# Glossary

*Affective aspect*

It describes the *orientation* (*content*) of action as manifested in a person’s pattern of reactions to a known pattern of stimuli or events. Related concepts: moral attitudes, values, motives, drives.

*Cognitive aspect*

It describes the *competence* (*structure*) as manifested in a person’s pattern of reactions to a known pattern of stimuli or events. See *Moral Competence*.

*Defining Issues Test (DIT)*

The DIT was developed by James Rest (1979; 1986). The DIT P score “is interpreted as the relative importance given to principled moral considerations on making a moral decision.” (Rest 1979, p. 101) “The P score indicates the extent to which the subject considers the 'Principled' items (items from stages 5 and 6) as most important.” (Rest & Narvaez 1991, p. 234)

*The Dual-Aspect model of moral behavior*

Moral behavior is defined and described by two aspects: *moral orientations* and *moral com­petence.* These aspects of behavior must be clearly *distinguished* from one another be­cause they are of a different nature and must be measured differently. They additionally have different origins and need different treatment in education and therapy.

But aspects *cannot be separated* from each other or from behavior. They are not components.

Quotes: “When behavior is studied in its cognitive aspect, we are concerned with its struc­tures; when behavior is considered in its affective aspect, we are concerned with its energetics (or ‘eco­nomics’ […]). While these two aspects cannot be reduced to a single aspect, they are nevertheless inseparable and complementary. For this reason we […] find a marked paralle­lism in their respective evolutions.” (Kohlberg 1958, p. 21)

“A systematic general observation of moral behavior, attitudes, or concepts in terms of such a set of formal criteria of morality […] cross-cuts the usual neat distinctions between moral knowledge or beliefs on the one hand and moral behavior or motivation on the other, since a moral act or attitude cannot be defined either by purely cognitive or by purely motivational criteria.” (Kohlberg 1958, p. 18)

*The Dual-Layer model of moral behavior*

This model comprises the unconscious layer of thinking and behavior as described by the *Dual-Aspect Model* of moral behavior, and the conscious layer of verbal reasoning and reflection. How both layers are related is still largely unknown. Piaget hypothesizes: “The child’s verbal thinking consists of a progressive coming into consciousness […], or conscious realization of schemas that have been built up by action. In such cases verbal thought simply lags behind concrete thought.” (Piaget 1965, p. 117)

*The Dual-Aspect-Dual-Layer model of the moral self*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Affective Aspect‬‬‬‬‬‬ | Cognitive Aspect |
| Ethical reflection(cons­cious layer) | Articulated ethical principles | Ethical judgment and reasoning |
| Overt moral behavior(unconscious layer) | Moral orientations, as they are manifested in the behavior | Moral competence, as it is ma­­ni­fested in the be­havior |

*The Education Theory of moral development*

I have suggested the Education Theory of moral development (Lind 2002) to explain, predict and foster moral(-democratic) competence as an alternative to *genetic theories* of moral development (inborn morality, inva­riant sequence of stages of development) and *socialization theories* (imprinting of moral dis­positions by cultures, sub-cultures, nations, or religious dogmas) The theory’s core as­sump­­tions are:

1. Basic moral orientations are inborn and do not need to be taught.
2. Moral competence exists only rudimentarily at birth but must be developed to match the dif­ficulty and complexity of moral tasks encountered in life.
3. Moral competence grows through coping with moral tasks (i.e., dilemmas, problems, conflicts, puzzles etc.) if these tasks are challenging but not too difficult. If they are too difficult and/or emotionally disturbing, and no support is provided, no learning takes place. By avoiding such tasks moral learning might even be hampered in future.
4. Because moral learning opportunities have become scarce for children in modern indus­trialized societies, they must be provided in schools, universities, and other institutions of education including public media and cultural events.

See also: *Konstanz Method of Dilemma-Discussion*.

*Konstanzer Methode der Dilemma-Diskussion* (*KMDD)*®

The KMDD is a method for fostering moral and democratic competence, developed by Georg Lind in the 1990s (Lind 2008b; see also this book)

The KMDD grew out of the *Blatt-Kohlberg-Method* (KBM) of dilemma discussion, but it has several new features and changes: a KMDD session lasts 90 minutes (KBM: 45 minutes), deals only with one dilemma story (KBM: 4 – 5 stories), involves no higher-stage modeling (KBM: plus-1 convention), includes 5 minutes quiet time to let participants become aware of, and articulate their moral feelings as elicited by the story (KBM: none), includes 10 minutes for dilemma clarification in the class (KBM: none), lets the participants take part in a ballot on the protagonist’s decision in the story (KBM: ?), allows for time to prepare for a controversial discussion in small groups (KBM: none), has a discussion between the pro and the contra group (KBM: none ?), has self-moderation through the ping-pong rule (KBM: only modera­tion by teachers), has a nomination of the other group’s best reason given (KBM: none), has a final ballot (KBM: none), and provides ample time for feedback of the parti­ci­pants to the KMDD teacher on their learning gains (KBM: none)

Reading: This book.

Note: The KMDD® is an internationally registered trademark in China, Germany, the European Union, and Turkey.

*Moral competence*

Moral competence is defined as the ability to resolve problems and conflicts on the basis of universal moral principles by means of deliberation and discussion, instead of through using violence, deceit and submission to others. Moral competence is visible in a person’s mani­fest responses to the *Moral Competence Test* (MCT): To which degree does the person judge argu­ments pro and contra a difficult decision in regard to their moral quality (i.e., the moral orientations which they reveal) instead of in regard to their opinion agreement?

The person must not be conscious of his or her moral competence. This concept is not to be confused with moral *judgment* competence, or *moral reasoning*, or *ethical competence.*

Related concepts: Moral *structure, moral cognition, moral ability*.

*Moral Competence Test (MCT)*

The MCT is a measuring instrument which enables us to simultaneously measure the two basic aspects of moral behavior: *moral orientations* (attitudes, values) and [*moral competence*](https://mct2kmdd.com/glossar/#moral_competence) (struc­ture) as manifested in a person’s pattern of reaction to a known pattern of stimuli, that is, pattern of reactions to arguments to be judged for their acceptability for this person. The MCT was formerly named the *Moral Judgment Test* (MJT) and, in German, *Moralisches Urteil-Test* (MUT). I designed the MCT as an experiment, not as a classical statistics-based test. I conceive of “consistency” as an attribute of the respondent’s moral competence, not as an attribute of the test (“measurement error,” “reliability”).

Reading: Chapter 4.

*Moral judgment competence (Kohlberg)*

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

*Moral Judgment Interview (MJI)*

The MJI was originally developed by Lawrence Kohlberg (1958) on the basis of his cognitive-developmental “Stage theory” of moral behavior. It is to measure the Stage of moral judgment development of adolescents and adults, that is, with the “interrelated development of basic moral concepts and attitudes.” (Kohlberg 1958, p. 1) He defined “morality [...] as 'having moral principles' [which] includes selection and ordering of the rules, intelligent interpretation of them, and inner conformity to them in difficult situations rather than outer conformity in routine situations.” (p. 3) “The Standard Moral Judgment Interview does attempt to tap the most advanced reasoning of which the subject is capable. [...] We expect that [this highest stage of] thinking will be quite internally consistent, and with the exception of some very slight decalage, will form a structured whole across widely varying content. That is, the stage properties presented earlier characterize competence though not necessarily performance in moral judgment.” (Colby et al. 1987, p. 8; for a critical evaluation of the MJI see also Lind 1989b) There are several MJI indexes: the Stage score ranging from 1 to 6, the Moral Maturity Score (MMS) ranging from 100 to 600, and the Weighted Average Score (WAS) also ranging from 100 to 600. Latter scores were tempo­rarily restricted to the range from 100 to 500 because, as the authors say, no “Stage 6” subjects were ever recorded.

*Moral orientation*

Moral orientation is the preferred moral principle which a person expresses in her or his pattern of responses. In this book we use the six Types of moral orientations which Kohlberg used to characterize his six Stages of moral development (Kohlberg 1976) Within Lind’s *Moral Compe­tence Test* these moral orientations are represented by the arguments.

Related concepts: Moral content, values, attitudes, motives.

*Moral dilemma*

A moral dilemma is a situation in which a person cannot solve a problem without violating one or more of his or her moral principles. The feeling of a moral dilemma can vary from person to person because a dilemma is in the eye of the beholder.

*Plus-1 convention*

Within the framework of the Blatt-Kohlberg method of dilemma discussion, this “convention” requires that a teacher should stimulate their students’ moral reasoning development by presen­ting arguments just one ‘Stage’ (of six Stages of moral reasoning) above the students’ own moral reasoning. This requirement has been criticized by users of the Blatt-Kohlberg method. (Berkowitz 1981; Oser & Althof 1992) Above all, this convention is not practical because it would require that the teacher first assesses all students’ Kohlbergian Stage of moral develop­ment, and prepares many arguments that are “plus 1” for the particular students. Neither is this convention compatible with Piagetian learning theory to which Kohlberg adheres. Piaget taught that stu­dents should be active learners, constructing their own arguments on the basis of their moral feelings.

Lawrence Walker (1983) demonstrated experimentally that any confrontation with arguments, ‘higher Stage’-argument as well as counter-arguments, stimulates moral competence equally well. Hence the plus-1 convention became superfluous. During KMDD sessions, the teacher does not intervene at all in order to allow students to construct their own arguments.

*Segmentation, moral-cognitive*

Moral-cognitive segmentation means the lowering of one’s moral competence in a dilemma situation in which a per­son turns over responsibility for judgment to an external authority like religion, ideology, military com­mand, or professional ethics instead of using his or her own reason to solve the dilemma.

Operational definition: In the MCT, moral-cognitive segmentation is defined as the difference of the C-scores between the two test parts (“Workers” / “Doctor”) of 8 C-points or more.

Reading: Wakenhut (1982); Lind (2000d); Senger (2010); Bataglia & Schil­linger (2013).

*Segmentation, moral-affective*

Moral-affective segmentation means changing one’s moral orientations in certain situations. Moral-affective regression has been rarely observed yet. Some participants seem to simulate their moral orientations “down” in inter­views for ‘moral understatement’.

This should be distinguished from different patterns of moral orientation shown in different dilemma contexts, which show that these contexts differ in regard to the moral principles or ideals they demand.

Related concepts: Adequate judgment, differentiated judgment.

Quote: “The concept of justice then helps to concretize the concept of the moral by de­li­mi­ting situations and attitudes to which our criteria of the moral may be applicable. It also helps to de­limit the concept of a ‘moral principle’ as something more than a fixed verbal for­mula.” (Kohl­berg 1958, p. 15)