

MORAL JUDGMENT:
INTENTION AND CONSEQUENCE RECONSIDERED

By
CARLA B. GOBLE
Bachelor of Science in Education
Central State College
Edmond, Oklahoma
1967

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1987



MORAL JUDGMENT:
INTENTION AND CONSEQUENCE RECONSIDERED

Thesis Approved:

John C. Miller

Thesis Advisor

Mona Lane

Juanita Meranda

Norman N. Duchon

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to my great-grandmother Mattie Ferris, my grandmother Alma Chaudoin, and my mother Geneva Epperson for having been my role models for endurance, courage, independence, and excellence. I wish they were here to share this accomplishment with me because it is also theirs.

Thanks go to my friends, Anne, Phil, Ruby, and Wanda, for their encouragement and support in times of crisis and for their being there to share my joy in times of success.

To my committee members, Dr. John C. McCullers, Dr. James D. Moran III, and Mona Lane, go special thanks for their guidance and assistance with this project. I am grateful for their constructive comments, insights, and professional skills which they so willingly shared.

Finally, to my family, Danney, Codie, Geoffrey, and Hannah, I extend my love and thanks. I am so glad that they have been part of not only this project but of my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
MANUSCRIPT FOR PUBLICATION	3
Cover Page	3
Abstract	4
Introduction	5
Method	7
Results	11
Discussion.	13
References.	16
Footnote.	19
APPENDIX A: LITERATURE REVIEW	20
References.	27
APPENDIX B: RESEARCH INSTRUMENT	30
APPENDIX C: RAW DATA.	41
APPENDIX D: VARIABLE CODES.	45
APPENDIX E: SELECTED STATISTICAL ANALYSES	47
APPENDIX F: SELECTED TABLES	51

INTRODUCTION

This project focused on the intention and consequence aspects of moral judgment decision making. The rationale for this study was based in Piaget's (1932/1965) theory of moral judgment and Kohlberg's (1969) stage theory of moral development.

The purpose of this study was to reexamine Piaget's conception of the role of intention and consequence as basis for moral judgments and assess the implication of this study for Kohlberg's concept of homogeneity of moral reasoning stages. Specifically, the present study examined the effects of manipulating severity of consequences in moral dilemmas.

This thesis deviates from the format called for in the Thesis Writing Manual (1982). The body of this thesis consists of a manuscript prepared for submission to a technical journal under the guidelines of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (1983). Materials which are usually presented in the body of the thesis are presented in appendixes. The appendixes contain a review of the literature and supplemental materials, raw data, and statistical analyses.

References

- American Psychological Association (1983). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and Sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research (pp. 347-380). Skokie, IL: Rand McNally.
- Oklahoma State University. (1982). Thesis writing manual: A guide for graduate students. Stillwater, Oklahoma.
- Piaget, J. (1932/1965). The moral judgment of the child. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Moral Judgment:
Intention and Consequence Reconsidered
Carla B. Goble
Oklahoma State University

This article is based on the Master's thesis research of the author conducted under the direction of John C. McCullers. The author wishes to thank the Psychology Department at Oklahoma State University for help in obtaining subjects and all of the students who participated in this study. Thanks is also extended to Anne K. Bomba and Phil Roberson for their help in collecting data.

Abstract

This study investigated the effects of severity of consequence in moral dilemmas on the moral judgments of 61 adults. All subjects received a common baseline story and one of two versions of four remaining stories. The stories differed in terms of intent and consequence. The story with the most positive intention and the most severe consequences produced the clearest evidence of consequence influenced judgments. The actor in this story was judged to be less intelligent and more careless ($p < .01$) when the outcome was more severe. This suggests that adults may respond on the basis of consequence just as children do. These findings raise questions concerning Kohlberg's conception of homogeneity of moral reasoning stages and are more consistent with Piaget's original view.

Moral Judgment:

Intention and Consequence Reconsidered

Piaget (1932/1965) proposed a theory of moral judgment based on cognitive development and social experience, consisting of two stages of development. According to Piaget, the young child makes moral judgments based on consequence with a transition to intention-based judgments occurring about seven years of age.

Kohlberg's (1969) theory, like Piaget's, emphasizes cognitive structures as underlying and organizing moral reasoning. Kohlberg's (1969) system consists of six stages of development. These six stages or organized systems of thought form an invariant sequence with movement always forward, never backward, and upward to the next stage. Stages are never skipped and moral judgments are consistent within stages.

Challenges to Kohlberg's (1969) assumptions that each stage of moral reasoning is homogeneous have been made by research studies (O'Malley, 1986; Walster; 1966) that have shown subjects can change the level of moral reasoning depending on the environmental circumstances, at times making moral judgments at one stage and at other times a different stage. Similar challenges to Piaget's (1932/1965) theory exist. For example, several researchers have shown that young

children who might be expected to make judgments on the basis of consequence, can under certain circumstances make them on the basis of intention (Berg-Cross, 1975; Moran & McCullers, 1984). Further, it has been demonstrated (Moran & O'Brien, 1983a; Moran & O'Brien, 1983b; Shultz, Wright, & Schleifer, 1986) that the young child is capable of using the actor's intent as the basis of forming moral judgments across a wide range of contexts.

Moran and McCullers (1984) read stories to children aged 4, 7, and 11 years, and to college freshmen to investigate the effects of recency and specific story content on moral reasoning. Their findings indicated that the child was able to use intent information, and thus made more negative judgments, only when the content involved injury to a person.

Elkind and Dabek (1977) suggested that young children judge personal injury as more serious than property damage, and thus make selective judgments on the basis of story content. They found that kindergarten, second-, and fourth-grade children judged personal injury as more culpable than property damage when intentionality was held constant. Thus, personal injury appears to elicit harsher moral judgments than other negative outcomes, regardless of intent.

In another study, Suls, Gutkin, and Kalle (1979) investigated roles of damage, intention and social consequence in moral judgments of children at all age levels from kindergarten through fifth grade. Both intention cues and social consequence cues increased in importance with age,

and parental reaction rather than peer reaction cues had more of an impact on children's judgments.

Elkind (1981) suggested that, when dealing with children, adults may judge actions on a quantitative ("consequence") basis rather than upon intention, giving more severe punishment for larger amounts of damage. As a result children may learn the importance of consequences by observing reactions to behavior.

Walster (1966) manipulated severity of consequences in accidents and found that adult subjects were harsher in their moral judgments when consequences were more severe. Thus it appears that adults, like children, do at times make judgments on the basis of consequence.

The purpose of this study was to reexamine Piaget's conception of the role of intention and consequence as basis for moral judgments and assess the implication of this study for Kohlberg's concept of homogeneity of moral reasoning stages. It was hypothesized that adults will at times make moral judgments based on the outcome of a situation, rather than the actor's intent, just as children do. Specifically, it was expected that actors in stories with more severe outcomes would be evaluated more harshly. The present study examined the effects of manipulating severity of consequences in moral dilemmas on the resulting moral judgments of adults.

Method

Subjects

The subjects were 61 undergraduate students enrolled in the introductory psychology course at Oklahoma State

University. Subjects were volunteers who received extra credit for participating in the research. An additional 58 undergraduate students ranked the stories for severity of outcome.

Instrument

The instrument consisted of a demographic information page and five short dilemma stories, each printed on a separate page, describing an accident and its consequences. The first story, which provided a baseline, was Piaget's classic story of the broken cups.

Sample Story

John, a five year old boy is playing in his room. He is called to dinner. He goes to the dining room. Behind the door there is a chair, and on the chair is a tray with fifteen cups on it. He rushes into the room, bangs the tray, and all the cups get chipped or broken.

Each of the remaining four stories described a different accident. Each of these had two outcomes; one was less severe (relatively mild) and the other was much more severe. Intentions of the main characters in three of the stories were neutral and in the fourth story the character's intent was positive. Listed below are the four stories, with the mild and severe endings.

Jackie

Jackie usually stopped on her way to work at a convenience store to buy a cup of coffee to go. She often left the engine running while she went into the store. One day while she was in the store the car was running, it slipped into gear. The car jerked forward and bumped the front of the store.

Mild Ending: Fortunately, no one was hurt and there was no damage to the car or store.

Severe Ending: The car broke a big glass front window of the store and a little girl inside the store was cut pretty badly by the flying glass.

Sue

Sue was on a ladder painting the trim on her house. David, her four-year-old-son, was watching her. The phone rang and Sue went into the house to answer it. While Sue was gone David decided to climb up the ladder.

Mild Ending: The ladder slipped and fell spilling Sue's paint. David was splashed with paint but unhurt.

Severe Ending: The ladder slipped and fell, spilling Sue's paint and giving David a bad bump on the head.

Mark

Mark was working on his car one day. He poured gasoline into the carburetor to get the car started.

Mild Ending: As Mark turned on the ignition, a spark ignited the gasoline. When the spark ignited the gasoline it caused a loud pop that scared Mark, but the car started ok, and no harm was done.

Severe Ending: As Mark turned on the ignition, a spark ignited the gasoline; the flame set the car on fire. Mark was burned putting out the fire and the car was almost a total loss.

Charles

Charles was fishing in his boat when he noticed Todd and Shelly, a friend's children, on the shore. He came over and asked if they would like to fish with him in the boat. Todd and Shelly climbed aboard and Charles went to the center of the lake. Not long afterward a bad storm began to blow up. Charles started to head back to shelter but the storm overtook them. The rain and wind caused the boat to capsize. Charles called to the children to hang onto the boat.

Mild Ending: All three clung to the overturned boat until they were rescued. They were scared, wet, and cold, but were ok.

Severe Ending: Even with Charles' help, Todd was not able to hang on. Todd eventually washed away from the boat and drowned.

The subjects used a 7-point rating scale to respond to six opinion statements presented as contrasted pairs (see Appendix B). Opinion statements were designed to measure subject's perception of the actor's: (a) responsibility for the accident; (b) intelligence; (c) goodness or badness; (d) carelessness; (e) concern for others; and (f) the foreseeability of the accident.

Procedure

The experimenter was a white female graduate student who administered the instrument in one session. Subjects participated as a group at a prearranged time in a classroom setting. The session took approximately 30 minutes.

Subjects were asked to read the stories and record their opinions on the rating scale. All subjects responded to the baseline story and one of two sets of each of the remaining four stories. That is, each subject received one of two sets of stories in random fashion. Set 1 consisted of the Sue and Charles stories with the mild ending and Mark and Jackie stories with the severe ending. Set 2 consisted of the mirror of set 1, that is, the Sue and Charles stories with the severe ending, and the Mark and Jackie stories with the mild ending. Both sets included stories with both female and male actors involved in both mild and severe consequences.

Scoring

The dependent variables, responses to opinion statements, were scored on a seven-point Likert scale with a score of seven representing the harshest, most negative judgment and a score of one the least harsh, more positive judgment.

Rating Severity of Consequence

In random fashion, half of the 58 additional subjects received the four mild ending stories and half the severe ending stories. Subjects were asked to rank the stories for severity of outcome, a rank of 1 being the most severe and 4 least severe.

Results

Mean rankings of severity of consequences in the more severe ending group of stories are presented in Table 1 in Appendix F. The rankings, from most severe to least severe, were: (1) Charles, (2) Jackie, (3) Mark, (4) Sue. In the mild ending group of stories the rankings were as follows: (1) Charles, (2) Sue, (3) Jackie, (4) Mark. Mean rankings of severity of consequences in the mild ending group of stories are presented in Table 2 in Appendix F. A 4X4 Chi square analysis was used to assess the frequency by rank and by story. Results are presented in Tables 3 and 4 in Appendix F. These tests were significant for the severe group, $\chi^2 (9, N = 29) = 156.02, p < .001$, and the mild group, $\chi^2 (9, N = 29) = 107.02, p < .001$.

An one-way analysis of variance was performed on the subjects' responses to the different story endings. No

significant differences between the two groups were found on the baseline story.¹ No main effects were found in subjects' responses to the story endings of the Sue or Jackie stories. For the Mark story, a significant difference was found for intelligence, $F(1, 59) = 12.49, p < .001$, and Carelessness, $F(1, 59) = 7.80, p < .007$ (see Table 7 in Appendix F). Subjects judged Mark to be less intelligent and more careless in the severe version of the story. Differences between the two versions of the Mark story approached significance, $F(1, 59) = 3.14, p < .08$ (see Table 9 in Appendix F), with more negative judgments occurring when the story had the more severe consequence.

Responses to the Charles story showed significant effects for Intelligence, $F(1, 59) = 7.34, p < .01$, Carelessness, $F(1, 59) = 5.85, p < .01$, and Foreseeability, $F(1, 59) = 4.83, p < .03$ (see Table 8 in Appendix F). Charles was judged to be less intelligent and more careless, and the outcome was judged to be more foreseeable in the more severe version of the story. Several nonsignificant trends were also found. In the severe version, Charles was judged as more responsible for what happened than in the mild ending version, $F(1, 59) = 3.68, p < .06$. Charles was also judged to be a bad person when the story had a severe ending, and a good person when the ending was mild, $F(1, 59) = 3.61, p < .06$. A significant composite effect was also found for the Charles story (see Table 9 in Appendix), $F(1, 59) = 8.46, p < .005$. Judgments made in response to the severe ending Charles story were

much harsher than the judgments made to the mild ending of the same story.

Discussion

The present study demonstrates that consequence can affect moral judgments, with more severe consequences resulting in more negative judgments. Thus, as hypothesized, it appears that adults, like children do not always stay at their expected level when making moral judgments. Results also show that intent is also taken in to consideration when making judgments. It should be noted that Piaget's (1932/1965) original conception of negative intent was rule breaking. By that criterion, the three dilemma stories with neutral intent would be considered negative intent in the original Piagetian view. The Charles character was the only one with a truly positive intent and negative consequences, and the one where consequences most clearly affected moral judgments. However, subjects were responsive to intent, giving more positive judgments for the Charles character than for the other three.

The findings of this study and others (Berg-Cross, 1975; Chandler, Greenspan, & Barenboim, 1973; Darley, Klosson, & Zanna, 1978; Moran & McCullers, 1984; O'Malley, 1986, Walster, 1966) indicate that both children and adults can be responsive to environmental circumstances, resulting in shifts of moral judgments. These results present difficulties for Kohlberg's conception of homogeneity of moral reasoning stages, and

would be more consistent with Piaget's (1932/1965) original theory of moral development.

Several theorists have suggested possible explanations for the occurrence of mixed moral judgments. Piaget (1932/1965) suggests:

It may therefore very well be that in the moral sphere there is simply a time-lag between the child's concrete evaluations and his theoretical judgment of value, the latter being an adequate and progressive conscious realization of the former. We shall meet with children who, for example, take no account of intentions in appraising actions on the verbal plane (objective responsibility), but who, when asked for personal experiences, show that they take full account of the intentions that come into play. It may be that in such cases the theoretical simply lags behind the practical moral judgment that shows in an adequate manner a stage that has been superseded on the plane of action. (p. 117)

Flavell (1982) proposes that in areas where people have had little experience they tend to use more fixed forms of reasoning, consistently centering on the most salient aspect of the situation. The less experience, the more intellectual homogeneity. Thus moral judgments of young children tend to be more homogeneous because they have had limited experience.

A similar theory has been suggested by Elkind (1981). Elkind proposes that mental growth occurs by substitution

and by integration. When mental growth occurs by substitution the old idea is not eradicated, but remains as a potential mode of thought with the possibility of re-emergence.

This may be the case in moral judgments. Elkind (1981) has also suggested learning as another explanation. He has pointed out that children are very alert to their parents' reactions to the consequences of actions, even though parents may emphasize intent as the proper basis for judging an action. Elkind proposes that children tend to center on what their parents do rather than what they say.

Finally, McCullers and his colleagues (Fabes, McCullers, and Moran, 1985; McCullers, Fabes, & Moran, 1987; Moran, McCullers, & Fabes, 1984) have proposed that material rewards may produce developmental regression. Recently, O'Malley (1986) has shown that rewards can produce regression in moral reasoning. Other environmental circumstances, such as severe consequences, might touch an emotional chord, something like the regression under material reward, and allow old modes of moral reasoning to emerge.

The present findings and this discussion have not been offered as a refutation of Kohlberg's general theory of moral development. They do, however, suggest that researchers may find it fruitful to reexamine Piaget's (1932/1965) original views of stage homogeneity in moral development.

References

- Berg-Cross, L. G. (1975). Intentionality, degree of damage, and moral judgments. Child Development, 46, 970-974.
- Chandler, M. J., Greenspan, S., & Barenboim, C. (1973). Judgments of intentionality in response to videotaped and verbally presented moral dilemmas: The medium is the message. Child Development, 44, 315-320.
- Darley, J. M., Klosson, E. C. & Zanna, M. P. (1978). Intentions and their contexts in the moral judgments of children and adults. Child Development, 49, 66-74.
- Elkind, D. (1981). Children and adolescents: Interpretive essays on Jean Piaget. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Elkind, D. & Dabek, R. (1977). Personal injury and property damage in the moral judgments of children. Child Development, 48, 518-522.
- Fabes, R. A., McCullers, J. C., & Moran, J. D., III. (1985). Effects of material rewards on inkblot perception and organization. American Journal of Psychology, 98, 399-407.
- Flavell, J. H. (1982). Structures, stages, and sequence in cognitive development. In W. Andrew Collins (Ed.), The concept of development: The Minnesota symposia on child psychology Vol. 15 (pp.1-28). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin

- (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research (pp. 347-480). Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- McCullers, J. C., Fabes, R. A., & Moran, J. D., III (1987). Does intrinsic motivation theory explain the adverse effects of rewards on immediate task performance? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 1027-1033.
- Moran, J. D., III, & McCullers, J. C. (1984). The effects of recency and story content on children's moral judgments. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 38, 447-455.
- Moran, J. D., III, & McCullers, J. C., & Fabes, R. A. (1984). A developmental analysis of the effects of reward on selected Wechsler subscales. American Journal of Psychology, 97, 205-214.
- Moran, J. D., III, & O'Brien, G. (1983a). The development of intention-based moral judgments in three- and four-year old children. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 143, 175-179.
- Moran, J. D., III, & O'Brien, G. (1983b). Influence of structured group experience on moral judgments of preschoolers. Psychological Reports, 52, 587-593.
- O'Malley, A. J. (1986). Paradoxical regression in moral reasoning in college student subjects: Artifact of material reward. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: Oklahoma State University.
- Piaget, J. (1932/1965). The moral judgment of the child. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

- Shultz, T. R., Wright, K., Schleifer, M. (1986). Assignment of moral responsibilities and punishment. Child Development, 57, 177-184.
- Suls, J., Gutkin, D., Kalle, R. J. (1979). The role of intentions, damage, and social consequences in the moral judgments of children. Child Development, 50, 874-877.
- Walster, E. (1966). Assignment of responsibility for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3(1), 73-79.

Footnote

¹An analysis of covariance, using scores from the baseline (John) story as a covariant, was also performed. However, because initial differences between the two groups on the John story were very small, the analysis of covariance yielded initially the same results as the analysis of variance.

APPENDIX A
LITERATURE REVIEW

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Moral Judgment

The Cognitive Developmental Approach

Piaget (1932/1965) posed hypothetical moral problems to children and then observed how the children formulated a solution. These interviews with children revealed to Piaget differences between the young child's and older child's thinking in the areas of obedience, authority, rules, punishment, and immanent justice. Based on these observations, Piaget suggested that there are fundamental transformations in the organization of people's thought in respect to moral reasoning. The structure of moral thinking is reorganized and changed through cognitive maturation and social interaction. As the child develops an understanding of the social world, the underlying moral judgment changes.

Piaget (1932/1965) speaks of two broad stages of moral development: moral realism and moral autonomy. In the first stage the young child bases moral judgments on the consequences of actions. Through cognitive development and social experience with peers a transformation to intention based judgments occur at about seven years of age. Piaget views moral development as establishing social equilibrium or reciprocal justice by individuals interacting with each

other. In Piaget's (1932/1965) system there are successive phases of mental processes recurring on different planes of behavior and consciousness. Piaget does not speak of global or inclusive stages characterized by heteronomy, but does speak of phases of heteronomy which define a process that is repeated for each new plane of thought.

Kohlberg (1958) expanded Piaget's cognitive developmental theory of moral development by describing the transformations in the organization of thought from childhood through adulthood. Kohlberg (1981) describes three broad levels in this theory of moral development: preconventional, conventional, and post conventional. At the preconventional level rules and social expectations are external; at the conventional level the rules and expectations of others have been internalized; and at the post conventional level rules and expectations of others have been differentiated and self-chosen principles defined. Within these three levels are six stages that Kohlberg suggests show the patterns of development in moral reasoning across the lifespan. Kohlberg's conception of stages is one in which individuals move one step at a time through the stage sequence with movement always in the same order and always upward. This implies that there are periods of development in which a given stage is predominant. The only kind of stage mixture would be between adjacent stages and with only two stages of mix at a time. Kohlberg's (1969) theory is one in which each stage represents an organized, homogeneous system of thought.

The studies on which Kohlberg's theory (1981) is based consist of presenting moral dilemma stories to subjects and asking them to indicate what solution would be best and why. Responses were analyzed to determine which of the six developmental stages reflected the subjects' answers. Kohlberg's longitudinal study of fifty boys over a 20 year time span tends to support his six stage model of moral development. Research (Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969; Rest, 1975) showing that older subjects exhibit higher stages of reasoning than younger subjects also supports the developmental stage model of moral judgment.

Research studies (Walster, 1966; Flavell, 1982; O'Malley, 1986) showing that subjects tend to change their moral judgments depending on environmental circumstances, at times making judgments based on consequence and at other times on intent, challenge Kohlberg's assumption of homogeneity of stages.

Walster's (1966) experiment manipulated severity of consequences in an accidental happening. Subjects were asked to rate the responsibility of a story character for an accident. The accident had four different outcomes: inconsequential damage; considerable damage; possible injury to a person; and considerable injury to a person. Subjects listened to a tape recorded description of the accident and then expressed their opinions concerning assignment of responsibility including moral responsibility. Results showed that judgments were dependent upon the severity of the consequences.

Significantly more responsibility was assigned to the story character for accidents with severe consequences than for mild consequences. Subjects were also found to apply stricter moral standards of judgment to the characters behavior when the accidental consequences were severe. However, Shaver (1970) was unable to replicate the findings of the Walster (1966) study.

O'Malley found that adult subjects' judgments tended to change under conditions of material reward. A regression in moral reasoning occurred under reward conditions but not under nonreward. Subjects' moral reasoning seems to be sensitive to the influence of material reward.

Chandler, Greenspan, & Barenboim (1973) presented children moral dilemmas either verbally or video taped. Moral judgments made in response to the verbal dilemmas were more often based on consequence. However, responses to the videotaped dilemmas were largely based on intention. The medium or presentation of the dilemma seemed to effect the moral reasoning and resulting judgments of the children.

Moran and McCullers (1984) investigated the effects of story content and recency on development of moral reasoning. In stories involving physical injury with either positive or negative intention no recency effects were found. However, recency significantly influenced the ratings of the characters in all of the other stories. Childrens use of intent information changed when personal injury was involved resulting

in more negative judgments. It appears that physical injury is a salient feature in moral dilemmas and possibly affecting judgments of subjects at all ages.

Moran & O'Brien (1983) investigated the effects of group experiences on preschoolers moral judgments. Findings suggest that the social environment influences young children's moral judgments. Group-care children showed significantly more intention based judgments than children at home for stories involving personal injury to a person and a trend for consequence-based judgments for stories concerned with personal property.

In another study, Elkind and Dabek (1977) found that more intention based judgments were made by kindergarten children when the stories involved injury to another person.

Research by Berg-Cross (1975) found severe consequences elicited harsher judgments regardless of intentionality. Berg-Cross interpreted this finding to mean that an extreme consequence may be used as an additional weighted factor that combines with other factors to influence moral reasoning and resulting judgments.

In other related research, Hoffman and Salzstein (1967) found that the use of physical punishment, deprivation of privileges or material objects or application of force or threat of any of these by the mother was associated with weak moral development. The use of induction by the mother was associated with advanced moral development.

Hoffman (1970, 1975) has also suggested a close link between parental discipline and altruistic behavior in children. Other researchers (Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, & King, 1979) have found that mothers who explained how their children's actions affected others and who did so in an affective tone, had children who were altruistic.

The findings of the present study and those of others suggest that further investigations should focus on circumstances or contexts that elicit certain types of moral judgments rather than on stage sequence. Such studies should not only investigate story contexts but also methods of presentation to subjects and subject's environmental circumstances.

References

- Berg-Cross, L. G. (1975). Intentionality, degree of damage, and moral judgments. Child Development, 46, 970-974.
- Chandler, M. J. Greenspan, S., & Barenboim, C. (1973). Judgments of intentionality in response to videotaped and verbally presented moral dilemmas: The medium is the message. Child Development, 44, 315-320.
- Elkind, D. & Dabek, R. (1977). Personal injury and property damage in the moral judgments of children. Child Development, 48, 518-522.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1970). Moral development. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Manual of child psychology. New York: Wiley.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1975). Altruistic behavior and the parent-child relationship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 937-943.
- Hoffman, M. L. & Saltzstein, H. D. (1967). Parent discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 45-57.
- Kohlberg, L. (1958). The development of modes of thinking and choices in years 10 to 16. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Chicago.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). Essays on moral development: The philosophy of moral development: Volume 1. San Francisco: Harper Row.

- Kohlberg, L. & Kramer, R. (1969). Continuities and discontinuities in childhood and adult moral development. Human Development, 12, 93-120.
- Moran, J. D. III, & McCullers, J. C. (1984). The effects of recency and story content on children's moral judgments. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 38, 447-455.
- Moran, J. D. III, & O'Brien, G. (1983). Influence of structured group experience on moral judgments of preschoolers. Psychological Reports, 52, 587-593.
- O'Malley, A. J. (1986). Paradoxical regression in moral reasoning in college student subjects: Artifact of material reward. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: Oklahoma State University.
- Piaget, J. (1932/1965). The moral judgment of the child. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Rest, J. R. (1975). Longitudinal study of the Defining Issues Test: A strategy for analyzing developmental change. Developmental Psychology, 11, 738-748.
- Shaver, K. G. (1970). Defensive attribution: Effects of severity and relevance on the responsibility assigned for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 14, 101-113.
- Walster, E. (1966). Assignment of responsibility for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3(1), 73-79.

Zahn-Waxler, C. Z., Radke-Yarrow, M. R., & King, R. A.
(1979). Child rearing and children's prosocial
initiations toward victims of distress. Child
Development, 50, 319-330.

APPENDIX B
RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Instructions:

In this questionnaire you will be asked to give your opinions about several stories. The stories are designed to explore what people think about other people and their problems. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Your answers will be anonymous, do not put your name on the questionnaire. However, we ask that you give us some information about yourself. This information will be used to help us learn if people think differently about these stories because of being male or female, or because of their age, marital status, etc. Thank you for your cooperation.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Sex: _____ Race: _____
 Year of Birth: _____ Place of Birth: _____
 Number of Brothers: _____ Sisters: _____
 Your Birth Order (e.g., youngest, 2nd oldest, etc.): _____
 Years of Education: Your Father _____ Your Mother _____
 Place Where You Grew Up (e.g., rural, small town, large city, etc.):
 _____ (approx. population, if known) _____
 Your Marital Status: _____ Number of Children: _____
 Your Employment Status: _____
 Your College Major: _____
 Your College Class Rank (Freshman, Sophomore, etc.): _____
 Political Party Preference: _____
 Actively Involved in Political Party Work? _____
 Church Preference or Affiliation: _____
 Actively Involved in Church? _____

SAMPLE STORY

John, a five year old boy is playing in his room. He is called to dinner. He goes to the dining room. Behind the door there is a chair, and on the chair is a tray with fifteen cups on it. He rushes into the room, bangs the tray, and all the cups get chipped or broken.

Opinion Statements:

For each statement, mark the box that is closest to your opinion. For example, if you agree with the lefthand statement, mark the box on the far left. If you agree with the statement on the right, mark the box on the far right. Use the boxes in between to show an intermediate opinion.

John is not responsible for what happened.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	John is entirely responsible for what happened.
John is very intelligent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	John is not intelligent.
John is a good boy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	John is a bad boy.
John is careless.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	John is not careless.
What happened could have been foreseen and avoided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	What happened was due to fate or chance and couldn't be avoided.
John is self-centered.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	John has concern for others.

Jackie

Jackie usually stopped on her way to work at a convenience store to buy a cup of coffee to go. She often left the engine running while she went into the store. One day while she was in the store and the car was running, it slipped into gear. The car jerked forward and bumped the front of the store. Fortunately, no one was hurt and there was no damage to the car or the store.

Opinion Statements:

For each statement, mark the box that is closest to your opinion.

Jackie is not responsible for what happened.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Jackie is entirely responsible for what happened.
Jackie is very intelligent.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Jackie is not intelligent.
Jackie is a good woman.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Jackie is a bad woman.
Jackie is careless.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Jackie is not careless.
What happened could have been foreseen and avoided.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	What happened was due to fate or chance and couldn't be avoided.
Jackie is self-centered.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Jackie has concern for others.

Jackie

Jackie usually stopped on her way to work at a convenience store to buy a cup of coffee to go. She often left the engine running while she went into the store. One day while she was in the store and the car was running, it slipped into gear. The car jerked forward and crashed into the front of the store. The car broke a big glass front window of the store and a little girl inside the store was cut pretty badly by the flying glass .

Opinion Statements:

For each statement, mark the box that is closest to your opinion.

Jackie is not responsible for what happened.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Jackie is entirely responsible for what happened.
Jackie is very intelligent.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Jackie is not intelligent.
Jackie is a good woman.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Jackie is a bad woman.
Jackie is careless.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Jackie is not careless.
What happened could have been foreseen and avoided.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	What happened was due to fate or chance and couldn't be avoided.
Jackie is self-centered.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Jackie has concern for others.

Sue

Sue was on a ladder painting the trim on her house. David, her four-year-old-son, was watching her. The phone rang and Sue went into the house to answer it. While Sue was gone David decided to climb up the ladder. The ladder slipped and fell, spilling Sue's paint. David was splashed with paint but unhurt.

Opinion Statements:

For each statement, mark the box that is closest to your opinion.

Sue is not responsible for what happened.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Sue is entirely responsible for what happened.
Sue is very intelligent.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Sue is not intelligent.
Sue is a good woman.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Sue is a bad woman.
Sue is careless.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Sue is not careless.
What happened could have been foreseen and avoided.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	What happened was due to fate or chance and couldn't be avoided.
Sue is self-centered.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Sue has concern for others.

Sue

Sue was on a ladder painting the trim on her house. David, her four-year-old-son, was watching her. The phone rang and Sue went into the house to answer it. While Sue was gone David decided to climb up the ladder. The ladder slipped and fell, spilling Sue's paint and giving David a bad bump on the head.

Opinion Statements:

For each statement, mark the box that is closest to your opinion.

Sue is not responsible for what happened.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Sue is entirely responsible for what happened.
Sue is very intelligent.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Sue is not intelligent.
Sue is a good woman.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Sue is a bad woman.
Sue is careless.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Sue is not careless.
What happened could have been foreseen and avoided.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	What happened was due to fate or chance and couldn't be avoided.
Sue is self-centered.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Sue has concern for others.

Charles

Charles was fishing in his boat when he noticed Todd and Shelly, a friend's children, on the shore. He came over and asked if they would like to fish with him in the boat. Todd and Shelly climbed aboard and Charles went to the center of the lake. Not long afterward a bad storm began to blow up. Charles started to head back to shelter but the storm overtook them. The rain and wind caused the boat to capsize. Charles called to the children to hang onto the boat. All three clung to the overturned boat until they were rescued. They were scared, wet, and cold, but were ok.

Opinion Statements:

For each statement, mark the box that is closest to your opinion.

Charles is not responsible for what happened.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Charles is entirely responsible for what happened.
Charles is very intelligent.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Charles is not intelligent.
Charles is a good man.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Charles is a bad man.
Charles is careless.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Charles is not careless.
What happened could have been foreseen and avoided.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	What happened was due to fate or chance and couldn't be avoided.
Charles is self-centered.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Charles has concern for others.

Charles

Charles was fishing in his boat when he noticed Todd and Shelly, a friend's children, on the shore. He came over and asked if they would like to fish with him in the boat. Todd and Shelly climbed aboard and Charles went to the center of the lake. Not long afterward a bad storm began to blow up. Charles started to head back to shelter but the storm overtook them. The rain and wind caused the boat to capsize. Charles called to the children to hang onto the boat. Even with Charles' help, Todd was not able to hang on. Todd eventually washed away from the boat and drowned.

Opinion Statements:

For each statement, mark the box that is closest to your opinion.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Charles is not responsible for what happened. | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Charles is entirely responsible for what happened. |
| Charles is very intelligent. | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Charles is not intelligent. |
| Charles is a good man. | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Charles is a bad man. |
| Charles is careless. | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Charles is not careless. |
| What happened could have been foreseen and avoided. | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | What happened was due to fate or chance and couldn't be avoided. |
| Charles is self-centered. | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Charles has concern for others. |

Mark

Mark was working on his car one day. He poured gasoline into the carburetor to get the car started. As Mark turned on the ignition, a spark ignited the gasoline. When the spark ignited the gasoline, it caused a loud pop that scared Mark, but The car started ok, and no harm was done.

Opinion Statements:

For each statement, mark the box that is closest to your opinion.

Mark is not responsible for what happened.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Mark is entirely responsible for what happened.
Mark is very intelligent.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Mark is not intelligent.
Mark is a good man.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Mark is a bad man.
Mark is careless.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Mark is not careless.
What happened could have been foreseen and avoided.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	What happened was due to fate or chance and couldn't be avoided.
Mark is self-centered.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Mark has concern for others.

Mark

Mark was working on his car one day. He poured gasoline into the carburetor to get the car started. As Mark turned on the ignition, a spark ignited the gasoline; the flame set the car on fire. Mark was burned putting out the fire and the car was almost a total loss.

Opinion Statements:

For each statement, mark the box that is closest to your opinion.

Mark is not responsible for what happened.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Mark is entirely responsible for what happened.
Mark is very intelligent.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Mark is not intelligent.
Mark is a good man.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Mark is a bad man.
Mark is careless.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Mark is not careless.
What happened could have been foreseen and avoided.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	What happened was due to fate or chance and couldn't be avoided.
Mark is self-centered.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Mark has concern for others.

APPENDIX C

RAW DATA

	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6	V7	V8	V9	V10	V11	V12	V13	V14	V15	V16	V17	V18	V19
1	1	4	1	5	5	4	6	6	3	5	5	3	6	7	3	7	7	1	
2	1	4	1	2	4	5	5	5	4	7	4	4	6	6	4	5	5	4	
3	1	4	1	6	4	4	4	2	4	6	5	3	6	7	4	2	5	2	
4	1	4	1	1	4	1	1	4	1	6	4	4	3	7	4	7	4	4	
5	1	4	1	3	4	4	5	3	4	2	4	4	5	6	4	6	7	4	
6	1	4	1	6	6	1	7	7	6	5	5	4	6	7	4	6	4	4	
7	1	4	1	1	4	4	2	1	4	6	5	4	6	7	3	1	4	4	
8	1	4	1	5	3	4	6	2	4	5	4	4	6	2	4	6	5	4	
9	1	4	1	4	4	4	4	3	4	5	4	4	6	7	4	5	4	4	
10	1	4	1	1	3	3	2	5	4	7	5	4	5	7	5	7	4	4	
11	1	4	1	3	4	3	4	5	5	1	3	1	5	4	3	4	3	3	
12	1	4	1	2	4	4	5	7	4	2	5	3	6	6	4	7	7	4	
13	1	4	1	2	4	4	4	7	4	5	4	4	6	7	4	7	6	4	
14	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	4	7	7	4	6	1	1	
15	1	4	1	4	2	3	5	4	4	7	2	2	6	7	4	2	2	2	
16	1	4	1	3	6	2	5	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	1	6	4	1	
17	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	1	7	1	7	7	1	1	1	1	
18	2	4	1	2	4	2	2	7	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	6	4	4	
19	2	4	1	3	4	2	2	3	3	3	4	2	5	6	3	7	6	2	
20	2	4	1	6	5	4	3	1	2	4	2	6	6	3	2	7	6	4	
21	2	4	1	4	4	4	6	6	4	3	6	4	7	7	4	7	6	2	
22	2	4	1	1	4	7	7	7	4	7	6	4	7	7	6	1	5	4	
23	2	4	1	4	3	3	4	5	5	6	5	4	5	7	5	7	5	4	
24	2	4	1	5	3	3	7	6	4	6	3	3	6	6	3	7	6	4	
25	2	4	1	2	4	4	5	7	4	5	4	3	6	6	3	6	5	4	
26	2	4	1	5	3	3	3	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	3	3	
27	2	4	1	3	4	4	4	7	4	6	4	4	4	5	7	4	4	4	
28	2	4	1	2	4	4	3	1	4	5	4	4	5	7	4	7	7	4	
29	2	3	1	4	4	4	4	7	4	6	4	4	5	7	4	6	4	4	
30	2	3	1	7	4	4	5	3	5	3	4	4	5	7	2	7	6	3	
31	2	4	1	3	4	4	3	1	4	4	5	3	5	6	4	7	7	4	
32	1	4	2	5	4	4	6	5	4	6	5	4	6	7	3	7	4	4	
33	1	4	2	3	4	4	6	2	4	3	5	4	6	6	4	6	4	4	
34	1	1	2	3	4	4	5	6	5	5	4	4	5	6	4	7	5	4	
35	1	4	2	2	2	2	5	6	5	5	4	3	5	7	4	5	3	1	
36	1	4	2	3	4	4	4	7	4	6	5	4	3	6	4	2	3	4	
37	1	3	2	5	4	4	6	5	5	6	5	4	7	7	5	7	5	4	
38	1	1	2	1	4	4	5	7	4	5	4	4	5	3	4	5	4	4	
39	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	5	3	5	3	7	3	2	2	1	
40	1	3	2	3	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	6	4	7	4	4	
41	1	3	2	1	3	4	1	3	4	6	5	4	7	6	4	7	2	4	
42	1	4	2	4	4	4	4	3	4	6	6	4	7	7	4	4	4	3	
43	1	4	2	1	4	4	4	1	4	5	4	4	4	6	4	1	4	4	
44	1	4	2	5	4	4	4	2	4	6	5	4	5	7	4	7	4	4	
45	1	4	2	1	1	7	1	7	1	7	7	1	7	7	1	7	1	1	
46	1	4	2	6	4	4	6	6	4	5	4	4	6	7	4	1	4	4	
47	1	3	2	5	4	4	5	7	4	7	4	4	7	7	4	7	4	4	
48	2	3	2	1	3	3	5	5	3	1	4	4	7	7	2	1	1	4	
49	2	4	2	2	4	4	5	7	4	7	5	4	6	7	4	6	4	4	
50	2	4	2	3	4	4	3	4	4	5	5	4	5	6	5	5	4	2	
51	2	4	2	4	5	2	6	6	4	6	6	3	6	6	5	7	5	2	
52	2	4	2	5	4	2	5	4	4	4	3	3	6	6	5	5	3	3	
53	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	7	3	2	
54	2	4	2	1	4	4	4	1	4	1	6	4	7	7	4	7	4	4	
55	2	4	2	5	4	2	4	4	4	5	3	3	5	7	5	7	2	2	
56	2	4	2	3	4	2	5	1	2	6	5	4	3	6	3	1	1	2	
57	2	4	2	3	4	4	5	2	4	5	4	2	5	3	4	6	4	4	
58	2	1	2	4	4	4	6	7	4	1	4	4	5	7	4	7	4	4	
59	2	1	2	2	4	4	4	2	4	7	7	4	7	7	4	7	5	4	
60	2	4	2	1	4	4	4	7	4	6	4	4	6	7	7	7	2	4	
61	2	2	2	2	4	2	4	4	4	6	5	4	5	6	4	2	4	4	

	V1	V20	V21	V22	V23	V24	V25	V26	V27	V28	V29	V30	V31	V32	V33	V34
1	7	7	4	7	7	1	7	7	6	7	5	1	7	7	3	
2	6	5	4	2	2	3	4	1	2	6	4	4	6	6	4	
3	7	7	4	2	3	3	5	5	4	7	6	4	7	7	4	
4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	1	1	6	6	4	6	7	4	
5	7	7	4	4	3	3	4	2	1	6	5	4	6	7	4	
6	6	7	4	1	4	2	5	5	4	2	3	3	7	7	4	
7	2	1	4	1	4	4	1	1	4	7	7	5	7	7	4	
8	6	7	4	5	3	2	5	2	1	2	5	4	5	5	4	
9	5	6	4	1	3	4	3	3	4	5	4	4	3	3	4	
10	6	7	4	2	3	2	3	5	1	7	5	4	5	7	4	
11	3	5	4	4	4	5	2	6	4	7	6	4	7	6	4	
12	7	7	4	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	7	4	7	7	5	
13	7	7	6	1	2	3	2	2	1	6	5	4	7	7	7	
14	7	1	6	7	7	4	6	6	5	7	6	1	7	7	5	
15	4	3	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	6	4	4	7	7	4	
16	6	1	3	2	1	1	2	1	1	7	7	3	6	7	6	
17	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7	7	7	7	1	
18	3	2	4	1	3	3	4	2	1	6	6	4	6	7	5	
19	6	4	3	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	5	3	7	2	4	
20	2	6	5	2	5	2	4	5	4	7	6	3	3	7	2	
21	7	7	4	6	6	2	3	2	3	7	6	4	7	7	4	
22	4	6	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	6	5	7	7	7	
23	7	7	4	6	4	3	5	6	4	7	5	4	7	7	7	
24	7	7	4	5	5	2	6	7	2	7	6	2	7	7	2	
25	5	6	4	6	4	3	5	4	3	5	4	4	5	5	4	
26	4	4	4	5	3	3	3	3	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	
27	5	3	4	5	3	3	4	4	4	6	3	3	5	7	4	
28	7	7	4	6	6	4	2	6	3	7	7	4	7	7	4	
29	5	3	4	7	6	4	6	7	5	7	5	4	5	7	4	
30	7	7	4	5	4	6	5	2	5	7	7	4	7	7	6	
31	7	7	6	1	1	1	3	2	4	6	5	2	5	7	5	
32	5	5	4	6	5	4	4	6	4	5	5	4	6	6	4	
33	5	6	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	7	5	4	6	6	4	
34	7	7	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	7	5	4	5	6	4	
35	6	5	4	6	3	2	2	2	2	6	6	3	6	5	4	
36	4	5	4	5	4	3	5	3	4	2	3	4	6	3	4	
37	6	6	4	3	4	3	5	5	2	7	5	4	6	7	4	
38	5	5	4	5	5	3	5	3	3	7	4	4	7	7	5	
39	1	2	1	6	5	2	6	6	3	5	3	3	3	3	1	
40	6	7	4	4	5	4	3	3	4	7	4	4	7	7	5	
41	4	5	4	3	5	4	5	5	4	7	5	4	3	6	4	
42	5	6	4	2	2	4	4	2	4	4	5	4	6	7	4	
43	2	7	4	6	5	4	3	7	4	6	4	4	2	7	4	
44	5	6	4	6	5	4	5	2	4	7	6	4	5	7	4	
45	1	1	1	1	7	1	1	7	1	1	7	1	7	7	1	
46	4	2	4	1	4	4	4	1	4	7	6	4	7	7	4	
47	4	7	4	4	4	1	4	4	1	7	4	4	7	7	7	
48	2	1	4	7	7	5	7	7	5	7	7	4	7	7	7	
49	6	7	4	6	6	4	6	3	2	6	4	4	7	7	4	
50	3	6	5	6	6	4	6	7	3	7	6	4	6	7	6	
51	6	6	5	7	3	2	4	3	5	7	7	5	7	7	5	
52	4	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	2	7	6	4	6	7	5	
53	2	2	4	1	4	2	4	7	4	7	6	4	6	7	4	
54	4	7	4	2	4	4	6	6	4	7	5	4	7	7	4	
55	6	7	5	6	5	2	6	7	2	3	4	3	4	5	4	
56	2	1	4	7	7	5	7	6	6	4	4	4	4	1	4	
57	6	6	4	2	2	2	2	6	2	7	4	4	7	7	4	
58	7	7	4	7	4	4	6	7	4	7	4	4	7	7	4	
59	5	5	4	5	4	4	3	5	4	7	6	4	7	7	4	
60	5	6	4	1	5	4	6	1	1	3	4	4	6	5	4	
61	4	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	6	4	6	6	4	

V1	JOHN	SUE	MARK	CHARLES	JACKIE
1	29.00	29.00	33.00	35.00	30.00
2	25.00	31.00	29.00	14.00	30.00
3	24.00	31.00	32.00	22.00	35.00
4	12.00	28.00	22.00	15.00	33.00
5	23.00	25.00	35.00	17.00	32.00
6	33.00	31.00	31.00	21.00	26.00
7	16.00	31.00	16.00	15.00	37.00
8	24.00	25.00	32.00	18.00	25.00
9	23.00	30.00	28.00	18.00	23.00
10	18.00	33.00	32.00	16.00	32.00
11	24.00	17.00	22.00	25.00	34.00
12	26.00	26.00	36.00	7.00	37.00
13	25.00	30.00	37.00	11.00	36.00
14	6.00	36.00	22.00	35.00	33.00
15	22.00	28.00	17.00	7.00	32.00
16	20.00	12.00	21.00	8.00	36.00
17	18.00	30.00	12.00	6.00	36.00
18	21.00	28.00	23.00	14.00	34.00
19	17.00	23.00	28.00	9.00	23.00
20	21.00	23.00	30.00	22.00	28.00
21	28.00	31.00	33.00	22.00	35.00
22	30.00	37.00	24.00	6.00	39.00
23	24.00	32.00	34.00	28.00	37.00
24	28.00	27.00	35.00	27.00	31.00
25	26.00	27.00	30.00	25.00	27.00
26	23.00	23.00	23.00	20.00	25.00
27	26.00	30.00	25.00	23.00	28.00
28	18.00	29.00	36.00	27.00	36.00
29	27.00	30.00	26.00	35.00	32.00
30	28.00	25.00	34.00	27.00	38.00
31	19.00	27.00	38.00	12.00	30.00
32	28.00	31.00	29.00	29.00	30.00
33	23.00	28.00	29.00	23.00	32.00
34	27.00	28.00	34.00	27.00	31.00
35	22.00	28.00	24.00	17.00	30.00
36	26.00	28.00	22.00	24.00	22.00
37	29.00	34.00	32.00	22.00	33.00
38	25.00	25.00	27.00	24.00	34.00
39	11.00	26.00	9.00	28.00	18.00
40	25.00	28.00	32.00	23.00	34.00
41	16.00	30.00	26.00	26.00	29.00
42	23.00	34.00	26.00	18.00	30.00
43	18.00	27.00	22.00	29.00	27.00
44	23.00	31.00	30.00	26.00	33.00
45	18.00	30.00	12.00	18.00	24.00
46	30.00	30.00	19.00	18.00	35.00
47	29.00	33.00	30.00	18.00	36.00
48	20.00	25.00	13.00	38.00	39.00
49	26.00	33.00	31.00	27.00	32.00
50	22.00	30.00	25.00	32.00	36.00
51	27.00	32.00	31.00	24.00	38.00
52	24.00	27.00	21.00	17.00	35.00
53	24.00	25.00	20.00	22.00	34.00
54	18.00	29.00	30.00	26.00	34.00
55	23.00	28.00	29.00	28.00	23.00
56	17.00	27.00	11.00	38.00	21.00
57	22.00	23.00	30.00	16.00	33.00
58	29.00	25.00	33.00	32.00	33.00
59	20.00	36.00	30.00	25.00	35.00
60	24.00	32.00	28.00	18.00	26.00
61	20.00	30.00	20.00	20.00	32.00

APPENDIX D
VARIABLE CODES

Variable Codes

VALUE LABELS

V2 1 'FEMALE' 2 'MALE' / V3 1 '40-47' 2 '48-54' 3 '55-61'
 4 '62-68' / V4 1 'SET1' 2 'SET2' / V5 1 'NOTRESP' 2 'LITTLE' 3
 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'RESPONSIBLE' /
 V6 1 'SMART' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT'
 6 'LITTLE'
 7 'NOTSMART' / V7 1 'GOOD' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL'
 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'BAD' / V8 1 'NOTCARELESS' 2 'LITTLE'
 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'CARELESS' /
 V9 1 'NOTFORESEEABLE' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL'
 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'FORESEEABLE' / V10 1 'CONCERNED'
 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE'
 7 'NOTCONCERNED' / V11 1 'NOTRESPONSIBLE' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT'
 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'RESPONSIBLE' / V12
 1 'SMART' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT'
 6 'LITTLE' 7 'NOTSMART' / V13 1 'GOOD' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT'
 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'BAD' / V14 1 'NOTCARELESS'
 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE'
 7 'CARELESS' / V15 1 'NOTFORESEEABLE' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT'
 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'FORESEEABLE' /
 V16 1 'CONCERNED' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL'
 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'NOTCONCERNED' / V17 1 'NOTRESPONSIBLE'
 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE'
 7 'RESPONSIBLE' / V18 1 'SMART' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOME' 4 'NEUTRAL'
 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'NOTSMART' / V19 1 'GOOD' 2 'LITTLE'
 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'BAD' /
 V20 1 'NOTCARELESS' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL'
 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'CARELESS' / V21 1 'NOTFORESEEABLE'
 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE'
 7 'FORESEEABLE' / V22 1 'CONCERNED' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT'
 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'NOTCONCERNED' /
 V23 1 'NOTRESPONSIBLE' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL'
 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'RESPONSIBLE' / V24 1 'SMART'
 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE'
 7 'NOTSMART' / V25 1 'GOOD' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL'
 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'BAD' / V26 1 'NOTCARELESS' 2 'LITTLE'
 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'CARELESS' /
 V27 1 'NOTFORESEEABLE' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL'
 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'FORESEEABLE' / V28 1 'CONCERNED'
 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE'
 7 'NOTCONCERNED' / V29 1 'NOTRESPONSIBLE' 2 'LITTLE'
 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'RESPONSIBLE'
 / V30 1 'SMART' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL'
 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'NOTSMART' / V31 1 'GOOD' 2 'LITTLE'
 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'BAD' /
 V32 1 'NOTCARELESS' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL'
 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'CARELESS' / V33 1 'NOTFORESEEABLE'
 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT' 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE'
 7 'FORESEEABLE' / V34 1 'CONCERNED' 2 'LITTLE' 3 'SOMEWHAT'
 4 'NEUTRAL' 5 'SOMEWHAT' 6 'LITTLE' 7 'NOTCONCERNED' /

APPENDIX E
SELECTED STATISTICAL ANALYSES

* * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * *

BY	MARK V4	GROUP					
SOURCE OF VARIATION			SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS			145.701	1	145.701	3.140	0.082
V4			145.701	1	145.701	3.140	0.082
EXPLAINED			145.701	1	145.701	3.140	0.082
RESIDUAL			2738.102	59	46.409		
TOTAL			2883.803	60	48.063		

61 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
0 CASES (0.0 PCT) WERE MISSING.

* * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * *

BY	JACKIE V4	GROUP					
SOURCE OF VARIATION			SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS			14.310	1	14.310	0.605	0.440
V4			14.310	1	14.310	0.605	0.440
EXPLAINED			14.310	1	14.310	0.605	0.440
RESIDUAL			1394.838	59	23.641		
TOTAL			1409.148	60	23.486		

61 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
0 CASES (0.0 PCT) WERE MISSING.

* * * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE * * *

BY		JOHN V4	SUE MARK CHARLES JACKIE GROUP					
SOURCE OF VARIATION				SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS				1.007	1	1.007	0.040	0.843
V4				1.007	1	1.007	0.040	0.843
EXPLAINED				1.007	1	1.007	0.040	0.843
RESIDUAL				1493.354	59	25.311		
TOTAL				1494.361	60	24.906		

61 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
0 CASES (0.0 PCT) WERE MISSING.

* * * ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE * * *

BY		SUE V4	GROUP					
SOURCE OF VARIATION				SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS				21.836	1	21.836	1.254	0.267
V4				21.836	1	21.836	1.254	0.267
EXPLAINED				21.836	1	21.836	1.254	0.267
RESIDUAL				1027.410	59	17.414		
TOTAL				1049.246	60	17.487		

61 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
0 CASES (0.0 PCT) WERE MISSING.

* * * A N A L Y S I S O F V A R I A N C E * * *

BY CHARLES
V4 GROUP

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
MAIN EFFECTS	460.828	1	460.828	8.462	0.005
V4	460.828	1	460.828	8.462	0.005
EXPLAINED	460.828	1	460.828	8.462	0.005
RESIDUAL	3213.238	59	54.462		
TOTAL	3674.066	60	61.234		

61 CASES WERE PROCESSED.
0 CASES (0.0 PCT) WERE MISSING.

APPENDIX F
SELECTED TABLES

Table 1
Mean Rankings for Severity of Story Consequences in
Severe Ending Stories

Story	Mean Ranking	Standard Deviation
Charles	1.13	.54
Jackie	2.48	.56
Mark	2.68	.79
Sue	3.68	.65

n=29 Note: A rank of 1 being most severe and a rank
of 4 being least severe.

Table 2

Mean Rankings for Severity of Story Consequences in
Mild Ending Stories

Story	Mean Ranking	Standard Deviation
Charles	1.31	.75
Sue	2.13	.68
Jackie	3.03	.76
Mark	3.52	.67

n=29 Note: A rank of 1 being most severe and a rank
 of 4 being least severe.

Table 3

Chi Square for Rankings of Severe Ending Stories

Story	Rankings				Total
	1	2	3	4	
Charles	27	1	0	1	29*
Jackie	0	16	12	1	29*
Mark	2	9	14	4	29*
Sue	0	3	3	23	29*
	29**	29**	29**	29**	116

f_e * Σf row ** Σf columns

$$\chi^2 (9, N = 29) = 156.02, p < .001$$

Table 4

Chi Square for Rankings if Mild Ending Stories

Story	Rankings				Total
	1	2	3	4	
Charles	24	3	0	2	29*
Sue	4	18	6	1	29*
Jackie	1	5	15	8	29*
Mark	0	3	8	18	29*
	29**	29**	29**	29**	116

f_e * f row ** f columns

$\chi^2 (9, N = 29) = 107.02, p < .001$

Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations of Opinion Statements
by Sue Story

Opinion Statements	Sue Story	
	Mild	Severe
Responsibility		
<u>M</u>	4.94	5.07
<u>SD</u>	1.67	1.66
Intelligence		
<u>M</u>	4.36	4.63
<u>SD</u>	1.17	1.03
Goodness		
<u>M</u>	3.45	3.73
<u>SD</u>	1.03	.74
Carelessness		
<u>M</u>	5.48	5.47
<u>SD</u>	1.09	1.20
Foreseeability		
<u>M</u>	6.03	6.27
<u>SD</u>	1.60	1.11
Concern for Others		
<u>M</u>	3.65	3.93
<u>SD</u>	1.08	.87

Table 6
Means and Standard Deviations of Opinion Statements
by Jackie Story

Opinion Statements	Jackie Story	
	Mild	Severe
Responsibility		
<u>M</u>	5.90	6.07
<u>SD</u>	1.73	1.50
Intelligence		
<u>M</u>	5.00	5.39
<u>SD</u>	1.15	1.17
Goodness		
<u>M</u>	3.83	3.68
<u>SD</u>	.65	1.14
Carelessness		
<u>M</u>	5.87	6.10
<u>SD</u>	1.38	1.22
Foreseeability		
<u>M</u>	6.17	6.42
<u>SD</u>	1.49	1.29
Concern for Others		
<u>M</u>	4.20	4.30
<u>SD</u>	1.22	1.35

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations of Opinion Statements
by Charles Story

Opinion Statements	Charles Story	
	Mild	Severe
Responsibility		
<u>M</u>	3.23*	4.30*
<u>SD</u>	2.30	2.07
Intelligence		
<u>M</u>	3.42**	4.50**
<u>SD</u>	1.79	1.28
Goodness		
<u>M</u>	2.68*	3.27*
<u>SD</u>	1.30	1.11
Carelessness		
<u>M</u>	3.55***	4.53***
<u>SD</u>	1.70	1.48
Foreseeability		
<u>M</u>	3.32**	4.50**
<u>SD</u>	2.15	2.03
Concern for Others		
<u>M</u>	2.74	3.33
<u>SD</u>	1.61	1.27

* $p < .06$. ** $p < .03$. *** $p < .01$

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations of Opinion Statements
by Mark Story

Opinion Statements	Mark Story	
	Mild	Severe
Responsibility		
<u>M</u>	5.23	5.48
<u>SD</u>	2.30	2.00
Intelligence		
<u>M</u>	3.43***	4.74***
<u>SD</u>	1.19	1.65
Goodness		
<u>M</u>	3.30	3.26
<u>SD</u>	1.09	1.13
Carelessness		
<u>M</u>	4.40**	5.58**
<u>SD</u>	1.69	1.61
Foreseeability		
<u>M</u>	4.93	5.13
<u>SD</u>	2.10	2.22
Concern for Others		
<u>M</u>	3.87	4.07
<u>SD</u>	.86	.89

p<.007. *p<.001

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations of Composite
Scores by Story Ending

Stories	Mild	Severe
Sue		
<u>M</u>	27.90	29.10
<u>SD</u>	4.96	1.16
Mark		
<u>M</u>	25.17*	28.26*
<u>SD</u>	6.92	6.71
Charles		
<u>M</u>	18.94**	24.43**
<u>SD</u>	8.60	5.86
Jackie		
<u>M</u>	30.97	31.94
<u>SD</u>	5.18	4.54

* $p < .08$. ** $p < .005$

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations of Opinion Statements
by John Story

Opinion Statements	John Story	
	Set 1	Set 2
Responsibility		
<u>M</u>	3.25	3.00
<u>SD</u>	1.75	1.55
Intelligence		
<u>M</u>	3.77	3.73
<u>SD</u>	1.09	.79
Goodness		
<u>M</u>	3.36	3.60
<u>SD</u>	1.31	1.07
Carelessness		
<u>M</u>	4.23	4.43
<u>SD</u>	1.75	1.33
Foreseeability		
<u>M</u>	4.42	4.40
<u>SD</u>	2.62	1.09
Concern for Others		
<u>M</u>	3.67	3.80
<u>SD</u>	1.17	.93

2
VITA

Carla B. Goble

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: MORAL JUDGMENT: INTENTION AND CONSEQUENCE RECONSIDERED

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Durant, Oklahoma, March 8, 1946, the daughter of H. W. and Geneva Baker. Married Danney G. Goble on August 14, 1967. Mother of three children, Codie Jae, Geoffrey Clark, and Hannah Blythe Goble.

Education: Graduated from Edmond High School, Edmond, Oklahoma, on May 22, 1964; received Bachelor of Science in Education from Central State College in May, 1967; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1987.

Professional Experience: Elementary teacher, Soldier Creek Elementary School, Midwest City, Oklahoma, 1967 to 1969; Special Programs Instructor, Tulsa Junior College, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1979 to 1982; Director of Mothers' Day Out Program, All Souls Unitarian Church, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1979 to 1981; Preschool Teacher, Channing Day School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1981 to 1982; Director of Youth Programs, All Souls Unitarian Church, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1982 to 1985; Graduate Research Assistant, Oklahoma State University, 1985 to 1987; Psychology Instructor, Tulsa Junior College, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1986; Assistant to the Editor, Home Economics Research Journal, John C. McCullers, Editor, 1986; Graduate Teaching Assistant, Oklahoma State University, 1986 to 1987; Member of American Home Economics Association, Omicron Nu, Society for Research in Child Development, National Association for Education of Young Children, and Certified Home Economist.