
Pro Rege

Volume 12 | Number 1

Article 3

September 1983

Stages of Intellectual Development: A Scheme

Gloria Goris Stronks

Dordt College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), [Developmental Psychology Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stronks, Gloria Goris (1983) "Stages of Intellectual Development: A Scheme," *Pro Rege*: Vol. 12: No. 1, 14 - 23.

Available at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol12/iss1/3

This Feature Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at Digital Collections @ Dordt. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pro Rege by an authorized administrator of Digital Collections @ Dordt. For more information, please contact ingrid.mulder@dordt.edu.

Stages of Intellectual Development: A Scheme

Gloria Goris Stronks
Associate Professor of Education



Gloria Goris Stronks, a graduate of Calvin College, received the Ed.D. degree in Curriculum and Instruction from Northern Illinois University. Prior to her appointment to the Dordt faculty in 1979, Dr. Stronks was a reading specialist in Christian schools in the Chicago area.

The child had been sitting quietly for a long time, staring into space. "What are you doing?" whispered her mother, slipping into the place beside her. "I'm thinking." "And what are you thinking about?" "I'm thinking about . . . my thinking," she replied with a puzzled expression.

According to the thesis of W.G. Perry of Harvard University, the intellectual person, whether a graduate of college or not, is one who has learned to think about even his or her own thoughts, to examine the way data are ordered and assumptions are made, and to compare these thoughts with the thoughts of others. In contrast, the anti-intellectual person, whether a graduate of college or not,

is not opposed to thinking. Rather, that individual is against thinking about one particular thing: his or her own thought.

In an attempt to describe or map the process of intellectual development during the period of late adolescence into adulthood, Perry accepted as his premise that this development takes place in the forms in which a person perceives the world rather than in the particulars or content of personal attitudes and concerns.¹ This view of cognitive development is not new. During recent years the resurgence of interest in the cognitive developmental theories of Jean Piaget has aroused in educators and psychologists curiosity concerning stage

development in other aspects of human life.² Erikson has described psycho-social development³ and Kohlberg has concerned himself with stages in moral development.⁴ More recently Fowler has contributed to the body of literature with research into the field of faith development, and has set forth stages through which individuals go in the process of moving toward mature faith.⁵ Each of these researchers has added greatly to our understanding of the developmental calling of the human individual. However, one common element is present in these stage development theories. All appear to use the Piagetian model and insights as a springboard, in spite of the fact that Piaget's descriptions of formal operational thought do not extend into late adolescence and adulthood. His descriptions do, however, point explicitly in this direction by describing the impact of the bringing to bear upon ideals the new capacity to think not only of what "is," but of all that "might be."⁶

Perry's work with the Bureau of Study Counsel was to undertake a longitudinal documentation of the reactions of undergraduates to the four years of college course work. Although the setting was an academic one, the researchers presumed the relevance of the research to the understanding of the intellectual and ethical development of adolescence and adulthood in a pluralistic culture.

Perry's model describes the variety of ways in which individuals respond to the relativism which permeates the intellectual and social atmosphere of a pluralistic culture. In interviews with undergraduate students it became evident that some seemed to find the notion of multiple frames of reference wholly unintelligible. On the other end of the scale were those who came into college already in full exploration of the modes of thinking and of valuing. An equal amount of diversity was found in the ways in which students went through the process of assimilating the experience of the pluralistic environment.

It is part of Perry's thesis that the young

person's discovery of diversity in other people's points of view is occurring earlier due to the exposure to mass media and to the vicissitudes of experiences taking place in the lives of adolescents. This diversity faced by students in the liberal arts college appears to be unique to the Western world only in its concentration and intensity.

A complicating factor in the twentieth century has been the change in the outlook of the faculty concerning the character of the intellectual task set for students on final examinations. A survey of test questions presented to freshmen at Harvard in the decade before 1920 indicates that approximately only 19 percent of the questions required consideration in more than one frame of reference. Perry calls these "relativistic" questions and gives the following example: Compare the concept of the tragic heroine exemplified by Antigone and Cordelia.⁷ Such a question is relativistic if the student is required to compare the concepts rather than compare Antigone and Cordelia as persons against the background of a single frame of reference. The number of relativistic questions confronting freshmen in the years between 1950 and 1960 at Harvard has been estimated at 75 to 80 percent. This change in the view of the intellectual task is not limited to Harvard but likely extends to most liberal arts colleges in a strong academic tradition. While it is possible that in the past two decades college examinations may have changed with the open admissions policies of many schools, it is still evident that confronting other value systems has become increasingly inescapable, not only in course work, but in daily life.

Following the model of Piaget, Perry describes the process through which people go in interpreting experiences meaningfully. For several reasons Perry describes this order in terms of Positions rather than stages.⁸ Piaget consistently used an estimation of duration of stage and Perry is unwilling to make this assumption of intellectual development at the late adolescent and adult levels. It is possible for individuals to remain

in any Position for varying degrees of time and it is also possible to divert from the forward progression. To the extent that an individual manifests a range of structures at a given time, a Position can express the focus of a central tendency or dominance among these structures. In addition, the notion of "Position" is more appropriate to the image of "position from which a person views his or her world."

Although Perry defines intellectual development in terms of 9 Positions, the scheme can be more readily understood in three parts, each consisting of three Positions. In Positions 1, 2, and 3, an individual modifies an absolutistic right-wrong outlook to make room, in some minimal way, for that simple pluralism Perry calls Multiplicity. In Positions 4, 5, and 6, the individual accords the diversity of human outlook its full problematic stature, next transmutes the simple pluralism of Multiplicity into contextual Relativism, and then comes to foresee the necessity of personal Commitment in a relativistic world. Positions 7, 8, and 9 trace the development of Commitments in the person's actual experience.⁹

Perry's description of each Position is presented here, followed by my presentation of the view of the world as seen through the eyes of individuals in that Position, based on interviews and descriptions of students in Perry's study.¹⁰

Position 1: Basic Duality

The individual sees the world in polar terms of me-right-good vs. others-right-bad. Right Answers for everything exist in the Absolute, known to Authority whose role is to mediate (teach) them. Knowledge and goodness are perceived as quantitative accretions of discrete rightnesses to be collected by hard work and obedience.¹¹

These individuals are more readily found

in high school than in college and they tend to view the learning task as follows: I do not really expect that going to college will change me very much. I expect to get more facts and if I work hard and do all the work they require on time, I should be successful. It would help, though, if teachers would stick more to the facts and do less theorizing in class. One could get more out of it that way. I hate questions that may have more than one right answer. How can you know how they want you to answer them?

Position 2: Multiplicity Pre-legitimate

The individual perceives diversity of opinion as uncertainty and accounts for them as unwarranted confusion in poorly qualified Authority or as mere exercises set by Authority "so we can learn to find the Answer for ourselves."¹²

This individual recognizes multiplicity, but perceives it as something alien or unreal: I suppose the professors know what they are doing when they show us different ways of looking at things. But sometimes they forget to tell us which is the right way to think and then it all seems rather pointless. Sometimes I think they get too far away from giving us the straight facts and put too much emphasis on reading between the lines and on interpretation. It used to confuse me when I would keep looking for an answer and it was not in the book. Now I can see they are trying to make my mind work and the answer is not in the book for a reason. We are supposed to think about it and come up with the answer. I can not see why we break into groups and discuss things. My peers do not have the answers and it is the instructor's job to teach.

Position 3: Multiplicity Subordinates

The individual accepts diversity and uncertainty as legitimate but still temporary in areas where Authority

"hasn't found The Answer yet." He or she supposes Authority grades in those areas on "good expression" but remains puzzled as to standards.¹³

The individual perceives some of the implications of multiplicity and views it this way: One thing I like about physics is that you get a definite answer to a point. Beyond that point you know there *are* definite answers, but you can not reach them. I can not understand about grades. It seems to me that the papers I work hardest on get the lowest grades and when I do not seem to work so hard my grade is better. It hardly seems fair. It seems to me that instructors do not really know how much work or how little work we put into something. I do not know how they can grade one student's work against another's when the right answer is not even known at all. I enjoy a good class discussion and a good discussion in the dorms but I depend on the instructor to tell me how it really is. However, learning is more than just memorizing facts. I can feel that my way of thinking is changing.

Position 4: Multiplicity Correlate

The individual perceives legitimate uncertainty (and therefore diversity of opinion) to be extensive and raises it to the status of an unstructured epistemological realm of its own in which "anyone has the right to his or her own opinion," a realm which is set over against Authority's realm where right-wrong still prevails, or the student discovers qualitative contextual relativistic reasoning as a special case of "what They want" within Authority's realm.¹⁴

This individual views the learning situation as follows: Well, in some areas we still have certainty about knowledge but in most areas we really do not know anything for sure. What it comes down to is that anyone's opinion is just as valid or invalid as

any other. What I like about reading something like *Moby Dick* is that nobody understands it and so my interpretation has to be accepted. Provided, of course, that I have done a thorough job of analysis. It must be an educated opinion. I feel a certain freedom now about learning because I can use supportive evidence for critique and can relate learning to other issues in other classes. As far as grades are concerned, it is my opinion that those who think the most independently should get the best grades. But that is not always the opinion of the instructor so I know how to give them what they want. No matter what the instruction is like, I am responsible for my own learning and I get personal enjoyment from that. I think college has opened the shell for me, let me out. I can see things that I have never seen before and think about things I never really thought about or thought were important. It is not only the learning itself. It is the paths that it opens up for you.

Position 5: Relativism Correlate

The individual perceives all knowledge and values (including authority's) as contextual and relativistic and subordinates dualistic right-wrong functions to the status of a special case, in context.¹⁵

These individuals recognize that right and wrong do exist if one accepts a basic underlying context, and they view learning as follows: There is something interesting about points of view. There is often a patterning within a point of view which will make it either valid or invalid. In that sense one can say that right and wrong do exist, but within a particular context. I used to have to try so hard to see different points of view but now that has become a habit, even outside of course work. I have learned to take complexity for granted. For a while I felt reduced to a level where I really was not sure there was anything in particular to follow. Now I see that you have to have a

basis for any decision and you have to find out on what principles you are going to decide any issue. It helps me that I can share my ideas with others and hear how they are working through the same process which I am. I expect the instructor to be a guide or consultant and in some cases I know that my comments aid the thinking of the instructor. A good critique on my work will have both positive and negative feedback and I need this kind of evaluation to help me in the process of learning. I can evaluate, conclude, support my analysis, and I can adapt, modify, and expand concepts because I truly have the intellectual tools for moving across contexts. However, often there are what seems to me equally good alternatives.

paper in which I took a stand. It came back with "oversimplified" written on it. Actually, the position wasn't over simplified. I just had not clearly stated the struggle in arriving at that point. I believe in taking a stand now. I have modified this from taking no stand at all. Sometimes I take too strong a stand, but then it is something that I feel I know a good deal about. I feel more independent now because I have a perspective on the world. I have more facts at my command on which I can make decisions and I can exercise my judgment. But it seems to me that one's commitment involves one's life's philosophy and includes a realization that past and present and ties all lead to making this conclusion or commitment.

One of the most significant implications is that students in late adolescence and early adulthood need regular opportunities for conversations with a faculty member concerning the process of their intellectual development.

Position 6: Commitment Foreseen

The individual apprehends the necessity of orienting himself in a relativistic world through some form of personal Commitment (as distinct from unquestioned or unconsidered commitment to simple belief in certainty).¹⁶

This realization of the necessity for Commitment may bring feelings of eagerness, ambivalence, dismay, turmoil, or simple acceptance and the individual views learning as follows: At a certain point you must begin to get control of yourself. You must look for a certain direction. You can not expect these internal evolutions to just develop and then suddenly bloom. You have to work at it. I felt annoyed, recently, when I had written a

Position 7: Initial Commitment

The individual makes an initial commitment in some areas. This includes some intimations of the implications of that commitment.¹⁷

The view of learning is as follows: I am no longer going through major restructuring of the background of my life. I have made some choices now and am beginning to actually experience some of the implications of those choices. I feel some relief after having taken this step and am beginning to think of myself as a doctor (lawyer, minister, teacher) rather than as one who is learning how to be that person. It is at times enlightening to hear myself say aloud some of the convictions which I have and to watch myself actually act on those convictions. It really is

working. Before, it seemed to me that I tried artificially to commit myself to this or I would intellectually realize that I would move this way. But now the realization is here. They are two different things, really. One is intellectual and comes fairly easily. The other is emotional and is a process of absorbing.

Position 8: Orientation in Implications of Commitment

The individual experiences the implications of Commitment and explores the subjective and stylistic issues of responsibility. There are at times tensions between feelings of tentativeness and finality, freedom and constraint, expansion and narrowing, action and reflection. There is the prospect of membership with authority in areas of Commitment.¹⁸

The individual views this Commitment in the following way: Well, I am decided on my profession but how many different ways there are of going about actually doing it! I see now that commitment is not just something I face. It is the beginning of a whole series of decisions which face me continually. I recognize now that whatever I do, there is going to be much more to do and to understand. And I am going to make mistakes. But I have a certain sense of being able to cope with a specific or rather a small fragment of the general picture, even though I am always looking for something. You still have to recognize that all these things are potential tools for destruction or construction, and that you must be careful in the way you utilize them.

Position 9: Development Commitment(s)

The individual experiences the affirmation of identity among multiple responsibilities and realizes

Commitment as an ongoing, unfolding activity through which he or she expresses a life style. Balances are development in the tensions of qualitative polarities of style, especially alternation of reflection and action. There is an acceptance of changes of mood and outlook, within continuity of identity. There is a sense of being "in" one's life. The circumstance of being a college student would hardly provide a basis for the seasoning described in this Position.¹⁹

The individual's view: I am in my profession now and my past decisions have settled what I am doing. *How* I am doing it emerges from the particular of each moment. I am often too busy to contemplate each moment in these terms but that does not reduce my feeling of responsibility.

In any of the Positions in the main line of development a person might suspend, nullify, or even reverse the process of growth. (1) The individual may pause for a full year or more, often quite aware of the step which lies ahead, as if waiting or gathering forces. Perry calls this pause "Temporizing" and states that it is most often seen in Position 6 because of the inner challenge of Commitment. The danger with Temporizing is that if it extends over too long a period it may lead into the style of alienation and irresponsibility Perry calls "Escape." (2) The individual may entrench, out of anger and hatred of "otherness," in the me-they or we-other dualism of the early Positions, most particularly Positions 2 and 3. Perry calls this "Retreat" and says that it always involves a retreat into a previously prepared Position. In the few instances of Retreat in the Harvard study, regression from higher levels back to Multiplicity defended itself by looseness. There is no one to argue with; everyone has a right to his or her own opinion. Regression into Dualism, however, appeared to require a fight, the enemy being either Multiplicity or a request for independent thought. (3) The individual might ex-

exploit the detachment offered by some middle Position on the scale, and choose the deeper avoidance of personal responsibility known as alienation. Perry suggests that this Escape is a result of extended Temporizing. Escape may be toward dissociation, a state which suggests a passive delegation of all responsibility to "we'll wait and see what happens." Although pleasure may be found in this irresponsibility, the over-all tone of this dissociation is depressed. There is no sense of active participation in the growth of one's identity. Escape can also be "escape into commitment," which is distinguished from Commitment as a step of growth in a relativistic world by the sense of hurling one's self through despair into choosing, hoping that the busyness of working at the commitment will absorb one entirely and all ambivalences will magically disappear.

Critique

Perry makes no apology for the fact that his research shares the assumptions of modern contextualistic pragmatism. He sees the individual's ultimate purpose as being to find those forms through which he or she may best understand and confront with integrity the nature of the human condition. In attempting to give a description of the "how" of development toward and through Commitment, he emphasizes the interweaving of hierarchies of values with hierarchies of thought, assuming that this structural linking of valuing with thinking will provide a frame in which steplike degrees of ethical objectivity are possible and he says that climbing the ladder of steplike degrees involves subsuming the values and thoughts of the earlier phase. But it becomes apparent that Perry's Positions are not hierarchically related in the same way as Piaget's cognitive stages. Piaget showed that the higher stages of cognitive development subsumed the lower into a more complexly related organization. It seems more likely that the individual at Position 4 of Perry's model would have rejected the reasoning of

Positions 2 and 3 as inadequate, rather than reorganizing the reasoning. In that sense, it seems impossible that moral development, judgments, and perceptions can be defined in terms which include so little recognition of faith development. A description of faith development would allow a clearer picture of the causes for the reorganization or rejection of the judgments of earlier Positions.

Many of us who have worked a great deal with children have recognized that there are certain individuals who, at an early age, show a strong faith in the teachings of Jesus Christ and a determination to live their lives with the purpose of understanding how that commitment is to be demonstrated. Does Perry's model limit their development to Positions 2 and 3 because of that basic commitment? Perry recognizes that an individual at an advanced position of development in the scheme might commit himself or herself to a faith in a religion which includes a faith in an absolute order manifest in human affairs, but considers that to be in a high Position only if the individual continues to respect the legitimacy of relativistic valuing in others' faiths in other absolutes. Perry suggests that an individual might use his or her faith commitment to entrench in Positions 2 or 3, but isn't it also possible that a strong faith commitment might change the way in which the person views the world in Positions 4 and 5? Such a view would steer clear of the fallacy of "everyone's opinion is just as good or bad as everyone else's." A strong faith commitment would surely ease the way through these stages and reduce the tendency to retreat or escape. It is also likely that a faith commitment would influence career and personal commitments or decisions in Position 6 and upward. It appears evident that either the sample did not include individuals who were moving through the intellectual levels from the viewpoint of a strong faith commitment, or that the researchers, upon encountering such commitment, simply explained it as an example of dualism. The very interweaving of hierarchies of value with hierarchies of

thought which Perry assumes, has been denied recognition.

Perry's model defines Commitment and upper levels of intellectual development only in terms of working through career decisions. It must be noted that, although a small number of women were included in Perry's study, the illustrations and validation drew on the reports of only the male participants. In addition, of the twenty researchers who conducted the interviews, only one was a woman. It has been shown that studies based on personal interviews or questions often depend on the projections of the experimenter more than on the facts. In creating an instrument for measuring moral development, Kohlberg based his work on all-male samples. The resulting instrument consistently scores women at an "immature" stage.²⁰ The existence of sex differences in moral reasoning has been corroborated by Gilligan's studies of women's moral judgments but those studies do not imply that women's reasoning is less advanced than men's.²¹ Studies of the different aspects of the life cycle which have taken for their model the lives of men, have failed to account for the experiences of women. Women tend to base their constructions of moral dilemmas on a morality of interpersonal responsibilities rather than on a morality of rights, according to Gilligan. Their perception of self, their mode of judgment, appears to be consistently contextual because from early childhood they have been taught to see themselves as involved in relationships with others while males were taught to respond to rules. Perry's expectation of independent thinking, clear decision making, and responsible action leading toward an autonomous life of work (all often associated with masculinity) are surely indications of what we view as a high position in intellectual development. But it is quite possible that his description reflects a view of intellectual development which is, in itself, out of balance. To view cognitive structures as dominating the affective dynamics is to say that only cognitive structures can serve as a

basis for describing the sequence of all developmental stages. In a study of children's games, Piaget found that when faced with an argument concerning the rules of the game, girls tend to preserve the relationship between players and start the game over. Boys tend to legislate their way through the issue, thus preserving the rules rather than the relationships. Rather than seeing either bias as a developmental deficiency, what is needed are developmental theories which include, rather than rule out, the feminine voice. The researchers who interviewed in Perry's study were given no opportunity to recognize whether or not females learn to make meaning in a unique way and develop an interpersonal rather than an individualistic structure of knowing. The real danger of such a bias is this. To educate females with the expectation that at the upper levels of intellectual development they will follow this model is to force them to view with suspicion any other kind of intellectual development. To educate males with the same expectation is to deny them the ability to be all it is possible for them to be. What is needed is a model which is free from the built-in bias.

Perry's descriptions of Positions 7, 8 and 9 are sketchy and it appears to have been much more difficult for the researchers to pinpoint the exact Positions of individuals within this range. Perry recognizes the shift away from spatial cognitive restructuring at this point and the move toward emotional and aesthetic assessments, but his documentations are crude. He excuses this roughness by claiming that at this point the study addresses issues which psychological science has not succeeded in differentiating conceptually. One of these is the intuitive aspect of thinking, which provides for the hunch, the sort of divination, the educated leap used by problem solvers, problem finders, and pioneers in all areas of life. The intuitive aspect is an important part of mature, intellectual thought but reference to intuition does not appear in the recorded interviews, likely because the interviewers had not

designed questions or statements which would lead to such reference and the respondents had never learned to recognize intuition as a valid part of the intellectual process.

In using Perry's model to determine the level of intellectual development of students on a variety of college campuses, Knefelkamp²² found that few students were shown to have reached a level beyond Position 5. She questioned the accuracy of Perry's research, which reported most seniors to be at Positions 6, 7, and 8. However, it must be noted that in her assessment, Knefelkamp asked students to write a series of three essays concerning their view of course work. These essays were written within a period of a few days. Perry conducted open-ended interviews with students during each of their four years of undergraduate experience. The interview method not only allows the individual to respond to questions and reactions of the interviewer, but the process of discussing one's view of the learning process periodically is, in itself, an aid to further development within that process. A large number of students in the Perry study indicated that they thought students would be helped in the process mostly if "every student had an interview like this each year." It seems possible that the Perry researchers were not only studying the process of intellectual development. They were also allowing an opportunity for the verbalization of the process and that verbalization aided the development.

Educational Implications

Perry is surely to be commended for his move into uncharted territory, particularly since his research techniques demanded those of an ethnographer at a time when the only behavioral research which was truly respected was that which could be easily quantified. He has provided some generalities which lead to very practical applications.

One of the most significant implications is that students in late adolescence and early adulthood need regular opportunities for conversations with a faculty member concerning the process of their intellectual development. "Every student should have an interview like this each year" must not be taken as a trivial statement. Students need to experience themselves more vividly in their efforts to integrate their learning in the responsible interpretation of their lives. The involvement of their own language in describing these efforts would intensify and reinforce the experience. This involvement could be attained through planned one-hour interviews once each year, beginning at approximately the eleventh grade and extending through college. At the earlier levels the format might include presenting to the student a series of statements concerning attitudes toward course work. For example, one statement might read: If teachers would stick to the facts and do less theorizing one could get more out of their classes. Other examples might include questions, such as: Would you like to say what has stood out for you in the past year? Do you think you have changed in any way? Are there ways in which you look at things differently than you did a year ago? A record would be kept of the student's responses, and any change from year to year concerning an opinion would be a point for discussion or clarification. During the later college years a more open-ended discussion might suffice, possibly in small groups. Recognizing the strong inclination of teachers to "teach," and the fact that inappropriate teaching (too much too soon) will stifle the student's dialogue, attentive listening skills on the part of the interviewer would be a requirement.

The Christian moving toward Commitment needs instruction concerning how one approaches problematic issues in all areas of life. Educators too often, with Perry, assume that Commitment is demonstrated only in the area of one's career. Adults are required to be decision makers in many areas in addition to their chosen careers and it seems

essential that they have instruction and dialogue concerning decision-making in issues relating to politics, environment, society, and education.

At any level of schooling Perry's model will, as did Piaget's before it, provide comfort to teachers in that it may explain on impersonal grounds how it is that their words can be so differently perceived by various students in the class. This is no small comfort, because it opens the door to greater understanding in personal conversations or confrontations with students. There is the danger, however, that the student's legitimate criticism of the presentation of content will be brushed off by the teacher as a result of limited intellectual development. Excellent techniques of pedagogy are expected at all levels of schooling, and mature intellectual development on the part of the instructor recognizes the value of legitimate criticism of instruction.

The aspect of schooling which seemed the most bewildering to the students in Perry's study was the system of evaluation. It is essential that each teacher addresses this bewilderment by providing examples of quality work and explaining the basis for judging them to be so. If one contrasts the definitions of knowledge as implied by college examinations of sixty years ago with those of today, it becomes evident that the task of the student is different now. If we expect our students to do more than simply memorize facts, we must give very explicit guidance in the process of thinking about those facts. And this guidance is needed both at the high school and college levels. We need to direct and support in our students a more sustained synthesis, analysis, and exploration.

It takes courage to move forward in intellectual development. It takes even more courage to work through Commitment. We need to give a great deal of thought to what environmental sustenance supports students as they mature intellectually. Perry suggests that such support is derived, in part, from the knowledge that in the very risk of

working out their Commitments, students are in the same boat not only with each other, but with their instructor as well. It is the creative obligation of any teacher, at any level, to find ways of encouraging each student as he or she assumes the risks of forward movement.

Notes

¹W.G. Perry. *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme*. Bureau of Study Counsel, Harvard University. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968).

²B. Inhelder and J. Piaget. *The Growth of Logical Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence*. (New York: Basic Books, 1958).

³E.H. Erikson. *Childhood and Society*. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1950, 1963).

⁴L. Kohlberg. "Moral Development and Identification," in *Child Psychology 62nd Yearbook*, ed. H.W. Stevenson, National Society for the Study of Education. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963b).

⁵J. Fowler, and S. Keen. *Life Maps: Conversations on the Journey of Faith*. (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1978).

⁶Inhelder and Piaget, pp. 341-346.

⁷Perry, p. 4.

⁸Perry uses the upper-case initial to designate the special use of the term in the following words: Position, Multiplicity, Relativism, Commitment, Temporizing, Retreat, and Escape. He also uses the numeral to indicate specific Positions.

⁹Perry, p. 57.

¹⁰Perry and his team of researchers interviewed a large number of individuals. The comments noted here are presented as an illustration of the response from individuals in each Position.

¹¹Perry, p. 4.

¹²Perry, p. 9.

¹³Perry, p. 9.

¹⁴Perry, p. 9.

¹⁵Perry, p. 10.

¹⁶Perry, p. 10.

¹⁷Perry, p. 10 and Chart of Development.

¹⁸Perry, p. 10 and Chart of Development.

¹⁹Perry, p. 10 and Chart of Development.

²⁰L. Kohlberg and R. Kramer. "Continuities and Discontinuities in Child and Adult Moral Development." *Human Development*, 12, 1969.

²¹C. Gilligan. *In a Different Voice*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).

²²L. Knefelkamp. Unpublished paper presented for Colleges of Mid-America, Sioux Falls, S.D., April, 1981.