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INTRODUCTION

In his review of juvenile crime statistics, Empey (1982) observed that official rates of delinquency increased considerably between 1960 and 1974, but have since leveled off or declined slightly. The positive trend of these figures is marred, however, by the fact that the population between the ages of 10 and 17 has also been declining in recent years so that the proportion of adolescents engaged in illegal activities is probably unchanged. Comparing a number of population statistics, Empey concludes that this age group is among the most criminal segment of the population. He points out that youth aged 10 to 17 comprise about 15% of the population but are arrested for "approximately 40% of the 8 serious felonies of the FBI's Index Offenses" (p. 82). Further, if society has shown modest progress in reducing crime among juveniles in general, it has shown stunning failure with some groups of chronic offenders. The Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin (1972) follow-up of a birth cohort in Philadelphia revealed that a core of chronic offenders (18% of the total number of offenders) were responsible for over one half of
all offenses. This finding is of particular concern, as research has shown that high rates of delinquency tend to be maintained once initiated (Loeber, 1982), and that chronic delinquent behavior during adolescence is strongly predictive of antisocial behavior in adulthood (Glueck & Glueck, 1968; Robins, 1966). Not only do professionals face a widespread problem among youth, but differences in chronicity may present them with more than one type of delinquency phenomenon. Clearly, the costs to society of the breadth and, for some, the depth of delinquent involvement present a challenge to current theories and modes of treatment.

For more than a century, theories seeking to understand delinquent behavior have ranged from the biological to the sociological and psychological. While the latter fields offer more enlightened explanations, the treatment programs they offer have major limits. In an overview of approaches to delinquency, Gold and Pertonic (1980) noted that many have shown a demonstrable lack of success. It would seem that to the extent that treatment programs focus only on problem areas without regard for the entire developmental experience of the individual, these efforts will see little success. That delinquent youth experience multiple problems (as with family and peer relations, schoolwork, health, etc.) quickly becomes evident to those working with them.
It would seem that a new approach to theory and treatment that encompasses broad environmental influences, individual factors, and the situations with which youth interact would be more constructive. Such an approach in psychology is embodied in the holistic orientation which stresses that the individual and his or her behavior cannot be understood solely through examination of isolated areas of functioning. Since, according to this approach, any behavior can be explained only within the context of the whole person, psychology must search for those pervasive factors that seem to influence numerous important areas simultaneously. This study seeks to demonstrate how the holistic view can be applied to the understanding of delinquency.

One area of demonstrated relevance to delinquent youth is the development of sociomoral reasoning as formulated originally by Kohlberg (1969). As later applied by Gibbs and Widaman (1982), the theory includes four stages, each of which represents an increasingly mature "prescriptive understanding of relations and transactions between people" (p. 24). Kohlberg's original construction of the stages was based on intensive analysis of the reasoning children and adolescents used to resolve situations of social conflict. Delinquent youth were among the groups that were observed to be immature relative to their peers (Kohlberg, 1978). Since one's
world view or structuring of social relationships is assumed to be a significant determinant of one's behavior (Kohlberg, 1976), sociomoral reasoning is believed to be of major importance in understanding delinquency.

While a large number of delinquents only attain an immature reasoning level for their age, the reasoning level of other delinquents is on par with the average teenager (i.e., at the conventional level). Apparently, relatively mature reasoning does not insulate youth from extensive involvement in illegal activity. The age appropriate abilities of some delinquents suggest that level of sociomoral reasoning cannot in itself explain the tendency of some juveniles to break the law frequently. Acknowledging the potential utility of a more holistic orientation to delinquency, the question to be addressed here explores whether understanding of the youth's development and use of sociomoral reasoning can be enhanced by examining personological variables.

The importance of need satisfaction to the development and/or application of sociomoral intelligence was introduced by Simpson (1976) when she noted close conceptual parallels between the need hierarchy of Maslow, and Kohlberg's stages of moral development. In accord with Maslow's own formulation, she viewed needs as emotional preconditions for intellectual growth (Maslow, 1970) and/or use of attained maturity in social situations.
While such information would be informative about the sociomoral development of adolescents in general, its specific application to delinquency derives from the documented relevance of deprivation (physical and/or emotional) to various indices of aggression (Parrington, 1978; Rutter, 1978), achievement (Garmezy, 1981), and delinquency (Glueck & Glueck, 1968) among lower-class youth.

The original purpose of this investigation was to explore the parallel between needs and both moral reasoning and moral behavior. Three questions were asked: (a) Does a higher level of need satisfaction relate to a higher level of attained moral reasoning? (b) Does a higher level of need satisfaction relate to more mature moral behavior? (c) Does need satisfaction influence moral behavior independently of reasoning maturity? After two attempts to obtain moral behavior ratings from staff (at two different institutions) failed due to unreliability of the ratings, the behavioral portion of the topic had to be abandoned. The final study investigates a possible relationship between Maslow's hierarchy of need satisfaction and Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning. Although the segment from the original project relating needs and behavior had to be dropped, this line of inquiry is still believed by the author to be extremely important in understanding the full range of delinquent behavior. Affective
variables such as need satisfaction may influence moral decision making independently of reasoning maturity, especially for those youth at conventional levels, but this will have to become material for future research.

The objectives of this study are threefold: (a) to demonstrate the importance of a holistic orientation to an understanding of delinquency as a complex phenomenon; (b) to investigate the potential relevance of affective variables such as need satisfaction to cognitive development, specifically sociomoral reasoning; and (c) to offer guidelines for treatment by differentiating the needs of various delinquents.

Several terms basic to this study require definition.

1. **Juvenile delinquent** is generally defined as a youth whose behavior has been found in violation of the law. A distinction is made between status and criminal offenses which depends on whether the behavior would be unlawful if exhibited by an adult. For example, status offenses such as home or school truancy apply only to juveniles while criminal offenses such as burglary or assault are illegal at any age. All youth in this study committed criminal offenses at the level of a felony.

2. **Institution** refers to a large (approximately 250 person capacity), state run facility for youth adjudicated for felonious behavior. It is a coeducational, minimum security facility. While the minimal length of
stay of either 6 months or 1 year is determined at the
court hearing, a system of petitioning for early re-
lease can result in a stay as short as two to four months.

3. Sociomoral reasoning. The moral aspect of this
term refers to thinking about situations of conflict be-
tween people which involve prescriptive issues of social
good or right behavior. The socio prefix seeks to em-
phasize that moral conceptions are dependent upon and
inseparable from the general social outlook people employ
in everyday interaction. Sociomoral reasoning is a newer
designation for what has been called moral reasoning or
judgment. The terms will be used interchangeably in
this report.

Of the limitations inherent in this study, two arise
from methodological considerations. The first is the cor-
relational nature of the project which can provide only
relationships between the variables but no cause-and-
effect information. Nonetheless, the presence of a rela-
tionship could suggest further exploration of need satis-
faction as a precondition for sociomoral maturity. Sec-
ond, the absence of data on the moral behavior of the sub-
jects leaves a disappointing gap in information. This
omission leaves moral behavior as the unique merging of
needs and moral reasoning in situ unexplored. This pa-
per hopes to contribute to the eventual study of this
question by outlining the special problems in measuring
behavior with this type of youth. The third limitation would stem from the query that this investigation falls prey to the same criticism that initially advanced it, that is, that needs and cognition explain only part of delinquency and are inadequate as a broad theory of behavior. This study does not purport to offer a comprehensive theory of delinquency, but intends only to clarify a relationship between two variables as a demonstration of a larger process.

The hypotheses for this study are threefold.

1. Individuals within the group will show differences in terms of most salient personal need. Specifically, it is expected that a predominant need for either safety or belongingness will emerge.

2. It is predicted that those with a predominant safety orientation will show significantly more reasoning at stage 2.

3. It is expected that belongingness-oriented youth will demonstrate significantly more reasoning at stage 3.
Prior to the dawn of scientific theory about delinquency in the late 19th century, delinquent behavior was thought to arise either from evil spirits or, in the early 19th century, a rational, calculated choice. The beginning of scientific theories about delinquency included two new assumptions (Empey, 1982) that to one extent or another continue today. These are that there are measurable personality differences between delinquents and nondelinquents and that these differences create impulses or behavior within the individual that are beyond their control.

Among the earliest theories in this tradition that could only loosely be called scientific were the biological deficiency theories. Representatives of this view saw delinquents as genetically inferior individuals who were biologically predisposed to antisocial behavior. Whether the problem stemmed from physical weakness (Lombroso as cited in Empey, 1982) or mental deficiency (Goddard as cited in Empey, 1982), those violating the law were thought to be innately unable to control their impulses. The more recent biological theory of Sheldon (Hall &
Lindzey, 1970), though not labeling some groups as inferior, classified people into bodily types. Each group produced different temperaments and personality traits, some of which were more prone to delinquency. With few exceptions, theories defending a primarily biological causation have largely been discredited as discriminatory and unscientific. Biological considerations have not totally disappeared from theorizing, however.

Freud brought a new perspective to the contribution of biology. A cornerstone of his theory was that all people are inherently antisocial. Empey (1982) points out that Freudian theory sees effective socialization within the family as the key to impulse control and prevention of delinquent behavior in adulthood. Delinquent behavior is thought to be a way of acting out internal conflicts from the past in current social relationships. Bios (1962) also suggests that the period of adolescence creates a vulnerability to antisocial behavior because of the turmoil in family relationships instigated by the onset of adult sexuality. McCandless (1970) views this same period in terms of a frustration-aggression theme where the adolescent must learn to reconcile intensifying drives during adolescence with societal prohibitions on their expression. Control of sexual drives is to McCandless only one of many tasks during adolescence. He also mentions blocked social and economic opportunities with which youth must deal.
While psychoanalytic theory claims family practices as the root of antisocial behavior, sociologists lean heavily toward societal factors as the prime agent. In his review, Empey (1982) states that the many variations on this theme can be divided into two categories. The first—cultural deviance theory—describes delinquency as a largely lower-class, group phenomenon. The reasoning is that delinquents are socialized in cultural settings which sanction, encourage, and then require antisocial behavior. In the Shaw-McKay version (cited in Empey, 1982) disorganized communities fail to supervise youth who pass on a tradition of deviance from one generation to another. Another variant (Miller, cited in Empey, 1982) posits that the lower class has developed a distinctive culture which promotes illegal behavior. The second type of sociological theory, represented by Cohen (cited in Empey, 1982) and Cloward and Ohlin (cited in Empey, 1982) is strain theory. This position, unlike the first, assumes that delinquents value middle class goals but find that they cannot achieve success by obeying conventional rules. This discrepancy between culturally valued goals and the limited means of achieving them creates antisocial behavior in youth. Both cultural deviance and strain theories seem to overlook the differences in individual responses to similar environments, the diversity that exists within these communities, and factors other than the larger
societal forces which can influence behavior.

Two sociological formulations which account for interpersonal influences on a smaller scale have been described by Empey (1982) as symbolic interactionist theories. As a form of social learning theory, they stress the importance of learning and reinforcement in interaction with significant others. One example is the differential association theory of Sutherland (cited in Empey, 1982) which postulates that tendencies to delinquent behavior will depend on what youths learn from the social groups they encounter about the value of conventional mores. Empey mentions Matza's drift theory as suggesting that delinquents are strongly influenced by both sets of values and fluctuate between the dictates of the legal code and the prescriptions of peers. Law violation is determined by the elements of the situation rather than preexisting personality or social forces. This last declaration seems to be the major flaw in both theories. Unanswered questions remain as to differential susceptibility to influence and the process by which this occurs.

These theories have tended to offer broad, all-encompassing explanations which place the burden of etiology on one factor or another and deny the complex origins of delinquency. Research has provided only partial support, at best, for cultural deviance theory (Empey, 1982). Further, this position overlooks the diversity that exists
within those communities and factors other than the larger
social structure that are influential. Social learning
and socialization theory likewise lack an adequate account-
ing of differences in individual response to similar home
environments and differences in individual susceptibility
to peer pressure. As Empey (1982) stated in his review
of theories of delinquency:

They provide little guidance for the agents of juv-
enile justice regarding the psychology of delinquent
behavior—little insight into the feelings of alien-
ation, stigma, or the anger which delinquents often
feel. Hence, those who organize and run correctional
programs are left to put flesh on the bones of sci-
entific findings. (p. 297)

The problem becomes more apparent from evaluations
of the various treatment programs for delinquent youth.
In their review of research evaluating various treatment
approaches, Gold and Petronio (1980) listed gang work and
behavior modification as no more or less effective than
cursory probation supervision. Inspection of treatment
programs that were successful was more instructive. As
the authors note in their summary:

Experience in delinquency treatment will also con-
tribute to our understanding of the causes of delin-
quency. For example, we have observed that two common
themes may run through various effective interven-
tions: 1) the support of warm, accepting relation-
ships with adults and 2) the enhancement of adoles-
cent's self-images as autonomous and effective in-
dividuals in the present and future. (p. 523)

These findings also suggest that concentrating on
developmental processes with specific goals in mind may be
more fruitful. The more successful treatment programs concentrated on the development of positive self-images, improved academic skills and striving for autonomy through vocational training. Other developmental processes have been suggested as being of importance in understanding delinquency. Among them are resolution of role identity (Erikson, 1968), delay in role-taking maturity (Gough, 1948), and moral maturity (Kohlberg, 1976). Studies differentiating either delinquents from nondelinquents or among typologies of delinquents on these or related dimensions are numerous. For example, results differentiating psychopathic delinquents from other subgroups or normals have been found for self- and peer perception (Berstein, 1981) and role-taking and cognitive development (Jurkovic & Prentice, 1977). Delinquents have been compared to nondelinquents in having lower cognitive perspective-taking skills (Chandler, 1973) and lower affective role-taking (Rotenburg, 1974).

One of the most extensively researched developmental theories that has application to juvenile delinquency is that of Kohlberg. This theory holds that maturation through five stages of moral thinking results from successive restructuring of thought at each stage to increasingly higher forms of reasoning. Movement through the stages is considered to be age related while following an invariant sequence. Using the moral hierarchy of Kohlberg
research suggests that lower-class adolescents (Hilton, 1978; Kohlberg, 1976), juvenile delinquents (Fodor, 1972; Gibbs et al., 1982; Hains & Miller, 1980; Hudgins & Prentice, 1973; Kohlberg, 1978; McColgan, 1976) and prison populations (Kantner, 1976; Kohlberg, 1976) score at a lower level of moral development (stage 2) than others of their age. Among the reasons offered to explain the failure of certain groups to mature in their moral thinking are father absence (Parish, 1980), socialization practices (Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967) and lack of opportunity to sample diverse viewpoints (Garbarino & Bronfenbrenner, 1976; Kohlberg, 1976).

That moral developmental theory cannot provide the entire answer to the problem of delinquency is apparent upon closer examination of the literature. Research has demonstrated that groups of delinquents are not homogeneous. A study by Jurkovic and Prentice (1977) found differences in moral reasoning among three types of delinquents. Fodor (1973) derived similar results comparing psychopathic and nonpsychopathic delinquents. In a review of the literature, Jurkovic (1980) concluded that "moral judgment stage does appear to covary with personality and behavioral characteristics of the delinquents" (p. 12). Another literature reviewer (Blasi, 1980) noted that immature moral reasoning is not a universal problem among delinquents, with many reasoning conventionally as do their normal
peers. Indeed, a study by Petronio (cited in Gold & Petronio, 1980) comparing recidivists with nonrecidivists found that those returned to court were higher in moral development (stage 3) than those who did not return. It would appear that delinquents tend to be heterogeneous on variables relevant to their deviance. Other factors might be fruitfully considered as contributors to this deviant outcome. The questions to be asked here are what additional factors would be relevant to delinquency, in what sense can delinquency be considered an example of developmental psychopathology, and what approach should be taken to understand the coalescence of factors in deviancy.

A major criticism of current theories about delinquency and the treatment programs arising from them is that they tend to be limited in scope. Many seem to take an either-or approach in attributing the primary influence to home or societal structures. Theorizing in and treatment of delinquency would benefit from a broader frame of reference as embodied in the holistic approach. A brief review of the main concepts of the organismic point of view and some of its representatives will aid in understanding its application to development in general and delinquency in particular.

Holistic theory begins with the assumption that the organism behaves as a unified whole and not as a series of differentiated parts (Hall & Lindzey, 1970). More
specifically, all behavior and responses are reactions of the total organism to the total stimulus situation. Since the laws of the whole govern the operation of the various parts, it is necessary to reveal the laws regulating the whole organism so that the functioning of any member component may be understood. Holism or organicist theory is not so much a theory in itself as it is an attitude to theory construction. It can be applied to many different areas of human functioning or to the greatly divergent circumstances that can dominate lives. In their review of organicist theory, Hall and Lindzey (1970) point out that Goldstein applied this viewpoint to brain-injured cases, Werner to ontogenetic and phylogenetic development, and Maslow primarily to the study of healthy, self-actualizing adults. Although many contemporary theories adopt an organicist outlook, only those of major historical value or relevance to this study will be reviewed.

One of the earliest proponents of organicist theory was Goldstein (cited in Hall & Lindzey, 1970), whose formulations were based on the study of soldiers suffering brain injury. He viewed the major impetus for development to rest in the master motive of self-actualization. Goldstein recognized that if conditions in the environment strain the capacities of children or adults, behavior inconsistent with self-actualization will result and development will become diverted from the pattern of life
characteristic for that individual. Werner, as described by Baldwin (1967), concentrated on the processes of learning and development exclusively. In his view, mental functioning is composed of various elements organized hierarchically, both in terms of maturation and application. There are similarities here to the developmental theories of both Kohlberg and his forerunner, Piaget. According to Hall and Lindzey (1970), Angyal's definition of the organismic position entails a complete interpenetration of organism with environment such that one could not be separated from the other. Tension between person and environment supplies energy for growth resulting in self-determination or, if the person becomes overwhelmed, self-surrender. Angyal believed in an intrinsic striving toward meaning in life and postulated a neurotic development arising from feelings of helplessness, being unloved, and doubts about one's ability to master the environment. Except for Werner's more restricted application, these theories along with some others (Maslow, 1968; Rogers, cited in Hall & Lindzey, 1970) share the concepts of integration of organism function, striving toward self-actualization, and the crucial role of the environment in fulfilling one's potential or stunting growth and diverting it into pathological directions.

The last theorist from the holistic school to be considered, and the theoretical base for this study's main
thesis, is Maslow (1968, 1970). By his account, the inherent nature of people is good or at least neutral. Even the infant possesses an active will toward growth and health, while in adulthood the striving is toward self-actualization. In a favorable environment, the personality "unfolds" through maturation. The concept of needs is central in that they are viewed as the essential nutriments which set the stage for the rest of development to occur. The five needs—physiological, safety, belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization—are formed into a hierarchy according to their relative strength and importance in sustaining the quality of life. The lower needs predominate during childhood, while under normal circumstances adults will be more influenced by the higher needs. Maslow's theory emphasizes the important role of the environment in promoting growth through the satisfaction of needs. As he stated, "The needs...can be satisfied only by other people, i.e. only from outside the person. This means considerable dependence on the environment" (Maslow, 1968, p. 34). During development, neglectful or pathological environments invite neuroticism or destructive behavior because the basic needs and/or individuality of the child are distorted, denied or frustrated. In addition to their essential, hierarchically ordered nature, needs provide direction and motivation to behavior at any age in an effort to satisfy any deficiency
among them. "Deficiency needs", by producing goal-directed behavior, can entirely dominate an organism and play an active organizing role for all its energies (Maslow, 1970). Once the deficiency needs for the hierarchy are met, the person can move to satisfy any number of growth requirements.

When considering the conditions which influence cognitive growth, the organismic approach would point to various aspects of the environment and to individual factors such as emotional maturity and stability as important in the course of development. Whereas Kohlberg emphasizes the cognitive elements of the environment, such as role-taking opportunities or direct exposure to higher levels that stimulate development, Simpson (1976) focuses on affective conditions which may exert a more subtle influence. She has outlined a detailed rationale of the congruency between the structural-developmental stages of Kohlberg and the need hierarchy of Maslow to illustrate her view. More specifically, a parallel between the motives accompanying each of Maslow's needs and the reasons Kohlberg's subjects gave to justify their choice of moral action becomes clear (see Table 1). Although Maslow did not specifically discuss an interaction between needs and cognitive development, he did elaborate on the impact of ungratified needs on growth in general. He claimed that such deficits exert a
Table 1

Parallels between Motivational Aspects of Kohlberg's and Maslow's Theories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kohlberg: Stages of Motives for Moral Action</th>
<th>Maslow: Hierarchy of Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fear of punishment by another</td>
<td>1. Physiological needs (necessary elements for physical survival—food, shelter, clothing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Desire to manipulate goods and obtain rewards from another</td>
<td>2. Security needs (for structure and stability in the environment, protection, freedom from fear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anticipation of approval or disapproval by others</td>
<td>3. Belongingness or affiliation needs (to be part of a group, to receive love and affection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anticipation of censure by legitimate authorities followed by guilt feelings</td>
<td>4. Need for esteem from others (desire for reputation, prestige, fame, importance, appreciation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Concern about respect of equals and of the community</td>
<td>5. Need for self-esteem from a sense of competence (desire for strength, achievement, adequacy, mastery, and competence)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kohlberg: Stages of Motives for Moral Action</th>
<th>Maslow: Hierarchy of Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Concern about self-condemnation</td>
<td>6. Need for self-actualization (to become everything one is capable of becoming)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

powerful fixative or regressive force in which, for example, strong fears for safety will mobilize the individual's energies in self-defense rather than growth areas. Need considerations are also believed to be important to character formation. Giving an example that reinforces Simpson's view of the correspondence between needs for love and respect and Kohlberg's stages, "People who have enough basic need satisfaction to look for love and respect (rather than just food and safety) tend to develop such qualities as loyalty, friendliness and civic consciousness" (p. 100). That these needs can exert enduring influence is evident from research which has shown that attempts to satisfy these needs produce general goal-directed orientation (Maslow, 1970) and can influence many areas of social behavior (Aronoff, 1967; Aronoff & Messe, 1971).

The notion is that broad dispositional factors such as need orientation may act through their own graded priorities as emotional preconditions for development in other areas. Particularly with a structural formulation having stages, as does Kohlberg's theory of moral maturation, need orientations may act as inhibitors or facilitators of development by virtue of their control over the subject's definition of the social world, selective attention given to certain elements, or need satisfiers that serve as reinforcers for certain behaviors.
Some precedents for this holistic developmental view exist which utilize the moral stages and/or need concepts imbedded in ego constructs. In a discussion of environmental influences on moral development, Gilligan (1980) outlines both the cognitive and emotional benefits of positive experience in relationships and groups. She sees "emotional capacity or ego strength" as found in a "willingness to trust others and risk disappointment in relationships" (p. 504) as essential to progress toward conventional thought. She goes on to explain that the experience of "trustworthy relationships" forms the basis for a cognitive definition of the social world along conventional lines. Gilligan then views a lack of security and affiliation need satisfaction as inhibitors, both cognitively and emotionally, of moral development. Some support for these ideas is provided by Sullivan, McCullough, and Stager (1970) who obtained a positive correlation between the stage progressions of conceptual, ego, and moral development. The authors discussed their findings in light of the need to uncover the "transition rules" governing movement between the stages. Their notion was that factors stimulating progression in one area might inform theorists about growth within other areas. As another application of holistic theory, Loevinger (1976) extensively discusses the similarity between her structural theory of ego development and numerous other stage formulations. Claiming
that ego structures should be viewed as the "master trait", Loevinger sees both cognitive (e.g., moral reasoning) and emotional dimensions as facets of ego functioning. Among these emotional dimensions are concepts listed (see Table 2) as consecutive levels of "conscious preoccupations" that incorporate elements of Maslow's theory of need satisfaction. Specific concerns mentioned are self-protection, social acceptance, self-respect, and achievement and self-fulfillment. Loevinger believes that emotional factors such as drives may serve to help move the individual through stage maturation by stimulating disequilibrium within attained stages. Again, the theoretical connection between need states and various stages of growth, including moral maturity, has been made.

The observations of Maslow and Simpson about needs stem from a dynamic view of development where basic physical and affectual satisfaction set the stage for growth in cognitive and sociomoral areas. Kohlberg (1969) takes a different point of view in asserting the primacy of cognitive stimulation in the growth of moral structures. Kohlberg's theory assumes that mental structures are produced by the patterning of the interactions between the individual and the environment. Specifically, the discrepancy between a child's expectancies and experienced events produce cognitive conflict which must be resolved in order to maintain equilibrium. Therefore interactive experience
Table 2

Some Milestones of Ego Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Impulse Control, Character Development</th>
<th>Interpersonal Style</th>
<th>Conscious Preoccupations</th>
<th>Cognitive Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presocial</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Impulsive, fear of retaliation</td>
<td>Autistic</td>
<td>Self vs. non-self</td>
<td>Stereotyping, conceptual confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbiotic</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Impulsive, fear of retaliation</td>
<td>Symbiotic</td>
<td>Bodily feelings, especially sexual and aggressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Fear of being caught, externalizing blame, opportunistic</td>
<td>Vary, manipulative, exploitative</td>
<td>Self-protection, trouble, wishes, things, advantage, control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformist</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Conformity to external rules, shame, guilt for breaking rules</td>
<td>Belonging, superficial niceness</td>
<td>Appearance, social acceptability, banal feelings, behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious-Conformist</td>
<td>1-3/4</td>
<td>Differentiation of norms, goals</td>
<td>Aware of self in relation to group, helping</td>
<td>Adjustment, problems, reasons, opportunities (vague)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Self-evaluated standards, self-criticism, guilt for consequences, long-term goals and ideals</td>
<td>Intensive, responsible, mutual, concern for communication</td>
<td>Differentiated feelings, motives for behavior, self-respect, achievement, traits, expression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>1-4/5</td>
<td>Add: Respect for individuality</td>
<td>Add: Dependence as an emotional problem</td>
<td>Add: Development, social problems, differentiation of inner life from outer</td>
<td>Add: Distinction of process and outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Add: Coping with conflicting inner needs, tolerance</td>
<td>Add: Respect for autonomy, interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vividly conveyed feelings, integration of physiological and psychological, psychological causation of behavior, role conception, self-fulfillment, self in social context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased conceptual complexity, complex patterns, tolerance for ambiguity, broad scope, objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Add: Reconciling inner conflicts, renunciation of unattainable</td>
<td>Add: Cherishing of individuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add: Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** "Add" means in addition to the description applying to the previous level.

is necessary to the formation of successive stages and the richer and more optimally matched to the individual's present level, the faster the progress. Kohlberg believes the term role-taking best describes the type of person--environment interaction conducive to moral development. He defines this as "the tendency to react to the other as someone like the self and by the tendency to react to the self's behavior in the role of the other" (p. 398). The basis of morality rests on the justice concepts of equality and reciprocity as products of this interaction such that the "moral stages represent successive forms of reciprocity" (p. 398). Opportunities to exercise one's role-taking skills provide the material for the successive reorganization of modes of role-taking which stimulate moral growth. Since role-taking requires participation in groups or institutions, the family, peer group or larger societal structures (legal or governmental) all provide the opportunity for growth-inducing experience.

Kohlberg has acknowledged that parental rejection and physical punishment (Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967) have shown negative correlations with moral stage, but believes this can be explained entirely in cognitive terms. Hostile, punishing environments discourage the child's taking of the parents' role and democratic participation in family affairs. Using delinquents as an example since they often live in negative environments and tend to show delayed
moral development, Kohlberg points out that a poor home life may fail to provide stage 3 altruistic models and offer no disparities of thinking that could create the stimulating cognitive conflict. Kohlberg states however that "family participation is not unique or critically necessary for moral development" (p. 399). It is the opportunity for role-taking that is important and not its place of inception. From the holistic point of view the emotions aroused in a hostile environment would be as significant in the long term as the suppression or absence of cognitive stimulation. Though other social groups might offer role-taking opportunities that the family failed to provide, holistic theorists would emphasize the general sense of insecurity or wariness a child might bring to all social situations, however inappropriate, which would then distort or negate any learning opportunities available.

Research linking moral reasoning with predominant levels of need satisfaction has generally been supportive of a relationship. Using 50 upper-class high school students, Simpson (cited in Simpson, 1976) found that "belongingness" and "esteem from others" were negatively associated with principled reasoning while "needs for esteem from a sense of competence" were positively associated with principled reasoning. Percival (1979) achieved significant results in an experimental examination of the parallels between Kohlberg's stages and three motivational
incentives offered for performance on a group perceptual motor task. A study by Green and Haymes (cited in Haymes & Green, 1977) found conative maturity necessary for the achievement of stage 4 moral reasoning. In this same high school group, conative fixation within the older students was associated with fixation of moral reasoning. Using college students, Wilson and Wilson (1977) found that safety-oriented subjects had significantly lower moral maturity scores (predominantly stage 3) than esteem-oriented subjects (stage 4).

While generally supportive, the exact stage relationships conflict with the conceptual parallels noted by Simpson regarding needs and reasoning. According to theory, the results should have produced a correlation between safety needs and stage 2 reasoning. Later, failing to replicate their results in a second study, Ward and Wilson (1980) concluded that "motives and cognitive schemas are interrelated processes but not necessarily correlated attributes of the self" (p. 274).

The failure of Ward and Wilson to replicate the above findings bears closer scrutiny. Both the stage mismatch of the earlier study and the later nonreplication may arise from several sources. First, the measures used (the Maitland Moral Judgment Scale and the Defining Issues Test or DIT) elicit recognition as opposed to production skills and may have overestimated the spontaneous judgmental
maturity of the safety-oriented subjects. Demonstration of the noncomparability of recognitory-versus-production measures of moral development has been shown in low correlations between the Moral Judgment Interview and the Defining Issues Test (Davison & Robbins, 1978; Froming & McColgan, 1979). A second source of difficulty may have been the omission of affiliation needs from Wilson's studies. Affiliation needs would seem important to understanding the development of moral reasoning, as subjects high in this need are described as more approval-seeking (Atkinson, Heyns & Veroff, 1954) and conform more than those who are low in this need (Hardy, 1957; Strickland & Crowne, 1962). This linkage is particularly relevant to the moral reasoning hierarchy since compliance for the sake of maintaining the approval of authority figures partially defines Kohlberg's stage 3 reasoning. Also, affiliation needs have been associated with greater helping behavior in the laboratory (Schwartz, Feldman, Brown, & Heingartner, 1969). Lastly, the definition of safety needs as assessed by the measure Ward and Wilson (1980) used, the Sentence Completion Test (Aronoff, 1972), was adjusted to meet the experience of the American college student. It would seem likely that needs for safety may have a different meaning for youth with middle-class values and often from like environments as compared to many lower-class delinquents who live in chaotic worlds.
If the consistency of the relationship between moral judgment and needs is yet unclear, studies in addition to the previously mentioned Schwartz et al. (1969) research, showing a correlation between need orientation and moral conduct, provide further support for some relationship between the two areas. Safety and esteem needs have been found to be differentially related to acquiescence in a mock jury situation (Ward & Wilson, 1980) and to helping behavior in a bystander situation (Haymes & Green, 1977; Michelini, Wilson, & Messe, 1975; Wilson, 1976). These findings imply that a second question of whether need orientation can influence moral behavior independent of moral reasoning stage might be relevant. Simpson (1976) suggested as much in stating:

> Individuals who remain motivated by unfulfilled psychological needs may not be able to function at higher levels of moral development, regardless of their stage of cognitive development. These needs may be isolated as an important mediating factor which shapes the effects of environmental conflict on moral reasoning and behavior. (p. 160)

As mentioned in the introduction, this issue appeared pertinent to delinquent behavior and attempts were made to test this possibility.

Maslow's (1968) theory relies heavily on the nature of the organism's interaction with the environment as he makes clear in saying, "the need for safety, belongingness, love relationships and for respect can be satisfied only by other people, i.e. only from outside the person. This
means considerable dependence on the environment" (p. 34). Should the environment fail to provide the lower-level essentials, at least to a minimal extent, pathology will result because "the organism is faced with a task or situation that is impossible for it to solve or cope with and which it wants very much to solve" (Maslow, 1970, p. 112).

In discussing child development, Maslow sees the family as the key to basic need satisfaction. From this vantage point, Maslow has much to say about the importance of a sense of security to children.

The need for safety or security is defined by Maslow as the need for structure (order, law, limits), stability (constancy, regularity, and dependability) and protection (freedom from fear, anxiety, and chaos). As long as these needs remain ungratified they will demand attention and may so dominate the energies of the individual that they will serve as "exclusive organizers of behavior". Maslow is specific about some of the threats to a child's security that may occur in the home. Physical assault, parental disharmony, separation, divorce or death are especially frightening. Threats, excessive anger or punishment directed toward the child can be equally intimidating. He also includes injustice and unfairness as creating anxiety and insecurity in a child. All the occurrences listed impart to the child a view of the world as being unreliable, unsafe or unpredictable. This brings to mind
Maslow's emphasis on the essential dependency of people on the environment to the point where the individual cannot really be described as self-governing. In childhood, with this dependency being more complete, the effects of need frustration should be more acute and pervasive. Consider then Maslow's (1968) observation of the "deficiency-motivated" person who "must be more afraid of the environment, since there is always the possibility that it may fail or disappoint him. We now know that this kind of anxious dependence breeds hostility as well" (p. 34). For those aggressive and delinquent youth coming out of disadvantaged neighborhoods, the question seems relevant as to whether their behavior may be a reaction to frustration and insecurity within the home.

Maslow's dimensions of security required during childhood and some of the consequences of their absence have received support in the literature. In reviewing four projects under his direction that studied families and children either in random samples or a clinic population, Rutter (1978) compiled a list of factors (Family Adversity Index) associated with severe conduct disorders:

**Family Adversity Index**

1. Father: unskilled/semiskilled job
2. Overcrowding or large family size
3. Marital discord and/or broken home
4. Mother: depression/neurosis
5. Child ever "in care"
6. Father: any offense against the law (p. 99)
Rutter sees each situation as a stressor to all family members. A consistent finding, however, was that children living with only one of these factors as a chronic stressor showed no increase in risk of disorder compared with children living with none of these situations. If two or more circumstances occurred together, the risk rose several fold beyond a simple summation of risks. Thus, threats to security do not arise from single situations but stem from a broader context of adversity and disadvantage. The pertinence of most of Rutter's factors have been supported by other researchers studying delinquency and conduct disorder. In a prospective longitudinal study, Farrington (1978) found the combination of low family income and large family size to be related to violent behavior among delinquents. Other factors which were associated with violent delinquency independently of each other were criminal parents, separations from parents, and harsh parental attitude and discipline. A comparison study of the home life of delinquent and neurotic children derived similar factors (broken homes, antisocial parents, child separated from parents for periods of time, disturbed relationships between parents and larger families) distinguishing the delinquent group (Bennett, 1960).

Glueck and Glueck (1968) outlined a number of household conditions differentiating delinquent from nondelinquent boys which again correspond closely with Maslow's
conception of safety needs. Though all the boys followed for this study were from underprivileged areas, those later becoming chronic delinquents more often lived in households that were crowded and marked by less effective management and routine. Thus, the parents of delinquents, in contrast to others living in the same circumstances, showed little or no organization of family resources, displayed confusion in daily routines (i.e., irregular bed and meal times for children), and in general tended "to live from hand to mouth" (p. 7). In addition, the delinquent youth came more often from homes where one or both parents were alcoholic or were criminally engaged, the parents were separated due to disharmony or desertion, and adult supervision was absent for long periods. In noting that these children more frequently experienced one or more extended separations from both parents and more often when under the age of five, Glueck and Glueck state that it is probably the first separation that has the most impact because "it is likely to deal the greatest emotional blow to a child's conception of the solidarity and reliability of the parental team and to disrupt his general sense of security as well as of family stability" (p. 12).

Since delinquency has been associated with academic failure (Wolfgang, Figlio, & Sellin, 1972), a review of the literature on achievement in poor children by
Neuchterlein (cited in Garmezy, 1981) deserves mention. The author noted that the physical and psychological environment of the home often differentiated achieving and nonachieving youngsters. Achievers tended to live in households that were cleaner, less cluttered, and less crowded, and have parents who took care to define separate roles for themselves and their children. On this last, the author's description speaks to elements of Maslow's safety need in saying, "Mothers of underachieving youngsters use their children to meet their own needs and stand more in the role of a pseudosibling than that of parent. The role relations for the competent children were more structured and orderly" (p. 220).

There seem to be subtle ways in which a child's security may be undermined. Since grade level has also been correlated with level of moral development (Gibbs et al., 1982), there is also the possibility that worry over safety concerns in a child may work to suppress, among other things, both academic achievement and maturity of cognitive structuring.

There is some support for this idea in a study comparing physically abused children with a group of matched controls (Barahal, Waterman, & Martin, 1981). It was found that such social cognitive skills as integration of social role identities, and cognitive and affective perspective-taking were negatively affected among the
abused children. Such skills are believed necessary for moral reasoning progression (Kohlberg, 1976). Children placed in group homes due to abuse, neglect, or desertion by their parents were found to be functioning at significantly lower and often very primitive levels of moral reasoning compared to a group of family-raised controls (Timm, 1980). The average moral stage scores for controls were twice as high as those of the abused/neglected children. The author concluded from study of the data that length of separation from family or placement in group homes alone could not explain the delayed development. Instead, it appeared that maltreatment by parents was more detrimental than separation from them in regard to moral growth. Various degrees of frustration and threat to security needs may impact on the development of many types of disadvantaged children, including the neglected and abused. There is agreement that the features of Maslow's security need, which he described as important for healthy development, are shown by the research literature to be lacking in a large proportion of youth who succumb to deviant outcomes. There is additional support in the literature on delinquency, however, for other segments of Maslow's theory.

The "belongingness" and "love needs", as Maslow calls them, occupy the next level in a person's hierarchy. In general, they follow the same laws as the other needs
as described earlier. They are defined as drives for affectionate interactions with people in general and more intimate relationships with family and close friends. Loneliness, ostracism, rejection, friendlessness, or rootlessness are examples of unfulfillment at this level. Maslow mentions that much emotional pathology in children and adults can be traced to frustrated needs for love and belonging. Some individuals may be defensively motivated as seen in an anxious desire to maintain relationships, a fear of rejection, or a fear of being left alone.

Growth motivation born of environmentally induced self-confidence in this area is seen in a calm openness to new or different interactions and a greater focus on the other person's desires rather than satisfaction of one's own. Maslow speculated that the psychopathic personality may be an instance of the permanent loss of love needs. It is theorized that the withholding of love from children during infancy may totally obscure in them the later desire and ability to give and receive affection. Barring such extreme circumstances, however, Maslow believed that even partial denial of love to a child can create a constant search for satisfaction. While a paucity of research exists on belongingness in humans, the allied concept of affiliation has been extensively studied. The object here is to demonstrate the relevance of belongingness and affiliation to the experience of delinquency and
aggressiveness in children. Some research which addresses this point will therefore be reviewed.

Information on the influence of love and affiliation on youthful behavior comes primarily from studies of the nuclear family. Research on parental behavior and family atmosphere in the etiology of conduct disorder, aggressiveness, and delinquency provides some idea of the roots of these behaviors. A brief overview of familial practices will present the most often studied dimensions, which are the absence or distortion of love and affiliation in the form of parental coldness, rejection, and harshness. Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957), for example, found that parents of children who were aggressive in the home tended to be severe in their discipline, lacking in maternal warmth, and disharmonious among themselves. Other research (Bandura & Walters, 1959; McCord, McCord, & Howard, 1961) supports the finding that cold, harsh, disharmonious parents tend to have aggressive children. Tying this into findings on delinquency, Farrington's (1978) results pointed to harsh parental attitude and discipline as the most significant factors differentiating violent from non-violent delinquents. Langner (1979) also isolated parental punitiveness as among the strongest predictors of fighting, conflict with parents, and delinquency in his sample. Glueck and Glueck (1968) found numerous indications that the delinquent's sense of love and belonging within the
family is often impaired. They reported that fewer delinquents than nondelinquents had strong and steady affectional ties with their family and a high proportion had mothers who were openly indifferent or hostile to their sons. In turn, the youth in the delinquent group tended to be less attached to their parents, and only 20% felt that their parents were genuinely concerned about them. Along the same lines, greater distancing from or avoidance of parents was more frequent among delinquent as opposed to nondelinquent girls (Duke & Fenhagen, 1975). Andry (1960) obtained similar results regarding weak affectional ties, and Langner (1979) found a strong correlation between parental coldness and delinquency as well as later conflict with parents, authority, and peers. A study including males and females (Simcha-Fagan, 1979) noted an early schism between parent and child as indicative of later delinquency in males, while for females, maternal rejection was uniquely related to later behavioral problems. Some work which distinguished among types of delinquents (Hezel, 1968) found that those scoring highest on psychopathic dimensions tended to view their mothers as rejecting, extremely autonomous and hostilely detached.

A number of other family situations may be less direct but still influential in undermining a child's sense of love and belongingness within the family. Often such
conditions may be likely to disrupt both safety and belongingness gratification simultaneously. Broken homes are one example and have been implicated numerous times in studies of delinquency (Chilton & Markle, 1972; Glueck & Glueck, 1968; McCarthy, 1979; Monahan, 1957). One mechanism by which single parent homes may be deleterious to children was suggested by McCarthy in her finding that the single parent mother reported less interaction with her child and fewer expressions of warmth. Maslow suggested that frequent household moves for a family may disturb a child's sense of well-being by uprooting them from neighborhood solidarity. A high number of addresses has in fact been linked to increased delinquency and fighting (Langner, 1979; Wolfgang et al., 1972). Separation from both parents, as when a child is placed in foster care, would seem to have similar disruptive effects on affectional needs, and accordingly correlations between foster care and later conduct disorder and aggressiveness were obtained, as reported in an earlier section on safety needs.

Perhaps the most dramatic evidence for the importance of affiliation comes from studies that show the therapeutic effect of its presence even in the face of other negative conditions. Among the factors which ameliorate the impact of the many negative circumstances discussed above is a warm, positive relationship with even
one of the parents. Rutter (1978) found that children in discordant, unhappy, disadvantaged homes who "had a good relationship with at least one parent were less than a third as likely to develop conduct disorders as children whose relationships with both parents were poor" (p. 110). Fighting and delinquent behavior were reduced in youth whose parents became warmer and less rejecting over a five year period (Langner, 1979). In general, changes in parental coldness evidenced a lessening of aggressive behavior in all settings. Rutter (1978) has documented similar results with youth previously exhibiting conduct disorders.

In sum, there is evidence that frustration of needs for safety and affiliation/belonging makes children much more vulnerable to deviant developmental outcomes such as delinquency. The presence of emotional and physical neglect in the backgrounds of these youth has been said to produce a need deprivation that inhibits maturity of behavior (Maslow, 1970). The full process through which various areas of development are impacted is not known. Considering maturation in cognitive understanding of social relationships (e.g., sociomoral development), Maslow has offered one perspective on how needs may influence this process. In addition to the affective changes produced by prolonged frustration, generalized attitudinal and expectational changes may occur during sustained
nongratification. The resulting form of dependency is one which "limits interpersonal relations. To see people primarily as need-gratifiers or as sources of supply...they are seen not as wholes, as complicated, unique individuals but rather from the point of view of usefulness" (Maslow, 1968, p. 36). This sounds similar to the outlook of the person at stage 2 of moral reasoning where social interactions are approached with a "what's in it for me" attitude. A finding pertinent to this issue is that of Rosenhan, Underwood, and Moore (1974), in which a strong negative correlation (-.50) emerged between self- and other gratification under conditions of negative affect. Children exposed to excessive physical punishment or abuse by their parents have shown greater egocentricity than normals and have been observed to relate to others primarily to satisfy their own needs (Barahal et al., 1981). An additional element of extreme defensiveness may be brought to every social interaction. Such maltreated children have been described as "hypervigilant" (Martin & Beezely, 1976) in surveying the environment for signs of imminent danger. They are described as readily interpreting minor frustrations as danger signals, and are likely to react aggressively because they perceive the situation as a threat to their survival. Whether excessive concerns with safety relate to moral
reasoning level or behavior is unclear. One study by Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) found a negative correlation between power assertion techniques of discipline and higher levels of moral development. The question arises as to whether deprivation of safety needs promotes a tendency to marshall one's resources for oneself and therefore an enduring orientation to stage 2 expediency. In a study of motives and helping behavior (Haymes & Green, 1977), some suggestive evidence was found for a fixation of safety concerns in high school students who did not show substantial movement to an affiliative orientation by age 15. There were also indications that the expression of affiliation needs was a sign of progress to an esteem orientation. A correlation between safety needs and the preconventional stage 2 morality in delinquents would lend credence to the notion of fixation in segments of this group.

Although recent research (Ward & Wilson, 1980) may have opened new questions about the relationship between needs and the moral judgment hierarchy, both the holistic theoretical assumptions and previous research findings of congruity point to the importance of further work in this area. The existence of a relationship between the hierarchy of need orientation and maturation of moral thinking could give impetus to the idea of needs as "transition" elements or readiness factors. Also, since a
quantity of literature is building linking safety and esteem needs to various moral behaviors as reviewed above, it would seem important to clarify the roles of safety and affiliation needs in moral development.
METHOD

The original purpose of this study was to investigate a potential relationship between moral reasoning, need satisfaction, and moral behavior as seen in observer ratings. The instruments were all paper and pencil measures, two completed by the subjects, and one, on moral behavior, to be completed by staff. The intent was to explore for the presence of a relationship between need satisfaction and the development of moral reasoning or the commission of moral behavior. The design was correlational in nature, and could not be informative about cause and effect. A revision, both in direction and methodology of the study, was necessitated by the experience with the pilot. The new study explores solely relationships between needs and judgments since data on moral behavior were unobtainable. The nature of the changes will become clear in a discussion of the pilot.

The Pilot Study

The pilot was conducted at a relatively small treatment center for dependent-neglected and/or behaviorally disordered youth in Columbus, Ohio. Most girls are placed because of a history of acting out behavior which has
brought them to the attention of the courts, accompanied by family neglect and/or abuse. The 140 students are primarily female, and of the three programs (residential, day, and group home), the residential is the largest. Girls are housed in cottages of 12 to 18. The center is run by the Sisters of the Good Shephard, who strive to provide a family atmosphere in a relatively open physical setting.

Treatment focuses on reality therapy, family therapy, and a behavioral merit system. The pilot included nine girls on whom all three assessments were made (behavioral, need satisfaction, and moral reasoning). Four additional girls had been observed and rated earlier in testing the behavioral instrument, but were unavailable later to complete the needs and reasoning measures. All girls studied had an IQ of 75 or greater, had been admitted at least two months earlier, and had parents considered to be of lower socio-economic status as assigned by the Duncan system (Mueller & Parcel, 1981; Stevens & Featherman, 1981). Earlier delinquent of the entire residential population characterized them as 75% white, slightly over half admitted due to a criminal offense, and staying for an average of 5 months.

The pilot was designed to serve two purposes: (a) to test the overall design to look for flaws or the need for new procedures; and (b) to specifically test the measure of moral behavior and motivation devised by the author. The results instigated major changes in the design of the
final study for two reasons. First, problems arose with
the test of need satisfaction (Need Satisfaction Schedule,
or NSS) (Appendix A). Part of the thesis, that two groups
could be differentiated on the basis of either safety or
affiliation needs, was not substantiated for the nine
girls tested. All were significantly low on safety needs,
but similarly high in affiliation. Possible explanations
for this latter finding concerned the type of girl admitted
to the center, the strong thrust toward high staff involve­
ment in a family atmosphere, and the emphasis of the affil­
iation need test items on peer relationships. Aside from
neglect or abuse, girls are placed for "status" and the
less serious criminal offenses that have not yet become
part of an entrenched behavior pattern. It was felt that
an adolescent population referred for more serious criminal
offenses might show more disturbed affiliation patterns.
As a result, the final study was shifted to a large state
institution housing adolescents who had engaged in more
serious offenses (felonies). Also, attempts were made to
obtain broader information on affiliation needs, that is,
on interaction with family and community adults. Greater
detail on efforts to obtain differential affiliation lev­
els will be offered in the appropriate sections of this
chapter.

The second problem involved work with the moral behav­
ior and motivation measure (Appendix B) using cottage staff
as raters. This approach did not achieve acceptable levels of reliability. The measure designed by the author will be briefly described so that the results, though unusable for relating to other factors, may later be discussed in terms of the difficulties of researching behavioral issues with delinquents. The rating form listed 15 situations depicting behavioral conflicts relevant for this type of youth. All situations were drawn from the author's several years of work experience at the aforementioned treatment center. Each situation was positively phrased to illustrate a single type of moral behavior such as conformity, honesty, helping, or cooperation. Cottage staff were asked to rate not only a girl's characteristic course of action, but also the intent underlying the behaviors observed. The purpose of the scale was to measure moral motivation and behavior based on the Kohlbergian stage theory of moral development. While ratings of behavior alone occasionally reached acceptable levels, ratings of motivation were too divergent between raters to be usable.

A second attempt to measure behavior was piloted at the state institution using the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist, or RBPC (Quay & Peterson, 1983) (Appendix C), with teachers as raters. This 89 item scale of negative behaviors included six domains (conduct disorders, socialized aggression, attention problems-immaturity, anxiety-withdrawal, psychotic behavior, and motor excess). Only
the first two were scored for this project. Although norms for the original scale were based in part on delinquent samples (Quay, 1964a, 1964b, 1966), the RBPC sampled "clinical" populations and also students with learning or more general developmental disabilities. The behaviors were in general, however, quite relevant to a delinquent population. The interim manual summed up the psychometric work done with the new scale by saying that, with the exception of one subscale (psychotic behavior), correlations between the old and new checklists "suggest that most results already obtained with the BPC could be generalized to the RBPC" (Quay & Peterson, 1983, p. 5). Measures of validity and reliability were reported as high for the original form. Inter-rater reliability for the RBPC was found by the authors to be .85 and .75 for the two subscales employed here. However, for this project, low reliability between raters at the second institution prevented use of the RBPC. As a result, the notion of assessing moral behavior was abandoned.

Research Setting

The state institution in Columbus, Ohio, where the research was conducted, is a minimum security, campus-like facility with a maximum population of 250. Youth live in cottages housing 20 to 35 students. The institution uses a behavioral, problem-solving approach to treatment. All admissions result from felonious behavior, though the boys'
commitments stem from less serious offenses. Slightly more than half of the girls in residence during testing were committed for felony 1 and 2 behavior. The more serious offenses, usually those involving high risk of injury to people, are classed as felony 1 and 2, and receive a one year commitment. Examples of felony 1 and 2 offenses are trafficking in drugs; aggravated crimes of burglary, robbery, or arson; felonious assault; less serious burglary and robbery; and so forth. Felony 3 and 4 offenses, which require a 6 month commitment, are primarily property crimes such as breaking and entering, the second shoplifting or petty theft, carrying a concealed weapon, aggravated assault, some cases of arson, or escape from holding.

Youth committed for either 6 or 12 months may appeal fairly early in their stay to the court for early release. If the student's behavior has been positive while in residence, this request is usually granted.

Subjects
Potential subjects were screened to control for the following characteristics: (a) at least 3 weeks residence at the institution; (b) ages 14 through 18; (c) a verbal and full scale IQ of at least 75 (on the WISC or WAIS); and, (d) a lower socioeconomic background. The latter was determined using the Duncan scales (Mueller & Parcel, 1981; Stev ens & Featherman, 1981). No youth who had committed homicides or were classed as psychotic or borderline
personalities was included. Exclusion of psychotic or borderline personalities was based on the absence of an express indication of either disturbance in the case history. It should be noted that residents with no psychological testing were included in the subject pool when casework summaries gave no indication of psychotic processes or behavior that could be diagnosed as such. Parents were informed by mail of their child's selection for the study and offered the opportunity to request that their child not participate by signing and returning a form sent with the explanatory letter. Selection of subjects was not random, as less than half met the control criteria, and of those remaining approximately one-third was unavailable on the testing dates, most often due to early release.

Fifty-seven subjects compose the study sample. Table 3 presents demographic characteristics for individual subjects. Females accounted for 61% (N = 35) of the sample, and 37% (N = 21) of all subjects were black. Average length of stay for the group was 3.73 months, although the averages for the sexes varied due to differences in the severity of original offense. All but seven were first admissions to the state system. Over half of the girls (N = 18) and all of the boys (N = 22) were committed for the less serious felonies 3 and 4. The great incidence of broken homes among delinquent youth as reported earlier (Glueck & Glueck, 1968) was supported here with a 60% rate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Felony Level</th>
<th>Recidivism</th>
<th>Stay (in months)</th>
<th>Parental Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>Wid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Wid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Wid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Unkn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Felony Level</th>
<th>Recidivism</th>
<th>Stay (in months)</th>
<th>Parental Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Males**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Felony Level</th>
<th>Recidivism</th>
<th>Stay (in months)</th>
<th>Parental Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Wid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>Wid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Wid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Wid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Tog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Div. = divorced; Sep. = separated; Tog. = together; Wid. = widow(er); Unkn. = unknown. Mean length of stay is 4.41 months for girls, and 2.67 months for boys. Mean age is 15.89 for girls, and 15.55 for boys.
Instrumentation

Maturity of moral reasoning was assessed using the Sociomoral Reflection Measure (SRM) by Gibbs and Widaman (1982) (Appendix D). This instrument requests written responses from subjects to a series of questions about each of two moral dilemmas. Multiple choice questions elicit the subject's opinion of various action options, then the subject is asked for a written justification of his or her choice. The latter is scored according to the conceptual maturity of the underlying reasoning. As an alternative to Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview (MJI), the SRM was designed to facilitate research by, among other things, providing for group administration and self-training of raters. Research with the scale shows high levels of reliability (inter-rater, test-retest, parallel form, and internal consistency) as well as good concurrent validity with the MJI (Gibbs, Widaman, & Colby, 1982). The construct validity of the instrument has been strongly supported by high positive correlations with pertinent subject characteristics (age, socioeconomic status, and grade level) and by its ability to chart the reasoning growth of subjects in sociomoral enhancement groups (Gibbs, Ahlborn & Arnold, cited in Gibbs et al., 1982).

The 15 questions on the SRM requiring an open-ended response cover justifications for eight normative issues. Scoring is accomplished by placing each response within one
of seven sociomoral levels according to a detailed scoring guide (Gibbs et al., 1982). This system provides for three different scores based on a four-stage conception of development (plus three transition-stage categories). The three summary scores are (a) modal stage, the most frequently represented stage; (b) the sociomoral reflection maturity score (SRMS), the point on a continuum from 100 to 400 derived by averaging the norm ratings and multiplying by 100; and (c) global stage, the categorical label for the SRMS score using a 10-level hierarchy. All protocols were blindly scored by the writer. To assess scoring reliability for the SRM, the first 20 protocols were blindly scored by the SRM's senior author. Minimal standards for inter-rater reliability were exceeded for five of the six indices (exact modal agreement 75% of the time, SRMS correlation .87, mean absolute SRMS discrepancy 9.25 points, global agreement of 80%). Modal stage agreement within a one-stage interval reached 95% instead of 100%, but was not considered problematic for this study by the senior rater.

To assess primary need orientation, Form II of the Need Satisfaction Schedule (NSS) by Lollar and Smits (1979) was used (Appendix A). This 80-item true and false test was designed specifically for reading-impaired, delinquent adolescents. Though based closely on Maslow's hierarchy of needs, the last need, for self-actualization, was dropped as being inapplicable to the population. Five scores are
reported, for physical, security, affiliation, and esteem needs (each composed of 20 items), and a total score. The higher the score, the greater the satisfaction. Development of the NSS began in 1970, and early results supported Maslow's hierarchy as a demonstrable entity as he had conceived it. Revisionary work increased the number of items from 32 to 80 to produce Form II. This second effort demonstrated increases in internal reliability and maintenance of the earlier discriminant validity between subscales. Convergent validity was demonstrated in the agreement of independent judges (a majority of eight participating) with the original assignment of items to need subscales. Validation was also supported by significant correlations between the need levels and relevant environmental variables for subjects such as parental marital status, parental education, source of family income, and number in the home. Scoring of the NSS entails summing the statements of satisfaction for each need.

As mentioned earlier, pilot work demonstrated that, among youth with "status" or milder criminal offenses, clear differences in affiliation need were not readily observable, and several individuals' responses indicated relatively normal satisfaction. These findings are at odds with research showing some offender groups (male delinquents and adult female inmates) to have lower affiliation needs than their normal peers (Hammer & Ross, 1977; Watson,
Pasewark, & Fitzgerald, 1970). Alienation, as a similar factor often cited as underlying delinquency, has recently been discussed in terms of types, not all of which may have relevance for delinquency. Specifically, alienation from peers may be less of a problem for many delinquents, while relations between family members (Glueck & Glueck, 1968; Gold, 1969) and community adults (Carr, Cooke, Strain, & McMillan, 1976) have been shown to be less warm, indifferent, or nonexistent. With these various affiliative groups in mind, the NSS was closely examined and the percentage (60%) of explicitly peer affiliation items found to predominate. Therefore, the remaining item pool dealing with family and community was augmented by the addition of five items paraphrased by the author from the NSS to deal specifically with non-peers, and five items taken from the author's reading and experience with troubled youth. The items, scored in the same manner as those of the NSS, are included in Appendix E.

Procedure

The instruments were administered by the author and a graduate student assistant, both white. The author, in her early thirties, had several years experience administering a variety of tests to a similar population. Her assistant, 10 years younger, had some classroom experience during her undergraduate years. The subjects, in groups of approximately 10, were called during school hours to
meet with the author in a classroom to allow her to explain the study (see Introduction to Study, Appendix F) and request their participation. During this introduction, subjects were assured that all information would be confidential and would not affect their stay at the institution. Test forms were identified by code number only. Those who chose to participate were read aloud two consent forms (Appendix G) that they were then asked to sign. A representative of the institution, either a caseworker or a teacher, was asked to be present during the introductions to convey the legitimacy of the researchers' presence. In almost all cases, the staff person exited after the consent procedures were completed. While even this short staff presence could have given the subjects an impression of collusion between the researchers and the institution, the nature of the subjects' responses suggests that this did not occur. The consent procedures and test took approximately 1½ hours to complete. All subjects received a copy of the introduction and their signed consent forms when all subjects had been tested (about 2 weeks later).

The tests were administered in the order of the NSS, the supplemental 10 questions, and lastly the SRM. Directions for each test were read to the subjects verbatim, with one exception for the NSS. Since greater information was needed on affiliative relationships with adults, and it would appear that subjects might interpret any item
ambiguities to favor peers, the directions were altered to induce consideration of adults in their responses to items which refer to "people", "anyone", or "someone". (An example would be item 11, "Do most people you know like you?".) Nine affiliation items use the vague references, four of which would be strongly influenced by this change. Both stories of the SRM and a few of the questions for the first story were read to the subjects to ensure comprehension. Additional assistance was given when requested. Subjects were grouped according to their reading level (high, medium, or low) to save discomfort for subjects and investigators alike when one or two subjects would fall far behind their peers in reading the test.
RESULTS

Before outlining the results of this study in terms of the hypotheses offered, it might be helpful to characterize the study's subjects as a group in terms of the descriptive statistics for needs and sociomoral reasoning.

Looking at the descriptive statistics for the various needs and the total score (Table 4), physical needs appear unremarkable in that somewhat higher numbers compared to security and esteem suggest physical wants fairly well satisfied. The security need stands out as being the second lowest mean with the lowest standard deviation and the least skewness. This combination, giving it the most normal distribution around a relatively low mean, yields the impression of a group who are similarly somewhat low in satisfaction on security. (Higher scores indicate greater satisfaction.) Esteem shows the lowest mean but varies greatly considering that it has the highest standard deviation and the greatest range of scores. Subjects appear most satisfied in the area of affiliation, given the relatively high mean, low standard deviation, and the largest negative skewness value.
Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for Need Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Esteem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>60.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>17 and 18</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range$^a$</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>9-20</td>
<td>7-19</td>
<td>3-20</td>
<td>35-77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Maximum score for each need is 20. Maximum score for the total is 80.
This latter indicates that the bulk of the subjects fell in the high satisfaction range. In fact, on affiliation, only 16% of the subjects scored 14 or less, whereas those scoring 14 or less accounted for 33%, 42%, and 42% for physical, security, and esteem needs respectively. It should be noted, regarding the total scores, that the mode of 72 is somewhat misleading, as this represents only six cases, and the scaled score of 55 was close behind with five cases. The median of 61 is more informative, as the scores were fairly evenly dispersed. It is interesting to note, however, that the total scores of subjects in this study grouped by age, sex, or race showed lower average total scores than the normative group (N = 275) described in the manual for the NSS (Lollar & Smits, 1979) by 10 to 20 points for each category. Responses to the 10 questions composed by the author were not particularly helpful. Of the four questions dealing with the subjects' relationships with family members, 80.7% (N = 46) indicated complete or nearly complete (three of four) satisfaction. The six questions concerning the subjects' relationships with the larger community produced only 15.8% (N = 7) of respondents failing to mark complete or nearly complete (five of six) satisfaction on these items.

The four needs of the NSS showed moderate simple correlations between them with the exception of security,
which correlated .39, .29, and .33 respectively for physical, affiliation, and esteem needs. A partial correlation controlling for demographic variables affected a slight rise in correlations between all needs except again for security, which failed to improve for relationships with affiliation and esteem (.28 and .31). (See Appendices H and I for correlation tables.)

Summary statistics for the Sociomoral Reflection Measure (SRM) can be examined in terms of the continuous SRM score (SRMS) and the two interval variables, the modal and global scores. The subjects earned a mean SRMS of 258.3, with a standard deviation of 27.5. In global score terms, this mean would fall into the stage 3(2) category. Tables 5 and 6 present frequency counts and percentages for each modal and global stage represented in the data. As can be seen, stage 3 was the most frequently used level of reasoning for this group, with stage 2 a distant second. Since the global stage index is a summary label for SRM scores, Table 6 elucidates the spread of SRMS or average highest stage level used by the subjects. The average level of reasoning most frequently displayed is the major-minor transition stage 3(2) with 49.1% of subjects. Combining 3(2) with the other global stages employing stage 2 reasoning, one finds 77.2% of subjects functioning below stage 3, conventional reasoning.
### Table 5

**Frequency Table for S-Attained Modal Stages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6

**Frequency Table for S-Attained Global Stages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emergence of Predominant Need Groups

The first of the three hypotheses for this study presumed that (as stated in hypothesis 1): Individuals within the group will show differences in terms of most salient personal need. Specifically, it is expected that a predominant need for either safety or belongingness will emerge.

This expectation was inadequately met for the purposes of this study for the 57 subjects analyzed. While security and affiliation were adequately differentiated (at least 0.75 standard deviation, or two points), 58% (N = 33) of the time, most of the differentials were in the direction of greater affiliation satisfaction over security than the reverse. The situation was similar for security and esteem differences, where slightly more than half (N = 29) could be differentiated on the 0.75 criterion (or three points), although they were approximately evenly divided.

The inability to obtain groups of subjects with distinct and predominant needs for either safety or affiliation not only failed to support the first hypothesis, but prevented the analysis of hypotheses 2 and 3 as originally stated, since both were dependent on the presumption of hypothesis 1. Hypotheses 2 and 3 read as follows:

\[ H_2 \] - It is predicted that those with a predominant safety orientation will show significantly more reasoning at stage 2.

\[ H_3 \] - It is expected that belongingness-oriented youth will demonstrate significantly more reasoning at stage 3.
The notion of safety versus affiliation need orientation relating to different levels of sociomoral reasoning must be tested in an alternative manner.

**Relationship between Needs and Reasoning Level**

Correlational methods were used to test for a relationship between the various needs and reasoning levels. A multiple regression analysis indicated that none of the needs as measured by the NSS, considered separately or in total, is linearly related to levels of reasoning (see Table 7). Among the 10 questions dealing with affiliative satisfaction with family (N = 4) and community (N = 6), the only relationship derived (F(5, 51) = 5.20, p. < .03) was between two questions addressing rapport with teachers and SRM scores. This was a negative relationship approaching significance (r = -.24, p. < .07). It should be noted that the family questions and the community questions include the two questions about parents and the two about teachers, respectively, that were teased out for analysis.

Simple correlations between the modal and global stage scores and the four needs were negligible for physical and security needs and in the mid-20s for affiliation, esteem, and total need scores. Some of the latter only approached significance, however. (See Appendix H). Correlations with SRM scores were negligible throughout. Partial correlations between the four needs and modal and global stage scores were somewhat stronger and reached
Table 7

F-Values and Probabilities for Simultaneous Regression Analysis of
Need Scores and Sociomoral Reasoning Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ph</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>Af</th>
<th>Es</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Pa</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>CM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>F=.04</td>
<td>F=.05</td>
<td>F=.33</td>
<td>F=.06</td>
<td>F=.03</td>
<td>F=.07</td>
<td>F=.24</td>
<td>F=1.27</td>
<td>F=1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.84</td>
<td>p&lt;.82</td>
<td>p&lt;.57</td>
<td>p&lt;.80</td>
<td>p&lt;.86</td>
<td>p&lt;.79</td>
<td>p&lt;.63</td>
<td>p&lt;.26</td>
<td>p&lt;.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMS</td>
<td>F=.11</td>
<td>F=.00</td>
<td>F=.21</td>
<td>F=.01</td>
<td>F=.04</td>
<td>F=.03</td>
<td>F=.00</td>
<td>F=5.20</td>
<td>F=.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.74</td>
<td>p&lt;.98</td>
<td>p&lt;.65</td>
<td>p&lt;.92</td>
<td>p&lt;.85</td>
<td>p&lt;.86</td>
<td>p&lt;.97</td>
<td>p&lt;.03</td>
<td>p&lt;.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>F=.20</td>
<td>F=.01</td>
<td>F=.80</td>
<td>F=.12</td>
<td>F=.02</td>
<td>F=.00</td>
<td>F=.04</td>
<td>F=3.73</td>
<td>F=2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.66</td>
<td>p&lt;.91</td>
<td>p&lt;.38</td>
<td>p&lt;.73</td>
<td>p&lt;.90</td>
<td>p&lt;.99</td>
<td>p&lt;.84</td>
<td>p&lt;.06</td>
<td>p&lt;.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. DF 5, 51. Ph = physical; Sc = security; Af = affiliation; Es = esteem;
Pa = parents; FM = family; TE = teachers; CM = community.
significance. Needs for esteem and total need score had coefficients in the mid-30s, $p < .01$. Physical and affiliation needs were slightly lower. (See Appendix I). Needs for security showed negligible correlations throughout.

Since regression and correlation results failed to support the hypothesis of a relationship between a hierarchy of need satisfaction and levels of sociomoral reasoning, these same statistics were turned to an exploration of a relationship between either factor and certain demographic variables. The characteristics on which subjects varied were age, sex, race, and offense level. In general, the group sizes need not be repeated here, as they were discussed in the Method section. With regard to age, however, there were only three 18-year-olds, with the remaining subjects fairly equally divided among the other four ages. Also, sex as a variable was confounded with offense level, since girls were admitted for all four levels, while boys were admitted for only two. Multiple regression analyses for NSS scores, sociomoral levels, and the supplemental 10 questions with offense level produced no significant results. Correlations between offense level and all of the above were almost zero. Given these results, sex will be treated as not seriously confounded by offense level.

The variables of age, sex, and race yielded some significant results. For girls there was a significant positive linear correlation with modal stage scores ($F(9,47)$ =
and global stage scores ($F(9, 47) = 5.70, p.<.02$), as well as a linear trend with the more precise SRMS ($F(9, 47) = 3.83, p.<.06$). A chi square (sex by modal score) analysis failed to reach significance, though table entries listed more boys than girls using lower level reasoning more frequently (20% of girls versus 36% of boys preferred stage 2, while 63% of girls and 45% of boys preferred stage 3). The remaining subjects preferred transition stage 2/3, except for one modal stage 4. Only physical needs were able to differentiate the sexes, both in regression analysis ($F(9, 47) = 4.68, p.<.04$) and ANOVA ($t(34, 21) = -2.52, p.<.01$), showing that girls felt less satisfied in this area than boys. One question among the supplementary 10 distinguished the sexes. Item eight, which concerned the subjects' satisfaction with his or her contact with family members, showed a difference ($t(34, 21) = -2.20, p.<.03$) with females desirous of more contact.

Trends only were in evidence on regression analysis between race and need variables (for physical needs, $F(9, 47) = 3.68, p.<.06$; for security needs, $F(9, 47) = 3.64, p.<.06$; total score, $F(9, 47) = 3.48, p.<.07$; and family affiliation, $F(9, 47) = 3.07, p.<.09$) indicating that blacks were more satisfied in these areas than whites. No relationships involving race were present in the reasoning level data.
Regression procedures using five age levels and controlling for the other demographics were productive only for the two rapport with parents questions ($F(4, 52) = 2.66, p < .04$), and the relationships with family items ($F(4, 52) = 2.40, p < .06$), both in the negative direction ($r = -.39, p < .003$ and $r = -.38, p < .003$, respectively). Both were indicative of deteriorating relationships between family and youth with increasing age.
SUPPLEMENTAL RESULTS SECTION

This section presents the results of two attempts to collect behavior data on delinquent and acting out youth in institutions. This type of effort is important because the role of needs and cognition in moral development cannot be fully understood without knowing their relationship to moral behavior. This seems especially true for delinquents because of indications that needs and cognition are uniquely related to moral development in youth displaying deviant behavior. Major difficulties in collecting behavioral data, then, should be explored so that new approaches can be considered.

Procedures for Collecting Behavioral Ratings

The attempts to collect behavior ratings were made at different institutions using two different measures. Since the development and description of the first rating scale was given in the method section, only the highlights will be mentioned here. The first scale, which was used by cottage staff, requested ratings of both behavior and the motives behind them in a situational context. Most were positive behaviors, sometimes presented in negative contexts (see Appendix B). The second scale (RBPC) was
a list of nonconforming and problem behaviors, all negatively stated, with no motive included (see Appendix C). A much lower proportion dealt with "moral" behaviors.

The type of rater differed considerably between the two institutions, primarily in terms of the opportunities for observation. The first attempt, at the small treatment center, employed child care staff spanning various shifts, one of whom was in a supervisory role. The eight raters, all female, ranged in age from their early twenties to over forty, the majority being at the younger end of the range. Two were black. Part of the teaching staff at the second institution completed ratings for the second attempt. Among the nine raters, five were black, four female, with their ages unknown, although they appeared to span a similar age range with the majority being 28 to 35.

The directions for the rating efforts differed slightly. Cottage staff were asked to rate on the basis of only those behaviors they had personally observed over a period of one month, although they could use observations from outside that time frame if the girl's behavior had not changed much. Ratings were completed in one session with this writer present. Staff were instructed to compare each ratee to the best girl and the worst girl they had known for that behavior, including those they had known outside the institution. Girls were not to be
compared to other ratees. Two rater errors were reviewed: (a) the similarity "effect", the tendency to attribute our own or positive motives to well-liked girls or those felt similar to the rater; and (b) the recency "effect", the tendency to consider only a recent portion of the observation period.

Directions given at the second institution were similar to the above, except they were asked to compare the ratee to the best and worst girl they had known, but only during their experience at the institution. Since reliability had been marginal at the first treatment center, more complete definitions of rater errors were given in both verbal and written form (see Appendix J for precise text). Definitions were developed on the basis of those used in prior research (Latham, Wexley, & Pursell, 1975; Thornton & Zorich, 1980). Although all 89 items of the scale were to be completed, raters were instructed to observe only a list of target behaviors (see Appendix K) that composed the Conduct Disorder subscale (22 items), and a selection of nine relevant items from the other scales to encourage observation of the person as a whole.

The following results sections contain two types of information. First, the findings on the reliability between raters will be covered to highlight divergent results. Second, the comments of raters at both institutions on the rating process will clarify some of the obstacles
in rating delinquent youth.

**Rater Reliability**

The eight raters at the small treatment center who rated a total of 13 girls were paired up such that two groups of three raters were each evaluating five girls. The remaining two raters evaluated three girls. Larger ratee sample sizes were unobtainable due to high student turnover and failure of some students to meet the researcher's control criteria.

Table 8 presents Pearson correlations for each combination of raters for both motivation scores and behavioral observations. No value of $r$ can be considered significant because sample sizes were so small. Using $r = .60$ as the lower limit for acceptable reliability, it can be seen that only one pair (raters 2 and 3) attained marginal to acceptable reliability for both behavior and motivation. Other near or fully adequate coefficients were accompanied by low values on their corresponding behavior or motivation scores. It should be noted that raters 1 and 8 were much older than the other raters, and raters 3, 6, and 7 worked primarily morning shift (with some weekends) where they tended to have less contact with the girls. Widely divergent ages between raters may have lowered reliabilities. Differences in shift (morning versus evening) seemed to exert a negative influence in two of three pairs (those including raters
Table 8

Correlations Between Child Care Staff Rating Sociomoral Behavior and Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raters^a</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 3</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 and 3</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 and 5</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 and 6</td>
<td>___b</td>
<td>___b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and 6</td>
<td>___b</td>
<td>___b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and 8</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>___c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aRaters grouped by cottage. ^bRater number six left so many items blank that the forms were unscorable. ^cThese raters felt unable to evaluate motivations.
6 and 7). Of the more reliable pairs on behavior, raters 4 and 5 were of similar ages and shared the evening shift for part of the time. Raters 2 and 3, the most reliable pair, were both fairly young, but had different shifts (morning versus evening). In general, raters were able to be more reliable in rating observable behaviors, as opposed to motivations.

Table 9 shows reliability results for teacher-raters at the larger, state institution. Again, the number of raters per ratee was low because, among the girls meeting the investigator's control criteria, few had many of the participating teachers in common. As can be seen, ratings using the conduct disorder (CD) subscale of the REPC failed to achieve even marginal reliability. The socialized aggression (SA) subscale showed better though not adequate results. For pairs where SA approached reliability, it should be noted that rater 7 had approximately 18 years experience at the institution, and raters 8 and 9 had more contact with their ratees than others. Rater 6 viewed ratees in very positive terms (thus giving many zero scores), and as a result had less to correlate with others. In general, for reasons to be explored shortly, these raters were unable to achieve reliable ratings.

Comments of Child Care Staff on the Rating Process

This section explores the numerous suggestions offered about the difficulty obtaining reliable ratings. Staff
Table 9
Correlation for Teaching Staff Ratings of Conduct Disorder (CD) and Socialized Aggression (SA) Subscales of the RBPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raters</th>
<th>Correlation on CD Subscale</th>
<th>Correlation on SA Subscale</th>
<th>Number Rated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 4</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and 6</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>---a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 6</td>
<td>---a</td>
<td>---a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and 7</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and 7</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 and 9</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 7</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Too many behaviors were scored zero ("no problem") to make calculations possible.
were asked to write their comments about the rating experience at their leisure and were then briefly interviewed on the subject. Responses can be divided into those concerning the scale, rater characteristics, and ratee characteristics.

It should be recalled that the first scale requested a rating first on behaviors observed, and then a ranking (in terms of percentage of time demonstrated) of four possible motives behind the behavior. Almost all behaviors were stated positively, for example, this girl conforms, is honest, and so forth. This positive frame of reference was problematic because staff felt that the pressure of attending to negative behavior in the residence prevented them from noticing the positive. The motivations created even greater difficulties for staff. Some would have changed specific motivations, presented them differently, or eliminated them altogether. A common complaint was that different motives should have been included. Examples were girls who wanted to "fade into the woodwork", defiant girls with an "I don't care" attitude, and inclusion of more expedient motives.

For those raters experiencing difficulty, the format of the motivational choices elicited the strongest opposition. Each behavior included four motives that raters were to mark as to percentage of time displayed by the girl (see Appendix B, rating instructions). In hopes of discerning
a predominant motive(s), the author asked raters to be certain each group of four choices summed to 100% (of the time). This rule drew strong objections from half of the raters who found it "unreasonable", "unrealistic", and "unfair". The other four raters were either unbothered or felt it encouraged more accurate ratings. The complaints were grounded in the impression that this type of ranking ran counter to their experience with girls' motives and/or was too difficult to evaluate under the circumstances. A similar concern was rating the girl with two strong motives operating simultaneously, to an equal degree. Marking each 50% of the time seemed inaccurate. The wording of the motivation choices was also troublesome. Each was written according to the stage terminology of the Gibbs et al. (1982) system of sociomoral motives. This contains some very fine distinctions that raters might have missed without training, because the choices appeared indistinguishable.

Lastly, rating five girls at one sitting seemed to "tire" some raters, and one felt this might threaten accuracy. (Rating one girl took approximately 10 to 15 minutes.) Format concerns aside, most staff (including some approached before the pilot began) seemed to feel the scale had good face validity. They mentioned that both behavior and motives were "on target with the girls we are seeing", and a couple offered that it would serve as a good training
device for staff.

Rater characteristics were mentioned by some staff as influential to inter-rater agreement. The personality of staff influences student behavior with them and their perceptions of students singly or as a group. The work shift of a staff member is important in terms of their opportunity to observe. Morning staff had less contact with girls on weekdays, with interaction restricted to one to two hours before school. The 3 to 10 shift spent more time, in more varied situations, with the girls. A helpful factor was that some morning staff worked two weekends per month. The staff position, whether on-line or supervisory, could be influential, not only because girls may relate to supervisors differently, but because the latter have freer access to a girl's file, and thus have more information on background and other's impressions of motivation.

Certain student characteristics were most often identified as the major impediment to accurate ratings. Thus, the inconsistency of behavior among all the girls was the prime concern in making these assessments. Staff reported that the girls' behavior varies not only with different staff, but at different times of the day, and with changes in circumstances. Some girls behave poorly in the mornings regardless of staff personality, then improve as the day continues. It was also mentioned that some girls tend to show all positive behaviors, while others are successful
in avoiding any staff attention.

Comments of Teaching Staff on Rating Students

In using a different rating device, this group of raters did not have to evaluate motivation, and were asked to observe largely negative behaviors instead of the positives of the first measure. Neither factor made it any easier for raters to agree. While some of this may be due to the difference in setting, the school, or to the fact that a few of the teachers said that 90% of their students were well-behaved, other considerations intervene. As with the previous raters, teachers almost without exception pointed to the extreme inconsistency in behavior as problematic to rating assessments.

Teachers listed several factors accounting for the "erratic" behavior of their students. They stressed the time of day, personality and sex of the teacher (girls behave better for male teachers), size of class, composition of the class (coed, or if their friends were present), and subject matter. On this latter, the woman who has taught physical education and health classes there for 18 years has often observed girls behaving quite differently in one class versus the other. Boys were described as better behaved than girls. Interestingly, though teachers and child care workers completed ratings in very different contexts, their comments about the inconsistency of students were quite similar.
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

None of the hypotheses offered for this project found support in the results. An adequately large group of subjects with a predominance of either security or affiliation needs was not obtainable, thus failing to confirm hypothesis 1. In that no clear correlational or regressive relationship was found between need levels and sociomoral reasoning stages, hypotheses 2 and 3 gained no support. Only partial correlations, controlling for demographic variables, showed weak correlations between esteem and total need scores and sociomoral reasoning. A group of supplementary items concerning affiliation with adults showed a negative regressive relationship between student rapport with teachers and sociomoral reasoning. Post-hoc analysis revealed girls to be reasoning at higher levels than boys, but feeling that their physical needs were less satisfied. Black subjects showed trends toward higher satisfaction of physical, security, and family affiliation needs. The linear relationships between age and needs reported elsewhere (Haymes & Green, 1977) were not discernable here.

The original formulation of this project planned to include behavior ratings to investigate a differential
relationship of needs with reasoning versus behavior. Two attempts were made to collect behavior ratings employing raters with different working relationships to subjects (child care versus teachers) in two settings with different rating devices. Both groups showed poor agreement among themselves, although some marginal agreement as obtained. In their written and interview explanations, raters offered numerous insights on rating delinquent youth. The first group found behavior easier to rate than motivation, in part because of the pressures on staff inherent in group care and the type of child rated. Concerns about the rating process arose from characteristics of the scale, the raters, or the ratees. The first group thought negative behavior might have been easier to rate, but this was not borne out by the second group. Despite differences between rater groups, raters in both settings observed that the behavior of their charges was extremely inconsistent, and that this was a major impediment to obtaining inter-rater agreement.

Discussion of Negative Results

The inability to obtain groups of subjects with predominant needs may have been the major obstacle in drawing some relationship between needs and reasoning level. The results of this study run counter to those of Green and Haymes (cited in Ward & Wilson, 1980) and Wilson and Wilson (1977), who both found esteem-oriented subjects
functioning at higher levels of moral reasoning than safety-oriented subjects. The current study was handicapped by the fact that the subjects were fairly homogeneous in regard to their needs. They tended to be low in fulfillment of safety needs and high in affiliation. Esteem was more variable, but difficult to analyze with the similarities of safety. Since one aim was to clarify the role of affiliation in moral development, the proportionately high satisfaction on this need was especially problematic. Several reasons may be cited for this pattern.

The use of institutional subjects may have distorted impressions of affiliative satisfaction. Perhaps the regimentation and generally threatening nature of institutional residence heightens an artificial solidarity among residents in response. Affiliation scores may also have been affected by tendencies to give the socially desirable response. Wilson (personal communication, July, 1983) mentioned that males in particular tend to be defensive about expressing affiliative needs, and a solution might be to administer multiple measures of the dimension. An alternative to the theory that affiliation is difficult to measure is the possibility that some subjects were not concerned enough about relationships to consider themselves unfulfilled. This is in line with Schaedler's (1973) finding that unsocialized-psychopathic delinquents had problems in their relationships with others, but because of a
general disinterest in people, were emotionally unaffected by it.

The uniformity of subjects on safety needs also prevented formation of subgroups. While this striking consistency was somewhat unexpected, it does intensify support for the notion that safety concerns may be a relevant dimension in understanding disadvantaged delinquents.

Although no connection emerged between needs and reasoning level, the research mentioned earlier (e.g., Michelini, Wilson, & Messe, 1975) indicates that a link between needs and moral behavior would be at least equally plausible. The lack of behavioral data was particularly damaging to this study in its goal to investigate personality antecedents of delinquent behavior. Ratings have the advantage of providing assessment of a range of behavior using repeated observation. The reasons behind the failure to derive reliable ratings would then be instructive to future efforts to understand delinquent behavior.

Although the reasons for the unreliable ratings as expressed by staff were reviewed previously, these can be viewed in a larger context of the unique impediments to evaluating delinquent youth. The fact that delinquents who are institutionalized provide a ready pool of subjects because of their accessibility and some measure of openness to requests imposed on subjects can be a deceiving advantage. The fact of institutionalization provides some
barriers to collecting behavioral information, particularly in the form of ratings. The organization of group care in this setting makes it difficult for staff to provide accurate ratings on positive behavior because staff-student ratios and competing task demands detract from careful observation. Rating positive behavior is particularly troublesome because of the negative behaviors requiring attention. The same problems arise in rating student motivation. Institutions also seem to vary in the amount of negative behavior exhibited by their students.

In this study, youth with similar offenses, placed in different residential settings, behaved very differently. Considering their offenses, students in one setting appeared surprisingly well-behaved while in the other setting students more often gave free expression to their frustrations. Aside from reducing generalizability of results, these effects impaired observation of the particular behavior (positive or negative) to be rated.

Two characteristics of delinquent youth handicapped ratings in other ways. The intense anger to which these youth often give vent can obscure the underlying motives to observers. However, the inconsistent behavior of the subjects was probably the greatest threat to reliable ratings. This complaint was so common among raters that inconsistency may be one of the most reliable characteristics of these youth which plays havoc with rating efforts.
Rater characteristics also had a negative impact on reliability. Work hours and job function are relevant in that morning staff and teachers had less opportunity to observe than did evening child care staff. Large age discrepancies within rater pairs may have suppressed reliability. Lastly, comments of staff rating motivation indicated that training in the terminology of the system and on what to look for would have improved rating agreement considerably.

Implications

Given the lack of support for all hypotheses proposed, the implications of the findings are primarily theoretical. The 10- to 20- point lower need satisfaction scores earned by subjects in this study compared to the normative group reported in the manual (Lollar & Smits, 1979) support the original assumption that this variable is relevant in studying delinquent youth. Although the directions given to subjects in this study for the NSS differed slightly from the original test instructions (see the Method chapter), it is doubtful that the difference would have created such a large and pervasive discrepancy.

Even if needs are relevant, this study provides no guidance on how they may be so. In fact, the absence of any relationship between needs and sociomoral reasoning would appear to support Kohlberg's (1976) position that growth of moral maturity is dependent not on fulfillment
of biological needs but on cognitive and social stimulation. The social stimulation referred to is evidenced in role-taking opportunities and exposure to moral atmospheres higher than one's own which presumably stimulate cognitive conflict.

Although no behavioral data were obtained for the final study, the two attempts and the rater comments about them yielded important information. Based on what staff say about their opportunities to observe in some segments of institutional life, staff can most often deal only with negative behavior and have little chance to notice, much less reinforce, positives. Since efforts at behavior change are more effective when timely reinforcement is given for positive behavior rather than consequences for negatives, it would appear that some ideal opportunities for changing behavior may be missed. A good grasp of student motives would also seem to enhance staff effectiveness in promoting behavior change. These observations would appear relevant to treatment in institutions where the major percentage of time is spent in school and residences. Some raters were close enough to acceptable inter-rater agreement that it would appear possible that positive behavior and motivations might be observable under the proper training conditions. Lastly, staff so frequently cited the inconsistency of students that delinquents might be better investigated in terms of their
inconsistency rather than deviance alone. Other investigators have noted extreme inconsistency as a characteristic of some groups as in Martin and Beezley's (1976) description of abused children as "chameleon" in their adaptation to various environments. Behavioral measurements for research with such groups must attend more closely to subtle environmental influences and exercise caution in the generalization of results.

Suggestions for Future Research

Although this project failed to uncover relationships between need dimensions and a sociomoral reasoning hierarchy, some procedural improvements might increase the chances of supportive results in the future. Since subjects in this study were strikingly homogeneous in their reported safety and affiliation satisfaction, future research with this dimension could focus on different measurement techniques in an effort to obtain various patterns of need orientations. Various subgroups, for example, using Quay's (1964a) typology of psychopathic, neurotic, and subcultural delinquents, have already been shown to vary in level of role-taking and moral development (Jurkovic & Prentice, 1977), and may provide a good test of divergent need patterns. Since affiliation would seem of prime importance during adolescence, special attention should be given to potential subcategories of this need. Some examples would be affiliation with peers versus
adults, conventional versus unconventional peers (Hinde-
lang, 1973), or timing of ruptured parent-child affil-
iation (Farrington, 1978). To tap this range of affil-
iative possibilities and control for response biases,
multiple measures of the need might be helpful.

At the present, the NSS is unique in being a measure
of needs that was developed and partially standardized on
delinquent youth. In seeking a complementary measure to
assess affiliation, McClelland's (1981) view about the
greater effectiveness of operant techniques in measuring
needs might be considered. He believes that operant tech-
niques yield a clearer view of the unconscious character
of needs. McClelland cautions that personality correlates
are most likely to be obtained when tests are matched on
their operant versus respondent character. Inclusion of
a projective device in testing for the needs of disadvan-
taged delinquents may be beneficial and interpretive
guides should be developed for this population. However,
operant measures can only supplement, not replace a
measure of needs like Lollar and Smit's which elicits di-
rect information on the adequacy of the subjects environ-
ment in meeting basic needs.

A type of moral reasoning which might be influenced
more by need orientation and relate more closely with be-
havior are dilemmas posed within the delinquent's imme-
rate context or those worded to involve the self. Kohlberg,
Scharf, and Hickey (1972) compared inmate reasoning on a standard set of moral dilemmas with reasoning about dilemmas reflecting experiences in a prison context. Without exception, the inmates displayed less mature moral judgment with the prison version. Also employing an alternate reasoning context, Weiss (1982) found that decision making in stories involving the self were distinguished from those involving hypothetical others in that adolescents displayed increased concern with consequences (as relating to the self), more prudentially based decisions, and less adequate reasoning. He suggests that under some conditions, moral reasoning may be dominated by decisions the youth prefers for prudential reasons. Similar results have been obtained by Leming (1978). Such alterations of research design might help clarify the role of needs in decision making.

Need fulfillment may have the greatest impact on moral action rather than on reasoning development. The notion possesses a certain face validity as applied to delinquents, since the fair number at the conventional level appear not to be applying this capacity to their personal lives. Since the pressures and the necessary organization of institutional life complicate the collection of behavioral data, a study of the needs and behavior of pre-delinquent teens may be more productive. However it is approached, the connection between needs, reasoning, and
behavior warrants closer scrutiny, particularly with the
often neglected population of delinquent youth.
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### Appendix A

#### Need Satisfaction Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Parents' mental status (check one—"/"): Together ☐ separated ☐ divorced ☐ widowed ☐
- Father's highest education level: 0-4th grade ☐ 5-8th grade ☐ high school degree ☐ college degree ☐ graduate degree ☐
- Mother's highest education level: 0-4th grade ☐ 5-8th grade ☐ high school degree ☐ college degree ☐ graduate degree ☐
- Major source of family income: Father's earnings ☐ mother's earnings ☐ public assistance ☐ other ☐
- How many people live in your home? ☐

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each question, choose only one answer—"yes" or "no." There are no right or wrong answers. Place an "X" in the column which best answers the question for you. If you are not sure about an item, answer it the way you usually think or feel. Please read each item carefully. **Do not skip any questions.** If you wish to change your answer, draw a circle around your first "X" and make a new "X" in the other box.

### NSS—II
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Appendix B

Moral Behavior and Motivation Measure

Social Motivation and Behavior Scale

Rater's name _______________________

How long have you known this girl? __________

Has this girl's behavior changed significantly recently? yes no. If yes, for the better or worse?

Has any significant event recently occurred in her life? yes no

If yes, please describe ____________________________________________

In your opinion, is this affecting her behavior? yes no

Code No. _________

Today's Date _________
Introduction

This is a rating scale which has been designed for staff to rate students' behavior and motives in social situations having a potential for conflict. Each item is organized to present four different motives for a behavior that might be demonstrated by a girl. The rater is asked to mark the frequency with which each behavior and motive is observed. Choices are available in case the behavior observed takes a negative form or if it has not been observed at all.

The behavioral items (1-15) were chosen for their relevance to institutionalized youth. The emphasis however is on the motivation (alternatives A-D) behind the behavior. Motivation is thought to be important because a person can behave less maturely than their capabilities would allow. A person can also behave in a particular manner for different reasons. These underlying reasons can sometimes help us understand the youth we are working with better than observations of outward behavior. It is hoped that an understanding of general motives for behavior can facilitate treatment objectives for a segment of the youthful population that has to date been a challenge to the therapeutic community.

Instructions

For each situation, read through all the alternatives A through D then respond to each one (circle your answer) in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation for that particular girl. Students may not be able to put feelings or beliefs into the exact wording printed in the alternatives. Rate according to the general thrust of their intentions.

For any given situation more than one motivation may be observed though probably each to various degrees. If only one alternative applies to a girl, you would mark that as being of higher frequency while the other four alternatives should be marked as less often occurring. In marking A-D you must rate some motivation to account for 100% of the time a girl shows a behavior (even if you only observed that behavior a couple of times). Think of the frequencies almost never to almost always as 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100% of the time respectively. When you finish marking motivations for a situation, your marks should add up to 100. Combinations yielding 100% would be four occasionally's, two occasionally's and one half the time, one almost always and three almost nevers, etc.
Sometimes an alternative for a situation will include more than one behavior or motive. Even if you feel that only one may apply, answer in terms of that one item. You must make some response to all lettered choices. The only exceptions would be if you rate a girl as almost never showing that behavior when faced with the situation or if you have not observed this girl in a particular situation. In that case, mark almost never (shows this behavior) directly under the behavioral stem or the space at the bottom of the page (if you have not observed her at all in the situation). In either case, skip the A-D choices and go on to the next page.

Responses should be based only on your own experience with the girl either through observation or discussion. Do not consider other's opinions of the girl without your own experience. Also do not discuss these situations with the girl just for this scale. Responses must be based on observation or discussion about actual situations. If you feel certain a student's reasons for her behavior are a "front" for other, perhaps selfish motives, respond to the underlying motive instead of the student's explanation.

Look through all 15 items before starting and if you find you have observed less than 8 of the situations please return the form so that it may be given to another person. A sample item is provided on the next page.
Sample

Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation for the situation presented.

This girl demonstrates courtesy and good manners in her interaction with staff and students ....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. because staff say a person should always be polite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. because staff expect the more mature girls to be courteous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. because she believes that everyone has a right to a certain amount of respect from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. because she realizes that if she's going to be able to leave the institution anytime soon, she'll have to be friendly with staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space _____ and go on to the next page.

*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

1. This student conforms to staff requests...

   | Almost | Occasion- | Half the | Fairly | Almost |
   | Never* | Ally     | Time     | Often  | Always |

   A. because she has formed a relationship with that person and seeks his or her approval.

   | Almost | Occasion- | Half the | Fairly | Almost |
   | Never  | Ally     | Time     | Often  | Always |

   B. when it is to her immediate advantage (gets a reward, to maintain or obtain her level).

   | Almost | Occasion- | Half the | Fairly | Almost |
   | Never  | Ally     | Time     | Often  | Always |

   C. because she believes obedience is important to maintaining the system of rules governing the institution.

   | Almost | Occasion- | Half the | Fairly | Almost |
   | Never  | Ally     | Time     | Often  | Always |

   D. to avoid being put on restriction or other punishment where normal benefits are curtailed.

   | Almost | Occasion- | Half the | Fairly | Almost |
   | Never  | Ally     | Time     | Often  | Always |

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space _____ and go on to the next page.

*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

2. This student tries to stick to promises she has made...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. because she's afraid staff and/or peers will make things hard for her if she doesn't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. because she sees it as a commitment that she has a responsibility to fulfill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. because she recognizes that a broken trust can harm a friendship or she wishes to be well thought of by her peers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

D. if the other person involved has agreed to do her a favor in return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space _____ and go on to the next page.
*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.*
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

3. When this girl is rightly suspected of misbehavior (evading responsibility, helping someone AWOL, starting a fight, mild damage to property, etc.) and when approached for an explanation she admits misbehavior...

   A. more readily to staff members with whom she has developed a relationship.
      Almost * Occasionally Half the Time Fairly Often Almost
      Never* * ally

   B. after first blaming others, outright denial, etc. so she isn’t punished.
      Almost * Occasionally Half the Time Fairly Often Almost
      Never* * ally

   C. after first trying to avoid getting caught or convince staff that she was at least partly justified or because she knows it will get her in deeper trouble to lie.
      Almost * Occasionally Half the Time Fairly Often Almost
      Never* * ally

   D. because she regrets that she was acting out of character.
      Almost * Occasionally Half the Time Fairly Often Almost
      Never* * ally

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space _____ and go on to the next page.
*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

h. A new or unpopular girl is being taunted, ridiculed, or harassed by a dominant girl or group in the cottage and is obviously bothered by it. The girl you are rating...

A. either joins in or watches in silence fearing that the dominant girl or group might turn on her next.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never ally Time Often Always

P. helps the victim especially if she has friends who share her discomfort with the cruelty of such taunts.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never ally Time Often Always

C. helps the victim because believes that if people have to live together in a group, they should show respect for one another.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never ally Time Often Always

D. either joins in or watches in silence believing that if the girl can't defend herself, that's too bad.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never ally Time Often Always

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space _____ and go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

5. Given the situation where this girl has important knowledge of a student behavior significantly harmful to that student or others (see below for examples), she would tell ....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasion-</th>
<th>Half the</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Almost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>if she perceived herself as &quot;owing a favor&quot; to a particular staff member, otherwise why get involved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Occasion-</td>
<td>Half the</td>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>Almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>if she had developed a relationship of sharing and trust with a staff member or if she feels her close friends would approve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Occasion-</td>
<td>Half the</td>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>Almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>if she perceived that no girls stronger and more dominant than she would come down on her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Occasion-</td>
<td>Half the</td>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>Almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>feeling that she has a responsibility as a member of the group, to do her part for the welfare of the individual or group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Occasion-</td>
<td>Half the</td>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>Almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples:
- a depressed girl telling her of serious plans to OD on drugs or other harmful substance,
- knowledge of specific individuals dealing drugs on campus,
- knowledge of a group of girls who set up another (innocent) girl to take the blame for some violation of rules,
- knowledge of an AVGL plan with serious consequences for the girl(s) involved, etc.

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space _____ and go on to the next page.

*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

6. This girl's attitude toward public property as demonstrated in her behavior toward cottage furnishings, school books and supplies, etc. seems to be...

A. one of respect because everyone has to do their part to maintain the property for everyone else.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. positively affected by her feeling that this is her temporary "home and family".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. that the items really don't belong to anyone, so hard treatment (defacement, destruction) is OK as long as you don't get caught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. that as long as no one is looking, hard treatment isn't wrong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space: _____ and go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

7. During a student disagreement with staff in a group meeting or activity, this girl would side with the student complaining.

Almost  *Occasion-
Never*  ally  Half the  Fairly  Almost
                     Time  Often  Always

A. to gain the approval of her peers.

Almost  Occasion-
Never  ally  Half the  Fairly  Almost
                     Time  Often  Always

B. if she was sure she would not somehow be penalized for her comments or if she feels more powerful staff would also side that way.

Almost  Occasion-
Never  ally  Half the  Fairly  Almost
                     Time  Often  Always

C. in an attempt to "jump on the bandwagon" so she could voice an unrelated but personal complaint about her own "mistreatment" or just let off some steam.

Almost  Occasion-
Never  ally  Half the  Fairly  Almost
                     Time  Often  Always

D. if she felt the staff's behavior broke the policy of the institution or similar agencies.

Almost  Occasion-
Never  ally  Half the  Fairly  Almost
                     Time  Often  Always

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space: ______ and go on to the next page.
*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

P. This girl will go out of her way to help another girl with schoolwork, a craft project, her charge, etc. . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasion-ally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. even if she hardly knew the girl because she feels that people ought to help each other so everyone will benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>Occasion-ally</td>
<td>Half the Time</td>
<td>Fairly Often</td>
<td>Almost Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. if it was one of her friends because she reasons that she might need her friends &quot;in a pinch&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>Occasion-ally</td>
<td>Half the Time</td>
<td>Fairly Often</td>
<td>Almost Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. if staff tell her to or if it would keep her out of trouble with staff or peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>Occasion-ally</td>
<td>Half the Time</td>
<td>Fairly Often</td>
<td>Almost Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. if the individual was a close friend or someone she wanted to develop a relationship with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space ______ and go on to the next page.

*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.*
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

9. This girl behaves in a nonprejudiced manner to whites/blacks (consider race other than her own) ...

A. because she realizes that the group can't function smoothly without each race accepting the other.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never\* ally Time Often Always

B. because she feels you should care the same about everyone or to maintain the personal acceptance of staff and/or peers.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never\* ally Time Often Always

C. to avoid getting into a racial fight where she could get physically hurt.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never\* ally Time Often Always

D. because she believes that a person's race is not important and everyone deserves equal respect and consideration.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never\* ally Time Often Always

E. when they can do something for her or she needs their help.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never\* ally Time Often Always

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space _____ and go on to the next page.

*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

10. "When this girl's wants or desires conflict with the needs of others and the staff decision does not allow her to have her way, this girl conforms (even if reluctantly) ..."

A. out of fear of staff authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. because she seems to accept the responsibility and general right of the staff to arbitrate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. so people won't think poorly of her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

D. to maintain her level of privileges but may also look for the opportunity to have her way after all or to get even.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space ____ and go on to the next page.

*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

11. This girl cooperates in doing an uninteresting group task (may include cottage charges individually done) ...

Almost Never  Occasion  Half the Time  Fairly Often  Almost Always

A. because everyone is expected to help out and that way others will know she is well-intentioned.

Almost Never  Occasion  Half the Time  Fairly Often  Almost Always

B. because she believes everyone must share the work or that she should accept responsibility.

Almost Never  Occasion  Half the Time  Fairly Often  Almost Always

C. to stay on the good side of staff or to obtain something attractive.

Almost Never  Occasion  Half the Time  Fairly Often  Almost Always

D. because staff have told her she has to and there may be consequences if she does not.

Almost Never  Occasion  Half the Time  Fairly Often  Almost Always

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space ______ and go on to the next page.

*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

12. If given the opportunity to borrow something from someone, this girl seems to be careful with the item ....

Almost

Occasion-

Half the

Fairly

Almost

Never

ally

Time

Often

Always

A. out of a sense of responsibility to honor the good faith of the lender.

Almost

Occasion-

Half the

Fairly

Almost

Never

ally

Time

Often

Always

B. if she fears punishment by the owner for loss or damage.

Almost

Occasion-

Half the

Fairly

Almost

Never

ally

Time

Often

Always

C. if it belongs to a person with whom she has developed a mutual relationship.

Almost

Occasion-

Half the

Fairly

Almost

Never

ally

Time

Often

Always

D. out of a self-interested need for the article. Gives little thought to owner’s feelings or possible retaliation after damage.

Almost

Occasion-

Half the

Fairly

Almost

Never

ally

Time

Often

Always

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space _____ and go on to the next page.

*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

13. When a controversy arises during some competitive activity (sports, games) this girl will try to go along with an unfavorable decision ....

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never* ally Time Often Always

A. if she can't think of some angle by which she or her team can gain the advantage in the argument.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never* ally Time Often Always

B. so her friends will consider her to be a good sport.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never* ally Time Often Always

C. if she feels in this case that if they are to continue playing together, someone will have to compromise.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never* ally Time Often Always

D. because she doesn't want her team or the staff to make things hard for her if they disagree.

Almost Occasion- Half the Fairly Almost
Never* ally Time Often Always

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space _____ and go on to the next page.

*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next pare.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

14. This girl leads or follows in a group rebellion against campus rules ....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasion-</th>
<th>Half the</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never*</td>
<td>ally</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. if she feels the campus rule violates basic standards for any institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasion-</th>
<th>Half the</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Almost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>ally</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. to let off steam, have fun or derive some other benefit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasion-</th>
<th>Half the</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>ally</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. to gain peer approval or if she believes the staff's support of the rules shows a lack of caring and affection on the part of staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasion-</th>
<th>Half the</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Almost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>ally</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. if she feels confident she will not be punished by staff or not be picked on later by peers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasion-</th>
<th>Half the</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Almost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>ally</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space _____ and go on to the next page.

*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.
Please read through all the alternatives for this situation, then answer each in terms of how frequently you have observed each behavior and motivation in the situation presented.

15. This student will share an item such as a food treat or cigarette with a peer ....

   Almost         Occasion-         Half the         Fairly         Almost
   Never*        ally             Time            Often           Always

   A. because it is a sign of maturity to be generous.

   Almost         Occasion-         Half the         Fairly         Almost
   Never         ally             Time            Often           Always

   B. when it is to her own advantage to do so (gets something in return, obtain a future favor) or if she likes the person.

   Almost         Occasion-         Half the         Fairly         Almost
   Never        ally             Time            Often           Always

   C. to avoid getting hurt by stronger peers.

   Almost         Occasion-         Half the         Fairly         Almost
   Never         ally             Time            Often           Always

   D. if she is close to them or wants to befriend them.

   Almost         Occasion-         Half the         Fairly         Almost
   Never         ally             Time            Often           Always

If you have not observed or discussed this situation with this particular girl, please mark this space _____ and go on to the next page.

*If you circled Almost Never, skip A-D & go on to the next page.
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Revised Behavior Problem Checklist

REVISED BEHAVIOR PROBLEM CHECKLIST

Herbert C. Quay, Ph.D.
University of Miami

and

Donald R. Peterson, Ph.D.
Rutgers University

Copyright © Herbert C. Quay and Donald R. Peterson, 1983

Please complete items 1 to 7 carefully.

1. Name (or identification number) of child

______________________________________________________________

2. Date of birth _______________________

3. Sex _______________________

4. Father’s occupation __________________________________________

5. Name of person completing this checklist ________________________

6. Relationship to child (circle one)

   a. Mother  b. Father  c. Teacher  d. Other _______________________

7. Date checklist completed _______________________

Please indicate which of the following are problems, as far as this child is concerned. If an item does not constitute a problem or if you have had no opportunity to observe or have no knowledge about the item, circle the zero. If an item constitutes a mild problem, circle the one; if an item constitutes a severe problem, circle the two. Please complete every item.
Appendix D

Sociomoral Reflection Measure

SOCIAL REFLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions

In this booklet are two social problems with questions for you to answer. We are asking the question not just to find out your opinions about what should be done in the problems, but also to understand why you have those opinions. Please answer all the questions, especially the "why" questions. Feel free to use the backs of the pages to finish writing your answers if you need more space.

Name: ____________________________
Age: ____________________________
Sex: (circle one): male/female
Date: ____________________________
Probleme ONE

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 wanted people to pay ten times what the drug cost him to make.

The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about half of what the druggist wanted. Heinz told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or to let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No. I discovered the drug, and I'm going to make money from it." So the only way Heinz could get the drug would be to break into the druggist's store and steal the drug.

Heinz has a problem. He should help his wife and save her life. But, on the other hand, the only way he could get the drug she needs would be to break the law by stealing the drug.

What should Heinz do?

should steal/should not steal/can't decide (circle one)

Why? 

Let's change things about the problem and see if you still have the opinion you circled above (should steal, should not steal, or can't decide). Also, we want to find out about the things you think are important in this and other problems, especially why you think those things are important. Please try to help us understand your thinking by writing as much as you can to explain your opinions—even if you have to write out your explanations more than once. Don't just write "same as before." If you can explain better or use different words to show what you mean, that helps us even more. Please answer all the questions below, especially the "why" questions.

1. What if Heinz's wife asks him to steal the drug for her? Should Heinz:

   steal/should not steal/can't decide (circle one)?

1a. How important is it for a husband to do what his wife asks, to save her by stealing, even when he isn't sure whether that's the best thing to do?

   very important/important/not important (circle one)
1b. WHY is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

2. What if Heinz doesn't love his wife? Should Heinz:

steal/not steal/can't decide (circle one)?

2a. How important is it for a husband to steal to save his wife, even if he doesn't love her?

very important/important/not important (circle one)

2b. WHY is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

3. What if the person dying isn't Heinz's wife but instead is a friend (and the friend can get no one else to help)? Should Heinz:

steal/not steal/can't decide (circle one)?

3a. How important is it to do everything you can, even break the law, to save the life of a friend?

very important/important/not important (circle one)

3b. WHY is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?
4a. What about for a stranger? How important is it to do everything you can, even break the law, to save the life of a stranger?

very important/important/not important (circle one)

4b. Why is this very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

________________________

________________________

5. What if the druggist just wants Heinz to pay what the drug cost to make, and Heinz can't even pay that? Should Heinz:

steal/not steal/can't decide (circle one)?

5a. How important is it for people not to take things that belong to other people?

very important/important/not important (circle one)

5b. Why is this very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

________________________

________________________

6a. How important is it for people to obey the law?

very important/important/not important (circle one)

6b. Why is this very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

________________________

________________________
7. What if Heinz steals the drug? His wife does get better, but in the meantime, the police take Heinz and bring him to court. Should the judge:

jail Heinz/let Heinz go free/can't decide (circle one)?

7a. How important is it for judges to go easy on people like Heinz?

very important/important/not important (circle one)

7b. WHY is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

8. What if Heinz tells the judge that he only did what his conscience told him to do? Should the judge:

jail Heinz/let Heinz go free/can't decide (circle one)?

8a. How important is it for judges to go easy on lawbreakers who have acted out of conscience?

very important/important/not important (circle one)

8b. WHY is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

9. What if Heinz's wife never had cancer? What if she was only a little sick, and Heinz stole the drug to help her get well a little sooner? Should the judge:

jail Heinz/let Heinz go free/can't decide (circle one)?

9a. How important is it for judges to send people who break the law to jail?

very important/important/not important (circle one)
9b. WHY is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?
Joe is a fourteen-year-old boy who wanted to go to camp very much. His father promised him he could go if he saved up the money for it himself. So Joe worked hard at his paper route and saved up the $40 it cost to go to camp and a little more besides. But just before camp was going to start, his father changed his mind. Some of his father's friends decided to go on a special fishing trip, and Joe's father was short of the money it would cost. So he told Joe to give him the money Joe had saved from the paper route. Joe doesn't want to give up going to camp, so he thinks of refusing to give his father the money.

Joe has a problem. Joe's father promised Joe he could go to camp if he earned and saved up the money. But, on the other hand, the only way Joe could go would be by disobeying and not helping his father.

What should Joe do?

should refuse/should not refuse/can't decide (circle one)

Why?

---

Let's change things about the problem and see if you still have the opinion you circled above (should refuse, should not refuse, can't decide). Also, we want to find out about the things you think are important in this and other problems, and especially why you think those things are important. Please try to help us understand your thinking by WRITING AS MUCH AS YOU CAN TO EXPLAIN YOUR OPINIONS—EVEN IF YOU HAVE TO WRITE OUT YOUR EXPLANATIONS MORE THAN ONCE. Don't just write "same as before." If you can explain better or use different words to show what you mean, that's even better. Please answer all the questions below, especially the "why" questions.

1. What if Joe hadn't earned the money? What if the father had simply given the money to Joe and promised Joe could use it to go to camp—but now the father wants the money back for the fishing trip? Should Joe:

refuse/not refuse/can't decide (circle one)?

1a. How important is it for parents to keep their promises about letting their children keep money—even when their children never earned the money?

very important/important/not important (circle one)
1b. Why is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2a. What about keeping a promise to a friend? How important is it to keep a promise, if you can, to a friend?

very important/important/not important (circle one)

2b. Why is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3a. What about to anyone? How important is it to keep a promise, if you can, even to someone you hardly know?

very important/important/not important (circle one)

3b. Why is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. What if Joe’s father hadn’t told Joe to give him the money but had just asked Joe if he would lend the money? Should Joe:

refuse/not refuse/can’t decide (circle one)?

4a. How important is it for children to help their parents, even when their parents have broken a promise?

very important/important/not important (circle one)
4b. Why is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

5. What if Joe did earn the money, but Joe's father did not promise that Joe could keep the money? Should Joe:
   refuse/not refuse/can't decide (circle one)?

5a. How important is it for parents to let their children keep earned money—even when the children were not promised that they could keep the money?
   very important/important/not important (circle one)

5b. Why is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?

6. What if the father needs the money not to go on a fishing trip but instead to pay for food for the family? Should Joe:
   refuse/not refuse/can't decide (circle one)?

6a. How important is it for children to help their parents—even when it means that the children won't get to do something they want to do?
   very important/important/not important (circle one)

6b. Why is that very important/important/not important (whichever one you circled)?
Appendix E

Supplemental Ten Questions

For these questions, follow the same directions as you did for the MSS-II you just completed.

1. Do you have parents or other adult family members (aunts, uncles) that you feel close enough to, to discuss very personal matters?  
   Yes  No

2. Are there two or more adults outside your family that seem to like you a lot?  
   □  □

3. Over the past few years has there been a teacher or adult from church that you've liked enough to try to get to know?  
   □  □

4. Do your parents usually show consideration for your feelings and needs?  
   □  □

5. Are there any adults outside your family that you could discuss very personal matters with?  
   □  □

6. Does it seem like your teachers want you to succeed?  
   □  □

7. Do you get along with most of the adults you know (outside your family)?  
   □  □

8. Allowing for the institution's rules, does your family visit or write to you as often as you think they should?  
   □  □

9. Are there any adults outside your home that like you enough to go out of their way to help you with a problem?  
   □  □

10. Do your parents know you fairly well as a person?  
    □  □

   code #:________
Appendix F

Introduction to Study

I am doing some research on what might influence how people think about situations where their wants and desires conflict with those of others. To be able to do this, I need some help from you. I have four forms here that I would like for you to fill out. The first two are consent forms. If you decide to sign them you will be agreeing to participate in this study as I am about to describe it. The third form has 90 questions about things people believe are important to getting along in life and being happy - things like being able to get enough sleep, having friends, etc. The other form describes two situations and asks questions about what you think about them. Also, for some of you I may gather some impressions from people you interact with to compare their opinions about your feelings with what you say about your feelings. The reason I am studying this is because I believe it can help staff and students in agencies understand each other better.

Some of the questions may seem a little personal but your answers will be between just you and me so no one else will know what you answered. Everything you do here will be entirely confidential. Your name will be on the consent forms only. For the paper where you write out answers, one other person from OSU will read it, but since your name won't be on it, he won't be able to connect you with your answers. You have the right to withdraw if you want to and there will be no consequences if you choose to do so. What you do here will be for research purposes only. No information from this research will be put in your file. Any information the agency receives will be about the group as a whole, not about specific individuals. If you ever have any questions about this, I will know where to reach me and then I will get in touch with you.
Appendix G

Consent Forms

Purpose:

This will indicate my consent to participate in a research investigation entitled: A Study of the Relationship Between Maturation of Moral Judgment and Need Satisfaction in Institutionalized Youth.

The nature and general purpose of the research program has been explained to me in a way which I understand. This research will be conducted under the direction of Henry Leland - Ohio State University.

I understand that any further inquiries I make concerning the research procedures will be answered. I understand that my personal identity will not be revealed in any publication, document, recording, photograph, storage system or in any other way without my expressed permission. Finally, I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time following the notification of the Research Director.

Signed ________________ (Subject)

Date ________________

Witness ________________

Investigator ________________

(code #: ________________)

139
CONSENT AND RELEASE

I, ______________________________________, hereby consent to the use of information and data obtained from me through the use of the Social Reflection Questionnaire and the NSS-II for the project entitled A Study of the Relationship Between Maturation of Moral Judgment and Need Satisfaction in Institutionalized Youth for research and statistical purposes. I understand that my name will not be used in connection with this information or data without my prior consent.

In consideration of the above, I hereby release the Youth Services, its officers, employees and agents from any liability which might otherwise be incurred as the result of the use, distribution or disclosure of the information or date referred to above.

WITNESSETH:

________________________________________  Youth

________________________________________

Youth
### Simple Correlations between Need, Reasoning, and Demographic Factors

#### Appendix H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.1794</td>
<td>0.2178</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.0592</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0.1794</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td>0.1920</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.1702</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>0.2178</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2165</td>
<td>0.1956</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.1920</td>
<td>0.2165</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0545</td>
<td>0.2022</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.1956</td>
<td>0.0545</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
<td>0.3912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.0592</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.2022</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.3912</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.1794</td>
<td>0.2178</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.0592</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td>0.1920</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.1702</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>0.1920</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2165</td>
<td>0.1956</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0545</td>
<td>0.2022</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.2022</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.2022</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
<td>0.3912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.1702</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.3912</td>
<td>0.3912</td>
<td>0.3912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
<td>0.3765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.1702</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Correlation coefficients are displayed with their corresponding significance levels under the heading 'Prob > |r| under H0 (p < .05) for N = 97.*
Legend

SN - subject number
AG - age
OL - offense level
SR - sociomoral reflection maturity score
PH - physical needs
SC - security needs
AF - affiliation needs
ES - esteem needs
TT - total need score
PA - affiliation with parents
FM - affiliation with family
N8 - item number 8
TE - affiliation with teachers
CM - affiliation with community adults
Monum - modal score
Glnum - global score
### Appendix I

#### Partial Correlations between Need and Reasoning Variables

The table below presents partial correlations coefficients from the error SSCP matrix with probabilities (PR) and degrees of freedom (DF) = 46.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>NNX</th>
<th>NNH</th>
<th>GLNNH</th>
<th>FH</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>AF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR</strong></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LN</strong></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FN</strong></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC</strong></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF</strong></td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES</strong></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TT</strong></td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PA</strong></td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FN</strong></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NB</strong></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IE</strong></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LN</strong></td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>TI</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>FH</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUH</td>
<td>0.213249</td>
<td>0.205747</td>
<td>0.205747</td>
<td>0.205747</td>
<td>0.205747</td>
<td>0.205747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0.198948</td>
<td>0.198948</td>
<td>0.198948</td>
<td>0.198948</td>
<td>0.198948</td>
<td>0.198948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLU</td>
<td>0.140277</td>
<td>0.140277</td>
<td>0.140277</td>
<td>0.140277</td>
<td>0.140277</td>
<td>0.140277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
<td>0.040948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
<td>0.026664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Definitions of Rater Errors and General Guidelines

The following are labels, definitions, and remedies for the four rater pitfalls that I discussed with you in our initial meeting. It is important to be mindful of these during both observation and actual rating as these errors can greatly influence the goodness of rating evaluations.

Halo or pitchfork error occurs when the rater is overly influenced by one characteristic (positive or negative) of a person in completing his evaluation. The result is that the overall rating is misleadingly skewed in the positive or negative direction. For example, a student who is a severe problem in terms of arguing or being easily angered is not necessarily a problem with regards to fighting. The remedy for halo or pitchfork error would be to recognize the independence of the behaviors being observed and to treat them separately during observation and rating.

Similar-to-me error is the tendency to judge more favorably those perceived as similar to oneself. A ratee for example may be similar to you in beliefs, ideas or preferences among other things. The remedy is to be on guard for those students (Ss) you consciously view as similar to yourself or those that impress you very positively overall. In the latter instance you may be overlooking some important behavior on their part. You can combat this error by seeking both confirming and disconfirming observations of your current impressions.

Contrast error operates during observation when one well-behaved S makes the others look bad. During actual rating it occurs when the evaluation of a S is affected by the immediately preceding S evaluation. In general you need to avoid comparing raters to each other both for observation and rating. A more specific remedy is to compare each of your rates to a common standard. The best standard is to compare your rates with the best and worst demonstration of that behavior you have seen within the institution.

Observation period errors stem from the tendency to use only the last part of the observation period allotted. It is important to use the full two weeks as a S who may be having a few bad days will end up with skewed ratings if that was the only time you were observing. Although this observation period is offered it may be helpful and perhaps wise to use your prior experience with the S in making your ratings. The only exception would be if the S's behavior has changed significantly since she arrived. When rating, the goal will be to evaluate each S's behavior as it is now.
General guidelines

1. Students should not be aware you are observing or will be rating them. Awareness on their part could jeopardize later work to be done with them.

2. Ratings should be done only on the basis of your own observations of the S and not on the observation of other staff.

3. The thrust of your observations should be whether the behaviors in question are not problem or a mild or severe problem for this child in your contacts with her. Be aware also that you will be rating students relative to other students you have observed at this institution.

4. Although you will be completing the full 89-item Revised Behavior Problem Checklist, focus your observations only on the 31 behaviors on the typed sheet.

Thank you very much for your assistance.
Appendix K

Target Behaviors for Observation.

Second Rater Group

Seeks attention; "shows off"

Fights

Disobedient; difficult to control

Hypersensitive; feelings are easily hurt

Negative; tends to do the opposite of what is requested

Irritable, hot-tempered; easily angered

Frouly admits disrespect for moral values and laws

Bulks and pouts

Tries to dominate others; bullies, threatens

Generally fearful; anxious

Brags and boasts

Not liked by others; is a "loner" because of aggressive behavior

Cheat

Refuses to take directions; won't do as told

Deliberately cruel to others

Will lie to protect his friends

Disruptive; annoys and bothers others

Has temper tantrums

Uncooperative in group situations

Impertinent; talks back

Irresponsible, undependable

Argues; quarrels

Feels he or she can't succeed

Persists and nag; can't take "no" for an answer

Picks at other children as a way of getting their attention;

... seems to want to relate but doesn't know how

Impulsive; starts before understanding what to do;

doesn't stop and think

Tastes others

Selfish; won't share; always takes the biggest piece

Cannot stand to wait; wants everything right now

Blames others; denies own mistakes

Nervous, jittery, jumpy; easily startled
Appendix L

Letters of Permission to Reproduce Copyrighted Material

Ms. Cheryl Greenway
Jossey Bass Publishing, Inc.
433 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94104

Dear Ms. Greenway,

As we discussed on the phone today, I am interested in using a table from the book *Ego Development* by Jane Loevinger, copyrighted, 1976. Specifically, it is Table I, entitled Some Milestones of Ego Development, pages 24-25.

The table would be reproduced in my dissertation which I am completing for a degree at the Ohio State University. No charges would be involved and I would estimate that eight copies at most would be made. (Agencies who offered their cliental as subjects would be the recipients.)

I would appreciate your expeditious reply as I am working under numerous deadlines. Thank you for your effort in this matter.

Sincerely,

Lenore Melmeyer
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April 9 1984

Lenore Helmsayer
61 E. Dunedin Rd.
Columbus, Ohio 43214

Dear Ms. Helmsayer,

Thank you for your letter requesting permission to use the following material in your dissertation, thesis, or paper:

Selection: Table 9.1 page 161.


The material you have requested may be used for the purpose you have indicated, provided you use the above credit line as your footnote.

If the selection above contains any excerpts, figures, or illustration from other sources, permission for the use of this material must be separately requested from the copyright holder of the original source, as indicated in our credit notice.

Should your dissertation, thesis, or paper later be accepted for any commercial publication or use, it would be necessary for you to renegotiate this permission, and our regular terms and fees would apply. If you have any questions, please let me know, and I will be glad to advise you.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

College Permissions