


1975

Verbal Communication Characteristics of Couples at Principled, Conventional, or Mixed Levels of Moral Development

Barbara Bledsoe Keller
College of William & Mary - Arts & Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#), [Developmental Psychology Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Keller, Barbara Bledsoe, "Verbal Communication Characteristics of Couples at Principled, Conventional, or Mixed Levels of Moral Development" (1975). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1539624920.

<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21220/s2-c1e8-0194>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

VERBAL COMMUNICATION CHARACTERISTICS OF COUPLES
AT PRINCIPLED, CONVENTIONAL, OR MIXED LEVELS
OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Psychology
The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

by

Barbara Bledsoe Keller

1975

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Barbara Bledsoe Keller

Barbara Bledsoe Keller

Approved, May 1975

W. Larry Ventis

W. Larry Ventis, Ph. D.

Virgil V. McKenna

Virgil V. McKenna, Ph.D.

Kelly G. Shaver

Kelly G. Shaver, Ph.D.

David H. Jones

David Jones, Ph.D.

Department of Philosophy

To the memory of
my father

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgments	v
List of Tables	vi
Abstract	vii
Introduction	2
Method	
Subjects	13
Apparatus	13
Procedure	18
Results	26
Discussion	40
Appendix	53
References	94

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to Professor W. Larry Ventis for his help in the conception, design, and evaluation of the present study. In addition, thanks are due to Professors Deborah Hartley, David Jones, Virgil V. McKenna, Cynthia Null, and Kelly G. Shaver for their contributions at various stages of the investigation. The writer is also indebted to Stephen Keller for his helpful suggestions, support and understanding. This study was partially supported by a grant awarded in November 1974 by the Faculty Research Committee of the College of William and Mary.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Means and Standard Deviations of the Questionnaire Variables for the Four Moral Pattern Groups	31
2. Means and Standard Deviations of the Observational Measures Based on all Five Discussions	32
3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Observational Measures Based on the Fifth Discussion	33
4. Means and Standard Deviations of Decision Time for Each of the Five Questions	34
5. Significant Intercorrelations of the Questionnaire and Observational Items Across All Moral Pattern Groups	35
6. Significant Intercorrelations of the Questionnaire and Observational Items Within the PP Group	36
7. Significant Intercorrelations of the Questionnaire and Observational Items Within the PC Group	37
8. Significant Intercorrelations of the Questionnaire and Observational Items Within the CP Group	38
9. Significant Intercorrelations of the Questionnaire and Observational Items Within the CC Group	39

ABSTRACT

The present study was designed to examine the relationship between types of moral reasoning preferred by people and characteristics of their dyadic interpersonal communication. The Defining Issues Test (Rest et al, 1974), based on Kohlberg's (1958) cognitive developmental approach to moral development, was used to determine the degree to which a person used reasoning characteristic of the "principled" level of moral development. At the principled level, moral values and principles are defined which have validity and application apart from the authority of groups or people holding these principles. Those people who responded predominantly at the principled level were labeled "principled" and those with a lower percentage of principled responses were referred to as "conventional." The verbal interaction of two good friends (a woman and a man) who were 1) both at the principled level, 2) both at the conventional level, or 3) at different levels of moral development was observed during their discussion of five questions. It was thought that the communication of couples dissimilar in their level of moral development would be less efficient and more labored than that of two people similar on this cognitive variable. Also the people at the principled level of moral development were expected to take the views of the other person into account more often than the conventional people. In addition it was hypothesized that there would be less conflict in couples in which the male was at a higher (principled) level than the (conventional) woman because of the wider social acceptance of the male-than the female-dominated dyadic relationship.

Neither the couples similar in moral development nor those dissimilar constituted a homogeneous group in terms of their verbal interaction characteristics. During the discussion of the question judged to be most relevant to the couples, people at the principled level appeared to take more of a dominant role in the decision-making process than the conventional people. Limited evidence was found for the hypothesis that there would be less conflict in couples in which the male was principled and the female conventional than in couples in which the female was principled and the male was conventional.

VERBAL COMMUNICATION CHARACTERISTICS OF COUPLES
AT PRINCIPLED, CONVENTIONAL, OR MIXED LEVELS
OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

Psychological inquiry into the development of morality has generally been based on either psychoanalytic, social learning, or cognitive developmental theory. Freud's psychoanalytic approach was one of the earliest approaches (Freud, 1893). Freud (1949) stated that moral values develop as a result of identification with one's same-sex parent after resolution of the Oedipal conflict. As a result of internalizing the values of one's parents around the age of five years, the superego develops. If this identification process proceeds smoothly, the child's moral values will parallel those of his or her parents. If appropriate identification does not occur, however, the development of moral values will be retarded due to the inadequacy of the superego. Thus, according to Freudian theory the critical period for moral development lies in the pre-school years. Empirical support for the psychoanalytic approach has been equivocal. Hoffman (1969) independently assessed the relation between identification and morality and found that father identification related positively only to internal moral judgment among middle-class boys. An implication of the psychoanalytic paradigm is the expectation that different aspects of a person's moral behavior will be

highly consistent with each other because they are all based on the same personality structure. Hartshorne & May (1928, 1930) examined this intraindividual consistency in over 10,000 school children. The small correlations between their measures of cheating, stealing, and lying did not support the view that there is a general trait of honesty, and therefore psychoanalytic theory was not supported.

One alternative to the psychoanalytic point of view which purports to explain intraindividual inconsistency of moral behavior is the social learning approach. Much of the research based on this approach has focused on children's behaviors in "resistance to temptation" paradigms. The self-control exhibited by children who are able to delay rewards is considered evidence for moral maturity. The extent to which a child is successful in this control has been shown to be related to the presence (LaVoie, 1974) and timing (Aronfreed, 1968) of punishment for deviation and, to a lesser degree, positive reinforcement of the desired behavior (LaVoie, 1974). In addition, the frequency of behaviors characteristic of successful resistance to temptation has been increased in middle-class (Walters & Parke, 1964) and lower-class (Walters, Leat, & Mezei, 1963) children through the vicarious punishment of models that the children observe.

A question which arises, however, is whether one's morality can be adequately assessed by merely observing acts.

Jean Piaget, like other cognitive theorists, believed that one's moral development cannot be fully evaluated this way because of the absence of information about the rationale behind such behavior. In other words he felt that a particular behavior such as breaking a cookie jar was in itself neither a sign of moral maturity nor immaturity; rather, he regarded the intentionality of the act as the determining factor.

Piaget (1932) was the first psychologist to emphasize and extensively explore the role of cognition in moral development. He proposed that the development of moral judgment generally follows the same basic pattern as that of cognitive development because the former is based on the latter. According to Piaget, the preoperational child is egocentric and incapable of decentration (taking the view of another person into account). At this stage the child objectively evaluates the rightness of an act by merely considering its physical outcome (in terms of damage or punishment). This is often referred to as the stage of heteronomous morality. As children begin to develop operational thought processes their moral judgments begin to reflect a subjective morality and intention becomes a salient criterion. With the development of abstract thought, movement into the stage of moral autonomy is possible. Persons at this stage possess moral sense which is based on abstract principles of right and wrong. Empirical evidence supporting this theory has been widespread. Bandura &

McDonald (1963) found that although there was much inter-individual variability, older children were more likely to make cognitively advanced (subjectively-based) judgments than objectively-based judgments. Additional support for this age trend across social classes and intelligence level has come from Boehm (1962), Grinder (1964), and MacRae (1954) among others. The applicability of Piaget's theory to adults is limited, however, because it isn't concerned with development past early adolescence.

Kohlberg has extended Piaget's cognitive theory of moral development. His measurements of moral development are made by analyzing the reasoning behind decisions made on dilemmas concerning such issues as euthanasia (Kohlberg, 1971). He has distinguished four levels of moral thinking: premoral, preconventional, conventional, and principled. At the premoral level the child defines good as that which is egocentrically pleasant with no awareness of societal rules. At the preconventional level the child is responsive to societal labels of right and wrong but has no real moral standard. The first stage at this level is termed the punishment and obedience orientation. At this stage, often referred to as Stage 1, merely the physical consequences of an action are believed to determine its goodness. This stage is similar to Piaget's heteronomous stage in that both are oriented to obedience. The difference between them lies in their interpretation of obedience. According to Piaget, young children have strong emotional respect for authority

and feel unable to judge for themselves. These children usually rely on adult sanctions and commands to define what is right and wrong. Kohlberg believes that Piaget wrongly assumes that young children have deep respect for authority and rules and overlooks the conflict that initially exists between them and their parents. Kohlberg's view is that young children have no respect for authority beyond recognizing that parents are more powerful than they are. In contrast to Piaget, Kohlberg believes that the child's definition of wrong in terms of punishment reflects a realistic and hedonistic desire to avoid punishment, rather than a deep reverence for the adult's view. According to Kohlberg's paradigm, wide respect for rules and authority are not apparent until the conventional level. A higher stage at the preconventional level (Stage 2) is the instrumental relativist orientation. According to Stage 2 reasoning, right action consists of behavior that satisfies one's own needs. Kohlberg's Stage 2 resembles Piaget's autonomous stage especially with respect to relativism and reciprocity. Kohlberg criticizes Piaget's autonomous stage, however, for attributing too much cognitive maturity to children who have attained that stage. Kohlberg believes that children of 10 to 12 years of age, who, according to Piaget, have advanced well into the autonomous stage, are as yet actually far removed from a fully autonomous and mature morality. It is only as the child moves further through Kohlberg's last three stages that such morality

develops.

The conventional level of moral development in Kohlberg's conceptualization is marked by an attitude of conformity to the social order and to the expectations of one's friends and family. The first part of this level, Stage 3 is referred to as the "good boy, nice girl" orientation. Good behavior is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. At Stage 4, the law and order orientation, the focus is on following fixed rules and on maintaining the social order for its own sake.

The postconventional or principled level is marked by an effort to define values which have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles. At Stage 5, the social-contract legalistic orientation, there is a clear awareness of the relativism of personal values and opinions and a corresponding emphasis upon procedural rules for reaching consensus. The universal ethical principle orientation, Stage 6, is characterized by concern for universal principles of justice, the reciprocity and equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons.

According to Kohlberg's paradigm, people progress through an invariant sequence of moral philosophies. In Kohlberg's (1958) initial study, age trends were found which were consistent with the view that his stages are developmental. He found that the frequency of preconven-

tional thinking decreased with age while the incidence of conventional and principled thought increased. A later study (Kohlberg, 1968) involving children from Taiwan, Mexico, Turkey, Yucatan, and the United States provided more evidence for the sequentiality of Stages one through four and their applicability across cultures. Turiel (1966) tested this trend with seventh grade boys. He found that children were more likely to accept and assimilate moral reasoning one stage rather than two stages above their current level. In addition, Rest, Turiel, & Kohlberg (1969) and Blatt & Kohlberg (1973) have found that people find it very difficult to comprehend reasoning from a moral development stage more than one stage above their own. Thus people at similar levels of moral development should have less difficulty communicating (especially in matters relating to moral issues) than those who are widely dissimilar in levels of moral development.

Some support for this hypothesis comes from Coombs' (1966) study and follow-up of computer-matched dates. He found that generally people evaluated as similar in values reported less difficulty in communicating than did those who were dissimilar in value orientation. A similar relationship was found between rated satisfaction with their partners and value orientation. Persons with similar value orientation were more satisfied with their partners than members of dissimilar couples. Further analysis indicated, however, that although value consensus was a contributing

factor, it did not actually explain much of the variability in either partner's satisfaction or communication ease. The relevance of this study to moral development as conceptualized by Kohlberg is actually rather limited. In the Coombs study, value consensus was measured by comparing partner preferences for one another with regard to campus popularity, good looks, fraternity membership, stylish clothes, and dancing ability. In addition, the range of value differences within couples was limited because the computer was, in fact, programmed to match people as closely as possible on the variables.

Kohlberg contends that his theory is designed to predict moral judgment, not moral behavior. He does not claim that a particular stage of thinking determines specific behavior in a particular moral dilemma. This point is illustrated by a study reporting the extent of participation in the 1965 Berkeley Free Speech Movement sit-in by people at different moral judgment levels (Haan, Smith, & Block, 1968). Before the sit-in, moral judgment levels of 957 college students and Peace Corps volunteers were measured. Afterward it was found that most of those classified as preconventional or postconventional had participated in the sit-in, but for different reasons. Interviews of the protesting students revealed that generally the Stage 2 types were participating to further their own personal goals at the college through power tactics while the Stage 6 types were concerned about

universal ideal principles of justice. The moral decisions of both the pre- and post- conventional people thus were manifested in identical behavior although their motives and goals differed.

At a more general level, apart from situations involving a specific moral dilemma, it seems plausible that people at different levels of moral development would interact differently in social situations. Support for this hypothesis comes from Kohlberg (1971) who has outlined the different perspectives that people at various stages of moral development are likely to have on the personal roles of affection and welfare. He describes people at Stage 2 as acquiring friends and being charitable to them to satisfy their own hedonistic desires. People functioning at Stage 3 are said to place much emphasis on the affection they have for someone in determining the extent of their concern for a person's welfare. At Stage 4 a person's loyalty to one's partner or group determines the extent of obligation to one another; they believe that a person should act on the basis of loyalty and not affection. Stage 5 types consider both affection for their family and loyalty to their group but subordinate them to their concern for the welfare of large numbers of people. At Stage 6 the orientation is to the principle of universal human love. The welfare of one person is considered as important as the welfare of the masses at this stage.

One basic unresolved question is whether the communi-

cation of two people who differ widely in levels of moral development would be less efficient and more labored than that of two people similar on this cognitive variable. Another question is whether people at the principled and conventional levels differ in the way in which they typically discuss and decide matters with others. No previous research has sought to answer these questions. The present study is thus directed at exploring the relationship of moral development level to behaviors observable in interpersonal interaction. Specifically, characteristics of the way in which decisions are made by dyads consisting of two principled people, two conventional people, or one principled and one conventional person will be observed. It is expected that couples at similar levels of moral development will differ from those at dissimilar levels. If similarity in preferred moral reasoning is characteristic of a general level of cognitive similarity, then couples similar in moral development may report more agreement and smoothness in their relationships than couples dissimilar in moral development. In addition it is thought that verbal communication characteristics of principled people will differ from those of conventional people. Because abstract and empathic reasoning is characteristic of the principled level while the conventional level is typified by great concern for following set rules and traditions, the couples containing two principled people should engage in more empathic discussions (i.e.

ask more questions of each other and when summarizing the discussion include the views of both people) than the couples containing two conventional people. In couples containing a principled and a conventional person only the principled member may exhibit this facilitation during the discussions. A third hypothesis is that sex differences will be found in dissimilar couples depending upon which member of the couple is at the higher level of moral development. Although recent societal changes have lessened the distinction between male and female roles, there may be less conflict in couples in which the male is at a higher level than in couples in which the female is at a higher level of moral development.

In summary, the present study seeks to examine the relationship between one's cognitive level of moral development and an element of one's interpersonal behavior. Because intimate personal and sexual relationships constitute a potentially critical event in moral development (Gilligan, 1974), the examination of verbal interaction in these relationships may reveal significant effects of moral development.

METHOD

Subjects. The participants were 37 unmarried couples who had been dating each other regularly although not necessarily exclusively. At least one member of each pair was a student attending the College of William and Mary. The average age of the women was 19.27 years and the average age of the men was 19.81 years. Participants of both sexes ranged in age from 18 to 23 years. According to written self-reports each couple spent an average of 40.51 hours per week with each other (SD = 27.22) and had known each other for an average of 2.26 years (SD = 2.65). Couples in the four experimental groups did not differ in age, length of acquaintance, or hours per week spent together.

Apparatus. The first questionnaire that was distributed (see Appendix C) contained the Defining Issues Test (DIT) which was a short, objectively-scored version (Rest, Cooper, Coder, Masanz & Anderson, 1974) of Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview (Kohlberg, 1971). People were simply instructed to rate and rank prepared statements reflecting their attitudes toward various moral dilemmas. Each of the prepared statements was indicative of either

a Stage 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 orientation or of an anarchistic or a pretentious orientation. The anarchistic orientation has been regarded as a transitional stage between Stages 4 and 5 (Rest, 1973). Statements characteristic of a pretentious orientation were lofty-sounding but meaningless and were included in the DIT to detect to detect people who selected statements on the basis of their complexity without understanding them (Rest, 1973). From the rankings a "P - score" was derived. This was based on the weighting people gave to statements indicative of the principled level of Kohlberg's sequence of stages. A correlation of .68 has been found between the P - score from the DIT and rankings by stage type using the global rating method on the Moral Judgment Interview (Rest, et al, 1974). The inability of people to fake higher stages on the DIT has been demonstrated by McGeorge (1975).

An additional short questionnaire composed by the experimenter was attached to the DIT as Part II of the initial questionnaire. It contained questions concerning the number of months that the members of a couple had been acquainted, the number of hours per week that they spent together when school was in session, and the amount of time they spent together during school vacations. These three measures, which can loosely be referred to as dimensions of closeness, were scaled and summed to compose

a "closeness rating."

The Individual Preference Questionnaire which was administered later was composed of five questions (see Appendix F). On this questionnaire each person was asked to rank three answers in order of preference to each of the following five questions: 1) What famous person would you most like to meet? 2) What magazine would you like to receive regularly? 3) If you could fly anywhere for a day where would you go? 4) If you had the time and the money to go away from campus (or away from home) during the weekend with your girl or boy friend, what would you want to do? 5) From the list below select three adjectives which best describe your relationship with your girl or boy friend. Restrictions were placed on the answers to two of the above questions. The magazine selected to be received regularly could not be either Time or Newsweek because of the widespread popularity of these magazines among a college population. It was felt that eliminating these magazines would increase the probability of initial disagreement on this question. Also, the participants were asked to select their answers to the fifth question from a list of adjectives. Most of these adjectives were taken from Block & Thomas' (1955) adjective Q-set, but because the adjectives in this list were all designed to be descriptive of a person, some modification of the list was necessary. Adjectives that were judged to be inappropriate descriptions of a rela-

tionship (e.g. absent-minded, feminine) were thus eliminated and other adjectives that were considered appropriate were added (e.g. stormy, sensuous). In addition, those adjectives which seemed widely applicable and very positive (e.g. sincere, considerate) were eliminated from the list to prevent couples from merely picking a safely positive choice in lieu of discussing alternatives.

The same five questions appearing on the Individual Preference Questionnaire (with only slight alterations in wording so that the question was addressed to a couple instead of an individual) were typed on separate pages so that at the beginning of each discussion each person could have a copy of the question to be discussed (see Appendix G). The Joint Preference Answer Sheet given to each couple during the taped discussion was merely a sheet of paper with five numbered blanks with space for only one conjoint answer per question (see Appendix H).

The final questionnaire (see Appendix I) was composed of questions from Locke & Williamson's (1958) Marital Adjustment Inventory (MAI), Navran's (1967) revision of the Primary Communication Inventory (PCI)(Locke, Sabagh, & Thomas, 1956), and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS)(Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). Although the MAI and the PCI were originally designed for married couples, they were used in the present study because of the absence of standardized written inventories for unmarried couples. When the MAI was factor analyzed

(Locke & Williamson, 1958) two of the factors which emerged were "agreement" and "affectional intimacy." Six of the eleven questions which comprised the agreement factor were considered appropriate for a description of unmarried couples. These were items one through six on the final questionnaire. Such topics as "agree on in-laws" and "never wish we had not married" were among those considered inappropriate. Of the seven items comprising the second factor, four were considered appropriate. On the basis of these items (e.g. never or rarely get on each other's nerves, agree on sex relations) this factor was renamed "smoothness." The questions denoting smoothness were items 5, 7, 8, and 9 on the final questionnaire. The PCI, which was created to measure "communication in marriage" consists of 25 questions such as "How often does your spouse sult or pout? Do you and your spouse talk over things you disagree about or have difficulties over?" A person responds by checking the appropriate answer: "very frequently, frequently, occasionally, or never." References to "spouse" in the PCI were changed to "friend" and those questions which began with "do you" or "does your" were changed to begin with "how often" to make the questions clearer. In the final questionnaire the PCI items were numbered 10 through 34. The MCSDS was designed to detect those people who responded to questionnaire items consistently in a socially desirable and thus probably inaccurate manner. Positive

responses to the following two statements, for example, are indicative of a socially desirable response set: "I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake." The MCSDC items were numbered 35 through 67 on the final questionnaire.

Procedure. Participation was solicited through an advertisement in the College of William and Mary's student-run newspaper (see Appendix A) and through personal solicitation in introductory and advanced undergraduate psychology courses, dormitories, fraternity houses and at sorority meetings and wedding receptions. Prospective participants were told that in order to take part they must have a special opposite-sex friend that they see on a regular basis. A total of 160 couples, mostly students at the College of William and Mary, volunteered for the initial phase of the study by returning a coupon from either the newspaper advertisement or a widely distributed information sheet (see Appendix B). The first questionnaire (which included the DIT) was delivered to the dormitory rooms or mailed to off-campus apartments of the people who returned the coupons. People slow in returning the questionnaire were sent reminders (see Appendix D). Questionnaires from both members of a dyad were returned by 50% of the original 160 couples.

Based on a frequency distribution, the top one-third of the P - scores were labeled "principled." At

face validity this label seems appropriate. Out of the 10 points assigned to a stage on the basis of the rankings for one dilemma, at least six of those points must be assigned to Stages 5 or 6 for the person to be labeled "principled." The bottom one-third of the P - scores were labeled "conventional." To qualify for this classification a person must get at least 60 % of the points in stages below Stage 5. People in the principled group who consistently ranked the pretentious statements high and people in either classification who showed a marked inconsistency between their ratings and rankings of the statements were eliminated from the study in accordance with the scoring guidelines set by Rest (1973).

On the basis of their performance on the DIT, 44 of the couples (55%) met the criteria for inclusion into one of the four groups of interest. The four groups were those in which 1) both members scored in the principled range (PP), 2) the woman scored in the principled range and the man scored in the conventional range (PC), 3) the man scored in the principled range and the woman scored in the conventional range (CP), and 4) both members scored in the conventional range (CC). Each of these couples was contacted to participate in a half-hour taped discussion. In a letter (see Appendix E) hand-delivered to them it was explained that they each would be paid \$4.00 for participating in the taped discussion and for completing a final questionnaire. Seven of the couples

who qualified chose not to participate further.

Just prior to the beginning of the taping session both members of a couple were given the Individual Preference Questionnaire to complete. After these were completed the couple was given a short tour of the Social Psychology Laboratory and then seated in front of a table in a small room. The room had one exposed two-way mirror in it and a 4' X 7' curtain covering a second two-way mirror. After seating the couples the experimenter informed the couples:

"On the other side of the two-way mirror is a tape recorder. During your discussion I will be in the next room monitoring the tape recorder. No one but myself and Dr. Ventis, who is a psychology professor here at William and Mary, will be on the other side of the mirror at any time. The reason I am taping your discussion is to allow me to analyze it later. I will score all of the tapes myself, but it will be necessary to get a second rater to score part of the tapes to enable me to measure the reliability of my ratings. The person who rates these randomly-selected tapes will have no personal acquaintance with any of the rated couples, and only a couple's number will be used for tape identification.

"I realize that this is a somewhat artificial situation, being in a social psychology lab and discussing questions, but I'm interested in getting a sample of the way in which you typically interact so I'd like you to try to act as naturally as possible. In the other room you each answered five questions. Now I'd like you to answer five similar questions, but this time you must both decide on one answer between the two of you. During the discussion you may or may not want to mention the answers you previously gave. It is up to you individually. First of all, however, after I hand out the first question I want you to read and think about it for a short while. In order to assure that you each have time to individually consider the question and to give me time to go into the other room and turn on the tape recorder, I'll use this lamp to signal the start of the discussion. When this light comes on, begin

discussing the question aloud. When you have agreed on one answer, say "agreed" so I will know that you are finished with your discussion of the question. The light will go out when you have come to the end of your discussion and have said "agreed." Then, write your answer on the line provided on this answer sheet. After you have reached agreement on this question and have written your answer I will return to this room to give you the second question. Do you have any questions? Please do not talk until the light comes on."

The lamp indicating the start of the discussion was turned on two seconds after the tape recorder was started. At the conclusion of the fifth discussion the couples were each given the final questionnaire and asked to return it in two weeks.

The 15 behavioral measures which were calculated for each couple on the basis of their taped discussions are listed below. In previous studies (Farina, 1960; Hetherington & Frankie, 1967; Hetherington, Stouwie & Ridberg, 1971), the first five items have been assumed to measure dominance and the next six, conflict. The last six were devised by the author to measure verbal facilitation of the decision-making process. A more detailed description of the rating procedure can be found in Appendix J.

1. Speaks first or last - The number of times the female member of the couple spoke first plus the number of times the female member spoke last during a discussion of one of the questions minus the number of times the male member spoke first minus the number of times the male spoke last.

2. Passive acceptance of solution - The number of times in discussing the five questions that the male passively accepted the other's solution minus the number of times the other behaved similarly. A simple unelaborated agreement in response to the friend's solution constituted passive acceptance.
3. Individual's speaking time - The percentage of the total speaking time that the female member of the couple spoke.
4. Yielding - An objective rating of how much the final conjoint answer differed from each individual's original answer. The rating was based on a five-point scale ranging from -2 (denoting male's first choice which was unranked by female) to +2 (female's choice not ranked by male).
5. Successful interruptions - The number of successful interruptions by the female member of the couple minus the number of successful interruptions by the male.
6. Simultaneous speech - The number of instances per unit time during the taped discussion that both people spoke concurrently.
7. Total interruptions - The number of occasions per unit time that a person was interrupted (not necessarily successfully).
8. Disagreements and aggressions - The number of instances per unit time that one person disagreed or aggressed against another during the discussion. It

incorporates simple contradictions, sarcasm, or any clear reaction of shock to a proposed solution.

9. Total decision time - The amount of time that the couple takes to come to an agreement on the final joint solution.

10. F+M Summary statements - The number of statements made which further the solution by summarizing the progress or present position of both people (e.g. "We both agree that we would want to vacation somewhere in Virginia. The question now is where, specifically?").

11. F-M Summary statements - The number of summary statements made by the female minus the number made by the male.

12. F+M Non-contributing statements - The number of statements made which appear irrelevant to the discussion of the question.

13. F-M Non-contributing statements - The number of non-contributing statements made by the female minus those made by the male.

14. F+M Questions asked - The number of questions asked for which answers were expected (i.e. rhetorical questions not included).

15. F-M Questions asked - The number of questions asked by the female minus the number of questions asked by the male.

These 15 variables were measured separately for each of the five discussions and then were summed across all five

discussions for each couple. The resulting 15 scores for each couple and the four overall ratings of dominance, conflict, F+M facilitation, and F-M facilitation (which were computed by separately summing the z-scores of the above clusters) were used in the major portion of the data analysis. In addition the fifth discussion was analyzed separately because the experimenter felt that the fifth question had particular relevance for dating couples and might result in different interaction patterns than the other four questions could.

The tapes of fifteen randomly-selected couples were rated by a second judge to determine interrater reliabilities of the measures which were scored with some subjectivity. The average Pearson correlation coefficient of interrater reliability for the 12 subjectively-scored variables (see Appendix K) was .75 when all five discussions were analyzed together and .58 when the fifth discussion was examined separately. The low reliability coefficients for the variables of "F+M summary statements, F-M non-contributing statements, and F-M summary statements" is probably largely due to the low frequency of occurrence of these behaviors. A disagreement on the rating of one summary statement adversely affected the reliability more than a disagreement on the rating of a more frequently occurring behavior such as the number of questions asked because of the smaller range of scores in the former variable. The number of successful inter-

ruptions was considered by both raters to be the most difficult variable to rate. Inconsistencies in the scoring may be the result of the specific scoring guidelines which (according to both raters) did not always coincide with the rater's own intuitive evaluation of the variable. The rater was thus constantly being torn between what intuitively seemed to be an interruption and what was actually a scorable interruption according to the experimental guidelines. This reliability could probably be improved in future studies by employing more experienced raters or by making the scoring criteria less detailed.

The final questionnaire provided self-reported information from each individual member of a couple concerning their relationship. Scores denoting 1) general agreement on relevant issues, 2) smoothness of their daily interaction, 3) dyadic communication efficacy and 4) the tendency to respond in a socially desirable way on the questionnaire were tallied for each person. One score for each of these four variables was then computed for each couple by summing their two scores. Comparisons of the questionnaire responses of couples in the four moral pattern groups were made.

RESULTS

The means and standard deviations of the questionnaire variables for each of the four dyadic moral pattern groups are listed in Table 1. A summary of the observational scores summed across all five discussion is reported in Table 2. The two groups containing couples that were similar in level of moral development (PP, CC) were pooled and compared to the (pooled) couples that were dissimilar (PC, CP). T - tests revealed no significant differences between the two groups on any of the questionnaire variables. A statistical difference was found on an observational measure, however. In the similar group, men made a higher proportion of passive acceptances of the conjoint solution than the women although this was not true in the dissimilar group ($t = 2.079$, $df = 34$, $p < .05$). Unfortunately this finding is somewhat misleading because no one in the CC group ever actually passively accepted any one of the five conjoint solutions.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance which was performed to determine whether differences existed between the four moral pattern groups revealed no significant differences on the questionnaire variables. A difference between groups was found, however, for the observational variable

"passive acceptance of solution" ($F_{3,33} = 3.141, p < .038$). The men in PP couples more often accepted without comment the solution that the woman proposed than the men in PC couples ($t = 2.73, df = 24, p < .02$); the magnitude of this effect (Friedman, 1969) was moderate ($r_m > .37$). Differences between groups on the variable of "F-M questions asked" approached significance ($F_{3,33} = 2.08, p < .122$). Women belonging to CC couples generally asked more questions than their male friend while women belonging to CP couples tended to ask fewer questions than their male friend ($t = 1.87, df = 10, p < .10, r_m > .48$).

A Two-Way Analysis of Variance which was used to assess possible differential effects of the specific dyadic moral patterns on women and men contributed little more to the analysis. The only significant finding was a Women X Men interaction on the observational variable of "F-M questions asked" ($F_{1,33} = 5.196, p < .05$). Conventional women asked more questions than their male friend when they were paired with a conventional man than when paired with a principled man.

Exploration of differences which were not detected by preliminary ANOVAs revealed that the rate of simultaneous speech was higher in the CC dyads than in the CP dyads ($t = 2.671, df = 10, p < .05, r_m > .58$). More F+M summary statements were made during discussions by PP than by PC couples ($t = 2.314, df = 25, p < .05, r_m > .42$). Other differences were found which approached significance with

a moderate effect. First of all, women in CP dyads made more successful interruptions than their male friend whereas this trend reversed for the PP couples ($t = 1.79$, $df = 16$, $p < .10$, $r_m > .39$). Secondly, the CC couples had higher F+M facilitation scores than PC couples; thus generally more summary statements were made, more questions were asked, and fewer non-contributing statements were made in discussions by CC than by PC dyads ($t = 1.90$, $df = 19$, $p < .10$, $r_m > .40$).

When the observational variables were examined separately for the discussion of the fifth question (see Table 3), the PC couples were found to have slight female dominance while the CP couples tended toward male dominance on the variable of "speaks first and last" ($t = 2.13$, $df = 21$, $p < .05$, $r_m > .40$). No significant differences were found between groups for the variable "passive acceptance;" in fact, there were no instances of passive acceptance of the conjoint solution in PP, CP, or CC groups and only one (by a man) in the PC group. The conjoint answer in the CC group resembled the woman's preference more often than either the CP ($t = 4.04$, $df = 9$, $p < .01$) or the PP groups ($t = 2.46$, $df = 12$, $p < .05$).

In addition to comparisons between the four dyadic groups, the decision times for each of the five questions were compared with each other (see Table 4). T - tests indicated that couples generally took longer to agree on a conjoint answer to the fifth question (in which they

were asked to select an adjective characteristic of their relationship) than to the first question which pertained to famous people ($t = 2.23$, $df = 35$, $p < .05$), the second question which was concerned with magazines ($t = 2.42$, $df = 35$, $p < .05$), or the fourth question which pertained to weekend plans ($t = 2.18$, $df = 35$, $p < .05$).

The reason more significant differences were not found in the data analysis might have been due to the somewhat lax criteria for inclusion into one of the four groups. The groups were thus defined more stringently for further analysis. Instead of using the top and bottom 33% of the P - scores, only the top 30% (P - scores of 34 and above) and the bottom 30% (P scores of 22 and below) were included. There were twelve instances of P - scores of 32 or 33 which previously were acceptable and nine instances of P - scores of 23, 24, or 25 which also had previously been included in the study. An additional restriction imposed to enhance between-group differentiation was to require a difference of at least ten P - score points in members of PC and CP couples and a difference of not more than three P - score points in couples regarded as similar in moral development (PP or CC couples). Eight couples in PC or CP failed to meet the 10-point criterion and three couples in PP or CC failed to meet the three-point criterion. After all the restrictions were instituted, five couples in PP, eight in PC, and none in either CP or CC remained. The PP and PC dyads were then compared on the

measures that had been summed across all five discussions. The difference found mirrored that previously found with the less stringently defined groups. The PP group scored higher on passive acceptance (denoting more passive acceptance by the male) than the PC group ($t = 2.12$, $df = 12$, $p < .06$, $r_m > .51$). The less stringent criteria were thus considered adequate for the purposes of the present investigation because of the similarities between the groups which were formed by the highly stringent criteria and those formed by less stringent criteria.

Significant ($p < .05$) Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the questionnaire and observational variables across all four of the moral pattern groups are reported in Table 5. Significant correlations within each moral pattern group are listed in Tables 6 through 9.

Incidental findings in the present study included the following. Overall, women in this sample made higher P - scores ($X = 32.8$, $SD = 8.2$) than the men ($X = 28.6$, $SD = 8.4$) although the effect was small ($t = 3.10$, $df = 146$, $p < .01$, $r_m > .23$). A Chi-Square analysis revealed that the men more often scored over the acceptable ceiling on the pretentiousness scale of the DIT than the women ($\chi^2 = 17.98$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$).

TABLE 1

Means (\bar{X}) and Standard Deviations (SD) of the Questionnaire Variables for the Four Moral Pattern Groups

Variables	PP		PC		CP		CC	
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD
Agreement	1.30	0.95	2.12	1.82	2.00	1.63	2.00	1.00
Smoothness	3.20	2.53	3.87	1.96	3.86	2.41	3.00	0.00
Communication*	103.60	20.90	103.69	14.95	109.86	15.63	110.00	9.00
Social Desirability	26.10	8.40	22.50	8.86	17.86	11.32	20.33	9.50
Length of Acquaintance (yrs.)	1.72	1.55	2.85	3.43	1.64	1.50	2.37	3.23
Closeness Rating	8.60	2.76	8.94	1.88	8.71	2.69	9.00	3.56

* the lower the score the better the communication

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations of the Observational Measures Based on All Five Discussions

Variables	PP		PC		CP		CC	
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD
Speaks First, Last	-2.20	4.47	-.75	4.55	-3.43	3.78	-.50	5.51
Passive Acceptance	.40	.52	-.19	.54	.14	.38	.00	.00
Percent of Time Female Speaks	47.80	10.18	45.87	9.51	47.29	8.84	38.50	3.70
Yielding	-.70	8.74	-2.19	9.84	-2.71	12.87	6.00	11.34
Successful F-M Interruptions	-.60	3.24	.37	3.74	2.86	4.74	.00	2.58
No. Instances of Simultaneous Speech	11.10	10.03	8.19	6.43	7.57	2.44	18.00	16.85
Rate of Simul. Speech (# per min.)	.83	.64	.76	.54	.52	.20	.88	.24
No. of Interruptions	13.40	12.26	8.50	6.60	13.14	17.34	19.50	19.82
Rate of Interruptions (# per min.)	1.07	.76	.77	.61	.78	.77	.91	.23
No. of Disagreements & Aggressions	10.00	15.36	7.44	5.90	12.00	12.37	12.00	9.83
Rate of Disagree. & Agg (# per min)	.63	.68	.55	.40	.62	.41	.65	.43
Total Decision Time (min.)	12.37	6.51	14.76	10.70	15.94	6.42	19.60	16.43
No. of F+M Non-contributing Statements	1.70	3.30	1.56	5.24	.71	1.11	.00	.00
No. of F+M Questions Asked	15.90	6.59	21.37	10.90	23.29	16.82	20.75	5.31
No. of F+M Summary Statements	1.30	1.64	.75	1.15	1.14	1.77	1.50	.58
No. of F-M Non-contributing Statements	.50	1.78	.31	.79	-.43	1.27	.00	.00
No. of F-M Questions Asked	2.20	5.63	.75	6.28	-1.00	9.98	9.25	5.44
No. of F-M Summary Statements	.50	1.08	.12	.88	.00	.82	.50	1.29
Dominance Summed Score*	.51	2.70	-.33	2.64	.41	2.13	-.06	1.40
Conflict Summed Score*	.19	3.75	-.11	1.82	.29	1.96	.95	2.40
F+M Facilitation Summed Score	-.31	1.16	-.20	.89	.51	1.89	.75	.95
F-M Facilitation Summed Score	.09	1.44	-.23	1.83	-.11	2.00	1.50	1.96

* Rates (not number of instances) of simultaneous speech, interruptions, and disagreements & aggressions were included.

TABLE 3
Means and Standard Deviations of the Observational Measures Based on the Fifth Discussion

Variables	PP		PC		CP		CC	
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD
Speaks First, Last	-.40	1.26	.50	1.15	-.57	.97	.00	1.63
Passive Acceptance	.00	.00	-.06	.25	.00	.00	.00	.00
Percent of Time Female Speaks	47.80	14.30	47.50	13.71	48.28	13.69	42.00	8.28
Yielding	-.40	4.03	-.18	5.38	-3.42	3.69	5.00	2.44
Successful F-M Interruptions	.30	1.49	.43	1.20	.71	2.21	.50	2.38
No. Instances of Simultaneous Speech	3.90	5.48	2.00	1.71	2.14	1.67	2.00	1.82
Rate of Simul. Speech (# per min.)	.69	.82	.61	.57	.38	.41	.44	.38
No. of Interruptions	4.30	5.85	1.81	1.83	2.57	2.07	2.25	2.63
Rate of Interruptions (# per min.)	.52	.33	.68	.66	.59	.49	.53	.64
No. of Disagreements & Aggressions	4.00	8.29	2.12	2.18	5.14	7.44	4.50	5.44
Rate of Disagree. & Agg. (# per min)	.56	.84	.50	.56	.73	.67	.13	.16
Total Decision Time (min.)	4.59	4.36	3.84	2.44	5.35	4.17	3.99	.92
F+M Non-contributing Statements	.50	1.58	.81	2.74	.00	.00	.00	.00
F+M Questions Asked	3.90	2.02	5.43	3.03	8.14	9.19	5.00	2.70
F+M Summary Statements	.80	1.22	.43	.51	.57	.78	.50	.57
F-M Non-contributing Statements	.50	1.78	.31	.79	-.43	1.27	.00	.00
F-M Questions Asked	2.20	5.63	.75	6.29	-1.00	9.98	9.25	5.44
F-M Summary Statements	.50	1.08	.12	.88	.00	.82	.50	1.29

TABLE 4

Means and Standard Deviations of Decision Time (min) for Each of the Five Questions

	Question Being Discussed				
	First (Famous Person)	Second (Magazine)	Third (Fly for Day)	Fourth (Weekend)	Fifth (Adjective)
\bar{X}	2.23	2.09	2.68	2.28	4.34
SD	1.56	1.62	3.03	1.44	3.25

TABLE 5

Significant^a Intercorrelations of the Questionnaire and Observational Items Across All Moral Pattern Groups

	2	6	9	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	22	23	24	25
1. Agreement	.60*					-.41										
2. Smoothness												-.34				
3. Communication				-.35				.42*								
4. Social Desirability						-.45*		-.36								-.39
5. Length of Acquaintance (yrs.)			.52*													
6. Closeness Rating																
7. Speaks First, Last												.54*	.49*			
8. Passive Acceptance			.50*									.34	.35	.48*		
9. Percent of Time Female Speaks							.38							.79*		
10. Yielding														.46*		
11. Successful F-M Interruptions										.78*						
12. Rate of Simul. Speech (# per min)														.61*		
13. Rate of Interruptions (# per min)									-.39					.63*		
14. Rate of Disagree. & Ass (# per min)									.40	.60*	.35	.42*		.59*	.51*	
15. Total Decision Time (min)														.34	.34	
16. No. of F+M Non-contrib. Statements										.45*	.41					-.38
17. No. of F+M Questions Asked														.53*		
18. No. of F+M Summary Statements														.56*		
19. No. of F-M Non-contrib. Statements																-.41
20. No. of F-M Questions Asked													.36	.40		
21. No. of F-M Summary Statements													.45*			.38*
22. Dominance Summed Score																.43*
23. Conflict Summed Score										.36						.68*
24. F+M Facilitation Score																
25. F-M Facilitation Score																.41

^a p < .05 unless otherwise specified
 * p < .01

TABLE 6

Significant^a Intercorrelations of the Questionnaire and Observational Items Within the PP Group^b

	1	5	11	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	22	23	24
1. Agreement														
2. Smoothness	.85*													
3. Communication						.74	.83*	.69						
4. Social Desirability														
5. Length of Acquaintance (yrs.)														
6. Closeness Rating														
7. Speaks First, Last														
8. Passive Acceptance														
9. Percent of Time Female Speaks														
10. Yielding														
11. Successful F-M Interruptions														
12. Rate of Simul. Speech (# per min)														
13. Rate of Interruptions (# per min)														
14. Rate of Disagree. & AGS (# per min)														
15. Total Decision Time (min)														
16. No. of F+M Non-contrib. Statements														
17. No. of F+M Questions Asked														
18. No. of F+M Summary Statements														
19. No. of F-M Non-contrib. Statements														
20. No. of F-M Questions Asked														
21. No. of F-M Summary Statements														
22. Dominance Summed Score														
23. Conflict Summed Score														
24. F+M Facilitation Score														
25. F-M Facilitation Score														

a $p < .05$ unless otherwise specified

b N = 10

* $p < .01$

TABLE 8

Significant^a Intercorrelations of the Questionnaire and Observational Items Within the CP Group^b

	1	2	3	5	8	9	14	16	18	20	22	23	24	25
1. Agreement														
2. Smoothness	.80													
3. Communication	-.75	-.83												
4. Social Desirability	.77	.87	-.83											
5. Length of Acquaintance (yrs.)				.76										.86
6. Closeness Rating														
7. Speaks First, Last														
8. Passive Acceptance														
9. Percent of Time Female Speaks														
10. Yielding						-.77								
11. Successful F-M Interruptions				-.92*										
12. Rate of Simul. Speech (# per min)														
13. Rate of Interruptions (# per min)														.84
14. Rate of Disagree. & AGS (# per min)														
15. Total Decision Time (min)				.81	.80	.91*			.87	.86				.79
16. No. of F+M Non-contrib. Statements					.94*									
17. No. of F+M Questions Asked														
18. No. of F+M Summary Statements														
19. No. of F-M Non-contrib. Statements						.80								
20. No. of F-M Questions Asked					.88*	.76								
21. No. of F-M Summary Statements				.82		.78								.97*
22. Dominance Summed Score														
23. Conflict Summed Score														.84
24. F+M Facilitation Score														
25. F-M Facilitation Score														

^a p < .05 unless otherwise specified

^b N = 7

* p < .01

TABLE 9

Significant^a Intercorrelations of the Questionnaire and Observational Items Within the CC Group^b

	1	4	12	14	17	20	23	25
1. Agreement								
2. Smoothness								
3. Communication					-1.00 ^c			
4. Social Desirability								
5. Length of Acquaintance (yrs.)								
6. Closeness Rating								
7. Speaks First, Last								1.00*
8. Passive Acceptance								
9. Percent of Time Female Speaks		-1.00	1.00					
10. Yielding						-1.00		
11. Successful F-M Interruptions								
12. Rate of Simul. Speech (# per min)								
13. Rate of Interruptions (# per min)								
14. Rate of Disagree. & Arg (# per min)								
15. Total Decision Time (min)								
16. No. of F+M Non-contrib. Statements								
17. No. of F+M Questions Asked							1.00	
18. No. of F+M Summary Statements								
19. No. of F-M Non-contrib. Statements								
20. No. of F-M Questions Asked								
21. No. of F-M Summary Statements						1.00		1.00*
22. Dominance Summed Score								1.00
23. Conflict Summed Score								
24. F+M Facilitation Score								
25. F-M Facilitation Score								

a p < .05 unless otherwise specified

b N = 3

c values are rounded off to nearest hundredth

* p < .01

DISCUSSION

Validity of Questionnaire and Observational Measures

Two different approaches to measuring agreement (namely self-report and direct observation) and the resulting convergence and divergence of appropriate measures provide support for its empirical validity. It was found that the higher the self-reported agreement, the better the self-rated smoothness of the relationship and the lower the rate of behavioral disagreements and aggressions. Evidence for the validity of other variables was also found. The better the self-rated communication efficacy, the smoother the relationship was rated and the more questions that were asked during the discussions. A puzzling positive correlation between communication efficacy and rate of simultaneous speech was found, however. It would seem that a low or zero rate of simultaneous speech would be typical of couples rating their communication efficacy high. It is possible, though, that a high rate of simultaneous speech indicates active involvement in a discussion by both people. More issues may be discussed, and discussed more thoroughly, than in discussions in which one or both people are more passive.

Of the dominance measures only "passive acceptance

of solution" and "percentage of the time that the female speaks" were significantly positively correlated. All of the dominance measures except for "successful F - M interruptions," however, were significantly positively correlated with the summed dominance score. Thus although there were few consistent significant relationships among the measures of dominance, all but one were significantly positively related to the general summed dominance score. Likewise, of all the conflict measures, only the rates of simultaneous speech and interruptions were significantly positively correlated with each other. All of the conflict measures were positively correlated with the summed conflict score, however. It was found that the more non-contributing statements made during the five discussions, the more questions that were asked and the more summary statements that were made. This makes the non-contributing variable appear more like a measure of verbal participation than of non-facilitation of the discussion. This idea is supported by the finding that total decision time is also positively correlated with total number of non-contributing statements. As could be expected, only the number of F+M questions asked and the number of F+M summary statements were significantly positively correlated with the facilitation (F+M) score. None of the measures of F-M facilitation correlated significantly with each other; all three of them were positively correlated with the summed F-M facilitation score, however.

One problem with the validity of some of the measures is that they are positively correlated with a measure of social desirability. Although overall, social desirability ratings were positively correlated with three observational measures, an analysis by moral pattern groups revealed distinct differences between groups. Those couples in the PP group who scored high on social desirability had a lower rate of disagreements and aggressions, lower summed conflict scores, made fewer F+M summary statements, fewer F-M non-contributing statements, and also lower F+M facilitation scores. This indicates that those PP couples who completed the final questionnaire with more socially desirable answers than would normally be expected, also showed less conflict or disagreement and less verbal facilitation. Or, from another perspective, the more that PP couples endorsed socially desirable items on a questionnaire, the less likely that their members appeared assertive in the taped interaction. In the CC group the higher a couple scored on the social desirability measure the higher percentage of the time that the male member spoke and the lower the rate of simultaneous speech. The CC couples may see the dominant male as more socially desirable than a dominant female and also regard simultaneous speech as undesirable when they are trying to look their best. Unlike the other groups, within the CP group the only measures that positively correlated with the social desirability measure were the

questionnaire variables -- and every one of them was highly correlated. In CP couples the higher their score on the social desirability scale, the more agreeable couples reported they were, the smoother they claimed their relationship was and the better they reported they communicated. The results of the questionnaire variables for the CP group thus must be interpreted cautiously because of the likelihood that they were reporting their agreement, smoothness, and communication better than it actually was. No variables correlated significantly with social desirability for the PC couples. Of all the groups, theirs was most likely to be free from the influence of the motivation to "look good."

Verbal Interaction of Couples Rated Similar or Dissimilar in Moral Development

In the present study neither the groups similar in moral development (CC, PP) nor those dissimilar (PC, CP) constituted a homogeneous group in terms of their verbal interaction characteristics. It was expected that those couples that were composed of people who preferred similar types of moral reasoning would communicate more easily and efficiently than those couples composed of people preferring dissimilar types of moral reasoning. No evidence was found to support this hypothesis. Dyadic verbal communication may thus be more affected by the actual levels of moral development of the members of the couple rather than just their similarity of moral devel-

opment.

Dominance in the Verbal Interaction of Principled and Conventional People

People at the principled level appeared to take more of a dominant role in dyadic verbal interaction when the question being discussed was most relevant to them. This is illustrated by the men in PP couples who occasionally accepted the conjoint solution passively in the first four discussions, but (like their female friend) did not passively accept the conjoint answer for the fifth question. A second example of the dominance of principled people in the fifth discussion involves couples with mixed levels of moral development. The PC women and CP men more often spoke first and last during discussion number five than their conventional girl or boy friends. It is possible that principled people (especially men) felt that the first four questions were not relevant or important enough to realistically discuss. This would help to explain their change in verbal behavior from the first four discussions to the fifth one.

An interesting observation is the dominance exhibited by conventional women when all five discussions are analyzed. Overall, women in CC couples got their choice of answers in the dyadic discussion more often than women in the CP or PP groups. The longer a CP couple had known each other, however, the more the dominance score became indicative of female dominance.

Considering also the evidence of female dominance in PP and PC groups for the first four discussions which was previously mentioned, there appears to be a general tendency for the female to be verbally dominant, regardless of the level of moral development, except in situations perceived as particularly important by the male member of the couple. In such relevant situations (such as the fifth discussion) the principled people, regardless of sex, tend to possess more verbally dominant characteristics.

Conflict in the Verbal Interaction of Principled and Conventional People

Few differences between moral pattern groups were found for any of the conflict measures. Generally CP couples had the lowest rate of simultaneous speech while the CC couples had the highest rate. The longer the CP couples had known each other, however, the higher their rate of simultaneous speech and the longer their decision time. This increase in what the present study terms "conflict" with increasing length of acquaintance initially seemed paradoxical. If one perceives the development of a dyadic relationship as progressing from a formalized, polite stage to a more informal and intense level, however, the initial passiveness and later assertiveness of the people involved becomes less confusing. Actually "conflict" may be too harsh a label for these measures. Perhaps they really reflect only how actively

a person participates in a discussion.

Facilitation of Discussions by Principled and Conventional People

The hypothesis that PP couples would engage in more facilitative behavior than CC couples during the discussions was not supported; in fact, the trend was in the opposite direction especially with regard to non-contributing statements and questions asked. Because the CC couples not only had the highest F+M facilitation scores, but also the highest rates of simultaneous speech, perhaps these facilitation measures are more indicative of verbal participation than of discussion facilitation. Or, perhaps a high degree of verbal activity in the discussion promotes good communication through a speedy exchange of ideas.

Once again there is evidence that women are verbally more active in the discussions. The women in the highly facilitative CC group asked an average of nine more questions than the CC men during the five discussions.

Sex Differences in Dyadic Interaction

Since theoretically the CP couples more closely conform to the traditional (male-dominant) dating relationship than PC couples, it was thought that CP couples might exhibit less conflict in their discussions than PC couples. The finding that CP couples had the lowest rate of simultaneous speech supports this. Also lending credibility to this conclusion was the measure showing

that the CP couples had higher F+M facilitation scores than the PC couples. Thus, there is some evidence to support this hypothesis although it cannot be considered conclusive.

Couples Declining to Participate in the Taped Discussions

After the data was collected it was determined that the couples who refused or were unable to participate in the taped interaction gave explanations which generally differed according to the moral pattern groups. Both of the PP couples that declined to participate had broken up and were no longer speaking to each other. Two other PP couples had recently altered their relationship to make it less exclusive but were still friends and consented to participate in the taped interaction. Of the three PC couples that declined to participate, two stated that it was too inconvenient because their friend lived out of town. The third PC couple had recently stopped dating and was on uncertain terms. In the CC group the men belonging to two couples merely stated that they were unwilling to participate. A third CC couple refused to return the final questionnaire after the taped discussion; the male member stated that his female friend did not want to answer the questions. All CP couples that were invited to participate further did so and also completed and returned the final questionnaire. From these brief anecdotal observations it appears that the PP couple's relationship is the least stable because they have the

highest break-up rate. The CC couples appear to be the most defensive and the least interested in revealing their communication patterns to others. The CP couples seem to be more tolerant to this sort of research and have one of the most stable relationships. No such inferences can be made regarding the PC couples.

Suggestions and Implications

The present investigation was an initial attempt to empirically explore dyadic verbal interaction of people at several levels of moral development. A major difficulty in this type of research lies in the selection of the interaction measurements. Because little previous research has dealt with communication measures of dating couples, the assessment methods have not been refined. The general method for collecting observational data in the present study was initially developed by Farina (1960) to evaluate the decision-making processes of parents and their children. In adapting it to the present study, the topics to be discussed were necessarily changed and some of the measurements were modified. In future research with families or couples one modification of the scoring procedure may be helpful.

As measures of conflict, Farina (1960) and Hetherington & Frankie (1967) used the number of instances of simultaneous speech, number of interruptions, and number of disagreements and aggressions. In the present study these variables correlated $r = .47, .42, \text{ and } .51$ respec-

tively with total decision time. When measures of rates of simultaneous speech, interruptions, and disagreements and aggressions were compared to total decision time, however, the results were quite different. Total time spoken correlated $-.27$ with rate of simultaneous speech, $-.24$ with rate of interruptions, and $.14$ with rate of disagreements and aggressions. The measurement of rate thus appears to be less confounded with total time spoken than the measurement of number. (The confounding of the other observational measures with time is not as serious because of their lower frequency of occurrence or the likelihood that the occurrence of the behavior will occur a certain number of times regardless of decision time). A comparison of the CP and CC groups on the variable of "number of instances of simultaneous speech" revealed no significant differences although the trend was similar to that significant difference found ($p < .05$) between the groups for rate of simultaneous speech. The overall discrepancies between the outcomes when number or when frequency of the conflict variables was used, however, did not appear to be too great in the present study. In fact, the number of instances of simultaneous speech, interruptions, and disagreements and aggressions correlated $.58$, $.70$, and $.82$ respectively with the rates of simultaneous speech, interruptions, and disagreements and aggressions. Future researchers in this field should be aware of the influence of decision time on measurements

of number, especially when there is great variability in the time that participants are observed.

Because of the limited number of participants in the present study the results must be interpreted cautiously. The specific hypotheses derived from Kohlberg's theory were not strongly supported but the results indicated that some verbal communication differences do exist between people at different levels of moral development. In future research exploring the relationship between level of moral development and interpersonal communication characteristics, several changes in the methodology could be helpful. First of all, the use of Kohlberg's lengthy Moral Judgment Inventory would enable a more exhaustive evaluation of a person's moral judgment level which might result in a more accurate assessment. Secondly, more directly relevant conflict situations should be used to determine whether one's level of moral development becomes a more prominent factor in verbal communication during discussions of more relevant issues. The fifth question in the taped interaction seemed to arouse more conflict than the other questions. People took longer to come to a decision and there was less passive acceptance of the solution in discussions of the fifth question than of the others. The reason for this may lie in its temporal order as well as its content. The first two discussion questions (which were considered to be less relevant to a dating couple by the experimenter) may have

served as warm-up questions. The third and fourth questions seemed to be regarded by the couples as more similar than the experimenter had intended; trade-offs between preferred solutions of these questions were frequent. That is, one person would often comment, "I'll agree to go to your favorite place for the third question if you'll agree to go to my favorite place for the fourth question." The fourth question had been constructed to elicit responses of what the couple would do not where they would go; nevertheless, many did not respond to the question in that manner. Those couples that had alternated their conjoint choices (i.e. they let the woman select the conjoint answer for one question and then let the man select it for the next question) were even after the fourth discussion. When the couples were presented with the fifth question they knew it was the last one. These factors may have resulted in more importance being placed on the fifth question at least by some people.

The chief potential for practical application of research of this type lies in the area of personal counseling. People who are involved in intimate personal and sexual relationships are often faced with moral choices whose resolution affects their dyadic relationship as well as the individuals themselves. From the current findings, level of moral development appears

to be associated with differential patterns of interpersonal interaction. By becoming aware of a person's preferred moral reasoning the person's interaction with others may be better understood.

APPENDIX A
Newspaper Advertisement

Students!

This semester you have the opportunity to contribute to a study of Values and Interpersonal Interaction that is now being conducted on campus by Barbara Keller, a graduate student under the supervision of Dr. Larry Ventis and the department of Psychology. If you are regularly dating someone now or have an intact but unmarried relationship, please fill out the coupon below and return it to the box marked "Keller-Ventis Study" in the Campus Post Office or Campus Center lobby. If you do return it you will be sent a questionnaire to fill out. About 50% of the people who return the questionnaire will be invited to participate further in this study, and will be paid for their future participation (1 or 2 hours).

Yes, I am interested in this study. Please contact me. (A separate coupon should be filled out by your boy or girl friend even though his or her name is listed below).

Name _____

Dorm or Local address _____

Phone no. _____

Date's name _____

Approximate length of your relationship (in months) _____

APPENDIX B
Information Sheet

Fall 1974

Dear Student,

I presently need people to participate in the preliminary part of a study of values and interpersonal interaction that I am conducting on campus. This research has been approved by the Department of Psychology and is being supervised by Dr. Larry Ventis.

If you are now dating someone fairly regularly or have a special good friend of the opposite sex, please fill out the bottom coupon on this page and return it to the box marked "Keller-Ventis Study" in the lobby of Swem library or to Rm. 125 in Millington Hall; then give your friend the other coupon to fill out.

After returning the coupons you will each be sent a questionnaire which will take about 20 minutes to complete. Some of the people who return questionnaires will be invited to participate further in this study and will be paid for their future participation (1 or 2 hours). Completion of the questionnaire, however, does not obligate anyone to participate further.

(If you already returned the Flat Hat coupon for participation in this study you need not fill out these coupons).

Thank you for your consideration,

*Barbara Keller*Barbara Keller
Graduate Student, Dept. of Psychology-----
I am also interested in this study. Please contact me.

Name _____

Dorm or Street address _____ Phone no. _____

Date's name _____

Yes, I am interested in this study. Please contact me.

Name _____

Dorm or Street address _____ Phone no. _____

Date's name _____

APPENDIX C

Initial Questionnaire Containing the Defining Issues Test
and Items Pertaining to "Closeness Rating."

Dear Participant,

Please complete both parts of this questionnaire without consulting anyone. Within a week please return it to the box marked "Keller-Ventis Study" in the lobby of Swem Library.

I will be happy to give you a summary of my general findings after the data has been fully analyzed in May or June. In order to receive this summary, please complete the appropriate attached form.

If you have any questions, feel free to come by my office or call. I am usually available on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays.

Thanks,

Barbara Keller

Barbara Keller
Office: Millington 125
Phone: x 227

PART I

This part of the questionnaire is aimed at understanding how people think about social problems. Different people often have different opinions about questions of right and wrong. There are not "right" answers in the way that there are right answers to math problems. We would like you to tell us what you think about several problem stories.

On the next page you will find the first problem story. After you read it and turn the page you will see 12 statements, "a)" through "l)". We are interested in how important you think each of these considerations is in making a decision about the story -- how would you want people to decide what to do in such a situation?

There are two things to do with these statements: first, look at each one, one at a time, and indicate in the left hand side how important it is (put a check above "most" or "much" or "some" or "little" or "none"). Second, after reading all twelve statements, indicate at the bottom of the page which one is most important of all (put its letter by #1). Indicate also your second, third, and fourth choice, but no further than this.

HEINZ AND THE DRUG

In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost to make. He paid \$200 for the radium and charged \$2000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about \$1000 which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So Heinz got desperate and began to think about breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife.

What should Heinz do? (Check one)

steal

can't decide

not steal

(Check one beside each question)

HEINZ

- | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|--|
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | a) Whether or not a community's laws are going to be upheld |
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | b) Isn't it only natural for a loving husband to care so much for his wife that he'd steal |
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | c) Is Heinz willing to risk getting shot as a burglar or going to jail for the chance that stealing the drug might help |
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | d) Whether or not Heinz is a professional wrestler, or has considerable influence with professional wrestlers |
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | e) Whether Heinz is stealing for himself or doing this solely to help someone else |
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | f) Whether or not the druggist's rights to his invention have to be respected |
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | g) Whether the essence of living is more encompassing than the termination of dying, socially and individually |
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | h) What values are going to be the basis for governing human interactions |
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | i) Whether or not the druggist is going to be allowed to hide behind a worthless law which only protects the rich anyhow |
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | j) Whether or not the law in this case is getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society |
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | k) Whether the druggist deserves to be robbed for being so greedy and cruel |
| <u> </u> MOST | <u> </u> MUCH | <u> </u> SOME | <u> </u> LITTLE | <u> </u> NONE | l) Would stealing in such a case bring about more total good for the whole society or not |

Now rank this list of questions by putting the letter of the most important question in space 1, below, the second most important in space 2, and so on. Even if there seems to be hardly any difference between the importance of some of the questions, go ahead and make a guess.

1. (most important) _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

STUDENT TAKE-OVER

At Harvard University a group of students, called the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), believe that the University should not have an army ROTC program. SDS students are against the war in Viet Nam, and the army training program helps send men to fight in Viet Nam. The SDS students demanded that Harvard end the army ROTC training program as a university course. This would mean that Harvard students could not get army training as part of their regular course work and get credit for it towards their degrees.

Agreeing with the SDS students, the Harvard faculty voted to end the ROTC program as a university course. But the President of the University, Nathan Pusey, stated that he wanted to keep the army program on campus as a course. The SDS students felt that President Pusey was not going to pay attention to the faculty vote or to their demands.

So, one day last April, two hundred SDS students walked into the university's administration building, and told everyone else to get out. They said they were doing this to force Harvard to get rid of the army training program as a course.

Should the students have taken over the administration building? (check one)

- yes, should take it over
- no, not take it over
- can't decide

STUDENTS

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

a) Are the students doing this to really help other people or are they doing it for kicks.

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

b) Do the students have any right to take over property that doesn't belong to them

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

c) Do the students realize that they might be arrested and fined, and even expelled from school.

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

d) Would taking over the building in the long run benefit more people to a greater extent

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

e) Whether or not the president followed the accepted university procedures in making his decision

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

f) Will the takeover anger the public and give all students a bad name

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

g) Could such a take-over be justified as within the framework of a society designed to maximize cooperation and mutual welfare

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

h) Would allowing one student take-over encourage many other student take-overs

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

i) Did the president bring this misunderstanding on himself by being so deceitful and uncooperative

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

j) Whether running the university ought to be in the hands of a few administrators or in the hands of all the people

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

k) Are the students following principles which they believe are above the law

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

l) Whether or not university decisions ought to be respected and not interfered with by students

Now rank this list of questions by putting the letter of the most important question in space 1, below, the second most important in space 2, and so on. Even if there seems to be hardly any difference between the importance of some of the questions, go ahead and make a guess.

1. (most important) _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

Escaped Prisoner

A man had been sentenced to prison for 10 years. After one year, however, he escaped from prison, moved to a new area of the country and took on the name of Thompson. For 8 years he worked hard, and gradually he saved enough money to buy his own business. He was fair to his customers, gave his employees top wages, and gave most of his own profits to charity. Then one day Mrs. Jones, an old neighbor, recognized him as the man who had escaped from prison 8 years before, and whom the police had been looking for.

Should Mrs. Jones report Mr. Thompson to the police and have him sent back to prison?

Check one: report not report can't decide

(Check one beside each question)

Escaped Prisoner

- | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---|
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | a) Hasn't Mr. Thompson been good enough for such a long time to prove he isn't a bad person. |
| most | much | some | little | none | |
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | b) Everytime someone escapes punishment for a crime, doesn't that just encourage more crime |
| most | much | some | little | none | |
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | c) Wouldn't we be better off without prisons and the oppression of our legal system |
| most | much | some | little | none | |
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | d) Has Mr. Thompson really paid his debt to society |
| most | much | some | little | none | |
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | e) Would society be failing what Mr. Thompson should fairly expect |
| most | much | some | little | none | |
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | f) What benefits would prisons be apart from society, especially for a charitable man |
| most | much | some | little | none | |
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | g) How could anyone be so cruel and heartless as to send Mr. Thompson to prison |
| most | much | some | little | none | |
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | h) Would it be fair to all the prisoners who served out their full sentences if Mr. Thompson were let off |
| most | much | some | little | none | |
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | i) Was Mr. Jones a good friend of Mr. Thompson |
| most | much | some | little | none | |
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | j) Wouldn't it be a citizen's duty to report an escaped criminal, regardless of the circumstances |
| most | much | some | little | none | |
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | k) How would the will of the people and the public good best be served |
| most | much | some | little | none | |
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | l) Would going to prison do any good for Mr. Thompson or protect anybody |
| most | much | some | little | none | |

Now rank this list of questions in terms of importance by putting the letter of the most important question in space 1, below, the second most important in space 2, and so on.

1. (most important) _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

THE DOCTOR'S DILEMMA

A lady was dying of cancer which could not be cured and she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a good dose of pain-killer like morphine would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, and in her calm periods, she would ask the doctor to give her enough morphine to kill her. She said she couldn't stand the pain and that she was going to die in a few months anyway.

What should the doctor do? (check one)

- give the lady an overdose that will make her die
- not give the overdose
- can't decide

DOCTOR

- | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | a) Whether the woman's family is in favor of giving her the overdose or not |
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | b) Is the doctor obligated by the same laws as everybody else if giving an overdose would be the same as killing her |
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | c) Whether or not people would be much better off without society regimenting their lives and even their deaths. |
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | d) Whether or not the doctor could make it appear like an accident |
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | e) Does the state have the right to force continued existence on those who don't want to live |
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | f) What is the value of death prior to society's perspective on personal values |
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | g) Whether the doctor has sympathy for the woman's suffering or cares more about what society might think |
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | h) Does helping to end another's life go beyond the bounds of responsible interdependence |
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | i) Whether or not only God should decide when a person's life should end |
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | j) What values the doctor has set for himself in his own personal code of behavior |
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | k) Can society afford to let everybody end their lives when they want to |
| <u>most</u> | <u>much</u> | <u>some</u> | <u>little</u> | <u>none</u> | l) Can society allow suicides or mercy killing and still protect the lives of individuals who want to live |

Now rank this list of questions by putting the letter of the most important question in space 1, below, the second most important in Space 2, and so on. Even if there seems to be hardly any difference between the importance of some of the questions, go ahead and make a guess.

1. (most important) _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

THE MANAGER OF A GAS STATION

Mr. Webster was the owner and manager of a gas station. He wanted to hire another mechanic to help him, but good mechanics were hard to find. The only person he found who seemed to be a good mechanic was Mr. Jones, but he was black. While Mr. Webster himself didn't have anything against blacks, he was afraid to hire Mr. Jones because many of his customers didn't like blacks. His customers might take their business elsewhere if a black mechanic was working in the gas station.

When the black mechanic asked Mr. Webster if he could have the job, Mr. Webster said that he had already hired somebody else. But Mr. Webster really had not hired anybody because he could not find anybody who was a good mechanic besides Mr. Jones.

What should Mr. Webster have done? (check one)

hired the black mechanic

not hired him

can't decide

WEBSTER

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

a) Does the owner of a business have the right to make his own business decisions or not

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

b) Whether or not there is a law that forbids racial discrimination in hiring for jobs

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

c) Whether Mr. Webster is prejudiced against blacks himself or whether he means nothing personal in refusing the job

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

d) Whether hiring a good mechanic or paying attention to his customers' wishes would be best for his business

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

e) What individual differences ought to be relevant in determining how society's roles are filled

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

f) Whether or not the greedy and competitive capitalistic system ought to be completely abandoned

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

g) Do blacks have the support of the general public to public to pass legislation which would obligate Mr. Webster

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

h) Whether or not the practice of hiring capable blacks would utilize talents that would otherwise be lost to society

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

i) Would refusing the job to the black mechanic be consistent with Mr. Webster's own moral beliefs

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

j) Could Mr. Webster be so hard-hearted as to refuse the job to the black mechanic, knowing how much it means to him

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

k) Whether or not the Christian commandment to love your fellowman applies to this case

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

l) If someone's in need, shouldn't he be helped regardless of what you get back from him

Now rank this list of questions by putting the letter of the most important question in space 1, below, the second most important in Space 2, and so on. Even if there seems to be hardly any difference between the importance of some of the questions, go ahead and make a guess.

1. (most important) _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

High School Newspaper

Fred, a senior in high school, wanted to publish a mimeographed newspaper for students so that he could express many of his opinions. He wanted to speak out against the war in Viet Nam and to speak out against some of the school's rules, like the rule forbidding boys to wear long hair.

Fred was a very good student, a student council representative, and a regional winner of a speaking contest, "What Democracy Means to Me," which was sponsored by a national patriotic group.

When Fred was starting his newspaper, he asked his principal for permission. The principal said it would be all right if before every publication Fred would turn in all his articles for the principal's approval. Fred agreed and turned in several articles for approval. The principal approved all of them and Fred published two issues of the paper in the next two weeks.

But the principal had not expected that Fred's newspaper would receive so much attention. Students were so excited by the paper that they began to organize protests against the hair regulation and other school rules. Angry parents objected to Fred's opinions. They phoned the principal telling him that the newspaper was unpatriotic and should not be published.

As a result of the rising excitement, the principal ordered Fred to stop publishing. He gave as a reason that Fred's activities were disruptive to the operation of the school.

Should the principal stop the newspaper?

Check one: stop not stop can't decide

(Check one beside each question)

Newspaper

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

a) Is the principal more responsible to students or parents

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

b) Did the principal give his word that the newspaper could be published for a long time, or did he just promise to approve the newspaper one issue at a time

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

c) Would the students start protesting even more if the principal stopped the newspaper

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

d) When the welfare of the school is threatened, does the principal have the right to give orders to students

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

e) Does the principal have the freedom of speech to say "no" in this case

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

f) If the principal stopped the newspaper would he be preventing full discussion of important problems

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

g) Whether the principal's order would make Fred lose faith in the principal

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

h) Whether Fred was really loyal to his school and patriotic to his Country

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

i) What effect would stopping the paper have on the students' education in critical thinking and judgment

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

j) Whether Fred was in any way violating the rights of others in publishing his own opinions

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

k) Whether the principal should be influenced by some angry parents when it is the principal that knows best what is going on in the school

MOST MUCH SOME LITTLE NONE

l) Whether Fred was using the newspaper to stir up hatred and discontent

Now rank this list of questions in terms of importance by putting the letter of the most important question in space 1, below, the second most important in space 2, and so on.

- 1. (most important) _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____
- 4. _____

PART II

1. How long have you known your current (opposite sex) friend? _____ yrs _____ mo.
2. Approximately how many hours per weekday during the school year are you with this friend? _____ hours. About how many hours per weekend (two days) are you with this friend? _____ hours
3. If your relationship is longer than 2 months, then generally how much time have you spent together during past summers and school vacations?
 (examples of answers: every day of vacation was spent together; no part of any vacation was spent together; one or two visits during the summer and none during Thanksgiving, Christmas, semester or spring vacations).

4. What is your age? _____ Your year in college? _____
5. One of the variables we will have to control for in this study is verbal ability; therefore, please list your Verbal SAT score : _____
 This score is : approximate (from memory) _____
 or exact _____ . (check one)
 If your score is approximate, would you object if your scores were checked to insure accuracy? _____

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS PAGE AND RETURN IT WITH THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IF YOU
WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A SUMMARY OF THE COMPLETED RESEARCH SENT TO YOU IN
MAY OR JUNE

Name: _____

Mailing address during school year:

Mailing address during summer:

APPENDIX D

Reminder to Participants

A REMINDER

* * * * *

* DON'T FORGET TO RETURN YOUR "DILEMMA" QUESTIONNAIRE *
 * AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. (ALL INFORMATION YOU GIVE WILL, *
 * OF COURSE, BE TREATED CONFIDENTIALLY). SO FAR OVER *
 * 100 COUPLES HAVE VOLUNTEERED TO PARTICIPATE IN MY *
 * STUDY, AND 43 COUPLES HAVE ACTUALLY RETURNED THE INI- *
 * TIAL QUESTIONNAIRE. SINCE I STILL NEED MORE COUPLES, *
 * HOWEVER, PLEASE TELL YOUR FRIENDS ABOUT THIS STUDY. IF *
 * THEY ARE INTERESTED THEY CAN PICK UP INFORMATION SHEETS *
 * AND COUPONS IN THE LOBBY OF SWEM LIBRARY. *

THANKS,

Barbara Keller

MILLINGTON, RM 125
X 227

* * * * *

* P. S. IF YOU HAVE DECIDED *
 * NOT TO PARTICIPATE, PLEASE *
 * RETURN YOUR BLANK QUESTIONNAIRE *
 * TO THE SWEM LIBRARY BOX. *

* * * * *

APPENDIX E
Letter to Qualifying Couples

Winter 1974

Dear

I want to thank you both for returning your completed "dilemma" questionnaires. On the basis of your responses to the questionnaire, I have found that you meet the criteria necessary for inclusion in the remainder of my study.

I would very much like both of you to participate in a half-hour taped discussion sometime between now and Jan. 30. The discussion will consist of both of you discussing topics by yourselves. The topics you will be asked to discuss are not of an intensely personal nature.

The most convenient times for me to tape your discussion are on Mondays and Wednesdays from 9 am to 5 pm between Dec. 2 and Dec. 21. If both of you can arrange to meet in Millington Hall for about 45 min. during these times, please specify the time below and return this to me or to my box in Swem library. If these times are inconvenient for you,

let me know and we can make arrangements for another day of the week or
 P.S. You will each be paid
 \$4.00 for participating in
 the discussion and for ^{paid}
 completing additional } in
 the discussion and for
 completing additional }
 questionnaires.

Thank you,
Barbara Keller
 Barbara Keller
 Office: Millington 125
 Phone: x 227 (or x 234)

We will be able to participate in the taped discussion at either of the following times:

First Choice: _____(month), _____(day), _____(hour)

Second Choice: _____(month), _____(day), _____(hour)

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX F
Individual Preference Questionnaire

Preference Questionnaire

Please rank your answers to each question below. Put your first choice answer next to # 1, second choice next to # 2, and third choice next to # 3.

A. What famous person would you most like to meet?

- (most) 1.
2.
3.

B. What magazine would you most want to receive regularly (regardless of whether you now receive it; do not include Newsweek or Time in your choices)?

1.
2.
3.

C. If you could fly anywhere for a day where would you go?

1.
2.
3.

D. If you had the money and the time to go away from campus (or away from home) during the weekend with your girl or boy friend, what would you want to do?

1.
2.
3.

E. From the list below, select 3 adjectives which best describe your relationship with your girl or boy friend. Then, rank these 3 adjectives at the bottom of this page. Put the adjective which best describes your relationship next to # 1 and so on. Try to be as accurate as possible; remember, your answers will be kept confidential.

ambitious	dull	restless
anxious	helpless	sarcastic
calm	hostile	sensuous
cautious	humorous	sentimental
competitive	idealistic	shrewd
confident	imaginative	stormy
confused	impulsive	stubborn
controlled	intense	suspicious
conventional	introspective	sympathetic
cooperative	jealous	timid
defensive	lazy	touchy
dependent	objective	unconventional
disorderly	persevering	unhappy
dissatisfied	rebellious	unsociable
dramatic	reserved	versatile

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

APPENDIX G

Questions Given During Taped Interaction

After you have discussed this question and come to an agreement, say "agreed" and then write your answer in the space provided on the answer sheet.

1. If both of you (as a couple) were able to meet only one famous person, who would you want it to be?

Again, after you have discussed this question and come to an agreement say "agreed" and then write your answer on the answer sheet.

2. If you (as a couple) could afford to receive only one magazine (Time and Newsweek excluded) what would it be?

3. If you (as a couple) could fly to any one place for a day, what would that place be?

4. If you had the money and the time to go away from campus (or away from home) with each other during the weekend, what would you want to do?

5. Which adjective from the following list best describes your relationship with each other?

ambitious	dull	restless
anxious	helpless	sarcastic
calm	hostile	sensuous
cautious	humorous	sentimental
competitive	idealistic	shrewd
confident	imaginative	stormy
confused	impulsive	stubborn
controlled	intense	suspicious
conventional	introspective	sympathetic
cooperative	jealous	timid
defensive	lazy	touchy
dependent	objective	unconventional
disorderly	persevering	unhappy
dissatisfied	rebellious	unsociable
dramatic	reserved	versatile

APPENDIX H

Conjoint Answer Sheet

ANSWER SHEET
JOINT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

APPENDIX I

Final Questionnaire

PART I

Questions # 1 through # 34 deal with your relationship with your male or female friend.

State the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement that you and your friend have on items 1 through 6 by circling the appropriate number on your answer sheet according to the following code:

1 = always disagree on this topic, 2 = almost always disagree, 3 = frequently disagree, 4 = occasionally disagree, 5 = almost always agree, 6 = always agree on this topic.

1. matters of recreation
2. religious matters
3. amount of time spent together
4. choice of friends
5. sex relations
6. aims, goals, and things believed important in life.

7. On your answer sheet circle the letter(s) of the following items which you think cause serious difficulties in your relationship:

a) insincerity, b) excessive criticism, c) narrowmindedness, d) paying attention to another person, e) untruthfulness, f) being easily influenced by others, g) religious differences, h) different amusement interests, i) lack of mutual friends, j) constant bickering, k) lack of mutual affection, l) selfishness.

8. Describe the degree of happiness of your present relationship by circling the appropriate number on the answer sheet according to the following scale:

1	3	4	5
very unhappy	happy		very happy

For questions # 9 through # 34 circle the number on the answer sheet which best represents the extent to which you and your friend behave in the specified way during the times

when you are together. For example, if you see each other only during school vacations, then you should answer the questions as they apply to you and your friend during these vacations. Thus, if you "get on each other's nerves" every time you see each other, but see each other only rarely, you should not respond that you rarely "get on each other's nerves." Rather, you should answer that you "get on each other's nerves very frequently since that is typical of your behavior during the time you spend together. Circling 1 = very frequently, 2 = frequently, 3 = occasionally, 4 = seldom, 5 = never.

9. How often do you and your friend "get on each other's nerves?" (refer to number code above and answer on attached sheet).

10. How often do you and your friend talk over pleasant things that happen during the day?

11. How often do you and your friend talk over unpleasant things that happen during the day?

12. How often do you and your friend talk over things you disagree about or have difficulties over?

13. How often do you and your friend talk about things in which you are both interested?

14. How often does your friend adjust what he or she says and how he or she says it to the way you seem to feel at the moment?

15. When you start to ask a question, how often does your friend know what is is before you ask it?

16. How often do you know the feelings of your friend from his or her facial and bodily gestures?

17. How often do you and your friend avoid certain subjects in conversation?

18. How often does your friend explain or express himself (or herself) to you through a glance or gestures?

19. How often do you and your friend discuss things together before making an important decision?

20. How often can your friend tell what kind of day you've had without asking?

21. Your friend frequently wants to visit some close friends or relatives. You don't particularly enjoy their

company but your friend always want you to accompany him (or her). How often would you tell your friend how you feel?

22. How often does your friend discuss matters of sex with you?

23. How often do you and your friend use words which have a special meaning not understood by outsiders?

24. How often does your friend sulk or pout?

25. How often can you and your friend discuss your most sacred beliefs without feelings of restraint or embarrassment.

26. How often do you avoid telling your friend things which put you in a bad light?

27. you and your friend are visiting friends. Something is said by the friends which causes you to glance at each other. How often would you understand each other's expression?

28. How often can you tell as much from the tone of voice of your friend as from what he (she) actually says?

29. How often do you and your friend talk with each other about personal problems?

30. How often do you feel that your friend knows what you are trying to say?

31. How often would you rather talk about intimate matters with your friend than with some other person?

32. How often do you understand the meaning of your friend's facial expressions?

33. If you and your friend are visiting friends or relatives and one of you starts to say something, how often can the other take over the conversation without the feeling of interrupting?

34. During your relationship, how often have you and your friend, in general, talked things over together?

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true (T) or false (F) as it pertains to you personally. If it is true of you, circle the "T" on the answer sheet; otherwise

circle "F."

35. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.

36. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.

37. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.

38. I have never intensely disliked anyone.

39. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.

40. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

41. I am always careful about my manner of dress.

42. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.

43. If I could get into a movie without paying for it and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.

44. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.

45. I like to gossip at times.

46. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.

47. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

48. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.

49. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.

50. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

51. I always try to practice what I preach.

52. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people.

53. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.

54. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.
55. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
56. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
57. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
58. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for by wrongdoings.
59. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
60. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
61. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
62. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
63. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
64. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
65. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.
66. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.
67. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

APPENDIX J

Scoring Guidelines for the Taped Discussions

Speaks first - The first person to speak two seconds after the tape recorder is heard being turned on is considered to speak first. If two people speak simultaneously, then the first person to speak after this simultaneous speech is counted as speaking first. Only words spoken, not sounds emitted, are considered.

Speaks last - The last person to speak during the discussion up to and including the time that a person says "agreed." If both people simultaneously say "agreed" then the last person to speak before that is counted.

The only exception to these guidelines is when the person who actually speaks last has been instructed to do so by the other person. In this case the person who told the other to respond is counted as speaking last. Again, only words spoken, not sounds emitted are considered.

Passive acceptance of solution - A person is judged to passively accept the final conjoint solution if 1) the final conjoint solution was not among the person's choices on the Individual Preference Questionnaire, 2)

the person did not suggest the final conjoint solution before the other person during the taped discussion, and 3) no rationale was given by the person for his or her agreement on the particular conjoint solution. Simply saying "I wouldn't mind that" is not considered a rationale.

Individual's speaking time - This consists of the amount of time that the woman speaks during the five discussions divided by the sum of the amount of time that the woman speaks and the amount of time that the man speaks.

Yielding - An objective rating based on each individual's rankings on the Individual Preference Questionnaire and the final conjoint solutions. The couple is assigned the number at the left if the final conjoint answer corresponds to . . .

- +7 the woman's first choice on the individual questionnaire and the man's unlisted choice.
- +5 woman's second choice and man's unlisted choice.
- +4 woman's first choice and man's third.
- +3 woman's third and man's unlisted
- +2 woman's first and man's second choice, or woman's second and man's third choice.
- 0 an answer which the men and women ranked similarly.
- 2 man's first and woman's second choice, or man's second and woman's third choice.
- 3 man's third choice and woman's unlisted choice.
- 4 man's first choice and woman's third choice.
- 5 man's second choice and woman's unlisted choice
- 7 man's first choice and woman's unlisted choice.

Successful interruptions - An interruption is judged successful if the person being interrupted stops speaking for two seconds (see criteria for Total Interruptions).

Simultaneous speech - An instance of simultaneous speech

is defined by an overlap of speech (words, not laughter or other such sounds) of more than half a second. The recording of each instance begins after a two-second lapse without simultaneous speech.

Total interruptions - An interruption is scored if 1) one person begins speaking while another is talking, or 2) if one person begins talking and thus prevents the other person from expressing a complete phrase or thought which the latter person had previously begun (no simultaneous speech), or 3) if a person interjects a word (other than a word of agreement such as "yes") into the other's conversation (not necessarily any simultaneous speech).

Disagreements and aggressions - Expressions of hostility, shock, sarcasm, and disagreement are counted.

Total decision time - The sums of the amount of time which the couple takes to come to an agreement and say "agreed" on each of the five questions.

Summary statements - The statements made which further the solution by summarizing the progress or present position of both people are counted (see example in methods section).

Non-contributing statements - These are statements made which appear irrelevant to the discussion.

Questions asked - Questions that members of the couple asked each other during the taped discussions are included. Rhetorical questions or other questions for which it is judged that no answer is expected are not included.

Individual's speaking time - This consists of the amount of time that the woman speaks during the five discussions divided by the amount of time that the woman and man speak.

APPENDIX K

Correlation coefficients of measures scored by two independent raters

Variable	for dis- cussions 1→5	for dis- cussion # 5 only
Speaks first, last	.91	.85
Passive acceptance	.70	1.00
Successful F-M interrupt	.80	-.10
No. instances simul sp	.75	.65
No. interruptions	.80	.72
No. disagreements and agg	.74	.81
F+M non-contrib statemts	.97	.72
F+M questions	.94	.90
F+M summary statements	.65	.14
F-M non-contrib statemts	.70	.08
F-M questions	.93	.87
F-M summary statements	.16	.36

REFERENCES

- Aronfreed, J. Conduct and Conscience. New York: Academic Press, 1968.
- Bandura, A., & McDonald, F. J. The influence of social reinforcement and the behavior of models in shaping children's moral judgments. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 274-281.
- Blatt, M. & Kohlberg, L. The effects of classroom moral discussion upon children's level of moral development. Collected Papers on Moral Development and Moral Education. Cambridge, Mass: Moral Education and Research Foundation, 1973.
- Block, J. & Thomas, H. Is satisfaction with the self a measure of adjustment? Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 254-259.
- Boehm, L. The development of conscience: a comparison of American children of different mental and socio-economic levels. Child Development, 1962, 33, 575-590.
- Coombs, R. H. Value consensus and partner satisfaction among dating couples. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1966, 28, 166-173.
- Crowne, D. & Marlowe, D. The Approval Motive. New York:

Wiley, 1964.

Farina, A. Patterns of role dominance and conflict in parents of schizophrenic patients. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 1, 31-38.

Freud, S. An Outline of Psycho-Analysis. New York: W. W. Norton, 1949.

Freud, S. Lecture on the psychical mechanism of hysterical phenomena, International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1893, 37, 8.

Friedman, H. A simplified table for the estimation of magnitude of experimental effect. Psychonomic Science, 1969, 14, 4, 193.

Gilligan, C. personal communication, 1974

Grinder, R. E. Relations between behavior and cognitive dimensions of conscience in middle childhood. Child Development, 1964, 35, 881-891.

Haan, N., Smith, M. B., & Block, J. Moral reasoning of young adults: political-social behavior, family background, and personality correlates. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 183-201.

Hartshorne, H. & May, M. S. Studies in the Nature of Character: Vol. I, Studies in Deceit; Vol II, Studies in Self-control; Vol. III, Studies in the Organization of Character. New York: Macmillan, 1928-1930.

in Hoffman, M. L. Moral development, Ch. 23 in Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, P. H. Mussen, Ed., Vol.2, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.

- Hetherington, E. M. & Frankie, G. Effects of parental dominance, warmth, and conflict on imitation in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 2, 119-123.
- Hetherington, E. M. Stouwie, R. J., & Ridberg, E. H. Patterns of family interaction and child-rearing attitudes related to three dimensions of juvenile delinquency. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 78, 2, 160-176.
- Hoffman, M. L. Identification and moral development. University of Michigan. Mimeographed paper, 1969. Cited in Hoffman, M. L. Moral development, Ch. 23 in Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, P. H. Mussen, Ed., Vol. 2, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.
- Kohlberg, L. Moral Judgment Interview and Procedures for Scoring, Cambridge, Mass: Moral Education and Research Foundation, 1971.
- Kohlberg, L. The child as a moral philosopher, Psychology Today, 1968, 2, 25-30.
- Kohlberg, L. The development of modes of moral thinking and choice in the years 10 to 16. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958. Cited in Hoffman, M. L. Moral development, Ch. 23 in Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, P. H. Mussen, Ed., Vol. 2, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.
- La Voie, J. C. Type of punishment as a determinant of resistance to deviation, Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 2, 181-189.

- Locke, H. J., Sabagh, G. & Thomes, M. M. Correlates of primary communication and empathy. Research Studies of the State College of Washington, 1956, 24, 116-124. Cited in Navran, L. Communication and adjustment in marriage. Family Process, 1967, 6, 173-184.
- Locke, H. J., & Williamson, R. C. Marital adjustment: a factor analysis study. American Sociological Review, 1958, 23, 562-569.
- MacRae, D., Jr. A test of Piaget's theories of moral development. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 14-18.
- McGeorge, C. Susceptibility to faking of the Defining Issues Test of moral development. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 1, 108.
- Navran, L. Communication and adjustment in marriage. Family Process, 1967, 6, 173-184.
- Piaget, J. The Moral Judgment of the Child. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1932.
- Rest, J. The Defining Issues Test: Instructions for Scoring "Opinions about Social Problems". Mimeo-graphed. 1973.
- Rest, J., Cooper, D., Coder, R. Masanz, J., & Anderson, D. Judging the important issues in moral dilemmas -- an objective measure of development. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 4, 491-501.
- Rest, J., Turiel, E., & Kohlberg, L. Level of moral development as a determinant of preference and comprehension

of moral judgment made by others. Journal of Personality, 1969, 37, 225-252.

Turiel, E. An experimental test of the sequentiality of developmental stages in the child's moral judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 611-618.

Walters, R. H., Leat, M. & Mezei, H. Response inhibition and disinhibition through empathetic learning. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1963, 17, 235-243.

Walters, R. H., & Parke, R. D. Emotional arousal, isolation, and discrimination learning in children. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1964, 1, 163-173.

VITA

The author was born in Washington, D. C. on August 22, 1950. She graduated from Prince George High School in Prince George County, Virginia in June 1968. She received the degrees of Bachelor of Arts in 1972 and Master of Education in 1973 from the College of William and Mary where she is presently a candidate for the Master of Arts degree in Psychology.