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There is a voice inside of you
That whispers all day long,
“I feel that is right for me,
I know that this is wrong.”
No teacher, preacher, partner, friend
Or wise man can decide
What’s right for you – just listen to
The voice that speaks inside.

Shel Silverstein, 1996
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Theory and Method: A Non-Relationship

- **Ludwig Wittgenstein (1971), Philosopher:**
  - “The confusion and barrenness of psychology is not to be explained by calling it a ‘young science’; ... For in psychology there are experimental methods and conceptual confusion... The existence of the experimental method makes us think we have the means of getting rid of the problems which trouble us; though the problem and method simply pass one another by.”

**Internal vs. Internal Definition of Morality**

- **External Definition (Heteronomy):**
  - Morality as an agreement between behavior with the expectations and norms of an external entity/authority (society, culture, religion, researcher)

- **Internal Definition (Autonomy):**
  - Morality as an agreement between behavior with one’s own moral principles (internal voice, conscience, moral judgment, practical reason)
External Definitions of Morality: Heteronomy

- **John Watson (1970): Behaviorism**
  - “The interest of the behaviorist in man’s doings is more than the interest of the spectator – he wants to control man’s reactions as physical scientists want to control and manipulate other natural phenomena.”

- **Emil Durkheim (1902/1984): Education, Morality and Society**
  - “We could also say, that morals are a system of rules of action which determine behavior. They determine how one should in specific cases ought to behave: Good behavior means well behaved.” (p. 78)

- **Hugh Hartshorne et al. (1929): Studies in the Nature of Character**
  - Moral behavior must be measured “without any reference ... to its motives or its rightness or wrongness.” (p. 11)

  - “(You ought to) tell the truth’ ... we might translate ... as follows: ‘If you are reinforced by the approval of your fellow men, you will be reinforced when you tell the truth.’ (p. 99, 102, 107).”
Critique of External Definition

- **L. Kohlberg (1984):**
  - “Proponents of behaviorist conceptions of moral conduct typically define conduct as moral if it conforms to a socially or culturally accepted norm. All of us recognize this is intuitively incorrect, since moral exemplars like Socrates, Ghandi, and Martin Luther King consistently acted in opposition to, and in order to change, social norms – in terms of the moral principles of Stage 5 or 6.” (p. 392)

**Internal Definition of Morality**

- **Immanuel Kant**
  - “Morality, insofar as it is grounded on the concept of man as a free being (but who for this very reason also binds himself through his reason to unconditioned laws), requires neither the idea of another being above him in order for him to do his duty. By no means does morality require religion for its own benefit (neither objectively, as regards the will, nor subjectively, as regards the capacity to act); rather, by virtue of practical reason it is self-sufficient.” (Kant, 1793)

Internal Definition of Morality

• Immanuel Kant*
  ○ “Dare to think! Have the courage to use your own mind!” (Kant, 1784)
  ○ “Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law without contradiction.” (Kant, 1785).

* Our translation, compiled from others; there are many.

Jean Piaget

- “The moral good is in essence autonomous and can not be prescribed.” (1947, p. 123)
- “The notion of autonomous ... means that which is possible for the (child) ... to elaborate his (or her) ... own norms, at least in part.” (1981, p. 66)

Internal Definition of Morality

- **Lawrence Kohlberg**
  - Moral judgment is “the capacity to make decisions and judgments which are moral (i.e., based on internal principles) and to act in accordance with such judgments” (1964, p. 425)

Internal Definition of Morality

- **Georg Lind**
  - “Moral competence is the ability to solve conflicts and problems on the basis of shared moral principles through thinking and discussion rather than through violence, deceit and power.” (2011, 2015)

Critique of the External Measurement of Morality

• **Pittel & Mendelsohn (1966):**
  - “Perhaps the greatest single shortcoming (of moral tests) is the failure to view evaluative attitudes as subjective phenomena whose measurement is best achieved independent of a concern with the relationship of those attitudes to conventional and normative standards of moral valuation.” (p. 32)

Paradox: External Measurement of Internal Morality

- **L. Kohlberg (1984):**
  - “I include in my approach a normative component. ... That is, I assumed the need to define philosophically the entity we study, moral judgment, and to give a philosophic rationale for why a higher stage is a better stage.” (p. 400)

- **J. Rest (1979):**
  - “The P index ... is interpreted as the relative importance given to principled moral considerations on making a moral decision.” (p. 101).

- **A. Colby & W. Damon (1992):**
  - “What was required (to be nominated as a moral exemplar), was an unusual commitment to commonly known values.” (p. 317)


The Moral Competence Test (MCT) comprises of two dilemmatic stories (Worker, Doctor), each with six Pro- and six Contra-arguments which in turn represent one of the six moral orientations as per Kohlberg’s Stages.

Participants must rate the arguments on a scale ranging from -4 to +4 (reject to accept).

Test of ability: The C-score measures the level of ability in judging arguments based on their moral quality instead of their conforming with their opinion.

Internal Standard: participant’s own moral orientation and not the researcher’s, employer’s, or similar authority figure.
Internal Scoring Standards

- The moral competence score (C) is tied to the participant’s internal orientations, not to external norms.
- Example: Two persons differ completely in regard to their moral orientations, but get same moral competence score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion: Arguments of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Person C

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contra</th>
<th>Pro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

C-score: 92.2  
Range: 0 to 100  
Modal moral orientation: Type 1

Person B

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contra</th>
<th>Pro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

C-score: 92.2  
Range: 0 to 100  
Modal moral orientation: Type 6

Note: The “Types” correspond to the six Kohlbergian Stage-Orientations.
Conclusion:
Internal Measurement of Morals Is Possible!

- The MCT demonstrates that internal objective measurement of moral competence is possible.
- The MCT tests the participant’s ability to judge arguments by his/her moral principles rather than by the arguments’ opinion agreement.
Piaget’s 'affective-cognitive parallelism' hypothesis is well confirmed: The higher the moral competence of a person, the more he/she accepts high-stage moral arguments and rejects low-stage moral arguments.
10th International Symposium on Moral Competence

- At the University of Konstanz, Germany
- August 4 – 5, 2016
- Pre-symposium workshop-seminar „Fostering moral-democratic competence through the Konstanz Method of Dilemma-Discussion (KMDD)
- August 1 – 5, 2016 (includes the symposium)

- AME: MCT workshop on Friday afternoon
References on the MCT


For more, see Lind’s web-site: http://www.uni-konstanz.de/ag-moral/