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INTRODUCTION

The cognitive-developmental theory of moral development has spawned a great deal of interest and research in the area of sociomoral development of delinquents and conduct disordered youths. The cognitive-developmental view implies that immature or developmentally delayed moral judgment levels should be disproportionately represented among youths exhibiting conduct disorders and treatment designed to enhance sociomoral development should be accompanied by improvements in behavior. This study attempts to assess gains in sociomoral reasoning attributable to a group dilemma discussion procedure and determine if these changes are accompanied by behavioral changes. Attention-control groups and passage-of-time control groups were employed to assess the specific effects of the dilemma discussion treatment intervention.

The sample was obtained from five high schools and consisted of students identified by teachers and school administrators as behavior problem youths or those considered to be at high risk for involvement in delinquent
behaviors. A behavioral observation report was completed by teachers familiar with each student before and after the interventions to evaluate changes in school behaviors. Data concerning school attendance and grades were obtained from school records for a period prior to the interventions and a period following the interventions.

Finally, archival data were gathered from the juvenile court on contacts with the court due to delinquent behaviors for a period prior to the interventions and a period following initiation of the interventions.
CHAPTER I
BACKGROUND

Research in the area of moral development in delinquents has been based largely on the cognitive-developmental stage theory of moral judgment developed by Lawrence Kohlberg. Beginning with the work of Jean Piaget (1932/1965), who identified two levels of moral development, Kohlberg expanded this theory to include development beyond adolescence and initially postulated six basic stages of moral development (Kohlberg, 1958). Later, based on cross-cultural and longitudinal studies, (e.g., Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, & Lieberman, 1983), Kohlberg and others (e.g., Edwards, 1981; Snarey, 1985) concluded most people reach a developmental endpoint at stage four or five (Kohlberg, 1978).

After working with Kohlberg, John Gibbs became interested in developing an alternative method for assessing moral judgment. Gibb's Sociomoral Reflection Measure (Gibbs & Widaman, 1982) is based on a
simplification of the testing and scoring procedures of the Moral Judgment Interview (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987). The Sociomoral Reflection Measure is a production-task measure designed to serve as a group-administrable counterpart to Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview. This measure is based directly on Kohlberg's stage theory of moral development and consists of fifteen questions which probe the subject's reasoning regarding the normative values and decisions pertaining to two dilemmas.

Although based directly on Kohlberg's stage theory of moral development, the Sociomoral Reflection Measure describes only four basic stages as opposed to Kohlberg's five basic stages. This reflects Gibbs' emphasis on the immature (stages 1 and 2) and the mature (stages 3 and 4) stages as being the best documented (Gibbs, 1977, 1979). In contrast, Kohlberg's stage 5 is rarely found and stage 6 is no longer scored (e.g., Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, & Lieberman, 1983). These four basic stages have been described by Gibbs (Gibbs & Widaman, 1982):

**Stage 1: Unilateral and Simplistic**

In Stage 1, sociomoral justifications involve simplistic, unilateral views of human relations. Morality is viewed in terms of the power an authority has over the individual. Maxim-like rules and unqualified positive or negative
labels are applied to sociomoral dilemmas. The punitive consequences of a behavior are used to define the moral wrongness of an action.

**Stage 2: Exchanging and Instrumental**

Stage 2 reasoning includes the insight that human relations can be two-way. This is limited to anticipated returns of favors and equal compensation. Helping others is important only because others may be of assistance to the individual in return. Otherwise, one should take care of his or her own business and let others fend for themselves. The individual is concerned only with getting as much as others and with getting even.

**Stage 3: Mutual and Prosocial**

Reflective sociomoral ideality first emerges in Stage 3. The individual develops a third-person perspective allowing genuine mutuality to emerge in relationships involving caring and trust. Empathic considerations pertaining to others' welfare become evident. Appropriate role conduct or normative expectations become important. Appeals for generalized prosocial or normative prescriptions beyond the context of particular relationships or roles are seen. In this Stage, wanting to be thought well of by others becomes important to the individual.
Stage 4: Systemic and Standard

At Stage 4, an expanded application of the third-person ideality of Stage 3 reasoning is seen. The individual's conceptualizations of human relations include not only dyadic relationships but the differentiated, hierarchical networks of complex social systems. Priorities for society or for social institutions become important to the individual. The individual recognizes and values basic or society-based rights. Responsibilities, obligations, and commitments become important. Concerns about consistent and objective practices along with procedural equity or social justice are expressed. Issues of personal conscience are seen in expressed appeals to "self-respect", one's "sense of self-worth", "personal satisfaction", "dignity", "honor", "consistency", or "integrity".

Much research has called attention to the relationships between juvenile delinquency and stages of moral reasoning (e.g., Gibbs, Arnold, Ahlborn, & Cheesman, 1984). The cognitive-developmental view implies that immature or developmentally delayed moral judgment levels (Stages 1 and 2) should be disproportionately represented among antisocial individuals in relation to those who do not engage in such offenses (Kohlberg and Freundlich, 1973).
Kohlberg (1978) examined samples of delinquent adolescents in Indiana, Connecticut, and Scotland and reported: "In each of the samples, the control group was significantly higher than the delinquent group in moral maturity" (p. 213). Numerous other empirical studies have substantiated the view that delinquent adolescents show significantly less mature levels of moral development than do their non-delinquent counterparts.

In a review of the available literature, Blasi (1980) found strong evidence to suggest delinquent individuals tend to use developmentally lower modes of moral reasoning than do matched groups of non-delinquents. He concluded that, at least on production measures, a significantly higher percentage of juvenile delinquents are functioning at sociomoral Stage 2 (instrumental motives and pragmatic exchanges) than are at Stage 3 (standards and systemic practices) in terms of Kohlberg's (1969) developmental typology. These results were felt to be particularly strong because several of the studies used small samples.

Assessing moral development in a group of 13-to 16-year-old delinquents, Rosenkoetter, Mazak and Landman (1980) found virtually all of them to be functioning at Stage Two. Kohlberg and Freundlich (1973) found 80 to 90 percent of the delinquents to be predominantly
preconventional in three separate samples used in their studies as well as in three samples used by other investigators. The corresponding control groups used in these studies were found to be predominantly conventional in moral stage.

Jurkovic (1980) also surveyed the available literature and concluded that there appears to be a moderate relationship between delinquency and a preconventional moral orientation. He concluded that "the majority of the investigators reviewed thus far have revealed heterogeneous groups of delinquents to reason morally at less mature levels than their nondelinquent counterparts" (p. 715).

Other authors have also demonstrated significant differences in moral orientation between delinquents and non-delinquents. Sagi and Eisikovits (1981) studied 13-to 17-year-old Israeli children and found non-delinquents to score significantly higher on a measure of moral development than delinquents. Gavaghan, Arnold & Gibbs (1983) likewise showed delinquents to score significantly lower than non-delinquents using the Sociomoral Reflection Measure.

Fodor (1973) compared a group of "psychopathic delinquents" and a group of "non-psychopathic delinquents" and found the "psychopaths" exhibited a lower level of
moral development. This suggests delinquent behaviors may be directly related to level of moral reasoning with more morally delayed subjects exhibiting more pronounced delinquent behavior.

Wright (1978) also suggests delinquency-proneness appears to indicate immature moral development. Using a sample of ten-to 13-year-old children (a critical transition period in which individuals may move from pre-conventional to conventional thinking) he found students described as being "delinquent" by their teachers to use significantly more stage one and stage two reasoning than did students described by teachers as being "non-delinquent" (p. 202). Bear and Richards (1981), using teacher ratings, found that children who employ lower stages of moral reasoning display more conduct problems in their classrooms than do children who reason at higher levels. In a more recent study, Arbuthnot and Gordon (1986) also found behavior problems in the classroom to be linked to lower levels of sociomoral reasoning.

Thus, the evidence strongly supports the view of delinquents and pre-delinquents as consisting to a disproportionate degree of morally immature individuals as compared to other adolescents who are judged to not be at risk for delinquency. These children are believed to
become developmentally delayed or arrested in the
development of their social and moral reasoning due to at
least in part, a dearth of role-taking opportunities
These authors suggest a lack of opportunity for
experiencing adequate role-taking opportunities by children
in hostile, highly power-assertive homes and ecologies are
identifiable as high-risk for delinquency. It is felt
these delays in sociomoral reasoning are attributable to
inadequate social role-taking opportunities at school, at
work, in social interactions, and especially in the home.
Coordination of social perspectives leads to sociomoral
development and cannot take place without role-taking
opportunities. When parents and other authorities punish
and threaten a child without explaining why their behaviors
are wrong (especially by appealing to the child to take the
perspective of the victim), do not encourage the child's
input into family decisions and do not insist on the
performance of family roles, the child is not given the
opportunity to take anyone's perspective but his or her own
(Gibbs, 1987). This type of experience is believed to
delay sociomoral reasoning and investigators have linked
the development of antisocial attitudes and behaviors to
parental histories of physically harsh punishment, disharmony and neglect (e.g., Farrington, 1978; Welsh, 1976; Fodor, 1973).

This view of delinquents and pre-delinquents as delayed in moral development due to a lack of opportunity for role-taking experiences has prompted investigators to attempt to facilitate moral development in groups of delinquent and delinquency-prone adolescents. These attempts have been of two basic types: (1) facilitation of moral development through group discussions of moral dilemmas, called a microintervention strategy; and (2) creating social environments more consistent with more advanced levels of moral functioning where moral development may occur, or a macrointervention strategy. The current study deals solely with the first type of moral development facilitation effort.

Moral dilemma discussion techniques have been demonstrated to produce gains in moral reasoning in children (e.g., Blatt & Kohlberg, 1975; Bear, Shever & Fulton, 1983). Schlaefli, Rest, Thoma (1985) reviewed the literature concerning programs designed to stimulate development in moral judgment using the Defining Issues Test. They concluded the dilemma discussion programs produced modest but significant moral judgment gains.
Further, they found treatments of about three to twelve weeks to be optimal. These results have encouraged attempts to enhance moral reasoning in delinquents and pre-delinquents.

Several investigators have found a group dilemma discussion intervention to significantly enhance levels of sociomoral reasoning in sociomorally delayed delinquents and pre-delinquents. Fleetwood and Parish (1976) demonstrated significant post-treatment gains in moral functioning as measured by the Defining Issues Test with a group of 16- and 17-year-old delinquents. By involving this sample of delinquents in six dilemma discussion groups, each lasting approximately one and a half hours, significant moral functioning gains were found. Rosenkoetter et al. (1980) obtained similar post-treatment gains in moral reasoning using an intervention program consisting of seven, one and one-half hour long group sessions in which Kohlberg-type dilemmas were discussed. Gibbs et al. (1984) have also reported gains in sociomoral development using a dilemma discussion group based on Dilemma Decisions Survey sociomoral dilemmas.

Arbuthnot and Gordon (1986) have also demonstrated gains in sociomoral development using a dilemma session technique with high-risk behavior-disordered adolescents in
a school setting. More recently, Niles (1986) also demonstrated significant gains in moral reasoning using a moral discussion group with institutionalized delinquent and predelinquent boys. However, when Wright (1978) used a dilemma discussion intervention program with a group of young children described as being "delinquent" by their teachers, no significant post-treatment gains in moral reasoning were found. Because of the young age of the children studied and the short length of the intervention program (six, one-half hour group discussions revolving around filmstrips about which little description is given), this study may not be comparable to other studies in the area.

Although these studies strongly suggest moral reasoning can be enhanced in groups of delinquent and predelinquent youths, the evidence is inconclusive concerning the impact of dilemma discussion interventions on behavior. Recently, Arbuthnot and Gordon (1986) demonstrated behavioral changes associated with gains in moral judgment and Niles (1986) failed to find such conduct changes associated with gains in moral judgment. Further, in the study finding behavioral correlates to changes in moral reasoning (Arbuthnot & Gordon, 1986), control groups consisted of matched groups of youths who did not participate in any
group activity. This type of control group does not control for the attention inherent in a group treatment program and does not show that cognitive and behavioral changes are the result of the dilemma discussion intervention process per se.

This discussion leads to two questions concerning the relationship of moral reasoning and behavior. First, do gains in moral reasoning associated with dilemma discussion interventions result specifically from moral dilemma group discussions or do these gains result from some element generic to group meetings? Second, do behavioral changes occur with gains in moral development? In an attempt to address these questions, this study presents two basic hypotheses: First, using pre-delinquent youths, a group dilemma discussion session intervention will show significant gains in sociomoral reasoning attributable to the group dilemma discussion process in comparison to attention-control groups and passage-of-time control groups. Second, concomitant improvements in behavior as measured by teacher ratings, school grades, absenteeism/truancy rates and referrals to juvenile court will accompany gains in sociomoral reasoning.
CHAPTER II
METHODS

Setting

The study was conducted at five public senior high schools (grades nine through twelve) in Fairfield County as a program offered through the Fairfield Family Counseling Center in Lancaster, Ohio. The schools are all in largely rural areas and range in size from 403 to 1218 students. The program was offered to all schools in the county through a letter of introduction addressed to the high school principals and followed by a telephone contact by the investigator. Five of the eight schools in the county agreed to participate and the study was conducted during three consecutive school years. All contacts with students were made in the schools they attended. The group meetings were held in available space within the schools, usually in vacant classrooms.
Subjects

A total of 50 subjects were initially included in the study. In each school, teachers and administrators were contacted (see Appendix A) and asked to nominate students for the program who they considered to be behavior problem youths, or considered to be at risk for involvement in delinquent behaviors. In order to maintain a homogeneous sample, only male students between 14 and 16 years of age were included in the study. Sixty-nine students were referred to the program but not tested because parental permission could not be obtained. Also, forty-eight subjects who were tested were excluded from the study in order to form equivalent groups by stratified random assignment.

Three of the original 50 subjects were excluded from the data analyses. One subject in the dilemma discussion group failed to attend any group meetings due to an extended absence from school and was therefore excluded from the study. Two subjects in the passage-of-time control group were not available for posttesting due to having withdrawn from school. The remaining 47 subjects ranged in age from 14 to 16 years (M = 15.26). All were from a rural county and 90 percent lived in a home with at
least one parent. The others were living with other relatives or foster parents.

**Measures**

**Sociomoral Reflection Measure-Form A (SRM)**

The SRM (Gibbs & Widaman, 1982) was used to measure level of sociomoral development (see Appendix B). The SRM is a production-task measure designed to serve as a group-administrable instrument that measures reflective sociomoral reasoning. It consists of 15 questions which probe the subject's reasoning regarding the normative values and decisions pertaining to two dilemmas. Acceptable reliability as well as concrete and concurrent validity have been established by previous studies (Gibbs & Widaman, 1982; Gibbs, Widaman & Colby, 1982).

Three main scores evaluating sociomoral reasoning are produced by the SRM protocol. First, the Sociomoral Reflection Maturity Score (SRMS) is an overall rating of sociomoral reasoning on eight norms based on a scale extending from 100 to 400. The second score is Modal Stage, which is the stage most frequently used by the subject in responses (stage 1, 2, 3, or 4) on the eight norms. Third, the global score is a qualitative summary label representing the developmental level in which an SRMS is located.
In addition to the three major overall scores produced by the SRM protocol, stage scores are produced for eight norms: (1) Affiliation; (2) Life; (3) Law and Property; (4) Legal Justice; (5) Conscience; (6) Family Affiliation; (7) Contract; and (8) Property.

The eight norm scores of the SRM were included in an effort to more precisely identify areas of sociomoral reasoning change.

All subjects were administered the SRM approximately four weeks prior to participation in the study and these SRMS scores were used to assign subjects to equivalent experimental and control groups using stratified random assignment. All available participating subjects were then administered the SRM again one to two weeks following the treatment interventions.

Teacher Ratings

The behavior rating scale used (see Appendix C) was an adaptation of the Dormitory Observation Report (DOR) developed at the John S. Wilder Youth Development Center in Tennessee and described by Veneziano & Veneziano (1984). The DOR is a checklist designed to measure problem behaviors in juvenile offender populations and was altered to be more applicable for use by teachers in a school setting. The resulting scale was intended to measure
behaviors observable in a school setting which are; disturbing and/or harmful to others, or harmful to oneself (e.g., being manipulated or exploited).

Using an aggregation strategy as described by Rushton, Brainerd and Pressley (1983) scores for the teacher behavior rating scales were averaged. Only scores for those teachers who completed both pretest and posttest behavior rating scales for a subject were used.

**Dilemma Decisions Survey (DDS)**

A modified version of the DDS was used with the dilemma discussion treatment group (see Appendix D). The DDS is a series of 16 sociomoral dilemmas used to facilitate sociomoral reasoning. Dilemmas used have been adapted from a variety of sources and some have been modified by the author as the result of experience with dilemma discussion groups in the past. Dilemmas were chosen for both their ability to stimulate group interaction and for their ability to facilitate a transition to stage 3 sociomoral reasoning. Subjects attending group sessions were presented with a copy of a different dilemma at each session and required to respond to the probe questions. Probe questions focus on relevant
aspects of the dilemma and subjects are asked to circle "yes", "no", or "can't decide" in reference to the "right course of action.

Archival Behavioral Indices

Data concerning the number of days absent, the number of days tardy, and grades were obtained from school records. Each group intervention began at the beginning of an academic semester with pretest attendance and grade scores consisting of number of days absent, number of days tardy, and grade point averages for the preceding semester. Posttest data consisted of attendance records for the semester following initiation of the intervention. Pretest and posttest academic records consisted of grade point averages computed for math, English and humanities, nonacademic classes and for overall grade point averages.

Records of contacts with Juvenile Court were obtained for a pretest period consisting of a six-month period prior to the beginning of the interventions. Posttest data consisted of court contacts during a six-month period following the beginning of the experimental period.

Design

Because of difficulty in recruiting enough subjects to form groups in each school, only two groups were formed in each of the five schools. By random assignment, two
schools were chosen to have an attention-control and dilemma discussion group, two schools were chosen for a dilemma discussion and a passage-of-time control group, and one school was chosen for an attention-control group and passage-of-time control group (see Table 1).

In each school, two comparable groups were formed by stratified random assignment using SRMS scores. Because only a limited number of non-delayed subjects (SRMS of 275 and above) were available, each group was composed of four delayed subjects and one non-delayed subject. Each group was then randomly assigned to a treatment condition.

Table 1
Group Assignment by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Dilemma Discussion</th>
<th>Attention-Control</th>
<th>Passage-of-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n=20</td>
<td>n=15</td>
<td>n=15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Groups

The experimental groups met one time each week for 12 weeks. Each session was held in the school the students attended and lasted one class period (45 to 50 minutes). Students were excused from their regular classes to attend group meetings and sessions were rotated through the class periods to minimize the number of times a student would miss each class. At each session, subjects were given a written copy of one dilemma from the DDS and responded to the probe questions. The group leader then recorded each subject's responses and directed the discussion of that dilemma, asking members to explain and justify their views. During each discussion, the group leader challenged group members' views and selectively attended to more advanced levels of sociomoral reasoning.

The attention-control group sessions were arranged to meet similarly to the dilemma discussion meetings. These groups used a self-defeating behavior model developed by Cudney (1975) to discuss specific problem behaviors identified by the group (see Appendix E). The self-defeating behavior model can be conceptualized as dealing with problem behaviors at a stage 2 level of sociomoral reasoning. This approach examines how behaviors can be self-defeating or create problems for oneself in the
long run. Because these problems interfere with satisfying one's own desires and needs, they are self-defeating and in need of modification. This process does not deal with ethical questions and no moral dilemmas are contained in the material.

Procedure

After subjects were nominated by teachers and school administrators for the study, the investigator met with all nominated students in groups. At that time, the project was explained briefly (see Appendix F). Each student expressing willingness to participate was asked to endorse the appropriate consent form (see Appendix G) and provide the name(s) of their parent(s) or guardian(s) (see Appendix H). Parents and guardians were then contacted by letter and asked to endorse and return the enclosed consent form (see Appendix I). If no response was obtained within ten days, the parent or guardian was contacted by telephone and asked to return the endorsed authorization form.

All subjects for whom parental permission was obtained were tested using the Sociomoral Reflection Measure. Using the subjects who produced scorable Sociomoral Reflection Measures, two equivalent groups of five students each were formed in each school using stratified random assignment of SRMS scores.
Each subject participating in the study was asked to identify three teachers in his school with whom he had at least one class and who he felt knew him well. These three teachers were then asked to complete the behavior rating scale one week before and one week following the interventions.

One to two weeks following the final group session in each school, subjects were again administered the SRM. Following the end of the school semester, archival attendance and academic data were collected from school records. Finally, after all groups had been completed for six months, records of court contacts were obtained from juvenile court. Archival data were found to be relatively complete.
Preliminary analysis describing the composition of the groups is presented first. Next, results concerning changes in moral judgment associated with the three treatment conditions are presented. Analysis of the results concerning behavioral correlates is examined next. Finally, supplemental analyses are presented.

**Preliminary Analysis**

Although subjects were assigned to treatment conditions by stratified random assignment, the data were evaluated to confirm the comparability of the groups formed. Using an ANOVA, pretest SRMS scores were examined and no differences were found between treatment groups, $F(2,47) = .01, p = \text{n.s.}$

**Moral Judgment Change**

A chi-square test was performed to examine change in modal scores (improved, not improved) within the three treatment conditions. No significant changes were found, $\chi^2(2, N=47) = .54, p = \text{n.s.}$ Because of the relatively small sample size, chi-square analysis of change in modal
scores for subjects delayed in moral judgment and those not delayed in moral judgment could not be done separately.

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) (with pretest SRMS score as the covariate) was done using posttest SRMS scores. No significant differences were found to be associated with the treatment conditions,

\[ F(2,41) = 1.25, \ p = \text{n.s.} \]

Subjects delayed in moral judgment (pretest SRMS scores below 275) and non-delayed subjects (pretest SRMS scores of 275 and above) were then examined separately. Using the subjects delayed in moral judgment, an ANCOVA (with pretest SRMS scores as the covariate) found no significant changes in moral judgment associated with treatment condition, \[ F(2, 34) = 1.42, \ p = \text{n.s.} \]. Subjects not delayed in moral judgment also showed no changes in SRMS scores associated with treatment condition in an ANCOVA (with pretest SRMS score as the covariate), \[ F(2, 2) = .23, \ p = \text{n.s.} \]

Because it was felt changes in moral judgment may be demonstrated selectively within norms of the SRM, a series of ANCOVA's (with pretest SRM norm scores as covariates) was done to examine changes on each norm by treatment conditions (see Tables 2 and 3). Interaction terms from these ANCOVA's were evaluated to determine if each of the
norms was affected in significantly different ways by the treatment conditions. Main effects assume the treatment conditions are affected in a similar manner from pretest to posttest while evaluating any difference between the means of each treatment condition.

On the contract norm, a main effect was found showing the attention-control group mean was lower than the dilemma discussion group and the passage-of-time group means. This difference was not found to be large enough to be significant based on the power of Tukey's Studentized Range Test.

The interaction term for the conscience norm indicated significance, but due to the small number of subjects in each condition (n = 9, 5, and 4) the results were not considered to be interpretable. The other SRM norms showed no effects attributable to treatment condition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRM Norm</th>
<th>Dilemma Discussion</th>
<th>Attention- Control</th>
<th>Passage- of-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Property</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Justice&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscience&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Affiliation</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The covariate in each analysis was the corresponding SRM norm pretest score with posttest scores adjusted by these scores. Adjusted mean not calculated due to insufficient n represented by --.

<sup>a</sup> The means in this analysis differ at the .05 level for the Dilemma Discussion Group and the Attention-control Group based on Tukey's Studentized Range Test.

<sup>b</sup> This comparison is of marginal validity due to n less than 10 in one or more condition.
Table 3
Analysis of Covariance of Posttest SRM Means per Norm by Group Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRM Norm</th>
<th>Main Effect of Group Condition</th>
<th>Interaction Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>2,34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Property</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Interaction effects are interactions of the main effects and covariates (corresponding pretest norm scores).
* p < .05.
Because it was hypothesized that moral judgment change would be evidenced largely in the delayed subjects, data for the subjects delayed in sociomoral reasoning (pretest SRMS below 275) were analyzed separately. Using a series of ANCOVA's (with pretest SRM norm scores as covariates), changes on SRM norms by treatment conditions were examined (see Tables 4 and 5).
Table 4

Adjusted Posttest SRM Stage Means per Norm by Group

**Condition-Delayed Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRM Norm</th>
<th>Dilemma Discussion</th>
<th>Attention-Control n</th>
<th>Passage-of-Time n</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life(^a)</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Property</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Justice(^a)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscience(^a)</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Affiliation</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property(^a)</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The covariate in each analysis was the corresponding SRM norm pretest score with posttest scores adjusted by these scores. Adjusted mean not calculated due to insufficient n represented by --.

\(^a\) This comparison is of marginal validity due to n less than ten in one or more condition.
Table 5

Analysis of Covariance of Posttest Stage SRM Means per Norm by Group Condition—Delayed Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRM Norm</th>
<th>Main Effect of Group Condition</th>
<th>Interaction Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Property</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Justice</td>
<td>4.06*</td>
<td>2,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscience</td>
<td>4.99*</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Affiliation</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>3.74*</td>
<td>2,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2,10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Interaction effects are interactions of the main effects and covariates (corresponding pretest norm scores). *p < .05.
With the delayed subjects, the contract norm was again found to have a main effect of treatment condition with the dilemma discussion group scoring highest. However, these differences were not found to be large enough to be significant based on the power of Tukey's Studentized Range Test.

Significant interaction terms were indicated on both the legal justice and conscience norms. Because of the small number of subjects in each condition, effects of both the conscience norm and the legal justice norm were not considered to be interpretable. No other norms showed significant changes by treatment condition for the delayed subjects.

Data for non-delayed subjects (pretest SRMS of 275 and above) were also examined using a series of ANCOVA's. No significant effects of treatment condition on the non-delayed subjects were found, although it is noted the number of non-delayed subjects was small (therefore limiting the effectiveness of the analyses).
Behavioral Indices

Teacher Behavior Rating Scales.

Behavioral changes were evaluated using both archival data and information concerning behaviors obtained from teachers using a behavior rating scale.

The behavior rating scale used was an adaptation of the Dormitory Observation Report modified for use by teachers in a school setting. Items on the scale were first evaluated to determine if they adequately composed meaningful and consistent composite scores representing the identified behavior areas. Within each behavioral grouping, items were correlated with each other and with the composite score for that grouping. This procedure was repeated with both pretest scores and posttest scores for each area.

All items in the groupings dealing with being easily led/manipulated and being exploited/victimized had Pearson correlation coefficients in the .90's. In the groupings dealing with truancy and manipulative behaviors, Pearson correlation coefficients were all .58 or above. Correlation matrices for the remaining six groupings are presented in Tables 6 through 11.

Evaluation of Pearson correlation coefficients suggested items within all the behavior groupings were
adequately related except the grouping labeled Physical Assaultiveness (see Table 6). Four items similar in content were found to have several negative correlations with other items within the grouping. Therefore, these items (1. Threatens to physically harm students; 2. Threatens to physically harm staff; 3. Attempts to physically harm students; and 4. Attempts to physically harm staff) were dropped from the analysis to improve the consistency of this behavior grouping. Items on this revised version of the physical assaultiveness scale were then re-examined and were considered to represent a more consistent measure (see Table 12).
Table 6  
Correlation Matrix of Behavior Rating Scale Items  
Relating to Physical Assaultiveness—Pretest and Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</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>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations presented in boldface type are significant at the .05 level or less. n's for all correlations ranged from 36 to 38. Items as presented on the behavior rating scale: 1. Threatens to physically harm students; 2. Threatens to physically harm staff; 3. Attempts to physically harm students; 4. Attempts to physically harm staff; 5. Damages personal property; 6. Damages other students' property; 7. Damages public property; 8. Has explosive temper; 9. Has temper tantrums. Number ten is the composite score for items relating to physical assaultiveness.
**Table 7**  
**Correlation Matrix of Behavior Rating Scale Items**  
**Relating to Oppositional Behavior—Pretest and Posttest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Posttest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Correlations presented in boldface type are significant at the .05 level or less. The n's for all correlations ranged from 35 to 37. Items as presented on the behavior rating scale: 1. Resents people in authority; 2. Is late for required activities; 3. Fails to return when supposed to; 4. Leaves required activity without permission; 5. Disrupts activities. Number six is the composite score for items relating to oppositional behavior.
Table 8

**Correlation Matrix of Behavior Rating Scale Items Relating to Being Verbally Aggressive—Pretest and Posttest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All correlations are significant at the .05 level or less. The n's for all correlations ranged from 37 to 38.

Items as presented on the behavior rating scale: 1. Teases or gossips about others; 2. Is verbally abusive with students; 3. Is verbally abusive with staff. Number four is the composite score for items relating to verbally aggressive behavior.
Table 9

Correlation Matrix of Behavior Rating Scale Items Relating to Following Rules/Regulations—Pretest and Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All correlations are significant at the .05 level or less. The n for all correlations is 38. Items as presented on the behavior rating scale: 1. Ignores rules or regular routines; 2. Resists following instructions, requests or orders; 3. Has impudent or rebellious attitude toward authority. Number four is the composite score for items relating to following rules/regulations.
Table 10

Correlation Matrix of Behavior Rating Scale Items Relating to Independent Functioning—Pretest and Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</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>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations presented in boldface type are significant at the .05 level or less. The n's for all correlations ranged from 34 to 38. Items as presented on the behavior rating scale: 1. Has to be made to do things; 2. Pays attention for more than fifteen minutes; 3. Becomes easily discouraged; 4. Fails to carry out tasks; 5. Is dependable; 6. Is cooperative; 7. Is selfish; 8. Interacts well with others; 9. Participates well in group activities. Number ten is the composite score for items relating to independent functioning behavior. Scoring inverted on items 2, 5, 6, 8, and 9.
Table 11
Correlation Matrix of Behavior Rating Scale Items Relating to Antisocial Behavior—Pretest and Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</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>Posttest</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations presented in boldface type are significant at the .05 level or less. The n's for all correlations ranged from 33 to 38. Items as presented on the behavior rating scale: 1. Is inconsiderate of others; 2. Does not return borrowed items; 3. Uses others' property without permission; 4. Steals others' property; 5. Cheats; 6. Lies about situation; 7. Lies about self; 8. Lies about others. Number nine is the composite score for items relating to antisocial behavior.
Table 12
Revised Correlation Matrix of Behavior Rating Scale Items Relating to Physical Assaultiveness—Pretest and Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations presented in boldface type are significant at the .05 level or less. The n's for all correlations ranged from 36 to 38. Items as presented on the behavior rating scale: 1. Damages personal property; 2. Damages other student's property; 3. Damages public property; 4. Has explosive temper; 5. Has temper tantrums. Number six is the composite score for items relating to physical assaultiveness.
To examine changes in behaviors as assessed by the behavior rating scales, a series of ANCOVA's (with pretest scores as covariates) was done using each of the composite scores for behavior areas and the overall scores on the behavior rating scale (see Tables 13 and 14). No significant main effects were found, although an interaction effect of treatment group was found on the score relating to manipulative behavior (see Table 15). In terms of reported manipulative behavior, the attention-control and dilemma discussion group members were viewed as becoming more manipulative while the passage-of-time group members were described as becoming less manipulative. No other reported behaviors were found to be affected by treatment group.

Data for the delayed subjects were analyzed separately to determine if they were differentially affected by the treatment conditions. Results of these analyses were similar to those found using all subjects. However, because of the small number of subjects, the results were not considered to be interpretable.
Table 13
Teacher Behavior Rating Scale Adjusted Means by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Dilemma Discussion</th>
<th>Attention-Control n</th>
<th>Passage-of-Time n</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.63 13</td>
<td>1.77 11</td>
<td>2.62 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Assaultive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.57 13</td>
<td>1.81 13</td>
<td>1.62 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.31 13</td>
<td>2.24 13</td>
<td>1.80 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.28 13</td>
<td>2.37 13</td>
<td>2.20 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily Led/Manipulated</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.08 13</td>
<td>3.22 13</td>
<td>2.38 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploited/Victimized</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.15 13</td>
<td>2.33 13</td>
<td>1.67 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbally Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.03 13</td>
<td>2.45 13</td>
<td>2.02 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Rules/Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.48 13</td>
<td>3.11 13</td>
<td>2.50 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Functioning</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.04 13</td>
<td>3.31 13</td>
<td>2.91 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.86 13</td>
<td>2.28 13</td>
<td>2.36 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.28 13</td>
<td>2.52 13</td>
<td>2.24 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The covariate in each analysis was the corresponding pretest score with posttest scores adjusted by these scores.
Table 14

Analysis of Covariance of Teacher Behavior Rating Scale Scores by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>( F ) Values for Main Effect of Group Condition</th>
<th>( F ) Values for Interaction Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Assaultive</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>6.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily Led/Manipulated</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploited/Victimized</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbally Aggressive</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Rules/Regulations</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Functioning</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( df = 2,28 \) for Truancy analysis; \( df = 2,32 \) for all other analyses. Interaction effects are interactions of the main effects and covariates (corresponding pretest norm scores).

* \( p < .05 \).
Table 15

Pretest and Posttest Means of Behavior Rating Scale Scores
for Manipulative Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma Discussion</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention-Control</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage-of-Time</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Archival Behavioral Data

Archival behavioral data were analyzed next.

Information concerning contacts with juvenile court was not analyzed because of the low frequency of court contacts. Only one of the subjects was reported to have any contact with the court, a member of the dilemma discussion group during the pretest period.

Evaluation of records of absenteeism using an ANCOVA (with number of days absent during the pre-treatment period as the covariate) revealed a significant interaction
between group and time from pre- to post-treatment periods (see Tables 16 and 17). Both the dilemma discussion group and attention-control group members increased in absenteeism while the passage-of-time group members decreased in number of days absent (see Table 18).

Table 16

Adjusted Posttest Attendance Means by Group Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Dilemma Discussion</th>
<th>Attention-Control</th>
<th>Passage-of-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>9.87 16</td>
<td>7.79 13</td>
<td>8.19 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tardiness</td>
<td>.88 16</td>
<td>2.22 13</td>
<td>2.84 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The covariate in each analysis was the corresponding pretest score with posttest scores adjusted by these scores.
Table 17

**Analysis of Covariance of Posttest Attendance by Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Records</th>
<th>F Values for Main Effect of Group Condition</th>
<th>F Values for Interaction Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism/Truancy</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>9.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tardiness</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>3.42*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. df = 2, 37 for all analyses. Interaction effects are interactions of the main effects and covariates (corresponding pretest data). *p < .05. **p < .0005.*

Table 18

**Pretest and Posttest Means for Days Absent/Truant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma Discussion</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention-Control</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage-of-Time</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Records of days tardy were also examined using an ANCOVA (with number of days tardy during the pre-treatment period as the covariate) (see Tables 16 and 17). This analysis also found a significant interaction term with the attention-control and passage-of-time control groups increasing in tardiness while the members of the dilemma discussion decreased in tardiness (see Table 19).

Another analysis was done to determine if the effect found for tardiness was an artifact of the changes seen in absenteeism (i.e., the dilemma discussion group members were simply tardy less because they were absent so frequently there were fewer days they could have been tardy). The number of days tardy in the pretest and posttest periods were adjusted by subtracting the number of days absent in each period from the total number of days in the period. Using an ANCOVA (with this adjusted number of days during the pretreatment period as the covariate), the results found the same interaction effect to occur $F(2,37) = 5.01, p < .05$. Again, no main effect was found $F(2,37) = .32, p = n.s.$
Table 19
Pretest and Posttest Means for Days Tardy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma Discussion</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention-Control</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage-of-Time</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data concerning attendance records for the delayed subjects were then examined separately (see Tables 20 and 21). No significant findings were made concerning absenteeism. However, attendance records for the delayed subjects showed a significant interaction effect for tardiness (see Table 22). Again a decrease in tardiness was shown for the dilemma discussion group and increases for the attention-control and passage-of-time groups.
Table 20

Adjusted Posttest Attendance Means by Group
Condition-Delayed Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Records</th>
<th>Dilemma Discussion</th>
<th>Attention-Control</th>
<th>Passage-of-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism/Truancy</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tardiness</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The covariate in each analysis was the corresponding pretest score with posttest scores adjusted for these scores. n = 12 for each group.
Table 21  
Analysis of Covariance of Posttest Attendance by Group  
Condition-Delayed Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Records</th>
<th>F Values for Main Effect of Group Condition</th>
<th>F Values for Interaction Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism/Truancy</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tardiness</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>5.50*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. df = 2,30 for each analysis. Interaction effects are interactions of the main effects and covariates (corresponding pretest data).  
* $p < .05$. 
Table 22

Pretest and Posttest Means for Days Tardy-Delayed Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma Discussion</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention-Control</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage-of-Time</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n = 12 \) for each group.

Archival data concerning academic performance was then analyzed (see Tables 23 and 24). A main effect was found on math GPA with the dilemma discussion group showing poorer performance than the passage-of-time group. No other significant differences were found on the other measures of academic performance and evaluation of delayed subjects showed no effect of treatment group on any of the measures of academic performance.
Table 23

Academic Performance Adjusted Posttest Means by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Records</th>
<th>Dilemma Discussion n</th>
<th>Attention-Control n</th>
<th>Passage-of-Time n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall GPA</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Humanities GPA</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math GPA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonacademic GPA</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The covariate in each analysis was the corresponding pretest score with posttest scores adjusted by these scores.

<sup>a</sup> The means in this analysis differ at the .05 level for the dilemma discussion group and the passage-of-time group based on Tukey's Studentized Range Test.
Table 24

Analysis of Covariance of Posttest Academic Records by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Records</th>
<th>F Values for Main Effect of Group Condition</th>
<th>F Values for Interaction Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall GPA</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Humanities GPA</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math GPA</td>
<td>3.45*</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonacademic GPA</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. df = 2,31 for analysis of nonacademic GPA; df = 2,37 for all other analyses. Interaction effects are interactions of the main effects and covariates (corresponding pretest academic record).

* $p < .05$. 
Supplemental Analyses

Further analysis of the data was done to examine the effects of group attendance on changes in SRM scores from pretest to posttest and to examine the correlation between changes in SRM scores and changes in behavior.

An ANOVA using subjects in the attention-control group found no effect of number of sessions attended on change in SRM scores from pretest to posttest, $F(1, 13) = 2.34, p = \text{n.s.}$ However, for subjects in the dilemma discussion group, the number of sessions attended was found to significantly affect change in SRM scores from pretest to posttest: $F(1, 17) = 21.29, p < .001$. This change was not in the predicted direction: pretest-to-posttest SRMS changes increased in the negative direction as the number of sessions attended increased. This effect of the number of sessions attended on sociomoral judgment appeared to affect most significantly the family affiliation and affiliation norms. The correlation between the number of sessions attended and change in scores on the family affiliation norm was significant: $(r = -.56, p < .05)$, while the correlation with the affiliation norm was, $r = -.54, p < .05$. Correlations with other norm scores were not significant at the .05 level.
Finally, the relationship between changes in SRM scores and changes in behavior was examined disregarding treatment condition. In terms of correlations between changes in rated conduct and changes in SRMS, the increases in oppositional conduct (as rated by teachers) related significantly to SRMS gains, $r = .35, p < .05$. No other behavior indices were found to be significantly related to changes in SRM scores at the .05 level.
Moral Judgment Change

The results of this study failed to confirm the first hypothesis, that a group dilemma discussion intervention would facilitate increases in sociomoral reasoning. Although the entire sample showed a small, nonsignificant, upward change in sociomoral reasoning, the dilemma discussion group did not increase significantly more than did the attention-control group or the passage-of-time control group.

Examination of the eight norms of the SRM did reveal a significant improvement on the contract norm for the dilemma discussion group as compared to the two control groups. However, no greater improvement was seen in the dilemma discussion group than the two control groups on the other seven norms of the SRM.

Dilemma discussion group interventions have been clearly shown to facilitate upward change in sociomoral reasoning in several studies using delinquents and
predelinquents (Fleetwood & Parish, 1976; Rosenkoetter, et al., 1980; Gibbs, et al., 1984; Arbuthnot & Gordon, 1986; and Niles, 1986). The question arises, then, as to why the present study did not obtain significant reasoning gains. Three lines of explanation appear possible.

First, it seems likely that the size and composition of the dilemma discussion groups may have resulted in the group process being ineffective or possibly even detrimental. Previous studies have typically used group sizes of seven to 12 subjects and most have been composed of approximately fifty percent non-delayed subjects.

Because of the difficulty encountered in recruiting enough subjects and obtaining the necessary parental permission in each school, group size was limited to five subjects per group. Only one non-delayed subject was included in each group because of the limited number of non-delayed subjects available for participation in the groups in some schools, and because of the need to form comparable groups. These constraints resulted in groups of five subjects consisting of four students who were delayed in sociomoral reasoning and one who was not delayed in sociomoral reasoning.

Role-taking opportunities and exposure to more advanced levels of sociomoral reasoning are considered to
be the elements of the dilemma discussion group that facilitate improvements in sociomoral reasoning for delayed subjects. To insure delayed subjects are adequately exposed to more advanced levels of reasoning, optimally constructed dilemma discussion groups should include a more or less even distribution of participants at adjacent stages of sociomoral reasoning (Arbuthnot & Faust, 1981). Because only one member of each group in this study was not delayed in sociomoral reasoning, the opportunities for delayed subjects to be exposed to non-delayed sociomoral reasoning by peers was limited. The non-delayed subjects may have been more reluctant to express their views because they were the only member of the group holding those views, even though the group leader supported their more advanced levels of sociomoral reasoning. This would result in the delayed subjects receiving less exposure to more advanced levels of sociomoral reasoning and fewer role-taking opportunities, the necessary elements of the dilemma discussion group for improvements in sociomoral reasoning.

Group size has also been described as an important factor in success by Vorrath and Bredtro (1985), who specify nine to be the optimal number of members when working with groups of adolescents. These authors feel that in a smaller group "the members are too few to keep
the process alive, interesting, and challenging. Input is limited, fewer perceptions and viewpoints are possible, and the adult role tends to be more prominent" (p. 52). Hence, due to the small group size in this study, subjects may have been inhibited and exchange between subjects therefore limited.

A second variable which may have resulted in the lack of advancement in sociomoral reasoning is the therapist involved in conducting the group sessions. The therapist conducting these groups was thoroughly familiar with the process of conducting dilemma discussion groups and made an effort to confront delayed levels of sociomoral reasoning and to facilitate the groups in a manner allowing subjects to exchange ideas and assume roles. As suggested by Arbothnot and Gordon (1986), little is known concerning the effects of group leader characteristics (e.g., relationship skills) and behaviors (e.g., amount of directiveness, participation, structuring) on outcome. These variables may be very important in facilitating sociomoral reasoning advances. In small groups with most members reasoning at a delayed level, the leader's role is more prominent and it may be more important for the leader to maintain a high level of participation and to be highly directive to facilitate sociomoral reasoning advancement.
Perhaps these high levels were not attained in the present study.

Because members of the dilemma discussion group were found to make smaller gains or decreases in sociomoral reasoning as they attended increasing numbers of sessions, it appears the group process actually had a detrimental effect on sociomoral reasoning gains, especially on the Affiliation and Family Affiliation areas. Since attending the attention-control group sessions with the same therapist showed no such detrimental effect, it would seem unlikely the therapist variable could explain this finding. Also, since random assignment was used, and the groups did not vary significantly on pretest sociomoral reasoning, this finding does not seem to be attributable to the particular sample of adolescents in the dilemma discussion group condition. The most likely explanation for this result may be the size and composition of the groups. This may have resulted in group sessions where the predominant sociomoral reasoning expressed was delayed reasoning and little opportunity was presented for appropriate role-taking. These group sessions appear to have not only failed to enhance sociomoral reasoning, but to have resulted in a decrease in moral reasoning.
A third possible contributing factor in the failure of the dilemma discussion groups to produce gains in sociomoral reasoning is the organization of the group sessions. In an effort to evaluate the specific effects of the dilemma discussion process, the group sessions were designed to focus only on the dilemmas. Little time was devoted specifically to developing rapport and enlisting the cooperation of the subjects. This may have resulted in a lack of cooperation and involvement by the subjects which contributed to their failure to make advancements in sociomoral reasoning. In the study by Arbuthnot and Gordon (1986), the entire first two sessions of the dilemma discussion group were "spent in building rapport, with the leaders paying attention to demonstrating warmth, humor, directness, and clarity" (p. 210). This may be an important element in conducting successful dilemma discussion groups.

The dilemma discussion group members did appear to make gains in sociomoral reasoning as compared to the attention-control group on the contract norm (keeping promises, telling the truth) of the SRM. This was a small effect, but it does appear the dilemma discussion process did manage to have some impact in this one limited area.
Behavioral Indices

The second hypothesis of this study, that increases in sociomoral reasoning would be accompanied by behavioral improvements, was also not confirmed. Generally, no trend was seen toward behavioral improvements associated with either participation in the dilemma discussion group or subjects' changes in sociomoral reasoning.

Participants in both the dilemma discussion group and the attention-control group were seen by teachers as becoming more manipulative in their behaviors. This may be the result of the setting in which group sessions took place. Since subjects were excused from classes to attend group sessions, teachers may have viewed this as yet another form of manipulation on the part of these students. Therefore, missing classes may have led teachers to rate these students as exhibiting more manipulative behavior.

Subjects in both the dilemma discussion and attention-control groups showed increases in absenteeism. This suggests that involvement in either group may have had some disinhibitive effect. Because both groups were excused from classes to attend group meetings, a disinhibitive effect may have resulted, with participants becoming more willing to ignore routines and expectations of school personnel. Also, by becoming more willing to
think and behave independently as the result of group participation (where subjects were encouraged to express themselves freely), they may have chosen to avoid school, which most of these students probably find to be a generally aversive experience.

The finding that increases in sociomoral reasoning were statistically correlated with increases in oppositional behavior as reported by teachers may also suggest some students were affected by the group processes and may have begun to express themselves in a more open and less inhibited manner.

Participation in the dilemma discussion group was related to a decrease in tardiness while members in both the attention-control and passage-of-time control groups increased in tardiness. The dilemma discussion group members appeared to become somewhat more responsible in arriving on time for school. Therefore, the dilemma discussion group did appear to have a positive behavioral effect in this one limited area.

Academic performance did not appear to be significantly influenced by group participation or by changes in sociomoral reasoning. The difference found in math GPA between groups represented a significant improvement in math by the passage-of-time control group.
while the dilemma discussion and attention control groups were relatively unchanged.

Because no increases in sociomoral reasoning were produced by the interventions, it is not surprising that no significant behavioral improvements were found. However, the finding that changes in sociomoral reasoning by subjects were not correlated with behavior change (except a negative correlation with ratings on manipulative behavior) is more interesting. Both Arbothnot and Gordon (1986) and Niles (1986) failed to find significant behavior changes associated with gains in sociomoral reasoning using teachers' ratings of behaviors. Thus, teacher ratings of behavior have consistently been unable to demonstrate any changes in behavior associated with changes in sociomoral reasoning. Interestingly, the findings in this study showed teachers' ratings of students' absenteeism and tardiness did not reflect actual changes in absenteeism and tardiness as found from school records. Thus, teacher ratings of behavior do not appear to reflect behaviors accurately and sensitively enough to be a good indicator of any behavior change that may occur, at least with the instruments which have been used.

Archival behavior data also failed to show a correlation with changes in sociomoral reasoning. Other
research in this area has been inconsistent. Arbothnot and Gordon (1986) found significant positive relationships between an increase in sociomoral reasoning and a decrease in school behavior referrals, a decrease in tardiness, an increase in grade point averages for English/humanities, and a decrease in police or juvenile court contacts. However, Niles (1986) failed to find relationships with behavior changes even though he demonstrated significant increases in sociomoral reasoning. Thus, it appears that a direct relationship between increases in sociomoral reasoning and improved behavior has not been clearly established.

Summary Statements

The two hypotheses of this study were not supported by the findings. No significant gains in sociomoral reasoning were found in the subjects who participated in dilemma discussion groups. Small group size, minimal presence of non-delayed group members, inadequate compensatory input by the group leader, and inadequate rapport development may negate the effectiveness of this type of intervention. Research that has attended to these factors has at least found moral judgment gain, and in one study, conduct gain as well.
Therefore, to facilitate moral judgment gains in dilemma discussion groups it appears to be necessary to compose groups carefully with an optimal group size of nine members, with approximately one-half of the group delayed in sociomoral judgment and one-half non-delayed. Furthermore, group leaders should develop adequate rapport while being sufficiently directive and confrontive to elicit higher levels of sociomoral reasoning from group members. Failure to provide these elements in a dilemma discussion group intervention may not only fail to produce gains in sociomoral reasoning but may actually be detrimental in this respect.

Also changes in behaviors were not found to be associated with changes in sociomoral reasoning. Other research in this area has been inconsistent and no clear link between increases in sociomoral reasoning and improvements in conduct has been established.

As noted by Niles (1986), "The importance of analyzing the link between moral reasoning development and behavior changes rests first in the fact that group counseling innovation must include a behavioral outgrowth to justify its utility" (p. 46). To date, the dilemma discussion intervention strategy has not been demonstrated to reliably
impact upon conduct problems and therefore has not proven its utility.

Kohlberg (1969) maintained that moral judgment was a necessary but not sufficient condition for mature moral action and the research has shown no linear relationship between moral judgment and action. Gibbs (1988) has also concluded that moral judgment development is insufficient for conduct gains. He identified three reasons why moral knowledge may not be utilized in moral conduct. First, moral knowledge may not be sufficiently proximal to impact upon specific situational conduct. The second consideration is the importance of the volitional, attitudinal, or conative factor. Third, the influence of the peer group is important because, otherwise, accomplishments on the individual level may be undermined by adverse peer influence.

In response to these conclusions, Gibbs (1988) has proposed a multicomponent intervention program. In addition to sociomoral facilitation, this approach: utilizes components to enhance social skills and anger control; has a cooperative group approach which places individual responsibility on the youth to make behavioral change; and uses the influential power of the peer group upon attitudes and motivation.
As noted by Kazdin (1987), conduct problems are typically identified in late childhood or early adolescence when the disorder may be well entrenched. At this point, "any intervention may need to be particularly strong to exert impact and to overcome other deleterious influences (e.g., extended exposure to poor child rearing, peer pressures). An important direction to help identify effective treatments may be to increase the strength or intensity of existing treatments" (p. 123).

Thus, an intensive multicomponent treatment approach including an effective dilemma discussion intervention component, may be found to be the most beneficial approach to treating adolescent behavior disorders.
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APPENDIX A

REQUEST FOR REFERRALS
Fairfield Family Counseling Center is currently offering a program in your school. This program is being called the Values Clarification Program and is designed to be a diversionary program for youths who are behavior problems in the school and who are considered to be at high risk for involvement in delinquent behaviors both in school and in our community. We feel that working with these youths in the school can have a significant impact on their problem behaviors. This program is being offered at no cost and has the full approval of your school administration. If you have any questions about the program, I will be happy to provide you with more information.

I would like to ask you to nominate students for this program. Please list any 14- to 16-year-old boys who you feel are behavior problems and/or are at risk for involvement in delinquent behaviors. Please return this sheet and I will contact the students you have identified.

Thank you for your assistance in this project.

Sincerely,

Cecil Miller, M.A.
Coordinator-Values Clarification Program

Please list any 14-16 year old boys you consider to have behavior problems and/or are at risk for involvement in delinquent behaviors.

Return to

________________________________________  _______________________________________
________________________________________  _______________________________________
________________________________________  _______________________________________
________________________________________  _______________________________________
APPENDIX B

SOCIOMORAL REFLECTION MEASURE:

SOCIAL REFLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE: FORM A
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:
79-87
APPENDIX C

BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE AND
LETTERS TO TEACHERS
Below are several statements describing behaviors. For each item, circle the number that best describes this student's behavior in the recent past. If the statement describes the student: Very Much; circle 4  
Pretty Much; circle 3  
Some; circle 2  
A Little; circle 1  
Not at All; circle 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Pretty Much</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assaultiveness</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Aggressiveness</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Rules/Regulations</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Functioning</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pupil's Name: ___________________________ Date: ____________
Teacher's Name: ________________________
Dear __________________________:

I am currently involved in working with some of the students in your school. This project is called the Values Clarification Program and involves several students, including the one(s) named on the attached sheet(s). This project is a group discussion procedure designed to assist young people who may be experiencing some behavioral problems. This project will also serve as my doctoral dissertation.

As part of this project, I will be evaluating these students' behaviors before and after the project. Students named on the attached sheet(s) have identified you as one of the teachers most familiar with them in your school. I would like to ask you to complete the attached behavioral rating scale(s) and return to me in the attached envelope. Written permission has been obtained from each student's parent and your school administration has approved your participation in this manner. The information you provide will be confidential and will be most helpful to me in evaluating the effectiveness of this project.

If you have any questions concerning this project, please feel free to contact me at the Fairfield Family Counseling Center (687-0606).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Cecil Miller, M.A.
Coordinator-Values Clarification Project
Dear ________________________:

As you may recall, I asked you to complete a behavioral rating scale on the youth(s) named on the attached sheet(s) earlier in the school year. Since that time, I have been involved in working with these students in your school. This project is called the Values Clarification Program and has involved these students in group discussions designed to assist young people who may be experiencing some behavioral problems. This project will also serve as my doctoral dissertation at Ohio State University.

Students named on the attached sheet(s) have identified you as one of the teachers most familiar with them in your school. Written permission has been obtained from each student's parent and your school administration has approved your participation in completing these rating scales. The information you provide will be confidential and will be most helpful to me in evaluating the effectiveness of this project.

As part of this project, I am evaluating these students' behaviors before and after the group discussions. It is now time to assess their behaviors once again and I would like to ask your assistance in this by completing the attached behavioral rating scale(s) and returning them to me in the enclosed envelope.

If you have any questions concerning this project, please feel free to contact me at the Fairfield Family Counseling Center (687-0606).

Thank you for your assistance in this project.

Sincerely,

Cecil Miller, M.A.
Coordinator-Values Clarification Project
APPENDIX D
DILEMMA DECISIONS SURVEY AND RESPONSE RECORDING FORM
"Your father called to say he had to work late," Reggie's mother told him one night as they sat eating supper. But Reggie knew better. He had passed his father's car on the way home from school. It was parked outside the Midtown Bar and Grill. Reggie's mother and father had argued many times about his father's stopping off at the bar on his way home from work. After their last argument, his father had promised he would never do it again. "Do you think I should believe your father?" Reggie's mother asks him. Reggie says, "Sure, you can trust him," even though he knows his father wasn't keeping his promise.

1. Should Reggie have covered for his father?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if Reggie's father had been asked by his boss to stop at the bar and drink with him? Then should Reggie lie to his mother?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. Was it right for Reggie's mother to put him on the spot by asking him a question about his father?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if Reggie had run into his father on the way home and his father had asked him not to tell? Then should Reggie lie to his mother?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if Reggie knew that his mother was sneaking off to the bar and drinking during the day while his father was working? Then should Reggie lie to his mother?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. Suppose Reggie's mother had said she would leave home if she ever catches his father stopping at the bar again. Then should Reggie lie to his mother?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. What if Reggie's father works hard all day and spends all the money he earns on his family except for the $10 a week he spends in the bar? Then should Reggie lie to his mother?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

8. What if Reggie's father is an alcoholic? Then should Reggie lie to his mother?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

9. In general, how important is it to tell the truth?
   very important / important / not important / (circle one)
LARRY'S DILEMMA

Larry is walking along a side street with his friend Jim. Jim stops in front of a beautiful new sports car. Jim looks inside and then says excitedly, "look, the keys are still in this baby! Let's see what she can do. Come on, let's go!" Larry replies: "That's not for me, but you can go ahead if you want to."

1. Should Larry instead try to persuade Jim not to take the car?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if Larry knows that Jim has a wife and a child who will suffer if Jim is caught, loses his job, and goes to jail? Then should Larry try to persuade Jim not to take the car?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. The owner of the car left the keys in the car. Does that make it all right to take the car?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if Jim is high? Then should Larry persuade Jim not to take the car?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if the car belongs to a friend Larry knows at work, who saved a long time for the car and doesn't even have insurance on it yet? Then should Larry try to persuade Jim not to take the car?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if the car belongs to Larry's supervisor at work who treats all the employees badly and nobody likes him. Then should Larry try to persuade Jim not to take the car?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. In general, how important is it for people not to take things that belong to others?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)
STEVE'S DILEMMA

Steve works as a clerk in a convenience store. The store isn't too busy and George, a friend of Steve's at school, comes over to his cash register and says, 'Hey, I've got a dollar with me. Ring up these cigarettes and a six-pack for a dollar, won't you? The manager's in the back of the store, he'll never know'. George is a pretty good friend of Steve's, and George has done some favors for Steve in the past. But, Steve feels trusted by the manager and doesn't want to lose his job. He hesitates for a moment, then tells George, "no", that he'll just ring up the cigarettes that he has enough money to pay for.

1. Should Steve have said no to George?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if Steve doesn't like the manager and he doesn't trust Steve very much anyway? Then should he have said no to George?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. What if Steve feels that other employees at the store do this for their friends? Then should Steve still say no to George?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if Steve knew that George didn't have a job and his family didn't have much money? Then should Steve have said no to George?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if George were Steve's brother? Then should Steve say no to George?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if Steve knew that George was poor and wanted to take a loaf of bread for his family instead of a six-pack? Then should Steve have said no to George?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. How important is it to be honest at a store where you work?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)

8. What if George walked out with the six-pack even though Steve said no? Should Steve tell the manager?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)
GEORGE'S DILEMMA

One day Jake tells his younger brother, George, a secret: Jake is selling dope. George and Jake both know that the kind of drug Jake is selling causes lung and brain damage, and can even kill people. George asks his brother, Jake, to stop selling. But the family is poor, and Jake says he is only doing it to help out with the family's money problems. So George promises to keep quiet by not telling on his brother.

1. Did George do the right thing in promising to keep quiet?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if George finds out that Jake is selling the drug to the ten-year-olds outside a school, who don't know that they're getting into? Then should George promise to keep quiet?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. Is it ever right to break a promise?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if George finds out that Jake isn't using any of the money at all to "help out" the family, but instead is spending it on booze and other things for himself? Then should George promise to keep quiet?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if Jake is crippled and he only sells the drugs so that other kids will like him? Then should George promise to keep quiet?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if Jake is being forced by a crime organization to sell the drug, and they will beat him up if he stops? Then should George promise to keep quiet?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. What if Jake made George promise to keep quiet before he told George he was selling drugs? Then would it be the right thing for George to keep quiet?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

8. In general, how important is it to keep a promise?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)

9. Selling drugs is against the law. How important is it, in general, for people to obey the law?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)
Howard is in school taking a math test. All at once, the teacher says, "I'm going to leave the room for a few minutes. You are on your honor not to cheat." After the teacher has gone, Ed, Howard's best friend, whispers to him, "Let me see your answers, Howard." Howard doesn't want to help Ed cheat. But he knows that Ed is flunking math and will probably have to repeat the year unless he does well on this test. So Howard decides to let Ed copy his answers.

1. Should Howard have let Ed copy his answers?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if Howard knows that the reason Ed is flunking is because he doesn't study? Then should Howard let Ed cheat?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. What if Ed once didn't help Howard when Howard needed help? Then should Howard let Ed cheat?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if the teacher tells them that he will flunk anyone caught cheating and anyone caught helping someone cheat? Then should Howard let Ed cheat?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if Ed went to a party the night before, but Howard stayed home to study for the test? Then should Howard let Ed cheat?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if Ed will be kept from graduating if he doesn't pass the math course? Then should Howard let Ed cheat?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. What if Howard hardly knows Ed? Then should Howard let Ed cheat?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

8. In general, how important is it not to cheat?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)
Sam and his best friend, Dave, are shopping in a record store. Dave picks up a record he really likes and slips it into his backpack. Dave then walks out of the store. Moments later, the security officer and the store owner come up to Sam. The store owner says to the officer, "That's one of the boys who were stealing records!" The security officer checks Sam's backpack, but doesn't find the record. "Okay, you're off the hook, but what's the name of the guy who was with you?" the officer asks Sam. "I'm almost broke because of shoplifting," the owner says. "I can't let him get away with it." But Sam keeps quiet and refuses to tell the security officer Dave's name.

1. Was Sam right not to give Dave's name?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. Is it ever right to tell on someone?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. What if the day before Dave had told on Sam for cheating on a test in school? Then should Sam keep quiet?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if Sam and Dave didn't know each other very well? Then should Sam keep quiet?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if the store owner is a nice guy, who sometimes lets kids buy a record even if they don't have quite enough money for it? Then should Sam keep quiet?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if Sam had dared Dave to steal something? Then should Sam keep quiet?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. What if the store owner's own son is always shoplifting from other stores? Then should Sam keep quiet?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

8. How important is it not to shoplift?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)

9. How important is it for storeowners to prosecute shoplifters?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)
JOE'S DILEMMA

Joe is a member of a gang of teenagers who live near an old school. The school is run-down and dirty. Many of the kids who go to the school say bad things about it. One night, the gang decides to have a rock-throwing contest to see who can break out the most windows in the school. Since the school is next to the railroad tracks, there is little chance that the boys will get caught.

The rest of the gang doesn't know it, but Joe's father is the principal of the old school. Joe's father will be the one who will get into trouble for not protecting the school better. But Joe and his father don't get along too well. Joe feels that his father is too bossy. So Joe joins in the contest and starts throwing rocks at the windows.

1. Should Joe have done that?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What about the fact that the gang will think Joe's chicken if he doesn't join them in breaking windows. Then should Joe join in the rock-throwing?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. What if the school is new and clean, and the students enjoy being there? Then should Joe join in the rock-throwing?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if Joe's father will lose his job if the windows are broken? Then should Joe join in the rock-throwing?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if Joe and his father get along great? Then should Joe join in the rock-throwing?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if Joe's father often gets angry at Joe, and punishes him for very little reason? Then should Joe join in the rock-throwing?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. What if Joe knows a secret: the school is going to be closed soon to build a new one? Then should Joe join in the rock-throwing?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

8. In general, how important is it not to vandalize buildings or property?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)
Just after Leon arrived at an institution for boys, he tried to escape. As a result, he was given extra time and the staff hassled him a lot. It had taken Leon nearly four months to earn their trust again. Now felt it was stupid to try to go AWOL. However, one of the new boys, Bob, told him he was planning to escape that night. He asked Leon to come with him. "I've got it all figured out," Bob said. "I'm going to hit the youth leader on the head with a lead pipe and take his keys." Leon tried to talk Bob out of it, but Bob wouldn't listen.

The more Leon thought about it, the more upset he got. He liked Bob and he didn't want him to get in any trouble. He also didn't like the idea of the youth leader getting hurt or even killed if Bob hit him with the lead pipe. Although he was afraid the other boys would call him a nark, Leon decided to tell the staff about Bob's plan. The youth leader caught Bob with the pipe and put him in lock-up.

1. Did Leon do the right thing by telling?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if the youth leader was mean and everyone hated him? Then should Leon have told on Bob?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. What if Bob was not guilty of the crime for which he was sent to the institution? Then should Leon have told on Bob?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if Bob is Leon's brother? Does that make a difference in what Leon should do?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. Is it ever right to nark on somebody?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. Is it any of Leon's business what Bob does?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. Which is more important: (circle one)
   A. not telling on your friend
   B. not letting other people get hurt
   C. telling what you know so you don't get in trouble
JOHN'S DILEMMA

One night two hit men come to the restaurant where John works, looking for Willie. They make everybody in the restaurant go into the back room. They have guns and they tell them they are going to kill Willie when he comes in. But for some reason Willie doesn't come in. The hit men finally leave, saying they'll find Willie and kill him.

John knows where Willie lives, so he goes to his house to warn him that he is in danger. Willie is a nice guy and he doesn't want him to get hurt. But Willie tells John that he's not a coward and he isn't going to run. "If they want to kill me," Willie says, "then let them go ahead." John decides that he has done what he could so he leaves.

1. Should John have left Willie?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if John and Willie had been good friends for many years? Then should John have left?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. Is it important to live even when you don't want to?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. Should John tell the police about the hit men?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if Willie has a wife and several kids to look after? Then should John warn Willie?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if Willie is the town bully and everybody hates him? Then should John warn him about the two hoodlums that are going to kill him?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. What if Willie has cancer and will die soon? Then should John warn Willie?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)
TONY'S DILEMMA

Anthony is supposed to be baby-sitting his little sister, Michelle. When he is not looking, Michelle climbs a tree and falls out. The situation looks serious: Michelle is unconscious and she is bleeding heavily. Anthony is scared. He thinks she might be dying, and there is no telephone nearby to call for help. He picks her up in his arms and carries her to the road.

There is nobody else around except for a man parking his car. Anthony runs over to him carrying Michelle in his arms. He asks the man to drive them to the hospital. The man says, "I'd like to help, but I'll be late for work." Anthony begs the man to let him borrow the car, but the man refuses. "How do I know I can trust you?" the man asks. Anthony puts Michelle down, grabs the man by the coat, and beats him up. He then takes the man's car and drives off to the hospital with Michelle.

1. Should Tony have beaten the man up to take Michelle to the hospital?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if the man dies because Tony beat him up? Then should Tony have beaten the man up to take Michelle to the hospital?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. What if the man gets over the beating, then sees Tony a few days later? Should the man beat Tony up to get even?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if Michelle is only bleeding a little and isn't going to die? Then did Tony do the right thing?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if the man isn't hurt at all by the beating? Then did Tony do the right thing?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if Tony isn't babysitting his sister, but only a neighborhood girl? Then should Tony beat the man up and take the car?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. Does it make a difference if the man is lying about being late for work and Tony knows it? Then should he beat the man up and take the car?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

8. Is it ever right to take someone's car if a life isn't at stake?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)
STAN'S DILEMMA

One day Stan takes his girlfriend, Maggie, to the race track. Stan gives Maggie $10 to bet on the horses. In one of the races, Maggie wins $50. Stan's luck isn't very good—he doesn't win anything. As Maggie is collecting her winnings, Stan says to her, "Aren't you going to give me half?" "What for?" Maggie asks. "Well," replies Stan, "I did give you the money to bet. Since you won, I figure you owe me something." Maggie thinks about it for a few seconds before putting the $50 in her purse. "You gave me the money," Maggie says, "so anything I win is mine." This makes Stan very angry. He jumps in his car and drives off, leaving Maggie to find her own way home.

1. Should Stan have left Maggie?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. Was Stan right to ask Maggie for half of the money she won?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. What if Maggie had only borrowed the money and refused to return it to Stan? Than should Stan have left Maggie?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. If Maggie had found the money at the race track, should she have given half to Stan?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if Maggie is Stan's wife? Then should Stan drive off without her?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if Maggie paid Stan back the $10 he had given her? Would that be the right thing to do?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. Should Maggie have given Stan much of the money she won, say, $30?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)
Dave's friend Matt does some dealing on the street. Once in a while, Matt even gives Dave some pills or something for free. Now Matt says to Dave, "Listen, man, I've got to deliver some stuff on the south side, but I can't do it myself. How 'bout it—will you take this stuff down there for me in your car? I'll give you some new stuff to try plus $25 beside for just a half-hour's drive. Will you help me out?" Dave feels he owes Matt a favor so he agrees to make the run.

1. Should Dave agree to deliver the pills for Matt?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if Dave knows that Matt will be in big trouble if the pills aren't delivered? Should he deliver the pills?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. What if Dave knows that the pills Matt wants him to deliver are laced? Should he agree to deliver them?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if Dave knows that his sister, who lives on the south side, might take some of the laced pills? Then should he agree to deliver them?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. Should Dave be taking the free pills from Matt?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. How important is it to stay away from drugs?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)
BEN'S DILEMMA

Ben met Patty at school and asked her out on a date. They went out together and had a really good time. Ben liked Patty and he thinks she likes him a lot. Then, Patty's father found out that Ben is on probation and Patty tells Ben her father would not allow her to go out with him anymore because her father doesn't want her hanging around with anyone who has been in trouble with the law.

Ben thinks that's unfair of her father, and suggests that Patty meet him downtown on Friday night. Ben tells Patty; "You could tell your father that you're going to study with your girlfriend."

1. Should Ben have asked Patty to do that?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if Ben knew that Patty sometimes told her father she was studying with her girlfriend and went other places? Should he ask Patty to meet him on Friday?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. What if Ben was innocent, he hadn't done anything wrong, but was put on probation because he was blamed for something someone else did? Should Patty meet him downtown on Friday?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if Ben's father knew Patty's father and he told him her father often lied to his parents when he was young? Then should Ben ask Patty to meet him on Friday?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if Ben and Patty loved each other? Then should Ben ask Patty to meet him on Friday?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. How important is it to tell the truth to other people?
   very important / important / not important (circle one)

7. Is it ever right to lie?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

8. What if Patty meets Ben on Friday night and her father finds out? Should Patty tell her father it was Ben's idea?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)
MARK'S DILEMMA

Mark has been going steady with a girl named Mary for about three months. It used to be a lot of fun to be with her, but lately it's been sort of a drag. There are some other girls Mark would like to go out with now. But Mark doesn't want to hurt Mary's feelings, so he makes up an excuse, telling Mary that his parole officer insists he stop dating for a while.

1. Should Mark break up with Mary by making up an excuse?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. Would it be better instead for Mark to simply stop seeing Mary? Would that be the right thing to do?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. Would it be better for Mark to have a friend tell Mary the truth, that Mark wants to date other girls? Would that be the right thing to do?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if Mary sees Mark later with another girl? Should Mary try to get even?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. Should Mark keep seeing Mary occasionally, date other girls and not tell Mary? Would that be the right thing to do?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if Mark and Mary were engaged to be married and he wants to break up with her? Should Mark break up with her by making up an excuse?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. What if Mark and Mary had been living common-law for several years and have two small children? Then should Mark still break up with Mary?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

8. Is it okay to lie to avoid hurting someone's feelings?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)
JERRY'S DILEMMA

Jerry was just moved to a new school and was feeling pretty lonely until one day a guy named Bob came up and introduced himself. "Hi, Jerry. My name is Bob. I heard one of the teachers say you were new here. If you're not doing anything after school today, how about coming over to shoot some baskets?" Pretty soon Jerry and Bob were good friends.

One day when Jerry was shooting baskets by himself, the basketball coach saw him and invited him to try out for the team. Jerry made the team, and every day after school would practice with the rest of the team. After practice, they would always go out together to get something to eat and sit around and talk about stuff, and on weekends they would sometimes take trips together. As Jerry spent more time with the team, he saw less and less of Bob, his old friend.

One day, Jerry gets a call from Bob. "Say, I was wondering," says Bob. "If you're not too busy on Thursday, my family is having a little birthday party for me. Maybe you could come over for dinner that night." Jerry tells Bob he'll come to the party. But during practice on Thursday, everyone tells Jerry about the great place they're all going to go to after practice. Jerry decides to go with the team.

1. Should Jerry have done that?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if Jerry calls Bob from school and says he's sorry, but something has come up and he can't come over after all? Then would it be right for Jerry to go with the team?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. What about the fact that Jerry's team members may be upset if Jerry doesn't come and start to think Jerry's not such a good friend? Then should Jerry go with the team?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. What if Jerry and Bob are not good friends, but instead hardly know each other? Then should Jerry go with the team?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. Is it always important to keep a promise?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if Jerry thinks that, after all, Bob came along and helped Jerry when Jerry was lonely. Then should Jerry go with the team?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. What if Bob has no brother or sister and will have no friends at the party unless Jerry comes? Then should Jerry go with the team?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)
BILL'S DILEMMA

NAME: ________________________________

One of Bill's friends, Harry, really likes a girl named Debbie. Harry and Debbie have dated, but they're not really involved. Bill thinks Debbie is pretty nice, too. Bill and Debbie are at the same party Saturday night. Harry isn't there and Bill and Debbie have a real good time together. So Bill asks Debbie out.

1. Should Bill date Debbie?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

2. What if Bill and Harry are best friends? Then should Bill date Debbie?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

3. What if Harry tries to stop Debbie from seeing Bill? Then should Debbie stop seeing him?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

4. Is it right to start dating your friend's girlfriend?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

5. What if Harry and Debbie are almost engaged? Then should Bill date Debbie?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

6. What if Harry and Debbie are only acquaintances? Then should Bill date Debbie?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

7. What if Debbie has told Bill she doesn't like Harry very much, and just dates him to avoid hurting his feelings? Then should Bill date Debbie?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)

8. Harry feels very hurt, and decides to get even with Bill and Debbie. Should he get even?
   yes / no / can't decide (circle one)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Consensus Decision</th>
<th>Best Reason(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

ATTENTION-CONTROL GROUP OUTLINE
Attention-Control Group Outline

Session

1. Introduction of the Self-defeating Behavior concept. Definition: Self-defeating behaviors are things we do in response to stressful situations and result in problems in the long run.

2. Group discussion directed at identifying some self-defeating behaviors group members sometimes do.

3. Group discussion concerning how the identified behaviors are self-defeating (i.e., what problems they cause in the long run).

4. Group discussion concerning the stressful situations (e.g., peer pressure) that contribute to self-defeating behaviors.

5. Group discussion concerning how to avoid the stressful situations that often lead to self-defeating behaviors (e.g., dealing with peer pressure).

6. Continued discussion concerning how to avoid situations that frequently lead to self-defeating behaviors.

7. Group discussion concerning "fears" (e.g., fear of rejection associated with peer pressure).

8. Group discussion concerning how to develop specific behaviors to replace self-defeating behaviors (e.g., spend time with friends who do not encourage self-defeating behaviors).

9. Continued discussion on how to develop alternative behaviors.
10. Group discussion concerning how responsibility for self-defeating behavior is denied (e.g., blaming friends for behaviors).

11. Group discussion concerning how to take responsibility for behaviors and how this gives one the ability to change the behavior.

12. Group discussion concerning the positive consequences one can logically expect for not doing specific self-defeating behaviors.
APPENDIX F

OUTLINE OF PROGRAM INTRODUCTION TO SUBJECTS
VALUES CLARIFICATION PROGRAM
Script for Initial Contact with Youths Being Solicited for Participation

Introduction:

Hello. My name is Cecil Miller and I'm from Ohio State University where I am working on my Ph.D. degree. I also work for the Fairfield Family Counseling Center which is supporting this project. I am doing this research project as part of my Ph.D. program and I would like you to help me by participating in the groups that I will be describing later.

You have all been recommended to me by the people here at the school. You have been chosen because you fit the requirements of my project and because we feel that these groups will be beneficial to you.

Your participation in this project is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time. However, I think that you will find these groups interesting and hopefully, enjoyable.

Purpose:

In this study, I will be looking at how you make decisions and give you an opportunity to learn more about yourself and how you make decisions. I will also be looking at your behaviors by asking teachers and by looking at your school records. I will also look at Juvenile Court contacts. Everything you tell me or write down will be kept confidential, nobody except my advisor, perhaps another person collecting the data and myself will see the information you provide. I will not be giving any information about you to the school.

Procedure:

First, I will be asking each of you to sign a form giving consent to participate in this project. This is a requirement of O.S.U. I will then ask you to give me your parent(s) name so that I can send them a letter asking their permission. Next, I will be asking you to give me the names of teachers who know you so that I can ask them about your behaviors.

As soon as I get consent from your parents, I will be coming back to the school and getting you to answer some questions on a questionnaire. This is to examine how you make decisions. I will then divide you into groups. There will be three types of groups and each group will have 7 people in it. The first type of group will be a dilemma discussion group. In this group we will discuss a hypothetical situation that concerns a person making a decision involving his values. The second condition will consist of group sessions in which behaviors will be discussed in terms of how some behaviors can be self-defeating. Each of these groups will meet once a week for 12 consecutive weeks for one class period. The third group will be a control group with you only completing the questionnaires and not meeting in groups.

Questions:

Does anybody have any questions.

Conclusion:

Thank you for your time and for helping me on this project. I think you
will like these groups and we can have a good time talking.

Now please sign the forms I gave to you, then complete the one with
the information about your parents and teachers.

I will be contacting your parents in the very near future. Please
ask them to sign the form and return it to me as soon as possible.
APPENDIX G

SUBJECT CONSENT FORM
AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH
(VALUES CLARIFICATION PROGRAM)

I consent to participate in the Values Clarification Program. Cecil Miller has explained the purpose of this study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding this program and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am free to withdraw from this program and discontinue participation without any negative effects. Any information obtained from me will remain confidential.

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.

Signed: ________________________________ (Your Signature)

Date: _________________________________

Signed: ________________________________ (Principal Investigator)
APPENDIX H
SUBJECT INFORMATION FORM
VALUES CLARIFICATION PROGRAM

Please provide the following information:

Name: ______________________________________________________________ Date: ________________

Age: __________________________________ Date of Birth: ________________
(month) (day) (year)

Sex: (circle one) : Male/Female

Parents' name(s): ______________________________________________________

Address: ____________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________

Telephone number: ____________________________________________________________________

Please list three teachers below. Please identify those teachers at this school who know you best and with whom you have at least one class:

(1) ______________________________________________________________

(2) ______________________________________________________________

(3) ______________________________________________________________
APPENDIX I

PARENTAL CONSENT FORM AND LETTER
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH
VALUES CLARIFICATION PROGRAM)

I consent to my child's participation in the Values Clarification Program. Cecil Miller has explained in writing the purpose of this study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my child's participation. The possible benefits of the study have also been described.

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 my child is free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to my child. The information obtained from my child will remain confidential.

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.

Signed: __________________________
(Signature of Parent(s))

Date: __________________________

Child's Name: __________________________

Child's School: __________________________

Signed: __________________________
(Principle Investigator)
Dear Parent:

Attached is an authorization form we would like you to sign and return so your son can participate in the Values Clarification Program at his school. Although the program is associated with the Fairfield Family Counseling Center, this does not mean your child will be considered a client of the Center and he will not have a file at the Center. All information about your child will be strictly confidential. Information obtained from your son will not be relayed to school personnel and only those directly involved in this study will have access to any information concerning your son.

The Values Clarification Program is provided at no cost to the schools by the Fairfield Family Counseling Center. This project is part of my doctoral dissertation project at Ohio State University (Behavior Effects of Developmental Treatment for Male Antisocial Adolescents) and is being directed by John C. Gibbs, Ph.D. The project will involve your son in one of three groups. The first group condition will be a dilemma discussion group. In these groups the members (7) will discuss a hypothetical situation that concerns a person making a decision involving his values. The second condition will consist of group sessions in which (7) students' behaviors will be discussed using a "self-defeating" behavior model (a model that examines how inappropriate behaviors cause problems for oneself in the long run). Both of these conditions will involve 12 weekly group meetings, each lasting one class period. Groups will be held in the school. We feel these groups can be beneficial to all young people by allowing them an opportunity to learn more about themselves. The program will also require that students complete a questionnaire before and after the group sessions to measure any changes in the way the students reason in making decisions. The third group condition will be a control condition with students completing the questionnaire only.

This project will also involve examining students' behaviors by looking at rates of absenteeism/truancy, school grades as contained in school records and teachers' ratings of their behavior. Referrals to juvenile court will be examined by contacting that court. Information obtained from the court will be held strictly confidential and will not be relayed to the school.

Your son's participation in this program is completely voluntary and he may withdraw at any time without negative effects. We feel this program can be very beneficial to young people by helping them to learn more about themselves and improving their behavior. We would very much appreciate your allowing your son to participate in this learning experience by signing and returning the consent form in the envelope provided. If you have any questions concerning this program, please feel free to contact me (687-0606).

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Cecil Miller, M.A., Coordinator
Values Clarification Project