ARTICLES

Abstract

There are at the present time two major approaches to moral education which have arisen out of the theory and research of Kohlberg and his collegues. The first to appear, the moral discussion approach, began as a result of the efforts of Moshe Blatt, a doctoral student of Kohlberg's who attempted to stimulate development through the discussion of hypothetical dilemmas in his Sunday School class. The second, the just community approach, orignated in a women's correctional institution and was later applied to high school settings. The moral discussion approach clearly grew out of Kohlberg's psychological investigations into moral development. The very dilemmas which Kohlberg used to assess an individual's moral stage were appropriated for classroom use in order to stimulate stage development. The just community approach while drawing in part from Kohlberg's psychological research represents other important theoretical considerations, considerations which have important implictions for future research in moral development and education.

Clark Power*

Moral Education Through the Development of The Moral Atmosphere of The School

The Moral Discussion Approach

When Blatt first started leading moral discussions, Kohlberg admitted that he was quite skeptical that they would have any significant effect.[1] Fortunately Blatt was stubborn enough to persist and he demonstrated that moral discussion could, in fact, influence development. A host of studies, recently reviewed by Higgins, have further substantiated Blatt's claims, and the moral discussion approach is now becoming a widely used method of moral education.[2] The popularity which this approach enjoys is not difficult to explain. It provides a way of doing moral education which claims to be neither indoctrinative nor relativistic. It avoids indoctrination because it aims at promoting the natural development of universal structures of moral decision-making and not on the adherence to a particular set of moral or religious values of beliefs. It avoids relativism because it postulates that the stages are ordered in a hierarchical sequence such that a higher stage is "better than" or more "just" than the preceding one. Thus educators using this approach can be critical of students' ways of making moral judgments, without having to resort to simply giving them the right answer. The role of the discussion leader, as Kohlberg describes it, is modeled after Socrates, who engaged students in a moral dialogue in which conflicting points of view were examined and a resolution was then attempted.[3] According to this approach, the leader never simply presents "ready-made" solutions to be accepted on the basis of his or her adult authority but rather stimulates the students' search for the solution. Thus this Socratic method respects the students as intrinsically oriented towards moral inquiry and seeks to provide the best classroom conditions for that inquiry.

In spite of the growing interest in this approach and its applicability to a variety of curricula (social studies, literature, health, etc.), critics both from within the Kohlberg

*Center for Moral Education Research, Harvard University

"camp", including Kohlberg himself, and from without have found the purely verbal discussion format quite limited as a means of bringing about significant changes in the moral attitudes and actions of students. The discussion of hypothetical moral dilemmas is, after all, a somewhat artificial way of approaching moral education. Why have students discuss hypothetical or even historical dilemmas in the classroom when they have genuine dilemmas of their own? Moral discussions which deal exclusively with abstract cases having little or no connection with real world decisions can become an exercise in teaching to the moral development test. Developing the reasoning capacity to make reflective and equitable moral decisions does not in itself guarantee that individuals will consistantly act in morally responsible ways. In this sense moral education must address itself to the issues of both competence and performance. This entails facing practical moral problems of consequence to the self and others. It also entails taking into account the social context in which individuals make decisions and act. Morality is by nature social and the development of moral individuals can never be fully realized without the development of a moral society.

Durkheim and Collective Education

Kohlberg's efforts to go beyond the moral discussion approach led him to adopt a Durkheimian perspective on moral education. In turning to Durkheim, Kohlberg brought the cognitive developmental approach to moral education around full circle. Piaget's pioneering research on the moral development of the child was for the most part a critique of Durkheim's psychology.[4] In his early work Kohlberg followed suit, rejecting Durkheim's view of the internalization or moral values as well as his moral philosphy with its emphasis on the maintenance of societal functioning and order.[5] Piaget and Kohlberg found the Durkheimian position incompatible with rational ethics and their own empirical research. In terms of moral education both Piaget and Kohlberg advocated programs which provided for intensive peer interaction in contrast to Durkheim's emphasis on the building of a strong classroom community. Kohlberg's return to Durkheim's work was influenced by his respect for Durkheim's sociological approach to moral education which he called, "the most philosophically and scientifically comprehensive, clear, and workable approach to moral education extant."[6] What Durkheim demonstrated and what his followers, such as Parsons, Dreeban, and Jackson, have elaborated is that the school not only provides moral instruction through its explicit curriculum but also through its "hidden curriculum". The hidden curriculum of the school is made up of its disciplinary rules and procedures, authority structure, distribution of rewards and punishment, and shared norms and values. Durkheim saw the "hidden curriculum" as a program for moral education, a program which, if examined, represents a definite moral point of view. Durkheim's genius was manifest in his ability to turn the hidden curriculum into a deliberate process of moral education.

The Kibbutz

Kohlberg witnessed the actual workings of the Durkheimian approach when he visited the Kibbutz Sassa in the summer of 1969 during a visit to Israel. The high school at Kibbutz Sassa is part of the Youth Aliyah movement in Israel which provides lower class, city-born children the opportunity of being educated on the kibbutz. Kohlberg found that the strong sense of community on the kibbutz had a powerful effect on the socialization of these 'transplanted' youth such that they developed to conventional stages of reasoning much more frequently than their counterparts who remained in the city. He observed that the kibbutz could become a model for an alternative approach to school discipline. On the kibbutz, the teacher's authority is based less upon an institutional role or personal charisma than upon respect for the group's will. In the kibbutz model the teacher or *madrich* is not only an academic instructor but a group leader as well. The function of the *madrich* is to

promote the development of a group atmosphere in which there is a strong commitment to the group and respect for its norms. The successful *madrich* mobilizes peer group pressure to support the goals of socio-moral development and academic achievement. While Kohlberg was fascinated by the collectivist practice of moral education on the kibbutz, he rejected those aspects of collectivist theory which advocated conformity to the "arbitrary" norms of the group. Addressing kibbutz educators, he wrote, "You have a practice better than your theory. ...(It) seems better than anything we can derive from our theory ... but we have a theory which can inform your practice and make it even better."[7]

While the kibbutz did not consciously adopt the principles of Durkheim's collectivist approach, Kohlberg found Durkheim articulated the practices he observed on the kibbutz. Kohlberg sought to integrate Durkheimian collectivism into his own approach by developing democratic procedures which would check those conservative and conformist tendencies endemic to collectivism. Kohlberg also recognized the value of a collectivist approach as a way of promoting the development from preconventional to conventional reasoning. While Durkheim's approach is well suited for promoting development to conventional moral stages, it is much more than a strategy to be applied only at a particular developmental period. Durkheim's approach is applicable to all developmental periods because it addresses itself not to a moral stage *per se* but to the fundamental precondition for any development — social connectedness. Kohlberg found the Kibbutz Sassa a "hotbed" of moral development because the kibbutz community sustained relationships of care and concern for fellow members and the group as a whole. It was out of that "hotbed" of sympathetic concern that moral questions were seriously explored as matters of communal interest.

The Just Community Approach To Corrections

Kohlberg's first opportunity to apply his synthesis of democracy and collectivism came in a women's reformatory. Kohlberg , Scharf, and Hickey had been involved in a moral discussion program when it became increasingly obvious to them that their efforts were being undermined by the negative moral atmosphere of the prison.[8] They demonstrated that custodial type prisons encouraged low stage (generally stage 2) resolutions of conflicts and frustrated those individuals who attempted to operate on conventional stages of reasoning. For example, Scharf found that inmates who demonstrated they were capable of stage three reasoning on the Standard Moral Dilemmas responded at stage two on practical dilemmas related to typical prison situations.[9] Inmates generally described the behavior and attitudes of staff as stage 1, "Its just a job they got, going and opening gates, watching us, making sure nobody gets out" and stage 2, "Its all favoritism, if you go out of your way for a guy, he will go out of his way for you." They saw the staff exercising their authority in an arbitrary way, without trying to understand inmates, and often resorting to keeping control through physical coercion. The inmates described their relationships with each other in similar stage 1 and 2 ways, referring to the dominance of physically stronger inmates and the need to make deals for drugs, protection and other benefits.

Kohlberg, Scharf, and Hickey thought that the just community approach could in time serve to change the stage 1-2 moral atmosphere of the prison and hopefully produce a stage 3-4 moral atmosphere. They also speculated that raising the stage of the group's moral atmosphere could have the positive effect of stimulating individual stage change. Interviews with and observations of women in the Niantic prison indicated that a stage 3 moral atmosphere did form — a moral atmosphere characterized by bonds of affection established among staff and inmate community members. Evidence for moral stage development has been more ambiguous. Scharf reports a modest amount of change in his dissertation while a subsequent evaluation study by Feldman did not find any significant change.[10]

The Just Community Approach to Secondary Education

The Niantic experience provided both a theory and practice for the creation of a just community. Kohlberg was able to carry much of what he learned from Niantic over to the Cluster School. Of course when Kohlberg decided to become involved in secondary education, he faced several new problems. Rehabilitative prison programs have as their primary purpose the moral reform of inmates. Schools, on the other hand, place a high priority on academic advancement and career preparation. If moral education was to become anything more than a "frill" in the total school program, a revolution in thinking about education would have to occur.

In the late sixties and early seventies there were signs that a revolution in education was occuring. Numerous alternative schools were being established across the country. Typically these schools reflected the themes of protest in the country. There was a questioning of the values of American society which could support a war in Vietnam while letting poverty and racism fester at home. Many educators saw these alternative schools as transforming American society through inculcating new values in its youth. In 1974, at the end of that era, a group of parents and teachers asked Kohlberg if he would like to be a consultant to a new alternative school in Cambridge. Kohlberg who had been looking for such an opportunity, eagerly agreed and with a group of parents, teachers, and students planned the opening of Cluster School over the summer.

The Cluster School was made up of approximately 65 students and six staff who met for classes and group meetings two hours each day. Cluster was housed within Cambridge High School, a large, urban public school, and the Cluster students took classes in the "parent" school. Although the Cluster students actually spent more time in the parent school than Cluster, they thought of themselves as belonging to Cluster and outsiders in the parent school. Three days a week Cluster classes in English and Social Studies were held. Once a week everyone in the school gathered for the community meeting. At this meeting all matters of rule-making and enforcement were decided by discussion and majority rule with students and teachers all having one vote. Every week before the community meeting the staff would gather with Kohlberg and occassional student volunteers to plan the agenda for the coming community meeting. At this time Kohlberg and the staff would select those issues which would be of the most interest to students and which would lead to the development of the Cluster community. They then discussed how they could best facilitate the discussion such that the students would be aware of the moral issues and could participate in the fullest manner. The day before the community meeting faculty and students met in small groups, called "advisor groups", as a way of introducing the issues which needed to be resolved in the community meeting. The advantage of the advisor groups was that it was a forum most conducive to full student participation and thorough moral discussion.

The community meeting was the single most important event in the school. It served two general purposes: it was the arena for democratic decision-making and the major community-building ritual. It was a ritual for community-building because at the community meeting Cluster members formulated and then reminded each other of their most basic ideals and beliefs as a school community. The rules and decisions which they made symbolized for them their sense of community. The representation of the community's norms, values, and basic ideals helped to strengthen them and thus strengthen the sense of community. This was particularly the case when the community's rules were broken. In the Cluster School enforcement of the rules was a matter of concern for the entire community because breaking the rules was treated as a violation of the community. Decisions about whether a student should be punished were first made in a student-faculty committee, the Discipline Committee. Then they were brought before the entire community for approval.

The act of punishing a student was not seen as an act of retribution, but rather as a symbolic way of reasserting the democratic authority of the group and "healing the wounds" to the community caused by the infraction. Generally few punishments were administered. Instead, those who flagrantly broke the rules were asked if they really understood the influence their behaviour had on the community. They were then given the opportunity to reaffirm their intention to remain members of the community and work at their problem during a probationary period. If a student failed to show improvement after having been given opportunities to change, then the community could expel a student. Expulsions, though infrequent, did occur and were painful experiences for all.

The Faculty Role and the Exercise of Authority

The just community theory emphasizes that there cannot be an effective exercise of authority without the presence of a viable community to which all members experience some sense of belonging. Once a group has common goals and purposes it is possible to appeal to a non-arbitrary authority on behalf of the group as a whole. Dewey in discussing the issue of conformity to authority, made a helpful analogy to a game of baseball.[11] If everyone agrees to play, then it is necessary to play according to a set of rules. As long as everyone abides by the rules, no one feels coerced. Order among the players, even in a competitive social situation such as baseball, is maintained not by submission to an external authority but strictly by a desire to participate in the game.

A problem in schools with a hierarchical structure of authority is that teachers and students often appear to be working at cross-purposes with different sets of rules. Students find that teachers enjoy special privileges as a result of their status. Teachers are account-able to administrators but not to students for what goes on in the classroom. Students also find that they are expected to follow a set of rules which apply only to them and in the making of which they had no voice. Teachers, on the other hand, often feel that students do not sympathize with their concerns and the constraints under which they must work. They resort to coercive strategies in the classroom because they see no other way of securing the minimal degree of conformity necessary for effective learning.

In a democratic community teachers and students are *equal* members with the same rights and privileges. They share a common project, the building of a just community, which entails making those rules which they feel are necessary to their endeavor. As a consequence of this equality teachers must be willing to work in accord with the commun-ity's democratic procedures and to submit to the community's decisions.

In Cluster school equality meant that faculty had to squelch the temptation to unilaterally "lay down the law" when problems arose in the community. It also meant that the faculty had to be willing to submit to the community's discipline for such things as lateness, rude and abusive language, failing to socialize with certain student cliques, and losing their temper. In these cases of "teacher violations" students discussed the importance of applying the same standards of fairness to the teachers as they wanted for themselves. For example, there was an incident in which a teacher, Norman, was brought to the Discipline Committee by a student who accused him of deliberately stepping upon and breaking his tape recorder. It seems as though the student had been told by Norman to stop playing the tape recorder several times. Disgruntled, the student snuck behind Norman and suddenly blared the recorder in his ear. The Discipline Committee sympathized with Norman but nevertheless felt that he had over-reacted. They recommended that Norman split the cost of repairing the tape recorder with the student and apologize. Norman appealed the decision to a community meeting. The meeting began with some students sharply admonishing Norman for the indignity of a teacher losing his temper. Finally one student intervened on Norman's behalf:

This is the first time Norman did something like that, alright. And he admitted that it was something

extraordinary for an adult to do, and a teacher to do... But he opened himself up and he is just sitting there just like anyone else ... He is human just like us and he is subject to emotions too. An he has an outside life too, and he has a personal life too. And think about this, in this school everybody is equal and everything like that, but you forget teachers are too...

The community responded with sustained applause. Norman agreed to share the cost of the tape recorder and the issue was resolved to everyone's satisfaction.

In addition to having responsibilities as community members, faculty do have special pedagogical responsibility and authority in a just community. Benne provides an interesting conception of this authority which he calls "anthropogogic authority."[12] "Anthropogogic" is a word coined for the purpose of broadening our understanding of pedagogy to include not only the task of the intellectual, social, and moral development of the young but also the task of facilitating their participation in their culture. Benne rejects a "cultural transmission" view of pedagogy in which the teacher has the responsibility of passing on the accumulated wisdom of the culture to the next generation. Instead, he advocates an interactionist view in which teachers and students are engaged in a dialogue over current cultural issues which can serve to transform the culture in the future. Thus teachers as well as students need to be jointly educated for a future in the making.

The expertise which a teacher has in a particular subject matter, and the life experience which she/he has accumulated need not create a rigid differentiation of roles between teacher and student. The teacher makes his/her expertise and experience available to students such that students can increasingly become more equal partners in the pursuit of truth.

In matters of discipline and community building the teacher must also be willing to exercise a leadership role by becoming a community advocate.[13] An advocate is literally one who pleads the cause of another — the other being the community. Faculty, when they do take a stand, should do so on behalf of the whole community. The role of the advocate should be distinguished from that of facilitator or indoctrinator. The facilitator focuses on improving group process without imposing his or her own views on the group. When the facilitator intervenes, it is for the purpose of clarification so that the group can come to a clearer consciousness of what its goals are and how to best meet them. The indoctrinator, on the other hand, focuses on imposing a set of values on the group and is willing to use whatever group process will help achieve this end. The indoctrinator attempts to make his/her own position the group position and is principally concerned with the group "learning" what she/he has to offer. The advocate, like the indoctrinator, tries to influence the group in a particular direction. However, unlike the indoctrinator, the advocate is not free to use any means to achieve that goal but must be concerned with observing democratic procedures and respecting the rights of all individuals. The advocate does not try to influence the group to adopt an arbitrary set of values or his/her own values, but does speak for the basic ideals of the community.

Building Community

The responsibility of faculty members can be summed up as "building community", but what does this entail? In order to clarify what we mean by community, it is helpful to contrast community with another type of social arrangement which we call a "pragmatic association."[14] In a pragmatic association individuals relate to each other for extrinsic instrumental purposes. Certainly schools function for the most part as pragmatic associations, bringing individuals together to develop those skills which will enable them to function in society, particularly in the workplace. In recent years schools have grown in size and in the technological sophistication of their facilities at the expense of a cohesive group atmosphere with many opportunities for student participation. In a pragmatic association individuals pursue their own private goals, considering the welfare of the group only in so

far as the group enables them to meet those goals. We may contrast this atomistic, instrumental organizational type with that of a community. In a community individuals relate to each other altruistically. There is a radical commitment to sharing such that all members of the group may in the Biblical phrase "live as one." For a group to become a community there must be a focus on its inner social life and a concerted effort to perfect that common life.

In the Cluster School, staff and consultants focused on developing a sense of community by establishing shared norms which reflected the values of justice and collective responsibility. As in most alternative schools, there were feelings of group solidarity which arose simply because of the small number of students in the school. What distinguished Cluster School was the way in which membership in the school meant that one had an obligation to help build the school community. In other alternative schools members were generally reluctant to develop shared expectations, binding on all. Although participation in non-academic school activities such as group meetings was hoped for, it was usually made strictly voluntary. Individuals were primarily responsible to themselves and for themselves.

This sense of individual responsibility was dramatically illustrated by an incident in one school in which a backgammon set, loaned to the school by a student for everyone's use, was stolen. A motion was made that all should chip in to replace the set since it had become, in a sense, "community property." However, that motion was defeated for several reasons. First, there was a consensus in the group that the set was stolen by an "outsider" and not a community member. Second, the student who brought the board to school never explicitly contracted with members of the school that they would all be held responsible if the board were lost. And third, as one staff person put it, "This is not a collective responsibility school; this is an individual responsibility school." Members of the school agreed to take up a collection if individuals wished to donate money to buy a new board; however, it was clear that the backgammon set was not the community's responsibility. In Cluster School a very different approach was taken to incidents of stealing and property loss. Students were encouraged to be responsible for each other and the community as a whole. For example, in Cluster's fourth year the guidance counselor had stamps stolen from his office presumably by someone outside Cluster. Students exhorted each other to vote for collectively chipping in to replace the stamps, since, as one student put it, "We are a community and we are using the stamps and we should be responsible just to make it up. We are supposed to be helping each other out."

The difference between the Cluster School and this other alternative School is not primarily one of individual moral stage or even of the moral stage of the collective agreement. In both schools there were conventional stage expressions of sympathy and concern for the victim of the crime. However, in Cluster School there was an understanding that membership in the community meant assuming some responsibility for what had occurred. In the other school there was no corresponding sense of collective responsibility in the absence of an explicit contract. Instead, members felt that everyone had to be responsible for themselves as individuals. In Cluster School individual responsibility was viewed as insufficient for the establishment and maintenance of genuine community. The norm of collective responsibility helped to make students aware that they were part of a social network and as such had social responsibilities. Furthermore, this norm reminded students of their interdependence and of the influence which their membership in a group had on their individual actions. Collective responsibility is meaningful only if we recognize what common sense and social psychology tell us — that individuals think and behave differently in groups than they would alone.

The task of building community through developing the norm of collective responsibility demanded that staff and consultants continuously monitor the state of the group. There were

no formulae which could readily be applied as problems arose. Instead it was important to respond to crises in the school in ways which made sense to the students and contributed to moving the school towards a greater sense of justice and community. Kohlberg's stages of moral judgment provided a useful standard in evaluating the development of the school toward those aims. Other standards of community progress were also adopted, for example, the extent to which all members of the school sincerely agreed to its norms and were committed to upholding them.

Moral Atmosphere Research

The major difficulty in trying to study a school such as Cluster is finding appropriate conceptual categories and empirical methods which can aid in describing and evaluating it with due sensitivity to its avowedly "moral" purposes. What distinguishes Cluster from other educational programs is the priority which its staff and consultants have given to the creation of a social atmosphere which is both just and communal. While there exists a considerable body of research on the moral development of individuals, little has been done to explore the development of the moral dimension of groups. Social atmosphere research on schools has focused on the relationship of various aspects of the social environment to the ends of scholastic achievement or individual satisfaction. It has ignored the question of the morality of the norms and values which make up the social atmosphere.

Our reseach on the moral atmosphere is designed to address the moral dimension of the social climate by evaluating to what extent a school has become a "just community."[15] Specifically, we are interested in two questions: First, the degree to which members of a school share norms and values and are committed to upholding them and second, the moral stage of these shared norms and values. We believe that by establishing a positive moral atmosphere students will not only develop their stage of moral judgment but become more committed to responsible moral action.

Before discussing our framework for evaluating the moral atmosphere it is helpful to distinguish, as does Moos, four parts of the environmental system: the physical setting, organizational factors, the human aggregate, and the social atmosphere or climate. [16] The physical setting refers to architectural and physical design of school buildings and classrooms which can have an influence on attitudes and behavior. Organizational factors are "fixed" program components such as the size of the school, faculty-student ratio, form of governance, method of instruction (e.g., team teaching), etc. The human aggregate defines the characteristics of the individuals making up the organization, for example, age, sex, IQ, stage of moral judgment, etc. The social atmosphere actually arises out of the first three parts of the environmental system and mediates to some degree their influence. But the social atmosphere cannot be reduced to the other parts of the social system because it is created through the *interactions* of the human aggregate as influenced by organizational factors in a particular physical setting. As such, a social atmosphere must be conceptualized as distinct from the other, more stable parts of the environmental system.

Collective Norms

The central unit of our analysis is the collective norm. A collective norm is a norm which binds members of a group *qua* members of that group to act in certain ways. Thus the collective norm is a prescription for action; it defines what is *expected* from members in their attitudes (e.g., caring about others) and actions (e.g., not stealing from others). It is important to note that we refer to a norm as an ideal or prescription for action and thus derive collective norms from what people state is expected in the group. We do not derive a collective norm from inferences about actions.

Collective norms are "normal" norms; that is, they define one's moral obligations as a group member and are related to the ideals of the group. The obligatory nature of a collective norm is different from the pressure to behaviorally conform to what others in the group are doing. We define norms which represent a conveyence of behaviors, perceptions, or attitudes towards some average as aggregate norms. Aggregate norms are not based on an interest in doing what is right by upholding such values as truth, respect for persons, and love but are based on an interest in "fitting in" and appearing as one of the crowd. Ordinarily the violation of a collective norm entails a conscious sanctioning of the offender while the violation of an aggregate norm is consciously excusable. For example, in Cluster the violation of the collective norm against stealing will lead to a punishment, such as having to apologize to the group and repay the victim, while a violation of the aggregate norm governing speech or dress may lead to one's being snubbed but not to any deliberate group punishment.

The Community Value

The community value refers to the way in which group members value their group *qua* community. This means valuing the solidarity, group consciousness, and commitment to communal living which make up the ideal of community. The collective norms of community are related to the community value in two ways: instrumentally and symbolically. Instrumentally, the collective norms of community serve as a means to achieve the terminal value of community. Thus in Cluster School the staff advocated norms of caring and trust because these norms would enable the group to become a real community. Symbolically, the collective norms of community express the terminal value of community. By upholding the community's norms members are able to manifest their commitment to the community.

The Phase of the Collective Norms and Community Value

Groups begin when individuals come together to pursue common goals and objectives. In the course of this coming together they make agreements which regulate their intentions and form shared ideals about the kind of group they wish to have. These agreements and shared ideals serve to organize the group and keep it whole and cohesive. Without them the group would fragment and cease to be. Collective norms and values are the products of social interaction in the group. They originate with individuals proposing their own standards of morality for acceptance by other members of the group. In a democracy agreements are made through a process of negotiation about what the duties of group membership entail. In order for these agreements to be effective, they must be upheld by members of the group. Otherwise, they will have no constraining force and the group will disintegrate.

In our research we are concerned about the involvement group members have in upholding the norms of the group. "Upholding" the norms has six meanings: 1) following the norm oneself, 2) expecting others to follow them, 3) persuading others who are deviating from the norms to follow them, 4) reporting others who do not follow them, 5) accepting some responsibility for the consequences of others not following the norms, and 6) being willing to sanction deviance. The more group members are willing to undertake these actions in support of a norm, the more "collectivized" the norm becomes. As a way of tracing the steps through which norms become collectivized in a group and as a way of describing the strength of collectivization, we have devised a scheme of phases for collective norms which is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Phases of the Collective Norm

Phase 0:   No collective norm exists or is proposed.

COLLECTIVE NORM PROPOSAL

Phase 1:   Individuals propose collective norms for group acceptance.

COLLECTIVE NORM ACCEPTANCE

Phase 2:   Collective norm is accepted as a group ideal but not agreed to. It is not an expectation for behavior.
                      a) some group members accept ideal.
                      b) most group members accept ideal.

Phase 3:   Collective norm is accepted and agreed to but it is not (yet) an expectation for behavior.
                      a) some group members agree to collective norm.
                      b) most group members agree to collective norm.

COLLECTIVE NORM EXPECTATION

Phase 4:   Collective norm is accepted and expected. (Naive expectation)
                      a) some group members expect the collective norm to be followed.
                      b) most group members expect the collective norm to be followed.

Phase 5:   Collective norm is expected but not followed. (Disappointed expectation)
                      a) some group members are disappointed.
                      b) most group members are disappointed.

COLLECTIVE NORM ENFORCEMENT

Phase 6:   Collective norm is expected and upheld through expected persuading of deviant to follow norm.
                      a) some group members persuade.
                      b) most group members persuade.

Phase 7:   Collective norm is expected and upheld through expected reporting of deviant to the group.
                      a) some group members report.
                      b) most group members report.

Our scheme begins with a Phase 0 when there is no collective norm for a particular problem. Each individual is left to act according to his/her own norms. Phases 1, 2, and 3 are the proposing and accepting phases. At this point the norm and values are not yet collective because the group does not expect them to be upheld. At Phase 1 individuals propose norms and values for acceptance by the group. They try to collectivize that which they feel should be normative for the group. Usually this requires a very intense process of persuasion which takes place not only in the community meeting but in smaller, formal and informal meetings. At Phase 2 members recognize a shared ideal for behavior. However, there is not yet a specific agreement on a definite norm or rule. Often norms stay at this phase because members believe them to be impossible to realize. At Phase 3 agreements such as rules are made for realizing normative ideals; however, there is not an expectation for these agreements to be upheld. Norms may remain at Phase 3 because members of the group do not want to revote an agreement but, nevertheless, do not consider it vital to the community. It is important to make a theoretical distinction between norm acceptance at Phases 2 and 3 and norm expectation at the higher phases. Acceptance implies that members agree that they should have a particular collective norm. Expectation means not only that they agree on a collective norm but also that they experience it as binding on their behavior.

Phases 4 and 5 are expecting phases. At Phase 4 there is a general expectation that members of the community live up to the collective norm. This may be a terminal phase if there are no known violations of the collective norm. At Phase 5 real disappointment is expressed when the collective norm is broken. The fifth phase does not represent a progressive evolution of the collective norm but rather a state of crisis created by deviance from the collective norm. At this point members of the group may choose from a variety of responses: 1) they may try to develop a new collective norm or value to replace the existing one; 2) they may simply cease to expect the norm in which case the phase of the norm would regress to Phases 3, 2, or 0; or 3) the group may decide to reassert the collective norm. If the group reasserts the collective norm in response to deviation, the phase of the norm advances to the sixth and seventh phases.

Phases 6 and 7 define actions which group members feel are obligatory in order to uphold a collective. At the sixth phase members are committed to persuading each other to live up to the norm. At the seventh phase members of the group recognize an obligation to report norm violators to the group. Persuading and reporting may be treated as second order collective norms. That is, they exist in relationship to the primary collective norm (e.g., respecting property) which they enforce.

Stage of the Collective Norms and Community Value

The stage of the collective norm or community value refers to the stage of those aggreements and shared understandings for resolving conflicts involving group members or the group as a whole. One of the most difficult problems in our method of analysis concerns how it is possible to speak about a stage structure of shared expectations and values which is distinct from an individual stage structure. The cognitive developmental psychology of Piaget, Kohlberg, and Selman maintains that individuals construct their own social reality by interacting with the social environment. Thus every social experience involves to some extent assimilation. How then is it possible to differentiate collective stages from individual stages when analyzing individual statements in an interview or in a community meeting? In the context of our study of the Cluster School, the question becomes whether students from Stages 2, 3, and 4 have overlapping perceptions of the school's collective norms, values, and elements which can be scored according to a structural stage scheme.

We maintain that it is reasonable to stage collective norms and values for three reasons. First, all collective norms originate with individual proposals and are "kept alive" for a group only through individuals interpreting their meaning when applying them in various situations. The process of developing collective norms and values is one in which an individual's prescriptive reasoning becomes the shared prescriptive reasoning of a group. Second, moral stages provide us with a way of speaking about the relative "morality" or "fairness" of certain collective norms and elements. Individuals can distinguish collective norms and values from their own and evaluate the standards of the group against their own standards. For example, individuals at higher stages with a strong attachment to the group strive to influence their group to the acceptance of more adequate moral norms. Individuals at lower stages often do not understand or agree with what they feel they are expected to do. Third, groups appear limited in their abilities to arrive at certain decisions and make certain policies. A collective stage concept may help to explain certain group differences in a moral concern and why a group can undertake a policy at one time in its history that it could not have at another time.

A problem for the enterprise of assessing the stage of the collective norm and element is the extent to which individuals share values and reasoning as well as concrete behavioral expectations. In any group it is minimally necessary that members agree about how they should act in particular circumstances. However, it is not as important that members agree on *why* they should act in a particular way. Nevertheless, in a democratic community in which members participate in the making of the rules, it is likely that they will take an interest in the reasons supporting normative positions so that they can argue persuasively and make rational decisions. In so far as human action is purposeful the *what* and the *why* of behavior cannot be separated. While there may be some slippage between the sharedness of a behavioral expectation and the sharedness of the reasoning behind it, that does not mean that its stage parameters cannot be assessed. Furthermore, behavioral expectations and group actions cannot be adequately understood without some reference to the values and reasoning behind them.

The strongest evidence in support of our claim that collective norms have a stage structure comes from those cases in which individuals do not necessarily agree with a shared understanding of the collective expectation but acknowledge that it exists. For example, in

interviews with students which presented them with practical dilemmas typically occurring in a school context, one student pointed out that Cluster members should be willing to go out of their way to help a fellow member "because Cluster is more of a community where people try to help each other out." However, she personally disagreed with the Cluster norm because she said she would not feel like going out of her way especially for someone she did not particularly like. Thus she indicated that there was a stage 3 expectation in cluster which was more altruistic than her own stage way of conduct.

Further evidence for the claim that collective norms have a stage structure comes from cases in which group members speak for the community in objecting to statements which appear to distort the meaning of a shared expectation. For example, during a community meeting discussion about an incident of stealing in the school, a proposal was made that everyone chip in 15¢ to repay the victim. This proposal won the enthusiastic support of many students who argue that everyone should feel a collective sense of responsibility for the theft and have a personal concern for the victim, a community member. Several students disagreed, saying that the theft was the victim's fault because she was careless. This led one student to respond in the name of the community: "They are all individuals and don't have to be in the community. Everybody should care that she got her money stolen." Bob, one of the most adamant students in opposition to collective restitution continued to object saying that he could not understand what being in a community had to do with his position. Someone finally asked him what *he* meant by "community." He responded, "People can help one another but I didn't say nothing about giving money out." From this statement and others it became apparent that Bob thought of "helping" in Stage 2 terms, that is, helping should be contingent upon the desires of the helper. He went on to make an analogy to Cluster as a bank - "If the bank gets robbed does that mean that you can knock on my door and tell me I have to pay for it." Bob, then, agreed that the community had a collective norm of helping; but he misinterpreted the meaning of the norm. It was his Stage 2 misinterpretation that brought him into conflict with other community members who thought that his *reasoning* was inconsistent with the true meaning of the collective norm.

Moral Atmosphere Development

We have used the categories of phase and collective stage to describe the development of the moral atmosphere of Cluster School and to compare its moral atmosphere with that of other high schools. Our data for assessing these moral atmospheres came from three sources: community meeting transcripts (if available), interviews with students, and observations. We found that Cluster's moral atmosphere did develop during the first four years of the school.[17]

Initially, as in any new school, the phase of the norms was 0. Students and staff had their own ways of resolving conflicts and they had to enter into a thorough discussion of their viewpoints in order to begin to share norms and values. Many students entering Cluster had a history of discipline problems. To make matters worse, their first impressions of Cluster with its democracy was that it was a "free, do your own thing school." Over the first few months of the school, rule making was a laborious process since many students were unwilling to impose any constraints on their behavior. However, by January rules covering all major problems in the school — disturbances, cutting class, marijuana and alcohol use, and stealing — had been made. While students came to understand the need to legislate in order to lessen the severity of these problems, they were unwilling to commit themselves to uphold their decisions. Thus they voted for rules with punishments for violations while leaving the actual enforcement of the norms to the staff. In terms of our scheme of phases, then, the norms did not go beyond that of phase 3, norm agreement. Students could agree on what was undesirable behavior but they did not really expect each other to live up to those agreements. This lack of norm development to what we would call phase 4 was most

apparent during a community meeting discussion of stealing incidents. Stealing was a common occurrence in Cambridge High School and the Cluster students did not understand why the faculty made such a "big deal" of them. As one student explained, "School isn't a place for trusting stuff, even at Cluster. Community or not, if you want something, you'll take it."

Not only were Cluster's norms weak with respect to phase but they were also low with respect to stage. Generally they were based on a stage 2 concern for self protection from such acts as stealing or abusive behavior relating to marijuana smoking. In addition, there was an emerging stage 3 concern for limiting those actions which might be harmful to the school's functioning, such as class cutting, or its reputation, such as flagrantly violating rules about drug use and disturbances.

During the second half of the year students were in the position of having to take responsibility for enforcing the decisions they had made. While the faculty generally reported rule violations to the Discipline Committee, the students had to decide whether or not to punish. At first, they were quite willing to excuse each other because many felt it would be hypocritical to punish some students who got caught doing what they were getting away with. Also they valued Cluster as a "refuge" from what they felt was the oppressive discipline of the high school. Nevertheless, they gradually began to take their rules more seriously, demanding from each other that they be willing to give to the school as well as take from it. The staff tried to impress upon the students that becoming a community would require a certain amount of "sacrifice" but that their efforts would result in creating the kind of group they could be proud of.

By Cluster's second year there were signs that it was developing into a genuine community. A stealing incident occurred early in the year which provoked student reactions of shock and disappointment that such a violation of the community's trust could occur. The group agreed to a motion that all chip in to restitute the victim because as one student argued, "It's everyone's fault that she don't have no money. It was stolen because people just don't care about the community.... Everybody should care that she got her money stolen." It was clear in this meeting that the norm of trust which had been phase 0 the year before had developed to at least phase 5. The stage of the group's norm in response to stealing had also developed from a stage two concern for protecting concrete ownership rights to a stage 3-4 concern for maintaining interpersonal and community trust. The fact that students were also willing to agree to collectively restitute the stolen money was a sign of their growing sense of their group as a community. After this meeting there were no more incidents in which Cluster members stole from one another, a further indication that a significant change in the school's moral atmosphere had occurred.[18]

During the third and fourth years of Cluster we noted similar developments in the norms of class attendance and integration. In the third year a "no cut" was passed, a significant departure from the previous policy of allowing ten cuts. This rule and others embodied a concern for increased participation in the community. Discussion about a norm of integration represented another effort to build community. Black and white students who typically congregated in separate groups throughout the high school openly talked about their difficulties in forming a unified group and took measures to mix more with each other during classes and free time.

A Comparative View of Moral Atmosphere

We interviewed students in Cluster and Cambridge High School with dilemmas typically encountered in schools, asking them to tell us how they would act in such a case and what they felt the shared norms of their school were. One of these dilemmas, previously mentioned, concerned whether one student, Harry, should help an unpopular student, Billy, by driving him to an appointment at a faraway college early on a Saturday morning. A

typical Cluster School student, Barbara, responded as follows:

IF THIS SITUATION SHOULD OCCUR IN YOUR SCHOOL, SHOULD SOMEONE HELP OUT?

Yes they would because Cluster is a community.

WHY DOES THAT MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

Because you have a responsibility to the kids in this school. Even if you don't like them that much, you are in the school and you are with them every day, you know. You are supposed to think of them as part of the school and part of the community. So you should do it.

For Barbara helping out in such a situation is a clear cut responsibility, based on a generally shared collective norm of caring. Her statements are in marked contrast to those of Anne, a Cambridge High School Student.

IF THIS SITUATION SHOULD HAPPEN HERE IN THIS SCHOOL, DO YOU THINK SOMEBODY SHOULD HELP OUT?

Yah, WHY? Just to be kind, it never hurts to do someone a favour.

WOULD THERE BE A GENERAL FEELING OR EXPECTATION IN YOUR SCHOOL THAT SOMEONE SHOULD HELP OUT IN A SITUATION LIKE THAT?

He (Harry) would probably be shocked if someone around here is that nice. People here are not that kind and friendly.

While Anne is willing to drive, she does not feel that there is a shared norm of helping in her school. Later in her interview she reports that students place such a high value on popularity that they would not "dare get caught with anyone who does not dress good or is not popular."

Both Barabara and Anne were scored as Stage 3 on Kohlberg's Standard Moral Judgment Interview, yet they present different pictures of their schools, pictures which we maintain have to do with the social reality of their school's moral atmosphere. While Barbara identifies her Cluster peers in sharing a Stage 3 collective norm of caring, Anne is critical of the attitudes of her peers which she categorized in Stage 2 terms. In analyzing interviews with students from large high schools, like Cambridge, we confirmed what we already had suspected that there exist few genuinely shared norms in these schools and that the informal peer norms which do exist tend to be at a lower stage than the students as individuals are capable of. This gap between one's capacity for making moral judgments and the norms of the peer group is, from our perspective, a waste of the potential of the peer group to encourage acts of justice and caring and to stimulate one's moral judgement reasoning. Furthermore, as Anne's interview indicates, being a student in a large high school can lead to alienation and isolation from one's peers. Anne says she is willing to help, "just to be kind because it never hurts to do someone a favor." Her desire to help proceeds from a stage 3 concern to be kind and sensitive to others but not as Barbara's does from a feeling of connectedness to the person in need. This sense of relatedness to others seems to be an important support for treating others with respect and care. Comparing student reports of actual caring behavior, we find, not surprisingly, that there was much more caring behavior in Cluster than in schools which were not just communities.

It appears from evidence such as this that the just community approach can lead to the creation of a relatively high stage and phase moral atmosphere which can in turn influence the ways in which students treat each other. In addition, our data suggest that the just community approach is an effective way of stimulating moral stage change. Although the

magnitude of change is not higher than that found to occur in moral discussion classes, stage change in Cluster was more evenly distributed than in most discussion classes.

Conclusion

The just community approach, having undergone a period of early experimentation, provides a promising new approach to moral education. It is far more comprehensive than the moral discussion approach: embracing the hidden curriculum as well as the explicit curriculum and addressing itself to the issue of moral behavior as well as moral reasoning. Because the just community approach is so ambitious and demanding, its applicability is naturally questionable. Given that the era of establishing alternative schools is over and the tightening economy seems to be forcing the consolidation of schools, it seems unreasonable to even consider implementing a program such as Cluster's... Nevertheless, it is possible within large schools to create various subunits with relative autonomy over disciplinary matters. These subunits may exist as "schools within schools" or as coalitions of classes taught by the same teachers and attended by the same students. Only a lack of imagination stands in the way of creating subdivisions within the school of small enough size so that a direct democracy could function. The real obstacle to implementing the just community approach is the commitment to engage in a long, arduous process setting up and working within democractic procedures building a shared sense of community. Teachers and administrators, though living in a democractic society, may need to drastically revise some of their ways of thinking and acting in the school situation. In addition, they may find a communitarian form of group organization may be quite removed from their experience. Obviously staff training will become an increasingly important issue and will require careful thinking about the developmental implications of becoming a moral educator. Yet we do not view teacher education as a one-way street in which the teacher is expected to operate according to the dictates of a theory. We do not pretend to have a theory which teachers must blindly follow but a set of procedures and ideals which we expect to modify and refine in dialogue with practioners working with this approach.

Résumé

Il y a actuellement deux conceptions majeures de l'enseignement de la morale qui sont issues des théories et recherches de Kohlberg et de ses collègues. La première, la discussion morale: résultat des efforts de Moshe Blatt, un disciple de Kohlberg qui dans sa classe de l'Ecole du dimanche essayait de stimuler la discussion en proposant d'hypothétiques dilemmes.

La seconde, la "communauté juste", est née dans un institut correctionnel pour femmes et fut ensuite adaptée à l'école secondaire. La discussion morale est manifestement issue des recherches psychologiques de Kohlberg dans le domaine de la morale. Les dilemmes que Kohlberg utilisait pour établir le niveau moral d'un individu ont été utilisés dans les salles de classe afin de stimuler la morale. Quoique dérivant en partie des recherches psychologiques de Kohlberg, la "communauté juste" inclut d'autres considerations théoriques importantes, qui auront d'importantes implications dans de futures recherches sur le développement et l'enseignement de la morale.

Footnotes

[1]Lawrence Kohlberg, Forward to Peter Scharf (Ed.), *Readings in Moral Education*, (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1978).

[2]Ann Higgins, "Moral Development Research: Results of Classroom Discussion and Democratic School Interventions", Ralph Mosher (Ed.), *Moral Education: A First Generation of Research*, (New York: Braeger, 1980).

[3]Lawrence Kohlberg, "Education for Justice, A Modern Statement of the Platonic View", Theodore Sizer (Ed.), *Moral Education*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).

[4]Jean Piaget, *The Moral Judgment of The Child,* (New York: Free Press, 1965).

[5]Lawrence Kohlberg, "Moral Development", *International Enclyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. X,* (New York: Macmillan, 1968).

[6]Lawrence Kohlberg, "The Moral Atmosphere of The School", N. Overley (Ed.), *The Unstudied Curriculum,* Monograph of the association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C., 1970.

[7]Lawrence Kohlberg, "Cognitive-developmental Theory and The Practice of Collective Moral Education, M. Wolins and M. Gottesman (Eds.), *Group Care: An Israeli Approach,* (New York: Gordon and Breach, 1971), p. 370.

[8]Joseph Hickey and Peter Scharf, *Toward a Just Correctional System,* (San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1980).

[9]Peter Scharf, *Moral Atmopshere and Intervention in The Prison: The Creation of a Participatory Community in Prison.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, 1973.

[10]Roy E. Feldman, "The Promotion of Moral Development in Prisons and Schools", R. Wilson and G. Schochet (Eds.), *Moral Development and Politics,* (New York: Praeger, 1980).

[11]John Dewey, *Experience and Education,* (New York: Macmillan, 1963).

[12]Kenneth D. Bemme, "Authority in Education", *Harvard Educational Review,* 40, August, 1970.

[13]For an elaborated description of the faculty's role as advocates see Lawrence Kohlberg, "High School Democracy and Educating for a Just Society", R. Mosher (Ed.), *Moral Education: A First Generation of Research,* (New York: Praeger, 1980).

[14]For an excellent treatment of the philosphical premises which underlie these two types of social organizations see Roberto M. Unger, *Knowledge and Politics,* (New York: Macmillan, 1975).

[15]This work was done in collaboration with Lawerance Kohlberg, Josephy Reimer, Ann Higgins, and Marvin Berkowitz and funded by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

[16]Rudolph Moos, *Evaluating Educational Environments.* San Francisco: Josey Bass, 1979).

[17]For a description of moral atmosphere development in Cluster, see Elsa Wasserman, *The Development of An Alternative High School Based on Kohlberg's Just Community Approach to Education.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University, 1977 and Clark Power, *The Moral Atmosphere of a Just Community School: A Four Year Longitudinal Study,* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, 1979.

[18]For a more thorough discussion of this incident and the relationship of the moral atmosphere to moral action see Clark Power and Joseph Reimer, "Moral Atmosphere: An Educational Bridge Between Moral Judgment and Moral Action", William Damon (Ed.), *New Directions For Child Development:* Moral Development. (San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1978).