



Morality

The Science of Resilience

✉ rrc@dal.ca

🌐 www.resilienceresearch.org

© R2 RESILIENCE



RRC - Evaluation
and Training Institute

Table of Contents

Definition	1
Moral Psychology.....	2
Relationship to Resilience	4
Improving.....	6
Interventions.....	7
Domain concordant instructions	7
Moral debiasing	8
Intuitive judgement and moral education.....	8
Cognitive behavioural therapy.....	10
Assessment	11
References	14
Appendix A: The Defining Issues Test (DIT) and the DIT-2.....	18
Appendix B: Sociomoral Reflection Measure – Short Form Objective	19
Appendix C: Moral Foundations Questionnaire	30

Definition

Morality, or a moral system, is “the system people use, often unconsciously, when they are trying to make a morally acceptable choice among several alternative actions or when they make moral judgements about their own actions or those of others” (Gert, et al., 1998, p. 3). In philosophy, morality can be defined in two broad senses: descriptively and normatively. In the descriptive sense, morality refers to certain codes of conduct created by a society or a group or accepted by an individual for their own behaviour. In the normative sense, it refers to a code of conduct that would be used by all rational persons in certain conditions (Gert & Gert, 2017). In the descriptive sense, there is no universal morality that applies for all human beings since morality is a product of distinct groups or societies. However, these conducts are distinguished from etiquette, law, and religion that are also formed by a society. In the normative sense, the codes of conduct are accepted by all *moral agents*, individuals who meet intellectual and volitional conditions and are rational. However, the acceptance of a code by all moral agents is not enough to classify the code as part of morality. In both the descriptive and the normative sense, individuals need to consider definitional features to give a definition of morality (Gert & Gert, 2017).

In psychology, the moral domain is defined as “prescriptive judgements of justice, rights, and welfare pertaining to how people ought to relate to each other” (Turiel, 1983, p.3). Based on this definition, Nucci (2001) defines morality as “conceptions of human welfare, justice, and rights, which are functions of the inherent features of interpersonal relations” (p. 7). The perception of the right and wrong are not simply a consensus or based on the authority’s view of right and wrong. However, Turiel (2006) and Haidt (2008) argue that the definition only makes sense for the liberal-progress narrative but does not make sense for the philosophical tradition that is based on social hierarchy, or for the community-lost narrative, in which modern industry overruns folk community’s custom and dissipates social trust. Haidt (2008) then proposes an alternative definition of morality:

Moral systems are interlocking sets of values, practices, institutions, and evolved psychological mechanisms that work together to suppress or regulate selfishness and make social life possible. (Haidt, 2008, p. 70)

This definition assumes that morality arises from the coevolution of genes and that cultures influence individuals to participate in the community and suppress their selfishness (by empathizing to other people, helping them, respecting their rights, and fighting for justice). Outside Western nations, authority/respect, in-group/loyalty and purity/sanctity are still parts of the moral domain. Traditional moralities suppress and regulate selfishness by binding people into larger collectives (families, guilds, teams). These bindings are fundamental sources of moral values for some communities (Haidt, 2008).

A systematic method to assess moral situations is called ethics. Ethics use reflection to analyse components of one's moralities. Ethics examines four components: moral sensitivity, moral judgement, moral motivation, and moral courage (Edwards & Delany, 2008). Moral courage is defined as taking moral actions even in the face of adversities (Edwards & Delany, 2008). Narvaez & Rest (1995) explain that four psychological processes occur to produce a moral act and propose the Four Component model:

- Moral sensitivity is the ability to recognize and interpret issues in complex social situations in terms of what actions are possible, who will be affected by the action and how they might react.
- "Moral judgement involves deciding which of the possible actions is most moral. The individual weighs the choices and determines what a person ought to do in such a situation." (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, p. 386)
- Moral motivation assumes that the person prioritizes moral value above other values and intends to fulfill it.
- Implementation is using the ego strength and necessary skills to perform the chosen action.

A lot of definitions of morality are linked to moral judgement. Haidt (2001) defines moral judgement as "evaluations (good vs. bad) of the actions or character of a person that are made with respect to a set of virtues held to be obligatory by a culture or subculture" (p. 1028). Moral judgement is used to organize thinking about choices especially in difficult situations. People adopt a single perspective to get a clarity in making judgements. However, sometimes it is clouded by the need to have a resolution or closure, especially in an uncomfortable situation; clarity in seeing then blends with a search for justification (Gilligan, 1987).

There are four components in making moral judgement: knowledge of ethical theory; perspectives and values of those involved; knowledge of the self; and an ability to apply these values and knowledge in the reasoning process (Edwards & Delany, 2008). When making a moral judgement, the reasoner makes inference in several steps, which are performed consciously and unconsciously (Haidt, 2001). Haidt (2001) describes the conscious mental activity of transforming information to reach a moral judgement as moral reasoning. The appearance of moral judgement without any conscious awareness of having gone through the steps of searching, analysing evidence and inferring a conclusion is called moral intuition (Haidt, 2001).

Moral Psychology

The two main lines of moral psychology came from Émile Durkheim and Jean Piaget (Haidt, 2008). Durkheim believed that increase in wealth, material comfort, and individual freedom put some strains on social cohesion and reduce its regulative effects on people's moral needs. Society functions properly when there is structure, order, and constraints. Rising wealth and individualism create emptiness, misery, and unhealthy state in a society. Durkheim argued that respect for authorities, which is the essential element of morality, can still be obtained

without teaching religion at school. Secular socialization needs to cultivate discipline (the authoritarian part of morality), groups attachment, and a sense of autonomy (Durkheim, 1973; Haidt, 2008).

Piaget focused on the development of moral judgement in children. He found that adult/child relations and peer relations introduce children to basic moral rules. Unilateral adult/child relations teach the children constraints and moral respects for superiors. Peer relations teach children rules of cooperation which are based on mutual respects and can be negotiated by moral standards (fairness and benevolence). Every child constructs their own moral development and, with the experience of fairness and reciprocity, they can develop more sophisticated notions of justice (Piaget, 1997; Haidt, 2008).

Kohlberg and Hersh (1977) explain stages of moral development in which a person's structure of thoughts are transformed and their knowledge of cultural values are improved. Kohlberg's moral development stages are explained below.

- Preconventional responses. At this level, the child labels right or wrong based on anticipated consequences, such as punishment or reward. This level is divided into two stages: the punishment-and-obedience orientation (in which the physical consequences determine good and bad) and the instrumental-relativist orientation (in which the right actions satisfy one's own needs and sometimes other people's needs).
- Conventional level. At this level, right or wrong depends on confirmation and maintaining support from one's group, family, or nation.
- Postconventional, autonomous or principled level. There is a clear effort to separate one's moral values and principles from groups authority. In this level, the right action is defined in terms of general individual rights and standards that is agreed upon by the whole society. On the later stage, right is defined by decision resulted from examining one's conscience and self-chosen ethical universal principles (justice, reciprocity, equality of human rights, and respect for the dignity of others as individual persons).

Gilligan (1987) argues that justice is only one of the two moral perspectives. Another way of seeing moral problems is through care perspective. From justice perspective, individuals judge the conflicting claims against a standard of equality while from care perspective, individuals respond to the issues by perceiving what is needed. The two perspectives focus on how human relationships can be characterized in terms of both equality and attachment, and that inequality and detachment can cause disturbance.

Bandura (1991) argues that instead of a series of stages, moral judgement is multifaceted and relies on reasoning from several moral standards rather than one type of moral standard. The "mature mode of thinking is characterized by sensitivity to the diverse factors that are morally relevant in any given situation" (Bandura, 1991, p. 49). He formulated *social-cognitive theory*, in which people use their action as a way to feel, believe, reflect, and gain self-control (Bandura, 1991; Haidt, 2008). As opposed to the controlled cognitive process, Bargh and Ferguson (2000) argue that social interaction, evaluation, judgement, and the

operation of internal goal structures are automatic and do not require conscious choice or guidance. Rather, human behaviours are shaped by cues in the environment and surpasses consciousness.

Haidt (2001) proposes that moral judgement should be studied as an internal process and thus, formulated the social intuitionist model (SIM) of moral judgement. In this model, moral judgement is a rapid intuitive process with two cognitive process involved: reasoning and intuition. In SIM, reasoning is used but is rarely open and unbiased. People use moral reasoning to support their initial intuition and when they have conflicted intuitions (Haidt, 2001; Haidt, 2008). When people make judgements, they may maintain their position even without supporting reason and base it more on gut feeling. Haidt et al., (2001) called termed this phenomenon “moral dumbfounding,” described as “the stubborn and puzzled maintenance of a judgement without supporting reasons” (p. 1). Moral dumbfounding supports the theory that moral judgement is based on an intuitive feeling (of right and wrong), from which individuals construct the reasoning based on the most salient features of the situation (Haidt et al., 2000). However, Royzman et al. (2015) argue that Haidt et al.’s (2001) concept of moral dumbfounding is influenced by two factors: (1) subjects’ inability to fully articulate their position, therefore coming across as stubborn and their desire to quickly end the interview; (2) researcher tendencies not to interpret certain subjectively supported reasons as such. They found that despite the judgements being outside the mainstream believes, the holder of these beliefs still has subjective warrantable reasons to their decisions. Therefore, the holder of the beliefs still uses rationalist model in making moral judgement (Royzman, et al., 2015). Moral dumbfounding came from individuals’ inability to put forward certain reasons which support their judgement (Sauer, 2012).

Individuals face uncertainties in their social life. When they are not sure if their next action is going to be good, they look at their past good deeds to lift their concern about being immoral. Monin and Miller (2001) define this as moral self-licensing. They argue that good deeds make people feel secure in their self-regards and therefore are more likely to act in dubious way (Monin & Miller, 2001; Merritt et al., 2010).

Relationship to Resilience

Painful experience causes grief and trauma. These emotions are based on individual value judgement and are constrained within a culture and a society that defines the boundaries of appropriate and inappropriate (Fierke, 2004). Individuals use moral order and moral appraisal to: acknowledge or deny their pain; consider where to put the blame for the cause of the pain; raise individuals’ and collective’s ethical concern; interpret negative emotions; and control their impulse in order to organize and prioritize their actions better (Fierke, 2004; Brassett & Clarke, 2012; Darvishzadeh & Bozorgi, 2016).

Trauma focuses on the victims and shows the painful connection between the past and the present. Individuals identify their moral responsibility in adversity by understanding the problem, the cause, and their relation to the situation (Fassin & Rechtman, 2009). By using this narrative, individuals and institutions identify the concern and response to it rapidly to solve the problem (Brassett & Clarke, 2012). For victims of trauma, speaking about their pain give them validation. By speaking their story, they express a moral order (an acknowledgment or denial of blame, innocence, or complicity) and define the perpetrators and victims in the situation. Acknowledging the trauma and recognizing the suffering of oneself and others engender individuals' and collective's compassion, which push people to deal with the situation and to prevent the probability of future suffering (Fierke, 2004).

In South Africa, where collective and personal traumas are widespread, the victims produce moral judgement in the community to help them reconcile and heal. Letting the victims of violence tell their stories helps the society to establish and repair the moral code that differentiates the right from the wrong. Through the recognition of this moral transgression, healing may happen (Humphrey, 2000).

Somali returnees experience emotional distress from suffering, social rupture, and injustice from war and displacement. Moral judgement is used to reinforce shared identity, experience and commitment for collective survival. The experience pushes them to create, recognize, reinforce, and mobilize the moral webs for individual and collective survival. Individual suffering can be grasped by other individuals with the same background and who are embedded in common moral webs. They understood the emotions and bear the responsibility to intervene and change the situation (Zarowsky, 2004).

A sense of hope builds resilience. The belief that individuals can overcome adversities and their meaning-making process of the situation gives them hope to get through it. A sense of morality and social order are fundamental aspects in building and maintaining hope, especially in difficult times. For individuals affected by war in Afghanistan, a sense of morality, along with faith, family unit, and their honour, built and maintained their self-respect, dignity, and social aspiration. Having good morals is deemed essential for success and prosperity (Eggerman & Panter-Brick, 2010).

Children who experienced sexual abuse who understand their feelings and attributions have a lower risk of revictimization. Their ability to determine right from wrong and for get help for themselves is a vehicle for normalization and reframing attributions, which in turn help them to overcome the abuse (Celano, 1992). A clear sense of life values gives individuals a focus to face their situation and to be less vulnerable (Paris & Bradley, 2001).

Helping other people in distress requires basic moral sensitivity and self-efficacy. Thornberg and Jungert (2013) found that adolescents with high basic moral sensitivity tend to either intervene and help a bullying victim or remain passive. The act of helping or remain passive is determined by the person's self-efficacy. Adolescents who believe that they have

power to produce results will make an attempt to help. If they think they are not capable of intervening effectively, they will remain passive even if they see the wrongness in the situation.

Individuals' sociomoral reasoning is one of the important aspects in their decision-making process. Individual's decision-making process are influenced by moral judgements (issues of fairness, welfare, and rights) and social convention (norms given by social system) (Smetana et al., 2014). Conflict happens when individuals make moral judgements about a situation but do not act on those judgements (Fry et al., 2002). Individuals may then experience distress and negative feelings (e.g. anger, frustration, guilt, anxiety, powerlessness and a sense of failure). The continuous distress does not affect their moral behaviours and actions, but it causes negative effects, such as loss of sleep, loss of appetite, nightmares, feeling of worthlessness, loss of confidence and physical symptoms. For military nurses deployed in dangerous environment, prolonged moral distress can push them to withdraw from nursing practice or make them feel reluctance to serve in future deployment (Fry et al., 2002).

This conflict is also experienced by military service members who served in a war. When an individual is unable to assimilate the traumatic events with their prior moral behaviours, they experience guilt, shame, anxiety, and prolonged psychological distress that affect their daily life. The altered beliefs about the world and the self may push the individual to view oneself as immoral and irredeemable and believe that they live in an immoral world. Understanding their feeling and the trauma itself helps them reconcile with their experience (Litz et al., 2009).

One of the causes of loss of morals in individuals affected by war in Afghanistan is economic hardship after the war. Failure to achieve their goals due to structural inequalities and injustice causes frustrations and decreases in health and well-being (Eggerman & Panter-Brick, 2010). In war, fragmented moral relations are also caused by losing a caregiver, particularly in children. The situation of war makes it difficult for these children to identify the aggressor or to attribute the blame. They have difficulties in determining good and bad, who committed the crime and should be punished (Rafman et al., 1996).

Immature moral judgement, antisocial cognitive distortion, and low empathy are often found in offenses perpetrated by delinquent adolescents. More mature moral judgement is correlated with more empathy and less cognitive distortions. Cognitive distortions help individuals to defend themselves against feelings of guilt after performing antisocial acts. Boys are found to have higher antisocial cognitive distortions compared to girls (Lardén et al., 2006) and girls tend to have more mature morals compared to boys (Darvishzadeh & Dasht Bozorgi, 2016).

Improving

Educational settings are a common context for the transmission of morality. In educational contexts, the traditional approach to teaching moral systems uses a direct instruction approach to transmit the values. However, cognitive developmentalists argued that the focus of education is building autonomy, not dependency, therefore an alternative approach is needed (Watson, 2008). For example, Watson (2008) argues that the classrooms environment for moral education needs to fulfill four conditions:

- There is a warm, supportive and mutual trusting relationship between the teacher and the children. Children who are raised in nurturing families are more morally matured compared to children from emotionally distant families.
- Availability of a caring and democratic community in which children's needs for competence and autonomy are fulfilled. Children need a sense of competence and a sense of autonomy to improve their moral growth. Therefore, they need to be involved in creating and maintaining their learning community. They also need to have influence in the community's decision-making process and participate in the community's actions. Teachers need to encourage students to help one another and limit classroom competition.
- Availability of opportunities to discuss and refine their moral values and learn to apply the values in daily activities. Conversations in moral discourses can be initiated in response to student's inquires or actions and in class meetings.
- Teachers use both proactive and reactive control technique to help children follow prosocial values. Indirect control (e.g. assigning seats, partners for group works, seat in a circle) can be used to shape classroom environment and intervene with potential misbehaviour. Involving students in determining the guidelines in the classroom gives them a sense of autonomy and control. However, sometimes teachers need to take full control in the classroom to facilitate the learning objectives and goals.

Interventions

Enhancing a sense of morality requires a proper balance between care for oneself and care for others. Awareness of one's own values improves individuals' self-care behaviour and resilience. This sections list some of the intervention in moral education and therapies for moral injuries after a traumatic event.

Domain concordant instructions

Moral education focuses on matching the development between social convention and morality domain (Nucci & Weber, 1991). Nucci & Weber (1991) investigate an intervention to help students develop moral and conventional concepts. The intervention involves student's engagement in discussions and written activities regarding moral and social-conventional issues.

The intervention is conducted within an American history course and an English composition course and entails a small group discussion with five to six students over 7 weeks

period. At the end of each session, students are given written homework assignments (essays) and are asked to incorporate the major points of the discussion. In history class, students are also randomly assigned to small group discussions with three conditions (Nucci & Weber, 1991):

- *Convention-only* condition, in which they treat all issues as if they were matters of convention using social norms. Violating the norms means disturbing the social order
- *Moral-only* condition, in which all issues are matters of morality. They are asked to consider the justice and welfare implications for each issue
- *Domain-appropriate* values education, in which the focus is synchronized with the domain of the issues being studied. In the case of mixed domain issues, the students consider the social-normative and justice features in the issues and then integrate the moral and conventional aspects.

The students then write essays that deal with common themes including resolving interpersonal conflicts, dealing with peer-based norms, and integrating into the adult world of work. Nucci et al., (2015) used this principle to study 254 middle school students. They found that the strategy, combined with changes in classroom structures (time and the patterns of discourse), was associated with improvements in students' levels of moral reasoning, their societal convention concepts, and their spontaneous tendencies to utilise cross-domain coordination when facing complex issues.

Moral debiasing

One strategy to counteract biases is by discussing the issue with wiser and more experienced people. This can help individuals in identifying the bias and getting a different perspective from one's own reasoning (Musschenga, 2008).

Horton (2004) proposes "moral methodology", a way to reduce bias and error in moral judgements. He uses debiasing strategies to improve moral reasoning process. The main strategy is to take steps to generate thought processes to counter the bias. This can be done by various techniques:

- Role-reversal: imagining to be in the position of other people affected by one's actions.
- Finding "the strongest case for claims other than one is inclined to defend" (Musschenga, 2008, p. 141). This technique consists of two stages: taking a step back to analyse one's thinking regarding the issue and find the biases; and re-examines the issues and how far it affected by bias.
- Not counteracting the bias but deciding to choose the biased conclusion after taking account of and acknowledging the bias.

Intuitive judgement and moral education

People's inability to accurately analysing the factors that influence their judgement can result in attitude/behaviour dissonance in which the reasons people come up with do not affect their output behaviour. Sauer (2012) proposes moral education to improve one's intuitions as well as the reasons behind their judgements.

People's experiences can improve their moral intuition. Individuals can improve their intuition through experience by changing their social environment to provide them with a situation they need to confront and joint action with other people with shared moral norms. Teaching moral intuition also works and is done explicitly, such as by teaching children to understand different social norms and what makes a judgement moral (Sauer, 2012).

Sauer (2012) explains that education of moral intuitions is a process of habituation. People's ability to make automatic intuitive judgement is improved with repetitions. Sauer (2012) explains five stages to obtain intuitive skill:

- For the *novice* (stage 1), the elements of moral judgement formation are separated to help them perform the judgement. The example for this is when parents explain to their children what they ought and ought not do and the reason for it.
- *Advance beginner* (stage 2) and *competence* (stage 3) in which the person's normative automaticity is increasing. In these stages, they also perform the judgement with greater reliability, autonomy, and flexibility in understanding their subject. At stage 3, they "have acquired mastery of moral concepts and implicit knowledge of the reasons that count in the context of moral discourse". (p. 267)
- *Proficiency* (stage 4) and *expertise* (stage 5), in which the person utilises their perception-like intuition to evaluate the situation. In stage 4, individuals are more original and independent in making their judgement and keep improving their moral beliefs. Individuals become an expert when they have meta-knowledge about normative and meta-ethical of the practices.

There are two possible way to improve intuition: *ex ante* education (focused on the conditions in which a moral intuition is generated) and *ex post* (focused on the response after the intuition is generated).

Sauer (2012) explains various ways to influence moral intuition *ex ante*:

- Selectively exposing oneself to a particular situation (as situational stimuli) and using retrospective and prospective reflections to control unwanted judgemental response. This, in turn, bridges the gap between people's attitude and behaviour. For example, in order to eliminate their own racial biases and prejudice, people deliberately connect with people from different races.
- Changing the internal processes that form the unwanted judgement by directly influencing the formation of the intuition. One way to influence intuition formation is by doing *implementation intentions*, in which individual imagine an uncomfortable situation and consider/ plan their behaviour in the situation. This activity improves people's automatic response and helps them to stay calm and relax when encountering uncomfortable situation.
- Repeated exposure to suitable stimuli in order to change or influence individual's judgements.

Ex post education is done by reflecting on the process and effect of individual's previous intuitive system and judgement to improve their intuitions in the future. By understanding one's own cognitive process, one can alter them to the standard of rationality that they see appropriate. People are able to take into account irrelevant factors which distort their judgement, and they are able to discount them when needed. Changes in people's behaviour is usually followed by changes in attitudes and feelings, therefore, changes in behaviour will change people's intuition. *Ex post* reflection can be done by interacting and talking to oneself or to other people (Sauer, 2012).

Cognitive behavioural therapy

Guilt is "a multidimensional construct consisting of an affective component and set of interrelated beliefs about one's role in a negative event" (Kubany & Manke, 1995, p. 29). People experience guilt when they violate their personal standards of right and wrong, when they feel responsible for causing the events, cannot justify their action at the time of the event, or when they have false beliefs about pre-outcome knowledge (Kubany & Manke, 1995; Fishhoff, 1975). Traumatic events cause great harm to self-and/or other by causing negative value judgements or appraisal about the self (Kubany & Manke, 1995). Morally injurious events (perpetrating, failing to prevent, or witnessing the action) cause transgressions in deeply held moral beliefs and expectations. In the long-term, the transgression creates personal conflicts and may cause psychological, behavioural, emotional, spiritual, and social problems in one's life (Litz et al., 2009).

Cognitive therapy can be used to eliminate individuals' distorted appraisal of their role in a traumatic event. It is done by teaching the patients about hindsight bias, the distinction between responsibility and blame, and components of guilt and by correcting thinking errors of oneself helps fixing the distorted view of the patients' role in their trauma (Kubany & Manke, 1995).

Kubany and Manke (1995) designed a cognitive therapy for trauma related guilt. First, the therapist explores the patient's role in the trauma and examines each of their guilt issues. Second, the patients are asked to retell their experience by focusing on the facts. After the retelling, three questions are asked: "what was the worst part?", "what were you feeling during the worst part?", and "what were your thoughts during the worst part?". Then, the distorted thinking is corrected by addressing components of guilt.

Litz et al., (2009) proposed a different intervention to repair moral injuries, focusing on veterans. Their approach is based on several assumptions:

- Moral injury (in the form of anguish, guilt, and shame) are a sign of an intact moral belief system. The patient's moral system is clouded by their experience, self-judgement, personal conflict, and confusion about good and bad. People who earnestly seek care are struggling but are still capable of moral directedness.

- There are “two routes of moral renewal: (a) psychological- and emotional-processing of the memory of the moral transgression, its meaning and significance, and the implication for the service member, and (b) exposure to corrective life experience” (Litz et al., 2009, p.701).
- Because beliefs about moral transgression tend to be very rigid, an equally intense encounter and experience are needed to counter these beliefs.
- The process takes time and there is no quick way to do it.

The intervention is a modified cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) with eight elements. Some steps can overlap, and some occur throughout the treatment (Litz et al., 2009).

1. *A strong connection, working alliance and trusting relationship* between the therapist and the patient.
2. *Preparation and education* about moral injury, its impact, and a collaborative plan to promote a healthier life
3. *Modified exposure component* by using hot-cognitive, exposure-based processing (emotion-focused disclosure) of events surrounding the moral injury. The patient needs to engage with the experience and its aftermath. This is done in tandem with ‘examination and integration’ and ‘dialogue with a benevolent moral authority’. Overtime, the exposure may become less necessary and the patient can directly go to the next step.
4. *Examination and integration* to reclaim one’s moral core and a sense of personal worth. This is done by asking the patient about the meaning of the event for themselves; how it affects their future; their attribution to the transgression; the maladaptive interpretation of themselves. The patients are directed to separate the individual’s overall worth from a particular act in order to challenge their beliefs about the self. It is important for the patient to feel remorse while examining the meaning and implication of the experience.
5. *An imaginal dialogue with a benevolent moral authority* about what happened and how it impacts the patient now and their plan for the future. It aims to help the patients to verbalize what they did or saw, articulate their attributions and the feeling about oneself after the experience, and what result is appropriate for them in their life course. Patients also share their remorse, sorrow, and what they would like to do to make amends. After that, the patients are asked to verbalize the moral authority’s response and the therapist introduced a forgiveness-related content, specific to the experience. This process is repeated in multiple sessions and at each end the therapist will elicit feedback about the experience.
6. *Fostering reparation and self-forgiveness*. To repair moral injury, the patients need to find ways of doing good deeds as a vehicle to make amends and forgive themselves.
7. *Fostering reconnection with various communities*. Patients are encouraged to seek positive relationships outside of therapy and connect or reconnect with important people in their lives.
8. *An assessment of goals and values moving forward*

Assessment

The Moral Judgement Interview (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987; Elm & Weber, 1994)

- The interview is designed “to elicit a subject’s (1) own construction of moral reasoning, (2) moral frame of reference or assumptions about right and wrong, and (3) the way these beliefs and assumptions are used to make and justify moral decisions” (Colby and Kohlberg, 1987, p. 61).
- The questions are intended to draw out normative judgements about what one should do.
- The coding process consists of 17-step process that is divided into three sections: (a) breaking down the interview material into interview judgements; (b) matching the interview judgements with previous judgements found in the scoring manual, and (c) assigning stage scores.

The Defining Issues Test (DIT) and the DIT-2 (Rest et al., 1999)

- The test is designed to measure moral judgement development.
- The test emphasizes cognition as the starting point and highlights personal construction of basic epistemological categories. It portrays development over time and characterizes the development in terms of a shift from conventional to postconventional moral thinking.
- The test employs a multiple-choice, recognition task that the participants have to rate and rank.
- The three schemas in the DIT are: personal interest (stage 2 and 3 of Kohlberg’s theory), maintaining norms (stage 4) and postconventional thinking (stage 5 and 6)
- There are 6 short issues statements reflecting Kohlberg’s six stages in the DIT and 5 in the DIT-2 (See Appendix A) and 12 item-statement for the action choice
- The traditional *p-score*, derived from participant’s ranking of postconventional items, is used as the DIT measurement. A new index, the N2 Score, then was developed to adjust the *p-score*. The index is based on “the participants’ ability to discriminate between *P* items and lower stage items” (Thoma, 2006, p. 80). A change on the *p-score* implies moral development

The Sociomoral Reflection Measure Questionnaire/Short Form (SRM-SF; Basinger & Gibbs, 1987)

- A self-report instrument measuring the developmental of moral judgement.
- The SRM-SF consists of two moral dilemmas and 11 open-ended questions that focus on sociomoral norm
- The score is calculated by averaging the mean close and closest scores, weighing the latter twice as heavily as the former.

The Sociomoral Reflection Measure-Short Form Objective (SRM-SFO; Brugman et al., 2007; Appendix B)

- A self-report instrument measuring the developmental of moral judgement
- The SRM-SFO consists of 10 sets of questions

- The score is calculated by averaging the mean close and closest scores, weighing the latter twice as heavily as the former

The Moral Judgement Test and the Moral Competence Test (Lind, 2006)

- The test is based on Kohlberg's notion of moral judgement competence and Piaget's two aspect model of behaviour
- "The C index describes the extent to which a respondent judges arguments given by other people on the basis of the moral quality of the arguments rather than agreement of the argument and respondent's opinion" (p. 581)
- The test items confront participants with moral dilemmas and their position in the situations
- The measurement used is a three-factorial, multivariate design, representing three factors: opinion-agreement, quality or stage of moral orientation and dilemma context

The Moral Foundation Questionnaire (Graham et al., 2011; Appendix C)

- The questionnaire aims to assess individuals' moral judgement based on harm/care, fairness/ justice, in-group/loyalty, authority, and purity domains.
- The items are measured on a 6-point scale (*not at all relevant* to *highly relevant*) and a 6-point scale (*strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*).
- "MFQ structure is not very resilient to smaller samples, short-form versions of the measure, fixed item-order, or less motivated participants" (Iurino & Saucier, 2018, p. 370).
- For more information about Moral Foundations Theory, see: www.MoralFoundations.org.
- To take this scale online and see how you compare to others see: www.YourMorals.org

The Moral Injury Questionnaire—Military Version (Currier et al., 2013)

- A 19 self-report items to measure moral injury as a negative consequence from war.
- Based on a moral injury construct: acts of betrayal (3 items), acts of disproportionate violence inflicted on others (5 items), incidents involving death or harm to civilians (four items), violence within military ranks (2 items), inability to prevent death or suffering (2 items), ethical dilemmas/ moral conflicts (4 items).
- The items are measured with a four-point scale: 1 = *Never*, 2 = *Seldom*, 3 = *Sometimes* and 4 = *Often*

References

- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (pp. 45-103). Erlbaum.
- Bargh, J. A., & Ferguson, M. J. (2000). Beyond behaviorism: On the automaticity of higher mental processes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(6), 925–945.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.6.925>
- Basinger, K. S., & Gibbs, J. C. (1987). Validation of the sociomoral reflection objective measure—short form. *Psychological Reports*, 61(1), 139-146.
- Brassett, J., & Clarke, C. (2012). Performing the Sub-Prime Crisis: Trauma and the Financial Event. *International Political Sociology*, 6(1), 4–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-5687.2012.00148.x>
- Brugman, D., Basinger, K. S., & Gibbs, J. C. (2007). Measuring adolescents' moral judgment: An evaluation of the sociomoral reflection measure—Short Form Objective (SRM-SFO). *Unpublished manuscript, the University of Utrecht & Urbana University*.
- Celano, M. P. (1992). A Developmental Model of Victims' Internal Attributions of Responsibility for Sexual Abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7(1), 57–69.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/088626092007001005>
- Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., Speicher, B., Hower, A., Candee, D., Gibbs, J., & Power, C. (1987). *The measurement of moral judgement: Volume 2, Standard issue scoring manual* (Vol. 2). Cambridge university press.
- Currier, J. M., Holland, J. M., Drescher, K., & Foy, D. (2015). Initial Psychometric Evaluation of the Moral Injury Questionnaire—Military Version. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 22(1), 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.1866>
- Darvishzadeh, K., & Dasht Bozorgi, Z. (2016). The Relationship between Resilience, Psychological Hardiness, Spiritual Intelligence, and Development of the Moral Judgement of the Female Students. *Asian Social Science*, 12(3), 170.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v12n3p170>
- Durkheim, E. (1973). *Moral education: A study in the theory and application of the sociology of education*. (Tr. Everett K. Wilson & Herman Schnurer) (pp. xxx, 288). Free Press.
- Edwards, I., & Delany, C. (2008). Ethical reasoning. In *Clinical Reasoning in the health professions 3rd edn*, 279-89.
- Eggerman, M., & Panter-Brick, C. (2010). Suffering, hope, and entrapment: Resilience and cultural values in Afghanistan. *Social Science & Medicine*, 71(1), 71–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.03.023>
- Elm, D. R., & Weber, J. (1994). Measuring moral judgment: The Moral Judgment Interview or the Defining Issues Test? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13(5), 341–355.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00871762>
- Fassin D., & Rechtman R. (2009) *The Empire of Trauma: An Inquiry into the Condition of Victimhood*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

- Fierke, K. M. (2004). Whereof we can speak, thereof we must not be silent: Trauma, political solipsism and war. *Review of International Studies*, 30(4), 471–491. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210504006187>
- Fischhoff, B. (1975). Hindsight is not equal to foresight: The effect of outcome knowledge on judgment under uncertainty. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 1(3), 288–299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.1.3.288>
- Gilligan, C. (1987). Moral orientation and moral development. In *Women and moral theory* (pp. 19-33). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Gert, B., & Gert, E. and J. C. P. of E. and H. V. B. (1998). *Morality: Its Nature and Justification*. Oxford University Press.
- Gert, B., & Gert, J. (2017). The Definition of Morality. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/morality-definition/>
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 366.
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. (2013, August 26). *Self-scorable MFQ30*. Moralfoundations. <https://moralfoundations.org/wp-content/uploads/files/MFQ30.self-scorable.doc>
- Haidt, J., Bjorklund, F., & Murphy, S. (2000). Moral dumbfounding: When intuition finds no reason. *Unpublished manuscript, University of Virginia*, 191-221.
- Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: a social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108(4), 814.
- Haidt, J. (2008). Morality. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(1), 65–72.
- Horton, K. (2004). Aid and bias. *Inquiry*, 47(6), 545-561.
- Humphrey, M. (2000). From Terror to Trauma: Commissioning Truth for National Reconciliation. *Social Identities*, 6(1), 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630051336>
- Iurino, K., & Saucier, G. (2020). Testing Measurement Invariance of the Moral Foundations Questionnaire Across 27 Countries. *Assessment*, 27(2), 365–372. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191118817916>
- Kohlberg, L., & Hersh, R. H. (1977). Moral Development: A Review of the Theory. *Theory Into Practice*, 16(2), 53–59. JSTOR.
- Kubany, E. S., & Manke, F. P. (1995). Cognitive therapy for trauma-related guilt: Conceptual bases and treatment outlines. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 2(1), 27–61. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1077-7229\(05\)80004-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1077-7229(05)80004-5)
- Lardén, M., Melin, L., Holst, U., & Långström, N. (2006). Moral judgement, cognitive distortions and empathy in incarcerated delinquent and community control adolescents. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 12(5), 453–462. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160500036855>
- Lind, G. (2006). The Moral Judgment Test: Comments on Villegas de Posada's Critique. *Psychological Reports*, 98(2), 580–584. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.98.2.580-584>
- Litz, B. T., Stein, N., Delaney, E., Lebowitz, L., Nash, W. P., Silva, C., & Maguen, S. (2009). Moral injury and moral repair in war veterans: A preliminary model and intervention strategy. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 29(8), 695–706. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.07.003>

- Merritt, A. C., Effron, D. A., & Monin, B. (2010). Moral Self-Licensing: When Being Good Frees Us to Be Bad. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(5), 344–357. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00263.x>
- Monin, B., & Miller, D. T. (2001). Moral credentials and the expression of prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(1), 33.
- Narváez, D., & Rest, J. (1995). The four components of acting morally. In *Moral development: an introduction* (pp. 385-400). Allyn & Bacon.
- Nucci, L. P. (2001). *Education in the Moral Domain*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nucci, L., & Weber, E. (1991). The domain approach to values education: From theory to practice. *Handbook of moral behavior and development. Vol. 3: Application*, 251-266
- Nucci, L., Creane, M. W., & Powers, D. W. (2015). Integrating moral and social development within middle school social studies: A social cognitive domain approach. *Journal of Moral Education*, 44(4), 479–496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2015.1087391>
- Paris, R., & Bradley, C. L. (2001). The Challenge of Adversity: Three Narratives of Alcohol Dependence, Recovery, and Adult Development. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11(5), 647–667. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973201129119352>
- Piaget, J. (1997). *The Moral Judgement of the Child*. Simon and Schuster.
- Rafman, S. (1996). Disrupted Moral Order: A Conceptual Framework for Differentiating Reactions to Loss and Trauma. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 19(4), 817–830. <https://doi.org/10.1080/016502596385596>
- Rest, J. R., Narvaez, D., Thoma, S. J., & Bebeau, M. J. (1999). DIT2: Devising and testing a revised instrument of moral judgment. *Journal of educational psychology*, 91(4), 644.
- Royzman, E. B., Kim, K., & Leeman, R. F. (2015). The curious tale of Julie and Mark: Unraveling the moral dumbfounding effect. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 10(4), 18.
- Sauer, H. (2012). Educated intuitions. Automaticity and rationality in moral judgement. *Philosophical Explorations*, 15(3), 255–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13869795.2012.706822>
- Smetana, J. G., Jambon, M., & Ball, C. (2014). The social domain approach to children’s moral and social judgments. In *Handbook of moral development, 2nd ed* (pp. 23–45). Psychology Press.
- Thoma, S. J. (2006). Research on the defining issues test. *Handbook of moral development*, 67-91.
- Thornberg, R., & Jungert, T. (2013). Basic moral sensitivity, moral disengagement and defender self-efficacy. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36 (3), 475-483.
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The Development of Social Knowledge: Morality and Convention*. Cambridge University Press.
- Turiel, E. (2006). Thought, emotions, and social interactional processes in moral development. In *Handbook of moral development, 2*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Watson, M. (2008). Developmental discipline and moral education. *Handbook of moral and character education*, 175-203.

Zarowsky, C. (2004). Writing Trauma: Emotion, Ethnography, and the Politics of Suffering Among Somali Returnees in Ethiopia. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, 28(2), 189–209.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/B:MEDI.0000034410.08428.29>

Appendix A: The Defining Issues Test (DIT) and the DIT-2

Rest et al. (1999)

The DIT presents six dilemmas:

- (a) "Heinz and the drug" (whether Heinz ought to steal a drug for his wife who is dying of cancer, after Heinz has attempted to get the drug in other ways)
- (b) "escaped prisoner" (whether a neighbor ought to report an escaped prisoner who has led an exemplary life after escaping from prison)
- (c) "newspaper" (whether a principal of a high school ought to stop publication of a student newspaper that has stirred complaints from the community for its political ideas)
- (d) "doctor" (whether a doctor should give medicine that may kill a terminal patient who is in pain and who requests the medicine)
- (e) "webster" (whether a manager ought to hire a minority member who is disfavored by the store's clientele)
- (f) "students" (whether students should protest the Vietnam War)

Note: Each dilemma is followed by a list of 12 considerations in resolving the dilemma, each of which represent different types of moral thinking.

The DIT-2 consists of five dilemmas:

- (a) "famine" (A father contemplates stealing food for his starving family from the warehouse of a rich man hoarding food— comparable to the Heinz dilemma in DIT1)
- (b) "reporter" (A newspaper reporter must decide whether to report a damaging story about a political candidate—comparable to the prisoner dilemma in DIT1)
- (c) "school board" (A school board chair must decide whether to hold a contentious and dangerous open meeting— comparable to the newspaper dilemma in DIT1)
- (d) "cancer" (A doctor must decide whether to give an overdose of a painkiller to a frail patient—comparable to the doctor dilemma in DIT1)
- (e) "demonstration" (College students demonstrate against U.S. foreign policy—comparable to the students dilemma in DIT1).

Appendix B: Sociomoral Reflection Measure – Short Form Objective

© K.S. Basinger, D. Brugman, & J.C. Gibbs

NAME: _____

DATE: _____

BIRTHDATE: _____

GENDER: MALE / FEMALE (circle one)

Instructions

In this questionnaire, we want to find out about the things that you think are important for people to do and especially **WHY** you think these things (like keeping a promise) are important. Please try to help us understand your thinking by choosing the answers that best match how you think. Also, please answer each question.

Example

I. How important is it to eat healthy, do you think?

Very important

Important

Not important

II. If you had to give a reason **WHY** it is **IMPORTANT** to eat healthy, what reason would you give? For each statement below, cross is "Close" or "Not Close" to your thinking. If the reason is too hard to understand, then just cross "Not Sure."

Is this close to a reason you would give?

A. Because else you would become ill.

Yes

No

Not sure

B. Because your parents would like you to eat healthy.

Yes

No

Not sure

C. Because you will get old.

Yes

D. Because eating healthy helps to live in a healthy milieu.

- No
 Not sure

- Yes
 No
 Not sure

III. Of the reasons given, which one is the **closest** to the reason you would give?

- A B C D

(cross one)

1. Think about when you've made a promise to a friend.

I. How important is it for people to keep promises, if they can, to friends?

Very important

Important

Not important

II. If you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT to keep a promise to a friend if you can, what reason would you give?

Is this close to a reason you would give?

A. Because your friend may have done things for you, and you need friends Yes

No

Not sure

B. Because friendships as well as society must be based on trust.

Yes

No

Not sure

C. Because otherwise that person won't be your friend again.

Yes

No

Not sure

- D. Because otherwise you would lose trust in each other. Yes
- No
- Not sure

III. Of the reasons given, which one is the **closest** to the reason you would give?

- A B C D

2. What about keeping a promise to a person you hardly know?

- I. How important is it for people to keep promises, if they can, even to someone they hardly know? Very important
- Important
- Not important

II. If you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT to keep a promise to a person you hardly know, what reason would you give?

Is this close to a reason you would give?

- A. Because otherwise the person will find out and beat you up or do something bad to you. Yes
- No
- Not sure
- B. Because then you can feel good about yourself and keep from giving the impression that you are a selfish person. Yes
- No
- Not sure
- C. Because it is important for the sake of your own integrity as well as the respect of others. Yes
- No
- Not sure
- D. Because you just might run into that person again some time. Yes

- No
- Not sure

III. Of the reasons given, which one is the **closest** to the reason you would give?

- A B C D

3. How about keeping a promise to a child?

- I. How important is it for parents to keep promises, if they can, to their children?
- Very important
- Important
- Not important

II. If you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for parents to keep promises to their children, what reason would you give?

Is this close to a reason you would give?

- A. Because parents want their children to keep promises, so parents should keep promises too.
- Yes
- No
- Not sure
- B. Because parents should never break promises.
- Yes
- No
- Not sure
- C. Because children must understand the importance of reliability or consistency.
- Yes
- No
- Not sure
- D. Because otherwise the children would lose faith in their parents.
- Yes
- No
- Not sure

III. Of the reasons given, which one is the **closest** to the reason you would give?

A B C D

4. What do you think about telling the truth?

I. In general, how important is it for people to tell the truth?

Very important

Important

Not important

II. If you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for people to tell the truth what reason would you give?

Is this close to a reason you would give?

A. Because people should always tell the truth.

Yes

No

Not sure

B. Because honesty is the best policy.

Yes

No

Not sure

C. Because lies catch up to you sooner or later.

Yes

No

Not sure

D. Because honesty is a standard that everyone can accept.

Yes

No

Not sure

III. Of the reasons given, which one is the **closest** to the reason you would give?

A B C D

5. Think about when you've helped your mother or father.

- I. How important is it for children to help their parents?
- Very important
- Important
- Not important

- II. If you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for children to help their parents; what reason would you give?

Is this close to a reason you would give?

- A. Because parents help their children, so children should help their parents
- Yes
- No
- Not sure
- B. Because it's nice for children to help their parents.
- Yes
- No
- Not sure
- C. Because that is what a family is all about.
- Yes
- No
- Not sure
- D. Because parents sacrifice so much for their children.
- Yes
- No
- Not sure

- III. Of the reasons given, which one is the **closest** to the reason you would give? ?

A B C D

6. What if a friend needs help and may even die, and you're the only person who can save him or her?

- I. How important is it for a person (without losing his or her own life) to save the life of a friend?
- Very important
- Important
- Not important

- II. If you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for a person to save the life of a friend; what reason would you give?

Is this close to a reason you would give?

- A. Because it's your friend, who might be an important person.
- Yes
- No
- Not sure

- B. Because you would feel close to your friend, and would expect that your friend would help you
- Yes
- No
- Not sure

- C. Because the friend may have done things for you, so you should do a favor for the friend, if you want your friend to help you in the future.
- Yes
- No
- Not sure

- D. Because a friendship must be based on mutual respect and cooperation.
- Yes
- No
- Not sure

- III. Of the reasons given, which one is the **closest** to the reason you would give? ?

A B C D

7. What about saving the life of a stranger?

I. How important is it for a person (without losing his/her own life) to save the life of a stranger?

Very important
 Important
 Not important

II. If you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for a person to save the life of a stranger; what reason would you give?

Is this close to a reason you would give?

A. Because the stranger is a person who wants to live.

Yes
 No
 Not sure

B. Because you should always be nice.

Yes
 No
 Not sure

C. Because people must help each other.

Yes
 No
 Not sure

D. Because life is precious and it is inhuman to let anyone suffer.

Yes
 No
 Not sure

III. Of the reasons given, which one is the **closest** to the reason you would give?

A B C D

8. People are not allowed to take away things that belong to others.

I. How important is it for people not to take things that belong to other people?

Very important
 Important

Not important

II. If you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for people not take things that belong to other people; what reason would you give?

Is this close to a reason you would give?

A. Because stealing gets you nowhere, and you are taking too much of a risk. Yes
 No

Not sure

B. Because it is selfish and heartless to steal from others. Yes

No

Not sure

C. Because living in society means accepting obligations and Yes

No

Not sure

D. Because stealing is bad, and you will go to jail if you steal. Yes

No

Not sure

III. Of the reasons given, which one is the **closest** to the reason you would give?

A B C D

9. People have to obey the law.

I. How important is it for people to obey the law?

Very important

Important

Not important

II. If you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for people to obey the law; what reason would you give?

Is this close to a reason you would give?

- A. Because the law is there to follow, and people should always obey it. Yes
 No
 Not sure
- B. Because otherwise everyone will be stealing from everyone else and nothing will be left. Yes
 No
 Not sure
- C. Because otherwise the world would go crazy, and there would be chaos. Yes
 No
 Not sure
- D. Because laws make society possible, and otherwise the system would break down. Yes
 No
 Not sure

III. Of the reasons given, which one is the **closest** to the reason you would give?

- A B C D

10. What should a judge do with some who breaks the law?

- I. How important is it for judges to send people who break the law to jail? Very important
 Important
 Not important

II. If you had to give a reason WHY it is IMPORTANT for judges to send people who break the law to jail, what reason would you give?

Is this close to a reason you would give?

- A. Because if they take the risk and get caught, then they go to jail. Yes
 No
 Not sure
- B. Because they must have known that what they did was wrong. Yes
 No
 Not sure
- C. Because they must be prepared to be held accountable for their actions. Yes
 No
 Not sure
- D. Because they did something wrong and judges should never let them go free. Yes
 No
 Not sure

III. Of the reasons given, which one is the **closest** to the reason you would give?

A B C D

(cross one)

Appendix C: Moral Foundations Questionnaire

Graham et al. (2008)

Part 1. When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking? Please rate each statement using this scale:

[0] = not at all relevant (This consideration has nothing to do with my judgments of right and wrong)

[1] = not very relevant

[2] = slightly relevant

[3] = somewhat relevant

[4] = very relevant

[5] = extremely relevant (This is one of the most important factors when I judge right and wrong)

- _____ 1. Whether or not someone suffered emotionally
- _____ 2. Whether or not some people were treated differently than others
- _____ 3. Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country
- _____ 4. Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority
- _____ 5. Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency
- _____ 6. Whether or not someone was good at math
- _____ 7. Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable
- _____ 8. Whether or not someone acted unfairly
- _____ 9. Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group
- _____ 10. Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society
- _____ 11. Whether or not someone did something disgusting
- _____ 12. Whether or not someone was cruel
- _____ 13. Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights
- _____ 14. Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty

_____ 15. Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder

_____ 16. Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of

Part 2. Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement:

[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
disagree	disagree	disagree	agree	agree	agree

_____ 17. Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue.

_____ 18. When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly.

_____ 19. I am proud of my country's history.

_____ 20. Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.

_____ 21. People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed.

_____ 22. It is better to do good than to do bad.

_____ 23. One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal.

_____ 24. Justice is the most important requirement for a society.

_____ 25. People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong.

_____ 26. Men and women each have different roles to play in society.

_____ 27. I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural.

_____ 28. It can never be right to kill a human being.

_____ 29. I think it's morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing.

_____ 30. It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself.

_____ 31. If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty.

_____ 32. Chastity is an important and valuable virtue.

To score the MFQ yourself, you can copy your answers into the grid below. Then add up the 6 numbers in each of the five columns and write each total in the box at the bottom of the column. The box then shows your score on each of 5 psychological “foundations” of morality. Scores run from 0-30 for each foundation. (Questions 6 and 22 are just used to catch people who are not paying attention. They don't count toward your scores).

Question #	Your Response	Question #	Your Response	Question #	Your Response	Question #	Your Response	Question #	Your Response		
1		2		3		4		5		6	
7		8		9		10		11			
12		13		14		15		16			
17		18		19		20		21		22	
23		24		25		26		27			
28		29		30		31		32			

Harm / Care	Fairness / Reciprocit	In-group/ Loyalty	Authority / Respect	Purity / Sanctity

The average politically moderate American’s scores are: 20.2, 20.5, 16.0, 16.5, and 12.6.

Liberals generally score a bit higher than that on Harm/care and Fairness/reciprocity, and much lower than that on the other three foundations. Conservatives generally show the opposite pattern.

For more information about Moral Foundations Theory, scoring this form, or interpreting your scores, see: www.MoralFoundations.org. To take this scale online and see how you compare to others, go to www.YourMorals.org



For more information about R2 or to discover how you can bring the program to your organization, business or educational setting, please contact us.

Paul McGuinness

Operations Manager

✉ rrc@dal.ca

☎ (902) 494-8482

Michael Ungar, PhD

Director

✉ michael.ungar@dal.ca

☎ (902) 229-0434



RRC - Evaluation
and Training Institute