principles. Moral rules are binding and obligatory and they can be universally applied to every person in the world. Moral principles are unlike conventions also in such a way that their existence is not dependent on social practices and generally held approval. (Turiel, 1983, 34 – 36.)

The third domain, personal autonomy, contains behaviors that are outside the realm of moral and conventional regulation and where personal freedom of choice is justified. The consequences
of personal behavior bear consequences only for the actor. (Nucci, 1981.) Personal issues define the limits of the area of personal autonomy: defining and maintaining the personal domain helps to construct a social border between the self and the group. Morality and personal autonomy are, however, interlinked: personal freedom is a necessary prerequisite for the development of moral conceptions and for the participation in moral action: the existence of the interpersonal domain requires the establishment of the personal domain. Even if it is understood in the domain theory that the personal domain exists universally, it is admitted that its content is bound to cultural influences. (Nucci, 1996.)

2.2.1 The development of conventional conceptions

Turiel assumes that the domains of social knowledge – morality, social convention and personal autonomy – are present in all human functioning. The early differentiation of conceptual domains is based on a child’s experience of different social interactions: the conceptual domains become visible as different reactions of actors to moral, conventional or personal behaviors. According to Turiel, there is cognitive uniformity inside the domains and variation in person’s argumentation is not, therefore, real but results from the fact that social knowledge is divided into domains.

Turiel has particularly studied the development of social conventional conceptions, which according to him, takes place as structural changes in a stage-like sequence that follows the same structural principles as Kohlberg’s stages. Developmental shifts are qualitative changes from a simpler to more complex cognitive structure and, in the same way as moral development in Kohlberg’s theory, an individual interprets social situations according to his/her prevailing cognitive-developmental stage. Development is directed towards increasing cognitive coherence, which enables the understanding of social action in the most efficient and comprehensive way. According to Turiel, the cognitive uniformity is limited to the domain of knowledge: cognitive variation is due to the variation between domains and informational assumptions associated with the nature of actors and context. (Turiel, 1983, 15 – 20, 100 – 102.)
Turiel (1978), based on one longitudinal and one cross-sectional study, has constructed a developmental model, which depicts the development of conventional conceptions from early childhood to early adulthood. Persons from 6 to 25 years of age participated in the cross-sectional study. Turiel’s model is constituted by seven, developmentally more or less functional ways to organize conventional knowledge. Since the interview consisted of people’s interpretation of one story only, it is possible that the stages might vary depending on the features of stories. The longitudinal study revealed a strong correlation ($r = 0.90$) between the developmental level and the respondent’s age.

The alternation of approval and questioning of conventions characterize the development of conventional conceptions. A shift from one way of thinking to another is manifested in the negation of the earlier way of thinking. The basis of acceptance and questioning is, however, different at each level: questioning results from the fact that an individual’s has begun to re-evaluate his/her conceptions again. In other words, the levels of approval describe an individual’s conceptions of a social system and its conventions whereas the levels of negation or questioning capture an individual’s observations of the weaknesses of the earlier pattern of thinking. Questioning the previous assumptions leads an individual to get involved in the process called disequilibrium in the cognitive-developmental approach. (Turiel, 1983, 105 – 106.)

The value of Turiel’s theory lies in the fact that it gives attention to the critical thinking that is an understudied domain in the psychological study of moral development. A critical way of thinking, for Turiel, is not only a sign of disputes between people but more likely it is manifestation of the developmental shifts in an individual’s thinking. External influence can work as a catalyst for development but, according to Turiel, conventional development is an internally regulated process and a critical approach to one’s own thoughts is an essential ingredient of development. At the stages of criticism or negation an individual’s thinking is re-structuring again so the rejection of the previous pattern of thinking gives way to the establishment of a new one. This is what happens also with the judgments associated with social conventions. (Turiel, 1983, 102 – 114; see also Turiel, 2002.)

However, there are no later studies of development inside the social conventional domain. Instead, the research has focused on
studying the grounds on which people make differentiations between the domains. The discussion of the empirical studies on differentiation of the domains is presented in the chapter that reviews the explanations for variation in moral and nonmoral judgments.

2.3 Change as development of intuitive non-thinking: Shweder’s cultural psychology

The assumption of the structural universality of morality is in tension with several findings made in social psychology outside the cognitive-developmental approach. Kohlberg’s and Turiel’s attempts to separate an individual’s judgment from its context seem particularly questionable when one views them in the light of the mainstream social psychological research according to which an individual and his/her judgments are in fact inseparable from context. Cultural psychologists claim that judgment and context should always be analysed together since one does not make sense without the other (Shweder et al., 1998). In addition, Turiel’s claim of an individual’s capacity to perceive all social conventions as social conventions is in contradiction with the widely known tendency of people to assess their own and other cultures’ social practices from an ethnocentric and prejudiced point of view. Also Tajfel’s (1978) social identity theory is in contradiction with the assumptions of Turiel. According to Tajfel, individuals are equipped with a tendency to perceive one’s own in-group in more positive light than out-groups.

It is argued that the cultural psychology is still working on its own identity, and it is easier to indicate what it opposes to than to say what it stands for positively (Belzen, 1999). Cultural psychologist Shweder and his colleagues (1987) reassess the cognitive-developmentalists’ notion of the universal, uniform developmental process of morality. They claim that cultural instructions, explanations and daily practices modify in a fundamental way the development of an individual’s thinking, emotions and morality. Shweder and his colleagues assume that even young children have an understanding of the universal concept of morality that is not preceded by the conception of morality that is embedded in social
convention. In this respect Shweder’s theory is in accordance with Turiel’s ideas. However, Shweder disagrees with Turiel by claiming that there does not exist a single universal process that would lead to the separation of moral, conventional and personal domains of social knowledge. Instead it is cultural ideology and worldview that assists in the birth of a child’s emerging concept of morality. According to Shweder a newborn is not a “tabula rasa” but on the contrary (s)he is born into the world equipped with complex schemes for interpreting social communication. These schemes will be only partly activated and modified by the culture during a life course. (Shweder & Sullivan, 1993.)

The concept of culture is essential for cultural psychology. Shweder (1998, 867) defines culture as “a ’symbolic and behavioral inheritance’ received from out of the historical / ancestral past that provides a community with a framework for other-directed and vicarious learning and for collective deliberations about what is true, beautiful, good and normal.” Thus, the cultural psychology wishes to give an equal emphasis on both symbolic and behavioral inheritance of a cultural community. The former refers to received ideas and understandings concerning personhood, society, nature and divinity of the cultural system, the latter, in turn, refers to routine or institutionalized family life and social practices.

Shweder’s and his colleagues’ moral pluralism should not be confused with moral relativism. In fact it is a “moral universalism without uniformity” (e.g., Shweder & Sullivan, 1993, 514 – 517). In practice, it means that morality has a universal core, consisting of components that are incompatible with each other (Shweder et al., 1987; Shweder, 1990). Different cultures select those components that fit their cultural conceptions of the person, society and nature. Each rational moral code consists of universal and culturally variable aspects, the former are called mandatory, and the latter discretionary features and they are presented in Appendix 1. The mandatory features are invariable universals and they make a moral code rational whereas discretionary features can be constructed in multiple, equally rational ways. Shweder (1990) assumes that some features of the culture regulate people’s moral conceptions more than others that he calls cultural propositions. The cultural emphasis of either individualism or collectivism is an example of a cultural proposition. According to Shweder, there are
three kinds of moral codes which are divergent in a sense that they value different principles as the most fundamental basis of morality: the moral codes place either individual rights, interpersonal duties or the protection of divinity as the highest moral value. Since all the cultures share the common components of the universal moral core it is possible for the members of different cultures to comprehend and understand each other’s moral principles.

2.3.1 Cultural conceptions of the self

Even if the boundaries between an individual and his/her external environment vary culturally both in their area and permeability, a conception of the individualized self is shared by most cultures (Shweder & Sullivan, 1991). According to Geertz (1984, 126), the Western and the non-Western self-conceptions are different from each other but at least some kind of conception of a human being as a contrast to non-living entities or animals, for example, can be found in all cultural systems. The cultural psychological research, which intends to define differences in human psychological functioning between various human groups, assumes that conceptual universals do exist. It is argued that there has to be particulars since they make universals possible and vice versa (Shweder et al., 1998). Differences can have significance only if there are universals that determine the conditions of differences. They function as a kind of meta-language that enables us to compare different cultural products. What makes us similar with each other and universalizes us in some sense is, in fact, a complex set of inherited psychological processes. These processes become activated, established and rationalized selectively and various ways in different cultures. (Shweder & Sullivan, 1993, 517.)

However, the level of generality where the universals can be identified is much more fundamental than Kohlberg’s and Tu-riel’s. What is regarded as universals in the cultural psychological approach is something that can be called a basic level humanity. Shweder et al. (1998) have argued that, for example, mental life exists among all humans: they think, know and use language and other symbolic systems and they feel, want and value certain things (Donagan 1987.) It is also assumed that psyche contains psychic “powers” that are universal: representational (to produce
beliefs and conceptions) and intentional (to influence the imagined future with “will” and acts associated with it, a person’s ability to influence causally the world with decision- and choice-making). It is also claimed, moreover, that human psyche has the ability to transform a reflective thinking into a routine or an automatic activity. This process is contrary to the one Piaget, Vygotsky and Kohlberg have studied. There are, admittedly, cases when the cognitive development means that a reflective thinking becomes automatic, such as the learning of the cultural customs that results in the fluent “non-thinking”.

According to Shweder and Miller (1985), the differences between the cultural moral codes are based on cultural variations in the conceptions concerning humanity and society. The moral code that emphasizes duties regards social roles to be fundamental building blocks of the social system whereas the rights-based moral code is based on the assumption that the social system is constituted of individuals with their own interests and wishes to pursue their rights and personal goals. Cultural differences between conceptions concerning personhood, in turn, lead to different explanations of causes of human behavior.

Moreover, the conception of what makes a “person” varies culturally. The idea that a person consists of internal traits or personality characteristics, may be only a Western notion – not recognized in India, for example. Miller (1982; 1984) discovered that when describing the behavior of actual persons, Indians concentrate on concrete, observable behavior and give an emphasis on role-based duties when explaining people’s behavior. In contrast, Americans’ descriptions of other people focus on their preferences as personalities and are prone to explain social behavior with general characteristics. A similar tendency was found out in the second study exploring the internalisation process of a cultural conception of the person. Youngest Americans and Indians were highly similar in their descriptions but along with the years Americans started to give more and more emphasis on the general behavioral tendencies of the persons whereas the Indians started to give more attention to contextual factors. Also in the Shweder and Bourne (1984) study which examined people’s various ways to explain human behavior, Indians regarded individuals’ actual mode of behavior more important than their internal personality characteristics: almost half of American’s descriptions were inde-
dependent of the context whereas only one fifth of Indians provided context-independent descriptions.

According to cultural psychologists Markus and Kitayama (1991), cultural conceptions regarding the relation of the self and society influence in a comprehensive way cognitions, emotions and behavioral patterns. They distinguish an independent view of the self and an interdependent view of the self. People have become sensitized to the information relevant to their conception of the self: the person having an independent view of the self focuses on the information concerning personality traits whereas the person having the interdependent view of the self concentrates on the information regarding important social relations. The major difference between the two views of the self is that how big emphasis is given to other people in the definition of the self: considerations of other people are included in an interdependent view of the self that is constructed of context-dependent relations to other people. The way of how social phenomena are culturally constructed and represented in memory influences strongly the way a person thinks about it: information by an interdependent view of the self is constructed as representations of real, concrete situations, not as hierarchical generalizations held by an independent view of the self.

According to Markus and Kitayama (1991), the culture modifies also the way emotions are expressed and experienced; therefore one can make a differentiation between ego-centered and other-focused emotions. Anger, frustration and pride are ego-centered emotions because they refer to the internal attributes of the person. On the other hand, sympathy, feelings of interpersonal connectedness and shame are other-focused emotions since they refer to other persons. The ego-centered person experiences the consequences of suppressing the ego-centered emotions negatively whereas the other-focused person accepts their suppression as a fact of life. Therefore the other-focused person experiences other-focused emotions more often than self-centered emotions. The conception of the self also influences people’s ways to explain social action. Many features in the ways to observe causal relations are generated by one’s concept of the self: if an individual is perceived as embedded in the web of social relationships, it is likely that a human behavior is interpreted in the same way on a larger scale, too. One can conclude, for example, that the person’s behavior emanates from a certain context and first one perhaps
takes into account the social situation where social action occurs. A conception of the self also gives direction to behavioral patterns: the person with an interdependent view of the self probably desires to adapt to the will of the other persons who are close to him.

Chiu et al. (1997) are in similar lines of thought with Markus and Kitayama. They, in turn, focused on to explore how the implicit theories of the permanence or malleability of the human nature and the universe are associated with the duty- and rights-based moral codes. Their findings revealed that the person, who believes in the invariability of the sociomoral reality, focuses his/her action and thinking on the maintenance of the existing order of things towards which his/her moral orientation is directed, as well. In that case the purpose of moral action is to fulfil certain duties and support the maintenance of existing practices. In contrast, a person who believes in the dynamic, malleable sociomoral reality, grounds also his/her moral beliefs on this assumption; he supports his/her judgments of the social practices by such principles as individual rights. The moral code of the person who relies on the malleability of the social reality is based on the conception that the state of affairs can be modified to support and promote individual rights.

2.3.2 The “Big Three”: The Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity

Turiel and Kohlberg contrast rationality with non-rationality, subjectivity with objectivity. In the real life, however, there are according to Shweder (1986), “subject-dependent objects and object-like subjectivity”. For many people the transmigration of souls and dreams are rational, hence objective: usually at the age of ten, children start to think of their dreams as fantasies whereas in the cultures where adults believe that dreams are part of reality, children are introduced with the theories about the transmigrating souls during the sleep (Kohlberg, 1969). According to Spiro (1982, 53 – 54, 63), the spiritual creatures are representatives of the external reality for religious persons since they are regarded to exist irrespective of one’s own psychological reality and in this respect they are like scientific conceptions. Therefore, it is impos-
sible to find the universal measure of rationality that one could utilize in making comparisons between cultural propositions. They cannot be verified nor falsified since they are not based on the process of logical reasoning or personal experience. Therefore Shweder regards cultural propositions as nonrational. The nonrational cultural propositions, in turn, function as a basis for the rational moral codes. The moral codes can be called rational because they can be derived from the cultural propositions with the method of rational argumentation. According to Shweder, it is possible to identify many divergent rational ways of explaining moral action in the world.

According to Shweder et al. (1987) there exist at least the moral codes of natural duties and natural rights. Later Shweder (1990) has added the third moral code, namely the code of divinity, into his model. Every moral code consists of mandatory and discretionary features. Without mandatory features the moral code would lose its rationality while the discretionary features can be exchanged without causing any loss in the degree of rationality in the moral code. The first moral code in Shweder’s model is called the Ethic of Autonomy which is a moral code based on harm, rights and fairness. It gives privilege to an individual who is authorized to make independent, free choices. Second, one can identify the ethic of Community, a moral code that emphasizes duty, hierarchy and interdependence. It defines the person as a member of the community, “an attendant at a court with a position or station or role” and therefore the conception of the self is defined by social roles. Third, there is the ethic of Divinity which is a moral code with has the preference structure that consists of natural or sacred order, tradition, sin or personal divinity. It perceives an individual as a spiritual whole and the purpose of morality is to protect its sacred core from action that might harm it (e.g., eating slaughtered animals). All three moral codes emphasize a certain interpretation of the relation of the person and society. According to Shweder, the second and the third Ethics share many characteristics: they both focus on the observance of duties, avoidance of sin and respect for authorities and neither of them recognize the conception of social convention. The second and third codes are, therefore, closely linked: the former concentrates on the fulfilment of profane duties whereas the latter gives primary emphasis on the
spiritual, sacred duties (such as the duty-based moral code of Karma among the Hindus).

When one compares Shweder’s moral codes with Kohlberg’s moral orientations, one might claim that the Shweder Ethic of Autonomy resembles the Kohlberg autonomous B-orientation and the Shweder code of Divinity the Kohlberg heteronomous A-orientation. Since Kohlberg’s ideal postconventional morality integrates both the perspectives of the self and society, it can be assumed that a person at the postconventional level of morality would use equally the Ethics of Autonomy and Community. However, Shweder assumes that the moral codes do not follow each other as a developmental sequence but are in this sense equal – in the longitudinal study of Kohlberg it has been documented that there is a developmental tendency towards the increasing use of the autonomous B-orientation. Curiously, Jensen (1995) found in her study where she conducted interviews on moral issues with past and present students of the University of Chicago, something that could be called opposite to Kohlberg’s assumption: there seems to be an age-related tendency to use the Ethic of Autonomy more in adolescence and shift towards the Ethics of Community and Divinity in more mature adulthood.

The moral realism which is associated with Piaget’s and Kohlberg’s heteronomous orientation is not a naive pattern of thinking which is characteristic of childhood and which one should try to get rid off, Shweder argues. Instead it is a major part of the everyday life of most adults in the world and there is no rational reason to argue that they should give it up.

Shweder’s theory assumes that a person always regards his/her moral code as a natural one and also Kohlberg’s and Turiel’s theories are based on the assumption of the naturalness of the moral law. The Hindus, as well, have a natural moral law of Karma according to which good and bad acts of a person determine his/her destiny in the process of transmigration of the souls; since it is based on duty it is different from the Western moral law that emphasizes autonomy and rights. The natural moral law consists of standards which social practices and human-made laws have to follow to be valid. The standards of validity or natural moral laws are believed to promote certain fundamental ends in life such as freedom, justice, salvation or elimination of suffering. Referring to the natural moral law is therefore a necessary requirement for
rational moral discussion. According to Shweder and Miller (1985), autonomy and community-based moral codes correspond to person-focused and role-centered social systems, respectively. They discuss the culturally conditioned salience-factor for social action. It describes how a cultural conception of the person determines how persons are described and which causal models are utilized when finding explanations for human behavior.

The Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity are not mutually exclusive but they usually appear contemporarily in persons’ arguments. However, since they promote different “goods”, they are often in conflict and their resolution results in emphasizing one of the Ethics more than others. For example in India the Ethic of Autonomy is embedded in the Ethics of Community and Divinity. It seems that different cultures are specialized in combining the three Ethics of three moral “goods” in slightly different ways. On the other hand, in the U.S. the Ethic of Autonomy is so dominant that it reaches even into the rights of animals and children. (Shweder et al., 1997.)

2.3.3 The development of moral intuitions

According to Shweder’s cultural psychological approach, communication and the internalisation of the moral code guide the direction of the development of social cognition: several studies comparing Indians and Americans document that culture-specific features are obtained as early as universal aspects. It is apparent that even the 5-year-olds have absorbed the moral code peculiar to their culture. Moreover, the direction of moral development is dependent on culture: the thinking patterns of Indian children are more suggestive of the thinking patterns of Indian adults than American children. Also Miller and Bersoff (1995) assume that early experiences of socialization contexts are important for the development of conceptions of the self and morality. This process is controlled by adaptive problems which persons face in their everyday lives. Meanings associated with the experiences are at least partly culturally constructed and therefore vary according to different cultural conceptions of the person and the cultural practices which are associated with them.
The major statement of Turiel is that the categories of social knowledge are internalised in social interaction. However, he does not take into account the possibility that social interaction patterns are not necessarily similar in all cultures. Edwards (1986; 1987) has studied how Kenyan children come to comprehend rules of their community. According to Turiel’s theory a child learns which transgressions are moral and which are conventional while (s)he observes various social interaction situations around him/her. While she was living among the Luo, Edwards noticed that for them, straightforward commands and threats of punishment function as the primary source of information about the importance and absoluteness of social rules. Moreover, Edwards found that moral and conventional rules are not necessarily internalised in qualitatively different types of social situations.

The most important elements of the moral development transmitted in social communication are cultural propositions. They are specific cultural features that regulate people’s beliefs and action such as the emphasis on individualism or collectivism. According to Spiro (1984), cultural propositions are traditional and collective in their nature. Even if culture determines the cognitive system of an individual, also personal experiences function as a source of cognitions. Personal experiences are not, however, transmitted through the enculturation process and therefore they can sometimes be in conflict with cultural propositions. Even if everybody can learn cultural propositions their significance is very different to the native and non-native members of the culture. Therefore one has to make a differentiation between the learning process of cultural propositions and the enculturation process or the internalisation of propositions as personal beliefs considered to be true (Shweder, 1984). Even for many natives the cultural propositions become clichés that have not been internalised as personal beliefs.

The process in which a cultural proposition reaches the status of a personal belief is psychological and for this reason it needs a psychological explanation. In that case one can talk about the cognitive salience of cultural propositions (Shweder & Miller, 1985) consisting of five levels. When cultural conceptions have gone through all the stages they end up being a part of the cultural moral code. Spiro (1984) describes the internalisation process of cultural propositions and it consists of the following steps. (1) First, culture or propositions are learned. (2) After that the tradi-
tional meanings of propositions are comprehended. (3) Next, the propositions are internalised after which a person judges them to be true and right. At this stage they have become personal beliefs. (4) Cultural propositions start to function as elicitors of social action. They start to organize the perception of the surroundings and guide a person’s behavior. (5) Propositions start to function as incentives to action. This is based on their emotional, cognitive and motivational salience in the mind of an individual. At this last stage propositions have been absorbed as constituents of the human motivational system. When faced with them an individual experiences a strong emotional state that motivates him to act in a certain way.

Since the cultural psychology is defined as a discipline that is interested in the way how “culture and psyche make each other up” (Shweder et al., 1998, 877) or as “the study of the way culture, community, and psyche are mutually instantiating” (ibid., 868), cultural psychologists have not agreed on their proper unit of analysis. Therefore it is suggested (ibid., 872) that an useful unit of analysis for the cultural psychology could be a “custom complex”, introduced by Whiting and Child (1953, 27) who define it as consisting “of a customary practice and of beliefs, values, sanctions, rules, motives and satisfactions associated with it.” This idea resembles the conception of “life space” put forward by Lewin (1943) or the idea of a societal “habitus”, developed by Bourdieu (1972, 1990). The idea put forward by cultural psychologists is that the development of practices or custom complexes develops from conscious to intuitive or automatic habitual practices.

Spiro (1984) points out that the representations about the socialization agents are often internalised as cultural propositions that guide a person’s behavior. Children assume their culture from people close to them and to whom they have developed strong emotional bonds. Representations of the socializers continue to persist in a person’s mind and provide a model that is used later in making the choices and interpretations of authority models. For example, if a certain image of a leader or God is consonant with a child’s representation of an adult person, it is this image or representation, if found in some political or religious ideologies, which is regarded as the most compelling and realistic.
2.3.4 Cultural construction of different kinds of knowledge

Shweder et al. (1987) view the domains of morality, convention and personal autonomy totally differently than Turiel. According to Shweder and his colleagues, moral actions do not have qualitative characteristics which would differentiate them from conventional ones: behaviors which are regarded as harmful norm violations in one culture are not necessarily perceived in a similar way in another culture. Moreover, there does not exist a universal domain of inherently nonmoral behaviors: deep universal principles do not always lead to similar judgments of what is right or wrong in a certain concrete situation. Moreover, on a worldwide scale it seems that the conception of social convention has only a minor significance when following the obligations of everyday life. The conception of social convention manifests itself only in the speech of North Americans. Shweder et al. state that morality and convention are not necessarily opposites but convention is a kind of second-order morality or morality of less importance which is characteristic of Western worldview that follows the ideology of free social contract. This ideology recognizes the thinking pattern associated with the free-market economy according to which everyone has the right to choose his/her way of life. The consensus, instead, that is the result of this individual choice to enter into society by the social contract, becomes the source of natural duties and the respect for this social contract the basis for moral commitment to the community.

The domain theory framework has criticized the cultural psychology and its conception of morality. Killen (1997) argues that dichotomous cultural templates such as independence and interdependence, as well as individualism and collectivism, do not accurately reflect the complexity of social life in Western and non-Western cultures and often result in stereotypic, rather than actual, characterizations of the social orientations of individuals and cultures. In the end, this kind of approach obscures the variation of intra-cultural diversity.

Another critique of the cultural psychology comes from the social constructionists. They claim that the cultural psychology has been reluctant to question universal metatheory. In addition, cultural psychologists tend to presume the independent existence
of a range of particulars such as culture, mind and socialization, the adequacy of empirical or interpretive methodology in assessing and reflecting the character of these particulars, and the possibility of cumulative knowledge about the socialization processes in question. Social constructionists argue that while universal psychological mechanisms are avoided, the universal metatheory is not, and in this way the cultural psychology remains a child of Western modernism. Moreover, questions of moral, political, ideological significance are largely absent from the cultural psychology. Little attention is paid to the ways in which concepts, methods and modes of representation enter into culture. (Gergen & Gergen, 1997.)
III
EXPLANATIONS FOR
THEORY-INCONGRUENT
MORAL VARIATION

By comparing various theories on social development one can notice that researchers’ definitions of morality (and what remains outside morality) vary drastically. Since they all perceive morality as a more or less universal and “static” entity, the perceived variation in moral judgments has shaken their theoretical grounds in diverse ways and produced different kinds of explanations. Next I am going to discuss the explanations for variation in moral judgments provided by three research traditions: Kohlberg who explains the differences as developmental, Turiel who claims that the differences reflect the fact that the social reality is divided into different domains, and Shweder who holds that the differences in moral judgments result from cultural differences. It can be seen that the theorists perceive the phenomenon of moral judgment in different ways: Shweder, for example, whose theory accepts some kind of variation in the definition of morality itself, tends to see the variation in more global terms whereas Turiel, who sticks to the definition of “inherent morality”, cuts the variation complex into pieces and handles them separately so that his claim for the existence of the universal global “deep structure” remains protected.

The explanations I will discuss are (1) features of the issues; (2) informational assumptions and culture; (3) “external” culture such as cultural hierarchies and authority concerns; (4) respondent’s own role in the dilemma involving also in-group – out-
3.1 Features of issues

Turiel (1983) assumes that social events themselves have certain features. Indeed, many studies confirm that in general, moral events can be separated from conventional events and events of “personal autonomy”. The distinctive characteristics separating the domains are presented in Table 1.

However, there are some events for which there is no consensus whether they are moral or conventional. Turiel has resolved this problem by proposing that it is so because these events are particular: they consist of characteristics that belong to more than one domain. Moral events with minor consequences or conventional events with serious consequences are an example of this kind of mix of characteristics. Tisak and Turiel (1988) studied how children differentiate between moral events bearing only minor consequences (e.g., a child steals an eraser from his/her friend) from strongly disapproved conventional events (e.g., a child goes to school wearing a pyjama). According to this study, consequences of the events do not differentiate moral and conventional events: conventional events with grave consequences were evaluated as negatively as prototypical moral events. Moral events and conventional events with serious consequences can be, moreover, regarded equally important. Turiel and Davidson (1986) pointed out that probably even older children and adolescents don’t make difference between morality and convention on the criteria of consequences and importance when exceptional norm violations such as sexual events or unfamiliar events are judged (Turiel et al., 1987; Turiel, 1983, 69). The domain differentiation is thus understood to be grounded on social experiences. Respondents’ age is associated to the evaluation of the importance and the domain of the event: older respondents assess the importance of the event from the domain category; younger respondents from the consequences of the event.
Table 1. *Structural criteria of morality, social convention, and personal autonomy.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morality</th>
<th>Social convention</th>
<th>Personal autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples of events</td>
<td>freedom of speech</td>
<td>school rules</td>
<td>choice of friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of behavior</td>
<td>other’s welfare, rights</td>
<td>social interaction</td>
<td>actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of meaning</td>
<td>inherent features</td>
<td>social system</td>
<td>social system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness of consequences</td>
<td>very serious</td>
<td>moderately serious</td>
<td>least serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of events</td>
<td>very important</td>
<td>moderately important</td>
<td>least important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptivity</td>
<td>prescriptive</td>
<td>not prescriptive</td>
<td>not prescriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) rules, laws, norms</td>
<td>not dependent</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>not dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) authorities</td>
<td>not dependent</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>not dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) social practice/tradition</td>
<td>not dependent</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>not dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalizability to out-group</td>
<td>generalizable</td>
<td>not generalizable</td>
<td>not generalizable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate punishment</td>
<td>most intense</td>
<td>least intense</td>
<td>no punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated emotions^4</td>
<td>guilt, shame</td>
<td>embarrassment</td>
<td>(shame more than guilt)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


^4 Turiel does not discuss emotions, the emotions studies were conducted outside the domain approach. Sources: Keltner (1995), Tangney (1992).
According to Weber's (1996) study applying the Kohlberg MJI, the seriousness of damage of the behavior and the facility to assess the damages are associated with the developmental level of moral judgment. The physical harm issues elicited judgments of highest, the economic damage issues elicited the next highest and the psychological damage issues that are difficult to perceive and interpret elicited the lowest developmental levels. Thus it seems that the moral intensity, consisting of quantity, probability, temporal distance, proximity and the concentration of damage dimensions as well as the societally held approval, influences the level of moral judgment.

Also Wark and Krebs (1997) document that the variation in moral judgment stems from the type of dilemma being judged when using the Kohlberg MJI. Moreover, their results also reveal a significant within-person inconsistency in the structures of moral judgment invoked by different types of moral dilemma. In other words, by changing the content of a moral dilemma it is possible to “change” the developmental stage of the respondent (Shweder et al., 1987; Weber, 1996). On the other hand, in a study where people were presented examples of the different levels of moral reasoning they seemed to understand the hierarchical nature of development: developmentally higher responses were regarded as better. Therefore it seems plausible to argue that the nature or content of moral dilemma only in part influences moral judgment that, however, seems to be determined by the developmental stage. However, no such study applying the Kohlberg MJI has been carried out in an international context. (Walker, 1984.)

It is possible to conclude from Weber’s (1996) study that the facility to perceive the consequences and the moral intensity of issues may have an effect on whether issues are interpreted as moral, conventional or personal: the more difficult it is to link consequences and the event, the more interpretations and assumptions vary. Helwig (1995b) provides an explanation that incidents involving psychological damage such as sexual harassment are associated with symbolic features that a potential victim has to interpret before (s)he can consider him-/herself as a victim. On the other hand, other persons can interpret the event of sexual harassment as involving only physical violence. Therefore, particularly the incidents that violate the psychological well-being of the per-
son are more dependent on culturally constructed patterns of interpretations than are incidents that cause physical damage.

Turiel (1989) argues that there are issues that are inconsistently and variably judged with the criteria of morality, social convention and personal autonomy. He calls them non-prototypical and divides them into three types. The first are “conflictu-
ally multifaceted” issues where the variation is caused by contradictory informational assumptions. Turiel et al. (1991) studied judgments of “conflictually multifaceted” issues: abortion, homosexuality and pornography. The judgments were not clearly moral or conventional; they involved references to personal autonomy, the legal authority and normative assumptions of the “correct” psychological, biological or religious order, used as a basis for making prescriptive judgments about right and wrong.

The second type of non-prototypical issues for Turiel involves “mixed events” because they require the coordination of moral and conventional conceptions. The findings obtained by Levy et al. (1995) revealed that sex roles are more rigid than “normal” conventions: according to conventional criteria they became more flexible or conventional with development (e.g., a boy can play with dolls) but the prescriptive dimension became more “moral” or rigid at the same time (e.g., a boy should not dance ballet), particularly in the context of male sex roles that were similar to moral prescriptions.

Turiel names the third type of non-prototypical events as “second-order moral” events. They are primarily conventional events but they are interpreted as moral if they are believed to harm other persons or if they are socially sanctioned. (Turiel, 1983, 114.) Drug use is an example of a second-order moral action. It is self-destructive but for Tisak and Turiel (1994), it is a “personal autonomy” issue since the consequences pertain mainly to the actor. However, drug use has moral implications since it is associated with the well-being of the user and it is legally sanctioned. Moreover, moral action, according to Turiel, is a social action whereas drug use is not (Berkowitz et al., 1995). In the Killen et al. (1991) study, the evaluations of various drugs were scattered on the continuum between morality (marihuana) and personal autonomy (alcohol). Also Stern and Peterson (1999) found out that children have problems to differentiate between moral and safety-
related prudential behaviors, the latter many children consider in moral terms.

Turiel focuses solely on negative moral and conventional issues and also his interviewing style is tightly designed to study negative moral principles or norm violations. Kahn (1992; 1995) differentiates between negative and positive moral principles. In his studies the principle of justice is more salient in negative than positive moral events. Positive moral behaviors are also regarded as less binding than negative ones. Kahn points out that it is possible that moral pluralism is more common within positive than negative moral issues.

To sum up the findings related to the features of the issues, it seems evident that a significant amount of events cannot be classified as purely moral, social conventional or personal. Even though it seems to be plausible to argue for the existence of prototypically moral and prototypically conventional acts, these indeed might be in the minority when the whole scope of human behavior is concerned. Even though the Kohlberg MJI is designed to differentiate the content and structure of moral judgment, curiously the facility to perceive the moral quality in the act to be judged influences the level of moral judgment in the Kohlberg MJI. Kohlberg argues that how you judge should not depend on what you judge, in other words, the content of the dilemma should not influence the moral judgment level.

However, the studies presented above reveal that there is something in the events themselves, or in the way they are interpreted, which does bear influence on the moral judgmental level. In other words, Turiel’s claim that events can be differentiated from each other, seems to get support, even though the significant amount of “exceptional” cases do not seem to validate the claim for the existence of the three-domain model. The tendency that a large number of human behavior includes features from more than one domain, speaks for multiple alternative explanations. First, it is possible to argue that the domains cannot be differentiated by their “inherent” characteristics. Second, even though different social events seem to elicit different kinds of moral judgments, it is possible social knowledge is not structured as domains. Third, if the domain structure does exist, the domains are more interrelated than Turiel assumes. The last alternative is actually consonant with the idea of Kohlberg (see Colby & Kohlberg, 1987, 14 – 15).
Consequently, the “exceptional cases” should not be treated only as empirical anomalies but instead they should be in the main focus of the study from now on in the domain approach. Respectively, Kohlberg’s model has the need to reconsider the possibility that the moral developmental level obtained in the MJI might, at least partially, be dependent on the type of dilemma to be judged. Many researchers who carry out research in Kohlberg’s framework, in fact, do this. Therefore, in the case of frameworks of Turiel and Kohlberg, it seems that the content of the judgment should get a greater emphasis than it has got so far and that the influence of content on the structure should be reconsidered and theorized in a more systematic way than it has been done until now. In other words, the relation of content and structure of moral judgment in the cognitive-developmental approach should be considered also at the theoretical and not only at the empirical level.

3.2 Informational assumptions – or is it culture?

Shweder claims that the variation in moral judgments is caused by fundamental structural differences in people’s thinking patterns, which they have internalized from culture and which the developmental factors cannot satisfactorily explain out. Turiel, however, refutes the idea of non-developmental structural differences in thinking. Therefore Turiel states that the process of social judgment takes place in a dynamic field where numerous factors “from the outside” influence people’s reasoning. Turiel asserts that the variation in moral and conventional judgments is due to different informational assumptions between and inside cultures. Turiel formulates culture as a provider of multiple sources of informational assumptions – such as science, tradition and religion – and he assumes that persons pick assumptions from these sources to interpret social behavior. He considers that the explanations for reality different sources of information (religion, science) provide, are often incompatible with each other and that this kind of information is often inaccurate and biased. People, in turn, have a tendency to pick uncritically various beliefs without questioning the reliability of their source. (Wainryb & Turiel, 1993; 1995.) In
other words, Turiel sees culture as a fragmented intermediate variable between social action and moral judgment rather than a coherent system where social action and moral judgment are seen as parts of a cultural whole.

Turiel et al. (1991) demonstrated the incoherence of informational assumptions in a study of the relationship between conflicting informational assumptions and moral judgments. The respondents, the U.S. college students, had to reason about abortion. It came out that most students did not have a clear conception about the beginning of life since most of them changed their statements during the interview when the interviewer questioned it.

Turiel argues that social judgments should be separated from informational assumptions and therefore variation takes place in informational assumptions so the structure of social judgments remains intact and universally invariant (see Asch, 1952; Wainryb, 1991; 1993; Wainryb & Turiel, 1993; 1995). In other words, if informational assumptions were held constant, there would be no variation within moral judgments. He argues that informational assumptions are likely influence only the reasoning of the issues that are difficult to observe or unfamiliar.

On the other hand, cultural psychologists tend to see informational assumptions as culture per se and claim that they cannot be separated from moral judgment. Actually this discrepancy seems resulting from two alternative ways to perceive morality: since the former defines morality as a more narrow phenomenon consisting only of a cognitive, “rational” judgment, it leaves “non-rational” assumptions held by that person outside its definition as opposed to the more global cultural psychological definition of morality. Moreover, Turiel does not discuss informational assumptions forming a coherent system of a worldview whereas cultural psychologists discuss the system of informational assumptions as a system of cultural propositions constructed around the cultural conception of the self. In the end, the ultimate issue is what researchers regard as belonging “inside” and what “outside” the definition of morality.

Shweder et al. (1987; see also Shweder & Much, 1987) ground their statement on a study where they explored Indian and U.S. children’s and adults’ judgments of moral rules and Indian cultural rules which prohibit a widow from remarrying, eating fish, wearing jewellery or colourful clothes. Indians said that it is morally
wrong to alter or break cultural prohibitions. Instead the U.S. children regarded the Indian cultural rule violations as conventional, or in other words, as dependent on consensus, practices and social context. These findings confirmed, according to Shweder, the theory of the three cultural Ethics: the differentiation of morality and convention takes place only in the cultures structured around an individualistic conception of the self. Only when the culture allows independent individuals to participate in the systems based on social contract allowing negotiation, an individual is able to judge certain social practices in conventional terms. In cultures that emphasize collectivism or interdependence, social roles are regarded as duties and permanent obligations that are expected to be followed and respected for the maintenance of moral order. In these cultural systems people do not interpret their social practices with conventional attributes.

In general, nonreligious North American college students use predominantly the Ethic of Autonomy (Haidt et al., 1993; Jensen, 1995) while the Ethics of Community and Divinity are used infrequently; however, in a study of Arnett and Jensen (in-press) North American young adults use the Ethics of Autonomy and Community in roughly equal proportions, the Ethic of Divinity being an infrequent Ethic, again. The researchers explain these findings resulting from socioeconomic differences since the sample of Arnett and Jensen study was drawn from the community where college students were only a minority. The general tendency is that the higher social classes use predominantly the Ethic of Autonomy, while the lower classes use predominantly the Ethic of Community (see also socioeconomic class differences in Haidt’s et al., 1993 study). This pattern, in fact, supports Turiel’s (1996) position that the members of the same society hold different moral orientations to same issues.

Jensen (1997a; 1997b) identified another source of North American moral heterogeneity, namely something that can be called “culture wars” between the representatives of the Ethics of Autonomy and Divinity. The Ethic of Divinity, according to Jensen, does not only predominate the Hindu priests’ moral life, it is also found in the heart of the Western world, the U.S., among the representatives of conservative religious denominations. Furthermore, the Ethics of Autonomy and Community were documented to correlate negatively in the North American culture (Arnett and
However, there seems to be an age-related tendency to use the Ethic of Autonomy more in adolescence and shift towards the Ethics of Community and Divinity in more mature adulthood (Jensen, 1995).

Hwang (1998) analyzed the discretionary features of Confucian ethics in terms of Shweder’s (1990) scheme for discerning a rationally defensible moral code. For example, he discovered that the core principle of the Confucian ethics is filial piety. One’s life is inheritance from one’s ancestors and the boundaries of the self are extended to include other family members. The natural law of Confucian ethics is built on the idea of natural duties and goals rather than natural rights. He asserts that Kohlberg’s construction of postconventional morality and the Confucian ethics represent two alternative ways to construct moral order with their own sets of mandatory and discretionary features. They can also be in conflict with each other.

Verhoef and Michel (1997) urge us to apply culture-based theoretical frameworks to the study of moral conceptions in the African context since African morality is merged with religion unlike in the Western countries. Moreover, the African conception of the person is related to the community as the main element of human existence. Also the conception of life is different: life in Africa, in general, orients towards the past rather than to the present. Moreover, morality is context-bound unlike in the Western countries.

Turiel (1989) (see also Wainryb & Turiel, 1995) criticize the studies of Shweder because they do not separate moral judgments from informational assumptions. When the Hindu informational assumptions of transmigration of souls and social causality are taken into account, Turiel argues that variation does not take place in moral conceptions but in informational assumptions. Shweder’s et al. results can be reinterpreted, according to Turiel et al. (1987), as (1) moral events, (2) conventional events and (3) events mediated by unearthly beliefs. All of these can be classified under the Shweder Ethic of Autonomy. Turiel et al. (1987) argue that Shweder concentrated on few genuinely conventional acts; most issues chosen were “moral events mediated by informational assumptions”. In addition, Turiel points out also that if a rule is considered as a social convention only when it is classified as alterable and context-dependent, it would mean that any practice re-
garded as unalterable but context-dependent would be classified as moral.

Turiel et al. (1987) argue that another explanation for the greater amount of moral judgments in Shweder’s study may result from the fact that the studies used different interview probes. In the Shweder et al. (1987; see also Shweder & Much, 1987) study even the North Americans used social conventional arguments more rarely and differentiated them from moral arguments later than in Turiel’s studies. Shweder measured generalizability of issues with the question: “Would another society be a better place if the activity (which violates the norm in a respondent’s own country) would be stopped there?” On the other hand, Turiel operationalised generalizability in the following way: “Is it alright to act (against the norm) in the other country if it is not forbidden there in any way?” Turiel points out that some respondents might be hesitant to interfere in the affairs of other country and don’t moralize the issues when the latter question is used.

Madden (1992), indeed, has identified the social convention in India. He studied Indian priests’ and college students’ social judgments in the same region as Shweder did. Madden discovered that the Indian conceptions of morality and convention varies with the social class: priests moralize Indian cultural norms but Indian college students consider them as social conventions. Even though Madden claims that variation in the Indian context results from informational assumptions and not culture, most Indian priests refused to imagine that opposite informational assumptions could be true in India or in other countries. As a critique to Madden one can argue that India consists of multiple cultures and that Hindu priests and college students may represent different cultures.

However, the idea that informational assumptions and evaluation of moral events are separate, has received much criticism. According to Nisan (1987; 1988), they cannot be separated: since the definition of an act as moral or conventional depends to a large extent on informational assumptions, the “inherent” characteristics cannot determine their domains. Nisan studied the judgments of norm violations among Jewish children residing in urban areas and kibbutzes and Arab countryside children. Urban Jews differentiated morality and convention most rigidly whereas rural Arab children did not make any differentiation between them. Turiel et al. (1987) criticized the methodological criteria for morality and
convention used by Nisan. Nisan stated, however, that if different criteria elicit different results, one could argue that there are more than three domains of social concepts based on multiple criteria, respectively. For Turiel et al. (1987) the short answering style of rural Arabs may be caused by their unfamiliarity with verbal expression and it could partly account for differences between the groups, but Nisan argues that Arab children displayed their verbal talent in other answers. Therefore Nisan claims that normative judgments of these children reflect their approach towards norms; also Orthodox Jews gave similar meagre responses; also their education consists of learning and understanding religious scriptures.

In general, the domain theorists argue that in different cultural groups the meaning of moral and conventional is sometimes variable. They claim that it is not because in different cultures the events can be constructed in a fundamentally different ways. Instead they argue that the meaning of moral and conventional events are fundamentally understood in a similar way in every culture but the construction of their meaning is sometimes influenced by informational assumptions, however, the informational assumptions affect only on the judgments of some events and can be considered an intermediate variable between the event and the judgment. Cultural psychologists, on the other hand, claim that informational assumptions or cultural propositions – how they call them – influence the interpretation of all human action and they are inseparable. In other words, cultural psychologists claim that the variation in the interpretation of the events is more than just fragmented and sometimes mutually incoherent informational assumptions picked from religion or science whose influence can be eliminated by “holding them constant” in an empirical study. Cultural psychologists argue that because these cultural propositions make up a coherent system called cultural Ethics, grounded on the cultural conception of the person, they manifest real cultural differences in the perception and interpretation of human action. Moreover, it seems that since the informational assumptions have so a fundamental role in the interpretation of the events, the claim of the existence of the domain differentiation grounded on the “inherent” features of the acts, can be put into question.
3.3 Social context: hierarchies and authorities

The relationship between moral judgments and social arrangements such as social hierarchies, functioning as the social context where moral judgments take place, appears to be a controversial issue for the moral psychologists. For Turiel, the variation of moral judgments does not indicate that the variation takes place because of their different conceptions of morality at the abstract level. Turiel argues that one should differentiate between the abstract conceptual domains and their application in concrete situations. Turiel states that concrete social contexts consist of unique mixes of conflicting moral and conventional considerations that influence the way events are judged. For example, at the abstract level almost everybody supports human rights such as freedom of expression but at the concrete level only a few can accept the public TV show of the Nazi party (McClosky & Brill, 1993). Helwig (1995a) has obtained similar findings: at the concrete level individual rights are often subordinated to other considerations such as the national safety concerns.

Turiel (1996) holds the idea that social arrangements, such as hierarchical social relations, act as a context where unequal social relations bear mutually conflicting values held by dominant and subordinate parties such as dominance and equality. Therefore persons in different positions apparently hold divergent moral conceptions of the same event. However, Kohlberg would say that moral judgment involves role-taking skill, or in other words, that the ideal moral judgment should not depend on what side of the moral dilemma the judger is standing on – moral judgment should be impartial.

Again, it can be seen that Turiel avoids using the global conceptions such as worldview; Turiel (1996) says that cultures involve the battle between conflicting value concerns, as is the case with the gender equality issue. The variation is interpreted to have origins in the unequal status between persons and for this reason they perceive social problems from different viewpoints (Asch, 1952; Turiel & Wainryb, 1994). Similarly, social class and cultural differences are manifested in the tendency of higher social classes to appreciate more individual rights and the tendency of lower social classes to give more emphasis on conformity and obedience. Also the study of Wainryb and Turiel (1994) in the
Druze and Jewish communities shows that the degree of hierarchy determines how the domain of personal privacy is perceived in the conflicts between the spouses. In the more hierarchical Druze community a man is entitled to have more administrative power than in the Jewish community. Men, who in general have the upper hand in the hierarchical arrangements, perceive it as a fair status of affairs whereas women don’t. Turiel (1998) claims that the general tendency in hierarchical social arrangements is such that people of higher status tend to perceive unequal social practices as more fair in terms of personal entitlements and autonomy whereas persons of lower social status perceive such practices as unfair. However, one can also argue that persons who hold such moral conceptions have not acquired the conception of “real morality” but something that can be equated with Kohlberg’s pre-conventional level morality characterized by self-interest.

It is argued, moreover, that the MJI favors Western elites: certain populations score higher than others and social class correlates strongly with the moral developmental stage. However, a study carried out in Finland (Helkama & Ikonen, 1986) reports no social class differences. This finding, however, might be explained by the fact that social class differences in Finland are among the smallest in the world (Atkinsson et al., 1995). Shweder (1986) claims that Kohlberg’s conceptual points of start are not culturally neutral but grounded on the Western liberal thinking. Kohlberg argues that certain societies are more rational than others but Shweder et al. (1987) say that it is instead because of the fact that the self-consciousness is unevenly distributed: the consciousness regarding one’s own thoughts increases with educational level as well as does the verbal ability to describe one’s own rational reasoning processes. The fact that other cultures rationalize more than others does not mean that they are more rational.

Moreover, many researchers have found moral principles, e.g., the maintenance of societal harmony, that are either very difficult or impossible to code with the Colby & Kohlberg (1987) manual. So far Kohlberg’s scheme has explained cultural differences as representing other than real cultural differences: the acquisition of the social roles, especially the administrative positions; educational level; occupational status; family structure; urbanization; the degree of ethnic diversity; and the living arrangements. (Boyes & Walker, 1988.)
There is also a famous critique of the Kohlberg MJI put forward by Carol Gilligan (1982) who argues that frequently reported gender differences, according to which males score slightly higher than females when age and education are held constant (see also similar, more recent findings of Dawson, 2002), reflect actually a gendered bias in Kohlberg’s theory favoring males. She argues that Kohlberg’s justice-based morality actually represents the male perspective to a moral socialization while ignoring the morality of women, the care-based morality.

Nucci (1997) contends that the domain of personal autonomy, grounded on the sense of bounded and distinct self, is the prerequisite for the construction of the moral domain. He argues that since personal autonomy and societal regulation are mutually exclusive, it is likely that social class and cultural variations influence the breadth of what is considered as personal. His research team (Nucci et al., 1996b) studied the effect of social class on the conceptions of Brazilians regarding personal autonomy and social regulation. Middle class children began to consider the issues of dressing and the use of terminology for the family members as personal autonomy issues earlier than lower social class children. Their explanation was that a lower social class environment sensitizes children to pay more attention to pragmatic concerns and risks of societally deviant behavior. It is probably also a product of different parenting styles associated with different social classes. (Nucci, 1996.) Indeed, there are certain parallelisms in Nucci’s and Shweder’s constructions of the selfhood regarding its cultural variation and the relations between the domains that follow from this assumption.

In fact, Turiel’s and Nucci’s view on the intra-cultural differences in moral judgment is parallel to Baumrind’s (1994) neo-Marxist perspective. She, as well, begins from the notion that culture is not a static entity but rather a dynamic process subject to change in response to internal contradictions and critical social thought. Moreover, a culture consists of multiple moral standpoints. Although the dominant morality in any society serves to justify the interests of its ruling class, it is the standpoint that represents the interests of the oppressed that is more valid because it is fairer, more comprehensive and more progressive. Feminists concerned with unequal distribution of power have expressed a similar idea. Okin (1996) argues that the Western family institu-
tion has never employed the conception of justice. There are studies reporting that the unequal division of household work, power and resources influence the development of children’s moral conceptions. These findings reveal that the families where the household work is unequally divided, children are socialized into the unfair division of work considering it fair, and perpetuate a similar pattern in adulthood even in a more extreme form than their parents.

Also Leman and Duveen’s (1999) study supports Turiel’s idea that hierarchically inferior and superior posts influence moral judgment. It was Piagetian (1932) study of the way social features of children’s social relations may either promote or constrain the communication and acceptance of moral knowledge. An authority of status was introduced into some pairs by varying the gender composition of the dyad and contrasted with the epistemic authority derived from the arguments more closely associated with moral autonomy. In dyads where the sources of authority were in conflict (an autonomous girl vs. a heteronomous boy) the length of persuasive communication was significantly longer than in other dyads. So, when a person holds a moral conception that deviates from the “norm” or the social representation held by the majority, more justifications are needed.

However, Shweder constructs the relationship between social arrangements and patterns of moral judgments in a different way. He considers that the relation of the cultural or institutional practices such as hierarchies should be studied together with beliefs and judgments associated with it. Whiting and Child (1953) introduced the conception of a custom complex to refer this kind of interpretation (see also Shweder et al., 1998). A custom complex is defined as consisting “of customary practices as well as beliefs, values, sanctions, norms and motives that are associated with it” (Whiting and Child 1953, p. 27). Shweder argues that choosing a custom complex as the unit of analysis enables to study how culture and psyche are socially reproduced which results in a close relationship between the mentality and the practice. One example of a custom complex is the cultural sleeping arrangements in families (Shweder et al., 1995). Determining who sleeps by whom in a family household is a symbolic action that simultaneously expresses and realizes some of the deepest moral ideals of a cultural community. It raises a question “whether a particular cultural
community has a characteristic mentality (for example, the Hindu mentality, the Protestant mentality) which leaves its generalized mark on many domains within that community, thereby making, for example, Protestant economics, Protestant religion and Protestant family life more like each other than like a parallel ‘natural domain’ in another cultural community”. (Shweder et al., 1998, 875.)

The cultural psychology, therefore, encourages us to enlarge the study of moral phenomena to include the considerations about the correspondence of external and internal reality, or in other words, about the idea that the cultural ideologies or representations actually reflect the living arrangements of societies that are more than merely different moral positions inside society. It has been proposed (Radcliffe-Brown, 1952) that the values, beliefs and practices of cultures arise in response to ecological needs and fulfil important social functions (e.g., promote solidarity, stability and adaptation). However, a cultural psychologist Miller (1988) argues that the socially constructed living arrangements should not be confused with determining the cultural modes from environmental restrictions since cultural practices are only partly adaptive and are determined by nonrational cultural values and assumptions.

Similarly, Inglehart (1995) maintains that cultural emphasis of duties or rights can be linked to the socio-economical and socio-cultural changes and their relation is therefore less arbitrary. Inglehart argues that there is an objective relation between the arrangement of social structure and value system. Inglehart provides evidence that various cultural elements tend to go together in coherent patterns. For example, societies that emphasize religion, also favor large families. Also in a study that compared the cultural values and the physical form of housing in England and in Japan, a correspondence between valuing individuality and creating more possibilities for privacy in the home was discovered (Ozaki, 2002). Moreover, Fiske’s (1992) famous model of the four elementary forms of sociality (communal sharing, authority ranking, equality matching and market pricing), based on the four classic scale types, associates forms of social relations with the way people make ideological positions and moral judgments.

Moghaddam et al. (2000) are in the same line of thought with Inglehart and Shweder. They argue that the interpretation of social
behavior as involving rights or duties depends on cultural factors, such as the existence of a feudal system, or a puritanical religious atmosphere, as well as of the agricultural mode of production which depend on the work of whole families: duties are more necessary than rights for the existence of many forms of society. Moreover, the cultural conditions of modern industrial societies have led not so much to a negation as to a reinterpretation of normative duties. The authors argue that contemporarily in the U.S. there are only duties to the self.

The recent research has also attempted to modify the Kohlberg MJJI in a way that combines the structural and content concerns in the measurement of moral judgments. For example, White (1996) has studied the sources of influence in moral thought and has elaborated the MAS, the moral authority scale that is a re-conceptualization of Kohlberg’s stage theory formulated initially by Henry (1983a). It puts special focus on distinctive sources of moral authority and, therefore, pays more attention on the content of moral judgments. Also other researchers such as Johnston et al. (1990) have attempted to elaborate methods that are sensitive to the contextual factors in moral judgments.

In conclusion, Turiel argues that the variation in moral judgments between persons holding different positions within the same society does not indicate that they hold different moral conceptions. Instead, in hierarchical settings, imposing the conflict between inequality and equality, people, because of their self-serving interests, prefer to support the moral position that favors them: persons at the privileged positions perceive the moral conflicts as fairer than persons in subordinate positions. This argument, however, contradicts with Kohlberg’s (1984) idea that the conception of morality that emerges at the conventional level of moral development, involves the idea of role-taking, the idea that one should be able to consider the issue from the perspective of the other and make the moral judgment from the impartial point of view. Cultural psychologists, instead, argue that moral judgment should always be studied together with the context where it takes place, including social practices and norm systems associated with it, as a custom complex. However, the cultural psychological idea of a custom complex that emphasizes the similarities among different aspects of culture, might not be sensitive enough to the intra-cultural variation stemming from social class differences, frequently reported both in studies associated with the domain and
quently reported both in studies associated with the domain and the cultural psychological approaches. Anyhow, the domain theory and the cultural psychology are in the same lines of thought since both of them consider the influence of social context on moral judgment.

### 3.4 Group memberships

In this chapter I focus on variation in moral judgment stemming from group dynamics. Individuals are also members of families and other social groups; in other words, persons are equipped with a social identity. In turn, it seems plausible to consider that when resolving moral issues people don’t necessarily treat actors of the dilemma as individuals, stripped from their social identity, under “the veil of ignorance” (Rawls, 1971) but instead consider information of persons’ group memberships and social roles as fundamental when making their moral choices. The social identity certainly functions in a multifaceted way in moral thinking but I selected some dimensions that I considered important. First, I focus on the idea that persons make moral decisions on the grounds of the “moral community” memberships, suggesting that persons differentiate between moral in-groups and out-groups and treat persons in moral dilemmas on these grounds. Moreover, I review the studies exploring the impact of group stereotypes on moral judgments. Also persons’ roles in the moral event and social roles in determining the social responsibilities are discussed.

Turiel argues that people tend to universalize moral judgments to out-groups but are relativistic or tolerant with conventional issues. In general, Turiel has not paid attention to how people argue about other cultures’ social practices (Shaw & Wainryb, 1999). However, some researchers using Turiel’s domain theory as a starting point have approached the issue of morality associated with tolerance. Wainryb (1993) points out that there are many different kinds of tolerance and demands that one should differentiate between tolerance, grounded on the understanding that different cultures may have different meanings for the same situations, and the recognition that different cultures, in fact, may have different conceptions of morality. She argues that the latter type of cultural difference is tolerated less than the former. Wainryb stud-
ied how children and young adults apply moral judgments to other cultures where people are said to have either a different moral belief or a different informational belief. One of the issues asked from participants concerned the hiring of the women, a different moral belief issue was: "there is a country where it is believed that women exist to serve men and therefore it is right to order them around and tell them where they can and cannot work", whereas the different informational belief issue was: "there is a country where people believe that God helps old pilots fly their planes safely". Most subjects contextualized their moral judgments when they applied them to cultures with different informational beliefs but made non-relativistic judgments with respect to cultures with opposing moral beliefs.

Moral relativism has traditionally been tied to tolerance. Wainryb et al. (1998) studied children’s and young adults’ judgments of dissenting beliefs, speech, persons, and conduct. Although, at all ages, participants were intolerant of the practices, they were relatively more tolerant of practices grounded in cultural contexts (see also similar findings in Shaw & Wainryb, 1999 study). Participants were more tolerant of people espousing dissenting information (e.g., the father believes that “boys are smarter than girls and know how to stay out of trouble, and girls are not as smart and always get in trouble”) than dissenting moral beliefs (e.g., the father believes that “it is okay to be nicer to boys than to girls and to give boys more privileges than girls”). At all ages, participants were more tolerant (1) of the holding of dissenting beliefs than of their expression, (2) of the expression of beliefs than of the persons engaged in acts based on those beliefs, and (3) of the persons than of the acts. Youngest participants also believed that there is an intrinsic connection between believing something and acting in accord with that belief. On the other hand, Rozin and Cohen (2001) study that explored Jewish and Protestant conceptions of the immoral thoughts documented that also for some adults, in particular in the Protestant Christian religion, it is common to use a similar kind of reasoning.

In addition to differentiation of tolerance regarding informational and moral differences, Shaw and Wainryb (1999) discovered that tolerant judgments regarding behaviors considered immoral in a respondent’s own country but morally acceptable in another, are grounded on the understanding that these practices
have a different meaning in that country, in other words, that they are actually beneficial and generally accepted there. If the behaviors are constructed as leading to harm or injustice and actually not consensual in another country, their evaluations become intolerant.

Moral judgments are shown also to vary in terms of moral communities. Ikonen-Varila (1997) examined how Finnish doctors and shop stewards use the principles of distributive justice in resolving real-life and hypothetical dilemmas. She discovered that the use of the principles of distributive justice is context-dependent: different principles were used in different contexts. What was particularly interesting, the participants used principles to highlight the borders of moral communities. For example, she presents an example from the Heinz dilemma, adopted from the Kohlberg MJII. The interview contains probes such as “does a husband have a good reason to steal if he does not love his wife?” and “Is it right for a man to steal for his pet he likes very much?” One of the respondents answered using the equality principle that the values of a wife and a stranger are equally precious. Instead, when judging the stealing for the pet, a respondent shifted to the degree of experienced closeness and liking towards the animal, or in other words, the equity principle. This respondent did not include animals into the same moral community with humans. Ikonen-Varila discovered that it was the equality principle that was used in particular when referring to the members of the “core” moral community and it was not used to refer to the “outsiders”.

Also group stereotypes have been reported to influence moral reasoning. A study of Horn et al. (1999) compared the judgments of the scenarios where behavior of the actors was consistent with group stereotypes, with scenarios where behavior deviated from group stereotypes. Also the judgments of appropriate punishments in both scenarios were analysed. This study tested Turiel’s domain theory according to which in a stereotype-congruent event the salience of social conventional (group stereotypes) increased relative to moral (fairness) considerations than in a stereotype-incongruent situation. In the scenarios where a group of school students were blamed for an act of vandalism, the most salient information would be the lack of evidence regarding who committed the transgressions. The majority of respondents judged the act of punishing a group without proper evidence as wrong and used moral reasons to justify these decisions. However, the respondents
gave a significantly greater proportion of moral reasons in the stereotype inconsistent than the stereotype consistent scenarios. The authors concluded that stereotypes were associated with decision-making in ambiguous situations because they made more salient social-conventional principles about appropriate behavior and were related to a decrease in concerns about fairness and justice based on the lack of evidence.

Killen et al. (2001) interviewed children (4.5 – 5.5 years old) about straightforward exclusion and inclusion for two gender-stereotypic peer-group contexts: activities (e.g., doll and truck play) and role-play (e.g., teacher and fire-fighter). All children evaluated straightforward exclusion based on gender (e.g., girls excluding a boy from doll play) as wrong and used moral reasons. Preliminary inclusion decisions in activity contexts (e.g., choosing a boy or a girl to join the group), in turn, were based on stereotypic expectations, particularly for younger children.

Sanders and Darley (2002) studied the different attributions people make for law-abiding behavior by “moral” and “immoral” persons. The set of four studies conducted on young adults reveal that individuals believe that they and other highly moral people obey laws because of internal reasons (e.g., laws reflect valued rules and moral behavior) whereas criminals obey laws because of external reasons (e.g., fear of punishment). However, the findings also reveal that even some criminals are seen as motivated to obey laws regarding particular types of crimes because of internal factors as well as that “moral” individuals obey laws regarding minor transgressions (e.g., speed limits) for both internal and external reasons.

Moreover, persons’ real or imagined role in the moral dilemma determines how the issue is interpreted. Krebs and Laird (1998) studied the relationship of moral development and exculpation or whether persons’ moral judgments about real-life moral transgressions are affected by the role they play in them and whether self-serving biases in such judgments vary with level of moral judgment. Participants were significantly more inclined to minimize and excuse their real-life transgressions than they were to diminish the transgressions of others. It seems that people are disposed to diminish their association with immorality. People at low stages of moral development are more susceptible to self-serving biases in social judgment than people at higher stages.
Bersoff (1999), discussing why people who are motivated to act ethically in fact make unethical choices, argues that people tend to construct the meaning of a situation where they behaved unethically, in a self-serving way, to make it seem morally acceptable. Similar findings have got also Menesini et al. (2002) when studying the attribution of responsibility and moral disengagement in bullying behavior in Italy. The results indicate that bullies, compared to victims and outsiders, show a higher level of disengagement when asked to put themselves in the role of bullies. The results also show that bullies have an increased sense of egocentric responsibility and use of deviant rules as compared to victims, outsiders and defenders. Moreover, victims, outsiders and defenders tend to have similar moral responsibility and moral disengagement patterns.

Similarly, Krebs and Denton (1997) argue that Kohlberg’s hypothetical dilemmas ignore the reality of real-life moral decisions. Factors that may influence moral choices and the structure of moral reasoning in real-life dilemmas involve promoting good social relations, upholding favorable self-concepts and justifying self-interested behavior.

Haidt and Baron (1996) interviewed North American university students (mean age 19 years) regarding moral judgments of harmful acts and omissions and varied the issues with manipulating information of social roles. The study explored two dimensions of relation between the actor and the victim: the degree of solidarity (a friend or a stranger, equivalent to Fiske’s “Communal Sharing” dimension) and hierarchy (superior or equal, corresponds to Fiske’s “Authority Ranking” dimension). Subjects were asked to judge the morality of the actor in each case, both for a harmful omission (intentionally withholding the truth) and for an equivalent act (actively lying). Subjects judged the behavior worse in the act than in the omission. Judgments were also affected by role relationships, omissions were also found to be more sensitive than acts to role manipulations. For actors in high solidarity or authority roles, the moral distinction between acting and omitting was at its minimum. As role was varied towards low solidarity or low authority, the bias towards favoring omissions grew. Authorities were judged more harshly than subordinates. Moreover, actors in close personal relationships (status) were judged more harshly than actors in more anonymous (contract) relationships. It seems,
therefore, that the prohibition against harmful acts tends to be more universal, applying to everyone, than prohibition against harmful omissions distinguished by social roles in some cultures.

Indeed, judgments of harmful omissions (determining whether the duty to help is moral or conventional) depend on social roles more in the U.S. than in India. In a study that compared Indians and North Americans (Miller et al., 1990; Miller & Bersoff, 1995), Indians regarded the duty to help as moral irrespective of role relationships or the seriousness of the emergency situation. Americans judged a duty to help as moral only in life-threatening contexts and, moreover, in cases where parents were obliged to help their child in at least moderately serious need. In another parallel study of Miller et al. (1990) a higher socio-economic status was associated among Indians with the somewhat increased use of personal autonomy judgments but explained the perceived cultural differences only partially. So it seems that Indians have a broader and more rigorous view of social responsibility than Americans. The insignificance of social roles for the Indians becomes intelligible when one takes into account that in their culture duties are regarded as ultimate obligations referring to all human relationships. For the Americans moral obligations are determined by social roles. (Shweder et al., 1987.)

This chapter explored the issue how the group dynamics influence moral judgments and how different theoretical frameworks have explained it. The aspects associated with group memberships bear a multifaceted influence on the moral judgment. First, the aspects of division between in-groups and out-groups, discussed also under the related idea of the “moral community” were observed. This issue elicited two further questions. Where are considered to be the borders of the moral community? Moreover, how the responsibility to help is influenced by the moral community memberships and on the other hand, what kinds of differences in moral conceptions held by different moral communities are regarded as tolerable?

It seems, at least in the Western countries, that the responsibility to help is strongly influenced by moral community memberships and social roles between the two parties of the dilemma, which does not seem to be the case in India, for example. In general, it seems that people are motivated to act in a self-interested way, also when resolving moral dilemmas. On the other hand,
when persons make judgments of different practices of other cultures, the idea that the morally diverging practices are grounded on different cultural contexts, makes their moral judgments more tolerant. However, the dynamics of tolerance and intolerance are little studied issue and should be also examined in cultural contexts different from the Western countries. In general, it can be argued, even though the idea of the original position put forward by Rawls (1971) holds that people should make a moral argument under the “veil of ignorance”, unaware of social statuses, role memberships and cultural backgrounds, that people seem to consider this information crucial when making moral judgments, not only when resolving real-life conflicts and but also Kohlberg’s hypothetical dilemmas (see findings of Ikonen-Varila, 1997). Therefore the cognitive-developmental theories focusing on the development of morality from the perspective how it gradually becomes independent of cultural customs and understandings as well as the group dynamics, might not grasp well the true moral conceptions held by respondents to whom they are an indispensable part of the moral judgment.

3.5 Emotions

What are the moral emotions? Following the discrepancy between different definitions of morality, also the moral emotions are regarded as controversial. According to the “mainstream” understanding, the moral emotions, consulting Eisenberg’s (2000) review, consist of embarrassment, guilt, shame, empathy (that however, is not other-oriented), sympathy and personal distress. She classifies anger, sadness, moods and dispositional differences in negative emotionality as the nonmoral emotions, but adds that they are closely linked to moral behavior. Cultural psychologists (see Shweder & Haidt, 2000; Shweder, 1993) remind us that besides the conception of moral emotions, the understanding of “basic” emotions varies cross-culturally. Ekman’s (1980; 1984) list of nine (six-plus-three) basic emotions (anger, fear, sadness, happiness, surprise, and disgust, plus interest, shame, contempt) which he derives from the analysis of everyday facial expressions is somewhat different from the Indian understanding of nine (eight-plus-one) basic emotions (sexual passion, amusement, sorrow,
anger, fear, perseverance, disgust, wonder, sometimes serenity) expressed in the Sanskrit text of the 3rd century A.D., the “Rasādhyāya”.

The cognitive-developmental theories have, as a rule, excluded emotions from the definition of morality. They see morality as a predominantly cognitive phenomenon that is made up with moral judgment, moral sensitivity, moral motivation and moral character (Rest et al., 1999). This might be a bad move because some studies have reported that expression of moral emotions might be related, probably in a complex way, to moral development. In the study Wark and Krebs (1997), for example, the Stage 3 judgments were associated with affective responses whereas the higher developmental stages were characterized of cold objectivity. On the other hand, Helkama and Ikonen (1986) discovered that moral development is associated with the increased expressions of guilt over moral act omissions and that the trend is stronger in females.

What are the functions of the moral emotions in moral judgment? Even though philosophers have held that emotions are subjective knowledge and therefore not accurate information to be considered when discussing the phenomenon of moral judgment (e.g., Kant, 1964), recently they have changed their position and argue that biased emotional reactions can be justified since they help people to distinguish moral features in specific contexts, motivate moral behavior and withdraw from immoral behavior (Eisenberg, 2000). Also moral psychology has recognized that guilt and sympathy are believed to motivate moral behavior and to play a role in its development and in moral character (e.g., Hoffman, 1998; Walker & Pitts, 1998).

Helen Block Lewis (1971, 30) presented now highly influential conceptualization of shame and guilt, centering on differences in the role of the self in these experiences. The experience of shame is directly about the self, which is the focus of evaluation. In guilt, the self is not the central object of negative evaluation, but rather the thing done or undone in the focus. In guilt, the self is negatively evaluated in connection with something but is not itself the focus of the experience. Moreover, there is evidence that unlike moral transgressions that equally likely elicit shame or guilt, nonmoral failures and shortcomings (e.g., socially inappropriate behavior or dress) may more likely elicit shame (Tangney, 1992; Tangney et al., 1994). However, failures in work, school, or
sport settings and violations of social conventions were cited by a significant number of children and adults in connection with guilt. Moreover, Tangney et al. (1996) argue that contrary to the popular belief, shame was no more likely than guilt to be experienced in “public” situations; all three (shame, guilt, embarrassment) typically occurred in social contexts, but a significant proportion of shame and guilt events occurred when respondents were alone. “Solitary shame” was about as prevalent as “solitary guilt”. In particular, embarrassment was a relatively distant neighbour of shame and guilt, and the differences among the three could not be explained simply by intensity of affect or by degree of moral transgression. Embarrassment seems to be the least negative, least serious, and most fleeting emotion compared with shame and guilt, and seems to be associated with the violation of social conventions (Keltner, 1995) or may prevent loss of face and serve to assure adherence to important social norms (Leary et al., 1996; Miller & Leary, 1992). Thus, there is consensus that embarrassment plays at most a minor role in moral behavior. Guilt and shame seem to be largely overlapping, both emotions can be responses to the same situations, and both can arise from concerns about the effects of one’s behavior on others (Tangney, 1992). Nonetheless, guilt appears to be the more moral emotion of the two. Shame, but not guilt, is likely to arise from nonmoral situations and issues (e.g., failure in performance situations or socially inappropriate behavior) and only shame involves concern about others’ evaluations (Ferguson et al., 1991; Tangney, 1992).

In Eisenberg’s (2000) view, empathy is not an other-oriented emotion. However, with a further cognitive processing, an empathic response turns into sympathy (other-oriented motivation), personal distress (self-oriented motivation) or some combination. Studies with adult populations demonstrated that sympathy may not only motivate moral behavior in specific contexts (Batson et al., 1997b) but may cause longstanding changes in individuals concern about other’s welfare (Batson et al., 1995).

Eisenberg (2000) considers happiness, sadness, and anger as nonmoral emotions. The research findings suggest that negative moods likely predict impaired moral functioning, the tendency to choose short-term instead of long-term solutions to situations. Happy people, instead, are hedonistically interested to maintain their positive state of mind and behave accordingly. (Wegener &
Anger and other negative emotions (e.g., disgust and sadness) tend to be substantially linked with the perception of injustice and immorality (Mikula et al., 1998; Scher, 1997).

The cultural psychological approach, (Haidt, in-press-a), when defining moral emotions, specifies the material conditions of a moral issue: thus moral emotions are “those emotions that are linked to the interests or welfare either of society as a whole or at least of persons other than the judge or agent”. Haidt has divided moral emotions into four categories: the other-condemning family (contempt, anger, and disgust), the self-conscious family (shame, embarrassment, and guilt), the other-suffering family (compassion), and the other-praising family (gratitude, elevation). The CAD triad hypothesis proposed by Rozin et al. (1999) asserts that the three cultural Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity are linked with three distinctive moral emotions respectively, anger (individual rights violations), contempt (violation of communal codes including hierarchy) and disgust (violations of purity-sanctity). Students in the U.S. States and Japan were presented with descriptions of situations that involve one of the types of moral violations represented in the Ethics, and asked to assign either an appropriate facial expression (from a set of six) or an appropriate word (contempt, anger and disgust). Results generally supported the CAD triad hypothesis.

As compared to other moral psychologists who either exclude emotions in their definition of morality or regard moral emotions as helping to perceive moral features of the events, cultural psychologists seem to turn the relation between moral judgment and emotion upside down. In fact, cultural psychologists use an intuitive conception of morality where emotions determine in the first place our moral judgments. Moral judgments are rationalizations of our intuitive reactions to social events: they are the “rational tail of an emotional dog” (Haidt, in-press-c). Haidt mentions five reasons for concluding that moral reasoning does not cause moral judgment; rather, moral reasoning is generally a post-hoc construction, fabricated after a moral judgment is reached. First, the participants of the moral judgment study usually begin their response with the conclusion that the act is wrong and they then search their memory for an argument, any argument that can be used to support the conclusion (post-hoc reasoning). Second, there are two cognitive processes that constitute a moral judgment, rea-
soning and intuition, and the former has been overemphasized. Third, the reasoning process resembles a lawyer defending a client rather than a scientist seeking the truth. Fourth, the reasoning process readily constructs justifications of intuitive judgments, causing the illusion of objective reasoning; and fifth, moral action co-varies with moral emotion more than with moral reasoning.

Haidt (in-press-c) contends that moral intuitions are innate: morality, like language, is a major evolutionary adaptation for an intensely social life, built into multiple regions of the brain and body, which is better described as “emergent” than as “learned”, yet which requires input and shaping from a particular culture involving the selective loss of innate intuitions and their immersion in custom complexes (see also Shweder et al., 1998). It is possible to argue that Turiel’s findings actually evidence children’s moral intuitions (since his method consists of rule transgressions sets that children simply have to evaluate as “right” or “wrong”). In a similar way, one can reinterpret Turiel’s findings so that the moral intuitions of 5-year-old children are similar to the intuitions of the adults of the same community, or in other words, that the intuitive thinking is not developmental. (Shweder & Haidt, 1993.)

Cultural psychologists claim to demonstrate that variation in moral judgments is not grounded on informational assumptions but on intuitions. For example, Haidt et al. (1993) studied the relation of emotions, socio-economic status, Westernization and moral conceptions in the U.S. and in Brazil. They collected people’s accounts of social situations associated with harmless but disgust-eliciting norm violations such as burning the national flag or preparing one’s pet dog for dinner. High socio-economic status and Westernization were associated with narrower moralization whereas lower socio-economic status and non-Westernization was linked to broader use of moral criteria. The differences between the respondent groups remained even when the influence of informational assumptions were eliminated. Cultural variation in morality can be, therefore, accounted for the interaction between culture and emotions: in the Ethic of Autonomy the link between harmfulness of the act and its judgment is strict and in that case emotions are not taken into account. Instead in cases where morality is not based on assessment of harmfulness, emotions determine the domain of action and, finally, its harmfulness, as well.
Rozin et al. (1999) discuss disgust as a moral emotion. As was mentioned earlier, disgust is associated with the Ethic of Divinity violations. One can identify the core disgust that consists of poor hygiene, inappropriate sex, body violations (open wounds, amputations) and the contact with death. These features, in turn, are associated with seven basic elements of animal life: eating, excrements, grooming, reproducing, getting wounded, dying and the dissolving body. What is common for these characteristics is that they all remind humans of their animal nature (Haidt et al., 1997). If a human has to convince him-/herself that (s)he is not an animal, these characteristics have to be either hidden or humanized (eating habits, burial rites). Thus, disgust is an emotion associated with civilization and socialization. Universally cultural taboos are associated with issues of food, sex and body modification. In addition, there is a subtype of interpersonal disgust (elicited e.g., by clothes worn by strangers in second-hand shops and AIDS tests) and sociomoral disgust (associated e.g., with paedophilia or brutal murders).

Haidt (2000; in-press-b) argues that positive moral emotions are a little studied domain. He discusses elevation as a moral emotion that uplifts and transforms people. It is associated with the Ethic of Divinity: on the moral continuum from “down” to “up”, disgust marks the movement downwards and elevation the upwards direction, towards the “soul purity”. He argues that elevation in Western countries is associated with issues like sexuality and drug use. Even though they should considered private issues, they are frequently moralized because despite the modernized surface, the Ethic of Divinity has remained as a way to attach ideas of purity and pollution to the human body. Recently, cultural psychologists (Keltner & Haidt, in-press) studied also another positive, rarely explored awe as a moral emotion. Awe is associated with religious experiences, charismatic political leaders, and also with near-to-aesthetic experiences elicited by nature.

Vasquez et al. (2001) studied the moral ethics of Filipinos and North Americans and discovered that the North Americans emphasized strongly the Shweder Ethic of Autonomy whereas the Filipino conception of morality was evenly distributed across all three Ethics. The method used in first set of five studies was interesting. Whereas in all previous studies researchers used their own examples of moral violations, Vasquez and his colleagues pre-
sented descriptions of each Ethic to the participants and asked them to describe in their own words the norms within each rhetoric. To study the association of emotions to moral violations, a list of violations from the first study was given to participants and photographs representing anger, contempt, disgust, happiness, shame, fear and sadness. The results revealed striking cultural differences. Anger was associated with moral violations more strongly in the U.S. than in the Philippines. Moreover, the Ethic of Divinity violations such as sexual and drug-related behavior were frequently associated with the happy facial expression in the U.S. and the fear expression in the Philippines.

Even though the present study does not include the empirical study of moral emotions, it was regarded to be important to discuss them since various moral development theories consider the role moral emotions in controversial ways. The cultural psychology gives a substantial importance to moral emotions: it considers the moral judgment only as the rationalization of moral emotions, deemed as the primary and the most important reactions to a moral issue. On the other hand, the narrower definition of morality used by the cognitive-developmentalists that, furthermore, gives the primary emphasis to the study of cognitive and self-conscious aspects of moral judgment, has thus far been quite silent of the role of moral emotions in moral judgment. However, the findings reported by the studies indicate that moral emotions are an important factor in resolving the moral dilemma and therefore the cultural psychologists’ recognition of them is very worthwhile.

3.6 Definitions of morality are multiple – are there multiple moralities? Some conclusions and alternative ways to construct morality

The discussion of the explanations for “controversial” variation within moral judgments focused on the inherent features of the events, socially institutionalized modes of interaction (such as hierarchies), social roles and group memberships, informational assumptions or cultural propositions and emotions. I wished to highlight the difference between Turiel who argues that all these factors (except emotions that he ignores) are intermediate vari-
ables between the event and the moral judgment, and on the other hand, Shweder who perceives all five elements as a part of the whole in the make-up of moral judgment. In this concluding remark I address the structural elements in morality underlying the discrepancy between Kohlberg, Turiel and Shweder. First, I discuss the differing definitions of morality, social convention and personal autonomy and the different suggestions regarding the interrelations between the domains. Next, I turn to the empirical criteria that are assumed to differentiate the domains of morality, social convention and personal autonomy in the studies. Then I intend to highlight the differing conceptions of structure and content in moral development theories. And in the end, I focus on the methodological issues.

Turiel and his colleagues tried to explain perceived variation in moral judgments with the features of the issues, the structures of social relations between persons, informational assumptions and group dynamics. For Turiel’s theory the multiplicity of explanations is problematic since Turiel assumes that people’s patterns to judge social phenomena are similar everywhere in the world whereas in the studies presented above the variability of judgments is apparent. If morality, convention and personal autonomy vary according to social circumstances and if a big part of social phenomena does not unambiguously fulfill the criteria of morality, convention or personal autonomy, one should consider that the domains might not have inherent characteristics but they are socially constructed and interpreted. In addition, instead of three domains it could be more useful to argue for many more domains of social knowledge. Rest (1983) hypothesizes that there is one socio-moral continuum rather than three domains. He points out that even though Turiel’s studies have been able to show that people tend to classify social phenomena, they don’t prove that this tendency is due to the stringent domain division of social knowledge. Rest et al. (1999) mention a wry remark of Orlando Lourenc, who pointed out that children distinguish between forks and knives, but that doesn’t imply that we have discovered a “fork domain” distinguished from a “knife domain”.

Thus, Turiel does not straightforwardly consider the possibility that there exist many equally rational ways of interpreting social reality and that there are no inherent features in social behaviors. Turiel’s leading idea is that social reality is independent of
human mind even if, paradoxically, it is created by human mind and would not exist without it:

If the process of interaction is a reciprocal relationship, rather than a unilateral imposition of the environment on the child, then it is to be expected that the nature of a social event will have a bearing on how it is interpreted by the child and how it influences conceptual development. The definitional criteria for morality and social convention provide a basis for characterizing naturally occurring social events. The starting point for this analysis is the proposed features of their intrinsic consequences of moral transgressions and the arbitrariness of social-conventional events. (Turiel, 1983, 40 – 41.)

For Durkheim, the act of killing has consequences only if it is connected to an institutional system of rules and sanctions (moral facts are institutional facts). Therefore, the intrinsic features of an act are defined narrowly to include only direct perception of consequences upon violation (consequences to the self resulting directly and mechanically from a violation). Durkheim’s scheme, however, does not take into account the relatively simple inferences that can be made about an act like killing. If the individual’s inferential capacities are included, then the act of killing is neither arbitrary nor dependent on an institutional or constitutive system. It is an event with intrinsic features, whose observation is likely to lead to inferences – to the construction of moral judgments… The source of morality, therefore, is not the standards of the group or society. On the contrary, the source of convention is in understandings of the characteristics of the social system. (Turiel, 1983, 42 – 43)

For Turiel, social conventions are products of social consensus. Nevertheless, societies vary greatly in their size and have multiple ways of social interaction. Turiel, however, assumes that the non-moral actions found in industrialized democracies with highly differentiated social structure and small tribal societies grounded on kinship system, have similar features that make them social conventions. He does not take into account that social congregations, groups or communities are established or are assumed to be established in very different ways: the Western democratic system
assumes that it is a social contract that keeps its members together whereas many tribal societies have the idea of a mythical, supernatural origin or consider that all the members of the community are relatives with each other. Therefore it is possible and probably quite likely that the concept of social contract does not exist in some societies or social arrangements, or at least it is not considered important, and therefore Turiel’s social contract-based convention would not be found in them.

Turiel’s universal theory attempts to undermine the uniqueness of communities and societies. However, it is the variation of social practices that defines the boundaries of different societies and adherence to certain social practices, in turn, expresses a person’s social identity. This pattern is evident in the present discourse of European practices as opposed to non-European practices and also inside Europe, Finnish practices as opposed to foreign practices. For example, the Finnish sauna culture when relatives (and also non-relatives) representing both sexes go together naked in sauna, would easily seem morally inappropriate in countries where nudity is regarded as avoidable. For example Korhonen (1993) mentions that the Finnish sauna culture still embarrasses some tourists and confronts it with the U.S., where taking care of one’s hygiene is so privatized that all family members may have their own bathrooms. On the other hand, Finns, known as heavy drinkers, are just learning the “European” drinking patterns to avoid embarrassed the “European” criticism and to adopt the “European” identity. It is also discussed to what extent immigrants should adopt the practices of their new home country or community, and abandon the old ones. In addition, it seems that the strategy adopted by the Western countries to maintain a borderline surrounding the Western moral community is to moralize differing cultural practices, or some of them. For example, nowadays merely espousing a rhetorical question “What about female genital mutilation?” is presumed to function as an obvious counterargument to cultural pluralism, both in the U.S. and in Europe (see the discussion of the present discourse of North Americans associated with female genital mutilation issue by Shweder, 2000). The examples where one’s social convention violates other person’s moral principle are anything but few. In fact, one could argue that the patterns of tolerance and intolerance regarding the practices held by the morally “Other”
actually reflect the patterns of inclusion and exclusion into the moral community.

Walzer (1983) is on the same lines of thought when he, as a criticism to Kohlberg, presents a theoretical account of the view that morality is not based on a Foundational Principle (like Kohlberg argues) but, rather, the morality of a community is gradually built up from the specific experiences of the community in dealing with specific cases. Walzer describes the growth of “common morality” in particular historical communities. Thus, Walzer argues, the development of morality is not to be understood as an individual’s applying of a Foundational Principle, but rather the community’s reaching agreement about how best to fulfil shareable moral ideals to suit the circumstances.

Shweder et al. (1987; 1998) states that the assumption of universal inherent features of social acts that could be utilized in dividing the three domains, is misleading. According to Shweder, people’s culturally constructed conceptions of their relation to other people, nature and supernatural beings determine the nature of patterns of social behavior. Shweder’s conception of morality is much broader than Turiel’s: for Shweder convention is also morality-bound or some kind of second-order morality and morality can, depending on the cultural orientation in question, get anchored either on rights, duties or divine worship. Shweder considers convention to be only a cultural construct of the individualistic Western culture. Turiel claims that in general, moral judgments are not influenced by the assumptions about the reality and in those exceptional cases where this influence takes place (such as in abortion or homosexuality), one should separate moral judgment and the assumptions about the reality in order to study moral judgments in an unbiased way. The cultural psychological theory, on the other hand, claims that informational assumptions or cultural propositions are an inseparable part of a moral judgment and it is impossible to separate them without doing violence to the understanding of respondents’ rational moral point of view.

The opposite of Shweder’s ideas can be found in sociological literature that assumes that there is only one dimension of social functioning: culture- and institution-dependent conventionality. Sociologists Berger and Luckmann (1966) claim that all social practices and institutions including moral ones, have a conventional source, which is the social interaction. Berger and Luck-
mann consider informational assumptions or cultural propositions as a veil that prevents persons to understand the "true conventionality" of all social events, were they moral or conventional in Turiel’s terms. These sociologists claim that the origins of some products of human action have just become dim; they are perceived as biological facts, products of cosmic laws or expressions of divine will. Berger and Luckmann have given this phenomenon a label "reification" which means that some phenomena of human origin are perceived as objects of non- or superhuman source. Also Durkheim (1915/1965, 466) expressed a similar idea when he wrote that religion is basically the mystification of social forces. Since all social phenomena emanate at least partly from social interaction, Gabennesch (1990), a sociologist too, draws a conclusion that all social phenomena are conventional including those that carry moral significance. For him, Turiel exaggerates a human capacity to separate morality and convention and, therefore, cannot explain the phenomenon of ethnocentrism – a global tendency to perceive the fundamental institutions of one’s own society as normal, natural and superior. Gabennesch thinks that not only children but adults as well reify conventions associated with monogamy, monotheism, ethics of self-fulfilment, individualism and definitions related to beauty and prestige. For Turiel they represent “non-prototypical” conventions; however, these “exceptional” cases are very common and important phenomena in many societies.

Even though there is disagreement between Turiel and Shweder regarding the division and the association of the domains of morality and convention, curiously other cultural psychologists and domain theorists are on surprisingly similar lines of thought when discussing the domain of personal autonomy or the idea of selfhood. It seems that many of them have considered the interrelation of morality, convention and personal autonomy, and on the other hand, the hierarchy between the Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity. On the one hand, Nucci (1996) who has conducted series of studies within Turiel’s domain framework exploring the domain of personal autonomy, argues that morality and personal freedom are interdependent and that personal freedom is necessary both for the construction of moral understandings and engagement in moral action. Nucci (1996, 43) argues: “Personal issues are a circumscribed set of actions that define the bounds of
individual authority. As such, the identification and maintenance of control over the personal serves to establish the social border between the self and the group.”

The personal and the moral are closely associated domains in the discourse of the Protestants who moralize immoral thoughts (Cohen & Rozin, 2001). However, the personal autonomy domain of independent, liberal-minded individuals living in Western countries is not totally free from moral concerns, either. Health is a strongly moralized issue among the Western peoples: to take care of one’s health is a moral responsibility so that an individual remains as autonomous and independent as long as possible and does not become a “burden” to a society (e.g., Shweder et al., 1998). Also Campbell and Christopher (1996) claim that the personal must be considered as a part of the moral as well as Witherell and Edwards (1991) who emphasize the moral self in persons’ self-conceptions.

The idea that conception of the self, or the scope of what is private and autonomous, varies culturally, is not incompatible with the cultural psychological idea that cultural Ethics are grounded on the different conceptions of the self and society. Moreover, Nucci’s idea that private domain varies inversely with the societal regulation, approaches the idea of cultural psychologists according to whom all the domains of knowledge are interrelated in a sense that they are defined by the cultural conception of the person. On the other hand, cultural psychologists Moghaddam et al. (2000) discuss the interrelatedness of the Shweder Ethics. In the context of duties, they mention that in addition to social duties, there are also duties to the self. In the individualized Western countries the conceptualization of duties has been renamed in the rights-emphasizing discourse as rights even though the practices have remained more or less the same. Moreover, they conclude that in the Autonomy-grounded Ethic the duties have been reduced to a minimum so that there are only duties to the “most important person”, the self. Bhatia (2000) is in accord with Moghaddam and his colleagues: he points out that the issues of morality and selfhood need emphasis if we are to consider the discourses of duties and rights. For example, in order to understand the cultural concept of duty in the West, duties should be conceptualized as embedded within the rights-based discourse rather than alongside each other.
According to Blasi (1990), the definition of morality is too restrictive when it excludes those phenomena that, according to lay understanding, are moral. He identified four other subtypes of morality in addition to justice. The first one is morality that is based on communion or benevolence and the second that emphasizes obedience and authority relations. The latter subtype is problematic for Turiel’s theory: authority-dependent behavioral patterns are conventional for him – indeed later Turiel and Davidson (1986) have classified authority-contingent judgments as second-order morality (which is one more argument for the interdependence of morality and convention). According to many studies people do not regard obedience to authority as conventional but moral (e.g., studies concerning religious contexts). The third underemphasized moral subtype is the one that Grice (1967) calls ultra obligations. They are subjective obligations without corresponding objective rights, sense of duty without any external obligation. The fourth subtype ignored by the mainstream moral psychology consists of personal obligations that a person perceives as having a moral value and that are binding irrespective of external consequences and interpersonal acts or relations (betraying one’s ideals, betraying oneself). According to Kohlberg and Turiel, morality is interpersonal so personal obligations are not moral for them. Nucci and Turiel put these considerations in the domain of personal autonomy. Anyhow, issues regarded as personally binding can be genuinely moral from a person’s own point of view.

Another critique concerns the criteria used by Turiel to differentiate domains of morality, social convention and personal autonomy. As in this chapter it became evident, it is very common that acts are judged inconsistently, criteria associated with them spring from more than one domain. The problem, therefore, is that what criteria are regarded as the most important criteria that differentiate the domains? Two most studied dimensions are rule alterability and generalizability. Only manipulating these two dimensions it is possible to get four different combinations of their use that are presented in Figure 1 below.
Shweder argues that in addition to domains of universal moral obligation and social convention, there is also a domain of context-dependent moral obligation that is regarded as unalterable but not universally binding. Moreover, he argues that on a worldwide scale, the most important differentiation is not made between moral and conventional domains but instead between universally binding and context-dependent moral obligations. He maintains: “It is important to emphasize that when context-dependent moral thinking does occur, which is not often, it is not because the practices in question are understood as arbitrary. On the contrary, a moral obligation is contextualized because the practice in question is viewed as distinctively expressive of, or adaptive to, the special conditions, temperament, or moral qualities of a population.” (Shweder et al., 1987, 58.) For example, the Vasquez et al. (2001) comparative study of the moral rhetorics of the U.S. and the Philippines reveal that Turiel’s notion applies only to the Ethic of Autonomy whereas the Ethics of Community and Divinity rhetorics are more contextually dependent.

Another source of dispute deals with the issue where the boundary goes between structure and content in moral judgment. Turiel regards that there is a fundamental division between moral and conventional acts, the former having “inherent characteristics” and the latter “inherently” lacking them. In fact, this statement is contradictory to the cognitive structuralists’ claim of separateness.
The dual proposition that categories of social judgments are organized within domains and that development involves transformations in those forms of organization implies that there are two aspects of the individual’s social concepts requiring specification and empirical analysis. One of these aspects will be referred to as criterion judgments (e.g., obligatoriness, impersonality, alterability, universality, relativism, social consensus, and institutional status) and the other as justification categories (e.g., those pertaining to moral domain of justice, harm and rights or to the social conventional elements of social system coordination)... Consequently, this procedure assumes that the relation between the stimulus event and criterion judgments is nonarbitrary. That is, there is a subject matter for each domain, so that a nonarbitrary relation exists between how one reasons and what one reasons about. (Turiel, 1983, 52 – 53)

It follows that the conventionality or morality of judgment depends on what you judge, for Turiel. Kohlberg responds in the following way to Turiel’s claim:

Turiel and colleagues have presented convincing data that support his argument that the domains of social conventional judgment and moral judgment are differentiated by young children. However, to show that two domains are psychologically distinct is not to show that they are independent. That is, the fact that children from the beginning can tell moral concerns apart from conventional concerns does not imply that these two sets of concerns do not inform and influence one another. Conventional and moral concerns, in fact, are so closely intertwined that one frequently becomes the other in the course of development, as when certain issues of sexual propriety are transformed from moral into conventional issues in individual’s thinking. We would hold, then, that it is more accurate to think of morality and social convention as distinct but closely interrelated rather
than completely independent conceptual systems. (Colby & Kohlberg et al., 1987, 14 – 15.)

Therefore, it seems plausible to claim that the theories of Kohlberg and Turiel disagree about the division of structure and content. What is universal for Kohlberg are the principles that people use (how you judge) but not the way the principles are associated to acts.

The fourth source of disagreements between moral researchers originates from the different methodologies used in the studies. One has to keep in mind that even though Turiel and Kohlberg start from the same cognitive-developmental assumptions, their requirements for genuinely moral judgments are different: Kohlberg asks his respondents to provide explicit justifications for their conception of social system whereas Turiel requires much less from the respondents – it is enough that a respondent provides an assessment and justification for the rightness or wrongness of certain acts (Rest et al., 1999). Variations in the data collection methods and criteria of analysis lead to the situation where the results collected with Kohlberg’s and Turiel’s methods are not comparable with each other. Therefore Turiel has been able to prove that even 4 years old children hold the conception of morality whereas according to Kohlberg, the conventional level morality (that he considered the first real understanding of morality) emerges much later, at the age of 8 to 10 years.

One of the problems in Turielian and Kohlbergian research is that while attempting to study respondents’ own interpretations of morality and convention, they end up studying something totally different. They define the most sophisticated form of morality in advance and measure how close to this construct their respondents are able to reach. Kohlberg’s and Turiel’s morality is therefore very distant from their respondents’ view of it. The cognitive approach to moral development claims to focus phenomenologically on people’s own interpretations and keep them as the starting point of research but instead Turiel defines morality, convention and personal autonomy in advance and studies how well his respondents are able to reach the same view of the domains he has. In other words, Turiel regards his own view of the domains as an objective measure of other persons’ conceptions. The sociological approach emphasizes people’s ability to perceive the convention-
ality of the society in a “correct” way. However, Shweder thinks that there is no objective, perceiver-independent way of making observations of social phenomena and therefore it is not possible to define the domains of social knowledge that would be universally applicable. According to Shweder, the conventional or moral nature of rules and regulations is dependent on the judgment of an individual and people’s judgments cannot be arranged along the relative order of superiority justified by developmental sophistication, for example. Therefore Shweder is able to reach much closer to the respondent’s own point of view than Kohlberg and Turiel who call themselves as phenomenalists.

The critique dealing with the methodology underlying Kohlberg’s theory, the MJJ, claims that it over-emphasizes the skill to produce arguments. However, it has been shown that an awareness of the conceptions precedes their self-reflective presentation in speech. It has been also argued if the MJJ dilemmas are effective elicitors of moral reasoning in other cultures (if they are perceived as dilemmatic) and it has been proposed that they should be translated and adapted to the cultural conditions of different cultures. It has been shown that the MJJ dilemmas are recognized as dilemmatic in many cultures and the judgments elicited by them are codable by Kohlberg’s manual. However, it has not been explained if hypothetical dilemmas are optimal ways of measuring the moral judgment capacity of persons living in different cultures. (Boyes & Walker, 1988.) For example Gilligan (1982) has used interviewees’ own dilemmas produced since Kohlberg’s approach has “a limited generalizability”. The advantage of using respondents’ own dilemmas is that they are surely regarded as dilemmatic by respondents and that respondents get more freedom to express their own conceptions of morality that can deviate from the narrow conception proposed by Kohlberg. (Walker et al., 1995; Snell, 1996.) For example Krebs and Denton (1997) argue that people rarely make the types of moral judgment evoked by Kohlberg’s test when they make moral decisions in their everyday lives.

On the other hand, one could argue against the three broad Ethics proposed by Shweder for the reason that also they risk to block cultural variation and uniqueness in the similar fashion as the theories of Kohlberg and Turiel did before him since the Shweder ethics and Kohlberg’s orientations serve largely similar
purposes. Therefore one can ask whether there is anything new in Shweder’s (see Shweder et al., 1997) latest theorising despite of ambitious aims to show cultural plurality. To show that one can identify universal, though cultural orientations that can be found everywhere in the world, does not add anything new to the theory moral development. It only repeats the earlier formulations of Kohlberg and Piaget, but in other words. Therefore it is necessary to avoid using ready-made coding manuals prepared in another culture, but instead to classify the data with the codes grounded on the data being studied, and construct data-based (not ready-made, theory-based) clusters or Ethics to test the theory.

Gergen (1997) holds that current conventions of research such as the use of group means, create false uniformities inside the groups. It would be interesting, since Kohlberg’s stages represent qualitatively different modes of thinking, to analyze in what kind of proportions the respondents use the different types of arguments. It would give a richer picture of a person’s argumentation. The present way, calculating means, leads to a loss of lots of information regarding respondents moral conceptions. Also Rest (1983) points out that discussing findings primarily by group means in subjects’ responses, the researchers direct our attention away from the often-substantial individual differences in the implicit categorization of items. Moreover, it is also worth considering, since classifying the data is always a process of interpretation and the process of interpretation is also a culturally conditioned process, whether it would be more theoretically satisfactory and less culturally biased to use native or indigenous coders to code the data, for example, using an Indian person to classify the Indian data and use a Finnish person to use the Finnish data. The reason for this is that for example, a European coder has a different sets of moral conceptions in his/her mind and when (s)he meets data, for example interviews of Chinese Buddhist monks, the conceptions that are not represented in the European moral framework such as the transmigration of souls, karma and dharma might be falsely understood and classified by a non-indigenous coder.

The studies that I have presented above raise many methodological and conceptual issues that require further consideration and research. First, the issue which criteria define morality, convention and personal autonomy, should be considered, and whether it is necessary that all of them be fulfilled for the act to be classified
under one of the domains. Second, it seems that different types of interview questions elicit different kinds of answers, particularly in the context of rule generalizability, and moreover, if generalizability is not a necessary requirement for morality, it might prove that morality, too, can be divided into many sub-domains such as context-dependent morality. Third, it should be thought over whether it is possible to separate informational assumptions and social judgments and if this is the case, one should reconsider if the domains of social knowledge are grounded in inherent features of behaviors or whether the domains are cultural constructions.

It became also evident that Turiel’s argument for the separateness of the domains of morality, social convention and personal autonomy has received lots of critique. It seems to me that most of the researchers, except Turiel, argue that the domains are interrelated: Shweder argues that personal autonomy and social conventions are part of the moral domain as do Campbell and Christopher, whereas some sociologists like Gabennesch argue that morality is part of social convention; Nucci, in turn, claims that the domain of personal autonomy is the requirement for the existence of moral domain and that the scope of personal autonomy is inversely related to societal regulation in a given society. It is possible that the controversy among the researchers regarding the construction of map of relations between the domains of morality, social convention and personal autonomy actually reflects the different ways to construct the relation between these domains. The controversy between the theorists regarding the structural aspects of morality: division of domains, split between structure and content, manifests that what is actually regarded as universal in the cognitive-developmental theories can, in fact, be construed in several different ways. Therefore the universality, or more specifically, the uniformity claim of the theories of Kohlberg and Turiel should be reassessed.
IV

CONCEPTUALIZING MORAL INVARIABILITY AND CHANGE: SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS

The social representations theory (or shortly, the SRT) formulated by Serge Moscovici (1961/1976) most comprehensively in *La Psychoanalyse, son image et son public*, serves as the integrative metatheory for the theoretical discussion in the present study. Moscovici defines social representations as:

System(s) of values, ideas and practices with a twofold function; first, to establish an order which will enable individuals to orient themselves in their material and social world and to master it; and secondly to enable communication to take place among the members of a community by providing them with a code for social exchange and a code for naming and classifying unambiguously the various aspects of their world and their individual and group history. (Moscovici, 1973, p. xiii)

The SRT has explicitly been made “loose”. For example, almost all social psychological theories find it necessary to define their object of study, but in the context of the SRT Marková (2000) argues that it is better to characterize than define what social representations are since, because of their dynamic nature, they exist only in relation to something else like “figure-and-ground”. It has been criticized for this reason for the lack of conceptual clarity, as well as providing too little guidance for the design of empirical research (Bauer & Gaskell, 1999). On the other hand, the open conceptualizations of the SRT can also be regarded as its strength.
For this reason the SRT suits particularly well for being a social psychological metatheory. In fact, Moscovici himself considered in his conversation with Ivana Marková (1998) the SRT to be a theory that unifies the field of social psychology. It, for example, does not clearly oppose the cognitive-developmental ideas neither the cultural psychological assumptions. It can be also confirmed by the fact that since the cognitive-developmental view gives the primary emphasis on the structure of knowledge, i.e., how knowledge is constructed while the cultural psychology emphasizes the content, or what is constructed, the SRT, in turn, accords the same significance to both aspects of the knowledge construction (Lloyd & Duveen, 1993). It can be argued that both the cognitive-developmental and the cultural psychological theories can be translated into the language of the SRT but it is impossible to translate the assumptions of the cognitive-developmental theory into the theory of the cultural psychology assumptions or vice versa.

Moscovici (1984) has adopted the conception of social representations from Durkheim who studied collective representations. Since the Western society had undergone an enormous change after the period of Durkheim, Moscovici felt that it is not necessary any more to discuss collective representations that are rather static since they belong to a society that has a static knowledge structure. The characteristic of the modern Western society is that the institution of science has replaced religion as the source of representations and since science creates new knowledge as opposed to religion that preserves knowledge, the nature of these new representations is essentially different. Therefore it is necessary to discuss the phenomenon of social representations that are dynamic and changing, as opposed to traditional collective representations that are static. However, to assume that non-Western or indigenous cultures are static, has received critique from cultural anthropologists who claim it to be solely an ethnocentric fallacy (Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Marcus & Fischer, 1986); instead, they argue that every culture is dynamic and evolves in response to the presence of other cultures (Stolzenberg, 2000).

Thus, the SRT is particularly interested in the process or transformation of knowledge, in other words, in the process of how new knowledge produced by scientific enterprise is scattered and absorbed into the general public both from the point of view of
societies with their existing cultural knowledge systems as well as of individuals living in them. The SR theory emphasizes the relationship between typicality (conventionality) and innovation; it emphasizes the clash of ideas in the formation of new social representations (Moscovici & Marková, 1998). Social representation is construed as being composed of two complementary functions, anchoring (whereby the unfamiliar or remote is absorbed into the familiar categories of everyday cognition) and objectification (whereby representations are projected into the world, so that what was abstract is transformed into something concrete) (Lloyd & Duveen 1993).

Moscovici (1981) discusses the common sense and the scientific discourse as distinct but integrated universes of knowledge. He defines the former as the consensual universe that is the realm of social representations and the latter as the reified universe also because these two acquire and treat knowledge in diverse ways. Flick (1994) discusses these universes as the knowledge of the collective and the knowledge of the everyday life. The former sphere includes the systems of religion, science as well as ideologies. The latter, on the other hand, consists of the spheres of common sense, everyday knowledge and social representations. The SRT stands against the idea that folk knowledge or the thinking of ordinary persons is irrational; it is assumed that knowledge is constituted by society and therefore Moscovici discusses the phenomenon of “thinking society”. In this respect the SRT is in accord with cultural psychologists.

However, the problem with traditional social psychological theories is that they conceptualise knowledge in a static way and for this reason they are not able to conceptualise change (Marková, 2000). As pointed out also earlier, Moscovici argues that Piaget followed the static conceptualisation of collective representations proposed by Durkheim and for this reason Piaget’s (and also Kohlberg’s) concept of structure is no more than a rearranging of pre-existing elements within a boundaried whole (Moscovici & Marková, 1998). Consequently, the cognitive-developmental theories are bound to describe the acquisition of knowledge that is static. Cultural psychologist Shweder, as well, adopts the definition of morality from Durkheim. However, Shweder assigns more variation in (moral) knowledge than the cognitive-developmentalists do, since for him knowledge is cul-
turally constructed and therefore variable, which implies that cogni-
tive mental structures and culture mutually construct each other.
Shweder assumes that cultural meaning systems are relatively
static and after describing the persons’ acquisition of the cultural
knowledge, the cultural psychology gives a rather static and uni-
form picture of culturally grounded moral judgments and is not
able to explain more subtle variation in them. Indeed, for Shweder
et al. (1998, 866) the cultural psychology “aims to document his-
torical and cross-cultural diversity in the processes and products of
the human mind. It examines the processes of schema activation
and social learning associated with becoming a member of a
group.”

The SRT provides an important contribution to the predomi-
nantly North American theorising of morality (Bègue, 1998) since
it is able to integrate presently opposing theoretical views of the
cognitive-developmentalists and the cultural psychologists. Both
the cognitive-developmental and the cultural psychological theo-
ries are bound to the traditional ideas of social psychology of
knowledge since they do not take any stand on the issue whether
knowledge itself that is to be acquired by persons, transforms. As
a contrast, the SRT assumes that also knowledge itself transforms,
not only persons’ thinking, since the reality is constituted by per-
sons (Moscovici & Markova, 1998). Moreover, since the SRT
explicitly studies change and variation in persons’ judgments and
regards variation in judgments as a “normal” phenomenon, in
relation to what is more static an unchangeable, the SRT provides
an important and more complete explanation for the variation in
moral judgments that is regarded as a “problem” in the cognitive-
developmental theories (threatens the idea of universal develop-
mental structures or the domains of knowledge) and in the cultural
psychological theories (threatens the idea of the relative intra-
cultural, or in particular, “intra-Ethical” (the Ethics of Autonomy,
Community, and Divinity) uniformity). Therefore the SRT is es-
sential for the social psychological understanding of the develop-
ment of moral conceptions in the modern society.

To understand the full map of the phenomenon of morality, it
is important to relate the opposing developmental trends described
by the cognitive-developmentalists and cultural psychologists. The
cognitive-developmental theories provide a model of the kind of
knowledge that develops from unconscious (intuitive) to conscious
(reflective). The cultural psychology, in turn, is interested in knowledge that at first is considered consciously or reflectively but with development is used more and more automatically, without reflection. In other words, the cognitive-developmentalists assume that there exists culture-independent knowledge that an individual acquires with development and is able to separate culture-independent knowledge from cultural understandings. And on the other hand, the cultural psychology focuses on the acquisition of the knowledge of cultural origin that is internalised during the process of enculturation.

To relate these two processes it is necessary to discuss the third process, their interrelation. It is particularly well grasped by the SRT. The SRT is interested in the meeting point of the two opposing processes described by the cognitive-developmentalists and the cultural psychologists: how the continuous flow of new knowledge is integrated into the pre-existing knowledge structures of persons. The outcomes of the meeting point of these two processes can be called social representations. The SRT discusses the developmental transformations of social representations from three perspectives: sociogenetical process that refers to the construction of social representations themselves; ontogenetical that concerns the development of individuals in relation to social representations; and microgenetical which concerns the evocation and transformation of social representations in social interaction (Lloyd & Duveen, 1993). Another strength of the SRT is that it can discuss multiple phenomena, which are studied under the labels of separate social psychological theories, as social representations. For example, the fundamental conceptions in theories of moral development that can be discussed as social representations are conceptions of the self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) and of society (Moscovici & Perez, 1997). Also categorical prejudices and criteria for defining in-group and out-group, phenomena discussed by the social identity theory, can be seen as social representations (Jedlowski, 1995).

One can formulate the metatheoretical map also in other words. The strength of the SRT is that it enables the differentiation between individual, collective and social representations and discusses their interrelation (see also Flick, 1994). The SRT explains how an individual argues, uses and handles social representations. The cultural psychological approach is not able at the moment to
show the agency of an individual that is separate from the context. It can only identify the tracks of cultural or social origin in an individual’s mind but does not go further. The argument that the present study puts forward is as follows: an individual and his/her context are more related than the cognitive-developmental theories assume but less than the cultural psychology expects. The cultural psychology is not concerned of those aspects in cognitive structures that are not directly produced by culture but are instead the reflections of an individual. The cultural psychology is interested in tracing the development of cognitive (conscious) to intuitive (unconscious) and the cognitive-developmental view is interested in the opposite. Even if the cultural psychology integrates the idea of an agentic self into its theory, it is not interested in showing the sometimes contradicting relationship between the conceptions of the collective or of society, and the conceptions of the individual. Also Doise (1990) is in the similar lines of thought when he discusses system and metasystem. In the cognitive-developmental approach, culture can be considered as a metasystem. Metasystem is a regulative system and an individual can use different metasystems in different situations.

Marková (1990) has formulated this in a similar way when she argues that all societal phenomena involve functioning of three principles, each of which can be expressed as a dyad of mutually interacting counterparts: individual and society, stability and variability, and reflexive and nonreflexive activities. Moreover, the relationship between individual and society becomes progressively differentiated, with some of its aspects becoming relatively stabilized and with others remaining variable (tradition vs. novelty; routinized vs. unpredictable forms of behavior). Last, societal development is characterized by the interaction of reflexively monitored activities and nonreflexive, customary activities. She differentiates between reflexive ethics and customary (non-reflexive) ethics and argues that in the context of medical ethics, for example, it is impossible to understand how the medical professionals make ethical choices in their work without considering both of them.

To integrate the different theoretical approaches discussed in the present study, the “language” of the SRT is very useful. It is assumed that morality is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon and that the cognitive-developmental and the cultural psychologi-
cal theories grasp different aspects of it. It can, therefore, be argued that the cognitive-developmental theory is interested in the development of the individual representational aspects of morality and the cultural psychology of the collective representational aspects of morality. It can be formulated further, that the SRT focuses on social representations of morality, i.e., describing the meeting point or integration of the individual vs. the collective representational aspects of morality. Also Farr (1998) argues that the cultural conceptions of the self could be a study of collective representations. He argues that the last collective representations of the modern society is the relative emphasis of individualism or collectivism and this, in turn, is associated with the cultural conceptions of the selfhood.

The cognitive-developmental and the cultural psychological approaches consider the development of morality as the acquisition of knowledge that is invariable. The source of conflict between these theories lies in the fact that they apply a different idea of what moral knowledge is. This disagreement is treated as an indication that moral knowledge might be more variable than is currently recognized. The solution proposed here to overcome the apparent contradiction between the cultural psychological and the cognitive-developmental approaches to moral development is to suggest that morality or moral knowledge is multifaceted and that both approaches capture one part of it. To integrate the opposing approaches, the metatheoretical approach of the SRT is used. This study follows the model parallel to the one proposed by Marková (1990). According to this model, moral decision-making involves the integration of two different kinds of morality (or ethics, as Marková names it): reflective ethics described by the cognitive-developmental theories and non-reflective ethics discussed by cultural psychologists. The SRT approach does not treat variation as an empirical exception that does not have to be taken into account in the theory, as a contrast, this approach gives the equal theoretical space on both variable and invariable aspects of moral judgment, were they consonant or conflicting with the cognitive-developmental and the cultural psychological theoretical assumptions.
5.1 Finnish rule systems: the laws

The present study applies that idea of a “custom complex” (see Whiting and Child, 1953, 27) used by the cultural psychologists as the unit of analysis. Shweder (Shweder et al., 1998, 877) encourages social psychologists to use a custom complex as the unit of analysis if the research problem fulfills the following conditions:

1. A “practice” displays significant variation across groups and differential patterning of within group variations.

2. The components of a mentality (knowing, thinking, feeling, wanting and valuing) display significant variation across groups and differential patterning of within group variation.

3. The distribution of the practice appears to be related to the distribution of the mentality, and vice versa.

To highlight the Finnish custom complexes, I compare them with the European custom complexes. I focus on the formal rule systems imposed by the state, namely, the laws. The laws are regarded to be part of the custom complex as well as the parliament, the institution that creates the laws by the legislative power.
granted to it. I discuss the laws and role of the state focusing on two types of laws: the ones that are associated with self-harming or “prudential” behavior and, second, the “moral” laws that promote human rights since the present study also empirically focuses on these two. The laws may be associated to practice in many ways: it either can totally prohibit the practice or it can regulate it to some extent. It is also possible that the legal system does not say anything about the practice in question. Moreover, since the cultural psychological idea of the custom complex implies that the conception of the practice is associated with the system of beliefs and values, I discuss the role of religious and nonreligious worldviews along with role of the state and laws as constituting different kinds of custom complexes. In the other words, I describe how the cultural conception of the self held by the respondent, his/her conception of the practice and the collective conception of the practice represented by the laws and the efficacy of the parliament in putting them into force, can be analyzed together as a custom complex.

How morality is related to notions of what kinds of similarities are believed to hold “us” together as a society and what kinds of changes, differences or deviations from the moral standards are tolerable? Social psychological studies document that moral diversity is less celebrated than demographic diversity. In the U.S. moral diversity is promoted but in social psychology it is demonstrated that moral diversity leads to conflicts. The concept of moral diversity itself is problematic and self-contradictory. (e.g., Haidt et al. 2001) For example Durkheim assumes that moral consensus in a society is necessary for setting the normative order; without it a society would fall apart. The study of Haidt et al. (ibid.) demonstrates that moral diversity reduces desires for interaction among college students. Wainryb (1993) studied how moral judgments are applied to other cultures where people are said to have either a different moral belief or a different informational belief (see Chapter 3.4). Evaluations were not changed when applied to contexts with opposing moral beliefs even if they were said to be part of the culture or tradition. By contrast, if different acts were based on different informational beliefs, judgments were more relativistic. Moral relativism has traditionally been tied to tolerance. Wainryb et al. (1998) also studied children’s and adolescents’ judgments of dissenting beliefs, speech, persons, and
conduct. Participants were more tolerant of people espousing dissenting information than dissenting values.

Variation in culturally held moral principles can be generated by contact with other cultures or it can originate from inside the culture. Is it possible to identify the Western countries, Europe or Finland as moral communities where values held as morally important are relatively uniform? It is interesting that even if we talk about Western values or European values as opposed to non-European values, it seems that there is no uniform value complex called the “European values”. For example, according to the European Values Study, between 1981 and 1990 the Western countries have become more similar in civic morality but more dissimilar in sexual and ethical issues (Halman, 1995). Moreover, the Western countries have adopted very different policies of the state control regarding morally unacceptable behavior of their citizens. Scarr (1996) has compared the contrasting role of the state in taking the responsibility of its citizens in the U.S. and in Sweden. She argues that the underlying moral values of autonomy versus community as well as the cultural conceptions of what is a just society count for this difference. Even though she has not carried out an empirical study in these countries, she has studied the structures of official social policy systems in these countries. Based on these comparisons, she argues that Sweden places the major emphasis on the Shweder Ethic on Community whereas the Ethics of Autonomy and Divinity are only modestly emphasized.

The important dimension to be considered for the purposes of the present study is the cultural conceptions of the state responsibility as opposed to citizens’ personal involvement in endorsing such moral principles that are expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Are the European countries similar in considering the importance of human rights, and moreover, who is regarded as responsible for promoting them? Doise et al. (1999) studied conceptions of human rights of university students representing 38 countries and five continents. The specific interest was to examine respondents’ conceptions of the responsibility of government versus individual activity in promoting human rights. The results revealed four approaches to human rights: advocates (most favorable human rights responses), sceptics (less favorable responses), personalists (high personal involvement and scepticism about governmental efficacy) and governmentalists (low personal
involvement and strong belief in governmental efficacy). The countries were also divided on the continuum of passive adhesion as opposed to active adhesion to human rights. The northern and central European countries fell on the side of passive adhesion to the rights whereas the southern European countries scored relatively high in personal adherence to the human rights. The Finnish sample was located between the advocates and governmentals.

The degree of the state control of potentially self-harming behaviors as opposed to the accepted individual freedom is another very important dimension to be considered in the present study. Halman and Petersson (1999) argue that in Europe, the decline of the importance of religion in general has influenced on the conceptions of the personal privacy in “prudential” issues. The impact of religion is different in public and in private sphere (family issues, sexuality, gender roles): the importance of religion in a secularizing or secularized country is stronger in the private sphere, according to the European Values study of 1981 and 1990. European countries have adopted different strategies with replacing the former religious control with state regulation regarding behaviors having potential harmful consequences on the physical, moral or psychological health of individuals. In general, the idea that the state has the responsibility to protect people from harming themselves is historically a very recent occurrence. For example, laws prohibiting drug use are a modern phenomenon linked with industrialization and the rise of the modern state. (Jiggens, 1995.)

However, religious worldview itself does not directly indicate what kinds of values it endorses. The relation between the church and the state in a country has a crucial role in determining religious persons’ values. Roccas and Schwartz (1997) argue, on the basis of the past studies, that individual religiosity relates positively to valuing conformity, security, tradition and benevolence towards close others, and negatively to valuing stimulation, self-direction, universalism, power and achievement. However, the opposition between the church and the state modifies the associations of values with religiosity because it influences the social and psychological functions of religiosity in society.

When the European countries are compared, the external control of the church to the private sphere of persons has been replaced in some countries by the state laws, but in other countries not. In Finland, the law currently restricts many behaviors that are
assumed to have harmful consequences to the person who wants unlimitedly to pursue them. The laws restrict or totally prohibit such behaviors as watching uncensored TV and video programs, use of marihuana, keeping shops open on Sundays, selling wines in food shops and replacing the presently Lutheran moral education by nonreligious moral education. As a contrast, for example in Italy, wines are sold in food stores without restrictions. In France the censorship of the TV and video is distinctively more liberal than in Finland. And in Sweden, it has been possible to keep shops open on Sundays for decades; in Sweden moral education, as well, has been nonreligious for a long time. Moreover, marihuana is a totally legalized drug in the Netherlands. The division in Europe may reflect the differences between predominantly Catholic and predominantly Protestant countries. Rozin (1997, 1999) argues that the Protestant cultures traditionally emphasize self-discipline unlike the Catholic cultures which may explain why the Protestant North Europe moralizes health-related behaviors more than the Catholic South Europe.

Thus, it seems that Finland exercises a relatively strong state control over sexual morality and self-harming behaviors as compared to the Western European, and in particular, other Nordic countries. Bradley (1999) discusses the Finnish law relating to unmarried parenthood, informal cohabitation, and same-sex partnerships. He draws the following conclusion based on previous research:

*Homogeneity and egalitarianism now appear to characterise Finnish society. (p. 177) In the past, the extra-marital birth rate in Finland has remained lower than in the other Nordic countries. Contemporary patterns of informal cohabitation came to Finland later than to Scandinavia and acceptance of extramarital relationships has been slower than in Sweden in the recent past... Finland is culturally more homogeneous and less permissive with respect to a diversity of lifestyles than are the more permissive countries of Sweden and Denmark: acceptance of common law marriages and homosexual and lesbian relationships are cases in point where Finland is still a laggard. The same holds for tolerance of diversity. The political onus in Finland has centered on equalizing differences between social classes, regions and sexes. At the same time, however, minority
rights and human rights have not been as well protected. (p. 178.) To date, Finnish policy has concentrated on eliminating benefits that cohabitees would enjoy over those who marry, for example, in relation to taxation and social security, and on leaving a flexible jurisprudence to evolve on issues such as property rights. In contrast, in Sweden it is proved possible to enact the Law on Cohabitees (Joint Homes) in 1987 to regulate (albeit to a limited extent) the property relations of an unmarried couple who live together in circumstances resembling marriage... (p. 181.) Differences in Swedish policy on homosexuality are striking... No legislation has been enacted comparable to the Swedish Law on Homosexual Cohabitees... 5 The introduction of registered partnership laws in Norway in 1993 and Sweden in 1994 appears to have intensified pressure for a similar scheme in Finland, or at least to raise the profile of rights in same-sex relationships... Enactment of Iceland’s Law on Confirmed Cohabitation isolated Finland among the major Nordic countries. (p. 182.)

The picture drawn by Bradley’s review depicts Finland as a homogeneous, collectivistic country that is less liberal than other Nordic countries, at least when sexual morality is concerned. Also a Finnish sociologist Allardt (1985) has recognized the “collectivism” of the Finnish culture. Anttila (1993) reminds that Finland, like all Nordic countries, are homogenous cultures: people resemble each other ethnically, culturally and morally. In the study reported by Anttila, the Finnish respondents were requested to evaluate the importance of certain words when associated in the Finnish context. As a result, the responses reflected the social representation of Finnishness. As compared to three other countries (the Dutch, Hungarians and North Americans), the Finns emphasized the words “homeland”, “state” and “independence”. In addition, “work”, “school” and “national defence” were significant attributes of the Finnish national character. Even though the Finnish sample consisted of a multifaceted population, the social

---

5 However, a new law regarding partnerships became effective in Finland in March, 2002, granting virtually equal rights and duties to homosexual, lesbian and married couples. However, the same-sex couples cannot adopt a child. (Helsingin Sanomat, December 10, 2001.)
representation of Finnishness was quite homogenous. Puohiniemi (2002, 61) obtained a similar finding using Schwartz value typology according to which Finns were either benevolent collectivists, security-oriented, individualistically hedonistic or self-directed universalists. Indeed, the Nordic countries may emphasize obedience and conformity as compared to individualism and self-expression more than the U.S., for example (see the study of Arnett and Jensen, 1994, on the comparison of the socialization patterns in the U.S. and in Denmark).

When applied to the study of moral development, the cultural and socio-economic homogeneity of the Finnish society is reflected in the fact that among the Finnish adolescents, for example, there is virtually no association between the parents’ socio-economic status and the development of moral judgment, when measured in the Kohlberg MJI (Helkama & Ikonen, 1986). Even though Finns endorse individualistic values, resembling in this respect other Westernized post-industrialized societies, Finns tend to score relatively high in conformist values, higher than Sweden and Estonia, for example (Verkasalo et al., 1996).

The relative intolerance among the Finns regarding differences among persons and less liberal attitudes towards sexual morality and self-harming behaviors may stem from the fact that Finland has had a stronger need to defend and maintain its national and cultural uniformity than other Nordic or Western European countries since Finland is a relatively young country. Finland as an independent country has existed only since the year 1917, before that it was occupied by Sweden for hundreds of years and later also by Russia, not to mention two wars in the twentieth century where Finland had to defend itself against Russia. The history of Finland as invaded by other cultures may explain why words associated with national integrity are regarded so important among Finns when defining Finnishness.

Ultimately, the interpretation of practices such as watching violent video programmes, using marihuana, or opening shops on Sundays, as harmful or harmless, depends on beliefs of causal relations (e.g., Shweder et al., 1997). The distinctive characteristic of these laws is that the Finns are discussing whether the purpose of these laws is to protect people from harmful effects of banned behaviors or alternatively, whether these behaviors are actually harmless and it is a matter of personal choice to do whatever one
wants to one’s own body and mind. In this respect these laws can be differentiated from the laws that prohibit stealing or killing that need less interpretation as to their harmfulness. Therefore the opposing opinions about these laws are focused rather on the disagreement about the right of the state to regulate individual freedom in the society than on practical considerations about the usefulness of societal regulation of acts that are not unambiguously harmful. For example, the critical literature review on the effect of exposure to media violence (including exposure to violent pornography) on aggressive behavior documents that exposure to television violence does not unanimously lead to a greater degree of aggressive behavior. It probably does have a small effect on violent behavior for some viewers, possibly because the media directs viewers’ attention to novel forms of violent behavior that they would not otherwise consider. (Felson, 1996.) Similarly, the research on the association of pornography and sexual offending has produced equivocal evidence (Seto et al., 2001). Another example is the meanings associated with the alcohol use. Alaväikkö and Österberg (2000) point out that in the EU framework alcoholic beverages have basically been treated as commodities as opposed the Nordic countries that have treated them as social or health hazards (Tigerstedt, 1990). As a result, the consumption of alcoholic beverages has been controlled in Finland by laws and state regulations for more than a century (see Österberg, 1985). However, the other side of the Finnish custom complex of alcohol use is in the words of Koski-Jännes (1992, 13) the fact that “drinking in our (Finnish) culture appears to be highly dependent on external limits and permissions... Finnish problem drinkers tend to be more external in their control orientation than similar populations of problem drinkers in the U.S. for instance.”

To sum up, the image drawn by literature depicts Finns as positioning themselves as maintainers of the relatively extensive structure of state rules and regulations for controlling persons’ private life. Finns tend passively to leave the responsibility of protecting citizens from harming themselves to the state. Similarly, even though Finns evaluate human rights very positively, they regard that it is the responsibility of the state rather than individuals’ concern to promote human rights. On the other hand, Europe seems to be a less uniform community when these two dimensions of morality are concerned. However, during the last
ten years Finns have begun to raise the issue, resulting perhaps also from joining into the European Union in 1995, to increase individual freedom and personal responsibility in engaging in potential self-harm. The Finns have considered opening shops also on Sundays, allowing wines selling in food stores, equalizing the status of the same-sex couples with married opposite sex couples, among other. However, the Gallup polls and the difficulties in the government to reach an agreement over these issues shows that the different conceptions regarding personal privacy and personal responsibility as opposed to state “protection” are rooted deeply in fundamental differences in persons’ worldviews. The evaluation of these laws depends on the interpretation of the relationship between an individual and society, or in other words, on how a “person” is defined. Those people who think that a person is in a subordinate position to a society or that a person is defined in terms of his/her role obligations towards his/her society believe that restrictive rules have to exist since a person is not able to behave in a correct way without external regulations. On the other hand, persons who hold the liberal stand, define a person as an autonomous being who is able to rationally assess the consequences of his/her own actions and is therefore capable of regulating independently his/her own behavior. An autonomous being needs societal regulation to establish and promote his/her autonomy and individual rights.

The present pressure towards changing the laws that restrict individual freedom is primarily due to the individualization of the Finnish society. On a psychological level this process is changing people’s worldviews, i.e., conceptions of a person, as well. The purpose of this study is to investigate how the trend of modernization is represented in traditional and modern Finnish adolescents’ conceptions of various religious and societal laws. It is assumed that the majority of the Finnish youth have a relatively individualistic worldview. In the present study adolescents who belong to the Lutheran Church and adolescents who do not have any religious affiliation represent this view. It is assumed that the latter group of adolescents would be especially individualistic in their judgments. In contrast, the adolescents who belong to the Conservative Laestadian movement have been chosen as representatives of the traditional worldview in this study. It will be interesting to find out how the process of modernization is manifested in Con-
servative Laestadian adolescents’ judgments since the major objective of the Conservative Laestadian movement is to promote and cherish traditional religious values, virtues and social practices (Huotari, 1981) and it has until now been very successful in this project.

In addition to modernization, there is also a process of internationalization that creates a pressure towards moral pluralism in the present-day Finnish society. On the individual, psychological level this process appears as a need to change or reassess old ways people have been interpreting the social practices that are occurring in their society. Persons who are living in the internationalizing society have to take a stand towards new social practices immigrants are bringing to their society. After all, the main question is how different rule systems and preferences between the Shweder Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity held by different social groups can fit together. Do individuals define their own in-groups and other cultural groups of their society as separate entities that do not share anything with each other or do the members of the groups identify themselves as participants of the broader, equally pluralist society? In other words, is a genuinely pluralist society practically possible? The present research project tries to find answers to these questions.

5.2 Worldview and religiosity

Religiosity or worldview is the main focus in the present study and it is treated as one factor in the variation in persons’ moral conceptions and conceptions of rule systems. A Finnish philosopher Niiniluoto (1984, 87) defines a worldview as a personal conception regarding the purpose of life, one’s place and purpose in the world. A worldview is grounded on the system of beliefs and values. According to Laitila and Vesala (1987) a worldview is a whole that consists of goals, values, attitudes and norms. A worldview determines individuals’ and communities’ conceptions of themselves and others and therefore orientates or directs persons to experience social and non-social phenomena in a certain way, and to adopt certain patterns of behavior.

This study uses the definition of religiosity that is adopted from Batson and Ventis (1982, 7 – 12) who have studied religious
experience from a social psychological point of view: according to them a religion can be understood in a broad way as persons’ ways to resolve existential problems when they have to confront an awareness of the fact that they are living beings and they have to die. Such questions are: What is the purpose of my life? How should I relate to other persons? How should I understand the fact that I will die sometime in the future? What should I do with my shortcomings? According to the definition of Batson and Ventis, religion is a dynamic experience that is constituted of attitudes, values and emotions. It includes both religiosity of an individual and a society (or community) but it does not necessarily imply the existence of a superhuman or Godly sphere of reality.

The conception of divinity, indeed, is not limited to religious contexts; also nonreligious persons may have the notion of the divine. The study in Finland using the SRT framework (Moscovici, 1961 / 1976), explored the social representations of God held by Finnish university students. God was most often associated with incorporeality. Religious persons associated God with omnipotence whereas atheists and averagely religious people associated God with nature. It thus seems that although most of the nature-related attributes were clearly non-orthodox from the Christian point of view, they nevertheless could also be seen as religious in a wider perspective. Other factors were God as “represented in curious metaphors” and God as “other gods”. (Lindeman et al., 2002.) God as nature for nonreligious Finnish persons implies that nature may be conceived in terms of the Ethic of Divinity in the Finnish context. Moreover, Finns might perceive also Finnish nation in terms of the Ethic of Divinity (see Anttonen, 1993, and his article titled as “Pysy Suomessa pyhänä – Onko Suomi uskonto?” / “Stay in Finland on a Holy Day – Is Finland a Religion?”).

Most persons in the Western countries are convinced that their worldview is a result of their personal, autonomous choice. In fact, this is only an illusion, since according to numerous studies persons’ worldview results for the most part of a socialisation process. One can argue that a person is free to choose the worldview that is determined by his/her society, and in particular, his/her socio-economic status. Since religious issues transform the experience of a daily objective reality, the social influence on religiosity is very strong. According to Festinger’s (1954) theory of social
comparison, conceptions of and attitudes to non-concrete phenomena are particularly prone to social influence. This theory assumes that in the absence of objective, observable standards a person begins to rely on the interpretations of his/her reference group. Social factors influence a person’s worldview in the form of role expectations, norms and reference groups. Gender, ethnic background, socio-economic status, educational level as well as the size and geographical location of the place of residence; the religious and political affiliations of the parents and the civil status all together have an impact on the nature of persons’ worldview. Even if the empirical connections between these factors to various worldviews have been confirmed, instead the theoretical explanations have not, since the connections have been documented at the statistical level. (Batson & Ventis, 1982, 29 – 47.)

Gordon Allport’s (e.g., 1966) distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic religion is one of the most famous conceptualizations of the ways of being religious in social psychology. According to him, this formulation “helps us to separate churchgoers whose communal type of membership supports and serves other, nonreligious ends, from those for whom religion is an end in itself – a final, not instrumental, good” (1966, 454). Later, Batson and Ventis (1982) have developed a three-dimensional model of being religious: religion as “means”, an “end” and a “quest”. The two first dimensions are more or less essentially the same as Allport’s formulations of extrinsic and intrinsic religion. According to Batson et al. (1993), the “Religion as means” orientation treats religion as a burden: the practitioner has to attend religions occasions so that (s)he could gain some other benefits and because of social approval. The “Religion as an end” orientation, on the other hand, conveys the problem that a religious person seeks reinforcement for his/her conviction from societal commitment from groups of like-minded people. The third, “Religion as a quest” is characterized by attributes of doubt, complexity and tentativeness. According to Batson and Ventis, it is “an approach that involves honestly facing existential questions in all their complexity, while resisting clear-cut, pat answers. An individual who approaches religion in this way recognizes that (s)he does not know, and probably never will know, the final truth of such matters… There may not be a clear belief in a transcendent reality, but there is a transcendent, religious dimension to the individual’s life.” (1982, 149 – 150.)
According to Batson et al. (1993), the “Religion as a quest” promotes most efficiently both mental health and sociability. Moreover, those persons who hold the “Religion as ends”, are documented to be the least tolerant and those who conceive the “Religion as a quest”, the most tolerant of divergent moral practices (Batson et al., 1999; 2001). The respondent groups studied in the present study can be seen as representing each three dimensions: the Lutherans the “Religion as means” -orientation, the Laestadians the “Religion as an end” -orientation and the adolescents without a religious community membership the “Religion as a quest” -orientation. (See the analysis of Vesala, 2002.)

5.3 Worldviews of respondents: majority and two different minorities

5.3.1 Evangelical Lutherans

Most, or around 90%, of the Finnish population belongs to the Evangelical Lutheran church. Only 2 % of the Finns belong to other religious communities and around half of this number is comprised of the members of the Orthodox Christian Church. It and the Evangelical Lutheran church enjoy the status of being the state churches in Finland. According to the Statistics of Finland, around one tenth of the Finnish population does not belong to any religious community. However, this group includes also the members of the Pentecostal Movement that are as many as the Orthodox Christians. Persons who claim to be atheists make up only a few percents of the Finnish population. (Heino et al., 1993.) The membership of the both two state churches, however, is obtained soon after birth since it is the choice of parents, not of children. At the age of 15, however, Finnish adolescents get the right to choose themselves what they want to do with their religious community membership. The state church status of Evangelical Lutheran Church means that it has a significant influence on laws relating to marriage, divorce, oaths, care of the poor and religious instruction in schools. With regard to these issues, the Finnish government is required to consult the Church Assembly before deciding to change the present laws or creating new laws. Moreover, the
Church receives financial support from the state and to cooperate extensively with the state on issues regarding both religious and secular matters facing the Finnish Republic. (Christensen, 1995.)

The high percentage of the state church members in Finland seems paradoxical since if religiosity is observed at the level of personal beliefs, Finland is one of the most nonreligious countries in the world. When one compares the Gallup polls carried out in 1951 and 1990, and in particular, the conceptions regarding life after death, they reveal that the conceptions have changed drastically during this time period. The proportion of those who believe that life in all forms ends at the moment of death, had doubled whereas the proportion of those that believed in the Christian conception (all the persons will be waken up from the death when the others will acquire an eternal life and the others will be doomed to an eternal death) had diminished into a half. However, despite the fact that it has been easy for a long time to withdraw from the church membership, and save on taxes, very few people have done so. It is a pattern that characterizes the religious life of Finns and other Nordic populations (Heino et al., 1997) and makes them seem unusual in the larger European context.

Presently Finland enjoys the freedom of religions, included in the UN Declaration of Human Rights. However, it is a relatively recent phenomenon in Finland. Until the end of the nineteenth century when Finland was under the Swedish rule, all Finns were required to belong to one of the state churches: either the Lutheran Church or the much smaller Orthodox Church. Only after Finland gained its independence from Russia after the First World War, as a part of the establishment of an autonomous democracy, Finns got the full freedom to choose to withdraw from state religions. (Bruce, 2000.) In addition, the regulations for joining and leaving a religious community, the Freedom of Religion Act also includes provisions concerning the criteria for exemption from religious instruction at school, the exemption of non-members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church from church taxes, the establishment of cemeteries and the right to have a burial place (Seppo, 1998).

However, it seems that Finns are more religious than other Nordic populations. The Nordic RAMP survey (reported by Bruce, 2000), showed that 33%, 34% and 32% of Norwegians, Danes, and Swedes “never” attended church whereas the proportion was only 19 % for Finns. Half of Finns pray at least once a
month, compared with a third of Norwegians and a quarter of Danes and Swedes. (ibid.) A difference is apparent in the answers to the question “How important is God in your life?” used in the World Values Survey. Denmark and Sweden rank lowest with a score of 18 and 19, Norway scored 27 but the Finns scored 42 (Inglehart et al., 1998). The explanation provided by Bruce is that religiosity of Finns is associated with the maintenance of national integrity. Denmark and Sweden were themselves imperial powers and Norway has been relatively untroubled by conquerors for almost two hundred years. As contrast, in the twentieth century Finland fought two wars against Russia.

5.3.2 Conservative Laestadians

The Lutherans represent the majority of Finns and the first group of the present study. The second group, in turn, consists of Conservative Laestadians. This movement exists inside the Evangelical Lutheran church. It belongs to the revivalist movements, which emerged first in Germany as a counterreaction to the secularization process of the society of that time as well as to the spread of the Enlightenment ideology. The Laestadian movement was established in the 1840s in the Northern Lapland of Sweden. The society of that time was undergoing people’s migration into towns that cut people from their original local identities and created feelings of rootlessness. Eventually the Laestadian movement spread into the Northern Finland. The movement has experienced many splits. Presently the dominant movement is called Conservative Laestadians and most of its members live in the region of North Ostrobothnia and, in particular, around the city of Oulu. (Huotari, 1981, 38 – 39.) The central administrators of the movement (that make up the organization called the Suomen Rauhanyhdistyksen Keskusliitto, SRK) do not maintain a register of their members but the movement arranges religious summer meetings that attract over 100,000 members every year (e.g., in 1996 when the data for this study was collected.). The Conservative Laestadians have always been members of the Evangelical Lutheran church.

In other words, the Conservative Laestadian movement was born in the middle of the social transformation of the Finnish society in the end of the nineteenth century: the technical innovations
gave push to the industrialization process which led to the emergence of new jobs. This societal change was interpreted by some Evangelical Lutherans to have a negative influence on the Finnish values and they tried to maintain the endorsement of “good values” by creating revivalist movements that attempted to call the values of the old society back to life. These values were regarded to be essentially religious but when observed from a broader point of view, it can be noticed that they are exactly the same as the values endorsed by the traditional Finnish agrarian society.

The characteristic of the Conservative Laestadians is that they try to isolate themselves from the surrounding Finnish society by rejecting the lifestyle of non-Laestadian Finns around them since the latter do not respect values that are regarded as traditional Christian values. Indeed, the Conservative Laestadians have been successful in closing the modern or post-modern lifestyle outside their community and, in fact, among the Finnish revivalist movements the Conservative Laestadians have been most efficient in this project. Conservative Laestadians stick to the lifestyle of the nineteenth century Finnish agrarian society: TV watching is prohibited as well as birth control, drug use including alcohol and divorce. Also the sex roles are traditional: men and women are regarded to be created as different beings according to the Bible and for this reason they are determined to have different roles in the society so the purpose in life for women is to take care of their family and give birth to children. (Huotari, 1981, 174; Suolinna & Sinikara, 1986, 30 – 31.) Conservative Laestadians, in addition, exert control over the other members’ observance of the religious rules and interfere if one of the members deviates from them. The issue, at large, is of the maintaining the coherence of the community and the religious rules function as some kind criteria for the community membership, or an outward expression of the religious community identity to the others: their violation means that a person has decided to go away from the community (Huotari, 1981, 174 – 175).

The religious ideology of the Conservative Laestadians holds that a human being is not responsible for becoming a Laestadian. However, a person has to wait for God’s call and his/her duty is to receive and accept it when it comes. Conservative Laestadians believe that the Biblical issues have to be approached and understood only with the faith and not with reason and, moreover, that
only their community holds the right kind of faith or “the keys to open the message of the Bible”. This is the ground on which Conservative Laestadians justify their strict stand on such issues as homosexuality, women’s priesthood as compared to the mainstream Finnish opinion. The Conservative Laestadians, moreover, interpret the Biblical scriptures very literally: they accept only the Finnish translation of the 1860s and condemn the later translations as heretical.

The Conservative Laestadian community is very tight also because their ideology emphasizes the unique and special status of their community in the eyes of God, like the Jews or the Amishes. For this reason the boundary between the in- and out-group is strong, the membership identity is explicit and the phenomenon of marginal community identity is rare. (Haavio, 1964, 73.) Since the transmission of the religious belief is regarded to belong to God, the Conservative Laestadians do not practice any missionary work. Their community increases mainly because of the high birth rate: the families having 10 to 16 children are common. The selective use of the mass media, choice of friends and active religious teaching, in addition, have kept the Conservative Laestadian adolescents from leaving the community.

5.3.3 Adolescents without a religious community membership

The third group selected for the present study consists of the adolescents who do not belong to any religious community. They seized the opportunity to study a subject called the “philosophy of life” instead of religion at school. The persons who do not explicitly belong to religious communities in Finland make up a heterogeneous group: they can be atheists, agnostics as well as members of religious communities that do not enjoy the state church status. However, this study included only those adolescents who identified themselves as having a nonreligious worldview and who studied the philosophy of life – a subject that claims to be not bound to any singular religious or nonreligious ideology – at school.

It is possible to have some kind of idea of the worldview of the adolescents who do not belong to religious communities and who have decided to study the philosophy of life subject by reading
their syllabus. The purpose of this subject is to give students resources to build up an individual worldview autonomously. In this respect it is unlike the subject of religion since it does not aim at transmitting any single coherently defined worldview. The syllabus at the comprehensive school level deals with social relations, moral growth, cultural identity and civic ethics as well as the significance of the “Golden Rule” in social relationships. Also the development of critical judgmental skills is given support. Only later at the comprehensive school level students study the major historically significant religious traditions. (Opetushallitus, 1994a, 95 – 96.) At the gymnasium level students are familiarized with a variety of conceptions and theories regarding values, norms and virtues as well as the moral development of an individual (including the theory of Kohlberg). During the classes also the conceptions of state, society and culture are discussed as well as the realization of justice and fairness in the world. (Opetushallitus, 1994b, 91 – 92.)

To sum up, even if the “philosophy of life” subject claims to be ethically neutral, it puts human rights at the first place in the definition of morality; in other words, the “philosophy of life” promotes the Shweder Ethic of Autonomy. In this way it can be expected that the students of this subject represent a strong version of the Western individualist and liberalist ideology.
VI
RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND MORALITY:
THREE VIEWPOINTS

6.1 Focus on religion and content-structure relation

The body of research carried out in Kohlberg’s research scheme is so vast that the review here focuses on the studies that are related to the association of religious-cultural-political ideologies with moral judgment, in other words, to the study of the interrelation between the content and structure of moral judgment.

In general, Kohlberg’s conception of the relation of morality and religion is grounded on the Western philosophy that considers religion and morality as separate systems. When this idea is applied to Kohlberg’s theory it follows that the universal structure and the cultural content of moral judgment are, or should be, independent; moral development does not have anything to do with social, cultural or religious circumstances. In general, the studies have demonstrated that all persons irrespective of differences in their worldview undergo the same sequence of moral developmental stages around at the same years of age. (Kohlberg, 1981, 25, 123, 302; see also Dawson, 2002, who examines 4 sets of data, collected by 4 research teams over a period of 30 years.) However, Kohlberg (1983, 123) has admitted that the fifth stage argumentation is more common in some cultures, for example in the U.S., than in Mexico or in the villages of Yucatan, Turkey or Taiwan. The first interpretation of the findings is that they reflect the real
differences between the cultures (Kohlberg, 1983, 128 – 129). The second interpretation is that a cultural bias is built in the MJI.

However, Rest (1979, 115 – 116) meta-analysed 24 studies carried out during the 1970’s that have used the DIT that is a simplified version from the Kohlberg MJI. In general, religious ideology, or ideologies in general, was not related to moral development stage but there were some studies which showed that conservative ideology was associated with lower level in the moral development: for example, persons in the conservative South U.S. obtain lower scores than persons living in the North (studies carried out among the college students). Also, the study of Ismail (1976) reveals that immigrants of Saudi Arabian origin were at the lower level of moral development than the students born in the U.S. The study of Ernsberger (1976), in addition to measuring moral development level, has also studied educational materials and official doctrines of various churches in the U.S. Fundamentalist churches obtained lower scores than more liberal ones. The leaders of the former, in a similar vein, were at a lower level than their followers whereas the leaders of the liberal churches were at a higher level than their followers. In other words, the moral development scores followed the lines of the official ideologies; the leaders were more extreme than the followers.

Rest (1983, 592) reports a study by Lawrence (1978) where ultra conservative Christian seminarians received “surprisingly low” scores in the Kohlberg MJI. The researcher interpreted the findings were such because the respondents did put aside, because of their religious ideology, their personal conceptions of justice and answered according to the pattern that was in accord with the religious scriptures: “Some stated that value judgments should not be based on earth-bound, human rationality but on divine revelation.” However, studies carried out during over the last 20 years demonstrate that persons choose the solution for the dilemma representing the highest level conceptually available for them Trevino (1992, 446). Blasi (1984; 1990), too, dislikes the interpretation proposed by Lawrence: it is more probable that for some persons morality becomes significant only when it is grounded in religion. Moreover, he criticizes Kohlberg for ignoring the subjective perspective of the respondents.

Other studies have documented that religious identification may also speed up moral development. Norman and Richards
(1998) investigated whether content and structure are independent in moral reasoning and religious belief. Their finding was that more Christian than public school students favored law, punishment, and authority. Moreover, regardless of school attended, students who used religious terminology to resolve dilemmas were less likely to reason in Kohlberg’s conventional level than those who did not use such terminology, and were more likely to use postconventional argumentation. The conclusion of the researchers is that religious people’s moral development is faster than others’.

On the other hand, the study carried out in Finland reported no relation between religiosity and moral judgment level. Lehtinen (1988) studied the influence of religiosity and the modernity of the place of residence on the moral judgments using the MJI in Finland. The results revealed no relation between the developmental stage and religiosity, whereas among the over 35-olds there was a link between religiosity and the A-orientation use. The relationship between religiosity and the A-orientation, however, held only for the respondents living in the non-urban environment of the North-East Finland, not in urban Helsinki.

In addition to religious affiliation, political ideology may influence persons’ moral reasoning. Emler has for a long time been involved with the problem whether the conservative vs. liberal political ideology influences the respondents’ moral reasoning level (see for example Emler, 1983). Emler and Stace (1999) mention that the study of American and British students, using the MJI, showed that political attitudes (left vs. right) varied consistently and significantly as a function of the respondent’s moral reasoning. They also question the claim that conventional (stage 4) and principled (stage 5) moral reasoning are distinct levels of the socio-cognitive development. The nature of the relationship between the two is, however, unclear. It is possible that the liberal ideology is built in the measure of moral development; particularly the DIJ has been criticized for this reason (see Emler et al., 1998).

Another concern for the structure and content relation is the adaptability of the MJI to non-Western cultures. Huebner and Garrod (1993) studied moral reasoning of Tibetan Buddhist monks in Nepal using culturally adapted Kohlberg interviews. Even though the dilemmas appeared meaningful for the respondents and the clear developmental pattern was found in all three respondent groups representing different ages, the findings suggest that Kohl-
berg’s model has only a limited use in examining the moral reasoning of monks in the Buddhist culture. In particular, the issues of justice were not important as all in this sample whereas the concepts of karma and dharma as well as the role of compassion were considered as more salient issues and they, unfortunately, were not captured by Kohlberg’s theory and coding manual. It seemed, for example, that the concept of karma was understood in a developmentally different way by monks of different ages. It is argued therefore, that Kohlberg’s theory fails to capture the non-Western morality since it has defined morality and moral development in so narrow a way that it excludes the considerations of worldview. It is argued, that any discussion of morality is dependent upon the world in which one is to be moral. (Huebner & Garrod, 1991.)

6.2 Morality, convention and personal autonomy differentiation

Many studies document that religiosity influences people’s ways to judge social and moral phenomena. Turiel interprets the influence of religion to manifest that a religion is an important source of informational assumptions for religious people. If the informational assumptions were held the same, there would not be any variation between the moral and conventional judgments among different religious convictions and nonreligious persons. Turiel, as mentioned also earlier, does not consider the role of worldview as a coherent system, he prefers to define moral development as a process in which multiple sources of knowledge – including those stemming from culture, religion, and everyday social experiences – interact to create a complex moral landscape (Turiel & Neff, 2000).

Nucci (1985) (see also Nucci & Turiel, 1993) has compared Catholics’ and Amishes’ views of moral and nonmoral religious rules. The Amishes did not differentiate moral and nonmoral reli-
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6 Curiously Nucci (1985) places the prohibition of female priesthood within the conventional domain but it can be interpreted also as a moral transgression violating gender equality.
igious rules in the alterability criterion whereas the Catholics did. Only the generalizability criterion differentiated the Amish religious rules from the moral ones: nonmoral religious rules were not generalized outside the Amish religious community as contrast to moral rules. In addition, they used “moral” justifications of justice and welfare in moral issues and not in nonmoral religious rules. The second aim of the study was to clarify the boundaries of religious authorities. For the Amish the critical authority is God’s word that differentiated moral and nonmoral religious rules. The answers, however, showed that the Amish did not regard their religious rules to be purely conventional: 15 – 20% of over 12-year-olds answered that the different conceptions of the non-Amish people resulted from their ignorance of God’s word. In addition, they held that their rules were not applicable outside their community since it is constituted of people “chosen by God”.

Nucci and Turiel (1993) have studied also the conceptions of Conservative and Orthodox Jews on the issues of moral and religious rules. For the Conservative Jews religious rules did not differ from moral rules with regard to their alterability and the Orthodox Jews differentiated between them even less. Both groups, however, referred in the context of moral rules to justice and welfare whereas nonmoral religious rules were justified with social consensus and religious authorities.

Turiel and his colleagues (1991) have studied the conceptions of moral versus non-prototypical issues (abortion, homosexuality, incest and pornography) among the Catholic adolescents. The Catholics assess the nonprototypical issues in different terms from the moral issues: all the respondents answered that moral transgressions are wrong and that they should be prohibited by the law both in the U.S. and in other countries; in contrast, only 41% of the respondents answered that nonprototypical behaviors were wrong and 73% of them, respectively, stated that they should be allowed in the U.S. law and 53% said that they should be legal in other countries. The justifications for moral behaviors referred to justice and rights whereas judgments for non-prototypical behaviors were justified by religious normative assumptions. The ideology of one’s religious community, therefore, seems to bear more influence on the judgments of nonprototypical than moral issues.

The findings reveal that morality is an independent domain for the Jews, the Amish and the Catholics. Religious nonmoral rules,
in turn, seem to be qualitatively different from nonreligious ones: the religious groups regard the former as non-alterable by religious leaders and binding only inside the religious community. Also the nature of a religious community is reflected in judgments: the Amish who isolate from the surrounding U.S. society and lifestyle and hold strictly a literal interpretation of religious scriptures, judge their religious rules in more moral terms than the Catholics who participate actively in the mainstream society.

Glicksman (2000) studied moral judgments of Orthodox Jewish adolescents (from 13 to 18 years). Subjects were asked to evaluate moral religious rules, nonmoral religious rules and religious rules that conflict with secular moral ideals. The criteria of rule alterability, generalizability and contingency on God’s word were examined for each rule. Most respondents viewed prototypical moral rules as generalizable and not dependent on God’s word whereas nonmoral religious rules were regarded as non-generalizable and contingent on God’s word. Religious rules that conflicted with secular moral ideals elicited more complex evaluations and justifications: most subjects regarded these rules to be only applicable to adherents of their religion, and judged these rules as immoral if they were performed by the persons who were not Jewish. The author argues that religious rules cannot be adequately reduced into the domains of morality and social convention as previously argued by domain theorists (e.g., Nucci & Turiel, 1993).

Moreover, there is evidence that in addition to different understanding of morality and convention in religious and nonreligious contexts, the domain of personal autonomy could have moral features in the religious context. However, Turiel claims that the domain of personal autonomy can vary with the domain of social convention but not with the moral domain. Cohen and Rozin (2001) provide evidence from four studies that American Jews and Protestants differ in the moral import they attribute to mental states (honouring one’s parents, thinking about having a sexual affair and harming an animal). Although both religious groups rated the moral status of the actions equally, Protestants rated a person having inappropriate mental states more negatively than Jews did. These differences in moral judgment were partially mediated by Protestants’ beliefs that mental states are controllable and likely to lead to action and were strongly related to statements
that thoughts are morally relevant. These religious differences were not related to differences in collectivism (interdependency) and individualism (independency).

However, it is a controversial issue whether religious non-moral rules are conventions from the point of view of a religious person since these rules are derived from religious teachings and it is believed that God has handed them down. For that reason they are not considered to be products of social negotiation unlike prototypical social conventions. Furthermore, the idea to equate God’s word authority with nonreligious authorities like a president or a parliament is questionable since for a religious person God’s word resembles a “natural law”. However, Turiel argues that religious persons do regard God’s word in a similar way with other authorities: God’s word authority, according to him, does have limits, in the recognition of the validity of certain moral obligations even if they were not required by divine law (Turiel & Neff, 2000). Moreover, the domain theorists support the narrow definition of morality according to which informational assumptions play a role only in non-prototypical issues; not all religious practices can be explained as mediated by assumptions about reality. For example, Turiel and his colleagues regard religious rules that are contingent on God’s word and particular to their religion, as conventional. (Helwig et al., 1996.) Nevertheless, the finding that a remarkable part of persons belonging to different religious traditions do hold also moral rules as dependent on God’s word, demonstrates that there exists an alternative, religion- or God’s-word-based moral law.

6.3 Religion-based morality as the Ethic of Divinity

Cultural psychology put forward by Shweder argues that the rational moral code grounded on the belief in superhuman or godly being or in the idea that a human body is the dwelling site of the divine soul, is essentially different from the justice-based natural moral law underlying Kohlberg’s (1984) theory of moral judgment. Therefore Shweder argues that the religion-based Ethic of Divinity is a neglected moral code in the cognitive-developmental
framework. Shweder has documented that the Hindu Indian moral code, expressed in the moral judgments of the Hindu priests living in Bhubaneswar in India, grounded on the notion of karma, cannot be translated to the Western conception of morality. Shweder argues that the former is the example of the moral code that is grounded on the idea that in the world there exist divine beings. Thus the divinity-based moral code functions differently from the nonreligious moral code. (See Shweder et al., 1987.)

However, the Ethic of Divinity is not only limited to non-European or non-North-American contexts. As discussed in the context of moral emotions (p. 66), disgust is a moral emotion associated with the Ethic of Divinity moral violations. It was associated with bodily violations and secretions that originally were associated with the animal aspects of humans; there is also the subtype of sociomoral disgust associated with the disapproval of immoral acts. All these associations still prevail in the U.S. and Europe and also among nonreligious persons. (Rozin et al., 1999; Haidt et al., 1997.) Moreover, the sexual morality and potentially self-harming behaviors such as alcohol use have traditionally been associated with the Christian Ethic of Divinity, as also discussed before (p. 100). Yet, nonreligious North Americans and Europeans still associate health and morality, when moralizing personal lifestyles – eating habits and physical exercise, in a manner that is not so far away from the Hindu Ethic of Divinity idea of the body and soul purity (Shweder et al., 1998).

Another evidence for the claim that there exist multiple moralities, is the persistence of the culture wars in the U.S. and lately also on a more global level, between “Western” and “non-Western” moral values, the controversy that somehow culminated in the attack to the Twin Towers in New York in September 11, 2001. Hersh and Haidt (1999) argue that the current culture war in the U.S. between the conservatives and the liberals cannot be interpreted with the differing informational assumptions suggested by domain theorists. Instead they argue that it is a real intercultural conflict that results from the fact that the opponents hold different moral systems. Also Jensen (1997b) found out that a “culture war” is evident between the moral thinking of “orthodox” and “progressivist” Baptists, the former focusing on the Ethic of Divinity and the latter on the Ethic of Autonomy. In the study of Hersh and Haidt (1999), the politically conservative students moralized (i.e.,
universalised) and condemned unusual but harmless sexual acts (e.g., consensual sex between siblings) more frequently than the liberal students did. The study revealed that the liberals used predominantly the Ethic of Autonomy whereas the conservatives held a broader and more multifaceted conception of morality that included, in addition to the Ethic of Autonomy, also the Ethic of Community and Divinity. The Ethic of Community contained two issues that were important for the conservatives: focus on issues of teleological conception of social roles and a fear of social degeneration. The conservatives perceived sexuality as a vertical dimension where God and purity dwell at the upper end, and carnality and sin at the lower end.

Belzen (1999) who studied a group of experience-oriented conservative Calvinists in the Netherlands from the cultural psychological perspective, argues that in heterogeneous societies religion is not always the same thing everywhere and for everyone: therefore it is important to study how a given religion works psychologically. The Ethic of Divinity may work differently in different religions and with different degrees of religious conviction. In fact, Jensen (1998) compared moral conceptions of Orthodox and Progressivist religious persons in India and the United States. In both countries Progressivists used the Ethic of Autonomy more than the Orthodoxes, who in turn used the Ethic of Divinity more than Progressivists did. In both countries the Orthodoxes and the Progressivists used the Ethic of Community in a similar way. There were also similarities between the cultures of the U.S. and India: in both countries the Orthodox considered that God is responsible for the existence of a human being whereas the Progressivists concentrated on this world. There were also religious tradition-based differences: “Abrahamic” religions emphasized the role of God as a judge. The Americans used the Ethic of Autonomy more than Indians. They had also different conceptions of the society: for the Orthodox the source of the society is sacred but for the Progressivists the society is a social system.
6.4 Does religious morality exist? Some conclusions

Traditionally sociologists and anthropologists have combined morality and worldview but psychologists such as the cognitive-developmentals have separated the two (Jensen, 1997a). This issue underlies also in the dispute between the cognitive-developmental and the cultural psychological views on moral development. The Kohlbergian approach focused on the relation of the A- or B-orientations and the level of moral judgment. On the other hand, in Turiel’s scheme the possible content-structure relation is reflected in the variation among the interpretation of moral, conventional and personal events. Studies that explored the religious moral conceptions applying the Shweder Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity reveal that religious persons hold a divinity-based moral conception that is different from the nonreligious Ethic of Autonomy. But if the Shweder Ethics represent the differences on content side of moral judgment between religious and nonreligious persons, does the content have a relation to its structural side?

The findings of the Kohlberg MJI and Rest’s DIT regarding the division of the structure and the content of moral judgment were inconsistent. One possible explanation to these findings is that religions are multifaceted and may have different influence on the structural side of moral judgment. On the other hand, the studies applying Turiel’s domain scheme reveal a consistent pattern in the structure-content division. Religious persons do perceive their religious principles that are interpreted as conventional among nonreligious persons, as moral, but frequently only applicable to their moral community. Limiting the applicability to one’s moral community, however, was associated to the degree of separation from the surrounding society the religious communities endorsed. Moreover, studies also reported that for many religious persons moral conceptions depend on God’s word.

The findings carried out in Turiel’s scheme, in fact, confirm the claim underlying the Shweder Ethics: the “nonmoral” practices having a religious significance are not interpreted as social conventions – the pattern characteristic of the Ethic of Divinity. In particular, social conventions turn in a religious context into something that represents Shweder’s idea of context-dependent moral-
ity (Shweder et al., 1987). Similarly, religious moral conceptions as dependent on God’s word do not exactly fit into Turiel’s moral domain. Moreover, at least in some religious contexts, the personal autonomy domain has some features peculiar to the moral domain. However, the domain division as well as the nature of the domains themselves was strongly particular to the moral communities studied.

The incoherent findings in Kohlbergian scheme regarding the content-structure division may suggest that the particularities, called either informational assumptions (Wainryb & Turiel, 1993; 1995) or cultural propositions (Shweder & Miller, 1985) characterising various religious worldviews should be identified and their influence analysed. Turiel’s way, as a contrast, reflects a clear interdependence between structure and content, when applied in a religious context. Turiel’s scheme may be more sensitive to differences of worldview than Kohlberg’s measure, since, as also discussed before, Turiel’s scheme focuses on the lower level of abstraction. At the level of explicit societal norm violations and the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview is destined to be context-bound every time it is carried out. This pattern can be also interpreted as manifesting that the structural aspects measured in the Kohlberg MJRI are more independent of content whereas the structural features underlying Turiel’s domain division are more intertwined with cultural and contextual particularities.

Presently only the structure and its variation across contexts, has been the focus of interest. From now on, there is a call for an emphasis of the contextual variation on the content side. According to Miller (1999) it is possible that the Ethics vary according to the content of the issue to be judged. For example in the U.S., conservatives may use the Ethic of Autonomy in the issue of permitting to carry guns and the Ethic of Divinity in the issue of abortion.

Anyhow, there is a need for the development of the theoretical model that links moral judgments and worldview in a comprehensive and thorough way. In fact, Jensen (1997a) has developed a model that combines moral judgments, worldview and moral behavior. In her model, the moral judgment is grounded on worldview. Moral behavior, in turn, maintains the worldview. An important element in the worldview is the two-dimensional definition of the person: the first dimension is called dependence-
independence and the second, hierarchy-equality. However, Dien (1997) maintains that the cultural psychological model of worldview-based morality does not yet take into account that there are also in-between worldviews. Moreover, the role of social conventions and the degree of emotional involvement and depth of conviction regarding particular issues should be included in the model. Also Blasi (1984) links the variation of importance of moral concerns in people’s lives to various moral identities which have diverging core ideals which could be compassion for one person, fairness to another, obedience to somebody and moral freedom to someone else. Blasi argues that the conception of moral identity can also explain the link between moral thinking and behavior better than the present mainstream cognitive-developmental theories. This link, according to him, consists of four steps: (1) Global moral structures are structured in social interaction and reflect the shared conception of social reality, which is open to change by new, complementary experiences. (2) Global moral structures function as a model for the construction of more concrete ideals of behavior. (3) This, in turn, leads to the construction of ideal moral self that leads to the moralization of the self and personality. (4) Finally, the self becomes the source of concrete moral judgments. In fact, this idea is close to Shweder’s et al. (1997) formulation of the “Big Three” Ethics that is constructed on the highest moral “core” principle is associated with the cultural conception of the person.
VII
RESEARCH HYPOTHESES,
METHODS AND DATA USED
IN THE PRESENT STUDY

The basic assumption underlying this study is that persons are socialized into their worldviews and it is therefore part of their personal representation of the Finnish culture. Since a person’s worldview is grounded on certain assumptions about human nature, society and world, this study assumes that also the personal conceptions of morality and rule systems reflects these underlying assumptions – the purpose of morality and rule systems, indeed, is to regulate and restrict individuals' behavior in society.

The present study intends to shed light on the issue how religiosity or nonreligiosity is related to the conceptions of morality and rule systems comparing the judgments of adolescents holding religious and nonreligious worldviews. The respondents were selected so that they represent contrasting worldviews in the religiosity – nonreligiosity dimension. In this sense, the respondents consist of three groups: Conservative Laestadians represent a conservative religious ideology and as a contrast, adolescents who do not belong to any religious community and who study the “philosophy of life” instead of religion at school hold a nonreligious ideology.

Moreover, since these two groups represent minorities in Finland, to increase the generalizability of the findings, the Evangelical Lutheran adolescents were also included in the study. Gallup polls portray this majority as very nonreligious in general so they can be assumed to be ideologically near to adolescents without a religious community membership. On the other hand,
the Conservative Laestadian movement is a part of the Evangelical Lutheran church so the official ideology of these two groups should be similar. However, their commitment to the religious community is very different.

This chapter is constructed as follows. First I present exploratory research problems (responding to the data-based demand of this study) and theory-based hypotheses\(^7\). After that I describe the data collection procedure and the methods used. Then I move to the methods of analysis and the definition of variables. In the end, I describe the data from the viewpoint of the main background variables. For practical reasons, the Evangelical Lutherans are referred to as EL, the adolescents without a religious community membership to as NR, and the Conservative Laestadians to as CL.

### 7.1 Research problems and hypotheses

**7.1.1 The Kohlberg Moral Judgment Interview**

Research problem.
How do the EL, NR and CL resolve hypothetical moral dilemmas?

Hypotheses.

1. It is hypothesized that religious respondents use the heteronomous A-orientation more frequently than nonreligious respondents.
2. Even though previous studies have presented an inconsistent picture on the relationship between conservative religiosity and the level of moral judgment, it is assumed, based on the original idea of Kohlberg, that the content and structure of moral reasoning should not have a relation, in other words, religiosity and the orientations do not correlate with the developmental stages.

\(^7\) The hypotheses, methods and results are presented in the order of the theoretical section of this study. The interview followed a different order (Appendices 18 in Finnish and 20 in English): Kohlberg MJI, Cultural-Religious dilemmas and the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview.
7.1.2 The Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview

Research problems.
What kind of domain differentiation do the EL, NR and CL make? How are the domain differentiation and contextuality dimensions (defined in Chapter 7.3.3.3) related to each other? How are justifications related to the perceived degree of morality of the rule?

Hypotheses.

(2.1) The findings of Turielian studies related to religious worldview are open to a variety of interpretations (see Chapter III) but it is assumed, based on the previous findings that religious respondents differentiate between moral and non-moral rule transgressions less than nonreligious respondents on the criteria of alterability (by authorities) and generalizability (to other countries).

(2.2) It is expected that for religious respondents the moral quality of rules is contingent on God’s word whereas for non-religious respondents morality is a universal and non-contingent sphere of social knowledge.

(2.3) It is also assumed that the relatively strong state regulation of nonmoral prudential behaviors, exemplified by such issues as alcohol use and marriage vs. cohabitation (see Chapter 5.1) bears influence on the judgment style so that both religious and nonreligious Finnish respondents justify their evaluations of nonmoral rules in a more “moral” way (using other than purely conventional justifications) than nonreligious North Americans.

(2.4) Based on the strong in-group – out-group differentiation made by the CL as well as on the results of many previous studies (of the Amish and the Orthodox Jews), it is hypothesized that the CL make a greater in-group – out-group differentiation in nonmoral religious rules than the EL and NR.

(2.5) The Open Question. It is hypothesized that the CL hold a moral conception contingent on God's word whereas the EL and NR evaluate morality as a universalizable domain distinct from authorities.
7.1.3 The Shweder Ethics

**Research problem.**
What is the cultural construction of the Shweder Ethics in Finland and among the EL, NR and CL in particular? How are the Ethics related to one another?

**Hypotheses.**

(3.1) It is hypothesised that religious respondents use the Ethic of Divinity more frequently than nonreligious respondents and that the Ethic of Divinity is the dominant Ethic for religious respondents.

(3.2) It is also hypothesized that since Finland is a Westernised country that has absorbed the ideology of individualism, the Ethic of Autonomy would be the dominant Ethic for nonreligious respondents.

(3.3) Based on previous studies it is assumed that there will be no religious ideology-based differences in the use of the Ethic of Community.

(3.4) It is also assumed that the Finnish (or the North European) welfare state conception of state responsibility of its citizens’ physical and psychological well-being (see the discussion in Chapter 5.1) bears the influence on the judgment style so that both religious and nonreligious Finnish respondents justify their evaluations of nonmoral rules using the Ethic of Community more frequently than nonreligious North Americans.

(3.5) Based on the argument of Hersh & Haidt (1999) that the holders of the conservative ideology are in a moral minority in the U.S. and presumably also in Finland, it is hypothesized that the users of the Ethic of Divinity discourse use a broader range of the Ethics than the Ethic of Autonomy holders who hold the moral majority status.

---

7.1.4 Integrative analysis

**Research problem.**
How are the findings obtained using the Kohlberg, Turiel and Shweder methods, respectively, related to each other?
Hypotheses.

(4.1) It is hypothesized that the Shweder Ethic of Autonomy correlates with the Kohlberg B-orientation and the Shweder Ethic of Divinity correlates with the Kohlberg A-orientation. This hypothesis is based on first, Kohlberg’s idea that the ideal postconventional morality is a successful integration of both the perspective of the self as well as of the society. Second, an analysis of the content of the Shweder Ethics, suggests that the Ethic of Autonomy represents Kohlberg’s idea of the perspective of the self and the Shweder Ethic of Community corresponds to Kohlberg’s perspective of the society. Similarly, based on an analysis of Piaget’s characterizations for the Heteronomous morality or the Kohlberg A-orientation, it is argued that the criteria nr. 1, 2, and 4 for the Heteronomous morality (see Chapter 2.1.1) characterize also the Shweder Ethic of Divinity.

(4.2) It is hypothesized that the Shweder Ethic of Autonomy makes Turiel’s differentiation of moral and nonmoral rules whereas the Ethic of Divinity does not make such a differentiation.

(4.3) Following the findings of Vasquez et al. (2001), it is hypothesized that the Ethic of Autonomy is associated with greater universalization and context-independence than the Ethics of Community and Divinity.

(4.4) It is expected that the differentiation of moral and nonmoral rules is not related to Kohlberg’s moral developmental stages since Turiel maintains that the domain differentiation is not a result of development.

(4.5) It is hypothesized that the Kohlberg A- and B-orientations, in turn, have a link to the differentiation between Turielian moral and nonmoral rules in such a way that the users of the A-orientation do not differentiate them whereas the users of the B-orientation differentiate between moral and nonmoral rules (see the hypothesis 4.2).

(4.6) It is expected that the Shweder Ethics do not have a developmental order, e.g., they do not correlate with the Kohlberg MJI WAS score.
7.2 Data collection

I had decided to compare Evangelical Lutherans, adolescents without a religious community membership and Conservative Laestadians with the intention to collect semi-structured interviews. I kept the sample size as 30, consisting of three groups of 10 respondents with equal numbers of both sexes in each group. Moreover, I wanted to keep the educational level, living area and age constant: I looked for adolescents who were doing their second year in gymnasium, living in the Oulu region and who were born in 1978.

I decided to collect the research material from two gymnasias in Oulu\(^8\) since it was the easiest place to find respondents to all three groups (Conservative Laestadian movement is concentrated around the city of Oulu). Both gymnasias were usual in the sense that they did not emphasize any special subjects in their curricula and they were not “elite” gymnasias. First I contacted the headmasters and teachers of religion or philosophy of life in all ordinary gymnasia in Oulu region. It turned out that the groups of persons who study philosophy of life were always extremely small. There was only one school where it was possible to find ten students of the Philosophy of life who, furthermore, consisted of five girls and five boys. In addition, there was only one school where it was possible to find enough (at least five girls and five boys) students who were members of the Conservative Laestadian movement. I decided to choose these two schools. Before going to interview I had cooperated with teachers of the selected gymnasia to find volunteers for the study who fulfilled the criteria (the religious membership criterion, the year of birth). It was also emphasized that the students were going to be interviewed anonymously; their names were not going to be registered.

In addition to the interviews, the respondents filled a questionnaire that was designed to collect relevant background information (Appendices 10 in Finnish and 12 in English). Both the interview and questionnaire data were collected in January 1996. The total number of respondents is 30. There are ten persons in each world-

---

\(^8\) Oulu is the sixth biggest city of Finland with around 123 000 inhabitants (situation in January 1, 2002) and it is located in Northern Finland, around 600 km to the north of Helsinki (the capital).
view group and there are equal numbers of boys and girls in all
groups. The interviews were carried out in empty classrooms or in
the school library during the lessons, only an interviewer and an
interviewee were present. The researcher carried out the inter-
views. The interviews were tape-recorded. The length of the inter-
vews varied greatly, from around 30 minutes to more than 90
minutes. The tape-recorded interviews were transcribed with the
precision level of words.

In practice the groups of the CL and the NR consist of all the
students born in 1978 and doing their second year of gymnasium
that were found in those schools and were willing to participate in
the study. One student in the CL group was born in October 1977
but has the same number of the years of school as the others.
Moreover, one CL participant refused to continue the interview
and we agreed to replace this participant with another CL of the
same sex who was born in 1978 but was doing the third year of
gymnasium. The group of EL was selected from the same school
as the NR (philosophy of life students) and they were randomly
selected from the group of volunteers. It is possible that there is
some bias in this group based on the motivation to participate in
the study, since the other groups were in practice more “obliged”
to participate (because the total group size among them was the
same as the selected study group). On the other hand, I can gen-
eralize the results of the NR and CL more confidently since the
sample represents all students in those schools born in that year.

7.2.1 Methods of data collection

Traditionally an empirical study in psychology has strived toward
a singular truth. However, cultural constructionists argue that there
should be a particular investment in methods that generate multi-
plicity as opposed to singularity (Gergen & Gergen, 1997). In this
study the conceptions of morality and rule systems are studied
using a multi-methodological approach.

The research methods are always dependent on the research
problem and on the nature of knowledge that a researcher expects
to extract from the data. Therefore the research methods have to
be associated with the research hypotheses and theoretical as-
sumptions of the study. Since the theories of Kohlberg, Turiel and
Shweder make up the theoretical background of this study, also the methods of data collection and analysis are grounded on these theories. The interviews of this study are divided into three parts (see the complete interview question set in Appendices 9 in Finnish and 11 in English). The first part is the Kohlberg Moral Judgment Interview. The second part uses the method developed by Turiel and is throughout this study referred to as the “Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview”. This section will to be analysed in two parts: the evaluations will be analysed in Turielian way whereas justifications will be analysed using the Shweder Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity. The third part consists of dilemmas constructed by me for this study, built on the contrasts between the Shweder Ethics.

The interview material was constructed on the comparison of different data collection methods. The differences between the Kohlberg MJI and, on the other hand, Turiel’s and Shweder’s method, are due to the fact that they employ different definitions of morality and social convention. The multiplicity of definitions of morality is one of the central problems in the social psychological study on morality. Researchers emphasize different aspects of moral thinking, which could explain why their findings seem to contradict with each other. It is also important to keep in mind that even though Kohlberg and Turiel share similar underlying assumptions of the cognitive-developmental approach their criteria for a genuinely moral judgment differ: Kohlberg asks his respondents to morally justify the structure of the social system whereas Turiel is satisfied when respondents provide an argument of the rightness or wrongness of some act. The simplicity of Turiel’s method is an advantage since it relies less on the respondent’s ability to articulate what is in his/her mind than Kohlberg’s method. However, the differences between Kohlberg and Turiel have led to a situation where the results of the two methods are not straightforwardly commensurable with each other. Therefore the comparative analysis of the Kohlberg and Turiel (and Shweder) methods is an important task that has not been done before.

The respondents also filled a questionnaire (see Appendices 11 and 13), asking for basic information such as gender, year of birth, religious community membership of the parents, number of siblings and school performance. In addition, there were sets of questions that measured respondents’ religious beliefs and behavior.
These questions were formulated from studies of Helve (1993) and Lehtinen (1988).

The number of respondents in this study is intentionally kept small. To collect and typewrite tape-recorded interviews is a very arduous project so the number of respondents is inevitably smaller than in questionnaire data. Therefore the generalizability of this study to larger populations is limited. However, the research objective of this study was to study participants multimethodologically and multitheoretically, to compare and integrate various theories of moral development, thus the interest in present study was not the generalizability in this dimension. Therefore it was regarded as more important to gather more information from each participant rather than to collect data of a large population. As a result, the interviews are methodologically and theoretically multifaceted: there is much information regarding the judgment style of each respondent.

7.2.1.1 The Kohlberg MJI

The section of the interview questions that is related to Kohlberg’s theory consists of two moral dilemmas from the Kohlberg Moral Judgment Interview. Turiel and Shweder use a method called the clinical interview in their studies and also the Kohlberg MJI (the moral judgment interview) has been developed from the clinical interview method. Piaget (1928) had introduced the clinical interview method to obtain research material that could illuminate the structure of respondents’ thinking. As one of the founders of the cognitive-developmental approach, Piaget was especially interested in the development of the cognitive structure of thinking. The clinical interview consists of tasks that are based on the research problem under investigation and of an interview that consists of previously defined questions that are based on the research hypothesis. The interview questions in the clinical interview are determined by the research problem and their purpose is to bring forth that aspect of the structure of respondents’ thinking that the researcher is interested in. (see also Turiel, 1983, 23 – 25.)

Kohlberg has used the standardised Moral Judgment Interview (MJI) to measure respondents’ developmental level of moral judgment. The MJI consists of hypothetical moral dilemmas that are stories where two moral values are in conflict. I used a short
version of Form A that consisted of the most commonly used
“Heinz” and “Police Officer Brown” dilemmas. I chose them since
they have been used also before in the Finnish context and, more-
over, their Finnish translation was readily available. In general, it
is recommended that the MJI consist of a full set of three dilem-
mas to reach a greater reliability of the scores. However, I decided
to choose the short version since the interviews in general were
lengthy and the hypothetical, dilemmatic interview questions were
supposed to be demanding for the respondents.

I used the coding manual developed by Colby et al. (1987) to
code the structure and content of reasoning. The task of a respon-
dent is to solve the moral dilemma by choosing the moral value
that is more important or valuable for him/her. In each dilemma of
the MJI the conflicting moral values correspond either to the
moral orientation A (heteronomous obedience) or the orientation
B (autonomous justice). For example, in the well-known Heinz
dilemma the solution that is in accordance with the orientation B is
to argue that Heinz should steal the expensive drug for his wife
who suffers from cancer from the greedy chemist who has in-
vented the drug since saving someone’s life is more important
than obeying laws. The respondent who supports the orientation A
would answer that the right thing for Heinz to do is not to steal the
drug since one has to obey the laws in all situations. The inter-
views are coded with the Colby et al. (ibid.) coding manual: an-
swers are matched with the “prototype judgments” that represent
the stages.

7.2.1.2 The Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview and the
Shweder Ethics

The specific objectives of research projects that are based on the
theoretical frameworks of Turiel and Shweder are varied but all of
them have focused on specifying at least two dimensions: evalua-
tions and justifications. Both dimensions help to clarify the do-
main (moral, conventional, personal) in different ways. There are
several dimensions that have been studied so far in addition to the
evaluation of an act (whether the act is right or wrong): obligator-
iness; alterability; generalizability vs. relativity; and contingency
on social consensus, existing rules, authorities, general practices
and personal jurisdiction. (Turiel, 1983, 52; Turiel et al., 1991.)
However, the discussion about the role of these criteria in determining the domain division is ongoing among moral psychologists. Which justifications can be regarded as moral or conventional, is also an unresolved issue between Turiel and Shweder.

In practice the Turiel Rule Transgression Interview presents a respondent a set of norm violations. The researcher asks respondent a set of criterion questions such as whether it is possible to change the rule (alterability), if authorities can change the rule (contingency on authority), whether it is alright in another country to perform the act if they do not have any restrictive norms regarding the act (generalizability), or how seriously the norm violation can be regarded (the seriousness of the act).

It is also required that a respondent provides justifications for each evaluation. Researchers, however, have not defined any norm which criteria are necessary in every study and until now their selection has depended on research interests. The advantage of this method is that it does not require of a respondent as high level of verbal skills as the Kohlberg Moral Judgment Interview does.

In the present study the interview questions related to the theories of Turiel and Shweder consist of ten norm violations; three were previously defined as moral and seven as nonmoral. The same format is often used in the Turiel and Shweder studies. In practice these interview questions followed the studies of Nucci (1985) and Nucci and Turiel (1993) that investigated Catholic, Amish and Jewish samples.

The rule transgression interview in the present study consists of the following norm violations:

**Moral issues:**
1. stealing
2. religion-based discrimination
3. inequality between men and women

**Nonmoral issues:**
4. making (presently Evangelical Lutheran) moral education in schools nonreligious
5. allowing the use and sale of marihuana
6. relaxing the censorship of TV and video programs
7. allowing shops to be open on Sundays
(8) making the legal status of cohabitation and marriage equal
(9) allowing the sale of wines in food shops
(10) making contraceptive pills prescription-free if it is proven first that they do not cause health problems.

I had to use many criteria to select norm violations. Moral norm violations had to be such that both Turiel and Shweder regard them as clearly moral. The selection of nonmoral norm violations was more difficult since Lutherans, Laestadians and nonreligious persons live in slightly different norm systems. They had to be such that the Evangelical Lutheran church, the Conservative Laestadian movement and the Finnish law regulate them with some norm so that all groups could understand them as norm violations. Second, it was required that there is a lack of social consensus about the regulation of these acts in Finland. Third, these rules should not be unambiguously only religious or societal so the respondents could freely interpret them as they wanted.

Even though I use the terms “moral” and “nonmoral”, I do not mean that these rules are inherently moral or nonmoral. The definitions are grounded on previous studies. In this study, as opposed to Turiel’s (1983) domain theory, it is not hypothesized that moral rules are automatically separated from nonmoral rules. The division was made so that the findings could be compared with the other studies that assume that the domain differentiation exists.

The criteria (asked within each norm violation) in this study were:

(1) **alterability** that included three questions:
(1.1) societal authority (the Parliament),
(1.2) church authority (the Evangelical Lutheran church for the Lutherans and the persons without a church membership; and the administrative of the Conservative Laestadian movement for the Laestadians), and
(1.3) God’s word authority.
(2) **generalizability** (to other countries that do not regulate the act with norms).

The alterability questions were formulated this way: “If the [societal, religious] authority decides to remove the rule of [e.g., stealing], would it be wrong or alright? Why?” The God’s word au-
The authority question was asked this way: “If there was nothing written in the Bible of [e.g., stealing], would it be alright then? Why?” The generalizability question was presented this way: “If there is no rule of [e.g., stealing] in the other country, would [stealing] be alright then? Why?” Unlike the previous studies by Nucci (1985) and Nucci and Turiel (1993), here the conceptions of nonreligious and religious authorities are compared in the same study.

Why only the alterability and generalizability dimensions were chosen, there were many reasons. First, these are the major defining criteria which separate morality and convention (Turiel, 1983; Shweder et al. 1987, see also Chapter 3.6). Second, the interview would have risked becoming too monotonous if there had been more criterion questions. Third, since this study also examined the justifications which is not the case in all studies, the control of only two criteria was not regarded as a limitation. It is important to study the spontaneous use of other criteria and they did emerge numerously in the justifications (34 moral and 3 other justification categories).

The second part of the rule questions is the so-called Open Question adopted from philosophy. It was asked only about the “moral” issues and its purpose was to find out if God’s command can make a morally wrong act morally right. It was formulated this way: “If God gives a command to a human being that (s)he should [steal, discriminate on religious grounds, and treat men and women unequally], would it be wrong or alright? Why?” Also this question was adopted from previous studies that focused on the relation of religious ideology and conceptions of rule systems (Nucci, 1985; Nucci & Turiel, 1993).

I decided to collect the data by interviewing the respondents like Nucci and Turiel (1993) did. The other option would have been to use questionnaires in a way that Nucci (1985) did. The reason for this choice was that there are no previous studies in Finland that have used Turiel’s and Shweder’s theories as a starting point. However, there is a Finnish study of children’s conceptions of authorities (Horppu, 1995) but from a different theoretical point of view. If I had used a ready-made questionnaire that was developed in another country, with predefined answer options, it

---

9 the respondents already had to evaluate 10 rules in 4 contexts plus three Open Question evaluations and justify each evaluation
would have remained unclear whether it captures Finnish conceptions of rule systems. In particular, since this study intends to study cultural differences and variations, a data collection method cannot be adopted from another culture especially if it contains a predefined set of answers for respondents. In an interview a respondent can express original ideas and interviewee can ask additional questions. In addition, in an interview a researcher can influence the quality of the data: if respondents misunderstand a question, an interviewer can explain it again, and if respondents are silent, a skilled interviewer can help them to express their thoughts by formulating questions in a different way – without leading respondents to answer in a certain way. The half-structured style of the interviews ensures that every interview answers all the main questions of the study.

### 7.2.1.3 The Shweder Ethics in conflict: cultural-ethical dilemmas

The third part consisted of dilemmas that were formulated for the purposes of this study. They were designed as dilemmas between the Shweder Ethics of Autonomy, Community, and Divinity. In other words, the dilemmas depicted situations where different worldviews held by persons create conflicting understanding of social practices. I wanted to study how respondents argue about those practices that are explicitly grounded on religious or nonreligious beliefs. These kinds of dilemmas are common in multicultural societies where it is assumed that pluralistic existence of different religions as well as nonreligious worldviews is possible. I wanted to examine if there is an underlying pattern of multicultur-alism vs. “uni-culturalism” that is associated with respondents’ worldviews. The dilemmas are presented in the Appendices 9 (in Finnish) and 11 (in English).

The first dilemma concerns ethnic Muslim minority living in France that endorses the absolute separation of religions and the state. The dilemma refers to a real case that deals with the controversy over the permissibility of head scarves for Muslim girls while in school and the relative inequality between Muslims, Jewish and Christians in the French context, as far as their public expressions of religious conviction is concerned. In a well-publicized dispute that began in 1989, three teenage Muslim girls living in a
town north of Paris were expelled from their gymnasium because they refused to remove their headscarves. In 1994, in response to continuing controversy over the issue, the French education minister issued a directive that headscarves would not be permitted in state educational institutions. However, this rule seems to have left room for wearing a yarmulke (a Jewish religious sign) or a crucifix (a Christian religious sign), while barring the headscarf. (Ewing, 2000.)

The second dilemma depicts a story of a Christian missionary going to an indigenous, non-Christian population who from time to time suffers from a paralysing disease. The issue refers to traditional Christian missionary practice to motivate non-Christian populations to adopt Christian religion by aggressive methods as was the case in the continents of America, or simply by building hospitals or schools (e.g., Malinowski, 1943; Axtell, 1978). It calls into question also whether only the existence of “Western” cultural models and religion (Christianity) are justified, or alternatively, whether also indigenous, “non-modern” cultural systems still have the right to maintain their lifestyle.

Both dilemmas consisted of the reading of the dilemma story to the participants and after reading the story, the interview continued with presenting probe questions that were associated with the dilemma story (see Appendices 9 in Finnish and 11 in English for the complete dilemma stories). Both evaluations and justifications were collected.

7.3 Analysis of the data and description of the variables

In this chapter I describe the data analysis process and how I constructed the variables. All the variables are also described and defined in detail in the Variables list (Appendix 2). When I discuss the respondent groups, I use the abbreviations, EL referring to the Evangelical Lutherans, NR to the adolescents without a religious community membership and CL to the Conservative Laestadians.
7.3.1 The background variables

I used several background variables collected with the questionnaire (Appendices 19 in Finnish and 21 in English), e.g., sex, school performance or number of siblings. I report here only those variables that I transformed, e.g., the scale conversions and sum variables.

An important measure that implies role-taking opportunities – a frequently used explanation for the variation in the level of moral judgment (Helkama & Ikonen, 1986) – is the questionnaire question no. 22 "Do you belong to some society, study group or association?" Since this question was open-ended and the sample size small, I decided to count the number of society memberships each respondent mentioned. It made up the variable *Number of society memberships* or MEMBER. The empirical range of MEMBER was 0 – 3 (M = 0.47, SD= 0.73) in the whole sample. Four CL had mentioned their religious community in this question but I excluded it since it was asked separately elsewhere in the questionnaire.

Another interesting issue was whether the frequency of discussing moral, religious or political issues with family and friends influences respondents' judgment style. The questions no. 27 and 28 in the questionnaire measured the frequency of discussing the issues. I converted the scales so that a higher value means a higher discussion frequency.

Knowing that respondents belong to certain religious communities provides some kind of assumption of their religiosity but in this study I did not want to rely on this assumption only. Since I wanted to examine religiosity as directly as possible I included sets of questions on it in the questionnaire. Persons can belong to religious communities because of family relations even though they would not be religious themselves.

To make a sum variable for measuring religiosity there were many options available: initially I was considering making a measure of "habitual religiosity" which would have been composed of the questions of no. 16 a – d in the questionnaire (I left the “e” question out since most of the respondents had left it blank) and another measure of “internal religiosity” which would have consisted of the questions no. 29 a – g. These two measures formed, however, both separately and together very reliable sum
variables (Cronbach’s alphas were 0.79 for the “habitual religiosity” measure and 0.98 for the “internal religiosity” measure). The correlation of these two measures was also very high (r = 0.84, p < 0.001) which indicated that they probably measured the same thing. For this reason I decided to combine them into a single measure. I also added into the sum variable the issues of “Prayer” (question no. 25) and “Reading the Bible” (question no. 18 a) since they measured personal religious behavior. At this moment I felt that the measure of religiosity was as comprehensive as possible (comprising habitual religiosity, internal religiosity and private religious behavior). I also converted all the values of the chosen 13 variables (1 → 5, 2 → 4, and so on) so that higher values in the religiosity sum variable would indicate higher religiosity. Cronbach’s alpha of the final version of the religiosity measure was 0.97 that can be regarded as very satisfactory. The range of this Empirical religiosity score or RELIGION was 13 – 56 (M = 33.53; SD = 15.59).

### 7.3.2 The Kohlberg Moral Judgment Interview

This study used a short version of the Kohlberg MJI, Form A that normally consists of three dilemmas but I chose only two (“Heinz” and “Police Officer Brown”). They were analysed using the standard procedure, described in detail in Colby and Kohlberg (1987) coding manual. For the analysis of the structure of moral judgments, the GSS and the WAS scores were calculated.

The orientation or content of the dilemmas was analysed in the following way. According to the coding guidelines, if one of the dilemmas is scored into the A-orientation the whole interview is scored into the A-orientation. However, since one of my research purposes was to explore the possible parallelisms of the Kohlberg A- and B-orientations and the Shweder Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity, I decided to present the results of the Kohlberg orientations in a way that is similar to the Shweder Ethics (of Autonomy, Community and Divinity), so that the divergent ways of computing the use of the orientations and the Ethics would not bias the comparisons between them. Therefore I decided to show the use of the orientations in both dilemmas separately. I coded the orientations as follows: 0 = A orientation in
both dilemmas, 0.5 = A orientation in one and B orientation in one dilemma and 1 = B orientation in both dilemmas. The range of the A/B orientation variable was thus 0 – 1.

Another trained scorer scored the justifications for reliability. Ten randomly selected interviews were scored for the GSS with an inter-rate agreement of 90% and for the content (the A- and the B-orientations) 80% when the two dilemmas were analysed separately, and 90% when the two dilemmas were assigned an overall orientation.

7.3.3 Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview

7.3.3.1 The analysis of evaluations

The analysis of the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview is divided into two parts: evaluations and justifications are analysed separately. This procedure was similar to other studies carried out in Turiel’s and Shweder’s research tradition.

First I discuss the analysis of the evaluations of the rules\textsuperscript{10}. In practice, I asked evaluations of ten rules and each rule evaluation consisted of evaluations of four criterion questions, discussed later as “contexts”\textsuperscript{11}. I assigned value 1 to the answer “it’s all right to commit an act”, and 3 to “it’s wrong”. Within each rule evaluation a significant proportion (ranging from 6.7% to 15%) of answers were not clearly identifiable into these categories (e.g., “it’s both right and wrong”, “it is not right and wrong” or “it depends”). These answers were coded as 2. If the value was > 2, the rule was interpreted as “moral” and if the value was \( \leq 2 \), the rule was labelled as “nonmoral”.

The basic unit can thus be defined as a rule evaluation within a context (range 1 – 3) of an individual respondent. If the variables are structured as a cross-tabulation where the rules are on the rows and the contexts on the columns (Figure 2 in Appendix 3),

\textsuperscript{10} The analysis of justifications is described separately in Chapter 7.3.4; I applied the Shweder Ethic on them.

\textsuperscript{11} The contexts were “Government”, “Church” and “God’s word” authorities and “Generalizability to other countries”.
one evaluation is the observation placed in one cell of this cross-tabulation. The interview consisted of 10 rules that were evaluated in 4 contexts so each respondent made 40 evaluations in the whole interview. Group means and group SD:s of evaluations of one rule within one context are used.

I chose to present evaluations as a three-point scale since it takes into account “it depends” -answers (which is not the case with the usual pattern to report the results in the Turiel and Shweder studies: to present only the percentages of negative evaluations). In addition, it enabled me to analyse the data from the rules and contexts point of view: for example, the means revealed graphically that division into moral and nonmoral rules was not clear-cut but a continuum. It also enabled the ANOVA use. I used this style originally in the Master’s thesis (Vainio, 1998, 91 – 94) where the sum variables to examine the contextuality and morality – nonmorality dimensions were constructed. Also Ikonen-Varila (2000) and Vasquez et al. (2001) use it.

I calculated ten new variables based on these rule evaluations (40 / respondent). The measures are:

1. MORARULE or Morality of a rule (10 variables; 1 for each rule)
2. MORCONT or Morality of a context (4 variables; 1 for each context)
3. CONTRULE or Contextuality of a rule (10 variables; 1 for each rule).
4. GROUPRULE or In-group – out-group differentiation of a rule (10 variables; 1 for each rule)
5. DOMAIN or Domain differentiation measure (1 variable)
6. CONTEXT or Contextuality measure (1 variable)
7. GROUPDIFF or In-group – out-group differentiation measure (1 variable)
8. CONTMOR or Contextuality in moral rules measure (1 variable)
9. CONTNON or Contextuality in nonmoral rules measure (1 variable)
10. CONTDIFF or Contextuality difference between nonmoral and moral rules (1 variable)
All sum variables were returned into their original range because they consisted of different numbers of items: returning the original range made them comparable to each other and to the original single evaluations. The variable list (Appendix 2) collects together all these measures and Figure 2 (in Appendix 3) is a visual representation of how these measures were computed. The measures are constructed on two dimensions: the rules dimension and the contexts dimension. Each new variable was assigned a code name. Next I discuss each variable in detail.

7.3.3.2 Variables for the rules and contexts

The *Morality of a rule* or MORARULE measure is a mean of evaluations of one rule in four contexts within evaluations of an individual respondent (range 1 – 3). Each respondent was assigned ten MORARULE variables or values (1 / rule). Rules obtaining a value > 2 are interpreted as “moral”.

The *Morality of a context* or MORCONT variable is a mean of evaluations of ten rules in one context (range 1 – 3). Each respondent was assigned four MORCONT values or variables (1 / context).

The *Contextuality of a rule* or CONTRULE variable is the SD of evaluations of one rule in four contexts for each individual respondent. CONTRULE variable was created in the following way: SD represents how one variable varies among several cases. Since

12 MORARULE, MORCONT, CONTEXT, GROUPDIFF, CONT-MOR, CONTNON

13 Example. MORARULE(Stealing) = Mean {evaluation (Stealing in Government context), evaluation (Stealing in Church context), evaluation (Stealing in God’s word context), evaluation (Stealing in Other country context)}.

14 Example. MORCONT(Church) = Mean {evaluation (Stealing in Church context), evaluation (Religious discr. in Church context), evaluation (Gender ineq. in Church context), evaluation (Nonr. moral ed. in Church context), evaluation (Marihuana in Church context), evaluation (Censorship in Church context), evaluation (Shops on Sundays in Church context), evaluation (Cohabitation in Church context), evaluation (Wines to shops in Church context), evaluation (Contrac. pills in Church context)}.
a CONTRULE variable was the SD of four context evaluations for each rule (e.g., four variables) an individual respondent (one case) made. I had to transpose the rows (cases) and columns (variables) in the SPSS. The original file contained 40 evaluations (ten rules evaluated in four contexts) and 30 cases (respondents). I created a new file where rows and columns were transposed: 40 evaluations became cases and 30 respondents became variables. I created a new variable with ten categories (each representing one rule) and I used it as an independent variable when I computed context SD:s for each rule separately, and where 30 respondents were “dependent variables”. The results were cut and pasted as 10 new CONTRULE\textsuperscript{15} variables for 30 cases into the original SPSS file. Even though the values of CONTRULE variables were originally SD:s, they should not be confused with group SD:s. Therefore the CONTRULE variable can be treated as other variables (e.g., MORALITY): one can calculate means, SD:s and the ANOVA for the CONTRULE variable. Thus ten CONTRULE variables were created (range 0 – 1,15), one for each rule.

It could be seen that respondents interpreted some criterion questions as representing an in-group context for themselves (the “Church” for the EL, “Government” for the EL and the NR) and similarly, an out-group (the “Other Country” for all the groups, even though for the NR the “Church” and for the CL the “Government” were clearly out-groups, too). The In-group – out-group differentiation of a rule or GROUPRULE\textsuperscript{16} variable is the SD of evaluations of one rule in two contexts: (1) in-group and (2) out-group context, for each individual respondent. The in-group context for the EL and the NR was the “Government” context and for the CL the “Church” context. The out-group context for all groups

\textsuperscript{15}Example. CONTRULE(Wines) = \text{SD \{evaluation (Stealing in Government context), evaluation (Stealing in Church context), evaluation (Stealing in God’s word context), evaluation (Stealing in Other country context)\}}

\textsuperscript{16}Example. GROUPRULE(Stealing), when a respondent was EL or NR = \text{SD \{evaluation (Stealing in Government context), evaluation (Stealing in Other country context)\}}, GROUPRULE(Stealing), when a respondent was CL = \text{SD \{evaluation (Stealing in Church context), evaluation (Stealing in Other country context)\}}
was the “Other country” context (range 0 – 1.41). As with the CONTRULE variables, I had to transpose variables and cases in the SPSS to calculate the SD:s for individual respondents (excluding the contexts irrelevant for the groups). Each respondent was assigned ten GROUPRULE values (1 / rule).

7.3.3.3 Domain differentiation and contextuality measures

Next I describe the overall contextuality and morality – nonmorality differentiation measures and how I constructed them.

I wanted to grasp how much a respondent makes a difference between most moral and most nonmoral rules; some persons apparently used a greater range, making a clear domain distinction and some others much smaller range. For this purpose I calculated the Morality – nonmorality differentiation measure or DOMAIN\(^{17}\).

The idea was that the MORARULE scores represented the average “morality” of each rule for each individual respondent. Thus, the overall degree of variation between “moral” and “nonmoral” extremes each individual respondent made would be captured with the SD of his / her MORARULE scores.

DOMAIN variable was created with the SPSS in the following way. The SD can only be computed of the values that one variable gets within several cases. Since the DOMAIN variable was the SD between the ten MORARULE scores (variables) of an individual respondent (a case), I had to transpose the rows (cases) and columns (variables) in the SPSS. The original file contained 10 MORARULE variables and 30 cases (respondents). I created a new file where rows and columns were transposed: 10 MORARULE scores became 10 cases and the 30 respondents became variables. I computed the SD:s of 10 MORARULE values for 30 respondent “variables”. They were cut and pasted as a new DOMAIN variable into the original SPSS file. DOMAIN was entered

\(^{17}\) Example. DOMAIN = Mean {MORARULE(Stealing), MORARULE(Religious disc.), MORARULE(Gender ineq.), MORARULE(Nonr. moral ed.), MORARULE(Marihuana), MORARULE(Censorship), MORARULE(Shops on Sundays), MORARULE(Cohabitation), MORARULE(Wines to shops), MORARULE(Contrac. pills)}
as a new variable and it consisted of the SD:s within individuals’ responses and should not be confused with the group SD:s.

Moreover, previous studies have paid little attention to the difference respondents make between different contexts. Therefore I computed the Contextuality measure or CONTEXT\textsuperscript{18}. It is the mean of individual respondents’ CONTRULE scores. Since the CONTRULE scores can be interpreted as the contextuality of the rule, to extract the overall contextuality an individual respondent made, I calculated the mean of an individual’s 10 CONTRULE scores for the overall contextuality score (or measure).

I computed also other contextuality measures that were constructed in a way similar to the CONTEXT measure described above. First I describe how I constructed the in-group – out-group differentiation measure. As also discussed in the In-group – out-group differentiation of a rule measure (GROUPRULE) earlier, the respondents tended to interpret some criterion questions as an in-group context (the “Church” for the EL, “Government” for the EL and the NR) and similarly, an out-group context (the “Other country” for all; “Government” was clearly an out-group for CL, too). The Overall in-group – out-group differentiation measure or GROUPDIFF\textsuperscript{19}, following the overall contextuality measure, is the mean of 10 GROUPRULE variables’ values, computed for each individual.

Are moral rules regarded as less contextual than nonmoral rules? I computed the Contextuality within moral rules measure or CONTMOR\textsuperscript{20}. It was the mean of three CONTRULE scores of the

\textsuperscript{18}Example. CONTEXT = Mean \{CONTRULE(Stealing), CONTRULE(Religious disc.), CONTRULE(Gender ineq.), CONTRULE(Nonr. moral ed.), CONTRULE(Marihuana), CONTRULE(Censorship), CONTRULE(Shops on Sundays), CONTRULE(Cohabitation), CONTRULE(Wines to shops), CONTRULE(Contrac. pills)\}

\textsuperscript{19}Example. GROUPDIFF = Mean \{GROUPRULE(Stealing), GROUPRULE(Religious disc.), GROUPRULE(Gender ineq.), GROUPRULE(Nonr. moral ed.), GROUPRULE(Marihuana), GROUPRULE(Censorship), GROUPRULE(Shops on Sundays), GROUPRULE(Cohabitation), GROUPRULE(Wines to shops), GROUPRULE(Contrac. pills)\}
moral rules. The *Contextuality within nonmoral rules* or *CONTMOR*\(^{20}\) was computed in the same way by calculating the mean of seven CONTRULE scores of the nonmoral rules. Moreover, the *Difference between the contextuality between nonmoral and moral rules* or *CONTDIFF*\(^{22}\) was computed as a new variable.

### 7.3.4 The Shweder Ethics

The evaluations and justifications of the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview were coded separately. I started the coding procedure of justifications from scratch; I did not try to apply the ready-made codes of the manuals, instead I coded the data with the codes that emerged spontaneously from the interviews. I decided to do this since the Ethics are supposed to be culture-bound and I wished my classification to be sensitive to the cultural specificities of my data. I was also aware of the fact that the three Ethics had not been used in a European, let alone a Finnish context before. I used the Atlas.ti program that made the process easier to handle.

The next step was to analyse the data the second time but consulting Jensen’s (1996) and Shweder’s (unpublished) manuals. I followed the coding guidelines Jensen describes in her manual. It consists of three Ethics, elaborated further into sets of subcodes. I coded justifications within the subcodes, not directly the Ethics. I assigned only one code to each justification. I assigned each code only once to each rule so the range for the occurrence of each code in the whole rule question unit was 0 – 10. When I transferred the codes to the SPSS, I counted the presence or absence of each code for each rule in a dichotomous manner (0 = the code absent; 1 =

\(^{20}\) *Example.* \(\text{CONTMOR} = \text{Mean} \{\text{CONTRULE(Stealing)}, \text{CONTRULE(Religious discr.)}, \text{CONTRULE(Gender ineq.)}\}\)

\(^{21}\) *Example.* \(\text{CONTNON} = \text{Mean} \{\text{CONTRULE(Nonr. moral ed.)}, \text{CONTRULE(Marihuana)}, \text{CONTRULE(Censorship)}, \text{CONTRULE(Shops on Sundays)}, \text{CONTRULE(Cohabitation)}, \text{CONTRULE(Wines to shops)}, \text{CONTRULE(Contrac. pills)}\}\)

\(^{22}\) *Example.* \(\text{CONTDIFF} = \text{CONTNON} – \text{CONTMOR}\)
the code present) for each whole rule judgment (consisting of justifications of evaluations of one rule in four criterion contexts).

Since some arguments were combinations of more than one justification, I divided these responses into separate justifications and coded these justifications under different subcodes. However, I assigned the same subcode only once to each rule (consisting of four criterion questions). I also treated the “God’s Authority” and “Scriptural Authority” (the Ethic of Divinity) as if they were a single category since they were conceptually difficult to separate in the data: I assigned one of them only once to each rule.

It was quite unproblematic to combine my own classification and the Shweder Ethics. However, the difficult thing was to decide when to select the “Other’s well-being” within the Ethic of Autonomy or the Ethic of Community; also some other subcodes were identical in both Ethics and were difficult to differentiate.

Some, maybe partly cultural, justification types found in my data did not fit automatically into the Shweder Ethics. I added five sub-codes that are written in italics in the codes list (Appendix 8). These codes implied clearly the meta-assumptions of some of the Ethics so I assigned them inside the Ethics. In addition, I adopted the sub-code “Personal autonomy” from Shweder’s manual (named there as ”Personal business”) that, unfortunately, does not make any division of sub-codes under the Ethics. However, I placed it into the Ethic of Autonomy since it seemed to reflect idea of the autonomous conception of the person. Moreover, four additional codes were not implications of the Ethics and for this reason I assigned them under the category “Other”. When I refer in my analysis to the way Jensen (1996) and Shweder (unpublished) have categorized the justifications into the Ethics, I indicate it with abbreviations *EA (for Autonomy), *EC (for Community) and *ED (for Divinity).

Under the coding process I started to question why Jensen and Shweder did not identify the Turiel domains. For this reason I identified them in my coding scheme. The cultural psychological approach agrees that the Shweder Ethic of Autonomy corresponds to Turiel’s conception of morality. Also the Turiel personal autonomy domain I mapped into the Ethic of Autonomy as I already mentioned.

The “Social convention” (subcodes “Tradition”; “Contingency on common practice”, “Habituation, attitudes”; “Legal / govern-
mental authority”; “Rational action: socially defined means-ends considerations” and “Important person’s authority”) are found within the Ethic of Community. Since I wished to identify the distinctions and similarities between the Turiel and Shweder traditions, it was necessary for me to show the location of the Turiel moral, social conventional and personal autonomy justifications in the Shweder original Ethics construction. I did not incorporate any Ethic of Divinity -code into the “Social convention” -sphere since the dispute whether references to the God’s word authority belong to the conventional or moral domain is fundamental between Turiel and Shweder.

The reliability coding was carried out as follows: a trained coder who was already familiar with Shweder’s theory of the three Ethics was provided with the interviews. The researcher taught her the coding procedure and gave the coding manual developed for this purpose23. Five interviews were coded for the reliability following the guidelines of the Jensen manual. These interviews consisted of 104 justifications and they were underlined by the researcher (me). The reliability of justifications was checked at the level of the Ethics and the category “Other”; thus the total number of the reliability coding categories was four. The initial reliability between the coders was 78%. After that the researcher and the reliability coder went through all the justifications where they disagreed. If the reliability coder changed her opinion after the discussion and turned to support the same code assigned also by the researcher, it was added into the total reliability percentage. The reliability after the discussion reached 86%.

7.3.4.1 Validation of the Shweder Ethics model use in the Finnish sample: the hierarchical cluster analysis

The cultural structuring of the three Ethics should be examined every time when the model is applied, particularly when it is applied the first time in a new culture. Moreover, the application of the theoretical model is tested since the present study intends to use data-based methods of analysis.

23 modified from the original manual of Jensen (1996), it contains the five additional categories of mine; Appendix 3
Shweder et al. (1997) created the Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity using the hierarchical cluster analysis with the Indian and U.S. samples. But it still needs to be studied whether the Ethics are structured in a similar way in other cultures, which is also the concern of Haidt et al. (1993). However, Shweder et al. (1997) study is so far one of few studies where the content of the Ethics is examined at all. Anyhow, it is also an open question whether the hierarchical cluster analysis, after all, is the best way to construct the cultural structuring of the Ethics. For example Vasquez et al. (2001) gave the respondents short definitions of each Ethic and asked them to list behaviors that belonged to each one.

To validate the use of the Shweder Ethics model in the Finnish sample, I carried out the hierarchical cluster analysis with the justifications of the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview. The hierarchical cluster analysis is suitable for explorative research that does not start from a priori hypotheses – unlike many other statistical procedures. The hierarchical cluster analysis classifies variables into homogenous groups. Also the factor analysis does it, but with a small data the factor analysis did not come into question. The hierarchical cluster analysis requires of the data that the variables must be measured on at least an ordinal scale (Norušis, 1985). One of the most fundamental problems with cluster analysis is the assessment of the stability and validity of the clusters found: most cluster analysis methods will give clusters even when applied to data containing no cluster structure. In a sense, cluster analysis finds the “most significant solution possible.” (Everitt, 1988.) Therefore, statistical significance testing is really not appropriate here. (StatSoft, 2002.) Everitt maintains that the hierarchical cluster analysis can be said to be valid if, e.g., a similar cluster structure emerges with another sample of individuals. For this reason the Pearson correlation coefficients between the Finnish clusters and the Shweder original clusters were examined to see their statistical correspondence.

The process was as follows. First I created a separate variable for each justification code, excluding the “Other” category, which made 34 variables as a whole. Each variable consisted of the total number of the dichotomous occurrences of the code within the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview unit, thus the range for each variable was 0 – 10.
The hierarchical cluster analysis provides several methods for forming the clusters. Moreover, there are different measures available depending on whether the data are interval, count of binary. I chose the Chi Square measure for count variables. According to the guidebooks (Norušis, 1985; Everitt, 1993; StatSoft, 2002), no clear-cut criteria have been established according to which one can select the correct method for forming the clusters. Therefore I explored all the methods the SPSS provided. According to a number of empirical investigations, the suitability of the clustering method depends strongly on the type of the data (e.g., whether data was binary, count or interval, whether it included outliers, or clusters of equal vs. different sizes) (see the overview of Everitt, 1993). Everitt (ibid., 73) recommends that for deciding the appropriate numbers of clusters, the dendrogram should be “cut” in the nested sequence of clusterings that comprise the hierarchy. One informal method which is often used for this purpose is to examine the differences between fusion levels in the dendrogram: large changes are taken to indicate a particular number of clusters.

Of the available methods in the SPSS, only the Ward method produced a clear three-cluster structure. The Ward method, in general, is regarded as a commonly used method that is efficient: it usually has a good fit to the real cluster structure of the data (Everitt, 1993; StatSoft, 2002). When using other methods, the partitions were scattered evenly across all the stages without forming any clear changes whereas the graphic presentation or dendrogram (Appendix 9) using the Ward method revealed clear “nested” differences between the initial and the final five stages of analysis: the three main clusters emerged within a short distance from each other; the next partitions taking place much later.

\[\text{24 The Shweder “original” Ethics clusters are indicated with abbreviations (*EA referring to Autonomy, *EC to Community, and *ED to Divinity) in front of each code in the dendrogram. The abbreviations are marked with an asterisk to differentiate them from the abbreviations referring to the respondent groups (EL, NR, CL).}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shweder Ethics</th>
<th>Turiel Domains</th>
<th>Finnish Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shweder Ethics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Autonomy (*EA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community (*EC)</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Divinity (*ED)</td>
<td>-.62***</td>
<td>-.77***</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turiel Domains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Convention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finnish Ethics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Autonomy (*FA)</td>
<td>.84***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Community (*FC)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Divinity (*FD)</td>
<td>-.63***</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>1.00***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
The dendrogram (Appendix 9) reveals that the Turiel morality (rights, reciprocity), convention and personal autonomy domains were clustered together within the first cluster that I named the “Finnish Ethic of Autonomy” (*FA). Social order -goals that do not seem to reflect the Shweder Ethic of Autonomy (*EA) but the Ethic of Community (*EA) were, however, also clustered within this cluster. Perhaps this combination reflected the Finnish welfare state Ethic emphasizing the Western liberal individual who prefers the state control of persons’ own welfare and emphasizes safety concerns in the society.

The second cluster I named the “Finnish Ethic of Community” (*FC): it emphasized social duties, other’s needs and the maintenance and stability of society and social relationships. Its social conventions were different: they were based on authority and tradition, not on custom or persons’ agreement, as was the case with the “Finnish Ethic of Autonomy” (*FA) conventions. It seemed to reflect a conservative political ideology. On the other hand, the third cluster, the “Finnish Ethic of Divinity” (*FD), was almost identical with the corresponding Ethic of Shweder (*ED).

The content analysis of the cluster analysis suggested that the “Finnish Ethic of Autonomy” was less autonomous and the “Finnish Ethic of Community” was less communal than the Shweder Ethics constructed in the U.S. and India. In other words, the Ethics of Autonomy (*EA) and Community (*EC) were merged in the Finnish sample.

Even though the Finnish (*FA, *FE, *FC) and the Shweder original (*EA, *EC, *ED) Ethics seemed to have some conceptual differences, these two formulations still, had a strong positive correlation with each other, as Table 2 above demonstrates. In other words, the Shweder original clusters were replicated in the Finnish data. Moreover, this hierarchical cluster analysis of the small Finnish sample can be used together with the Shweder original Ethics construction to show cultural differences in the Ethics.

I continue to use the Shweder original formulation of the Ethics as the basis of further analysis in my study since it enables cross-national comparisons. Moreover, high positive correlations
assure that this choice does not bias (when measured statistically) the analysis of the Finnish Ethics.

7.3.4.2 Multiplicity of Ethics and justifications use

I created two new variables on the basis of these justification categories. The first one was the *Use of multiple justifications sub-categories* or MULTIJUST. The justifications provided to the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview unit (excluding the Open question) made up 34 justification sub-categories that were part of the Ethics. This variable revealed how many different justifications a respondent provided in the whole unit and the theoretical range in this variable was 0 – 34, but the empirical range was much narrower (4 – 16). Each respondent was assigned one MULTIJUST score.

The second variable was the *Multiplicity of the Shweder Ethics* (super-categories) or MULTIETH. This variable followed the Shweder original classification of justification sub-categories within the Ethics (the super-categories), presented in the coding manual, Appendix 8. Since the number of the Ethics was three, the theoretical range was 0 – 3. Each respondent was assigned one MULTIETH score.

7.3.5 The Open Question

The second part of the Turiel Rule Transgression section was the “Open Question” that was designed to reveal the dependency of respondents’ moral conceptions on God’s authority. The question was picked from philosophical literature where it is discussed as an issue whether God’s word can make a morally wrong act morally right. The Open Question was asked only of the three rule transgressions that Turiel defines as moral: “Stealing”, “Religious discrimination” and the “Gender inequality”.

The evaluations and justifications were analysed separately. First I analysed the evaluations. The range was similar to Turiel Rule Transgressions unit with a scale consisting of three categories, “it’s alright” = 1, “it’s wrong” = 3. Complex answers, e.g., “following God’s commands is the right thing to do”, but “God does not give morally wrong commands”; and refusals to imagine
the whole scenario, were coded as value = 2 (around 26% of total evaluations).

After analyzing the evaluations, I proceeded into the analysis of the justifications. While I was reading the responses of this section, it became evident for me that the codes should be answers to the question: “Who or what defines what morality is?” The justifications were structured as six types of characterizations of the groundings of morality. I assigned only one code to the whole justification provided by the respondent to each rule. Some respondents expressed themselves only in few words and in those cases I took into account the whole response to the rule in question (responses to the four criterion questions).

The **Number of justifications to the Open Question** or JUSTOPEN variables were thus six: one variable for each justification category. Each variable simply counted the number of occurrences of a justification category in the whole Open question unit (empirical range 0 – 3).

Ten interviews were coded for the reliability (a total of 30 justifications). The reliability coding was carried out as follows: a trained coder received the interviews and the researcher (I) taught her the coding procedure as well as gave the coding manual developed by the researcher (Appendix 12). The coding manual consisted of six categories. The initial reliability between the coders was 77%. After that the researcher and the reliability coder went together through all the justifications where they disagreed. If the reliability coder changed her opinion after the discussion and turned to support the same code that was assigned by the researcher, it was added into the total reliability percentage. The reliability after the discussion reached 87%.

### 7.3.6 The Ethics in conflict: Cultural-Ethical Dilemmas

This section discusses the dilemmas where the Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity are in conflict as opposing conceptions of social practices. The first dilemma is called Ethnic Minority Dilemma and the second Missionary Dilemma. The full dilemma stories and probes are presented in Appendices 9 (in Finnish) and 11 (in English).
Following the style adopted in the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview, I analysed evaluations and justifications separately. In the analysis of evaluations I used a three point scale: if the respondent disagreed with the statements presented in Table 31, the response was assigned the value 0, and 1, if (s)he agreed with the statements. If the respondent’s evaluation was in between, the response was assigned the value 0.5. The basic unit in the dilemma evaluations were thus the evaluations of the probes (see interview questions, Appendices 18 in Finnish and 20 in English).

This scale was different from Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview section because I wanted to highlight the separateness of these two sections: the Cultural-Religious Dilemma evaluations did not intend to measure morality and contextuality dimensions, I did not intend to make other variable transformations such as sum variables, and moreover, the scale 0 – 1 can be easily read as proportions.

I coded the justifications qualitatively. I classified the justifications emerging from the dilemmas without coding manuals. The overall number of justification categories was 38: 14 of them were common to both dilemmas, 13 specific to the Missionary Dilemma and 11 to the Ethnic Minority Dilemma; (the code list in Appendix 15). I assigned each code only once to each dilemma so the range among the codes common to both dilemmas was 0 – 2 and among the dilemma-specific codes 0 – 1. I coded the presence (1) or absence (0) of each code for both dilemmas separately which made up 38 variables.

The hierarchical cluster analysis using the Ward method and the Chi Square measure for the count data revealed again the three-class Ethics structure, represented in the dendrogram (Appendix 17) and Pearson correlation coefficients were statistically significant between this construction and the Shweder original Ethics. However, the Ethics constructed on the cultural-religious dilemmas correlated less with the hierarchical cluster analysis performed with the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview justifications (dendrogram in Appendix 3); the Pearson correlation coefficients of this cluster analysis Ethics to the Shweder original (*EA, *EC, *ED) and the Ethics constructed from the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview justifications (*FA, *FC, *FD) are presented in Table 32 (in Appendix 16).
7.4 Description of the data

I describe the data analysing the background variables that were asked in the questionnaire (Appendices 10 in Finnish and 12 in English). The variables used and created in the following analysis are identified with abbreviations, mentioned in the Variable list (Appendix 2).

**Table 3.** Means, standard deviations and ANOVA table of society memberships (MEMBER), siblings (SIBLING), school performance (SCHOOL) and religiosity (RELIGION) for EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>F (2,27)</th>
<th>EL/ NR</th>
<th>EL/ CL</th>
<th>NR/ CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0,70</td>
<td>0,70</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>3,62</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0,67</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBLING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2,80</td>
<td>2,30</td>
<td>11,40</td>
<td>88,21</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1,14</td>
<td>1,06</td>
<td>2,55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8,16</td>
<td>8,30</td>
<td>8,18</td>
<td>0,11</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0,69</td>
<td>0,53</td>
<td>0,91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>31,80</td>
<td>16,80</td>
<td>52,00</td>
<td>104,62</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7,77</td>
<td>4,26</td>
<td>3,30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < 0,05; **p < 0,01; ***p < 0,001
x) Tukey’s HSD test for equal variances (Games-Howitt test for unequal variances with other variables)

The total number of the respondents in this study was 30 and they were divided into three groups based on the religious community membership: the Evangelical Lutherans (referred in tables to as EL), the persons without religious community membership (NR), and the Conservative Laestadians (CL). There were 10 respondents in each group. There were equal numbers of boys and girls...
(N = 5) in each group. All the respondents, except a single respondent born in October 1977, were born in 1978 so the respondents were around 17 years of age at the time of data collection.

An important background variable in the study was the school performance (SCHOOL), reported in Table 3. It was measured as the average of the grades of the yearly school report where the range of the grades in theory varies between 4 and 10. However, in my sample the grades varied between 6.5 and 9.3 (M = 8.21, SD = 0.70). According to the yearly school report there were no significant differences between the three groups in the school performance. The school performance might imply verbal skills that may, in turn, affect the skills respondents are able to answer to moral dilemmas.

Number of society memberships and siblings imply the role-taking opportunities. As Table 3 reveals, the EL and the NR belonged to societies much more than the CL who did not mention any society membership (in addition to their own religious community). Another measure of role-taking opportunities is the number of siblings (including the respondent) in the family (SIBLING) (the questionnaire question no. 6). Here the CL did have significantly more siblings than the other respondent groups (the range in the whole sample was 1 – 16).

All the respondents of my data have probably been socialized into their worldviews at their homes: all the parents of the EL belonged to the Lutheran church and also all the parents of the CL were members of the Laestadian movement. Also none of the parents of the NR, with the exception of one mother and one father, had a religious community membership. The questionnaire question no. 7 that asked with whom a respondent lives, revealed that 20 respondents lived with both parents, 6 with one parent (I combined “with mother” and “with father” options) and four “in other way”.

As Table 3 reveals, all the three groups based on religious community membership differed clearly in the degree of religiosity (RELIGION) from each other. However, there were no significant differences in religiosity between boys (M = 32.33) and girls (M = 34.73) according to T-test (df = 28, n.s.)

If the 30 respondents were divided in terms of the religiosity score (RELIGION) into three equal-sized groups of low, medium and high religiosity, it came out that 8 NR belonged to the group
of low religiosity, 9 EL to the group of medium religiosity and 9 CL were found in the high religiosity group, when the group size was 10 in each.

The analysis of the questionnaire question no. 26 (“In case you belong to a religious community, have you ever considered leaving it?”) revealed the strength of the respondents’ identification with their religious community. When one excluded the persons without the religious community membership group from the data (since this question did not concern them), this question correlated ($r = -0.50, p < 0.05$) negatively with the religiosity score (RELIGION). However, the mean for the EL was 1.70 (SD = 0.67) and for the CL 1.30 (SD = 0.48), which means that they either had never thought of divorcing from their community or if they had thought about it, they would be likely to do it. In other words, they did identify with their religious communities.

Table 4. Means and ANOVA table of how frequently EL, NR and CL discuss different issues at home and with friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>F(2,27)</th>
<th>EL/ NR</th>
<th>EL/ CL</th>
<th>NR/ CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answering options in the questionnaire for this question: 1=“never”, 2=“at least once a year”, 3=“at least once a month”, 4=“at least once a week”, 5=“every day”;

$p < 0.05$; $**p < 0.01$; $***p < 0.001$

(Tukey’s HSD test for equal variances)

Another interesting issue was whether the frequency of discussing moral, religious or political issues with family and friends influences respondents’ judgment style. I am going to discuss the rela-
tion of discussion frequency to social and moral argumentation styles later. As Table 4 above reveals, the CL discussed much more frequently all the issues both in the family and friends contexts than the other groups. According to the ANOVA, highly significant difference was found in discussing religious issues with the family; the CL did it much more frequently than the other groups. In all the groups political issues were discussed most often, around once a week. The CL discussed religious issues with their family nearly as often, whereas the other two groups did it around once a year. The EL and the NR discussed all the issues more frequently with friends than with their family, but this trend was the opposite among the CL. It might be an indication of a strong role of the Laestadian families as religious and ideological socializers as opposed to peers. Anyhow, the religiosity scores (RELIGION) and the frequency of discussing religious issues with the family showed a strong positive correlation ($r = 0.68$, $p < 0.001$).
The results are divided into five sections. I begin with the results of the Kohlberg Moral Judgment Interview. After that I describe the results of the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview evaluations and justifications; the latter applies the Shweder Ethics model. Next I continue with the analysis and results of the “ethnic-religious” dilemmas where the Shweder Ethics are in conflict. In the end, I present an integrative analysis of all the findings.

When reporting the results of the ANOVA, T-test, and correlation coefficients, I have set alpha at 0.05 but I mention also marginal effects (p < 0.08). Moreover, I use Games-Howitt post-hoc test for unequal variances and Tukey's HSD post-hoc test for equal variances of pairwise differences. For practical reasons, the respondent groups are referred to as abbreviations: EL refers to the Evangelical Lutherans, NR to the adolescents without religious community membership and CL to the Conservative Laestadians. The group sizes of the EL, NR and CL are always N = 10 in each, the total sample size being N = 30. Because of the shortage of space the group sizes are not reported in tables. Moreover, all the variables computed on the different parts of the interview are described in the variable list, Appendix 2.

8.1 The Kohlberg Moral Judgment Interview

The mean of the WAS score was in the whole sample 321.83 and the SD = 31.47. Table 5 below shows that the EL and the CL were around at the third stage of moral development but the NR were about 1/2 stage above the other groups. According to Levene's test
(p < 0.05) the NR was a more heterogeneous group than the others in their WAS score.

When the orientations of the dilemmas are observed, the EL and the CL were similar to each other: they used predominantly the A-orientation whereas the NR used more B-orientation than other groups.

Table 5. Means, standard deviations and ANOVA of WAS scores and dilemma orientation for EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>F (2,27)</th>
<th>EL/ NR</th>
<th>EL/ CL</th>
<th>NR/ CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAS score (x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>309,00</td>
<td>347,10</td>
<td>309,40</td>
<td>6,75 *</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>15,72</td>
<td>37,62</td>
<td>21,66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of B-orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0,15</td>
<td>0,50</td>
<td>0,10</td>
<td>5,29 *</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0,24</td>
<td>0,41</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
x) Games-Howitt test for unequal variances

The same pattern of the WAS score and the orientations suggests that there may be a link between the WAS score and the orientation or, in other words, between the structure and the content of moral judgments. Indeed, there was a correlation between the WAS score and the orientation (r = 0.48, p < 0.01). The original hypothesis (no. 1.2) thus was not supported.

There were no statistically significant differences between boys and girls, the mean WAS score was for boys 316,90 (SD = 26,69), and for girls 326,70 (SD = 35,88). However, according to the T-test this difference was near to be significant (p < 0.070, df = 28). The T-test did not reveal significant sex differences in the use of the A- and B-orientations (df = 28, n.s.), either. The mean of the B-orientation use was for boys 0,30 (SD = 0,32) and for girls 0,20 (SD = 0,37). The school performance did not correlate
with the WAS score \((r = 0.19, \text{n.s.})\) nor with the B-orientation \((r = 0.31, \text{n.s.})\).

On the other hand, there was a clear association between religiosity and the WAS and the orientation. The religiosity score correlated negatively with the B-orientation \((r = -0.46, p < 0.01)\) use as was hypothesized (hypothesis no. 1.1). Moreover, religiosity correlated also negatively with the WAS score \((r = -0.42, p < 0.05)\), as a contrast to the original hypothesis (no. 1.2).

Some kind of role-taking opportunities measure was the questionnaire question no. 22: “Do you belong to some society, study group or association?” (MEMBER) This variable did not correlate with the WAS \((r = 0.28, \text{n.s.})\), however, it had a weak positive correlation with the B-orientation \((r = 0.42, p < 0.05)\). When this variable was controlled, the religiosity score did not correlate any longer with the WAS \((r = -0.35, p < 0.061)\), neither with the B-orientation \((r = -0.35, p < 0.066)\), even though its negative correlation to both measures approached significance. On the other hand, if the religiosity score was controlled, there was no correlation between the society membership and the WAS \((r = 0.12, \text{n.s.})\) neither with the society membership and the B-orientation \((r = 0.27, \text{n.s.})\).

Another role-taking opportunity measure was the number of siblings in the family (SIBLING). It did not correlate with the WAS score \((r = -0.20, \text{n.s.})\) neither with the B-orientation \((r = -0.31, \text{n.s.})\). It is very interesting to note that neither the WAS score nor the orientation had any significant correlations with the reported frequency of discussing moral, religious or political issues with the family or friends.

To sum up, the higher level of moral development within the NR group may result from various reasons. First, the NR are not instructed an explicit moral ideology (such as religion), instead, the philosophy of life encourages the NR to construct independently a personal worldview. Second, the group of the NR do not have a strong, explicit institution that could mark their social identity. Instead, the only thing that holds this aggregate together is that they do not belong to religious communities. Thus, this group might have had to question the grounds of their moral conceptions more than the EL and the CL, which might have produced a greater degree of cognitive conflicts in their lives. However, the standard deviation is also notably greater in the group of NR than
in the others which may indicate that belonging to the NR does not explain fully their higher WAS score.

It is possible that the NR show more internal variation in their moral judgments than other groups since they don’t have an explicit moral ideology that could make their moral judgments more uniform. Unfortunately role-taking opportunities, another significant factor counting for moral development (Kohlberg, 1984; Helkama & Ikonen, 1986), were not operationalized well in the present study. However, the number of association memberships and the number of children in the family that are some kind of measures of role-taking opportunities, did not correlate with the WAS score.

8.2. The Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview evaluations

8.2.1 Evaluations of the rules and the contexts

The results associated with the evaluations and justifications of rule transgressions are presented separately. I begin with the results of rule evaluations. When the Morality of the rules or MORARULE scores are observed in Tables 6 and 7 below, it can be seen that the division of the moral and nonmoral domains made by the NR matched perfectly with the Turiel’s definition.

In other words, the NR recognized the three rules called “moral” in Turiel’s tradition as moral. The EL, too, differentiated moral and nonmoral rules; of the Turiel “nonmoral” rules they regarded only the “Marihuana” issue as moral. In general, the EL gave slightly more moral evaluations than the NR to the rule transgressions. As a total contrast to the other groups, the CL conceptualised all ten rules in moral terms. Thus the initial hypothesis (no. 2.1) was confirmed. It is interesting to note that there was a bigger difference between the EL and the CL in the “Gender inequality” issue than between the NR and the CL.
Table 6. Means and standard deviations of Morality of rules (MORARULE) for EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig. disc.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ineq.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. mor. ed.</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops Sund.</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to sh.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrac. pills</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. ANOVA table of pairwise differences in Morality of rules (MORARULE) between EL, NR and CL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL &amp; NR</th>
<th>EL &amp; CL</th>
<th>NR &amp; CL</th>
<th>F(2, 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious discr.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ineq. (x)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. moral ed. (x)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>28.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana (x)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship (x)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>11.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sund.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>8.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation (x)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>21.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrac. pills</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginally significant differences: a) p < 0.062; b) p < 0.051
p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
x) Games-Howitt test for unequal variances
When the evaluations are observed more carefully at each context (Tables 22 and 23 in Appendices 4 and 5), one can see that in general, the CL regarded the evaluations of nonmoral acts dependent on “God’s word”. “God’s word” determined also the evaluations of moral rules for them, as hypothesized (hypothesis no. 2.2). The finding that the NR evaluated issues like “Shops open on Sunday”, more negatively in the “Church” context, suggests that they considered the rules a part of the religious context even if the “Church” authority did not concern the NR (since they were not members of the church). There were more similarities than differences between the EL and the NR, one of few differences between them could be found in the “Cohabitation” issue that the EL regarded as moral in the “Church” context whereas the NR didn’t. Also the “Marihuana” issue divided these two groups.

As a whole, the evaluations of the NR and the CL were most far away from each other: they differed in the Turiel nonmoral rule evaluations but not in moral rule evaluations. The T-test revealed some statistically significant sex differences: girls were more moral in the “Stealing” \((p < 0.001, \text{df} = 28)\), “Gender inequality” \((p < 0.05, \text{df} = 28)\) and “Wines selling in food stores” \((p < 0.05, \text{df} = 28)\) issues, than boys.

When one observes findings of the Contextuality of the rules (CONTRULE) in Tables 24 and 25 (in Appendix 6), one can see that for the CL, “Nonreligious moral education”, “Wines selling in food stores” and “Contraceptive pills” were significantly more contextual than for the other groups. The EL was more contextual than the NR in evaluating the “Cohabitation” issue.

The Ingroup – outgroup differentiation of the rules (GROUPRULE) results, displayed in Tables 26 and 27 (in Appendix 7) were similar: the CL were made a greater differentiation than other groups within the same rule evaluations as with the contextuality of the rules (the “Contraceptive pills” issue approached a significance).
Table 8. Means and standard deviations of Morality of contexts (MOR_CONT) for EL, NR and CL within all rules and within moral and nonmoral rules separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All rules (10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral rules (3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonmoral rules (7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. ANOVA table of pairwise differences of Morality of contexts (MORCONT) within all rules and within moral and nonmoral rules separately between EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F(2,27)</th>
<th>EL&amp;NR</th>
<th>EL&amp;CL</th>
<th>NR&amp;CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All rules (10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>50.05</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s word</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other country</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral rules (3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (x)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church (x)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s word (x)</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other country</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonmoral rules (7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church (x)</td>
<td>63.54</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s word</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other country</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginally significant difference: a) 0.056
p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
x) Games-Howitt test for unequal variances

The contexts dimension was observed in terms of the Morality of a context or MORCONT variable. Tables 8 and 9 above illustrate that the NR did not make contextual differentiations in moral issues; however, they were relativistic in the “Other country” criterion. The contexts influenced more on the evaluations of the other two groups. In general, it can be seen that for the EL and the CL the most moral context was the “Government”. But in nonmoral rules the “Church”, interestingly, was most moral context for all three groups. The “Other country” was the most nonmoral context in moral issues for all three groups (for the CL also “God’s word”). Among the nonmoral rules the pattern was quite the same: for the EL and the NR the least moral zone was the “Other country” whereas for the CL it was “God’s word”. 
As Tables 8 and 9 reveal, the contexts differentiated the groups more within nonmoral than moral rules. The only exception within moral rules was the “God’s word” authority: it defined morality for the CL significantly more than for the other groups. However, the difference between the NR and the CL in the “Church” authority in moral issues approached significance. Interestingly, all groups differed from each other in nonmoral issues in the “Government” and “Church” contexts.

8.2.2 Domain differentiation and contextuality

Next the overall contextuality and morality variables are discussed. Table 10 below shows that the EL and NR made a clear domain differentiation (DOMAIN) whereas the CL used a significantly narrower range, in accord with the hypothesis (no. 2.1).

On the other hand, the CL were significantly more contextual (CONTEXT) than the other groups. The pattern was similar in the in-group – out-group differentiation (GROUPDIFF), as was hypothesized (hypothesis no. 2.4). Table 10 reveals that Turiel’s idea that nonmoral or conventional rules were more contextual than moral rules (CONTDIFF), applied clearly only to the arguments held by the CL.

There was a sex difference in the domain differentiation: boys (M = 0.75) differentiated the domains more clearly than girls (M = 0.67). The T-test revealed this difference as significant (p < 0.01, df = 28).

Moreover, the Domain differentiation or DOMAIN measure correlated negatively with the Contextuality or CONTEXT (r = -0.63, p < 0.001). In other words, those persons who differentiated moral and nonmoral events didn’t consider contexts (and the opposite) when making moral judgments. Similarly, the negative correlation between domain differentiation and the in-group – out-group differentiation approached significance (r = -0.36, p < 0.051).
Table 10. Means, standard deviations and ANOVA of overall domain differentiation (DOMAIN) and contextuality measures (CONTEXT, GROUPDIFF, CONTMOR, CONTNON, CONTDIFF) for EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>F(2,27) EL/ NR</th>
<th>EL/ CL</th>
<th>NR/ CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOMAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,36 n.s. ***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,02 n.s. ***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUPDIFF(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,75 n.s. n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTMOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,61 n.s. n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTNON (x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,59 n.s. ***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTDIFF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,16 n.s. n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
x) Games-Howitt test for unequal variances

In other words, within the moral extreme, the Morality of a rule (MORARULE) measure correlated negatively with the Contextuality of a rule (MORCONT) measure. As a contrast, within the nonmoral extreme they correlated positively. In the questionnaire study of Ikonen-Varila (2000) the morality and contextuality dimensions correlated negatively. However, these two dimensions displayed a different and more complicated picture in the present study. The findings of Ikonen-Varila might be explained by the
fact that the study included only the issues that the respondents evaluated as moral (e.g., stealing, drinking-driving, drug use) and in that case the negative correlation between the “morality” and “contextuality” dimensions was to be expected. As a contrast, the correlation between the “morality” and “contextuality” dimensions was positive within nonmoral rules in the present study.

8.3. Analysing the justifications: The Shweder Ethics

Next I describe the results of the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview justifications. I refer to the justifications coded in terms of the Shweder original Ethics (*EA, *EC, *ED). Tables 28 and 29 (Appendices 10 and 11) present the way the EL, NR and CL used the Ethics to justify each rule. One can see that the EL and the NR used very evenly the Ethics of Autonomy and Community, the former being slightly more frequent, as was hypothesized (hypothesis no. 3.2). As a contrast, the CL justified almost all the rules with the Ethnic of Divinity confirming thus the initial hypothesis (no. 3.1); only the “Gender inequality” issue elicited equally the Ethnic of Autonomy and Divinity, and “Religious discrimination” was interpreted as the Ethnic of Autonomy issue.

The T-test did not reveal any statistically significant (df = 28, n.s.) differences in the Ethics use between girls (M = 7.60 for the Ethnic of Autonomy, M = 5.87 for Divinity and M = 5.27 for Community) or boys (M = 7.13, M = 5.00 and M =5.27, respectively).

When the Ethics use is observed as a whole, the CL, as can be seen in Tables 11 and 12, used predominantly the Ethnic of Divinity, confirming again the initial hypothesis (no. 3.2). On the other hand, the EL and the NR used mostly the Ethnic of Autonomy (confirming the initial hypothesis 3.1, again) and also almost as frequently the Ethnic of Community. The Ethnic of Divinity was a non-significant Ethnic for the EL and even more for the NR. There were no differences between the groups in the use of the Ethnic of Community, in accord with the research hypothesis (no. 3.3).
Table 11. Means and standard deviations of Ethics of Autonomy (*EA), Community (*EC), Divinity (*ED) and "Other" justifications use among EL, NR and CL (4 categories in bold included in total percentages).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethic of Autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (%)</td>
<td>8,90 (44,5%)</td>
<td>8,70 (49,2%)</td>
<td>4,50 (20,2%)</td>
<td>7,37 (36,8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2,18</td>
<td>2,26</td>
<td>2,37</td>
<td>3,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (%)</td>
<td>1,50 (7,5%)</td>
<td>1,20 (6,8%)</td>
<td>1,10 (4,9%)</td>
<td>1,27 (6,4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1,27</td>
<td>1,14</td>
<td>1,10</td>
<td>1,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethic of Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (%)</td>
<td>6,70 (33,5%)</td>
<td>4,80 (27,1%)</td>
<td>4,30 (19,3%)</td>
<td>5,27 (26,4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3,56</td>
<td>2,35</td>
<td>2,41</td>
<td>2,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social convention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (%)</td>
<td>3,50 (17,5%)</td>
<td>2,40 (13,6%)</td>
<td>1,10 (4,9%)</td>
<td>2,33 (11,7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2,22</td>
<td>1,26</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>1,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethic of Divinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (%)</td>
<td>2,50 (12,5%)</td>
<td>1,50 (8,5%)</td>
<td>12,30 (55,2%)</td>
<td>5,43 (27,2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2,17</td>
<td>1,43</td>
<td>2,54</td>
<td>5,35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (%)</td>
<td>1,90 (9,5%)</td>
<td>2,70 (15,3%)</td>
<td>1,20 (5,4%)</td>
<td>1,93 (9,7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1,60</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>1,03</td>
<td>1,34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (%)</td>
<td>0,50 (2,5%)</td>
<td>1,10 (6,2%)</td>
<td>0,00 (0,0%)</td>
<td>0,53 (2,7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0,53</td>
<td>1,10</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (%)</td>
<td>0,30 (1,5%)</td>
<td>0,20 (1,1%)</td>
<td>0,90 (4,0%)</td>
<td>0,47 (2,4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0,67</td>
<td>0,42</td>
<td>0,88</td>
<td>0,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (%)</td>
<td>1,10 (5,5%)</td>
<td>1,40 (7,9%)</td>
<td>0,30 (1,3%)</td>
<td>0,93 (4,7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1,45</td>
<td>0,84</td>
<td>0,48</td>
<td>1,08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total            |      |      |      |       |
| Mean (%)         | 20,00 (100,0%) | 17,70 (100,1%) | 22,30 (100,1%) | 20,00 (100,1%) |
Table 12. ANOVA table of pairwise differences within Ethics of Autonomy (*EA), Community (*EC) and Divinity (*ED), and “Other” justifications use between EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL/ NR</th>
<th>EL/ CL</th>
<th>NR/ CL</th>
<th>F(2,27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethic of Autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal autonomy</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>11.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethic of Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social convention (x)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethic of Divinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>80.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic (x)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t concern</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical (x)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginally significant differences: a) p < 0.051; b) p < 0.074
p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
x) Games-Howitt test for unequal variances

The relatively heavy loading of the Ethic of Community among the EL and the NR seems a cultural pattern characteristic of the Nordic countries: the Ethics of Autonomy and Community appeared highly intertwined, as was hypothesized (hypothesis no. 3.4). Moreover, it is worth noting that social conventional justifications played only a minor role in the data even if seven out of ten rules were “conventional” when judged in Turiel’s terms, lending thus support for the research hypothesis (no. 2.3). The EL used conventional justifications most frequently. On the other hand, the NR used the highest number of pragmatic justifications whereas the CL did not provide them at all; perhaps the NR regarded many issues not as violating any norm and thus not moral nor conventional.
Table 13. Means, standard deviations and ANOVA of Use of multiple justifications (MULTIJUST) and Use of multiple Ethics (MULTIETH) among EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>F (2,27)</th>
<th>EL/ NR</th>
<th>EL/ CL</th>
<th>NR/ CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTIJUST (x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIETH (x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
x) Games-Howitt test for unequal variances

Table 13 above reveals how many different justifications that were part of the Ethics (MULTIJUST) (empirical range from 4 to 16) the respondents provided to the whole Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview section. The NR used the least and the CL the most multifaceted range of justifications. On the other hand, significant between-groups differences in the Multiplicity of the Shweder Ethics (MULTIETH) measure were not found.

The T-test did not reveal statistically significant sex differences in the multifaceted use of the justifications. Instead, the T-test (p < 0.005, df=28) revealed that girls (M = 2.93) used the Ethics in a more multifaceted way than boys (M = 2.73). Anyhow, the multifaceted use of justifications and the Ethics correlated understandably positively (r = 0.46, p < 0.05).

8.3.1 Positioning individual evaluation to the norm of the moral community

Associated with the general research problems, it was explored whether the morality of the rule evaluations and the number of justifications go hand in hand. One could assume that as the moral nature or the importance attached to the rules increases, the more
justifications are used. Since nonreligious persons evaluated the rule transgressions least negatively, they did not find it reasonable to argue using the Ethics or moral arguments and probably for this reason their use of different justifications was less multifaceted.

Table 14. Means for Morality of rule (MORARULE) and Use of multiple justifications (MULTIJUST) within each rule and their Pearson correlations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morality of a rule</th>
<th>Use of multiple justifications</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>-.32(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious discr.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>-.34(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender inequality</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrel. moral educ.</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sundays</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive pills</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.47*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginally significant correlations: a) p < 0.068; b) p < 0.080
p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001

To test this assumption, the Pearson correlation coefficients between the Morality of a rule scores (MORARULE) and the Use of multiple justifications (MULTIJUST) were computed. The results are compiled in Table 14 above. It revealed an interesting relationship between how moral the acts were judged and how many justifications were needed. All rules defined as moral beforehand ("Stealing", "Religious discrimination", "Gender inequality") correlated negatively with the "moral" evaluation and with the number of justifications. The nonmoral issues correlated in the opposite way. All nonmoral rules except the "Marihuana" issue
correlated positively with the perceived degree of morality (MORARULE) and the number of justifications (MULTIJUST).

This result can be explained best with the social representation theory or as the personal positioning of the respondent to the cultural conception or social representation. The interpretation goes as follows: when the judgment of morality of the act is in accord with the social representation, a respondent does not have to justify his/her position. As a contrast, when a judgment deviates from the shared social representation, a respondent has to provide more justifications to justify his/her stand. As Table 14 reveals, the Finnish social representations of the Turiel nonmoral acts (except “Marihuana”) are generally nonmoral and if a person regards them as moral, (s)he finds it necessary to provide more justifications. Conversely, if a person perceives the three Turiel moral rules (that the Finnish social representation characterizes as moral) in nonmoral terms, (s)he finds it necessary to furnish his/her stand with more justifications than usual. The result that the degree of perceived morality (MORARULE) and the number of justifications (MULTIJUST) do not correlate in the “Marihuana” reveals that there is no established social representation regarding marihuana use, perhaps because it is relatively rare practice in Finland.

Next the relationship between the morality of the rule and the number of evaluations is observed within each respondent group. Table 15 below reveals that the NR regarded “Nonreligious moral education” as a particularly nonmoral (perhaps “moral personal autonomy” or “right to have a personal liberty”) issue and that the NR assumed the majority Finnish opinion to be different from theirs since the correlation between the number of justifications and the moralization was especially high.
Table 15. Pearson correlations of Morality of rule (MORARULE) and Multiplicity of justifications (MULTIJUST) within EL, NR and CL. Rank of “morality” before correlations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious discr.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender inequality</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>-0.67*</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonmoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. moral educ.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sundays</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>0.65*</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive pills</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginally significant correlations: a) $p < 0.079$; b) $p < 0.051$
p < 0.05; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$

Moreover, the directions of the correlation coefficients are interesting. For the EL and the NR the division went between the Turiel “moral” and “nonmoral” rules: within the “moral” rules, moralization (MORARULE) and the number of justifications (MULTIJUST) correlated negatively whereas within the seven “nonmoral” rules the correlation was positive. The case of the CL, in contrast, was very different. Among this group moralization (MORARULE) and the number of justifications (MULTIJUST) correlated negatively (i.e., the more moral was the rule, the fewer justifications were provided) in both the Turiel “moral” and “nonmoral” rules. The exceptions were the “Religious discrimination” and “Contraceptive pills” issues where the correlation was positive. In general, the CL probably held a different social representation of the rule systems as compared to the other respondents and therefore did not have a need to justify their moralized views to out-groups.
8.3.2 Linkages between the Ethics

It became evident during the coding procedure that the three Ethics were interrelated. This is also manifested by the fact that the justifications belonging to one Ethic rarely were expressed alone (especially in societally more controversial issues); they were often combined with the justifications belonging to the other Ethics. However, the coding manuals at present do not capture the relations between the Ethics and this is an issue that should be developed in the future. It seemed to me that the respondents regarded one of the Ethics as the most important and they used this core Ethic to justify the validity of the other Ethics. In practice, the person who gave the highest importance to the Ethic of Divinity, combined the judgments belonging to the other Ethics with it. In other words, the Ethics seemed to have a hierarchical, more complex relationship that the manuals of Jensen and Shweder don’t capture yet. The respondents combined the Ethics in the following way:

The CL held that the lack of religious conviction is apt to lower the level of morality of the nation as a whole, leading to a societal chaos. In other words, the Ethic of Divinity was used to justify further arguments belonging to the Ethic of Community. The CL frequently justified the “Censorship”, “Wines selling in food stores” and “Marihuana” issues with the combination of the Ethics of Divinity and Community: the morality of the nation depends on the endorsement of Christian values and their absence probably leads to societal chaos. Also in general, irrespective of one’s religious affiliation, many considered that if there were no societal regulations written in the Bible, the present-day society would be totally different.

[Nonreligious moral education, government authority] - Well, religious teaching at school does not correspond even near the proper religious instruction, teachers of religion can be in my opinion wrong or of other [], such as at the elementary school or secondary school there are differences between the teachers but some teachers teach totally wrongly and it does make a difference, that Parliament action. It depends, what kind of instruction it is. Of course morality would go even more down if it was eliminated. [Now it emphasizes Christian religion but if they
changed it so that all religions were emphasized equally?"
- Well, in that case it would do wrong. In my opinion this Evangelical Lutheran (religion) should be emphasized. [Why?]
- Well, because it's the only and right religion, so of course all-round education is needed and it's important to know about other religions. But nowadays young people, so they don't get religious instruction from anywhere but schools. They don't, if one thinks, in general, visit anywhere. They just hang around there and they don't go to church or elsewhere. [God's Word Authority]
- Well, those are again those, if and if, questioning and questioning. Of course he has said in the Bible that everybody should be given the knowledge. Of course it's not the right kind of knowledge, it's just a basis. In my view there should be more morality than there is now. [Is it possible to acquire morality from the philosophy of life or general philosophy?]
- Yes, one can get but from there one can get also a wrong kind of morality. (27 C)

[Nonreligious moral education, God's word authority]
- You mean that if it was grounded on the (Biblical) missionary commandment or somehow, respectively. Well, it's how one considers if a state, for example in America, there is no religious instruction at school, so yes, it functions also in that way in my opinion. It's the state's own business that how it thinks about the issue. But it's always, in my opinion, it's always, or not necessarily, or a good example is that, the U.S. is, there are lots of people who don't have any kind of values and on the other hand, a much greater proportion of people belongs to a some kind of church than in Finland, like as an active member, so they have a some kind of religion and if one thinks on moral grounds, it's much better for the state that, on the other hand, when in Finland there is the national church, so everybody belongs at least to a some kind of church. In America there are lots of such people who never get any kind of instruction. But in Finland many after the baptism never go to church. But it's anyhow how that people know that yes, I'm a member Lutheran church and it perhaps gives some kind of basis for it. They've heard something at school that surely influences somehow the moral basis that without it, who has always lived in a suburb, or not, in a slum region and has never even heard of anything. [Can, in your opinion,
philosophy replace religious instruction?] - No. [Why?] - Because of course, in this sense if the state, well, if the level of the morality of the state is reserved at the same level, if we think societally that the morality of the society would remain at the better level and would make people think more of that thing, so it was better that it was philosophy or anything else like that. But on the Biblical grounds, of course it was better that it was better that it was this kind of religious instruction what it’s now and it’s better. (28 C)

The “Marihuana”, “Wines selling in the food stores” and “Contraceptive pills” issues elicited an answering pattern that combined the Ethics of Autonomy and Community: the society has to protect an individual from acting harmfully to the self. This pattern did not follow religious borderlines.

[Wines in food stores, church authority] - It doesn’t do (right), it’s so that the Alko (the state monopoly alcohol store) is known since it sells the spirits in its own stores and if one encounters these wines in normal food stores, it anyhow is not, even if the shopkeepers explained that they keep a strict control, so it’s anyway a total nonsense that of course the rules were stretched that “yes, you can buy it”. So, it would be a totally bad move.

[God’s Word Authority] - No, I believe that down the line it had become evident that drugs and alcohol is for many such thing that it becomes, in a way, a life-companion. At least I would still consider it wrong. (01 A)

[Prescription-free contraceptive pills, other country] - Well, in my opinion wrong in a sense that it has all kinds of problems of misuse, but of course if they’ve had a good experience of it so of course they can keep it. [Parliament Authority] - Well, does wrong in a sense that it’s a thing that has many risks so I don’t see any sense in making them prescription-free. [If it’s proven that they are safe?] - Well, it would lead to a situation where everybody bought the contraceptive pills and anyhow, when they don’t protect from those diseases so it would become complicated and a girl would have to become more responsible of it and it’s not good then. (7 A)
[Prescription-free contraceptive pills, government authority]
- In some way yes, some way no. In my opinion such, at all, that some drugs are made prescription-free, is a bit frightening in my opinion in a sense that then children can misuse them or otherwise people misuse them and then so many things can happen and even for normal people who have not, for example, known something that it can be dangerous and then, and a doctor could not have told that and then you can continue to use them and then something can happen, that yes in my opinion, such a thing. Of course now, when speaking of contraception, so maybe, why not. (19 B)

Many also stated that “a society has the right to have its own kind of social conventions”, which means that the Turiel sphere of social convention was grounded in the principle of “moral group rights”. On the other hand, it was interesting that the moral issues “Stealing”, “Gender inequality” or “Religious discrimination”, acquired conventional flavour in the responses of the EL and the NR: they contextualized the moral events as if they were conventional, justified with social conventions. It therefore turns out as if the Turiel domains were interrelated.

[Religious discrimination, other country] - Yes, they do right in their own country but in my opinion not, but on the other hand I cannot judge them and in my opinion it shouldn’t be so that it should change there since if those people are content with it so it’s all right and they think of things, or they are so much different from us that I cannot judge them. [Can you say whether it is right or wrong?] - If I went there so it would feel like a great wrong but if I was born there so in that case not, so both-and, so when I’m like now it would feel wrong. (18 B)

[Gender inequality, other country] - I don’t know, a difficult question. Of course, at least in my opinion they should treat them (women) equally but since that culture surely is different, for example men go for hunting and women take care of children or at least before it used to be like that, but on the other hand then, if women do more work so there is a little bit of inequality if that culture is such, so I don’t know about it then, but I don’t have anything to say about that. [Can you say whether it is right
or wrong?] - No, I cannot so easily, but I can say that I’m personally against it but on the other hand, if is accepted in this kind of culture so then I don’t have anything to say to it, that of course if women are treated unequally, so they could be educated about it somehow. (11 B)

Moreover, the conceptions of rights, individual freedom and personal autonomy were closely related and they were sometimes difficult to differentiate. The Turiel domain of personal autonomy was frequently grounded in the notion if moral individual rights; “an individual had the right to have personal freedom”. Theoretically, the domain of personal autonomy is a necessary prerequisite for the notion of the individual rights.

When considering Turiel’s domains and their interrelation, it seems that religious persons considered the personal autonomy domain as a part of the moral domain: many religious respondents considered immoral thoughts as having a moral significance. It was manifested in their tendency to refuse to think that God would change his/her Biblical orders or that God would order a human to act in an immoral way. It is possible that the CL hold a different conception of the personal autonomy than the EL or the NR, since many of them refused to imagine the situation that God could change his/her words. Also in the Cohen and Rozin (2001) study, Protestants regarded thoughts of immoral acts as morally wrong. According to this conception even a person’s thoughts are not his/her private business but even there reign the Godly and Satanic powers:

...conscience in general, I feel at least... that the right thing it says, that do the right thing, so it’s a bit that could have done oneself or it has, another voice a little calms down that don’t, you can do it, that it’s not a bad thing. [What is that other voice?] - Eh, I don’t know, could be maybe something of the Satan’s or that kind of the Evil’s or God’s enemy or soul’s enemy or something like that. [What is conscience?] - It’s something like God’s I think, I’m not sure actually, God’s voice inside, that even if a human being, if does something wrong, a little, ehh, God says that not, ehh say, but God’s other voice says something that now you’ve done wrong. [What’s its purpose?]
- To make a human being understand that you’ve committed a sin and to do the right thing. (21C)

[Stealing, Open Question] - It would be a totally impossible idea that God had said so. In my opinion it is totally stupid to even think about that God would change his own word. It is always the same. [But through the Bible God speaks and if some original texts were found and it was noticed that “hey, here is a mistake”, so would it be possible?] - No, that is so fictitious that I just laugh at that question. [But is it possible for God to give such an order?] - No. [Why not?] - I cannot find any reason for it but I believe so that it could not be. (27 C)

The interviews, moreover, suggested that the respondents did not interpret other countries’ differing “nonmoral” practices in a conventional (which means relativistic) way if the practice was forbidden in respondents’ own country or religious community. This evaluative and moralizing discourse came out in some responses of the EL and the CL to the “Nonreligious moral education” issue (presently in Finland moral education is Evangelical Lutheran). Even if many stated that the other country had the right to decide about its own businesses, they added that in the atheistic countries a social system “does not function well” and some respondents mentioned Russia as an example. Behind such arguments lies a supposition that a society has to be grounded on religious, preferably Christian, values to maintain a societal harmony and not to fall apart. Many CLs who evaluated the “Contraceptive prescription-free pills” negatively in the context of other countries, justified their stand arguing that if “the social systems of those countries were based on the Bible, they would not have the overpopulation catastrophe and poverty problems”. These arguments suggest that the respondents did not regard nonmoral practices as totally arbitrary and contractual but as reflecting the (moral) value systems of the societies and people.

[Contraceptive pills, other country; … Is it right for example in India where they have a great population growth?] - Well, so, if one takes separately a case like that. But if one thinks otherwise that if they had also other things than the contraception
organized) in a different way, so it would be then that it would not be such a chaos. (22C)

[Nonreligious moral education, government authority] - ...I think that Russia is indeed a good example of what a country can become or a state can become if there is no religion. It anyway gives so many virtues, high morality and like... I think that it’s like Finland would be driven to become damaged because of it. [Wines selling in food stores, generalizability] - They should think themselves if it’s right. If I don’t live according to the Bible, so anyway it brings all kinds of harm that it cannot be regarded as the right thing. (24C)

[Stealing, other country] - But God has told in his Word that it’s wrong that it’s not even in the constitutional law of Russia that one should not steal but they do wrong when they steal. They don’t know that they do wrong any amount of the property they take away from the others. (27C)

The “Gender inequality” issue was complicated for the CL: around half of them held that God assigns a woman “a different social status of men even if they have the equal value as human beings”. Anyhow, they considered this to be “an equal treatment of women as compared to men”. Because of biological and mental differences “a woman is meant to concentrate on doing the household work”, and “because of the ‘natural defects’, a leading position in the society or priesthood in a religious community is forbidden from women”. It seemed, therefore, that conceptions of the personhood or of “natural tasks” related to gender influence moral conceptions. According to this idea, “naturally determined” social roles define what is fair and just for persons of different social status. In the light of my interviews, respondents regarded very different social circumstances of life as fair and equal. The “Gender inequality” issue illustrated well how strong role the conceptions of a human nature have as the determinants of morality:

[Gender inequality, government authority] - ...but it’s strange why men cannot give birth yet ... it’s not possible in any way, in practice, equality, when man and woman are different so how could they be equal. How a bear and a fox could be equal when
they have totally different skills and all thoughts and instincts and so ... the biggest obstacle for the women’s salaries development is always that they are jealous to each other and then fight with each other. And there one can see that if men were in the army so they didn’t fight with each other there. [What is said in the Bible about equality?] - It’s, too, so a relative conception... how you interpret that Bible... I can say for example that men and women are these days unequal because a woman can have two jobs, she can be at work at home, she knows all about how things work out there. These days in the society men don’t have anything to do... a woman can be also at work outside home, a man is probably without a job, so he will not understand anything about the washing machine, so he feels a total looser...
I could think that woman’s workplace was at home and it also has a value, that work what a woman does at home and what a man does at work ... nowadays Finland’s unemployment, could be quite well resolved if all the women went home. [Other country] ... in those Eastern countries, men understand and a woman has also always thought that they have always been equal and it’s always clear that a man beats his woman twice a day ... and I don’t know if one can say that unequal, one can say that they are equal but just different tasks. (28C)

Menon and Shweder (1998) discovered that Hindu Indian women held a parallel idea about the gender roles and equality. For these women, the relations between persons are base on differences and solidarity, as opposed to the Western conception of equality and competition. The researchers concluded that “to understand the Oriya moral universe as it applies to gender, one must understand that the popular Oriya recognition of the worth of women’s work and widespread acknowledgement of greater female effectiveness is not a local idiomatic Oriya expression of a feminist viewpoint, for, quite emphatically, neither women nor men in Orissa believe that women and men are equal.” (ibid, p. 159.)
8.4 The “Open Question”

Table 16 below displays the respondent groups' evaluations of the “Open Question”. When one compares the evaluations between the three groups it is easy to notice that the EL and the NR regarded morality as independent of God’s word. In contrast, morality for the CL was grounded in God’s word: for many of them morally wrong behaviors became, because of God’s command, morally right, and a notable part of the CL (ranging between 50% – 60%, coded as 2) were not able to define the morally unacceptable acts clearly morally right or wrong in such a situation. The research hypothesis (no. 2.5) thus was confirmed.

Table 16. Means, standard deviations and ANOVA of “Open Question” evaluations for EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>F (2,27)</th>
<th>EL/ NR</th>
<th>EL/ CL</th>
<th>NR/ CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious discrimination</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender inequality</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginally significant difference: a) p < 0.052
p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
x) Games-Howitt test for unequal variances

In turn, Table 17 below shows justifications the EL, the NR and the CL presented to the “Open Question” (JUSTOPEN). The analysis of justifications confirmed and completed the sketch drawn with the analysis of the evaluations. For the EL and the NR
morality was a universal sphere independent of other considerations. In contrast, for the CL morality was a complex entity: a mix between a God’s word-based moral conception and universalistic, autonomous moral concerns, lending again support for the research hypothesis (no. 2.5).

**Table 17. Means, standard deviations and ANOVA of “Open Question” justifications (JUSTOPEN) for EL, NR and CL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>F(2,27)</th>
<th>EL/</th>
<th>EL/</th>
<th>NR/</th>
<th>CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>God’s word</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can’t imagine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God’s word &amp; Just God</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universal morality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relativism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The categories are described in Appendix 12. Marginally significant differences: a) p < 0.070; b) p < 0.057; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001 s) Tukey’s test for equal variances
Moreover, it is worth noting that among the EL, the morality based on the “Social convention” was more common than among other two groups. Another interesting finding was for the EL and NR the second most common category was “Relativism” that treats “Stealing”, “Religious discrimination” and “Gender inequality” issues as if they were everybody’s private concerns.

8.4.6 The “Open Question” and the Shweder Ethics

The correlations between the “Open Question” justifications (JUSTOPEN) and the Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity (*EA, *EC, *ED) use were examined. Table 30 (Appendix 13) reveals that the Ethic of Autonomy correlated positively with the universalistic, autonomous notion of morality. The Ethic of Divinity, on the other hand, correlated with the justification category God’s word & just God. Also the positive correlation between Ethic of Divinity and the God’s word -based morality approached significance. Also refusals to imagine that God could change his/her words were associated with the Ethic of Divinity. Probably, as was also mentioned before, this refusal resulted from the moralization of thinking that God could order a person to act immorally. The Ethic of Community was not related to any particular Open Question justification category.

When one analyses the directions of correlations, it is easy to see that “God’s word”, “Cannot imagine” and “God’s word & just God” categories reflect religion -based moral codes. As a contrast, “Universal morality”, “Convention” and “Relativism” are categories associated with nonreligious conception of morality.

8.5 Conflicting Ethics: Cultural-religious dilemmas

The Cultural-religious dilemmas explored the relation of the Shweder Ethics in dilemmatic situations. The evaluations of the Missionary and the Ethnic Minority dilemmas of the EL, NR and CL are presented in Table 31 (Appendix 14). The evaluations of the Missionary Dilemma elicited bigger between-group differences than the Ethnic Minority Dilemma. The evaluations of the
EL and the NR were highly similar whereas the CL, again, evaluated the dilemmas differently.

**Table 18.** Means, standard deviations and ANOVA of Ethics of Autonomy (*CA), Community (*CC), and Divinity (*CD) use among EL, NR and CL in Cultural-religious dilemmas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>F(2, 27)</th>
<th>EL/ NR</th>
<th>EL/ CL</th>
<th>NR/ CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*CA</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CC</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
x) Tukey’s test for equal variances

The hierarchical cluster analysis, run with the 38 justification categories of the Cultural-Religious dilemmas (codes list in Appendix 15), revealed again the Ethics structure. Table 18 above shows the use of the three main clusters, created with the hierarchical cluster analysis, called here as the Ethics of Autonomy (*CA), Community (*CC) and Divinity (*CD). The Ethic of Autonomy (*CA) was the dominant rhetoric for all groups. The EL used predominantly the Ethics of Autonomy (*CA) and Community (*CC) whereas the CL used the Ethics of Autonomy (*CA) and Divinity (*CD). The NR used mainly the Ethic of Autonomy (*CA).
Table 19. Pearson correlations between Shweder original Ethics (*EA=Autonomy, *EC=Community, *ED=Divinity) and Cultural-Ethical dilemma probe evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Minority Dilemma</th>
<th>*EA</th>
<th>*EC</th>
<th>*ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. “The school prohibition should be removed”</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “It’s right to not go to school even if violates the Constitutional Law”</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “The school board didn’t have the right to prohibit the veils”</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Wearing veils at school is right despite the school regulations”</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.33 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “It’s wrong if parents force daughters to wear veils”</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. &quot;A person wearing religious signs shouldn’t be punished in France”</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. “The law should be removed”</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “Persons should follow religious beliefs, not laws”</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missionary Dilemma</th>
<th>*EA</th>
<th>*EC</th>
<th>*ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. “The missionary’s plan is wrong”</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.34 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “It’s better if tribesmen keep their own religion”</td>
<td>.34 (c)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “It’s better if the tribesmen don’t wear clothes”</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “The tribesmen should pretend conversion to obtain the medicine”</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “The missionary is responsible if the tribesmen become ill”</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “It’s alright if the tribesmen continue to use drug leaves”</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.69***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “The practices of various cultures are equal”</td>
<td>.33 (d)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginally significant correlations: a) p < 0.072; b) p < 0.068; c) p < 0.068; d) p < 0.076
p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
Since the clusters (*CA, *CC, *CD) were based on only two dilemmas (as compared to the analysis of the Turiel Rule Transgression Interview section where existence of each code ranged between 0 – 10), most codes were actually dichotomous and perhaps for the small size of the analyzable material accounted for the difference between the Shweder original Ethics and the Ethics constructed from my dilemmas. However, these different cluster analyses can be used as validating each other.

The Pearson correlation coefficients between the Shweder original Ethics (*EA, *EC, *ED) and the dilemma evaluations revealed an interesting pattern: in practice the cultural dilemmas were, indeed, conflicts between the Ethics. Table 19 above presents the correlations between the evaluations of dilemma probes and the Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity. This Table reveals that the respondents interpreted the dilemmas as conflicts between the Ethics of Autonomy and Divinity; the dilemmas did not correlate with the Ethic of Community.

A look at the correlation coefficients26 between the Ethics (*EA, *EC, *ED) and the Ethnic minority dilemma evaluations in Table 19 reveals that the Ethic of Autonomy (*EA) correlated with the argument that “one’s religious rights are more important than the violation of the constitutional law” or “school regulations”. On the other hand, the Ethic of Divinity (*ED) correlated, interestingly, with the notion that “if a person wore religious signs in public places in France where it is prohibited by law, this person should be punished”.

Table 19 reveals also that the persons who used predominantly the Ethic of Autonomy (*EA) argued in the Missionary Dilemma that it is better “if tribesmen kept their religion”, “if they pretended conversion to obtain the medicine” and “if they continued to use their traditional drugs”. The Ethic of Autonomy rhetoric was also associated with the idea that if the cultures were evaluated from their customs’ point of view, “all cultures are equal”.

On the other hand, the Ethic of Divinity (*ED) thinkers responded very differently. They held that “it is alright if the missionary executed his plan to give medicine only if the people converted into Christianity”, and that “it is better if the tribesmen

26 including marginally significant correlations
became Christians”. It would be better also “if the tribesmen wore clothes and wouldn’t pretend conversion to obtain the medicine”

Those who had internalised the Ethic of Divinity held that “the missionary is responsible if the people got paralysed”. They also held that “it is wrong if the tribesmen continued to use their drugs in their ceremonies”. Moreover, the Ethic of Divinity was in accord with the idea that “some cultures are better than others when their customs are compared”. Based on these responses one can make interesting conclusions regarding the patterns of tolerance in different domains of Ethics. Tolerance, if it is understood as acceptance of other cultures’ practices, seemed to be associated with the Ethic of Autonomy -type thinking only.

8.6 Integrative analysis

In this part I intend to draw the full multi-methodological map of the different parts of the data. I carried out the Pearson correlation coefficients analysis to integrate all the parts of the study. I describe the results first, from the Shweder Ethics point of view. Then I discuss the Kohlberg MJI and its connection to various measures calculated from different sections of the study. All the variables are defined in the Variables list, Appendix 2.

8.6.1 The Ethic of Autonomy

Table 20 reveals that the Ethic of Autonomy (*EA) had a strong negative correlation with the RELIGION score. Moreover, it had a weak positive correlation with the Kohlberg B-orientation, as expected (hypothesis no. 4.1). However, it was not related to the moral development stage, the WAS score, as hypothesized (hypothesis no. 4.4).

The Ethic of Autonomy (*EA) was strongly related to the domain differentiation (DOMAIN), as hypothesized (hypothesis no. 4.2). Its negative correlation between the contextuality (CONTEXT) approached significance, in accord with the research hypothesis (no. 4.3).
Table 20. Pearson correlations of the Shweder original Ethics and the Finnish Ethics to religiosity, MJI, Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview and Shweder Ethics measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shweder Original Ethics</th>
<th></th>
<th>Finnish Ethics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. RELIGION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohlberg:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. WAS</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. B-orientation</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turiel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DOMAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CONTEXT</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. CONTNON</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. CONTMOR</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. CONTDIFF</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. GROUPDIFF</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.33 (b)</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shweder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. MULTIETH</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MULTIJUST</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginally significant correlations: a) p < 0.069; b) p < 0.071
*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
8.6.2 The Ethic of Community

Table 20 reveals further that the Ethic of Community (*EC) was virtually unrelated to the RELIGION score, confirming the initial hypothesis (no. 3.3). It is interesting to note that the Ethic of Community was totally unrelated to Kohlberg’s orientations.

The correlation between the Ethic of Community and the in-group – out-group differentiation (GROUPDIFF) approached significance. However, it did not correlate with the overall contextuality (CONTEXT). Thus the original hypothesis about the greater contextuality of the Ethic of Community as compared to the Ethic of Autonomy was partially confirmed but partially disconfirmed (hypothesis no. 4.3). This finding, however, showed that the context differentiation (CONTEXT) and the in-group – out-group differentiation (GROUPDIFF) measures referred to slightly different things.

The Ethic of Community did not correlate with the multiple use of the Ethics (MULTIETH). However, the Ethic of Community correlated moderately with the use of multiple justifications (MULTIJUST). This pattern might show that the Ethic of Community type argumentation has a minority status in Finland so that its use has to be justified with more justifications.

8.6.3 The Ethic of Divinity

When the results presented in Table 20 are observed from the Ethic of Divinity (*ED) perspective, one can see that it correlated strongly with the RELIGION score. It did not correlate with the Kohlberg WAS score and neither with the use of the orientations, thus disconfirming the original hypothesis (no. 4.1).

The Ethic of Divinity had a strong negative association with the domain differentiation (DOMAIN), confirming the hypothesis (no. 4.2) of the study. Moreover, it differentiated strongly between the contexts (CONTEXT), both in moral (CONTMOR), and particularly, in nonmoral (CONTNON) issues as hypothesized (hypothesis no. 4.3). In addition, the Ethic of Divinity made a moder-
ate in-group – out-group differentiation (GROUPDIFF), in accord with the research hypothesis (no. 2.4).
The Ethic of Divinity correlated weakly with the use of multiple Ethics (MULTIETH), consonant with the research hypothesis (no. 3.5). Moreover, the Ethic of Divinity correlated moderately with the use of greater number of justifications (MULTIJUST) in the present study indicating that the Ethic of Divinity is a minority moral ideology in Finland and its use has to be justified more carefully than the Ethic of Autonomy.

8.6.4 The Shweder original and Finnish Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity

When the Pearson correlation coefficients of the Shweder original (*EA, *EC, *ED) and the Finnish (*FA, *FC, *FD) Ethics are observed in Table 20 above, it seems that the Shweder original Ethics and the Finnish Ethics correlated almost identically with the Kohlberg MJI and the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview measures.

The only difference was that the Finnish Ethic of Community (*FC) regarded moral issues as less contextual and nonmoral issues as more contextual (CONTDIFF) than the Shweder original Ethic of Community. It is understandable that the differences found between the Shweder original and the Finnish Ethics were most likely to be found in the Ethic of Community cluster these had the lowest correlation (Table 2, p. 144).

8.6.5 Links between the Kohlberg and Turiel measures

Table 21 reveals that nonreligious persons scored a little higher in the Kohlberg WAS than religious persons, as a contrast to the original hypothesis (no. 1.2). As also mentioned earlier, the moral development level correlated moderately with the Kohlberg B-orientation and thus supported the initial hypothesis (no. 1.1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5a</th>
<th>5b</th>
<th>5c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RELIGION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. WAS</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. B-orientation</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DOMAIN</td>
<td>-.75***</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CONTEXT</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>-.35 (a)</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.63***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.CONTNON</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.60***</td>
<td>.94***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b.CONTMOR</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. CONTDIFF</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d.GROUPDIFF</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>-.35 (b)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.33 (c)</td>
<td>.82***</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginally significant correlations: a) p < 0.060; b) p < 0.059; c) p < 0.078; p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
It is interesting to compare this pattern here with the Shweder Ethics: as a contrast, none of the Shweder Ethics (*EA, *EC, *ED) correlated with the level of moral development, confirming the research hypothesis (no. 4.6). This finding is in accord with Shweder’s claim that the Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity do not constitute a developmental order.

The negative correlation between the Kohlberg WAS score and the contextuality (CONTEXT) approached significance. However, when the other, more specific context differentiation measures were observed, we can see that the WAS correlated negatively only with the contextuality of nonmoral issues (CONT-NON); also the negative correlation with the in-group – out-group differentiation (GROUPDIFF) approached a significance.

The level of moral judgment and the domain differentiation (DOMAIN) were not related, confirming the original hypothesis (no. 4.4). This finding is contrary to Ikonen-Varila’s (2000) finding that the interpretation of norms as moral correlated positively, though weakly, with the level of moral development (measured with Rest’s DIT) among the Finnish adolescents.

The use of the B-orientation had a weak negative correlation with the domain differentiation (DOMAIN), thus confirming the initial research hypothesis (no. 4.5). However the orientations were not related to any contextuality measure.
9.1 Multiple moralities, multiple explanations

The title of this book reflected the major research problem of the present study. Do the adolescents having Lutheran, Laestadian and nonreligious affiliation share the same conception of morality or alternatively, do the moral conceptions held by the respondents reflect different moral realities? However, the other, related research problem that had to be considered first was question the definition of morality itself. Is morality of one kind or are there multiple moralities?

The difficult problem associated with theories and methods is that the theory used frequently determines or at least influences what kinds of findings are obtained. The traditional way of social psychological research to look for a singular truth was put aside in the present study. Instead, the aim was to capture morality as a multifaceted phenomenon (see Gergen & Gergen, 1997). In multitheoretical approach, the way morality is defined became important: can morality be defined as a distinct class of knowledge or, rather, is it something that can be understood only when its relation or relatedness to other kinds of knowledge and psychosocial phenomena as well as to the “external” reality is concerned? It came out that the factors that, in general, have been used to explain the variation in moral judgments have to be integrated in the characterization of morality. They included the consideration of different types of events in terms of their “inherent features” as well as the notion of informational assumptions, social context and
group memberships. Moreover, the moral emotions were discussed even though the present study did not empirically study them. Turiel considered these factors to be outside the scope of morality but Shweder included all these considerations within the definition of morality. This study grasped the aspects of the division of morality and convention in terms of their “inherent features”, as well as the consideration of group memberships influencing the way persons make moral judgments and, moreover, discussed the idea whether informational assumptions constitute a system called culture.

Consequently, the multitheoretical approach enabled me to re-assess the assumptions underlying the cognitive-developmental approach as opposed to the cultural psychological approach. One of most fundamental and controversial is the division between the structure and the content of moral judgment and the discussion here is structured around this theme. As mentioned before, both Kohlberg and Turiel consider the structure and the content of moral judgment to be independent but Shweder argues that they are inseparable. The distinctive result obtained from the Kohlberg MJI was that the adolescents without a religious community membership scored higher in the WAS and used more the B-orientation than the other groups. There was a significant correlation between the moral judgment stage and the use of the B-orientation in the whole sample. Therefore it seems plausible to argue that the structure and the content of moral judgment may be related. However, the variation in the WAS score and the orientation within the adolescents without a religious community membership was significantly greater than in the other two groups. Thus it seems that the explicit religious ideology influences the moral judgments made by the Conservative Laestadians and the Lutherans by making them more uniform than the judgments made by the adolescents without a religious community membership. In Batson’s and his colleague’s (1993) words, the way of being religious may influence the level of moral development (see also the analysis of Vesala, 2002). Adolescents without a religious community membership clearly represent dimension of the “Religion as a quest”. Questioning, open-ended way of being religious may enhance moral development unlike more or less unquestioning the “Religion as an end” or the “Religion as means”-orientations.
The Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview, in turn, differentiated the Laestadians from the other groups. The Laestadians regarded all the ten rules as moral whereas the adolescents without a religious community membership and the Lutherans matched almost perfectly the Turielian conception of morality (3 moral and 7 nonmoral rules). The further measures grounded on the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview included the consideration of the domain differentiation (DOMAIN), the contextuality (CONTEXT) and the in-group – out-group differentiation (GROUPDIFF) measures. Based on these measures, two different subtypes of morality were identified. The universal morality type was opposed to the God’s word-dependent morality type. The former was related to the interpretation of the seven nonmoral events as social conventions and the latter, in turn, in terms of the context-dependent morality. The context-dependent morality is a sub-type of morality suggested by Shweder et al. (1987) which evaluates practices as unalterable, thus moral, in one’s own community but as alterable, thus nonmoral, when endorsed outside one’s community.

The Laestadians differentiated most clearly the moral in-group and out-group as compared to the two other respondent groups. Only the Laestadians were clearly more contextual in nonmoral than in moral rules even though the Laestadians were, in general, significantly more contextual in all ten issues than the other two groups. The fact that the Laestadians evaluated nonmoral rules most strictly in the Church authority context reveals that the moral obrigatoriness of the Laestadian religious rules does not extend beyond the limits of their religious community. In other words, different authorities have their boundaries that follow the boundaries of their communities. Moreover, it seems that the persons without a religious community membership treat the religious out-group context as more moral than the nonreligious out-group: they evaluated opening shops on Sundays, for example, as most moral in the Church context. As a contrast, the Laestadians evaluated most acts as less moral in the Government (out-group context for them) than their own in-group context of Church.

For the Laestadians the crucial authority regarding nonmoral issues is God’s word. Moreover, an interesting finding was that the morality – nonmorality differentiation is the opposite for the contextual differentiation. In other words, the persons who differentiate between the events do not differentiate between the con-
texts. The moral arguments thus can be divided either as behavior-dependent or context-dependent. Moreover, the pattern of the distribution of moral – nonmoral quality across the ten rules resembles Rest’s (1983) idea that morality – nonmorality is a continuum rather than Turiel’s idea that it is divided as distinct domains.

The justifications given to the evaluations of the rule transgressions were analysed using Shweder’s and Turiel’s interpretive schemes simultaneously. The low proportion of purely social conventional justifications to the nonmoral rule violations is striking. When Turielian moral (assuming that it matches with the Shweder Ethic of Autonomy), personal (indicated separately in the Shweder Ethic of Autonomy) and social conventional (indicated separately within the Shweder Ethic of Community) justifications are left out (see Table 11), it is worth noting that 38% of the Lutherans’, 37% of the adolescents without a religious community membership, and remarkably, 74% of the Laestadians’ justifications remained outside Turiel’s three domains. In other words, the Turiel scheme left a high proportion of justifications as unnoticed and unrecognized since they didn’t match with the domains. Also this finding speaks for the dangers of adopting too strict theoretical definitions of morality as a starting point of research. Moreover, the justifications provided to each rule displayed interesting patterns such as the high proportion of conventional justifications in Stealing issue that is classified as moral in Turiel’s scheme (see Tables 28 and 29 in Appendices 10 and 11).

The present study did not confirm Turiel’s idea that religion is just a source of informational assumptions. Instead, the findings revealed that the religion-based morality for many Laestadians constitutes a natural moral law. Many Laestadians held that God’s commands are binding to all human beings irrespective of their belief, or lack of belief, in God. According to Shweder, the Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity are based on the natural moral laws that are different from each other. Kohlberg, in contrast, argued that there exists only one kind of natural moral law. Some of my Laestadian interviewees, however, represented the conception of God’s-word-based natural moral law that is parallel to the idea of the nonreligious Kohlbergian natural moral law since they regard it as (1) unchangeable, (2) not as a product of a social contract, (3) binding irrespective of one’s religious conviction, and (4) mandatory. According to Turiel, God’s-word -
dependent evaluations are nonmoral, or in other words, conventional. However, from the point of view of a religious person the superhuman authority endowed with unlimited powers is not comparable to a human authority: for the religious person God has created the universe including human beings and directs people’s lives, also his/her personal life, from the beginning to an end. In this sense God’s word is a kind of natural law, like physical laws, that cannot be changed, according to the understanding of a religious person.

[Censorship, God’s word authority] - God’s word is the basis of my life, it gives purpose to everything and this kind of trust. It affects really everything. (22C)

When considered historically, the European natural law tradition as a moral code has a long past, stretching from antiquity to modernity. Moreover, Judeo-Christian religious traditions have always been an essential part of this natural law tradition. (Bielefeldt, 2000.) Therefore it seems odd not to consider religious moral codes as constituting a natural moral law in social psychology.

Kohlberg’s conception of morality incorporates the idea of a rational basis of morality. However, this is not necessarily the case with religious persons. The interviews collected for this study revealed that the moral judgment of the Laestadians is not based on rational reasoning, or “logic”, but instead on faith. It is, therefore, probable that the idea of rational reasoning is solely the characteristic of the Ethic of Autonomy. On the other hand, faith in a superhuman authority is the approach used in the Ethic of Divinity, also noted by Durkheim (1915/1965, 205 – 223) a long time ago. However, the Laestadians are well aware of the fact that by using rational reasoning as an approach for making moral judgments one can end up with moral conclusions that are different from theirs. Also nonreligious persons presented a similar idea: they had an understanding that the religion-based moral code system produces different moral judgments from their own. Moreover, nonreligious persons were able to consider what is divine for other persons and required that they should follow their divine principles. Some Laestadians also remarked that if they were not religious they would consider nonmoral religious rules only as “conventions”. A person’s awareness of the fact that there exist
various ways of making moral judgments confirms Shweder’s claim of the “universality of morality without uniformity” according to which the moral codes share the same basic fundamental characteristics that enables persons to understand and compare each others’ conceptions of morality.

[In case you hadn’t heard of God’s word, would the contraceptive pills be still wrong?] - I would have a totally different opinion of everything. Because if a person doesn’t have a faith, he uses in everything his own brains and with the brains, you know where you go when you use only your brains. (22C)

[Shops open on Sundays, God’s word] …The Bible is written through the Holy Spirit and it can be opened only through the Holy Spirit. We believe that we hold the key for it that only we, or a normal person does not understand it with his senses, or of course I understand with my senses all these (persons) who make decisions in the government, who think of the things with their senses. Of course I also think like that with my senses but if I think about my own religion so it is the opposite such as all these. (27C)

The fact that God’s word determines the state of affairs of the whole world is also manifested in the Laestadians’ idea that a human being does not have the responsibility to help, as far as the worldly injustices such as the poverty of the developing countries, are concerned. Since the Laestadians think that the world runs according to God’s plan, they also consider that the main responsibility in the broader moral issues belongs to God. Perhaps one characteristic of the religious moral landscape is the belief that the world is fundamentally and ultimately a fair place for everyone. According to it also famine in the poor countries that seems unfair is interpreted as a part of God’s complex justice plan. The belief in the just world for the Laestadians could also explain why they do not find it necessary for a human being to rebel against social regulations or ponder about the rational justifications for the social chains of his/her life – even though the relation between the belief in just world and the religious affiliation is a controversial issue according to research (see e.g., Crozier & Joseph, 1997, for a weak positive correlation between the two).
It can be also argued that binding oneself to the Ethic of Divinity is also based on a “social” contract like the Ethic of Autonomy contract but the former is a contract between the parties that are unequal and aware of their differential status: the Ethic of Divinity requires of the follower that (s)he believes in the existence of the superhuman authority, that (s)he agrees to follow religious regulations of life and gives away his/her personal autonomy – the use of drugs, rebellious and questioning thoughts – and the person who wants to do it, in turn receives the perfectly orderly just world where the moral responsibility belongs to God and makes a person free from making sense out of the painful dilemmas and moral contradictions of life. As a contrast the Ethic of Autonomy is a social contract between the parties that are equal and its purpose is to maintain the autonomy of the individuals that have made the contract. Also the persons without a religious community membership used frequently the Ethic of Divinity: in particular, they considered what is divine for other persons and required that they follow their divine principles.

[Prescription-free contraceptive pills, other countries; What do you think about introducing prescription-free contraceptive pills in the developing countries?] - I understand fully what they are doing and they have that overpopulation, stop. But God reigns and we don’t have to take care of it in that way. [Does the overpopulation have a reason?] - Yes, he knows what he is doing. I don’t have to care about it. (27C)

[Prescription-free contraceptive pills, other countries; What do you think about introducing prescription-free contraceptive pills in the developing countries?] ... it is not our job to worry about how much the world’s population grows or something like that. [Is it right that the contraception is not used in India and children are born with a hopeless future?] - Well, God has meant it to be so and he does so perhaps to speak to the Western people … that’s why we go on pumping money there and try to maintain our own better status … I think that the things go the way God has meant them to go… but anyway, they are happy about their own lives even if they had how miserable conditions or so, that it is anyway so that happiness does not depend on this material well-being. [But if they don’t have food to eat there?] ...God
The social psychological study of the majorities and minorities suggests that the majorities do not only represent the norm, but they are the norm (Moscovici, 1985). How does the fact that the Lutherans are the majority whereas the Laestadians and the persons without a religious community membership represent the minorities, influence their moral judgments? The Laestadians and the adolescents without a religious community membership both constitute minorities in Finland but they have adopted opposing stands in justifying their moral positions. The findings obtained in the present study demonstrated that individuals relate their judgments to the norm judgment of the moral community in a way that the more the individual judgment deviates from the norm judgment, the more an individual provides justifications for his/her argument. Moreover, the findings revealed that Finland does not constitute a uniform moral community: the Laestadians, for example, form a distinct moral community with its own moral norm system. On the other hand, the persons without a religious community membership, even though they also hold a minority status in Finland, seemed to identify more or less with the moral majority of Finns, the Lutherans. In this respect, the adolescents without a religious community membership are significantly more similar to the Finnish moral majority than are the Laestadians and may not experience the minority status as clearly as the Laestadians do. The Laestadians evaluated all rule transgressions more contextually than the other groups, which might be explained by their experienced “moral minority status” in the present-day Finland. It can be argued that the dynamics between the perceived context-dependence and context-independence may be related to the experienced moral minority or moral majority status. It anyway serves the interests of the majority to consider their morality that is the dominant morality of the society, as more uniform and context-independent “than it is”. As a contrast, the moral minority benefits by interpreting their moral conceptions as contextual. The process suggested here is as follows. Since the minority has to be more conscious of its minority status than the majority, it emphasizes more the borderline of moral communities. It, in turn, leads to the creation of the conception of the context-dependent moral-
ity. This idea, in fact, gets support from the study conducted by Plaut and Markus (reported in Markus et al., 2000, 245 – 247) in the U.S. that examined the conceptions held by undergraduate students belonging to a white majority and a non-immigrant minority regarding the multiculturalism and differences between the ethnic groups. The findings revealed that the white students tend to focus on sameness and similarity, whereas the minority students see differences between cultural and ethnic groups.

The Shweder “Big Three” were identified also in Finland, in addition to the U.S. and India. This finding supported the notion that the Ethics seem to exist universally, at least in rough terms. In other words, the content of morality seems to be divided as the Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity and the content of moral argument, as well, thus may be more universal than previously assumed. In practice, the adolescents without a religious community membership assigned eight rules predominantly to the Ethic of Autonomy and one to the Ethic of Community (one equally to Autonomy and Community). The Lutherans, in turn, assigned five rules to the Ethic of Autonomy, three to Community and one to Divinity (one equally to Autonomy and Community). The Laestadians assigned eight rules to the Ethic of Divinity and one to Autonomy (one equally to Autonomy and Divinity).

It is possible that the controversy among the researchers regarding the construction of the map of relations between the morality, social convention and personal autonomy, actually reflects the different ways to construct the relation between these domains that could be cultural (or discretionary in Shweder’s terms) and found from the interviews of the respondents. Hypothetically, it is possible to argue that, applying the idea of moral community, in general, morality is seen as belonging to the moral domain, but in the internationalizing world, those countries that are in close contact with each other, have to treat each other’s moral conceptions as if they were social conventions. And, finally, in the multicultural society where many moral systems co-exist inside the same country, the only way to respect each others’ diverging moral points of view is to treat them as personal, private issues. This could get support from the analysis of the justifications to the Open Question where six types answers to question “Who or what defines what morality is”, were discovered. Different kinds of “moral” conceptions of morality were found (the “God’s word”,
the “God’s word & just God” as well as the “Universal morality” types), as well as morality as a “Social convention” and morality as “Personal autonomy” (representing the category of relativism). Responses to Open Question revealed that the Laestadians hold a predominantly God’s word-based conception of morality. On the other hand, the adolescents without a religious community membership and the Lutherans hold the universalistic conception of morality. Curiously, the second most important justification category for the adolescents without a religious community membership and the Lutherans in the Open Question, indeed, was “Relativism” that treats persons’ diverging conceptions of morality as personal autonomy issues.

However, the hierarchical cluster analysis in conjunction with the qualitative analysis of the patterns of the Ethics combinations revealed that the Ethics are constructed in Finland in a way that is different from the U.S. and India. In Finland, the Ethics of Autonomy and Community are merged to some extent. The common pattern was to moralize potentially self-harming behaviors such as wine consumption and marihuana use as well as watching uncensored TV programs and using contraceptive pills without medical control system. The justifications contained the idea that the state has the responsibility to protect individuals from harming themselves. This pattern seems to be a characteristic of a Finnish welfare state morality. The Ethics of Autonomy and Community are positively related in Finland but in the U.S. (Arnett & Jensen, in press) they correlated negatively. The Finns use the Ethic of Community more frequently than the North Americans, which parallels with the notion of Scarr (1996) regarding the case of Sweden. The Laestadians, in turn, combined the Ethics of Community and Divinity: they frequently argued that the lack of a religious conviction results in the moral degeneration of the Finnish society. In the Hersh and Haidt (1999) study the politically conservative respondents provided similar concerns.

Moreover, the Shweder Ethics are very useful in explaining the cultural clashes. In particular, Shweder’s model helps to find out what kinds of moralities are in conflict. When observing the findings on the cultural-religious dilemmas in the present study, the conflicting opinions contrasted the Ethic of Autonomy and Divinity. In Jensen’s studies, the Ethic of Community as well as the Ethic of Divinity correlated negatively with the Ethic of
Autonomy. In other words, in the U.S. the “culture wars” between the Ethics of Autonomy and Community, as well as between the Ethics of Autonomy and Divinity, may be found (the latter is well documented in Jensen’s studies). On the other hand, in Finland the Ethics of Autonomy and Community are relatively unlikely to generate moral conflicts; the only “true” cultural conflicts can be identified between the Ethics of Autonomy and Divinity.

However, it should be kept in mind that religion is not always, everywhere and for everyone the same thing and may influence the psychological processes of an individual in multiple ways. Therefore one should be wary of treating all religions as the one and single dimension of religiosity. (Belzen, 1999.) The Laestadians are in some respects similar to other religious communities studied before, such as the Amishes (Nucci & Turiel, 1993), the Catholics, the Jews (Nucci & Turiel, 1993) and the Protestants (Rozin, 1999), but also different. The Church authority did not have significance for the Laestadians since they held that also the Church has to follow the orders of God. The Laestadian conception of the relationship between morality and God’s word is, therefore, near to the Orthodox Jewish conceptions: in the both groups around half of the respondents held that the moral evaluation of stealing depends on God’s word. Both the Laestadians and the Orthodox Jews interpret their religious scriptures very literally: for example the Laestadians think that the only right version of the Bible is the Finnish translation made in the 1860s and they maintain that none of the later translations any longer represent the genuine, right word of God. Thus, as was hypothesized in the beginning, the nonreligious persons hold a universal sphere of morality as well as domains of social convention as personal autonomy whereas the religious persons’ morality is contingent on God’s word. Moreover, the Laestadians held a context-dependent conception of morality that differentiates between in-groups and out-groups.

To sum up the findings focusing on the controversial issue of the content – structure division of moral judgment, it seems that the content and structure are related, but in a complex way. It may be that the endorsement of an explicit ideology may make the judgments more uniform in the group. Belonging to a group who cannot base its identity on the explicit, written ideology such as the adolescents without a religious community membership may
elicit a greater need among these persons to justify their moral position. This in turn might explain the higher MJI score of the nonreligious adolescents. However, one has to keep in mind that previous studies have documented inconsistent findings (Rest, 1983; Kohlberg, 1984; Lehtinen, 1988) on this issue. On the other hand, when content and structure are defined in Turielian way, the findings revealed that religious ideology affects the way the domains of morality, social convention and personal autonomy are understood and the way they are interrelated.

9.2 Methodological concerns

Some methodological points need to be mentioned. First, the purpose of the present study was to explore morality multitheoretically with the aim to integrate the opposing theoretical viewpoints. Indeed, this choice proved to be fruitful. It enabled me to relate seemingly opposing findings obtained by different methods used by the social psychologists studying morality. However, the intention was not to achieve generalizability from a larger population. Rather, the aim was to generate and test new theoretical hypotheses, while leaving their generalizability to further studies.

The present study elaborated some measures used in earlier studies. First, the present study elaborated the Turiel Rule Transgression Interview. The apparent simplicity of the Turiel domain analysis can be regarded as its advantage since it makes the interview very flexible: it can be modified to a variety of contexts and purposes and, moreover, enables the statistical elaborations. Even if the “right or wrong” -evaluations of this style may seem very simple, they can capture very complex details in the judgment style. For example, the criterion questions can be modified for the specific purposes of each study as the present study also did. This study analysed the evaluations on two dimensions: rules and contexts. Several new measures were computed (see Appendix 3). In addition, another new perspective used in the present study was to analyse the number of judgments.

Moreover, to validate the Shweder Ethics model in the Finnish context the hierarchical cluster analysis was carried out. However, it needs to be assessed if the hierarchical cluster analysis is the best way to capture the actual cultural Ethics of the population
under study or if other, more qualitative methods are needed, as well. However, the attention is addressed to the dangers in the use of ready-made coding manuals and their application in different cultural contexts without questioning the local cultural clusterization of the Ethics (see also Haidt et al., 1993). At least, the Ethics model should be validated in some way before it is applied. Otherwise, the cultural Ethics approach remains as no more than the replication of earlier formulations of Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1984). Shweder (2000, 219 – 221) claims that the purpose of the cultural psychology is to “globalize the local”. By this he means that when studying the indigenous psychologies of other cultures we can simultaneously learn more of some under-studied aspects of our culture (the logic of filial piety or the logic of benevolence in the Chinese culture may help us to understand the aspects of North American or European psychology). This aim is a very ambitious one and is also one of the objectives of the present study. Moreover, the interrelatedness of the Ethics should get more emphasis in the future studies and it should be discussed, moreover, how best to capture it, both theoretically and methodologically.

In addition, the previous studies carried out in the Shweder Ethics approach have been criticized since they have not related the Ethics to Turiel’s domains (e.g., Miller, 1997). In the present study this idea was taken into account by locating Turiel’s moral, social conventional and personal autonomy domains in the scheme of the Shweder Ethics.

Another concern associated with the study of the Shweder Ethics is the apparent contradiction how it is possible, or whether it is possible at all, to retrieve unconscious or intuitive cultural propositions from the data that consists of verbal reports of persons. To retrieve the cultural Ethics that are used unconsciously, from the consciously produced account of a respondent, requires a large amount of interpretation. Moreover, if these Ethics are used unconsciously, it is however required from a researcher to be conscious of his/her own cultural Ethics and the Ethics used by the others. Is there a risk that a researcher is blind to his/her own Ethic? On the other hand one can ask how a researcher can recognize the moral concepts of a different culture if they are not common in his/her own Ethic. How to create the methodologies that enable us to prevent the researcher’s interpretive scheme from interfering in the process of interpreting the data? This problem
was resolved in the Kohlberg MJI by developing a coding manual but this solution is not applicable to the Shweder Ethics since the cultural psychology attempts to capture cultural multiplicity and authenticity of moral conceptions and coding manuals would distort this pursuit. Anyhow, the problematization of the researchers’ interpretation process is an important task that should get more emphasis in the future studies.

9.3 Limitations of the study

The present study had many limitations. The most significant is the small sample size so that the claims grounded on the findings stand on less firm grounds. However, the small sample size is quite inevitable in studies that employ interview data since it is very time-consuming and expensive to collect, transcribe and analyse.

Moreover, the structure of the sample that consisted of an equal number of Lutherans, Laestadians and adolescents without a religious community membership clearly is not representative of the whole Finnish society. Therefore most findings can be generalized to each religious (and nonreligious) community separately and not to the Finnish population as a whole. For example, the construction of the Shweder Ethics using a hierarchical cluster analysis might have produced different results if the structure of the sample had been different, consisting predominantly of Lutherans. One way to resolve the problem would have been to collect questionnaire data on a larger population after collecting the interview data.

Another weakness was related to the interview method. While collecting the data, I realised that the structure of my interview questions was highly monotonous: many respondents became fed up in the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview with evaluating and judging the four criterion questions for each ten rules separately that made up altogether 40 similar questions plus 40 justifications. In addition, the abstraction level of the rules and their detachedness from the social context may have caused problems for respondents in interpreting the questions; many mentioned, for example, that the evaluation of the discrimination on religious grounds depends on situation and context. Thus, it seems that per-
sons had a strong need to contextualize their judgments of rule violations even if the questions were abstract. Therefore, the respondents were forced to interpret the issues having different contexts in mind and since their resulting judgments of the rule violations refer to different contexts, the evaluations might be more or less incompatible with each other. Therefore in the future studies it may be useful to ask additional questions both at the abstract and concrete level to stabilize the interpretation process – if the purpose is not to study the contextualization process itself.

Moreover, the present study was not able to address to the issue why the adolescents without a religious community membership represented a higher level of moral development measured on the MJI. School performance, gender and the frequency of discussing moral, religious and political issues with friends and family were excluded. Role-taking opportunities as a possible explanation for the variation in moral development were not operationalized well in the present study. However, role-taking opportunities were indirectly implied in the questionnaire questions (no. 6) “The number of children in the family”, (no. 7) “With whom do you live”, (no. 22) “Do you belong to some society, study group or association”, and their association to the WAS score was explored.

Perhaps another, similar weakness was the fact that worldview (conceptions of the self, world, humanity, for example) could have been operationalized more thoroughly than it was done. This problem resulted from the fact that I initially did not intend to use the Shweder Ethics (that was the only theory of the “Big Three” that makes explicit references to these concepts) as an interpretive scheme when I was deciding about my research design.

In addition, perhaps because of the difficult interview questions or the uneasy feeling that I was testing their moral development may have accounted for the fact that some respondents were very silent and as a result their interviews were quite difficult to interpret. On the other hand, the way to express oneself with silence and few words might be cultural since North American interviewees’ excerpts in the Colby and Kohlberg (1987) manual used very different modes of expression as compared to my Finnish ones. One may raise the question whether the interviews should be interpreted literally so that it is assumed that the pattern of expressing a moral judgment is similar in different cultures, or by assuming that there is more in a person’s moral conception than
(s)he expresses verbally. Shweder et al. (1987), in fact, support the latter assumption.

Another explanation for some respondents’ uneasiness with dilemma questions may result from the fact that dilemmatic thinking may be unevenly distributed among individuals and may result from cultural differences. To be able to interpret Kohlberg moral dilemmas or Turiel’s rule transgressions as hypothetical dilemmas a respondent should, first, to be used to hypothetical thinking, and second, to hold a worldview that interprets world as dilemmatic, consisting of dilemmas.

Moreover, the fact that I shifted the theoretical frameworks at least twice during the process of research, resulted in the situation where the final theoretical positioning and the initial research design (as the set of interview questions) were somewhat incompatible with each other. When I collected the data I had not had in mind to use the Shweder Ethics to code them, for example. The idea to use the Shweder Ethics turned out to be a good idea when I had proceeded into the analysis of the interviews and the interpretation of the findings. Even though it might be also considered as strength, the limitation was revealed while coding the interviews according to the Shweder Ethics manual (Jensen, 1996) I realised that some interviews had not been elaborated well enough by the interviewer to reveal the differences between the Ethics used.

9.4 Kohlberg’s, Turiel’s and Shweder’s 27 “Big Three”

The Social Representations theory (or the SRT) was used in the present study as a metatheory with the intention to unify the field of moral psychology. The research problem of this dissertation implied clearly the idea of the social representations approach: how respondents’ worldview orients them to relate to a hypothetical change in moral conceptions imposed by state, church, God as well as the “moral out-groups”. Since the SRT was used as a

---

27 Kohlberg’s preconventional, conventional and postconventional stages; Turiel’s morality, convention and personal autonomy domains; Shweder’s Ethics of Autonomy, Community, Divinity
metatheory, it was not discussed in the results section. The SRT was elaborated in a way that it worked as a map where the Kohlberg moral stages represented the individual representational aspects and the Shweder Ethics the collective representational aspects of moral judgment. The findings clearly indicate that differing collective representations held by respondents, i.e., cultural, relatively stable conceptions regarding selfhood, community and divinity, functioning as the basis of the Shweder Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity, influence the ways of conceiving change in rule systems.

Moreover, the present study was able to reassess Turiel’s notion that morality is only of the universal, context-independent kind. Ikonen-Varila’s (2000) study discovered that moralization is associated with non-contextuality. However, new measures developed in the present study enabled us to reveal that this pattern is more complex: the domain differentiation and contextuality correlated negatively which means that non-contextuality was associated with both moral and non-moral extremes. However, the stages of moral development correlated negatively with the context differentiation within the seven nonmoral issues that easily can become contextualized. On the other hand, it is worth noting that whereas the Kohlberg orientations were related to the level of moral development, the Shweder Ethics were not associated in any way to the level of moral development.

When the findings on the Shweder and Turiel’s schemes are compared, it seems that each Ethic has its own “domains” with distinctive characteristics. It seems that Turielian domains of morality, social convention and personal autonomy work perfectly, but only in the framework of the Ethic of Autonomy. The Ethic of Divinity domains, in turn, seem to be totally different. This is also manifested by the fact that three fourths of the justifications provided by the Laestadians were not classifiable into the domains of Turiel. The moral domain in the Ethic of Divinity can be identified as “God’s-word -contingent morality”. Turiel’s social convention domain turns into the “Context-dependent morality” domain in the Ethic of Divinity. In practice they are moral principles but only applicable to one’s moral community. The personal autonomy domain in the Ethic of Divinity could be labelled as the “God’s-presence-influenced personal autonomy” domain since it is somewhat moralized unlike personal autonomy concerns in the Ethic of
Autonomy. Laestadians, for example, moralize immoral thoughts. To put it in other words, the Shweder Ethic of Divinity differentiates between contexts (in-group or out-group) and authorities. The Ethic of Autonomy, in turn, differentiates between the acts (moral, social conventional and personal) in terms of their “inherent” features such as harmfulness. Similarly, Indians’ description of persons’ actions focus on contextual determinants whereas North Americans’ descriptions are predominantly context-independent (Shweder and Bourne, 1984).

However, the religious persons seem to recognize religious and nonreligious rule systems but it should be explored, if religious persons themselves hold simultaneously religious and nonreligious rule systems. Or in other words, it should be investigated if religious persons have a sphere of rules in which they do not apply religious principles. Nevertheless, all the rules in this study could be understood both in a religious and nonreligious way. The future studies should focus especially on grasping the whole spectrum of persons’ understanding of rule systems since it is easy to manipulate the scientific social representation of the social reality by selective interview questions. On the other hand, it could also be so that nonreligious, societal rule systems allow an individual to have his/her own sphere of total personal autonomy but it is not the case with the religious rule systems: according to my interviewees, religious rules govern (or should govern) also the thinking of a religious person. This seems to be one of the crucial differences between religious and nonreligious rule systems. It is understandable since the Ethic of Autonomy is grounded on the notion of an autonomous individual but the Ethic of Divinity does not recognize such a notion; therefore it seems plausible that divine moral concerns touch also the personal sphere of action, including thoughts.

Curiously both Turiel and Shweder consider their “Big Three” models as consisting of three mutually independent components. In other words, Shweder does not consider the interrelation of the Ethics. Jensen, however, has carried out qualitative analysis of the Shweder Ethics interrelations. Turiel explicitly holds that the domains are independent but sometimes get mixed in some particular events. The present study revealed that the Turiel domains were evidently related to each other. For example, grounding the assumption on the findings of previous studies associated with the
Turiel domain theory, the associations between the Turiel morality, convention and personal autonomy domains could be constructed in the following way. Nucci’s (1981; 1997) suggestion is that the personal autonomy domain is a necessary prerequisite for the existence of moral domain. This idea, in fact, is near Shweder’s idea that construction of the Ethics is grounded on the conceptions of the self. Turiel should consider the interrelation of the domains, for example in the following way: conception of the personal autonomy (or conception of the self) is the basis for the moral domain. Moral domain, in turn, makes sense to the conventional domain that is for Shweder “morality of less importance” or “secondary morality”. In turn, this modelling is not against Shweder’s construction of the Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity, on the contrary. If it is assumed that the conception of the self is the ground of other domains, the cultural differences related to the construction of selfhood determine the nature of moral conceptions (universal morality, God’s word morality). They, in turn, determine if the conception of social convention is conceived as universally moral, contextually moral or social conventional in a given “moral community”. This construction would give the space to interpret Turiel’s domains in religious and nonreligious contexts, as well.

The present study follows the notion of Shweder et al. (1987) that moral principles are not noncontextual, individualistic and universal for all peoples in the world. The differentiation of universally binding morality and contextual morality is very useful when considering the increasing trend of present-day multiculturalism. Perhaps Western countries are able to be, or at least to seem relatively more tolerant than other cultural systems since they treat practices that are easily contextualized (such as seven nonmoral practices of the present study) as social conventions that represent contextual morality to some different “moral communities”. However, paradoxically, the “tolerant” Ethic of Autonomy is more universalistic and context-independent when treating moral issues than the Ethic of Divinity.

On the other hand, the declaration of Universal Human Rights, consisting of a set of abstract universal principles, has been accused of being a form of cultural imperialism, ignoring the moral significance of non-individualistic and non-rights-based moral principles of non-Western cultures. If the Universal Declaration of
Human Rights were to imply an abstract dichotomy between tradition and modernity, then those who continue to cherish their religious or cultural traditions would be conceptionally excluded from having full access to human rights (Bielefeldt, 2000, 97). To characterize some moral principles in a non-contextual way is certainly a cultural construct held by the Westernized cultures, functioning sometimes as a sophisticated form of practicing intolerance against non-Western cultural traditions.

9.5 Some concluding remarks

The claim put forward in the present study is that the social psychological theory of moral development has a need to develop a multidimensional model that is flexible enough to take into account both stability and change in moral judgments. Turiel (1996) suggests that it should include the degree of a cultural hierarchy. Jensen’s (1997) model, in turn, combines a worldview, moral judgments and moral behavior. In her model, the moral judgment is based on a worldview and the purpose of moral behavior is to maintain a worldview. This study supports the model developed by Jensen, even though this study was not able to address the moral behavioral side.

The model suggested in the present study integrated the unconscious and conscious aspects of a moral judgment and it was structured under the SRT framework. The idea of studying morality as a social representation integrates the cultural psychological focus on the “belief-based” or “culture-related” morality and the cognitive-developmental emphasis on the “knowledge-based” or “culture-independent” morality. Since the previous theories focused on describing stability in moral judgment, however in various ways, the advantage of the SRT approach is that the (theory-incongruent) change in moral judgment does not any longer remain unnoticed as an empirical anomaly. Instead, it is expected and can be elaborated at the theoretical level. However, this approach requires that the strict theoretical definitions of morality have to be abandoned.

The cultural psychological notion to study morality wholeheartedly as the units of “custom complexes” proved to be fruitful. In the future studies the comparison of “internal” and “external”
aspects of morality and moral behavior might prove to be worthwhile. Inglehart (1995) argued that the trend of modernization involved the shift from the religious authority (the Ethic of Divinity in Shweder’s scheme) to the state authority (the Ethic of Community). Postmodernization, in turn, produced a shift from the religious and state authorities to the individual (the Ethic of Autonomy). If the Ethics represent different levels of societal modernity, one could justifiably link the patterns of moral conceptions and rule systems to the social reality and the objective socio-economic structures. This assumption gets support from the comparison of Laestadian, Lutheran and nonreligious persons’ life arrangements. As was argued in Chapter 5.3.1, the Laestadian community has arranged its social life differently from the mainstream Finnish society: the Laestadians do not use certain commodities such as the TV, alcohol and contraceptive pills, and their families are significantly greater than the Finnish families in average. One is likely to find out that certain living arrangements and certain moral conceptions go hand in hand.

The suggestion to study “objective” arrangements of life along with the persons’ moral conceptions, indeed, may sound very sociological. Certainly, the combination of social psychological and sociological approaches to the study of moral conceptions might produce interesting insights. A classical sociological line of research is to compare the formal ideology of a social community, the structure of social organisation and their association with moral conceptions. Durkheim (1915/1965), for example, has said long time ago that the conceptions of divine hierarchies reflect the hierarchy of the society. In the end, both the societal and religious hierarchies cut across the individual conceptions of the person and the society that ultimately is manifested in individuals’ conceptions of rule systems. Both Moscovici (1993) and Durkheim (1915/1965) argue that what holds people together and makes them act and change is the God they have made for themselves. It means that they have created a belief for which they have a passion. In other words, beliefs hold people together. Moscovici divides between resistible and irresistible beliefs and argues that the present cognitive-oriented psychology has focused only on the former, the type of beliefs that persons are able to control, suspend or alter. However, it is the domain of irresistible beliefs that controls us, it is the “one on which we continuously think and stick to not be-
cause it corresponds to valid information or perception but because we steer by it, relate by it, and certainly live by it. However, we still don’t know why these beliefs, stereotypes, ethnic prejudices and proverbs control us.” (Moscovici, 1993, 50.)

The “model” of moral judgment suggested here starts from the assumption that in every society the concepts of social judgments are structured hierarchically so that they are more or less close to the moral core principle of a given society which can be justice or the respect of divine ancestors, depending on the society. The more distant the social principles are from the moral core, the more symbolic and contractual is the way they carry out the nuclear principle. All social practices have significance only if they are grounded on the nuclear principle of the society. For example, for the Christians Sunday is a day that should be celebrated by going to church to show respect for God. The basis of this practice – the respect for a superhuman authority – is genuinely moral for a person who believes in his/her religion. However, the way the respect is acted out is contractual and symbolic.

The conception of the nature of the person and society is reflected in the justifications of moral and nonmoral rule transgressions: if a respondent holds the conception that an individual is in a subordinated relation to the society, his/her rule judgments are based on the maintenance of societal order and discipline. On the other hand, a person who has the conception of an autonomous personhood according to which individuals are bound to the society by a social contract, judges nonmoral rule transgressions in a conventional way (that the purpose of conventions is to facilitate social interaction between persons, to consider the points of view of different individuals, and to acknowledge the right of all societies to have their own conventions). It is possible that the domains similar to morality, convention and personal autonomy, exist everywhere in the world but that their specific characteristics vary according to the nuclear, highest principle of the society. It should be considered, therefore, if these domains can be discussed using the same names in different contexts of different moral orientations since their nature probably is different in different contexts.

The moral nucleus of the society is reflected in the meaning of conventions so that their purpose is either to facilitate social interaction (the Ethic of Autonomy) or to show respect to divine being(s) (the Ethic of Divinity). The relative differences of moral
and nonmoral rules show that the domain differentiation is not a dichotomy but a continuum. The conventionality or morality of a rule is determined by the role of interpretation between concrete behavior and its meaning, or in other words, the degree of the symbolization of the rule. The more symbolic or contractual this relation, the more nonmoral or conventional the rule is considered in a given society.

Many respondents answered that an individual has the right to autonomy and a social community has the right to its own kinds of conventions. This pattern shows how morality, convention and personal autonomy are conceptually interwoven spheres. Human rights are the core moral principle of the Ethic of Autonomy from which the principles of convention and autonomy are derived. The Ethic of Divinity, in the present study, proved to have its own set of principles that are located around the core principles of the Ethic. It may be possible that also the Ethic of Community might consist of domains characteristic to it. This is an issue that should be investigated in the future. In other words, the domains of morality, convention and autonomy are associated with each other in such a way that the conceptions of convention and autonomy are justified by conceptions of morality. It seems that the domains of social knowledge are not independent of each other (such as Turiel argues) but are structured hierarchically: societies have their own nuclear moral principles from which other principles of social knowledge are derived from. One should also include into the analysis the consideration of the function of the nonmoral conceptions for the persons (Moghaddam et al., 2000). In general, social conventions perpetuate social continuities of their culture. Since continuity is more emphasized in the duty-based social system, conventions are more heavily loaded and their violation is more sanctioned in that kind of society.

One of the tasks of the future research is to diminish the gap between various theories of moral development both methodologically and conceptually. If researchers go on ignoring the findings made in competing theoretical frameworks as they have done until now, they are themselves victims of the fundamental error of information processing which according to Nisbett and Ross (1980) is the problem of lay thinking. If the researchers who believe in the universality of morality cannot find a common conceptual ground, how can they imagine finding it in the moral judgments of
their respondents? The studies pertaining to a single theoretical framework so far are so numerous that now time is ripe for integrating the theories, methods and findings made in various branches of moral psychology.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1. The structural features of the rational moral codes.

I Mandatory Features

Mandatory feature 1: The abstract idea of natural law.
The idea is implicated whenever we speak of a discrepancy between what is and what ought to be. There are certain actions or practices that are inherently wrong no matter how much personal pleasure they might bring us, and despite the existence of positive rules or laws that might permit their occurrence. The idea of objective occurrence.

Mandatory feature 2: The abstract principle of harm
The abstract principle of harm states that a legitimate ground for limiting someone’s liberty to do as they want is a determination that harm is being done to someone. Life in society is made up of the direct and indirect effects of people’s actions and inactions. Every rationally appealing moral code defines what consequences are permissible and justifies the regulation of certain actions by reference to their harmful effects, however, those are conceived.

Mandatory feature 3: The abstract principle of justice.
The principle of justice states that like cases must be treated alike and different cases differently. Alternatively, what is wrong for one person is wrong for any similar person in similar circumstances. The principle of justice is the normative or prescriptive side of the abstract idea of categorization. In effect, the principle of justice forces us to group people into those we treat one way (in like fashion) and those we treat another way (in like fashion). Any social categorization (kin and non-kin, teacher and student) implements the principle of justice by defending the kinds of people there are to have similar or different kinds of relationships with.

II Discretionary Features

Discretionary feature 1: A rights-based conception of natural law.
One discretionary feature of Kohlberg’s moral code is a rights-based conception of natural law. The feature is discretionary because not every rationally defensible moral code must be founded on a conception of natural “rights”. A moral code may be founded on a conception of natural “duties” or natural “goals” and remain rationally defensible. Dworkin (1977) proposed that all moral codes encompass personal rights, personal...
duties and social goals, but they may differ in the priority given to these three concepts.

**Discretionary feature 2: Natural individualism in the abstract.**
A second discretionary feature in Kohlberg’s moral code is the priority given to individualism. Societies are built out of roles and statuses (mother-child, doctor-patient, etc.), for which there are performance obligations, and out of individuals, who have differential talents, abilities, powers, intelligences, resources, and beauty. Both are necessary for social action. A discretionary feature in any moral code concerns what is taken as more fundamental, real, natural, or of value: “roles and statuses” (the parts to be played) or “individuals” (the people who play the parts). The most fundamental entity in Kohlberg’s code is the “abstract individual” who is abstracted, first, from society, and second, out of his/her personality and divested of all distinguishing marks of character. Thus Kohlberg’s “abstract individual”, by definition, has no individuality.

**Discretionary feature 3: Who is a person?**
A third discretionary feature in Kohlberg’s moral code is his substantive conception of what or who is a “person” or “moral agent”. Every moral code has some kind of more or less inclusive definition of who must abide by the standards of natural law and is entitled to just treatment and protection from harm. What is discretionary, however, are the category boundaries of the “person” or “moral agent”. The rational defensibility of a moral code is probably unaffected by such decisions as, for example, whether illegal aliens have the same rights as citizens of the state or whether such entities as corporations, fetuses, cows, or dogs should receive protection from harm.

**Discretionary feature 4: Which territories of the self?**
A fourth discretionary feature in Kohlberg’s moral code is his substantive conception of where to draw the boundaries around the “territories of the self”. Within any moral code “moral agents” or “persons” are entitled to protection from harm; yet, even after it is decided who is a “moral agent”, another discretionary decision must be made: how expansively to define the realm worthy of protection that surrounds the “person”. In other words, which invasions of which territories of the self are to be considered harmful attacks (only our bodies and physical possessions, or also our feelings, reputation, and honor)?

**Discretionary feature 5: Justice as equality.**
A fifth discretionary feature in is a substantive conception of justice in which likenesses are emphasized and differences overlooked. Kohlberg argues that justice requires every person’s claims to be treated as equal, regardless of the person (1981, 144). Kohlberg believes that in employ-
ing the utilitarian rule for maximizing general welfare the only just thing to do is count each individual as equal to one unit; no weighting is allowed. That conception of justice is not implied by the abstract idea of justice, which merely states “treat like cases alike and different cases differently”. The abstract idea of justice does not state which likenesses or differences should count, whether or how they should be weighted, or how, in particular, like cases should be treated, other than being treated in the same way. When relevant differences can be cited it is not unjust to treat different cases differently.

**Discretionary feature 6: Secularism.**

Kohlberg’s code rejects divine authority (1981, 312 – 318). For him, the knowledge possessed by a superior or divine being set forth in sacred text has no greater epistemological status than majority votes or other expressions of the subjective preferences of a group of human beings. That idea commits Kohlberg to a particular definition of natural law, in which the only things that count as natural laws are things that human beings can discover for themselves (1981, 313), without the assistance of revealed or handed-down truths about right and wrong. Yet the idea of a superior or divine being (whose privileged access to truth is revealed in sacred texts) is neither incoherent nor irrational.

Appendix 2. The variable list

Background variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>Number of society, association or study group memberships (excluding religious community membership). Questionnaire question no. 22, range 0 – 3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIBLING</td>
<td>Number of siblings in family (including the respondent); questionnaire question no. 6, range 1 – 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>School performance, based on the yearly school evaluation, questionnaire question no. 3, theoretical range 4 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION</td>
<td>Religiosity-score, sum variable, the construction of this variable described in Chapter 7.3.1. Theoretical range 13 – 65.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other background variables, i.e., sex, frequency of discussing political, religious and philosophy of life issues with family and friends are discussed in Chapter 7.4 (Description of the data); they don’t have an abbreviation code.

Kohlberg MJI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAS</th>
<th>Weighted average score, theoretical range 100 – 500 (corresponding to Kohlberg stages 1 – 5).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>Global stage score, theoretical range 1 – 5 (corresponding to Kohlberg stages 1 – 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/B orientation</td>
<td>Orientation of MJI dilemmas, range 0 – 1 (0 = A orientation in both dilemmas, 0.5 = A orientation in one and B orientation in one dilemma, 1 = B orientation in both dilemmas).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview

| Evaluation | The basic unit can be defined as a rule evaluation within a context (range 1 – 3) made by a respondent. If the variables are structured as a cross-tabulation where the rules are on the rows and the contexts on the columns (Figure 2 in Appendix 3), one evaluation is one |
observation in one cell of this cross-tabulation. The interview consisted of 10 rules that were evaluated in 4 contexts so each respondent had 40 evaluations in the whole interview. Group means and group SD:s of evaluations of one rule within one context are used (Tables 28 and 29 in Appendices 10 and 11).

**MORARULE**  
*Morality of a rule.* Mean of evaluations of one rule in four contexts. Range 1 – 3. Each respondent was assigned ten MORARULE values (1 / rule)

*Example.* MORARULE(Stealing) = Mean {evaluation (Stealing in Government context), evaluation (Stealing in Church context), evaluation (Stealing in God’s word context), evaluation (Stealing in Other country context)}.

**MORCONT**  
*Morality of a context.* Mean of evaluations of ten rules in one context. Range 1 – 3. Each respondent was assigned four MORCONT values (1 / context).

*Example.* MORCONT(Church) = Mean {evaluation (Stealing in Church context), evaluation (Religious discr. in Church context), evaluation (Gender ineq. in Church context), evaluation (Nonr. moral ed. in Church context), evaluation (Marihuana in Church context), evaluation (Censorship in Church context), evaluation (Shops on Sundays in Church context), evaluation (Cohabitation in Church context), evaluation (Wines to shops in Church context), evaluation (Contrac. pills in Church context)}

**CONTRULE**  
*Contextuality of a rule.* SD of evaluations of one rule in four contexts for each individual respondent. Range 0 – 1.15. Each respondent was assigned ten CONTRULE values (1 / rule).

*Example.* CONTRULE(Wines) = SD {evaluation (Stealing in Government context), evaluation (Stealing in Church context), evaluation (Stealing in God’s word context), evaluation (Stealing in Other country context)}

**GROUPRULE**  
*In-group – out-group differentiation of a rule.* SD of evaluations of one rule in two contexts: (1) in-group and (2) out-group context, for each individual respondent. The in-group context for the EL and the NR was the “Government” context and for the CL the “Church” context. The out-group context for all groups was the “Other country” context. Range 0 – 1.41. Each
respondent was assigned ten GROUPRULE values (1 rule).

**Example.** GROUPRULE(Stealing), when a respondent was EL or NR = SD {evaluation (Stealing in Government context), evaluation (Stealing in Other country context)}.

GROUPRULE(Stealing), when a respondent was CL = SD {evaluation (Stealing in Church context), evaluation (Stealing in Other country context)}

**DOMAIN**

*Domain differentiation measure.* SD of MORARULE (morality of a rule) scores of ten rules for each individual respondent. Range 0.25 – 1.01. Each respondent was assigned one DOMAIN score.

**Example.** DOMAIN = Mean {MORARULE (Stealing), MORARULE (Religious disc.), MORARULE (Gender ineq.), MORARULE (Nonr. moral ed.), MORARULE (Marihuana), MORARULE (Censorship), MORARULE (Shops on Sundays), MORARULE (Cohabitation), MORARULE (Wines to shops), MORARULE (Contrace. pills)}

**CONTEXT**

*Contextuality measure.* Mean of CONTRULE (contextuality of a rule) scores of ten rules. Range 0.05 – 0.82. Each respondent is assigned one CONTEXT score.

**Example.** CONTEXT = Mean {CONTRULE (Stealing), CONTRULE (Religious disc.), CONTRULE (Gender ineq.), CONTRULE (Nonr. moral ed.), CONTRULE (Marihuana), CONTRULE (Censorship), CONTRULE (Shops on Sundays), CONTRULE (Cohabitation), CONTRULE (Wines to shops), CONTRULE (Contrace. pills)}

**GROUPDIFF**

*In-group – out-group differentiation measure.* Mean of GROUPRULE (in-group – out-group differentiation of a rule) scores of ten rules. Range 0 – 0.99. Each respondent is assigned one GROUPDIFF score.

**Example.** GROUPDIFF = Mean {GROUPRULE (Stealing), GROUPRULE (Religious disc.), GROUPRULE (Gender ineq.), GROUPRULE (Nonr. moral ed.), GROUPRULE (Marihuana), GROUPRULE (Censorship), GROUPRULE (Shops on Sundays), GROUPRULE (Cohabitation), GROUPRULE (Wines to shops), GROUPRULE (Contrace. pills)}
CONTMOR  Contextuality in moral rules measure. Mean of CONTRULE (e.g., contextuality of a rule) scores within three moral rules. Range 0 – 0.67. Each respondent is assigned one CONTMOR score.

Example. CONTMOR = Mean {CONTRULE (Stealing), CONTRULE (Religious discr.), CONTRULE (Gender ineq.)}

CONTNON  Contextuality in nonmoral rules measure. Mean of *SCT (e.g., contextuality of a rule) scores within seven nonmoral rules. Range 0 – 1.03. Each respondent is assigned one CONTNON score.

Example. CONTNON = Mean {CONTRULE (Nonr. moral ed.), CONTRULE (Marihuana), CONTRULE (Censorship), CONTRULE (Shops on Sundays), CONTRULE (Co-habitation), CONTRULE (Wines to shops), CONTRULE (Contrac. pills)}

CONTDIFF  Contextuality difference between nonmoral and moral rules. Range -0.55 – 0.56. Each respondent is assigned one CONTDIFF score.

Example. CONTDIFF = CONTNON (contextuality in nonmoral rules score) – CONTMOR (contextuality in moral rules score)

Open question

Evaluation  The basic unit can be defined as a rule evaluation within a context (range 1 – 3) made by a respondent. This section applied only to three moral rules and there was only one context, namely the Open question. Thus each respondent made 3 evaluations in the Open question unit. Group means and group SD:s of evaluations of one rule within the Open question context are used.

JUSTOPEN  Justifications of the Open Question. The justifications were analysed separately. They made up six justification categories, one variable for each, each variable counted the number of occurrences of a justification category in the whole Open question unit. The justification categories are described in the coding manual, Appendix 12. Range 0 – 3. Since the number of justification categories was six, each respondent was as-
signed six JUSTOPEN scores (1 / justification category).

Shweder Ethics

Justifications The justifications of Turiel Rule transgressions interview were analysed separately, using the Shweder Ethics. The basic unit here is an occurrence of a justification in the whole interview. The justifications were analysed qualitatively and 34 sub-categories were found. With the hierarchical cluster analysis the sub-categories were, in turn, classified under the Ethics of Autonomy, Community and Divinity (the super-categories). Since each sub-category was assigned only once to each rule, the theoretical occurrence of a sub-category was 0 – 10. Each sub-category made up a separate variable, so for each respondent 34 justification variables were calculated.

MULTIJUST Use of multiple justifications sub-categories. The justifications provided to the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview unit (excluding the Open question). The justifications made up 34 justification sub-categories. This variable revealed how many different justifications a respondent provided in the whole unit, theoretical range in this variable was 0 – 34. Each respondent was assigned one MULTIJUST score.

MULTIETH Multiplicity of the Shweder Ethics (super-categories). The justifications provided to the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview unit (excluding the Open question). This variable followed the Shweder original classification of justification sub-categories into the Ethics (the super-categories), presented in the coding manual, Appendix 8. Since there were three Ethics, the theoretical range was 0 – 3. Each respondent was assigned one MULTIETH score.

*EA The Shweder original Ethic of Autonomy. One of three justification super-categories, sub-categories were classified according to the coding manual (Appendix 8) into this Ethic. The number of occurrences of this Ethic in the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview unit.
Range 2 – 12. Each respondent was assigned one *EA score.

*EC

The Shweder original Ethic of Community. One of three justification super-categories, sub-categories were classified according to the coding manual (Appendix 8) into this Ethic. The number of occurrences of this Ethic in the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview unit. Range 1 – 13. Each respondent was assigned one *EC score.

*ED

The Shweder original Ethic of Divinity. One of three justification super-categories, sub-categories were classified according to the coding manual (Appendix 8) into this Ethic. The number of occurrences of this Ethic in the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview unit. Range 1 – 15. Each respondent was assigned one *ED score.

*FA

Finnish Ethic of Autonomy. One of three justification super-categories, sub-categories were classified according to the hierarchical cluster analysis (Appendix 9) into this Ethic. Range 2 – 18. Each respondent was assigned one *FA score.

*FC

Finnish Ethic of Community. One of three justification super-categories, sub-categories were classified according to the hierarchical cluster analysis (Appendix 9) into this Ethic. Range 0 – 7. Each respondent was assigned one *FC score.

*FD

Finnish Ethic of Divinity. One of three justification super-categories, sub-categories were classified according to the hierarchical cluster analysis (Appendix 9) into this Ethic. Range 0 – 15. Each respondent was assigned one *FD score.

The Cultural-Religious Dilemmas

Evaluations The basic unit in the dilemma evaluations were the evaluations of the probes (see interview questions, Appendices 18 and 20). They were coded as statements presented in Table 31 (in Appendix 14), with 0 = disagree, 0,5 = agree, 1 = agree scale (this scale was different from Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview
section because I wanted to highlight the separateness of the sections: the Cultural-Religious Dilemma evaluations did not intend to measure morality and contextuality dimensions; the scale 0 – 1 can be easily read as proportions). Each respondent was assigned 15 dilemma probe evaluations.

**Justifications**

The justifications were coded qualitatively. The categories list is presented in Appendix 15. The hierarchical cluster analysis performed on these categories revealed the Ethics structure (*CA, *CC, *CD).

*CA  
*Ethic of Autonomy in Cultural-Religious Dilemmas.* Justification super-category, constructed with the hierarchical cluster analysis. Range of occurrences 3 – 11.

*CC  
*Ethic of Community in Cultural-Religious Dilemmas.* Justification super-category, constructed with the hierarchical cluster analysis. Range of occurrences 0 – 6.

*CD  
*Ethic of Divinity in Cultural-Religious Dilemmas.* Justification super-category, constructed with the hierarchical cluster analysis. Range of occurrences 0 – 6.
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Figure 2. Variables computed for each respondent from Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RULE VIOLATIONS</th>
<th>CONTEXTS</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MORALIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CONTRACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MORN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RULE VIOLATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. INTRUSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PERVASION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RULES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RULES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RULES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 1: MORALIZATION
- MORALIZATION = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ
- CONTRACTIONS = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ
- MORN = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ
- MOR = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ
- MOR = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ

### Section 2: CONTRACTIONS
- CONTRACTIONS = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ
- PERVASION = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ

### Section 3: INTRUSION
- INTRUSION = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ
- RULES = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ

### Section 4: RULES
- RULES = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ
- RULES = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ

### Section 5: GROUPS
- GROUPS = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ
- RULES = MAJ or MIN MAJ / MAJ + MIN MAJ

## Additional Notes
- MAJ = Majority of a context
- MIN = Minority of a context
- MAJ or MIN = Majority or Minority of a context
- MAJ + MIN = Majority + Minority of a context
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Table 22. Means and standard deviations of rule evaluations within four contexts among EL, NR and CL. ("moral" issues > 2 in bold).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Church Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>God's Word Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Other Country Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious disc.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ineq.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. mor. ed.</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sun.</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrac. pill</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious disc.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ineq.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. mor. ed.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sun.</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrac. pills</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious disc.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ineq.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. mor. ed.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sun.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrac. pills</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 23. ANOVA table of pairwise differences between EL, NR and CL in rule evaluations within four contexts; F (2, 27).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>God’s Word</th>
<th>Other Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious disc.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ineq.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonmoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. mor.ed.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sun.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrace. pills</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |            |        |            |               |
| **EL & CL**      |            |        |            |               |
| Stealing         | n.s.       | n.s.   | n.s.       | n.s.          |
| Religious disc.  | n.s.       | n.s.   | n.s.       | n.s.          |
| Gender ineq.     | (c)        | (d)    | n.s.       | n.s.          |
| **Nonmoral**     |            |        |            |               |
| Nonr. mor.ed.    | ***        | ***    | *          | n.s.          |
| Marihuana        | n.s.       | n.s.   | n.s.       | n.s.          |
| Censorship       | **         | **     | n.s.       | *             |
| Shops on Sun.    | **         | *      | n.s.       | *             |
| Cohabitation     | (e)        | n.s.   | n.s.       | n.s.          |
| Wines to shops n.s. | ***    | n.s.   | n.s.       | n.s.          |
| Contrace. pills  | n.s.       | *      | n.s.       | n.s.          |

|                  |            |        |            |               |
| **NR & CL**      |            |        |            |               |
| Stealing         | n.s.       | n.s.   | n.s.       | n.s.          |
| Religious disc.  | n.s.       | n.s.   | n.s.       | n.s.          |
| Gender ineq.     | (h)        | (d)    | n.s.       | n.s.          |
| **Nonmoral**     |            |        |            |               |
| Nonr. mor.ed.    | ***        | ***    | **         | (f)           |
| Marihuana        | (a)        | **     | n.s.       | n.s.          |
| Censorship       | **         | ***    | (a)        | ***           |
| Shops on Sun.    | ***        | n.s.   | *          |               |
| Cohabitation     | ***        | ***    | n.s.       | *             |
| Wines to shops n.s. | ***    | n.s.   | *          |               |
| Contrace. pills  | **         | ***    | n.s.       | (g)           |

Marginaly significant differences: a) p < 0.070; b) p < 0.068; c) p < 0.059; d) p < 0.080; e) p < 0.053; f) p < .075; g) p < 0.003; p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001

Bolded differences calculated with Tukey’s HSD test for equal variances.
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Table 24. Means, standard deviations and ANOVA of Contextuality of rules (CONTRULE) for EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NR Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CL Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious disc.</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ineq.</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonmoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. mor. educ.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sun.</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive pills</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. ANOVA table of pairwise differences between EL, NR and CL in Contextuality of rules (CONTRULE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F (2,27)</th>
<th>EL &amp; NR</th>
<th>EL &amp; CL</th>
<th>NR &amp; CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious discr.</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ineq.</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonmoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. mor. educ.</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sundays</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive pills</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
x) Games-Howitt test for unequal variances
### Table 26. Means and standard deviations of In-group – out-group differentiation within rules (GROUPRULE) between EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NR Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CL Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>0,42</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>0,42</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>0,28</td>
<td>0,49</td>
<td>0,38</td>
<td>0,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig. disc.</td>
<td>0,35</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>0,35</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>0,14</td>
<td>0,45</td>
<td>0,28</td>
<td>0,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ineq.</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>0,22</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>0,34</td>
<td>0,28</td>
<td>0,37</td>
<td>0,19</td>
<td>0,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. moral ed.</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,78</td>
<td>0,62</td>
<td>0,23</td>
<td>0,51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>0,57</td>
<td>0,56</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>0,48</td>
<td>0,35</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>0,38</td>
<td>0,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>0,14</td>
<td>0,30</td>
<td>0,35</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>0,48</td>
<td>0,24</td>
<td>0,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops Sun.</td>
<td>0,35</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>0,14</td>
<td>0,45</td>
<td>0,57</td>
<td>0,65</td>
<td>0,35</td>
<td>0,58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>0,48</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>0,22</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td>0,70</td>
<td>0,31</td>
<td>0,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to sh.</td>
<td>0,14</td>
<td>0,30</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>0,22</td>
<td>0,71</td>
<td>0,58</td>
<td>0,31</td>
<td>0,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrac. pills</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,50</td>
<td>0,58</td>
<td>0,17</td>
<td>0,40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 27. ANOVA of pairwise differences in In-group – out-group differentiation (GROUPRULE) between EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F(2,27)</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig. disc.</td>
<td>0,49</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ineq. (x)</td>
<td>1,17</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. moral ed. (x)</td>
<td>15,78</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>1,06</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>0,52</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sundays</td>
<td>1,37</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation (x)</td>
<td>3,37</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops (x)</td>
<td>7,73</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrac. pills (x)</td>
<td>7,23</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Marginally significant difference: a) p < 0.073  
  p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001  
x) Games-Howitt test for unequal variances*
Appendix 8. The Shweder Ethics Codes list: Moral justification categories found in the Finnish sample

The Ethic of Autonomy
1. Rights
2. Self’s Physical Well-Being
   Action’s effect is outside the realm and moral concern. Applies where doesn’t matter what a person does (Shweder’s definition).
   [Marihuana] - Well, I think that it shouldn’t be (legalised) at all, but if it has been decided there that it can be used there, so they who want to use, so they can use it then.
4. Self’s Psychological Well-Being
5. Respect for Property
6. Self’s Interest
7. Conscience
8. Fairness and Reciprocity
9. Other’s Physical Well-Being
10. Other’s Psychological Well-Being
11. Other’s Interest

The Ethic of Community
12. Virtues
13. Commitment to Relationships
   [Cohabitation] - It somehow does not feel so fine, when there is not a certain, some kind of a promise to another person, has been done, it feels like that one has not promised to the other person and then one can make up all kinds of stories then.
   The action is justified since it has been practised for a long time.
   [Cohabitation] ... every time these, certain kinds of fundamental things would disappear then in society that have somehow re-

28 The categories that are added by me (see other categories: the manual of Jensen, 1996) are indicated in italics.
mained always. That all the time those good things would disappear and it would destroy it then all the time.

15. **Convention: Contingency on Common Practice, Habituation, Attitudes.**

The action is evaluated on the grounds whether the persons currently act in that way or nobody acts in that way; or if people regard the action all right or wrong.

[Shops open on Sundays] - Also now, I must say, that kind of, well, the real conscious sanctification of Sunday is so rare that it really doesn’t make any difference nowadays.

[Wines to food stores] …anyway, the wines are somehow bought from somewhere so it does not matter if they are in a dairy or an off-license.

16. **Convention: Legal / Governmental / Institutional Authority**

17. **Rational Action: “Scientific” Means-Ends Considerations**

The rightness or wrongness of the action is based on the accurate or inaccurate, valid or invalid, true or false knowledge of the facts which are the premise of the action (accuracy, validity, truth determined from native respondent’s point of view). (Shweder’s definition)

[Marihuana] …if one uses something like marihuana so one can switch into using other drugs then. Because you see, alcohol does not cause the same kind of addiction.

18. **Convention: Rational Action: Socially Defined Means-Ends Considerations**

[Religious discrimination] - If there everything is based on religion, all the laws and other things, so yes in that case, if they deviate a lot from that religion, so it is a difficult situation if it makes a life difficult in that country, so then yes, intolerance is right.

[Stealing] - It depends on that if it really does harm to that group or if it’s some kind of honourable thing if one can steal very skilfully.
19. **Rights** (role- or social status-related)

   [Prescription-free contraceptive pills] - Because children should have good parents and so on, that surely it would reduce the number of those children who have bad home life.

20. **Social Order (Harmony) Goals**
21. **Other's Physical Well-Being**
22. **Other's Psychological Well-Being**
23. **Other's Interests**
24. **Convention: Important Person’s Authority**
25. **Duty**

**The Ethic of Divinity**

26. **God’s Authority**
27. **The Authority of Natural Law** (not necessarily religious)
28. “Rights” (of the soul)
29. **Self’s (“Soul’s”) Psychological Well-being**

   [Censorship] - It is not, favoring any kind of sin and piggishness, it does not nourish a human soul in any way and it is of no use.

30. **Scriptural Authority**
31. **Important Person’s Authority**
32. **Maintenance of Religious Conviction**

   [Nonreligious moral education] ... it (religious moral education) is good because from there everybody gets, every Finn gets some knowledge of what Evangelical Lutheran religion is, and the basic knowledge, that it’s that kind of a good alternative that it’s given... that it’s, let’s say, a better ground for the morality of the nation and that not all parents necessarily teach their children anything and they don't belong to any church and for this reason it leads to a moral decay.

33. **Conscience** (based on religion)
34. **Duty**
35. **Does Not Concern the Respondent**

[Nonreligious moral education] ... I’m not a religious person and for this reason I don’t care, it doesn’t make any difference to me, actually, if it’s taught at school or not.

[Relaxing censorship] - It is not right or wrong, it is quite an insignificant law for me.

36. **Pragmatic**

Practical Facilitation of Life, Consequences to National Economy

[Cohabitation] ...first, it would facilitate enormously the lives of people since if a common-law relationship had the same privileges as marriage so then people would manage much more easily and then it would be possible that life was much easier, simply.

37. **Categorical Right / Wrong** (from Shweder’s manual)

Something is inherently or obviously just right or wrong.

(Shweder’s definition; unpublished manual)

[Cohabitation] - In my opinion they are actually the one and same thing, none of them cannot be respected more than the other.

[Marihuana] - Well, I myself don’t accept drugs and their use and I’ve never tried and surely I’ll never try them so it’s not right to make them legal. [In your opinion, are mild drugs as bad as strong drugs?] - Anyway it would be wrong, it’s nevertheless a drug.
Appendix 9.

**Figure 3.** Dendrogram representing the hierarchical cluster analysis of the Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview justifications.

* * * * * HIERARCHICAL CLUSTER

Dendrogram using Ward Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE Label</th>
<th>Num</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA 9. OTHER'S PHYSICAL WELL-BEING</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 34. DUTY</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 22. OTHER'S PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 12. VIRTUES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 4. SELF’S PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 19. RIGHTS (ROLE- OR STATUS-RELATED)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 11. OTHER’S INTEREST</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 6. SELF’S INTEREST</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 10. OTHER’S PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 14. CONVENTION: TRADITION</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 5. RESPECT FOR PROPERTY</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 23. OTHER’S INTERESTS</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 7. CONSCIENCE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 13. COMMITMENT TO RELATIONSHIPS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 31. IMPORTANT PERSON’S AUTHORITY</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 25. DUTY</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 21. OTHER’S PHYSICAL WELL-BEING</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 16. CONVENTION: LEGAL-INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 24. CONVENTION: IMPORTANT PERSON’S AUTHORITY</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 28. “RIGHTS” (OF THE SOUL)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 29. SELF’S (“SOUL’S”) PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 27. THE AUTHORITY OF NATURAL LAW</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 32. MAINTENANCE OF RELIGIOUS CONVICTION</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 26. GOD’S AUTHORITY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 33. CONSCIENCE (BASED ON RELIGION)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 30. SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 3. PERSONAL AUTONOMY</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 18. CONVENTION: SOCIALLY DEF. MEANS-ENDS CONSID.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 15. CONVENTION: PRACTICE, HABITUATION, ATTITUDES</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 2. SELF’S PHYSICAL WELL-BEING</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 17. CONVENTION: “SCIENTIFIC” MEANS-ENDS CONSID.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 20. SOCIAL ORDER (HARMONY) GOALS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 8. FAIRNESS AND RECIPROCITY</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 1. RIGHTS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 28. Means and standard deviations of Shweder Ethics (*EA, *EC, *ED) use within each rule among EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHIC OF AUTONOMY (The Turiel personal autonomy in brackets)</th>
<th>EL Mean (SD)</th>
<th>NR Mean (SD)</th>
<th>CL Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Total Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>0.90 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.74 (0.32)</td>
<td>1.20 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.42 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious discr.</td>
<td>1.20 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.42 (0.00)</td>
<td>1.10 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.57 (0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender inequality</td>
<td>1.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.47 (0.00)</td>
<td>1.20 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.42 (0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonmoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. moral ed.</td>
<td>0.90 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.57 (0.32)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.47 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>1.00 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.52)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.30)</td>
<td>0.74 (0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>1.10 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.57 (0.52)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sunday</td>
<td>0.80 (0.30)</td>
<td>0.63 (0.48)</td>
<td>0.30 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.48 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>0.30 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.48 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.40 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.52 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops</td>
<td>0.80 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.63 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrac. pills</td>
<td>0.90 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.74 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.57 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHIC OF COMMUNITY (The Turiel social convention in brackets)</th>
<th>EL Mean (SD)</th>
<th>NR Mean (SD)</th>
<th>CL Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Total Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>1.60 (0.90)</td>
<td>1.26 (0.99)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious discr.</td>
<td>0.30 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.48 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.60 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.52 (0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender inequality</td>
<td>0.20 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.42 (0.42)</td>
<td>0.20 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.42 (0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious discr.</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender inequality</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonmoral</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. moral ed.</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sunday</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrac. pills</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 29. ANOVA of pairwise differences between EL, NR and CL in Shweder Ethics (*EA, *EC, *ED) use; $F (2, 27)$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHIC OF AUTONOMY (The Turiel personal autonomy in brackets)</th>
<th>EL &amp; NR</th>
<th>EL &amp; CL</th>
<th>NR &amp; CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious discr.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender inequality</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonmoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonr. moral ed.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marihuana</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censorship</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops on Sun.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines to shops</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrac. pills</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>(n.s.)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ETHIC OF COMMUNITY (The Turiel social convention in brackets) |         |         |
| **Moral**                                                   |         |         |
| Stealing                                                   | n.s.    | (n.s.)  | n.s.    |
| Religious discr.                                           | n.s.    | (n.s.)  | *       |
| Gender inequality                                          | n.s.    | (n.s.)  | n.s.    |
| **Nonmoral**                                                |         |         |
| Nonr. moral ed.                                            | n.s.    | (n.s.)  | n.s.    |
| Marihuana                                                  | n.s.    | (n.s.)  | *       |
| Censorship                                                 | *       | (n.s.)  | n.s.    |
| Shops on Sun.                                               | n.s.    | (n.s.)  | n.s.    |
| Cohabitation                                               | n.s.    | (n.s.)  | n.s.    |
| Wines to shops                                             | n.s.    | (n.s.)  | n.s.    |
| Contrac. pills                                             | n.s.    | (n.s.)  | n.s.    |

| ETHIC OF DIVINITY                                          |         |         |
| **Moral**                                                   |         |         |
| Stealing                                                   | n.s.    | n.s.    | *       |
| Religious discr.                                           | n.s.    | (b)     | (b)     |
| Gender inequality                                          | n.s.    | *       | (b)     |
| **Nonmoral**                                                |         |         |
| Nonr. moral ed.                                            | n.s.    | ***     | ***     |
| Marihuana                                                  | n.s.    | **      | *       |
| Censorship                                                 | *       | ***     | ***     |
| Shops on Sun.                                               | n.s.    | (c)     | ***     |
| Cohabitation                                               | **      | ***     | ***     |
| Wines to shops                                             | ***     | ***     | ***     |
| Contrac. pills                                             | ***     | ***     | ***     |

Games-Howitt test for unequal variances used throughout the table. $p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$ Marginally significant differences: a) $p < 0.059$; b) $p < 0.060$; c) $p < 0.080$
Appendix 12: The codes list of the “Open Question” justifications

God’s Word
God’s word determines what is morally right and what is morally wrong. For example, stealing is morally right if God tells to a person to do it since God knows what is best for a human being or since for God everything is possible. Morality is contingent on God’s word.

[Religious discrimination] - God’s law is to be followed. [Is it possible for God to give this kind of order?] - Well now, when I’m thinking so, well, if God gave such an order, well. For God everything is possible, everything. I, in a way, think that he is above all other beings and such things that for him everything is possible and a human being has to follow God’s will.

[Religious discrimination] - If he (God) considers it as alright, so for sure then it’s good that he gave such a thing but we humans cannot understand it.

Can’t Imagine
Respondent refuses to imagine that God could give orders that are contrary to the Biblical rules; also imagining such scenarios is a wrong thing to do since it shows disrespect for God.

[Religious discrimination] - Well, it’s again the same thing. It’s an impossible idea because he (God) has given them (the orders) in so many places at every turn that it cannot, in such a way. It contradicts with love for one’s neighbour if he (God) had said so. [Is it possible for God to give such an order?] - God is so good that he has done all at once, said it in such a way that there is no need to change it, like the cohabitation thing, in my opinion it’s ridiculous even to start arguing about it. It’s a crystal clear thing to me. [For many it’s not.] - I know it, I believe in such way that I have the Holy Spirit who says the right thing. Those other people think with their brains.

God’s Word & Just God
Complex combination of God’s word-based morality and universalistic, above-God grounded morality considerations. It is right to follow all kinds of God’s orders but God is just. For example, it can be argued that
it is right to follow God’s commands but God does not give immoral commands since God is just.

[Religious discrimination] - Well, does (rightly). [Why it is right that he does it (discriminates other religions)?] - He follows God’s will. [Would it be possible that God gave such an order?] - No. [Why not?] - Maybe he thinks that people are equal.

[Stealing] - A strange question. Well, this is his (God’s) world, so maybe we would do then according to what he orders. [Is it possible that God would give this kind of order?] - Well, no. [Why not?] - He is a just God.

Universal Morality
Morality is independent of God’s word, societal conventions and personal considerations; morality is universal in its nature.

[Gender inequality] - No. [Can God give this kind of order?] - No, he can’t. [Why not?] - It doesn’t matter, or in my own opinion man and woman are equally significant beings.

[Stealing] - No. [Why?] - Because stealing is in my opinion personally wrong. [Can God give this kind of order?] - No, because stealing is so a bad thing in my opinion. If God gave this kind of order so anyway it doesn’t matter. Especially for me it’s very difficult to say myself because I don’t believe in God.

Conventions (law, habituation, upbringing) -based morality
Moral conceptions are contingent on law, traditions and considerations of what is rational for the social system, can be also dependent on the person’s upbringing. Morality can vary.

[Gender inequality] - Maybe it would be so, if we think, well, from the historical point of view, that if such an order had been in the Bible so then, especially in the fifteenth or sixteenth century and so, and it would have been handed down until the modern times, the idea if there had been a common understanding that it’s okay to accept the discrimination of the other sex and it would have been okay for a long time, so I also would have adopted it, for sure, but if it came now suddenly, somebody would find from somewhere that “hey, here is this kind of order”, so I wouldn’t consider it at all and I would leave it like
that. [Can God give this kind of order?] - Well, maybe it’s possible but according to those former grounds, it doesn’t matter, if it as been a well-established practise and so on.

Relativism
There exist multiple conceptions of morality. Different moral conceptions are morally right for different persons, for example for religious persons even if for the self the immoral acts remain morally wrong.

[Religious discrimination] - For that kind of a person who believes in that God, so yes (it is okay) but since I don’t believe (in God), so in my opinion he does wrong. [Can God give this kind of order?] - Yes, God can do anything.

[Gender inequality] - Maybe those who believe, so in their own opinion they do right. But then they don’t do right to other people because they don’t respect that according to other persons’ moral conception equality exists and then they hurt other persons’ customs and conceptions. [Can God give this kind of order?] - Yes, he could do it very well. It would fit in the scene in my opinion, it would be that kind of the final straw, it would be the only thing still missing. But it wouldn’t be very smart.
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Table 30. Pearson correlations of “Open Question” justifications (JUSTOPEN) to Shweder Ethics (*EA,*EC,*ED) and Turiel social convention and personal autonomy domains use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification Categories</th>
<th>GOD</th>
<th>CANNOT</th>
<th>JUSTGOD</th>
<th>UNI</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>REL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal autonomy</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>-.56***</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social convention</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Divinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.33(a)</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.33(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification categories: GOD = God's word; CANNOT = Cannot imagine; JUSTGOD = God's word & just God; UNI = Universal morality; CON = Convention; REL = Relativism. Note: The justification categories explained in Appendix 12. Marginally significant correlations: a) \( p < 0.072 \); b) \( p < 0.079 \); c) \( p < 0.076 \); d) \( p < 0.066 \) \( p < 0.05 \); **\( p < 0.01 \); ***\( p < 0.001 \)
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**Table 31.** Means, standard deviations and ANOVA of Ethnic minority and Missionary dilemma probe evaluations (range 0 – 1) among EL, NR and CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL Mean SD</th>
<th>NR Mean SD</th>
<th>CL Mean SD</th>
<th>Total Mean SD</th>
<th>F (2,27)</th>
<th>EL/ NR</th>
<th>EL/ CL</th>
<th>NR/ CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Minority Dilemma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. “The school prohibition should be removed”</td>
<td>0.90 0.21</td>
<td>0.70 0.48</td>
<td>0.70 0.42</td>
<td>0.77 0.39</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “It’s right to not go to school despite the Constitutional Law”</td>
<td>0.50 0.41</td>
<td>0.60 0.39</td>
<td>0.30 0.48</td>
<td>0.47 0.43</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “The school board didn’t have the right to prohibit veils”</td>
<td>0.65 0.41</td>
<td>0.60 0.46</td>
<td>0.80 0.35</td>
<td>0.68 0.40</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Wearing veils at school is right despite the school regulations”</td>
<td>0.95 0.16</td>
<td>0.80 0.35</td>
<td>0.60 0.32</td>
<td>0.78 0.31</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “It’s wrong if parents forced daughters to wear veils”</td>
<td>0.80 0.35</td>
<td>0.80 0.26</td>
<td>1.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.87 0.26</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “A person wearing religious signs shouldn’t be punished”</td>
<td>0.55 0.44</td>
<td>0.85 0.34</td>
<td>0.30 0.48</td>
<td>0.57 0.47</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. “The law should be removed”</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “A person should follow religious rules or beliefs”</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Missionary Dilemma**

1. “The missionary’s plan is wrong” | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 0.16 | 0.98 | 0.09 | 1.00 | n.s. | n.s. | n.s. |
2. “It’s better if tribesmen keep their original religion” *(x)* | 0.85 | 0.24 | 0.95 | 0.16 | 0.55 | 0.28 | 0.78 | 0.28 | 7.93 | n.s. | * | ** |
3. “It’s better if the tribesmen don’t wear clothes” | 0.85 | 0.24 | 0.90 | 0.21 | 0.65 | 0.24 | 0.80 | 0.25 | 3.26 | n.s. | n.s. | (a) |
4. “The tribesmen should pretend conversion to obtain medicine” *(x)* | 0.85 | 0.34 | 0.80 | 0.35 | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.57 | 0.47 | 23.07 | n.s. | *** | *** |
5. “The missionary is responsible for the paralysis” | 0.40 | 0.46 | 0.60 | 0.52 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.67 | 0.46 | 5.86 | n.s. | ** | n.s. |
6. “It’s alright if the tribesmen continued to use drug leaves” | 0.80 | 0.35 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.35 | 0.70 | 0.41 | 15.96 | n.s. | * | *** |
7. “The practices of various cultures are equal” | 0.95 | 0.16 | 0.85 | 0.34 | 0.60 | 0.39 | 0.80 | 0.34 | 3.31 | n.s. | (b) | n.s. |

Marginally significant differences: a) $p < 0.060$; b) $p < 0.056$
p $< 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$

x) Tukey’s HSD test for equal variances
Appendix 15: The code list of the cultural-religious dilemma justifications

CODES COMMON TO BOTH DILEMMAS
*CA 40 degree of harm
*CC 41 identity, culture
*CA 42 own will, a person him-/herself defines right and wrong
*CA 43 law, authorities, rules, societal approval
*CD 44 Biblical commands, Christian teachings
*CA 45 rationality of the act / law in a social context
*CA 46 religion (of actors in the dilemma, not respondent’s)
*CA 47 freedom (of religion), right
*CA 48 societal harmony / order
*CC 50 elsewhere the behavior is practised in a similar way
*CD 54 consequences for the true faith
*CC 59 the cause – effect considerations (determines who is responsible)
*CC 61 ignorance (liberates from responsibility)
*CD 64 virtues

CODES SPECIFIC TO THE MISSIONARY DILEMMA:
*CC 49 destiny, God’s plan
*CC 51 it’s wrong (as a justification)
*CC 52 cleanliness, hygiene
*CC 53 habituation
*CC 55 having the possibility to help determines the responsibility
*CC 56 equality
*CC 57 influences / does not influence outside the community
*CC 58 reciprocity
*CC 60 it’s right to do wrong towards a selfish person
*CC 62 value of life
*CD 63 naturalness (natural way of life)
*CC 65 rationality of religion in a social context (the applicability to people / society)
*CC 66 usefulness, uselessness

29 Cluster memberships marked as follows: *CA - Ethic of Autonomy, *CC - Ethic of Community, *CD - Ethic of Divinity (from the cluster analysis, Ward’s Method, Chi Square Measure)
CODES SPECIFIC TO MINORITY DILEMMA:
*CD 67 Christianity as the only right religion
*CD 68 others’ security
*CC 69 punishment avoidance
*CD 70 equality
*CC 71 self’s security (actors of the dilemma)
*CC 72 actors themselves responsible for their lives (for prudential behavior)
*CD 73 external things secondary, internal primary (in faith)
*CC 74 one should not generalize from a single event
*CD 75 tradition
*CC 76 age or social role related rights
*CD 77 justice
Appendix 16:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*CA</th>
<th>*CC</th>
<th>*CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural-Religious Dilemma Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CC</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CD</td>
<td>-.33 (a)</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Shweder Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EA</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EC</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>-.34 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ED</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.35 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish (Rule Transgressions Interview) Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*FA</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*FC</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*FD</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.37*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginally significant correlations: a) p < 0.075; b) p < 0.064; c) p < 0.062
p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001
Appendix 17.

Figure 4. Dendrogram representing the hierarchical cluster analysis of justifications of the cultural-religious dilemmas.

**Hierarchical Cluster Dendrogram using Ward Method**

CASE Label Num
*CC69 punishment avoidance 17
*CC58 reciprocity 37
*CC72 actors’ responsibility 20
*CC57 influence outside community 36
*CC49 destiny, God’s plan 30
*CC60 right to do wrong for a selfish person 38
*CC76 age- or role-related rights 24
*CC51 it’s wrong (as a justification) 31
*CC52 cleanliness, hygiene 32
*CC66 usefulness, uselessness 29
*CC62 value of life 26
*CC56 equality 35
*CC65 rationality of religion 28
*CC61 ignorance (liberates from responsibility) 13
*CC74 non-generalizability of a single event 2
*CC59 cause-effect considerations 12
*CC55 having the possibility to help 34
*CC50 elsewhere practiced in a similar way 10
*CC53 habituation 33
*CC41 identity, culture 2
*CC71 self’s security 19
*CD54 consequences to the true faith 11
*CD67 Christianity the only right religion 15
*CD73 external secondary, internal primary 21
*CD44 Biblical commands, Christian teachings 5
*CD68 Other’s security 16
*CD63 Naturalness (as a way of life) 27
*CD75 Tradition 23
*CD77 Justice 25
*CD70 Equality 18
*CD64 Virtues 14
*CA43 Law, Authorities, Rules 4
*CA47 Freedom (of religion), Right 8
*CA45 Rationality of the act 6
*CA40 Degree of harm 1
*CA48 Societal harmony, order 9
*CA42 Own will, person defines right / wrong 3
*CA46 Religion (of actors in the dilemma) 7
Appendix 18. Haastattelukysymykset (In Finnish)

I Kohlbergin moraalidilemmahaastattelu
(Osa A, lyhyt versio)

Seuraavaksi esitän Sinulle joitakin todella tapahtuneita ja keksittyjä tilanteita. Niihin ei ole olemassa mitään yleisesti hyväksyttyjä oikeita tai väärä vastauksia, vaan olen kiinnostunut Sinun omista mielipiteistäsi ja käsityksistäsi.

1. **Hanneksen dilemma**


1. Pitäisikö Hanneksen varastaa lääke? Miksi?
1.a. (jos pitäisi) Olisiko varastaminen tässä tapauksessa Hanneksen velvollisuus?
2. Kumpi on pahempi, se että antaa jonkin ihmisen kuolla vai se, että varastaa? Miksi?
2.a. Mitä elämän arvo merkitsee Sinulle?
3. Onko apteekkarilla oikeus vaatia lääkkeestä niin korkea hinta? Miksi?
4. Onko aviomiehellä hyvää syytä varastamiseen, jos hän ei rakasta vaimoaan? Miksi?
5. Olisiko yhtä oikein tai väärin varastaa tuntemattomalle kuin vaimolleen? Miksi?
6. Oletetaan, että Hannes ei varasta lääkettä ja hänen vaimonsa kuolee. Onko Hannes vastuussa vaimonsa kuolemasta? Miksi?
7. Onko apteekkari vastuussa Hanneksen vaimon kuolemasta? Miksi?
8. Mitä Sinä luulet Hanneksen ajattelevan, jos hän ei varasta?
9. Mitä muut ihmiset ajattelevat jos Hannes ei varasta?
10. Mitä apteekkari ajattelee jos Hannes ei varasta ja hänen vaimonsa kuolee?
11. Kumpi on enemmän vastuussa, apteekkari vai Hannes?
12. Kuka tai mikä määrittelee, mistä ihminen on vastuussa?

2. Mustosen dilemma


1. Pitäisikö konstaapeli Mustosen tehdä ilmoitus Hanneksen varkaudesta? Miksi?


2. Tulisiko oikeuden tuomita hänet rangaistukseen vai jättää hänet rangaistukseen tuomitsematta?
3. Jos ajatellaan yhteiskunnan näkökulmasta, pitäisikö sellaisia ihmisitä rangaista, jotka rikkovat lakia?
3a. Kuinka tämä soveltuu siihen mitä Hanneksen kohdalla pitäisi tehdä?
5. Mitä ihmiset tarkoittavat omallatunnolla? Mitä ajattelette omasta omastatunnosta, mikä merkitys sillä on, mitä se tekee?
6. Miten ihmiset saavat omantuntonsaa tai miten he kehittävät sen? Miten on Sinun oma omantuntosi syntynyt?
7. Hanneksen täytyy tehdä moraalinen päätös. Pitäisikö moraalisen päätöksen pohjata tunteisiin vai ajatteluun ja järkeilyn oikeasta ja väärästä?

II Uskonnollis-kulttuuriset dilemmat

3. Etnisen vähemmistön dilemma


1. Pitäisikö oikeuden poistaa tämä kielto? Miksi?
3. Oliko koulun johtokunnalla oikeus kieltää tyttöjen huivin käyttö koulussa? Miksi?
4. Jos tytöt haluavat noudattaa uskontoaan ja pitää huivia koulussa, hän rikkoo koulun järjestysääntöä. Tekeekö järjestysäännön rikkominen huivin käytöstä väärän? Miksi?
5. Voivatko vanhemmat pakottaa tyttöjä pitämään huivia koulussa? Miksi?
Ranska on kieltänyt kaikkien uskonnollisten tunnusmerkkien käytön julkisissa tiloissa, koska Ranska on maallistunut valtio. Tällaisia uskonnollisia merkkejä ovat esimerkiksi kristittyjen risti ja juutalaisiisten fetsi-lakki.

6a. Onko Ranskan laki sinun mielestä hyvä vai pitäisikö se kumota? Miksi?
7. Yleensä ottaen tulisiko ihmisen noudattaa ensi sijassa uskonnon säätöjä vai valtion lakeja? Miksi?

4. **Lähetyssäarnaajan dilemma**


1. Pitäisikö lähetyssäarnaajan toteuttaa aikansa? Miksi?
2. Pitäisikö näiden ihmisten käännyttää uuteen uskontoon? Miksi?
3. Pitäisikö näiden ihmisten pukeutua vaatteisiin? Miksi?
4. Pitäisikö ihmisten teeskennellä käännyttämistä uuteen uskontoon, jotta he saisivat lääkettä ja parantuisivat? Miksi?
5. Jos lähetysaarnaaja ei anna lääkettä ja ihmiset halvaantu- vat, onko lähetysaarnaaja siitä vastuussa? Miksi?
7. Kuka tai mikä määrittelee, mitkä teot ovat väärin (pukeutuminen, huumeet)? Miksi?
8. Voiko lähetysaarnaajan uskonnon tapoja pitää parempina kuin heimon tapoja? Voiko toisten kulttuurien tapoja pitää parempina kuin toisten? Miksi?
III Turielin sääntörikkomushaastattelu

Kysymyksiä moraalisista ja ei-moraalisista säännöistä:

Moraaliset sääntörikkomukset:
(1) varastaminen
(2) suvaitsemattomuus uskonnon perusteella
(3) sukupuolten eriarvoinen kohtelu

Ei-moraaliset sääntörikkomukset:
(4) koulun tunnustuksellisen (evankelis-luterilaisen) uskonnon- tai moraaliopetuksen muuttaminen tunnustuksettomaksi
(5) marihuanan käytön ja myynnin laillistaminen
(6) TV- ja video-ohjelmien sensuurin vähentäminen
(7) kauppojen normaali aukiolo pyhänä päivänä
(8) avoliiton ja avioliiton saattaminen laillisesti samanarvoisiksi
(9) viinien myynnin salliminen elintarvike-liikkeissä
(10) e-pillierien muuttaminen reseptivapaaksi, jos ensin osoitetaan, että niistä ei ole terveyshaittoja

Osa 1:
Jokaisesta kymmenestä säännöstä kysytään seuraavat kysymykset:

1.1 Säännön muutettavuus / maallinen auktoriteetti:
Jos Suomen eduskunta muuttaa [säännön, joka kieltää teon suorittamisen], tekeekö hallitus Sinun mielestäsi oikein vai väärin? Miksi?

1.2 Säännön muutettavuus / uskonnollinen auktoriteetti:
(evankelis-luterilainen kirkko luterilaisille ja kirkkoihin kuulumattomille; SRK lestadiolaisille)
Jos [omat uskonnolliset johtajat] muuttavat [säännön], tekevätkö he oikein vai väärin? Miksi?

1.3 Säännön muutettavuus / Jumalan sanan auktoriteetti:
Jos Jumala ei ole antanut mitään [sääntöä, joka kieltäisi teon], tekeekö ihminen oikein vai väärin, jos hän varastaa? Miksi?

1.4 Säännön vleistettävyys:
Jos jollain toisella maalla ei ole lakia tai uskonnollista [sääntöä joka kielletä teon], tekeekö tämän maan kansalainen oikein, jos hän maassaan varastaa? Miksi?
Osa 2:  
Avoin kysymys  
(kysyttiin vain moraalisista rikkomuksista ts. varastamisesta, syrjinnästä uskonnon perusteella, sukupuolten eriarvoisesta kohdeltusta).

Jos Jumala käski, että ihmisä pitäisi [varastaa, syrjää uskonnon perusteella, kohdella sukupuolia eriarvoisesti], tekeekö ihminen sinun mielestäsi totellessaan oikein vai väärin? Miksi?

Voisiko Jumala antaa käskyn, että ihmisen pitää [varastaa, syrjää uskonnon perusteella, kohdella sukupuolia eriarvoisesti]? Miksi?
Appendix 19. Taustatietolomake

Haastattelun numero: ______________________ Ryhmä: ______________________

1. Syntymävuosi: 19_______

2. Sukupuoli:
   1 nainen
   2 mies

3. Lukuaineiden keskiarvo viimeisessä todistuksessa: __________

4. Isän ammatti: ______________________

5. Äidin ammatti: ______________________

6. Lasten lukumäärä perheessä ja lasten sukupuoli: ________________

7. Asutko
   1 molempien vanhempien luona
   2 äidin luona
   3 isän luona
   4 muulla tavalla, miten ________________________________

8. Osallistutko koulussa
   1 ev.-lut. uskonnon opetuksena
   2 elämänkatsomustiedon opetuksena
   3 muuhun, mihin ________________________________
   4 en osallistu mihinkään näistä

9. Mikä on em. oppiaineen arvosana viime koulutodistuksessa? ____________

10. Miiltä luokalta lähtien olet osallistunut em. oppiaineen opetuksena? ____________
    Entä mihin oppiaineeseen osallistuit tätä ennen? _________________________

11. Kuuhuko Sinä kirkkoon, herätysliikkeeseen tai muuhun uskonnolliseen yhteisöön?
    1 kyllä, mihin? _________________________
    2 ei

12. Kuuhuko Sinun isäsi kirkkoon, herätysliikkeeseen tai muuhun uskonnolliseen yhteisöön?
    1 kyllä, mihin? _________________________
    2 ei

13. Kuuhuko Sinun äitisi kirkkoon, herätysliikkeeseen tai muuhun uskonnolliseen yhteisöön?
    1 kyllä, mihin? _________________________
    2 ei
14. Kuuluvatko Sinun sisaruksesi kirkkoon, herätysliikkeeseen tai muuhun uskonnolliseen yhteisöön?
   1 kyllä, mihin? _____________________
   2 eivät

15. Oletko käynyt
   1 evankelis-luterilaisen kirkon rippileirin tai -koulun
   2 lestadiolaisen herätysliikkeen rippileirin tai -koulun
   3 väestörekisteriin kuuluville, uskonnollisiin yhteisöihin kuulumattomille järjestetyyn Prometheus leirin tai -koulun
   4 jonkun muun uskonnollisen yhteisön rippileirin tai -koulun, minkä?
       ______________________________
   5 en ole käynyt mitään edellisistä

16. Oletko Sinä käynyt uskonnollisissa tilaisuuksissa viimeisen yhden vuoden aikana (valitse kussakin kohdassa vain yksi vaihtoehto)

   joka päivä
   a) jumalanpalveluksiassa 1 2 3 4 5
   b) seurasssa 1 2 3 4 5
   c) raamattukerhossa 1 2 3 4 5
   d) nuorten uskonnollisissa tilaisuuksissa 1 2 3 4 5
   e) muissa uskonnollisissa tilaisuuksissa, missä?
       ______________________________

   ainakin kerran viikossa
   a) jumalanpalveluksiassa 1 2 3 4 5
   b) seurasssa 1 2 3 4 5
   c) raamattukerhossa 1 2 3 4 5
   d) nuorten uskonnollisissa tilaisuuksissa 1 2 3 4 5
   e) muissa uskonnollisissa tilaisuuksissa, missä?
       ______________________________

   ainakin kerran vuodessa
   a) jumalanpalveluksiassa 1 2 3 4 5
   b) seurasssa 1 2 3 4 5
   c) raamattukerhossa 1 2 3 4 5
   d) nuorten uskonnollisissa tilaisuuksissa 1 2 3 4 5
   e) muissa uskonnollisissa tilaisuuksissa, missä?
       ______________________________

   ainakin kerran kertaakaan
   a) jumalanpalveluksiassa 1 2 3 4 5
   b) seurasssa 1 2 3 4 5
   c) raamattukerhossa 1 2 3 4 5
   d) nuorten uskonnollisissa tilaisuuksissa 1 2 3 4 5
   e) muissa uskonnollisissa tilaisuuksissa, missä?
       ______________________________

17. Minkä vuoksi käyt uskonnollisissa tilaisuuksissa?

   ________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________

18. Kuinka usein olet lukenut seuraavia kirjallisuutta viimeisen yhden vuoden aikana (valitse kussakin kohdassa vain yksi vaihtoehto)?

   joka päivä
   a) Raamattua 1 2 3 4 5
   b) Uskonnollisia kirjoja 1 2 3 4 5
   c) Uskonnollisia lehtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   d) Tiedekirjoja 1 2 3 4 5
   e) Tiedelehteitä 1 2 3 4 5
   f) Sanomalehtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   g) Aikakauslehhtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   h) Kaunokirjallisuutta 1 2 3 4 5
   i) Yhteiskunnallista kirjallisuutta 1 2 3 4 5

   ainakin kerran viikossa
   a) Raamattua 1 2 3 4 5
   b) Uskonnollisia kirjoja 1 2 3 4 5
   c) Uskonnollisia lehtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   d) Tiedekirjoja 1 2 3 4 5
   e) Tiedelehteitä 1 2 3 4 5
   f) Sanomalehtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   g) Aikakauslehhtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   h) Kaunokirjallisuutta 1 2 3 4 5
   i) Yhteiskunnallista kirjallisuutta 1 2 3 4 5

   ainakin kerran vuodessa
   a) Raamattua 1 2 3 4 5
   b) Uskonnollisia kirjoja 1 2 3 4 5
   c) Uskonnollisia lehtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   d) Tiedekirjoja 1 2 3 4 5
   e) Tiedelehteitä 1 2 3 4 5
   f) Sanomalehtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   g) Aikakauslehhtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   h) Kaunokirjallisuutta 1 2 3 4 5
   i) Yhteiskunnallista kirjallisuutta 1 2 3 4 5

   ainakin kerran kertaakaan
   a) Raamattua 1 2 3 4 5
   b) Uskonnollisia kirjoja 1 2 3 4 5
   c) Uskonnollisia lehtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   d) Tiedekirjoja 1 2 3 4 5
   e) Tiedelehteitä 1 2 3 4 5
   f) Sanomalehtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   g) Aikakauslehhtiä 1 2 3 4 5
   h) Kaunokirjallisuutta 1 2 3 4 5
   i) Yhteiskunnallista kirjallisuutta 1 2 3 4 5
19. Minkä vuoksi luet uskonnollista kirjallisuutta?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

20. Kuinka usein olet seurannut seuraavia ohjelmia tiedotusvälineistä viimeisen yhden vuoden aikana (valitse kussakin kohdassa vain yksi vaihtoehto)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>joka päivä</th>
<th>ainakin kerran viikossa kvä:ssa</th>
<th>ainakin kerran vuodessa</th>
<th>ainakin kerran kertaakaan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Radion jumalan-palveluksia</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Radion muita uskonollisia ohjelmia</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Television jumalan-palveluksia</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Television muita uskonollisia ohjelmia</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Radion tiedeohjelmia</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Kuunnelmia</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Television tiedeohjelmia</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Elokuvia</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) TV:n uutis- ja ajankohtaisohjelmia</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Radion uutis- ja ajankohtaisohjelmia</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Minkä vuoksi seuraat uskonollisia ohjelmia?

_________________________________________________________________________

22. Kuulutko joihinkin yhdistyksiin, opintopiireihin tai seuroihin?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

23. Minkälaisia harrastuksia Sinulla on?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

24. Miten vietät vapaa-aikaasi?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
25. Oletko rukoillut Jumalaa tai Jeesusta viimeisen yhden vuoden aikana (valitse vain yksi vaihtoehto)?
   1 melkein joka päivä
   2 noin kerran viikossa
   3 1–2 kertaa kaukaudessa
   4 1–2 kertaa vuodessa
   5 ei koskaan

26. Jos kuulut kirkkoon tai uskonnolliseen yhteisöön, oletko ajatellut siitä eroamista (valitse vain yksi vaihtoehto)?
   1 en ole koskaan ajatellut siitä eroamista
   2 olen ajatellut eroamista, mutta en todennäköisesti tule eroamaan
   3 olen ajatellut eroamista, ja todennäköisesti tulen eroamaan
   4 en kuulu mihinkään kirkkoon tai muuhun uskonnolliseen yhteisöön

27. Keskustellaanko kotonasi (valitse kussakin kohdassa vain yksi vaihtoehto)
   a) moraalisista ja uskonnollisista ja elämänkatsomuksellisista kysymyksistä
      joka päivä 1 2 3 4 5
      ainakin kerran viikossa 2 3 4 5
      ainakin kerran vuodessa
   b) yhteiskunnallisista kysymyksistä
      joka päivä
      ainakin kerran viikossa
      ainakin kerran vuodessa

28. Keskusteletko ystäviesi kanssa (valitse kussakin kohdassa vain yksi vaihtoehto)
   a) moraalisista ja uskonnollisista ja elämänkatsomuksellisista kysymyksistä
      joka päivä 1 2 3 4 5
      ainakin kerran viikossa 2 3 4 5
      ainakin kerran vuodessa
   b) yhteiskunnallisista kysymyksistä
      joka päivä
      ainakin kerran viikossa

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uskon taysin</td>
<td>uskon melko sanoa</td>
<td>en usko melko taysin</td>
<td>en usko taysin</td>
<td>varmastivarmasti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Jumalaan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Jeesukseen Jumalan poikana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Pyhään Henkeen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Suojelusenkeleihin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Saatanaan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Johdotuukseen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Kuoleman jälkeiseen elämään</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1. Uskon Jumalaan aivan samalla tavalla kuin kristinusko opettaa.
2. Uskon Jumalaan, mutta eri tavalla kuin kristinusko yleensä opettaa.
3. En ole varma, onko Jumala olemassa.
4. Uskon, että Jumala ei ole olemassa.
5. En voi/osaa ottaa kantaa siheen, onko Jumala olemassa.

31. Ympyröi se vastausvaihtoehto, joka kuvaa parhaiten omaa käsitystäsi Jeesuksesta (valitse vain yksi vaihtoehto).

1. Uskon, että Jeesus on Jumalan poika.
2. Uskon että Jeesus oli historiallinen henkiö, mutta hän ei ollut Jumalan poika.
3. En ole varma, onko Jeesus koskaan ollut olemassa.
4. Uskon, että Jeesus ei ole koskaan ollut olemassa.
5. En voi/osaa ottaa kantaa siheen, onko Jeesus koskaan ollut olemassa.

KIITOS!
Appendix 20: Interview questions

I. The Kohlberg Moral Judgment Interview
   (Form A, short version)

Next I present you some scenarios, some of them have happened in real life and some have been invented. They do not have any generally accepted right or wrong solutions, I am just interested to know your opinions and conceptions.

1. *Heinz Dilemma*

   In Europe, a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost him to make. He paid $400 for radium and charged $4,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman’s husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money and tried every legal means, but he could only get together about $2,000 which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, “No, I discovered the drug and I’m going to make money from it.” So having tried every legal means, Heinz gets desperate and considers breaking into the man’s store to steal the drug for his wife.

1. Should Heinz steal the drug? Why?
1a. (in case if he should) Does Heinz have a duty or obligation to steal the drug? Why?
2. Which one is worse, to let a person die or to steal? Why?
2a. What the value of life means to you?
3. Did the druggist have the right to charge so much for the drug? Why?
4. Does it make a difference whether or not he loves his wife? Why?

---

*30 Interviews were originally carried out in Finnish.*
5. Is it as right or wrong to steal for a stranger as to one’s wife? Why?
6. Suppose that Heinz does not steal the drug and his wife dies. Is Heinz responsible for the death of his wife? Why?
7. Is the druggist responsible for the death of the wife of Heinz? Why?
8. What do you think Heinz to have in his mind if he did not steal?
9. What other people think if Heinz did not steal?
10. What the druggist thinks if Heinz did not steal and his wife died?
11. Who is more responsible, the druggist or Heinz?
12. Who or what determines what an individual is responsible of?

2. The Police Officer Brown Dilemma

Heinz did break into the store. He stole the drug and gave it to his wife. In the newspapers the next day there was an account of the robbery. Mr. Brown, a police officer who knew Heinz, read the account. He remembered seeing Heinz running away from the store and realized that it was Heinz who stole the drug. Mr. Brown wonders whether he should report that Heinz was the robber.

1. Should Officer Brown report Heinz for stealing? Why?

Officer Brown did report Heinz. Heinz was arrested and brought to court. A jury was selected. The jury’s job is to find whether a person is innocent or guilty to commit a crime. The jury finds Heinz guilty. It is up to the judge to determine the sentence.

2. Should the judge give Heinz some sentence, or should he suspend the sentence and let Heinz go free?
3. Thinking in terms of society, should people who break the law be punished?
3a. How does this apply to how the judge should decide?
4. Heinz was doing what his conscience told him when he stole the drug. Should a lawbreaker be punished if he was acting out of conscience? Why?
5. What do people mean when they talk about conscience? What do you think of your conscience, what is its purpose, what does it do?
6. How do people obtain their conscience or how does their conscience develop? How has your conscience developed?
7. Heinz has to make a moral decision. Should a moral decision be based on feelings or reasoning about right and wrong?

II Cultural-Religious Dilemmas

3. Ethnic Minority Dilemma

There are many ethnic minorities in France. In one ethnic minority girls are used to wear a dress that includes a head-covering scarf. This dress is an important part of their religion and culture. Once, at school during the physics class a girl’s scarf caught a fire. She got serious burns that left permanent signs. Thereafter the school board decided that the headscarf was prohibited in the school for the security reasons. The parents of the girls objected to the decision. They said that the scarf was an important part of their dress; if the girls didn’t wear it they would violate the rule of their religion. The parents decided that the girls shouldn’t go to school as long as the prohibition was in force. The case went to court. They judge had to decide whether the school prohibition had to be kept or removed.

1. Should the judge remove the school prohibition? Why?
2. If the girls didn’t go to school they would breach the French constitution. Does it make girls’ behavior wrong? Why?
3. Did the school board have the right to prohibit veils at school? Why?
4. If a girl wanted to follow her religion and wear a scarf at school she would violate the school regulations. Is wearing a headscarf wrong in that case? Why?
5. Do parents have the right to force daughters to wear the veils at school? Why?

France has prohibited the use of all religious signs in public places since France claims to be a secular state. Such religious signs, for
example, are the crucifix for the Christians and the fez for the Jews.

6. If a Christian wants to wear a crucifix at school should (s)he be punished? Why?
6a. Do you think the French law is good or should it be removed? Why?
7. Generally speaking, should people follow the rules of their religion or the laws of their state? Why?

4. The Missionary Dilemma

In the middle of a jungle there lived a tribe totally isolated from the outside world living a very simple life. Since the climate was always warm, they did not wear clothes. They did not believe in God but they believed that in the jungle there were good and bad spirits. Once there came a Christian missionary since God had ordered him to convert these people into the Christian religion. He told them that God wanted a man and a woman to cover themselves with clothes and that the tribe violated God’s will. The tribesmen did not want to turn into a new religion since they already had their own beliefs. They didn’t want to wear clothes either since they were uncomfortable. The missionary became desperate since God had told him to convert the tribe. Some of the tribesmen were suffering from a disease that could cause a permanent paralysis. This disease could be easily cured with a medicine that the missionary was having with him. The missionary began to ponder whether he should give them the medicine on the condition that they turned into the Christian religion and began to wear clothes.

1. Should the missionary carry out his plans? Why?
2. Should these people turn into a new religion? Why?
3. Should the tribesmen wear clothes? Why?
4. Should the tribesmen pretend conversion so that they could obtain medicine and heal the sick? Why?
5. If the missionary didn’t give the medicine and the people got paralysed permanently, is the missionary responsible for the paralyses? Why?
6. When the tribe got together, they used to chew the leaves of a certain plant. The leaves had a mild drugging effect and helped them to relax. Should the tribe stop using the drug leaves? Why?

7. Who or what defines what actions are wrong (dressing, drugs)? Why?

8. Can one prefer the practices of the missionary’s religion to the practices of the tribe? Is it possible to prefer the practices of one culture to another? Why?
III The Turiel Rule Transgressions Interview

Questions about moral and nonmoral rules:

*Moral issues:*

(1) stealing
(2) religion-based discrimination
(3) inequality between men and women

*Nonmoral issues:*

(4) making (presently Evangelical Lutheran) moral education in schools nonreligious
(5) allowing the use and sale of marihuana
(6) relaxing the censorship of TV and video programs
(7) allowing shops to be open on Sundays
(8) making the legal status of cohabitation and marriage equal
(9) allowing the sale of wines in food shops
(10) making contraceptive pills prescription-free if it is proven first that they do not have health risks.

**Part 1:**

In each rule the following questions are asked:

1.1 *The rule alterability / societal authority:*

If the Government decides to remove the rule regarding [the act], would it be wrong or allright? Why?

1.2 *The rule alterability / church authority* (the Evangelical Lutheran Church for the Lutherans and the persons without a church membership; and the administration of the Conservative Laestadian movement for the Laestadians)

If the [religious authority] decides to remove the rule regarding [the act], would it be wrong or allright? Why?

1.3 *The rule alterability / God’s Word authority*

If there was nothing written in the Bible regarding [the act], would it be allright then? Why?

1.4 *Generalizability* (to other countries that do not have rules regarding the act)

If there is no rule regarding [the act] in the other country, would [the act] be allright then? Why?
Part 2:
The Open Question
(only for moral transgressions: stealing, religious discrimination
and unequal treatment of sexes)

If God orders a person to [steal, discriminate on religious
grounds, treat men and women unequally], would it be
wrong or alright? Why?
Can God order a person to [steal, discriminate on religious
grounds, treat men and women unequally]? Why?
Appendix 21: Questionnaire

Interview no.: _______________ Group: _______________________

1. Year of birth: 19_____

2. Sex:
   1 female
   2 male

3. Mean of the theoretical subjects’ grades in the latest school report: __________

4. Father’s occupational status: ______________

5. Mother’s occupational status: ______________

6. Number of children in the family and their sex: ______________

7. Do you live
   1 with your both parents
   2 with your mother
   3 with your father
   4 otherwise, how___________________________

8. Do you attend at school
   1 Evangelical Lutheran religious instruction
   2 philosophy of life instruction
   3 other, what___________________________
   4 I don’t attend any of the subjects above.

9. What was the grade of this subject in your latest school report? __________

10. Since which class have you attended the instruction of this subject? __________

   And which subject did you attend before that? ______________

11. Are you a member of a church, a revival movement or other religious community?
    1 yes, what? ____________________
    2 no

12. Is your father a member of a church, a revival movement or other religious community?
    1 yes, what? ____________________
    2 no

13. Is your mother a member of a church, a revival movement or other religious community?
    1 yes, what? ____________________
    2 no
14. Are your siblings members of a church, a revival movement or other religious community?
   1 yes, what? ____________________
   2 no

15. Have you taken
   1 the confirmation class / camp organised by the Evangelical Lutheran church
   2 the confirmation class / camp organised by the Laestadian movement
   3 the Prometheus class / camp for adolescents belonging to the population register and who don’t belong to religious communities
   4 the confirmation class / camp organised by other religious community, what? ___________________
   5 I have not taken any of the above

16. Have you attended religious functions or occasions during the last one year?
   (please select only one option for each item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>every day</th>
<th>at least once a week</th>
<th>at least once a month</th>
<th>at least once a year</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) church services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) revivalist meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Bible study groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) religious youth meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) other religious functions or occasions, what?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Why do you attend religious functions or occasions?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

18. How often have you read the following literature during the last one year? (please select only one option for each item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>every day</th>
<th>at least once a week</th>
<th>at least once a month</th>
<th>at least once a year</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Bible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Religious books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Religious periodicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Science books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Science periodicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Magazines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Societal or political literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Why do you read religious literature?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

20. How often have you followed the following programs in media during the last one year? (please select only one option for each item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Every Day</th>
<th>At least once a week</th>
<th>At least once a month</th>
<th>At least once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Church radio services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Other religious radio programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Church services on TV programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Other religious TV programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Science programs on radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Radio plays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Science TV programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Films</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) TV News and current affairs programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Radio News and current affairs programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Why do you follow religious programs in media?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

22. Are you a member of some societies, study groups or associations?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

23. What kinds of hobbies do you have?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

24. What do you do during your leisure time?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
25. Have you prayed for God or Jesus during the last one year (please select only one option)?
   1 almost every day
   2 around once a week
   3 1–2 times a month
   4 1–2 times a year
   5 never

26. If you belong to a church or a religious community have you ever considered leaving it (please select only one option)?
   1 I have never considered leaving it
   2 I have considered leaving it but I am not likely to do it.
   3 I have considered leaving it and I am likely to do it.
   4 I don’t belong to any church or other religious community.

27. Do you discuss with your family (please select only one option for each item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>every day</th>
<th>at least once a week</th>
<th>at least once a month</th>
<th>at least once a year</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) moral issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) religious and philosophy of life issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) social and political issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Do you discuss with your friends (please select only one option for each item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>every day</th>
<th>at least once a week</th>
<th>at least once a month</th>
<th>at least once a year</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) moral issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) religious and philosophy of life issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) social and political issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Do you believe in the following things? Please circle the option that is most near to your own conception. (please select only one option for each item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I believe</th>
<th>I cannot</th>
<th>I don’t believe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>without a doubt</td>
<td>quite surely</td>
<td>say believe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) in God</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) in Jesus as the Son of God</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) in the Holy Spirit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) in guardian angels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) in Satan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) in God’s guidance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) in life after death</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Please circle the option that describes best the way you believe in God (please select only one option).

1. I believe in God exactly the way the Christianity teaches.
2. I believe in God but in a different way than the Christianity teaches.
3. I am not sure if God exists.
4. I believe that God does not exist.
5. I cannot take a stand on whether God exists.

31. Please circle the option that describes best your conception of Jesus (please select only one option).

1. I believe that Jesus is the Son of God.
2. I believe that Jesus was a historic person not the Son of God.
3. I am not sure whether Jesus ever existed.
4. I believe that Jesus never existed.
5. I cannot take a stand on whether Jesus ever existed.

THANK YOU!