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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

The internal regulation of human conduct depends on the interaction between moral judgment and self-critical guilt among other factors. It has been found that an appreciable percentage of delinquents are delayed in moral judgment development (Kohlberg & Freundlich 1973; Blasi, 1980), and that within the juvenile delinquent population there is a relationship between moral judgment and guilt (Ruma & Mosher, 1967). There are also indications that moral judgment and guilt can possibly enhance the prediction of conduct in delinquents. Like their adolescent counterparts, adult offenders disproportionally evidence less advanced moral judgment in relation to matched controls (Thornton & Reid, 1982). Many adult offenders could be described as preconventional individuals with the rules of society being external to themselves and with a concrete individual perspective. Furthermore, many adult offenders do not evidence self-critical guilt (Samenow, 1984).

The objective of this dissertation is to explore the relations between moral judgment, expression of guilt, and conduct in adult offenders. In addition to guilt and moral judgment maturity, self-esteem will be studied. It is postulated by Kohlberg (1969) that "affective" aspects of moral judgment, such as guilt, can be described in cognitive-structural terms, and hence that there should be a correlation between moral judgment stage and self-critical guilt. The relationship of moral judgment and guilt to self-esteem also will be explored.
As noted, Ruma and Mosher (1967) found a correlation between guilt and stage of moral reasoning in male juvenile delinquents. The present study extends this work by assessing this relationship for male adult offenders, as well as the relationship of both variables to offender conduct.

If the results have predictive validity with this sample for both of the measures (sociomoral judgment, guilt), then prerelease assessment and associated treatment implications could be considered. The population chosen for the study could possibly benefit from the results of the research and from participation in the research.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW
Moral Judgment

The socio-moral cognitive-developmental (SMCD) approach to crime and delinquency addresses the interaction of environment, personality and conduct, and suggests an optimistic outlook on the explanation and treatment of delinquency. The SMCD approach assumes that under normal developmental conditions the individual proceeds through distinct stages of moral and social understanding, and that moral judgment mediates moral action. Delinquency is looked upon partially as a case of arrested or delayed moral development. This view of delinquency as a specific case of developmental psychopathology because of delayed moral judgment was supported by research (Blasi, 1980, Hains, 1980, Hanson, 1984, Jennings, 1983, Kohlberg & Freundlich, 1973).

According to Piaget (1981), cognitive structural acquisitions mediate the individual's social behavior and his interpretation of affective objects. Such a cognitive component of personality functioning as moral judgment is intertwined with its affective component of guilt, and they both relate to psychological adaptation, of which moral action is a specific case. Building on Piagetian theory, Kohlberg developed a theory of moral judgment which is represented by a sequence of stages divided into three levels: preconventional, conventional, and postconventional. Relevant to this study are the preconventional and conventional levels and the first four stages which constitute these levels (see Table 1).
Kohlberg (1979) analyzes the stages in terms of "what is right", in terms of the rationale for following "what is right", and in terms of the social perspective of each particular stage. The stage of moral judgment contributes to the definition of the situation for the individual and is related to the action taken.

Among the factors influencing moral development are logical reasoning and role-taking opportunities. Logical reasoning is considered to be a necessary but not sufficient condition for attainment of a higher moral stage. In other words, it is possible to find a juvenile or adult offender who is in the stage of formal operations in his logical reasoning but in the stage of instrumental exchange in regard to his moral reasoning (stage 2). It also was found that with an increase in age the difference in moral and cognitive development between delinquent and nondelinquent juveniles increased, with the delinquents becoming more delayed especially in moral judgment (Hains and Miller, 1980). In regard to stage development, it was found that although the delinquents showed the same pattern, their ability to generalize and rate of generalizing moral concepts across different situations were lower and that they possibly start developing later in moral thinking than nondelinquents (Eshraghi-Tabari, 1975).

In addition to cognitive mediating structures, role-taking opportunities are important in accounting for the variability of moral stages within the delinquent population. Thus, it could be the case that the age-appropriate moral development is not achieved, in part, as a result of a lack of role-taking opportunities. The data supporting the role of social role-taking opportunities in moral maturity was provided by Sigman (1983) and Serok and Blum (1983). Consistent with the role-taking opportunities hypothesis, Serok and Blum (1983) found that play can enable delinquents to adjust to social expectations.
Table 1
The Six Moral Stages
Content of Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Preconventional</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Conventional</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Postconventional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Acting to meet ones own interests and needs and letting others do the same</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>&quot;Being good&quot; having good motives, showing concern about others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heteronomous Morality</td>
<td>Superior Power of authority</td>
<td>To serve one's own needs</td>
<td>&quot;Need to be a good person in your own eyes and those of others&quot;</td>
<td>Perspective of the individual in relationships with other individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Fulfilling the actual duties to which you have agreed</td>
<td>Social System and Conscience</td>
<td>To keep the institution going as a whole</td>
<td>Differentiates societal point of view from interpersonal agreement or motives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Awareness that nonrelative values and rights like life and liberty must be upheld</td>
<td>Social Contract or Utility and Individual Right</td>
<td>&quot;The greatest good for the greatest number&quot;</td>
<td>Prior-to-society perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>Following self-chosen ethical principles</td>
<td>Universal Ethical Principles</td>
<td>Belief in the validity of universal rational principles</td>
<td>Perspective of a moral point of view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relationship between moral judgment and moral action has been studied by comparing groups of delinquents and nondelinquents of the same age. Delinquency, recidivism, and institutional conduct were found to be related to the level of moral judgment (reviewed by Blasi, 1980; Fodor, 1972; Hudgins & Prentice, 1973; Campagna & Hurter, 1975; Jurkovic & Prentice, 1974, 1977, Emler, 1978), (Ruma & Mosher, 1967).

The question of whether moral judgment is normally subject to further change and development through adolescent and adult years was studied by Kohlberg and Kramer (1968; Kohlberg, 1973). It was found that a decrease in lower stages occurs in adolescence and adulthood for normal samples. Haan (1968) suggested that moral judgment could go through further change and development in young adults as a result of their experiences or in response to social change. However, this further development is apparently less likely to have taken place in offender populations.

Extending from the Blasi (1980), Fodor (1972), Kohlberg and Freundlich (1973), Hudgins and Prentice (1973) studies, it may be assumed that moral judgment is likely to be predictive of behavior for the adult offender as well. The lower-stage adults are governed in their moral judgment by appeals to the superior size and to punitive power of authority (stage 1), and to instrumental exchanges (stage 2). For example, being deficient in affect and role-taking, the psychopathic personality type is likely to exercise moral judgment characteristic of stages 1-2, with a focus on self-serving objectives, with a limited awareness about feelings, and with little guilt or anxiety. This personality type does not judge his own behavior from others' point of view (Gaugh, 1948), is limited in empathy, and is the one who easily violates the rights of others.

In contrast, stage 3 adults are characterized in their moral judgment by a need to meet expectations of others, to be a "good person". This
personality type is characterized by a conflict between awareness of internal states and self-centered desires on one hand, and prosocial feelings, intentions and expectations on the other hand. At this stage when the behavior in question is ego-dystonic (contrary to ego values), the discrepancy between behavior and moral judgment may be accounted to situational or circumstantial pressures, e.g., drug addiction (Jurkovic and Prentice, 1977 Jurkovic, 1980, Blasi, 1980, Munk, 1979, Ward and Wilson, 1980).

Jennings et al. (1983) found that a disproportionate frequency of stage 3 delinquents are drug abusers (pp. 305-306), and suggested that researchers relate stage of moral judgment to the type of offense (p.317). In general, however, the studies relating the type of offense to the level of moral judgment in the adult offender (Renwick and Emler, 1984, Thornton and Reid, 1982, Kantner, 1975, Powitsky, 1975), reflect serious psychometric and validity problems. A more straightforward and possibly less problem-plagued measure of antisocial behavior would be offense frequency. Therefore, it is suggested in this study that the stage of moral judgment will be studied in its relation to the first-time vs. repeat adult offender. Most of the studies reviewed here, indicate a difference between the moral judgment level in the offender vs. nonoffender populations. A study that compared the first time and repeat offenders' moral judgment and did not find significant differences (Hartnet and Shumate, 1980) used Hogan's Survey of Ethical attitudes which is "an explicitly nondevelopmental study of individual dispositional differences in adult moral judgment" (Gibbs & Widaman, 1982, p.5).

Adult offenders, as do their juvenile counterparts, evidence certain variability in the relationship between the stage of moral judgment and moral behavior. Among the factors contributing to the indirectness of this
relationship are the type of offense, personality type, and situational stresses. It was found that stage 3 inmates used stage 2 moral reasoning when presented with the dilemmas related to prison life, seeing the relationship with other inmates in terms of instrumental reciprocity (Kohlberg & Freundlich, 1973). This result possibly could be interpreted in terms of psychological adaptation.

The point of this study is to investigate to what degree the "structural deficiencies in some adult populations" (Gibbs & Widaman, 1982 p. 23) could be possibly identified as variables responsible for criminal behavior in adult male offenders. In an adult offender, the moral judgment deficiencies could be related to the interaction of cognitive and affective variables, resulting in antisocial behavior. Wolff and Smith (1983) found moral judgment to discriminate between adult criminal and noncriminal population in a more reliable way than does the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). They also found that the content of moral judgment stage could possibly predict different probationer statuses. In another study, the MMPI appeared to be less discriminative in regard to Psychopathic Deviancy (Pd+K) scale than the moral judgment test (Hawk and Peterson, 1974). This result possibly indicates that while the MMPI measures general deviancy from societal norms, the moral judgment measures have more specific and explanatory power in terms of criminal conduct (i.e., likely to be associated with the lower levels of moral reasoning).

It is assumed in this study, then, that level of moral judgment is a fundamental factor in the behavior of criminal offenders. I will investigate whether first-time vs. recidivist offenders could be possibly differentiated in terms of stage of moral judgment; specifically, whether repeat offenders evidence less advanced moral judgment stage.

Guilt was traditionally viewed as an aspect of conscience essential for social order and moral behavior. According to Freud (1930), "the sense of guilt is the most important problem in the evolution of the culture" (p. 383). Within psychoanalytic theories guilt is considered to be an unconscious feeling, a painful reaction to a transgression against the values of the superego (someone with whom the identification took place). It is therefore a self-punishing response which does not appear prior to superego formation (Kohlberg, 1963).

Although Freudian theory identifies guilt in adult experience, it fails to account for certain developmental prerequisites. Hoffman (1982) suggests a developmental scheme for guilt that parallels the development of empathy. The cognitive requisites for guilt offered by Hoffman begin with the awareness of others as separate entities (rudimentary guilt), perceptions of one’s actions as responsible for the hurt caused to another person, awareness of others’ internal states, and awareness of one’s actions as being a cause of someone’s distress. Maccoby (1980) indicates that Hoffman’s model allows for the possibility of another kind of internalized morality beyond the punitive inflexible superego, and that is for the possibility of "rational" guilt resulting from an inductive socialization process.

In the SMCD approach as well, the feeling of guilt is not reducible to the internalized fear or the conflict between id and superego. This approach sees the child as participating in social interactions and, through role taking coordinating of another’s prospective with his own. (Gibbs & Schnell, 1985). The structural acquisitions and qualitative changes of this process
constitute sociomoral development into an adult (mature) state. The implication of these processes is that the affective state of guilt is partly mediated by sociomoral-cognitive constructions. The thoughts that are critical of self are likely to result in the emotion of guilt. A person with lower-level judgments is unlikely to experience self-critical guilt over a transgression.

Although the affective intensity may be comparable for someone who is experiencing fear of external punishment (stage 1) and the one who is critical of self (stage 4), the feelings are qualitatively different. It is a cognitive-structural difference: "In some sense, the feeling in the pit of one's stomach is the same whether it is dread of external events or dread of one's own self-judgment. The difference between the two is that in one case the bad feeling is interpreted by the child as fear of external sanctioning forces while in the other case, it is interpreted by the child as produced by the self's own moral judgments. When the child reaches adolescence, he tends to reject fear as a basis for conformity. If he is a member of a delinquent gang he will deny the anxiety in the pit of his stomach because it is chicken to fear the cops. If he has developed more mature modes of moral judgment, he will link the same dread in the pit of his stomach to his own self-judgments and say, "I could never do that, I'd hate myself if I did". (Kohlberg, 1969, p.392). Moreover, as Kohlberg (1969) stated, "intense fear of punishment doesn't predict resistance to temptation, whereas self-critical guilt does." Empirical evidence indicates that the self-critical guilt "appears at about the same age as conventional moral judgment" (Kohlberg, 1969 p. 392).

Specifically, Ruma and Mosher (1967) assessed the guilt over transgression leading to incarceration in 36 delinquent boys and found significant correlations (p < .01) between guilt and moral stage level (Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview, MJI).
The question explored in the present study is whether the correlation between moral judgment stage and self-critical guilt also will found for a sample of adult offenders. Furthermore, if self-critical guilt and moral judgment maturity are fundamental to conduct such that absence of guilt and moral judgment immaturity renders the individual amenable to antisocial conduct, then repeat offenders relative to first-time offenders should evidence less guilt and lower moral judgment stage.
Guilt as reflected in aspects of self-concept and self-esteem.

The relationship of moral judgment and guilt to self concept or self-esteem also was explored. Self-concept has been defined as a "... theory about oneself" (Epstein, 1973 p.415), or as a "semiopen system which integrates experiences into a coherent framework, and regulates action, thought, emotion" (Connel & Ryan, 1984 p.68). The structural-developmental perspective states that in a process of social interaction, the self develops a bipolarity of "I" (observer, subject) and "Me" (the observed object). The transformation of subjective actions-perceptions (experience) into "me", an object of my attention, enables the self to construct a theory about the self and to become a cognitive mediator of behavior (Harter, 1983; Broughton, 1981; Kegan, 1979).

The cognitive advance of I-Me, and Self-Other separation implies a possibility of a discrepancy between real and ideal self. Lynd (1968) relates this differentiation to becoming conscious about culturally defined transgressions. Harter suggests that the preservation of self-image is mediated by one's evaluation of self-worth and possible guilt as a reaction of such evaluation (Harter, 1983).

In traditional psychoanalytic theory the guilt mediator of real self and ideal self disparity was assumed to be an index of psychological maladjustment (Lewis, 1971). Katz and Zigler (1967) found this disparity to be a function of developmental level due to an increase in cognitive differentiation and an increased capacity for "social guilt". The differentiation hypothesis was also supported by Montemayor (1977) who found that with increase in age, the self-concept becomes more abstract, and undergoes a developmental transformation based on the cognitive ability to infer a set of personal beliefs from the self. Zigler, Bella and Watson (1972) found that the rapid development of an ideal self in adolescence results in decrease in
self-esteem and in an increased gap between the ideal and real self with an increased feeling of guilt. This decreased self-esteem could be especially evident for individuals with higher levels of moral judgment for whom the real-ideal self disparity may be large. Hales (1979) found that moral behavior is related to self-esteem and that acting according to one's internalized moral standards leads to a more stable self-esteem and to a better adjustment. Achenbach and Zigler (1963) found that the individuals with higher psychological competence have higher real-ideal self disparity and that the amount of disparity is related to the type of psychological defense used by individuals, so that the neurotic individual who is higher on social competence is not likely to act out his frusrations, whereas the individual with a low level of disparity, low on guilt is likely to have an action disorder.

It is suggested in this dissertation that 1) in accordance with cognitive developmental theory the level of moral judgment maturity will be related to the level of self-critical guilt; 2) guilt should be associated with lower self-esteem; and therefore (3) moral judgment maturity should be inversely related to self-esteem. An outlook on adult criminality as a specific case of psychological maladjustment due partly to delays in development of sociomoral cognitive structures is suggested.

For the entire sample of adult male offenders, it is hypothesized that moral judgment will be related to guilt and that both will be related to ratings of institutional conduct (see Table 2). The relations of moral judgment, guilt, and self-esteem to conduct will also be investigated in two ways dividing the sample into first-time versus repeat offenders. First-time offenders may evidence higher moral judgment maturity, higher self-critical guilt, and possibly lower self-esteem but better institutional conduct relative to repeat offenders.
Table 2

Hypotheses

Complete Set of Predicted Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MJ</th>
<th>TG</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>ON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral Judgment (MJ)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>-*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgression Guilt (TG)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem (SE)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Conduct (IC)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>+*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense Number (ON)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Central hypotheses
+ Positive correlation
- Negative correlation
CHAPTER III
METHODS

Site

The study was conducted at Orient Correctional Facility, Department of Rehabilitation and Correction of the State of Ohio. The Orient Correctional Facility was, at the time of data collection, a minimum security institution. The inmates assigned to a minimum security institution represent offenders that are judged as not immediately dangerous and amenable to the treatment opportunities provided by the institution. The inmates were living in cottages in a rural setting with a variety of job, educational, and treatment opportunities, in an environment apparently conducive to rehabilitation.

Subjects

The subjects of this study were inmates of the Orient Correctional Facility, admitted to the institution during the period from April through August, 1985. Seventy-eight inmates participated in the study. The inmates were male felons, ages 20-48. The mean age was 32.1; mean IQ was within the average range (see below) and mean of grade level achieved was 8.11. The minimum IQ was within the borderline range and the maximum was within the superior range of intelligence. Inmates whose records indicated a self-reported inability to read were not tested. Thirty-nine inmates or 50% of the sample were within the average intelligence range and 16 (20.5%) were in the
above average range, 14 inmates (19%) were in the below average range. The Ohio Penal System Test (OPCT), was used for IQ assessment and the ranges are: an IQ of 125 and up-superior, IQ of 110-124-above average, IQ of 90-109-average, an IQ of 80-89-below average, an IQ of 69-79-borderline.

The range of school grade completed by the inmates varied from 4th grade to 12th grade and college. The occupational categories of the inmates varied from unskilled laborer to accountant, journalist, manager, with the blue-collar skilled workers constituting 39 (51.3%) of the sample. Forty-four (57.1%) of the subjects were white, 33 (41.5%) were black and 1 (1.2%) was hispanic. The records indicate that 72 inmates (92.3%) of the total sample had no history of escapes and 63 inmates (80.8%) had no history of violence. Sixty-three inmates (76%) of the sample had good family/community ties (visitations, letters with wife, common law wife, mother or other member of the family, religious leaders of the community), 15 inmates (16.6%) had poor or minimal family/community ties. Forty-two inmates (53.8%) of the sample admitted involvement with alcohol or drugs within past 5 years, 4 inmates (5.1%) admitted involvement more than 5 years ago, and 32 inmates (41%) claimed not to have been involved with alcohol or drugs. Two criterion groups of subjects were selected through a random procedure for this study: a group of first time and a group of repeat offenders. The two samples differed significantly in terms of type of offense. Whereas 17 (48.6%) of the 35 first-time offenders were sex offenders, only 1 (2.3%) of the 43 repeat offenders was sex offender. Conversely, whereas only 4 of the first-time offenders (11.4%) were property offenders, 26 of the repeat offenders (60.4%) were property
offenders. Other offenses (drug trafficking, aggravated assaults, aggravated vehicular homicide, felonious assault, carrying concealed weapon) were lower in frequency and were represented comparably in the samples.

Mean age for the first time offender group was 35.1 ranging from 22.0 to 48.0, and the mean age for the repeat offender group was 29.7 ranging from 20.0 to 45.0. 30 inmates (85.7%) among the first offender group were white and 5 inmates (14.3%) were black. In the repeat offender group 14 inmates or 32.5% were white and 28 or 65.2% were black. Fifteen inmates (42.8%) of the first offender group, IQ was within the average of intelligence, and 10 inmates (28.5%) were within the above average range. In the second offenders group, 24 inmates (55.8%) were within the average range of intelligence and 13 inmates (20.9%) were within the below average range of intelligence. The Intake Screening Psychological Evaluations and Institutional records were used to determine the CA, reading ability, IQ range, major occupation, drug abuse or dependency, prior record of criminal conduct, and possible history of violence and escapes.

Information about subjects and test results were handled in agreement with the guidelines set forth by The Ohio State University's Revised Guidelines for Use of Human Subjects in Research and additional guidelines of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction of the State of Ohio. The participants were asked to sign a consent form which included an introduction to the study. This was read to the group prior to administration of the measures. Failure of the subjects to participate at the testing site was due to such factors as failure of the custody to deliver to the inmates passes for the school, where the testing took place; and passes for visitation, hospital, commissary, and job assignment issued for the same time as time of testing. Six inmates reported for testing but refused to participate in the study. Localized attrition with reference to particular measures can be inferred from sample sizes.
Measures

Conduct Measures

The modified form of Dormitory Observation Report (Veneziano & Veneziano, 1984), which was initially intended to be used as a measure of institutional conduct, was found not to be usable for two reasons: first, its items were not appropriate to the present residential setting at Orient Correctional Institution and second, the interrater reliability was low. The Security Designation Form is a document which indicates an inmate's security level and resultant institutional placement. It is based on 6 weighted variables (type of detainer, severity of current offense, time to earliest possible parole hearing, type of prior commitments, history of escapes or attempts to escape and history of violence). The resultant score determines security level (which was minimum for the most of the sample).

The Institutional Department of Treatment also completes for each inmate the Supervision Classification Form derived from the supervision scoring based on 7 weighted variables that are directly related to institutional conduct. Every 6 months the inmates are reevaluated and those who demonstrate responsible institutional behavior could increase their supervision status. The variables are: percentage of time served, involvement with drugs/alcohol, mental/psychological stability, type or seriousness of disciplinary report, frequency of disciplinary report, responsibility inmate demonstrated on the job or at school, family/community ties. The supervisory score is based on, custody, psychological, social workers', and job/school supervisors'
evaluation of the inmates' actual institutional conduct. For example, if for the minimum security inmate the Supervision Score Total is 11-19, an increase in supervision is recommended; if the score is from 20-22, the present supervision is recommended; and if the Supervision score is within 23-30 range a decrease in supervision may be considered. Therefore the Supervisory Score total can be considered a valid measure of institutional conduct by staff members with considerable experiential bases for making the conduct assessments. The form itself is not provided in the appendices since it is designated for the Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections internal use only.

Moral Judgment

The Sociomoral Reflection Measure (SRM, Gibbs & Widaman, 1982) is a production task which provides a measure of reflective sociomoral reasoning. The SRM is a group-administered alternative to Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview (MJI; Colby, Kohlberg, Candee, Hewer, Power & Speicher-Dublin, 1984).

SRM consists of two dilemmas, followed by questions which elicit reasoning about the dilemmas. Two types of scores are calculated and reflect the level of moral reasoning. The most often used stage in the protocol responses defines the modal stage (Stage 1, 2, 3, or 4). The more differentiated rating which extends from 100 to 400 will give the Sociomoral Reflection Maturity Score (such that the highest possible rating at stage 4 will be 400 and the lowest possible rating will be 100). Four kinds of reliability have been assessed using age-homogeneous samples: test-retest, parallel form, internal consistency, and interrater. Acceptable levels of reliability were obtained (Gibbs, Widaman, & Colby, 1982).
A correlation of .85 with the Standard issue method in an age heterogeneous sample and a .50 correlation with age controlled sample was demonstrated (Gibbs, Widaman, & Colby, 1982).

The protocols in the present study were scored blind by a trained scorer. The scorer established a reliability coefficient of .69 (Spearman-Brown) and an exact global stage agreement of 55.5 percent with the first author of SRM (Gibbs & Widaman, 1982). The reliabilities were based on a random sample of 18 protocols. Exact modal-stage agreement was 50.0 percent. Because of the marginality of the reliability obtained, the SRM author reviewed (using a blind procedure) all of the present study SRM protocol assessments and introduced scoring adjustments where appropriate.

**Guilt**

Ruma and Mosher (1967) developed the Transgression Guilt interview (TGI) as a measure of guilt. The transgression interview deals with the inmates' feelings regarding the offense for which he was incarcerated. The questions would assess the feelings at the time of committing the crime and afterwards, while incarcerated. Content analysis (CA) is supposed to analyze the responses given in the transgression interview as to the degree to which they indicate the presence of internalized moral standards (focus on violation of internal standards vs. fear of external punishment). The TGI questions and the scoring criteria are given in the appendices. The interrater reliability of .98 (Spearman-Brown) was obtained between the writer and a trained TGI scorer. It was based on 16 randomly selected protocols.
Self-Esteem

Messer and Harter's Adult Self-Perception Profile (ASPP) consists of twelve separate subscales in which adults make distinct self-evaluations regarding their competence and adequacy. In addition to being a measure of competence in several discrete domains (Work/job competence, intelligence, sociability, and physical appearance), the Adult Self-Perception Profile includes the General Self-Worth scale, which is a global perception of worth, independent of any domain. The morality scale refers to living up to one's moral standards and feeling that one's behavior is ethical. Each item of the scale presents two polarities of a concept, so that the Subject decides which type of person he is like. On the scale from 1 to 4, the subject decides whether the chosen polarity is "sort of true for me" or "really true for me." The subscales are analyzed individually and the average competency scores and importance ratings for each domain are obtained.

Design and Procedures.

The testing was completed at Orient Correctional Facility. Two of the tests, SRM and ASPP, were group administered. The exact size of the groups tested at one time was determined by the security requirements and custody considerations, but ranged between 10 and 15 subjects.

The inmates were told that the examiner was doing a research project as part of her work at The Ohio State University and were asked to participate. They were also given a short introduction to the study and the confidentiality issues were explained to them (see the Solicitation Script in the Appendices). They also were given a consent form at the beginning of the session. This form was read aloud and the participants were asked to sign the consent form. Then the participants were asked to complete the ASPP. When necessary
the test questions were read orally by the examiner, and possible questions relevant to the test administration were answered. After completing the Adult Self-Perception Scale an opportunity for a short break was given and the Sociomoral Reflection Measure was administered.

The group administration of both tests took about one hour and thirty minutes. The two group administered tests were given in a written form. The opportunity for a short break was given after the first test.

The TGI was conducted individually with all those subjects who successfully completed the SRM and SPP. The TGI was audio-taped. The inmates were initially put at ease by discussing nonjudgmental issues such as the weather, or what county the inmate is from. After a few minutes of general conversation, the transgression interview items were administered and when necessary, probing questions (no more than two) were asked in order to determine whether the affect expressed is guilt or fear elicited.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The data analysis focused on comparison between first-time and repeat offenders, and on relationships between psychological, especially, moral judgment and transgression guilt variables, and conduct variables for the total sample, and for the first-time and repeat offenders groups. Of particular interest was the possible relationship between moral judgment maturity and transgression guilt.

The first hypothesis of this study was that the subsample of first-time offenders would differ significantly on a) Moral Judgment, b) Guilt and c) Institutional Conduct from the subsample of repeat offenders. Specifically it was hypothesized that the first time offenders would be higher on those three measures.

Table 3 shows the difference between the two groups on level of moral judgment, guilt, and institutional conduct, as well as pertinent sample statistics. The null hypothesis was that there is no difference between means of first and repeat offenders for the SRMS (moral judgment), TG (guilt), and IC (institutional conduct).
Table 3

The mean differences between First-time and Repeat offenders groups on Moral Judgment (SRMS), Transgression Guilt (TG) and Institutional Conduct (IC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>STD Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRMS</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>318.1</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>291.8</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>202.8</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>125.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An F test for homogeneity of variance was performed. The assumption of equal variance was acceptable, because the F value was not significant at the .05 level, $F(28,40) = 1.38$, $p = .34$ for SRMS; $F(30,41) = 1.52$, $p = .21$ for TG; and $F(34,42) = .96$ for IC.

All three components of hypothesis 1 were confirmed using two-tailed T-tests (pooled variance technique). First-time offenders' mean SRMS was significantly higher than that of the repeat offenders', $t(68) = 3.06$, $p < .01$; mean TG was significantly higher, $t(71) = 6.73$, $p < .0001$; and mean IC was significantly higher $t(76) = 7.56$, $p < .0001$. The two variables, guilt and institutional conduct, showed more highly significant differences between the means than the moral judgment variable, but all three differences were significant. Thus hypothesis one is supported in regard to all three variables (moral judgment, guilt, and institutional conduct).
Table 4

Frequency Distribution of Sociomoral Reflection Maturity Scores for the Total Sample
Moral judgment stage represented in the total sample ranged from stage 2 to stage 4. Stage 3 was the modal category; 44 (65.67%) of offenders were diagnosed as stage 3. The distribution of offenders across the remaining modal stage categories was: a) stage 2=7 (10.5%), b) stage 2/3 = 2 (2.98%), c) stage 3/4 =7 (10.5%), d) stage 4 = (10.5%). The frequency distribution of SRMS variable is represented on Table 4.

The distribution of offenders across global stage categories was:
a) stage 2=3 (4.47%), b) stage 2(3)=1 (1.49%), c) stage 3(2)=9 (13.43%), d) stage 3=36 (53.73%), e) stage 3(4)=5 (7.46%), f) stage 4 (3)=13 (19.4%).

With respect to the first-time and repeat offenders categories, the modal stage distribution was: a) stage 2=2 (6.9%), b) stage 3=16 (55.1%), c) stage 3/4 =5 (17.2%), d) stage 4=6 (20.7%), for the first offender; and stage 2=6 (14.6%), b) stage 2/3=2 (4.8%), c) stage 3=30 (73.1%), d) stage 3/4 =2 (4.8%), e) stage 4 =1 (2.4%), for the repeat offender group.

The total sample served as the referent for the second and third hypotheses. The second hypothesis tested was that level of moral judgment maturity is likely to be related to level of self-critical guilt. The third hypothesis was that, taken together, those two variables are likely to account for more of the IC variance than each variable (moral judgment, guilt) taken separately.

Both of the hypotheses were confirmed. The correlation between Moral Judgment and Guilt was \( r(66) = .35 \ p < .05 \) for the total sample, \( r(40) = .30 \ p < .05 \) for the repeat offender group, and \( r(26) = .05, \ p < .1 \) for the first offender group. Guilt and Moral Judgment together showed a significant relationship to the institutional conduct variable. The analysis of variance for the model \( \text{SRMS} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{TG} + \beta_2 \) is presented on Table 5. The estimates of \( \beta_0, \beta_1 \) and \( \beta_2 \) are presented on Table 6.
There was a strong relationship between SRMS and TG; because of this relationship the two variables (SRMS and TG) taken together are more predictive of IC variable than each of those variables taken alone. A larger R value (Table 6) would be expected if those two variables were independent, and they also would be better predictors of behavior if taken separately. When each of those variables (SRMS, TG), was taken alone their prediction of behavior was not significant even for the whole sample (n=70). Due to the lack of sufficient observations, analysis of covariance for relations between IQ (which was not a continuous variable) and MJ (which had less than 5 expected counts on fifth of the cells), was not performed.

Table 5

Analysis of Variance for Moral Judgment, Guilt and Institutional Conduct for the Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sum of squares</th>
<th>mean square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>model</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>220.85</td>
<td>110.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>631.63</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>852.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F(2,63) = \frac{110.43}{10.03} = 11.01$  
$p( > F) = 0.001$

$R \text{ square} = \frac{220.85}{852.48} = 0.259$
Table 6

The Estimates for Moral Judgment, Transgression Guilt and Institutional Conduct for the Total Sample

| Parameter | Estimate | T for HO: Parameter =0 | PR>|T| | STD Error of Estimate |
|-----------|----------|------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Intercept | 11.64    | 3.72                   | .0004          | 3.13                 |
| TG        | .025     | 3.48                   | .0009          | .007                 |
| SRMS      | .018     | 1.73                   | .0891          | .01                  |

The relationship of moral judgment and guilt to institutional conduct was not significant for separate analyses of First-time and Repeat offenders (N=29 and 35, respectively). For both groups First offenders and Repeat offenders when multiple regression analysis was done to predict or explain behavior based on the two independent variables, neither TG, nor SRMS or the total of the two combined explained a significant amount of IC variance.

One possibility why the analysis based on 70 observations (total sample) explained a significant amount of variability in the behavior, whereas the analysis based on 29 and 35 observations (First and Repeat Offenders groups respectively), did not, is that the larger number of observations gave more power to the test to detect significance (see Table 5).

The simple uncorrected Pearson correlation between MJ and TG for the total sample was $r(66) = .35$ which was significant $p < .01 (=0.0039)$. IQ correlated with MJ $r(70) = .40, p < .01$, and with TG $r(73)=.24,$
Because of the covariation with intelligence (and therefore the possibility that the correlation was attributable to intelligence), the correlation between MJ and TG was also computed with IQ partialled out. The correlation between TG and SRMS, corrected for IQ was \( r(66) = .285 \) \( p < .05 \) (=.02). The partialled out correlation magnitude was smaller but still significant.

The stepwise multiple regression was used to investigate the relationship between the IC (dependent variable) and SRMS and TG (independent variables). TG variable was chosen first and explained 22.4% of the variability in the IC variable. When SRMS was entered on the second step, 25.9% of the dependent variable was explained. However, the level of significance on the SRMS alone was \( p < .08 \).

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1 Variable TG entered</th>
<th>R-square =.224</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-Value</td>
<td>Str. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>16.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2 Variable SRMS entered</th>
<th>R-square = .259</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-value</td>
<td>Str. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>11.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMS</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Zero-Order Correlations and Descriptive Statistics for the Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Moral Judgment</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Transgression Guilt</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Self-Esteem (Global)</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Self-Esteem (Morality)</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Intelligence</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Frequency of Disc Report</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Type of Disc Report</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Drug Involvement</td>
<td>-.330</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Offense Number</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Grade</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Age</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001.

Variables 6 through 8 represent Institutional Conduct.
Correlations between MJ and IC, TG, and other variables were studied for the whole sample and for the groups of First-Time and Repeat Offenders in order to investigate the predicted relationship between MJ and other variables.

While TG was significantly related to both conduct measures, IC and offense number, MJ was significantly related only to IC. Twenty-four percent of the IC variance could be accounted for by TG and ten percent by MJ. Also, there was a strong inverse correlation between the two conduct measures, and 27.4% of variance in IC variable can be explained by offense number (one vs. greater than one). It can also be seen from Table 8 that in addition to the already described significant correlation with IQ, the MJ variable significantly correlated with type of disciplinary report and frequency of disciplinary report variables. In other words, 11.8% of variability in type of disciplinary report variable, and 10.3% of variability in frequency of disciplinary reports can be explained by level of moral judgment. Respectively the same figures for the transgression guilt variable in regard to the two important variables of institutional conduct were respectively: 18.1% and 14.8%. Both MJ and TG correlated with type and frequency of disciplinary report, TG more strongly. TG (but not MJ correlated) with drug involvement.

There also was a significant inverse correlation between the offense number and age; the older inmates were more likely to be found in the first offenders group. The older inmates also were more likely to have less frequent and less severe disciplinary reports. Offense number also correlated negatively with drug involvement in a significant way, - the first time offenders - were less likely to have been involved in drugs, -about 10.8% of drug involvement could be explained by the offense number.
The drug involved inmates were likely to be high on guilt (12.5% of drug involvement could be explained by guilt), however, correlation with moral judgment was not significant. Correlation analysis by offender subsample did show a marginally significant correlation between MJ and Morality subscale of SPP for the first-time offenders.

There was a significant correlation of the offense number with guilt, - for the total sample and for the samples of repeat and first time offenders.

The SRMS variable correlated significantly with age in the repeat offender group (mean age of this group is 29.6) but there was no statistically significant correlation with age in the first offender group (mean age 35.1). On the contrary the correlation with IQ was more significant for MJ variable in the first offender group and it was not statistically significant in the repeat offender group (r = .44, p < .01; and r = .2, p < .1, respectively).

There also was a significant correlation between the grade level (the actual grade level was assessed by reading ability), and the MJ variable in the first, but not in the repeat offender group, r(29) = .53, p < .001, r (41) = .258, p < .1, respectively. MJ correlated significantly with the morality scale of SPP r(29) = .36, p < .05 in the first but not in the repeat offender group, which indicates that the first offender is more likely to have a realistic perception of his moral level than the repeat offender.

Regarding demographic and offense variables, correlations also were computed for the separate samples. Whereas for the first time offenders group guilt correlated on a statistically significant level with age r(31) = .38, p < .01, this relationship for the repeat offender group was not statistically significant r(42) = .14, p < .1). There also was no statistically significant relationship between the TG variable and IQ and grade variables in both groups, however the direction of the relationship for the first offender
group was inverse, although insignificant. While TG correlated significantly with the frequency of disciplinary report variable in the first offender group, the relationship was not statistically significant for the repeat offenders, $r(31) = .38, p < .01$, and $r(42) = .15, p < .1)$. There was however, insignificant inverse relationship between number of offense and guilt in the repeat offender group.

The Morality subscale, the Global Self-Worth subscales of SPP were significantly correlated in both groups, with a correlation between those two variables for the repeat offender group of $r(40) = .51, p < .001$ and a correlation of $r(35) = .41, p < .01$ for the first offender group. For the total sample, however, the hypotheses that moral judgment and guilt would correlate with self-esteem was not confirmed. Morality subscale also correlated significantly with the grade level variable in the first offender group $r(35) = .511, p < .001$ but not in the repeat offender group $r(40) = -.01, p < .1$.
The theoretically predicted relationships between moral judgment maturity, self-critical guilt and moral behavior were supported by the results of this study. By assessing social-cognitive, emotional and behavioral domains it was shown that there is a strong relationship between social-cognitive (moral judgment) and emotional (guilt) domains and that, taken together, they are predictive of moral behavior.

Twenty years ago, Ruma and Mosher (1967) found a relationship between the moral judgment and guilt in a sample of juvenile delinquents. The present study assessed this relationship for a sample of adult offenders and found that there is a significant relationship between the level of moral judgment maturity and self-critical transgression guilt for the adult offenders. The fact that this relationship was supported twenty years later, for a different age group, and even after it was corrected for intelligence, points to its pervasive and robust nature.

The significant correlation between guilt and moral judgment maturity found in the first and repeat offender groups points to a functional link between these two variables: morally advanced individuals are likely to have higher posttransgression guilt because they judge themselves internally regardless of the external punishment they receive.
As an inmate put it: "No, it wouldn't be all right to do it even if the charges wouldn't be pressed, because the man worked hard for what he has, I would still feel bad about myself." Related responses were: "I was glad when it was over, I wanted to be caught." "I couldn't live with myself anymore, I felt relieved when the charges were pressed." The internality of these type of response indicates that an internal principle of judgment rather than consequences, or punishment determined the situation for the individual, and that development of affect and action was mediated by cognitively defined stages (positive relationship between the level of moral judgment and level of self-critical guilt).

Dienstbier et al. (1975) indicated that emotional arousal will affect people's behavior differently based on the stage of moral judgment: the level of moral judgment determines for the individual what his transgression-related feeling means (e.g., internally vs. externally attributed) and what behavior he will choose. Thus, not only the high level of guilt, but the faculty of being objective to the situation, being able to attribute the experienced affect of guilt to a certain justice notion transcending the immediate situation, would enable an individual to resist temptation. On a lower level of moral judgment maturity, fear of external punishment seems to be the motive to avoid a transgression.

An external or, amoral orientation can also be accomplished through self-serving rationalizations. Dostoyevsky, whose writings about criminals were treated with interest by Freud and Kohlberg, describes Raskolnikov's process of reasoning on the eve of committing the crime.

For Raskolnikov, who had previously concluded that "the main reason for a criminal to be easily discovered lay not so much in the physical impossibility of concealing a crime as in the criminal himself:"

"criminal himself, at
least almost every criminal, is subject at the moment of the crime to a kind of breakdown of his reasoning faculties and of his willpower, which are replaced by an amazingly childish carelessness just at the moment when he is most in need of caution and reason." Raskolnikov reasons further that since he doesn't consider what he is going to do to be a crime, he is not in danger, and his will and reasoning abilities should be intact during the commission of the crime (Schneck, 1966 p. 279). Similar systems of reasoning were present in our sample in repeat offenders, for example, with regard to trafficking in drugs: "it was not a crime"; "I sold drugs to lawyers and doctors who knew what they are doing"; "I never sold drugs to children;" and, "I sold drugs to people who suffered, they needed a fix." The level of moral judgment maturity of such statements demonstrate an inability to reason beyond the immediate situation, which is characteristic of lower levels of moral judgment, and can result into antisocial moral behavior. Historically, the emotional aspect of conscience development was assessed in the realm of Freudian psychodynamic tradition, and the cognitive aspect was assessed in Piagetian tradition. The importance of the present study is that it bridges those two domains not only by examining the relationship between transgression guilt and moral judgment, but also by assessing the prediction of moral behavior (specifically, institutional conduct) through the relationship between cognitive and emotional domains. The study finds that moral behavior (in terms of institutional conduct) could be explained by this relationship, whereas alone neither guilt nor moral judgment is predictive of moral behavior. In other words, guilt alone, even though it accounted for a larger portion of the variance in the behavior than moral judgment, did not predict institutional conduct without moral judgment. Hence, the traditional affective emphasis on morality should be related to cognitive aspects of morality. (Gibbs & Schnell, 1985).
The cognitive-developmental perspective, innovated mainly by Piaget and refined by Kohlberg, suggests that moral behavior is related to moral judgment maturity and self-critical judgment. It was found that indeed the repeat offenders were lower on moral judgment, guilt and institutional conduct than were the first time offenders, and that institutional conduct correlated with both moral judgment and guilt. First-time offenders were less likely than repeat offenders to be involved in serious disciplinary problems (refusal to carry out work, fighting, stealing or embezzlement, possession of a weapon, malicious destruction of property, etc.).

On the other hand, first-time offenders received citations with comparable frequency. Citation frequency could be possibly less valid than seriousness of citation (type of disciplinary report variable) as an indicator of antisocial conduct, however, since first-time offenders, who sometimes initially didn't "know the ropes", may receive citations for unintended rule infractions (e.g. being out of place, "reading a book", etc.).

Significant correlations also were found between the level of moral judgment and behavioral, psychological, and demographic (age, education, occupational background, family/community ties) characteristics of offenders. The significant relationship between MJ and grade level, attributable mostly to the first time offenders and nonsignificant for the repeat offenders, corresponds to another finding of this study, that the MJ-IQ correlation was mostly attributable to the first-time group (not significant for the repeat offender group). This difference is probably accounted for by the greater restriction of range in the variables for the repeat offender sample. On the other hand, MJ for the first-time offenders, who were older, did not correlate with age, a result consistent with other studies finding no significant MJ-age correlation for older adults. (e.g., Gibbs, Widaman, & Colby, 1982).
Although the inmates whose number of offenses was more than one (repeat offender group) were found to be significantly lower on MJ than the first offender group, the correlation between number of offense and MJ was not linear or significant. This discrepancy was possibly due to the fact that the offense number variable was not a continuous variable and the moral judgment variable frequency distribution approximated a bimodal distribution in the present study (table 4). At the same time the transgression guilt variable, whose frequency distribution approximated the normal distribution, did show a significant correlation with the number of offense variable. This discrepancy also could possible suggest a difference between moral judgment and guilt in their relationship to antisocial conduct. Although the affective and cognitive aspects of morality both influence conduct, the affective aspect is more important in accounting for degree of antisocial or prohibited conduct. The guilt affect is specifically prohibitive and explicitly linked to transgressions (at least as measured in the present study); perhaps for these reasons, antisocial conduct is especially likely to be associated with absence of guilt. Future research should perhaps differentiate within global MJ those norms that specifically related to prohibitive morality (law, property, legal justice) to assess whether prohibitive MJ -- which is specifically pertinent to antisocial conduct -- relate more consistently than global MJ to antisocial conduct.
The external validity of the results is limited by the minimum-security nature of the setting and sample and by the fact that the first-offender group had an unusually high percentage of inmates charged with sex offenses. Furthermore, some of the committed sex offenses were of a nature that might not be considered deviant in other cohorts. The sex offenders in this study were atypically older (Cline, 1980), and associated with a stable social environment, sometimes had advanced occupational and educational background, with high level of responsibility demonstrated while in the institution.

Future research should explore whether the present results are replicable with other types of offender populations (severe offenders, female offenders) and other types of incarcerated settings.

Failure to find correlations between the SPP subscales and other psychological and conduct variables (with the exception of a positive correlation between the grade level and the morality subscale in the first offender group), possibly indicates the preliminary nature of the adult version of the Harter scale, and/or its questionable application to the offender population.

The theoretical implications of this study are that the results can be interpreted in terms of cognitive-developmental theory. The possible practical implications of the present study are that the measures used (MJ and TG) could be used for institutional decision making, placements of the offenders.
(especially in the institutions with the full implementation of living unit concept in order to insure that inmates drastically different on MJ are not placed in the same unit), and for preparole evaluations, since it was shown that those two variables taken together are likely to be predictive of behavior, and that the inmates low on conduct were also lower on moral judgment and self-critical guilt.
SUMMARY

Relationship between moral judgment (MJ), transgression guilt (TG) and institutional conduct was studied for a sample of 78 adult male first-time and repeat offenders placed in a minimum-security institution. The mean age was 32.1 and the mean IQ was within the average range. It was found that MJ and TG were significantly related even with intelligence controlled, and that MJ and TG considered together for the total sample (n=70) significantly accounted for institutional conduct, as had been hypothesized. Also, first-time offenders scored significantly higher than the repeat offenders on MJ, TG, and institutional conduct (supervisory score variable). It was concluded that both affective and cognitive aspects of morality are important for the understanding of antisocial conduct. Future research should assess the replicability of the results for other offender populations, e.g., severe offenders or female offenders.
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Appendix A
Material Used in Study
SOLICITATION SCRIPT

I am Sophia Mityagin, a doctoral candidate in psychology from the Ohio State University. I am trying to investigate whether there is a relationship between the level of Moral Judgment and Self-Critical Guilt in an adult offenders population. Therefore I am asking for your participation in the study. Participation in the study includes 2 group testings and one individual interview. In addition I am asking your permission to obtain certain information (age, school grade, IQ score) from the psychological files, and to talk to your social workers, psychologists, teachers, job supervisor.

During the first group testing you will be asked to judge certain situations and to indicate what is the right thing to do and why.

During the second group testing you will be asked to compare and contrast on different issues what kind of person you are or are not.

During the individual interview I will ask you to share your feelings about what brought you here, your thoughts during the period between committing the offense and being confined. The individual interviews are going to be audiotaped, and the tapes will be destroyed after the study is over, in addition, your code numbers not names will be used for audiotaping.

All participants will be given a code number, so that the actual names and prison numbers of the inmates would not appear in the study.

All the personal information will be kept strictly confidential, and it will be shared neither with the administration of the prison or the custody personnel. All the materials of the study will be taken away from the prison premises after each testing session by this investigator. The results of the test and the fact of your participation would not have any bearing on your status in the institution and/or parole status. There is, however, a possibility for the
participants to accomplish a certain degree of personal growth and self-understanding by being involved in the testing and the individual interview. Furthermore, if the hypotheses advanced in this study would not be rejected, the result can possibly benefit more inmates in the future by the possibility of therapeutic intervention and preparole evaluations.

The participants do not have an obligation to stay in the study if they will find it in any way uncomfortable and can withdraw their participation at any point.

Thank you for your cooperation.
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled: Moral Judgment, Guilt and Institutional Conduct in First-Time and Recidivist Adult Male Offenders.

Dr. John Smith

(Principal Investigator)

or his/her authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child). The information obtained from me (my child) will remain confidential unless I specifically agree otherwise by placing my initials here __________.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ____________________ Signed: ____________________

Signed: ____________________ Signed: ____________________

(Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative) (Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: ____________________

HS-027 (Rev. 1/89) - To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.
Social Reflection Questionnaire

Name:___________________________ Age:______ Sex (circle one): male/female
Father's job:______________________ Mother's job:______________________
Date:________________________________

Instructions

In this booklet are two social problems with questions for you to answer. We are asking the questions 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 space in the margins to finish writing your answers if you need more space.

Form A (code #:____________________)
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 it.

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?
Circle one: should steal should not steal can't decide

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 opinion—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:
Circle one: steal not steal can't decide
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?

Circle one: very important important not important

1b. WHY IS THAT VERY IMPORTANT/IMPORTANT/NOT IMPORTANT (whichever one you circled)?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

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

Circle one: steal not steal can't decide

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

Circle one: very important important not important

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 a friend (and the friend can get no one else to help)? Should Heinz?

Circle one: steal not steal can't decide

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

Circle one: very important important not important

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?

Circle one: very important important not important

4b. WHY IS THAT 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?

Circle one: steal not steal can't decide

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

Circle one: very important important not important

5b. WHY IS THAT VERY IMPORTANT/IMPORTANT/NOT IMPORTANT (whichever one you circled)?

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

Circle one: very important important not important

6b. WHY IS THAT VERY IMPORTANT/IMPORTANT/NOT IMPORTANT (whichever one you circled)?

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

Circle one: jail Heinz let Heinz go free can't decide
PROBLEM TWO

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 the 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 didn'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?

Circle one: should refuse  should not refuse  can't decide

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:

Circle one: refuse  not refuse  can't decide
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?

Circle one: very important important not important

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?

Circle one: very important important not important

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?

Circle one: very important important not important

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:

Circle one: refuse not refuse can't decide
4a. How important is it for children to help their parents, even when their parents have broken a promise?
   Circle one: very important important not important

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:
   Circle one: refuse not refuse can't decide

5a. How important is it for parents to let their children keep earned money—even when the parents did not promise their children that they could keep the money?
   Circle one: very important important not important

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:
   Circle one: refuse not refuse can't decide

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?
   Circle one: very important important not important

6b. WHY IS THAT VERY IMPORTANT/IMPORTANT/NOT IMPORTANT (whichever one you circled)?
1. What did you do to get in here
2. How did you feel while you were doing this?
3. How did you feel right afterwards?
4. How did you feel in between this time and the time you got caught?
5. How did you feel when you got caught?
6. How did you feel in between that time and the time you were in court?
7. When you went to court, how did you feel after the judge told you you were coming here?
8. When you look back now on what you did, how do you feel about it?
9. How would you have felt about this behavior we have been discussing if you had not gotten caught?
The Transgression Guilt Interview (TGI) is an interview technique developed to gain information about the subject's level of guilt. It consists of nine questions which ask how the subject felt during the time he committed the offense and at various intervals since.

The purpose of the interview is to determine the level of the subject's guilt. That is...

1) Does the subject have an absence of affect in regard to the crime committed?

2) Does the subject have affect which is influenced by an external sanction as its referent?

3) Does the subject have affect which is based on an internal moral standard such as would be defined as self-critical judgment?

The absence of affect would be considered the lowest level of response. This response is more typical of a psychopathic personality. Not only does the person feel no guilt, he also feels no fear. He feels no differently after committing the transgression than before committing it.

A response would be deemed an external response when the affect focuses on fear of being caught and/or punished. Happiness because one did not get caught is also considered an external affect. The subject's affect is a response to an external sanction as a referent.

An internal response would include affect such as guilt and/or shame. This response would describe the affect as being dominated by an internal, self critical judgment which has been violated by committing the transgression.

Scoring Procedure

When measuring the content of a response to a TGI, affect (feeling emotion) is the scoreable response. However, the interviewer may need to determine "why" the affect is present for the feeling to be clearly categorized. For example, "mad" may mean "mad at oneself" or "mad that he was caught and/or punished."

Answers are scored according to content alone. In other words, non-verbal behavior and voice inflections are not scored. However, if the interviewer notes either non-verbal behavior or voice inflections which could be discrepant with the content, it would be important to probe to determine if the subject was actually functioning at a level higher or lower than the content suggested. It is also important when probing to ask only "why" questions and to make reflective statements. Suggesting or interpreting what you think the subject felt may lead him to respond with what he thinks you wish to hear. In some cases the subject may tell you that these questions are "silly." At this point it might be helpful to
explain that he probably knows very clearly how he feels. However, not everybody feels the same way in a similar situation and you are interested in knowing specifically how he feels. Since you don't know this person very well you are asking the questions to help him clarify or describe his feelings to you.

The TGI consists of nine questions. Question #1, "What did you do to get in here at Buckeye Youth Center?" is considered a warm-up question. It is important to get a clear response to this question. But the response is not scored. On question #1 if the response is "B & E" or "Grand Theft" (a label defined by the court) ask for the specific circumstances surrounding the incident. In some cases, the subject was involved in a series of offenses and several charges were dropped or reduced.

In other cases the subject violated parole or misbehaved or went AWOL while in a less structured detention center. If the subject's actual offense took place sometime prior to being committed to the Department of Youth Services (DYS), then it may be necessary to discuss the subject's feelings about that original offense. For example:

Answer to #1: "violation of probation" or "fighting at Hillcrest".
Probe the reason for being on probation or the reason for being at Hillcrest. Then use this offense as the topic for the rest of the interview.

Another type of response which might be given to Question #1 is a response of denying that he had committed the offense for which he was charged. If this happens, ask the subject:

"Have you ever done anything that you considered to be wrong?"

If he answers "Yes," ask him to describe that offense and use that offense as the topic for discussing the subsequent questions. Questions may have to be paraphrased if this was an offense which had not been caught. In other words, the subject would be asked:

"How do you think you would have felt if you had been caught...?" etc.

If the subject answers "No" he does not feel he has ever done anything wrong, then ask:

"Do you think anyone has ever done anything wrong? If so, what?"

Use this incident as the topic for answering the rest of the questions.

Questions 2 through 9 are scoreable questions. However not all 8 must receive a score for the protocol to be valid. At least 4 or more items must meet scoring criteria. Scoring criteria means that the response must meet the descriptions of one of the levels 0-3. If a question does not yield a scoreable response, probes may be given.
Probes:

No more than two probes should be utilized per question. If a subject uses a one-word response such as:

"Upset"  "Stupid"
"Angry"  "Bad"
"Mad"  "Worried"
"Shook"

Respond by saying:

"What made you feel...?"

or

"Why were you...?"

It is necessary to gain a referent for the emotion expressed in order to determine if it is based on an external sanction or a violation of the subject's internal moral code.

If the response to the above probe is:

"I don't know, I just felt...."

Respond by asking the subject to think back to what was happening at the time and ask either one of the two above mentioned probes or...

"How do you think you came to feel...?"

If the subject is unable to respond at this point, it is best to go on to the next question. However, another way of gaining more information is to reflect back to the subject what he has just said. It is extremely important that you use the same terminology that he used and do not interpret what he said. For example:

Subject: "I was mad!"

Interviewer: "You say you were mad at the time you got caught?"

This may lead the subject to respond with a more adequate explanation of why he was mad.

Scoring Levels:

Each scoreable response on the interview will be given a score of 0, 1, 2, or 3. The scores will be based on the answer matching the definition listed below for each of these levels. If more than one level of "feeling" is given in a response, try to clarify which "feeling" is the stronger feeling. However, if this cannot be determined, score the answer as a 2. There should be no question of discrimination between level 0 and level 1.
Level 0 will give no indication of concern about being caught and no description of any kind of feeling.

The sum of the total points will then be divided by the number of scoreable items in order to determine the mean. The mean will be multiplied by 100 to receive the final score for the protocol. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Scoreable Items</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are listed the definitions of each scoring level and some examples of items which are scoreable at that level.

**Level 0**

These responses show total absence of expression of affect in regard to the transgression committed. There is no concern for avoiding punishment or for being caught. There is no expression of guilt. The response would describe the subject as feeling the same after committing the transgression as he felt prior to committing it.

Examples:

"I didn't feel nothing."

"I didn't feel no different."

"I don't remember feeling anything."

**Level 1**

These responses show anxiety and/or a fear of being caught and/or punished. The subject states that he either felt "scared" or "mad" that he was caught and/or punished. The person may also express concern about another person getting into trouble; therefore causing him to get into trouble. The level 1 responses give or imply an external sanction as the referent for why the subject had these feelings. The subject may also express happiness at not getting caught.
Examples:

"I was mad." (Probe why.)

"I didn't want to get locked up."

"I was happy I didn't get caught."

"I was scared they might get my buddy to confess and implicate me."

"I was really mad that I was being sent up for such a little thing. If I had known I would get sent up, I'd have stolen something bigger."

"I was worried I'd be sent up this time. I just had this feeling that I was going to DYS even before the judge told me."

Level 2

These responses are transgression-related feelings which are intermediate between external sanctioned feelings and internal self-critical judgment-related feelings. The response may include interpersonal socio-emotional sanctions as opposed to strictly concrete external sanctions. In other words, instead of expressing concern about getting caught or punished, the subject will express concern about how his behavior has affected his family and friends. His concern is that his affiliative relationships remain intact. These responses suggest that the subject wants to maintain a relationship and avoid being censured by others.

He may also express the concept of fairness (i.e. - "It wasn't fair for my buddy to take the rap alone").

The subject may also be able to state that the transgression was wrong. (However, if he can state, "It was wrong of me," then this statement would receive a score of 3 vs. 2.

If probing elicits a level 3 response, the response should only be scored 2. Only spontaneously given level 3 responses should receive a score of 3.

Examples:

"I knew I deserved to get punished, but not this much."

"I knew it was wrong, but I did it anyway 'cause I thought I wouldn't get caught."

"My folks would be really mad at me for doing that."

"All my family was mad at me for stealing my uncle's truck."
"My buddy got caught. It wouldn't be fair for him to take the rap alone."

"I was glad I got caught."

"I knew it was wrong to deprive those people of their gas."

After Probing:
"Yeh, I feel bad about what I did now."

**Level 3:**

These responses directly express "guilt" without probing. The subject is straightforward in stating that he feels terrible about what happened or that he has it on his conscience. The actual word "guilt" may not be used, but the guilt concept is definitely described.

Level 3 responses express a concern for violating some internal, personal moral standard. It is apparent from the response that the subject has an internal self-critical moral code which is deeply involved in how he feels about himself when he transgresses. These feelings are expressed; explicitly, strongly, and spontaneously.

**Examples:**

"I felt guilty."

"I felt really bad that I had done that."  
(Probe to be sure this "bad" is an internally induced bad.)

"It was wrong of me to take those things. I worried about it until I confessed."

"I couldn't live with myself if I did that."  
(Probe for why. Need to clarify that this is a statement based on internal referent.)

"I'm not the kind of person who would do something like that."  
(Probe for why. Clarify that this is a statement based on an internal referent.)
These are statements which allow people to describe themselves. There are no right or wrong answers since people differ markedly. Please read the entire sentence across. First decide which one of the two parts of each statement best describes you; then go to that side of the statement and check whether that is just sort of true for you or really true for you. You will just check ONE of the four boxes for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
<th>BUT</th>
<th>Other adults don't like the way they are leading their lives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Some adults like the way they are leading their lives</td>
<td>Some adults feel that they are enjoyable to be with</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults often question whether they are enjoyable to be with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Some adults are not satisfied with the way they do their work</td>
<td>Some adults see caring or nurturing others as a contribution to the future</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults are satisfied the way they do their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some adults see caring or nurturing others as a contribution to the future</td>
<td>In games and sports some adults usually watch instead of play</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults usually play rather than just watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In games and sports some adults usually watch instead of play</td>
<td>Some adults are happy with the way they look</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults are not happy with the way they look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Some adults are happy with the way they look</td>
<td>Some adults feel they are not adequately supporting themselves and those who are important to them</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults feel they are providing adequate support for themselves and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Some adults feel they are not adequately supporting themselves and those who are important to them</td>
<td>Some adults live up to their own moral standards</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults have trouble living up to their moral standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Some adults live up to their own moral standards</td>
<td>Some adults are very happy being the way they are</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults would like to be different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Some adults are very happy being the way they are</td>
<td>Some adults are not very organized in completing household tasks</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults are organized in completing household tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Some adults are not very organized in completing household tasks</td>
<td>Some adults have the ability to develop intimate relationships</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults do not find it easy to develop intimate relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Some adults have the ability to develop intimate relationships</td>
<td>Other adults are not very organized in completing household tasks</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults are organized in completing household tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other adults are organized in completing household tasks</td>
<td>Some adults are not very organized in completing household tasks</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults do not find it easy to develop intimate relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
<td>Sort of True for Me</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>When some adults don't understand something, it makes them feel stupid.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults don't necessarily feel stupid when they don't understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Some adults can really laugh at themselves.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults have a hard time laughing at themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Some adults feel uncomfortable when they have to meet new people.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults like to meet new people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Some adults feel they are very good at their work.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults worry about whether they can do their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Some adults do not enjoy fostering the growth of others.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults enjoy fostering the growth of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Some adults sometimes question whether they are a worthwhile person.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults feel that they are a worthwhile person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Some adults think they could do well at just about any new physical activity they haven't tried before.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults are afraid they might not do well at physical activities they haven't ever tried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Some adults think that they are not very attractive or good looking.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults think that they are attractive or good looking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Some adults are satisfied with how they provide for the important people in their lives.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults are dissatisfied with how they provide for these people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Some adults would like to be a better person morally.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults think that they are quite moral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Some adults can keep their household running smoothly.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults have trouble keeping their household running smoothly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Some adults find it hard to establish intimate relationships.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults do not have difficulty establishing intimate relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Some adults feel that they are intelligent.</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>Other adults question whether they are very intelligent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
<td>Sort of True for Me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Some adults are disappointed with themselves</td>
<td>BUT Other adults are quite pleased with themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Some adults find it hard to act in a joking or kidding manner with friends or colleagues</td>
<td>BUT Other adults find it very easy to joke or kid around with friends and colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Some adults feel at ease with other people</td>
<td>BUT Other adults are quite shy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Some adults are not very productive in their work</td>
<td>BUT Other adults are very productive in their work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Some adults feel they are good at nurturing others</td>
<td>BUT Other adults are not very nurturant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Some adults do not feel that they are very good when it comes to sports</td>
<td>BUT Other adults feel they do very well at all kinds of sports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Some adults like their physical appearance the way it is</td>
<td>BUT Other adults do not like their physical appearance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Some adults feel they cannot provide for the material necessities of life</td>
<td>BUT Other adults feel they do adequately provide for the material necessities of life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Some adults are dissatisfied with themselves</td>
<td>BUT Other adults are satisfied with themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Some adults usually do what they know is morally right</td>
<td>BUT Other adults often don't do what they know is morally right.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Some adults are not very efficient in managing activities at home</td>
<td>BUT Other adults are efficient in managing activities at home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Some people seek out close relationships</td>
<td>BUT Other persons shy away from close relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Some adults do not feel that they are very intellectually capable</td>
<td>BUT Other adults feel that they are intellectually capable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Really True for Me</td>
<td>Sort of True for Me</td>
<td>Sort of True for Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Some adults feel they have a good sense of humor</td>
<td>BUT Other adults wish their sense of humor was better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Some adults are not very sociable</td>
<td>BUT Other adults are sociable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Some adults are proud of their work</td>
<td>BUT Other adults are not very proud of what they do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Some adults like the kind of person they are</td>
<td>BUT Other adults would like to be someone else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Some adults do not enjoy nurturing others</td>
<td>BUT Other adults enjoy being nurturant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Some adults feel they are better than others their age at sports</td>
<td>BUT Other adults don't feel they can play as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Some adults are unsatisfied with something about their face or hair</td>
<td>BUT Other adults like their face and hair the way they are.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Some adults feel that they provide adequately for the needs of those who are important to them</td>
<td>BUT Other adults feel they do not provide adequately for these needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Some adults often question the morality of their behavior</td>
<td>BUT Other adults feel that their behavior is usually moral.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Some adults use their time efficiently at household activities</td>
<td>BUT Other adults do not use their time efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Some adults in close relationships have a hard time communicating openly</td>
<td>BUT Other adults in close relationships feel that it is easy to communicate openly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Some adults feel like they are just as smart as other adults</td>
<td>BUT Other adults wonder if they are as smart.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Some adults feel that they are often too serious about their life</td>
<td>BUT Other adults are able to find humor in their life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELF-PERCEPTION PROFILE FOR ADULTS

Scoring Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Items and Item Scores</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIABILITY</td>
<td>2 14 27 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB COMPETENCE</td>
<td>3 15 28 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURTURANCE</td>
<td>4 16 29 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHLETIC COMPETENCE</td>
<td>5 18 30 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL APPEARANCE</td>
<td>6 19 31 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADEQUACY AS PROVIDER</td>
<td>7 20 32 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORALITY</td>
<td>8 21 34 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>10 22 35 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIMATE RELATIONSHIPS</td>
<td>11 23 36 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELLIGENCE</td>
<td>12 24 37 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSE OF HUMOR</td>
<td>13 26 38 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLOBAL SELF-WORTH 1 9 17 25 33 41 (divide by 6)

Aid to find averages for the 11 specific Domains (Totals divided by 4):

Total: 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
Average: 1.0 1.25 1.5 1.75 2.0 2.25 2.5 2.75 3.0 3.25 3.5 3.75 4.0

On the graph below plot the average competency scores and importance ratings for each domain: