

AN EMPIRICAL ATTEMPT TO DEVELOP A SCALE TO
MEASURE STRENGTH OF CONSCIENCE IN CHILDREN
OF THE AGE RANGE FOUND IN GRADE EIGHT IN THE
VANCOUVER SCHOOLS

by

STANLEY SOLOMON BLANK

B.A., University of British Columbia, 1957

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

PSYCHOLOGY

We accept this thesis as conforming to the
required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April, 1960

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Psychology

The University of British Columbia,
Vancouver 8, Canada.

Date April 13, 1960.

AN EMPIRICAL ATTEMPT TO DEVELOP A SCALE TO
MEASURE STRENGTH OF CONSCIENCE IN CHILDREN
OF THE AGE RANGE FOUND IN GRADE EIGHT IN THE
VANCOUVER SCHOOLS

Abstract

Historically, moral awareness and conscience have been considered matters for speculation by philosophers and moralists and it is difficult to find many studies that set out explicitly to gather empirical evidence concerning conscience. A few psychologists, however, have attempted to measure these phenomena. These studies can be criticized because the moral categories and questionnaire items used were derived by "armchair" methods rather than by empirical methods.

This study was undertaken as an attempt to develop, empirically, a reliable set of conscience items. From these items a scale to measure conscience in children of the age range found in grade eight in Vancouver schools could be constructed. In order to develop a set of conscience items by empirical methods, two tasks were undertaken:

1. To obtain empirical data regarding behavioural situations illustrating instances of moral awareness and conscience.
2. To construct, from these data, items describing these behavioural situations, to administer these items to a sample population and to test these items for reliability.

The data were collected by presenting to 200 grade eight students a word list of categories evolved in a previous study. The subjects were asked to write statements, from their own experience, which would illustrate the meaning of each of these words. In this manner 5,440 statements were collected from which were evolved 247 items. These items were checked for understanding by presenting them to a sample drawn from the original population.

Two scales were constructed from the original 247 items. Each of the scales was administered to 100 grade eight students and the results analysed. The analysis of the results consisted of testing the answers to the questionnaire items for significant differences in the way in which the subjects answered these items.

A limitation of this thesis is that it excludes any reference to the areas of Lust and Sex. This exclusion was a condition set by the Vancouver School Board in granting permission to conduct the study in one of the schools.

As a result of the analysis, it was concluded that of the original 247 items, 229 items would lend themselves to a scale which would measure conscience in both boys and girls of the age range found in grade eight in Vancouver. While such a scale is outlined in the present study, the checking of its reliability and validity is left for future study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is deeply grateful to his advisor, Dr. E. Signori, for his wise counsel and general guidance throughout the course of this study.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. R. F. Sharp, Superintendent of Schools, Dr. S. A. Miller, Director of Research and Special Services and Dr. E. N. Ellis, Assistant in Research and Testing, for arranging the availability of the school and subjects in the Vancouver School District.

The writer is grateful also to the Principal and staff of the school in which the study was conducted, for their co-operation.

CONTENTS

Chapter		page
1	Statement of the Problem	1
	Review of the Literature	3
	Introduction to the problem	3
	Review of subjective studies	3
	Review of objective studies	7
	Summary	22
11	Procedure	23
	Object of method	23
	Organization of study	23
	Collection of data	24
	Treatment of data	25
	Construction of questionnaires	26
	Administration of questionnaires	27
111	The Results and Their Statistical Treatment	28
	Results of identical items	28
	Results of questionnaire answers	28
	Discussion of the results	36
1V	Summary and Conclusions	38
	References	42
	Appendices	
A	Category headings	44
B	Number of items derived from each category and the frequency of report of each item as shown in the original data	49
C	Items presented to subjects to check for understanding	60
D	Questionnaire forms	68
E	Outline of suggested scale to measure conscience in children of the age range found in grade eight in Vancouver schools	88

TABLES

Table		page
I	Frequency of choices, χ^2 , P, df, for items tested for significant difference on boys' scale I	32
II	Frequency of choices, χ^2 , P, df, for items tested for significant difference on boys' scale II	33
III	Frequency of choices, χ^2 , P, df, for items tested for significant difference on girls' scale I	34
IV	Frequency of choices, χ^2 , P, df, for items tested for significant difference on girls' scale II	35
V	Items on which subjects' answers differed significantly at the .05 level of confidence	37

CHAPTER 1

1 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

While philosophers and moralists have produced a vast literature on the subject of conscience, psychologists have tended to neglect it and it is difficult to find many studies that set out explicitly to gather empirical evidence concerning conscience.

Indeed, past research has resulted for the most part in confusion and contention, not only regarding what conscience is and of what it consists, but also regarding how it develops.

The need for a means to describe and measure conscience has long been recognized by psychologists. However, in all previous studies conscience has been defined and questionnaires based on limited areas of conscience-feelings. To overcome these limitations Leedham (1956), in her study, does not rigidly define the content of conscience but takes it as being "that which causes individuals to have feelings of discomfort which they themselves might describe as twinges of conscience". In her study she has set out to describe the principal areas of moral awareness "as they are reflected in the broad pattern of conscience data obtained from a variety of groups of individuals", by collecting close to 4,000 statements from over 900 people representing various sections of the population. These were reduced, because of duplications, to 1,555 different items which were

classified into 760 general principles which were finally reduced to 75 categories.

The present study proposed to use these empirically developed categories as a basis for developing items which could be formulated into a scale which would measure conscience in children of the age range found in grade 8 in the Vancouver schools. This was done by presenting a group of 200 grade 8 children with 73 of Leedham's 75 categories which they were to use as topics for statements regarding instances of conscience-related behaviour. From the 5,440 statements thus obtained, some 250 different items were reduced and presented in a questionnaire to a second sample drawn from the grade 8 population. These items were then tested for reliability.

11 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction to the Problem

There have been only three studies in which the main concern was to construct a scale to measure conscience. These will be discussed in detail in the final pages of this review. Since Leedham (1956) has already made a rather complete survey of the theoretical and psychoanalytic literature, the purpose of this study will be better served by examining mainly those empirical studies wherein attempts have been made to develop scales to measure conscience, both in children and adults. These may be broadly classified as approaching conscience from two different angles. One may be called the subjective approach insofar as the subject himself observes and reports the workings of his mental processes. The second approach may then be called the objective approach insofar as the products of moral consciousness may be observed, rated and evaluated by a person other than the one who experiences.

Subjective Approach

In the opinion of many investigators in this field, the work of Jean Piaget (1932) should be one of the major sources for anyone who wishes to do research in the area of moral consciousness and conscience. His study was not an attempt to measure conscience

in any way but rather an investigation of the whole area of moral judgement of children. However, his work is of interest because he was one of the first to really examine this area using a scientific method.

His approach was to question children carefully, without suggestion, about pieces of behaviour described to them by means of stories and to observe them in their play in order to discover the rules by which they play and how they thought about moral problems. Piaget found that he could differentiate three types of behaviour which correspond to three types of rules. These behaviour manifestations he classified as motor, egocentric and cooperative, which are related to motor, coercive and rational rules. He finds that these patterns follow one another in a developmental sequence which is paralleled by personality growth, not as a clear-cut series of stages, but rather as blends of behaviour corresponding to the rule and the actual recognition of the rule. Parallels to this sequence may be found, he claims, in the relationship of the child to his parents and his fellows in the formation of a moral consciousness, and specifically of a sense of justice. In other words, a child's morality changes as he grows older from strict and specific moral rules deriving force from parental authority to more general principles supported by groups of equals.

Adopting Piaget's techniques, Lerner (1937) also utilized

story situations and presented supposedly conscience-laden stories to children and then questioned them regarding the actions of the various characters in the stories. Some slight attempt was made (one question out of a series) to have the subjects project themselves into the story but mostly the questions pertained to the subjects' opinions of another's actions. As in Piaget's case there was no report of any attempt to measure the reliability of the stories or the questions about these stories nor was there any report as to how the stories were arrived at. Thus it may be assumed that they are based on investigators' opinions as to what is or is not a conscience-laden situation. As a result of his study, Lerner noted a pattern of development in moral judgement of children in the United States similar to that found by Piaget.

Both Piaget's and Lerner's findings and theories were subjected to additional tests by MacRae (1954) to examine what he felt were the two main hypotheses involved in their work: (a) that the questions used involve a single underlying dimension or entity other than the child's age, and (b) that this dimension of moral judgement is associated with the type of authority relations to which the child is subjected. To test these hypotheses he conducted a study of the moral judgement of 244 boys aged 5 to 14 using a questionnaire composed of moral judgement stories about which the children were to express opinions as to which act of a pair of acts

was worse - and why. They were also to express an opinion about what the characters in the stories should have done - and why.

Based on his findings, MacRae hypothesizes that the Piaget-Lerner questions are more concerned with the child's cognitive moral development, while the questions relating to violations of norms are more closely related to his emotional moral development and hence to parental authority. Since MacRae does not describe how his questions and stories were arrived at except to say that they were much the same as Piaget's with slight changes, the question again arises whether they do tap the area of moral judgement and if so, how widely.

Horton (1937) also used a situation-like problem in his study of the truthfulness of boys and girls. He presented his subjects with a situation in which they were to pretend they had been given a gift by someone they liked and were then questioned by this person about their feelings regarding the gift. There were four questions and the children were to respond to the questions and then tell if their answers were truthful or not. While Horton assumes that this test does give some measure of honesty the question arises as to the possibility of the test measuring the presence of tact, as children grow older, rather than honesty.

Kecheissen (1945) added the use of diary material to traditional test methodology in her study of moral problems. She

asked 145 first-year girls in a Catholic high school to keep daily diaries of any instances that occurred which caused them anxiety or difficulty; in short, anything that constituted a problem of conduct. The diaries were kept for six months. The entries were then classified into faulty character traits. A check list was drawn up from the items in the diaries and the reliability of the entries checked by having the subjects check off (after a lapse of three months) any situation which they had experienced. In this way the author arrived at a list that she considered covered all the necessary moral situations in which the subjects had found themselves. However, since the investigation was limited to girls of the Catholic faith, its findings must be so limited. Further, since the girls knew that the diaries were to be examined by another person, many experiences may have been omitted and thus some vital areas of moral awareness may have been missed. Finally, as a method of measuring moral problems this seems too time-consuming.

Objective Approach

A number of the studies that have used this approach have contributed to the knowledge of the development of moral consciousness.

The actual content of the developed moral consciousness could be inferred (for particular populations) from studies done by Brogan (1923). These studies revealed a positive correlation

between the frequency of offences committed and the degree of their offensiveness which would indicate that moral consciousness does not necessarily correspond to behaviour.

In his first study, Brogan developed a scale of moral values. Brogan felt that the first step in developing such a scale would be to have the public (from which his sample would be drawn) make a list of moral topics. To do this he had college students make a list of the ten worst practices among the students in the university; he then picked out the sixteen most mentioned items. This list was arranged in alphabetical order and presented to 1,000 students at the University of Texas with instructions to rank order the items from the worst practice to the least offensive. He checked the reliability of his list by having many groups submit subsequent lists.

The chief criticisms of this study lie in Brogan's using such broad terms as selfishness, idleness, etc. without defining them or relating them to actual behaviour situations. Thus the meaning of terms could vary from locale to locale or even from person to person in the same locale. Further, by simply having subjects rank items, one can get no idea of how badly they view any item outside the scale; that is, is it very bad or just a little bad, etc., but only its relative position on the particular scale presented.

However, Brogan's use of items obtained from the students themselves was commendable when contrasted with so many studies

in which the scale constructor made up his own lists.

Thompson (1949) also based his behaviour lists on material obtained from students. He asked boys and girls from grades 6 to 12 to list behaviour which would be praised or blamed by other children their own age. These responses were analysed into 29 categories of blame responses and 27 categories of praise responses. Slides consisting of the ten most frequently mentioned praise and blame categories in each combination were made up and presented to a new population. While this method of empirically obtaining data for the study of moral awareness is praiseworthy, yet, as in the case of Brogan's study the use of the general terms of the categories in the second phase of the study is not satisfactory because of the possible confusion in the precise meaning of terms.

Of great interest in regard to the changes that take place in the individual are the studies of Lincoln and Shields (1931) and McGrath (1923).

On the basis of the results of the Shields moral judgement examination as administered to more than 1,300 students, Lincoln and Shields concluded that there is a gradual development of moral judgement from childhood to maturity. While they could not determine the age of maturity, they felt it most certainly occurred well over sixteen on the average. (The authors claim that this gradual development of moral judgement is well illustrated by the reaction of

individuals of various ages in the vocabulary test). The scale used by Lincoln and Shields consisted of eight groups of tests (similar in form to the Stanford-Binet) which were selected on an a priori basis of "conventional morality"; that is, on the basis of "generally" accepted standards, both social and legal. The placement of the tests in the various age levels was determined on the basis of what the average child of any age can do. The reliability of the scale was determined by the Spearman-Brown method using odd and even items for correlation. Since the authors do not indicate how they arrived at the generally accepted standards of conventional morality it may be assumed that this was the result of their own determination and had no empirical basis. Also, since the test was obviously highly dependent on verbal skills, it is possible that the results may have been distorted because of a lack of complete understanding of the vocabulary and sentence structure used rather than of the moral concepts described in the test.

McGrath, whose study also ended in an instrument resembling the Stanford-Binet in form and method of scoring, found that the child in his development first comes to a realization of duty to God, then to his neighbor and himself, and finally to social groups. The tests she used to measure moral knowledge were in three groups: a series of questions and exercises, a group of pictures about which questions were to be answered, and finally a number of stories regarding which

the subjects were to express opinions. The author states that "in compiling these three groups the attempt was made to touch upon the most vital and concrete problems that the average child is called upon to meet", and then says that the original items were taken from literary sources such as "The Baltimore Catechism", "A Child's Bible History", "Sunday School Lesson" and school readers. The assumption is therefore that these sources rather than the children themselves are the ultimate authorities of what are the most vital and concrete problems a child is called upon to meet. Since no scientific evidence is presented to substantiate such an assumption, it may be considered open to question. While McGrath's test is probably less dependent on intellectual achievement than that of Lincoln and Shields, it would seem to be restricted to areas based upon religious precepts and to adult versions of what problems should concern children.

The changes in what may be called the moral consciousness of society have been of great interest to several investigators in this field. In his study of the changes in moral judgement over time, Crissman (1942) used a rating scale in which he asked college students to evaluate 50 acts, each of which posed some relatively familiar and concrete situation or instance of behaviour. The questionnaire was administered to 848 college students from two widely separated universities. Of the 848 replies, 295 were secured in 1929 and 553

in 1939. The respondents were asked to rate each of the 50 acts on a ten point scale of wrongness, from most wrong to not wrong at all. The author found that the judgements of the women were almost uniformly more severe than those of the men in respect to items dealing with premarital sex relations and adultery. He further found that in regard to temporal change the total average rating of all 50 items by the 1939 group is but .032 more severe than that by the 1929 group; too small to be significant. While Crissman's questionnaire is laudable in that well defined situations are used as the basis for the ratings he does not state how these situations were arrived at. Thus it could be assumed that they are based on the author's own judgement as to what constitutes a moral situation, a procedure that leaves much to be desired in a scientific investigation.

A long-term study, done at ten year intervals since 1923, has been reported by Pressey and Jones (1955). The authors used the Pressey X - O tests in their study: however, it is only the third of these tests, the moral discrimination and experience test, that concerns this survey. This test consists of 25 lists of five moral terms each. The respondent is asked to cross out such of the items he thinks are wrong and then circle the one item in the line that he thinks is worst. The authors found a decrease in the number of borderline acts, such as smoking, considered wrong. There was also a decreasing condemnation of, and an increasing liking for certain

freedoms in sex-social relationships and social amusements. They also found no change in what they felt were the more basic aspects of morality such as social responsibility. However; these last two studies lose value because the terms used are broad and undefined which may well have made for various interpretations in meaning and use of terms. Further, since the authors do not indicate how they arrived at the "moral" terms used, the validity of these terms is open to question.

Whitlow (1935), who used a questionnaire similar to the X - O test for his study of attitudes and behaviour of high school students, is to be criticized on the same basis as Pressey in his choosing of items. As a result of this limitation it may be concluded that all the author is getting is an indication as to which of the items he presents, the respondents think are worst and not a true indication of what they think are moral situations.

While Eberhart's study (1942) was not properly a test of conscience, yet it did seek to find what changes take place in boys' rankings of property offences from grades 1 to 12 and how this compares with those of adults. The results indicated steady progress towards adult norms. Fear of punishment was a chief factor in children's judgements, while older people gave diverse reasons showing concern for others. Two tests were used by Eberhart; these were statements and pictures. The statements were derived from

20 offences from life histories of delinquents. These were ranked and grouped into four categories: property in the home, lost property, property having many owners and property owned by one person. By pairing the various items, 190 pairs were evolved. The respondents were asked to judge which deed was the worst in each pair. Since the original items for the test were selected on an a priori basis from a limited source, its validity as a general measure of attitude towards property is open to question; also there is no indication of an attempt to establish the reliability of the test.

In his investigation, Beller (1949) found an overall drop in honesty with increasing age. However, with this increasing age there was also, he found, a trend to higher ideals of honesty rather than a tendency to behave honestly. In order to measure this attitude component, Beller constructed a scale comprised of ten items each of which was chosen as representing a concrete situation. These items were obtained by reviewing previous studies and interviewing teachers, scoutmasters and ministers. The scale was administered to nine, twelve and fifteen year old boys who were asked to review the situation in the scale and predict their own behaviour in each instance as well as indicating how they felt they "ought" to act in each case. The reliability of the scale was found to range from .68 - .88 by the split-half method corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula. Once again the criticism can be made that there is no

evidence of just how meaningful the items used were to the respondents, since they were selected by an adult from a group of items supplied by other adults.

In studying the effect of training on moral character, Voelker (1921) compared a control group and an experimental group, to whom special ethical instruction had been given, on various situational tests designed to measure trustworthiness. The situations were so designed as to provide the subjects with opportunities to steal, cheat, not return lost articles, accept credit not due them, to accept overcharge, etc. As a result of his tests Voelker concluded that trustworthiness is improved by special training and that morality is more susceptible than intellect to education. While Voelker felt that it was only through placing subjects in actual situations that a true assessment of an individual's purpose and ability to carry out this purpose could be achieved, this type of study leaves itself open to criticism from several angles. Firstly, there is the unwieldiness, both as to cost and time, of individual testing for large numbers. Secondly, there is both the unknown effect of the judges on the subjects and the impossibility of controlling bias on the part of the judges in their judgements of the subjects' reactions, which in turn leads to a questioning of the value and reliability of these judgements. This method of investigating moral problems can be criticized also on the basis of the impossibility of creating actual situations for other areas

of moral awareness such as killing, sex morality, etc.

Hartshorne and May (1927), whose Character Education Inquiry produced results which contradict Voelker's findings, investigated among other things the possibility of measuring the knowledge of right and wrong in children. They state in their study that in the planning of such tests it is necessary to cover as wide a range of moral experience as possible but in attempting to do this they themselves were guilty of setting limits on their tests. Instead of either studying the children or obtaining the limits from the children themselves they "did the best we could with the knowledge of life and of children we happen to possess". Thus in some of their tests they presented words they considered to be morally significant and the choices from which the children were to pick out what they thought best described what would result from the descriptive words. In other tests they gave statements of situations they devised and a choice of resulting actions. While the results of the tests allowed certain deductions within their frameworks, these frameworks were of necessity limited to a set of criteria decided upon by the authors and could not be assumed to have tapped the complete range of moral understanding or experience of the subjects tested for any particular area of moral awareness.

As was stated at the beginning of this survey, there have been only three studies that have had as their main concern the

construction of a scale to measure conscience. These are the studies done by McCord and McCord (1956) in their overall investigation of delinquency; Friedenberg and Havighurst (1948) and Dunstan Wack (1952). The first of these was an investigation the purpose of which was to provide an instrument which would measure what the authors considered to be the "core" of conscience, that is "feelings of social inhibition of socialized guilt". In order to measure what they term internalized guilt feelings, McCord and McCord constructed a questionnaire which utilized ten stories, each of which described a situation in which a boy named "Bob" had violated some standard of social behaviour. Each subject was asked "How does Bob feel?" with regard to such acts as stealing cake, telling a teacher he did not like her, stealing from a store, running into someone with a bike, killing a man, setting a house on fire, and several other acts of varying seriousness. The responses given could generally be classified as indicating fear, happiness or guilt. The results obtained with this questionnaire showed differences between delinquent and non-delinquent groups that the authors considered significant. However, in the construction of this questionnaire two unwarranted assumptions seem to have been made. These are (a) that the ten stories fully covered the whole area of conscience even as defined by the authors and (b) that the subjects would project themselves (if indeed they could do so) as the individual in the stories. There is no evidence of any

attempt to obtain examples from the subjects' own experience.

The test used by Friedenberg and Havighurst in their study, "An attempt to measure strength of conscience", consisted of two protocols which formed what they called a "C-questionnaire". It consisted of the A-protocol or "How bad is it?" questionnaire and the B-protocol or "How would you feel?" questionnaire. The A-protocol asks the subjects for their judgements with respect to their own moral standards of behaviour, listed as if it was performed by another child. The B-protocol asks the subject to consider how he, himself, would feel if he performed these acts. Both protocols consisted of the same 115 items covering eleven main categories of behaviour; loyalty, honesty, self-control, responsibility, ego-ideal, kindness, cleanliness, moral courage, religion, authority and miscellaneous taboos. A twelfth category included items the authors believed to be neutral or positive according to typical prevailing moral standards. All the items were couched in concrete terms such as "killed birds or other small animals". The reliability of the first questionnaire was determined by the split-half method using odd and even items, while that of the second questionnaire was determined by test-retest with a one year lapse between testings. In both cases reliability was high. The subjects were asked to indicate their judgements by checking off one of "very, very bad", "bad", "not bad", "not good", or "good". The questions were simply worded

so that intellectual influences would not affect the test result.

The difference in the scores on the two questionnaires was expected to give a measure of the strength of conscience since the authors believed that this depended on the extent to which the subject judged his own actions more severely than those of others. The authors concluded after a subjective analysis of the instrument that it did not measure strength of conscience as an isolable character trait. They further concluded that the "How would you feel?" questionnaire was probably the closest to a valid measure of conscience. It should be noted that the authors give no indication of how the items or categories were evolved which leads to the conclusion that they may have been developed on the basis of their own judgement rather than through empirical investigation.

The purpose of Wack's study was to investigate the relationship between moral consciousness and conscience which he defines as "that function of personality by which a person recognizes a moral value in a concrete situation and responds positively with a feeling of obligation to do the good and avoid the evil --- conscience puts in its appearance when a decision has to be made concerning one's own behaviour", (Wack, 1952, p.2). In his investigation of this relationship, two instruments were designed to measure these aspects of personality. These were the "Examination of Conscience", a subjective self-rating scale, and the "Reaction to a Moral Stimulus"

or "RMS" scale, a battery of five tests measuring moral consciousness. The items for the first questionnaire were constructed to cover the Ten Commandments and were to be rated by the subjects as to both the degree and frequency of the sin committed. The RMS scale was constructed from items covering five areas of morality: God, family, property, sex and society. The subjects were asked how they would feel if they were to do certain acts. The items used in this scale were those judged pertinent to the test by judges (moral theologians) from a pool of items constructed by the author. In order to hold as many variables constant as possible, the subjects were selected, to obtain a fairly homogeneous sample, from two Catholic boarding colleges in the midwest. Reliability, estimated from the Spearman-Brown formula, was reported to be .958.

Wack concluded from his study that conscience and moral consciousness are related and that an instrument for measuring conscience and moral consciousness had been developed.

However, since this study was carried out on a particular population only, the applicability of its findings are limited to such a population; that is, of the Roman Catholic faith. A further restriction is the use of terms which have meaning mainly to individuals of this faith.

As a result of her survey of studies in this field, Leedham (1956) undertook to "map out the general areas of behaviour that have

moral implications, and to educe general principles upon which individuals may make moral decisions". After a comprehensive review of the theoretical and experimental literature Leedham concludes that there are few theories regarding conscience and moral awareness which have a valid basis in empirical evidence and which have been verified through investigation. As a result of her conclusion she has endeavored to determine the main areas of moral awareness and conscience as shown by empirical data.

In the collection of data, 944 persons from various sections of the population contributed 3,952 statements regarding situations or behaviour which caused them to "feel guilty or have twinges of conscience". These were narrowed down, because of duplication, to 1,555 different items. Other sources such as law books, previously developed scales were also searched for data. Categories were defined by a group of judges and the 1,555 items were classified. Three judges then scrutinized them to ascertain aptness of each item. From these items and categories 760 general principles were drawn out and formulated under 75 categories such as anger, arguing, injustice, favoritism, etc. (Leedham, 1956, p.122-126). The categories were organized along the dimension of "Behaviour"; that is, the basic activity underlying the wrong-doing, rather than the person or thing to whom it was done or the setting in which it was done.

SUMMARY

This review has surveyed those studies which have had as their purpose the development, through scientific methods, of instruments for the measuring of moral awareness and conscience. An attempt has been made to emphasize their methodology so that their strengths and weaknesses might provide a guide in the construction of reliable items from which a scale to measure conscience might be built.

As a result of this survey it has been concluded that the common weaknesses of past studies might be avoided by developing a scale by empirical inductive methods rather than the usual deductive approach which leads to the definition of questionnaire items based on some pre-conceived theory of moral awareness.

The specific task in this study has been to develop reliable items which can be used to construct a questionnaire to measure conscience, in children of the ages found in grade eight in the Vancouver schools, which will avoid the weaknesses found in previous studies; that is, restriction to particular religious faiths, limited areas of moral awareness, costly and time consuming instruments, items based on questionable and unwarranted assumptions.

CHAPTER 11

PROCEDURE

Object of Method

As was stated earlier, the object of this study was to develop empirically a reliable set of conscience items. From these items a scale to measure conscience in children of the age range found in grade 8 of the Vancouver schools could be constructed. In order to accomplish this a sample of the population concerned was presented with the names of conscience categories developed in a previous study (Leedham, 1956). These names were to be used as topics about which the subjects were asked to write statements describing various behavioural situations. From these statements various items were evolved and presented in questionnaire form to a sample population, after which the items were tested for reliability. In following this procedure it was hoped that some of the limitations of previous studies would be overcome.

Organization of Study

The study was divided into two sections, the work on the first necessarily preceding that of the second. The first section was concerned with obtaining empirical data regarding behavioural situations illustrating instances of moral awareness and conscience.

The second section was concerned with constructing, from these data, items describing these behavioural situations, the administering of these items to a sample population, and finally the testing of the items for reliability.

Collection of Data

A word list was made up from the titles of the 75 conscience categories developed by Leedham (1956) and was presented to Dr. S. A. Miller of the department of Research and Special Services of the Vancouver School Board, together with a letter requesting permission to use the grade 8 students in one of the secondary schools as subjects for this study. Permission to conduct the study was granted on condition that two of the categories (Lust and Sex) were omitted. The need to omit these two categories was unfortunate since this omission limits the scope of the present study as the place these areas occupy in the subjects' moral awareness remains unknown. A new list was made up of the remaining 73 categories and was presented to 100 grade 8 boys and 100 grade 8 girls. The subjects were instructed to write statements from their own experience which would explain or illustrate the meaning of each of the words on the list. In this manner 5,440 statements were collected. These statements constituted the raw data from which the final items were developed. Appendix A lists the category headings used in the word list from which the

subjects were to form the statements.

Treatment of Data

After the statements had been collected, they were examined and grouped in their respective categories. Each category was then examined and all similar statements; that is, those which clearly expressed the same idea, were grouped together. Following this examination a frequency count was made of each statement in each of the categories. In this manner a total number of responses for each category was derived. Items were then constructed from those statements which the greatest number of subjects had chosen. The language used in the construction of the items was the same as that used by the subjects themselves when supplying the original statements. The number of items taken from each category was determined on the basis of one item for every twenty responses. Thus if there were 180 responses made to a category there would be 9 items taken from this category. In this way 247 items were selected. Appendix B lists the number of items derived from each category as well as the frequency of report of each item as shown in the original data.

In order to check for understanding of the items, lists containing all 247 items were presented to 35 subjects selected from the original population with directions that they indicate any statement

which they did not understand. The results indicated that all items were clearly understood. Appendix C lists the items as they were presented in the check for understanding.

Following the check for understanding, the items were arranged in order of frequency of report; that is, from those most frequently chosen to those least chosen as indicated in the original data collected.

Construction of Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were constructed using alternate items on each questionnaire. That is, the first questionnaire was made up of items 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11 and so on, while the second questionnaire was made up of items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and so on. The items were originally listed in order of those most frequently chosen to those least chosen, as indicated in the original data collected. By alternating the items on the two questionnaires it was felt that the questionnaires would be as evenly balanced as possible with regard to the frequency of report of their items.

The questionnaires themselves were so constructed that each item presented the subjects with a statement phrased in the first person. That is, each item began with either: "If I were to ---" or "If I were not to ---". Thus an item would be phrased as follows: "If I were to hurt animals, I would feel ---". Four

choices of : "not bad at all", "not too badly", "quite badly" and "terrible" were presented after each statement and the subjects were asked to indicate which of these choices most closely indicated their feelings about the situation described by the statement. For purposes of convenience the two questionnaires were called Scale I and Scale II. Appendix D shows the two questionnaire forms.

Administration of Questionnaires

The questionnaires were administered to three grade 8 girls' classes and three grade 8 boys' classes (all of the classes were heterogeneous as regards I.Q.); a total of 100 grade 8 girls and 100 grade 8 boys. The questionnaires were distributed in such a way that the subjects sitting in the even numbered seats were given the Scale I questionnaire and those sitting in the odd numbered seats were given the Scale II questionnaire. Because of school period schedules, all subjects were limited to 50 minutes for answering the questionnaire. However, this would seem to have been ample time since all subjects were finished well before the time limit.

CHAPTER 111

THE RESULTS AND THEIR STATISTICAL TREATMENT

Altogether, 200 grade eight students contributed 5,440 statements in the raw data. From these statements 247 different items were derived.

Results of Identical Items

Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 70, 71, 72, 73 of Scale 11 and items 48, 50, 51, 52, 55, 64, 72, 93, 100, 104 of Scale 1 are identical items. The responses made to these items were tabulated and tested and showed no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence using the following formula for chi-square (χ^2):

$$\chi^2 = \frac{N \left((AD-BC) - \frac{N}{2} \right)^2}{(A+B)(C+D)(A+C)(B+D)} \quad (\text{Siegel, 1956})$$

As a result of testing these identical items it was assumed that there was no essential difference in the way the two groups were answering the questionnaires and that the results could be treated as if the same subjects were replying to all 247 items.

Results of Questionnaire Answers

In analysing the answered questionnaires for reliability, it was decided to treat the girls and boys as two separate groups

since it was felt that there might well be sex differences that would not be revealed if they were all treated as one large group. While this study did not concern itself with sex differences in the analysis of the answered questionnaires, it was felt that by separating the results into these two groups (boys and girls) the separated information would be available for study at some future time. As an added control it was decided to randomize the questionnaires before trying to tally the answers. Since in each case (boys and girls) there were 50 Scale I and 50 Scale II questionnaires, it was possible to use the short method for randomizing items from 0 to 50 described by Edwards (1950, p.23). Thus for the two groups (boys and girls) the 50 questionnaires of each scale were randomly separated into 2 groups of 25. The answers were tallied and then tabulated. In this way it was possible to examine the results of the questionnaires to determine if there was any significant difference in the way in which the various groups responded to the items on the questionnaires.

The first step in examining the results was to pick out, by inspection of the tabulated answers, those items on which the groups being compared seemed to obviously differ. In this way, those items which provoked the greatest differences could be examined more closely. The statistical examination consisted of testing the null hypothesis, viz. that there was no significant difference in the

way in which the various groups answered the items on the questionnaires. A "P" of .05 was chosen as the critical point and any item on which chi-square was of a size that "P" was .05 or less was held to indicate a significant difference in the way in which the various groups answered it. If chi-square was of a size where "P" was .06 or larger, then it was assumed that there was no significant difference in the way in which the various groups answered that item. (Garrett, 1958, p.255). It was felt that if there was no significant difference in the way in which the various groups answered those items in which the greatest discrepancies occurred it could be safely assumed that there would be no significant difference in the way in which they answered the remaining items.

Table I shows the results of the tests for significant differences on those items answered by the boys on Scale I. Table II shows the results of the tests for significant differences on those items answered by the boys on Scale II. Table III shows the results of the tests on those items answered by the girls on Scale I and Table IV the results of the tests on those items answered by the girls on Scale II. These chi-square results were obtained using the formula:

$$\chi^2 = \frac{N^2}{A_t B_t} \left[\frac{B_i^2}{A_i + B_i} - \frac{B_t^2}{A_t + B_t} \right] \quad (\text{McNemar, } 1949, \text{ p.208})$$

This was checked against the results obtained using the longer formula described by Siegel (1956, p. 107) and the results were found to be the same. However, this method was not applicable for those items where there was a zero frequency on any of the choices (Siegel, 1956, p. 104 - 110). For these items the following formula was used:

$$\chi^2 = \frac{N \left(\left[\frac{AD}{(A+B)(C+D)} - \frac{BC}{(A+C)(B+D)} \right] - \frac{N}{2} \right)^2}{(A+B)(C+D)(A+C)(B+D)} \quad (\text{Siegel, 1956, p. 109})$$

An examination of Tables I and II showed that none of the items answered by the boys' groups being compared on Scale I showed any significant difference at the .05 level of confidence; two items, viz. 90 and 141 on Scale II however, did show a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in the way the two groups of boys answered them. An examination of Tables III and IV showed that on Scale I there was a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in the way in which the girls answered items 11, 53, 84, 89 and 129; on Scale II there was a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in the way in which the girls answered items 2, 48, 60, 61, 87, 91, 94, 107, 109, 128 and 130.

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY OF CHOICES, χ^2 , P, df FOR ITEMS TESTED FOR
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ON BOYS' SCALE 1

Item	Frequencies of Choices								χ^2	P*	df
	group 1				group 11						
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4			
5	4	6	10	4	1	4	10	10	4.80	.20	3
15	3	5	15	2	0	6	14	5	.10	.70	1
19	0	4	5	16	0	1	15	9	.89	.30	1
22	10	5	10	0	4	8	11	1	.11	.70	1
23	9	11	5	0	9	8	5	1	.01	.90	1
24	1	5	12	7	4	6	11	4	2.74	.50	3
27	1	3	12	9	0	3	12	9	.002	.95	1
28	8	10	5	2	9	9	5	2	.108	.98	3
29	3	5	7	10	2	4	9	10	.616	.90	3
33	5	1	4	15	4	5	5	11	2.512	.50	3
50	13	5	5	2	9	9	5	2	1.036	.70	3
68	0	2	8	14	0	2	15	8	.230	.60	1
78	3	5	14	3	3	3	10	9	4.140	.20	3
95	0	2	3	15	0	1	5	19	.040	.95	1
103	3	11	5	5	1	10	12	2	4.868	.20	3
104	9	11	4	1	8	7	9	1	2.648	.50	3
105	0	3	11	11	0	4	15	6	.700	.40	1
128	1	8	9	7	2	3	16	4	5.396	.15	3
129	7	7	6	5	2	7	10	6	3.848	.25	3
146	10	5	6	4	6	3	12	4	3.468	.30	3

* Any item with a "P" of less than .06 is considered to show a significant difference in the way in which the various groups of boys answered it.

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY OF CHOICES, χ^2 , P, df FOR ITEMS TESTED FOR
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ON BOYS' SCALE 11

Item	Frequencies of Choices								χ^2	P*	df
	group I				group II						
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4			
16	0	5	7	8	0	2	9	9	0.690	.40	1
27	6	1	5	3	4	6	4	10	5.690	.15	3
30	5	6	4	10	2	11	6	5	4.776	.20	3
45	2	10	6	7	0	9	12	1	0.037	.85	1
47	7	5	6	5	1	6	9	9	6.190	.10	3
69	0	4	11	9	0	0	11	14	2.600	.10	1
79	1	4	17	3	0	7	19	6	0.910	.30	1
83	1	12	9	3	0	4	15	6	5.600	.02	1
90	0	0	6	19	0	2	6	17	4.700	.04	1
109	1	0	5	19	0	0	5	20	0.001	.99	1
123	0	0	15	9	2	6	7	10	11.800	.001	1
128	1	3	13	7	1	4	6	14	5.010	.15	3
141	0	0	2	23	0	2	3	20	4.680	.04	1

* Any item with a "P" of less than .06 is considered to show a significant difference in the way in which the various groups of boys answered it.

TABLE 111

FREQUENCY OF CHOICES, χ^2 , P, df FOR ITEMS TESTED FOR
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ON GIRLS' SCALE 1

Item	Frequencies of Choices								χ^2	P*	df
	group I				group II						
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4			
2	0	6	9	10	1	1	15	8	1.300	.20	1
11	0	0	7	18	0	2	4	19	3.700	.05	1
12	10	10	3	2	7	8	9	0	1.100	.30	1
33	0	7	4	14	1	1	6	17	2.200	.10	1
53	2	4	10	9	2	1	19	3	7.580	.05	3
76	1	2	8	14	0	0	10	15	0.440	.05	1
84	0	0	9	15	2	0	8	15	4.600	.04	1
89	0	0	8	17	1	0	7	17	4.100	.04	1
129	2	2	9	11	5	3	15	2	13.320	.01	3
135	1	1	9	14	1	1	3	20	3.400	.30	3
137	2	4	8	11	2	2	3	18	4.530	.20	3

* Any item with a "P" of less than .06 is considered to show a significant difference in the way in which the various groups of girls answered it.

TABLE IV

FREQUENCY OF CHOICES, χ^2 , P, df FOR ITEMS TESTED FOR
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ON GIRLS' SCALE 11

Item	Frequencies of Choices								χ^2	p*	df
	group 1				group 11						
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4			
2	2	3	15	4	2	3	13	7	15.36	.001	3
28	1	2	9	13	0	0	9	16	1.50	.20	1
31	1	4	10	10	1	0	12	12	1.90	.15	1
48	0	0	3	21	1	0	1	23	4.20	.04	1
53	3	5	12	4	5	4	7	9	3.80	.25	3
60	0	0	8	17	1	1	5	18	3.70	.05	1
61	0	0	12	13	1	1	9	14	3.70	.05	1
81	4	1	11	8	2	1	7	15	3.74	.30	3
87	0	0	12	13	1	1	8	13	3.70	.05	1
91	0	0	8	17	1	1	8	15	3.70	.05	1
94	0	0	7	17	1	0	7	17	4.10	.04	1
96	0	1	7	17	0	0	3	22	0.01	.99	1
107	0	0	6	19	0	1	5	19	4.10	.04	1
109	0	0	5	20	2	0	3	19	4.90	.04	1
115	0	3	10	12	0	0	11	14	1.40	.20	1
118	0	2	6	17	0	0	5	20	0.74	.30	1
128	0	0	7	18	1	0	5	19	4.10	.04	1
130	0	0	12	13	1	0	11	13	4.10	.04	1

* Any item with a "P" of less than .06 is considered to show a significant difference in the way in which the various groups of girls answered it.

Discussion of the Results

As was explained earlier in this chapter, it was felt that if those items on which the subjects differed most widely by inspection, were tested statistically and were found not to differ significantly, then it would be safe to assume that the balance of the items would not differ significantly. The results of the statistical examination are listed in Tables I to IV. Table V lists those items on which the subjects did differ significantly in their answers, at the .05 level of confidence.

The results of this examination thus indicate that as far as the boys were concerned all the items except items 90 and 141 on Scale II were reliable items. As far as the girls were concerned, all items except items 11, 53, 84, 89 and 129 on Scale I and items 2, 28, 60, 61, 87, 91, 94, 107, 109, 128 and 130 on Scale II were reliable items.

Thus it is concluded that all items excepting those mentioned above are reliable both for girls and boys of the ages found in grade 8 in the Vancouver schools.

It is not presumed that all the areas of moral awareness have been tapped by these items. However, it is felt that these items will provide a basis for further examination of this field.

TABLE V

ITEMS ON WHICH SUBJECTS' ANSWERS DIFFERED
SIGNIFICANTLY AT THE .05 LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE

Scale	BOYS		Scale	GIRLS	
	Item	P		Item	P
11	90	.04	1	11	.05
11	141	.04	1	53	.05
			1	84	.04
			1	89	.04
			1	129	.01
			11	2	.001
			11	28	.04
			11	60	.05
			11	61	.05
			11	87	.05
			11	91	.05
			11	94	.04
			11	107	.04
			11	109	.04
			11	128	.04
			11	130	.04

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was undertaken as an attempt to develop, empirically, reliable items from which a scale could be constructed, which would measure conscience in children of the age range found in grade 8 in the Vancouver schools. In order to develop these items two main tasks were set:

- (1) To obtain empirical data regarding behavioural situations illustrating instances of moral awareness and conscience.
- (2) To construct from this data, items describing these behavioural situations; to administer the items to a sample population and to test for reliability.

In order to avoid the weaknesses of previous studies and to benefit from their experiences, a review of the literature pertaining to the empirical investigations of moral problems has been made. Special attention has been given to the three previous attempts to measure conscience by McCord and McCord (1956), Friedenberg and Havighurst (1948) and Wack (1952). An examination of their limitations, assumptions, aims and methods has been made. Particular attention was paid to the study done by Leedham (1956) upon whose work this study was based.

In describing the method used in the present study, emphasis was placed upon the manner in which the data was collected, the way

in which the items were constructed and the procedure followed in testing these items for reliability.

The data was collected by presenting to 200 grade 8 students a word list of the categories evolved in a previous study (Leedham, 1956) and asking them to write statements from their own experience, which would illustrate the meaning of each of these words. Permission was sought to use the grade 8 students in one of the Vancouver secondary schools for the purposes of this study. This permission was granted on the condition that two of the categories, Lust and Sex, be omitted from the word list presented to the students. Accordingly, a revised list of the categories omitting these two categories was used. In this way, 5,440 statements were collected from which were evolved 247 items. These items were checked for understanding by presenting them to a sample drawn from the original population.

Two scales, each containing 146 items, were constructed from the original 247 items. Duplicate items were placed in the questionnaires to provide a check on the similarity of the groups answering the questionnaires. An examination of the answers to these duplicate items showed that there was no significant difference, at the .05 level of confidence, in the way in which the groups answered them. As a result, it was felt safe to assume that the results could be treated as if the same subjects were replying to

all 247 items.

The two questionnaires were administered to 200 grade 8 students in one of the Vancouver secondary schools. The analysis of the results consisted of testing the answers of the boys and girls separately for both questionnaires, for any significant difference in the way various groups answered the items. The results of the statistical examination showed that of the 247 original items, 229 could be considered reliable at the .05 level of confidence for both boys and girls, but that for the boys alone, 245 items could be considered reliable at the .05 level of confidence. These findings indicate the possibility for investigation into sex differences in the way in which these items were answered. However, since this was not the concern of the present study, it is left for future consideration.

Thus it is felt that it is safe to conclude that of the original 247 items, 229 would lend themselves to a scale which would measure conscience in both boys and girls of the age range found in grade 8 in the Vancouver schools, and that 245 items would lend themselves to a scale which would measure conscience in boys alone of this age range.

The next step in the study of conscience in children of the ages found in grade 8, is to actually use these items to construct a scale to measure conscience. Such a scale is outlined in Appendix E. This scale would be applicable to both boys and girls of the age range

found in grade 8 in the Vancouver schools. It is hoped that when the validity and reliability of this scale is checked and found satisfactory, that some of the problems long plaguing psychologists in this field will be brought closer to solution.

REFERENCES

- BELLER, E. K., Two attitude components in younger boys, J. Soc. Psychol., 1949, 29, 137-151.
- BROGAN, A. P., A study in statistical ethics, Int. J. Eth., 1923, 33, 119-134.
- CRISSMAN, P., Temporal changes and sexual differences in moral judgement, J. Soc. Psychol., 1942, 16, 29-38.
- EBERHART, J. C., Attitudes toward property: a genetic study by the paired comparisons rating of offences, J. Genet. Psychol., 1942, 60, 3-35.
- EDWARDS, A. L., Experimental design in psychological research, New York, Rinehart and Co., 1950, 23.
- FRIEDENBERG, E. Z., and HAVIGHURST, R. J., An attempt to measure strength of conscience, J. Personality, 1948, 17, 232-243.
- GARRETT, H. E., Statistics in psychology and education, Toronto, Longman's, Green and Co., 1958.
- HARTSHORNE, H. and May, M.A., Testing the knowledge of right and wrong, Rel. Ed. Assoc. Monog., No. 1, July, 1927.
- HORTON, B. J., The truthfulness of boys and girls in public and private schools, J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1936-37, 31, 398-495.
- KECHEISSEN, M. G., An empirical study of moral problems and character traits of high school pupils, Stud. Psychol. Psychiat. Cathol. Univ. Amer., 1945, 6, No. 6.
- LEEDHAM, L. R., An empirical investigation into areas of moral awareness and the formation of principles basic to the construction of a scale to measure conscience, Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1956.
- LERNER, G., The problem of perspective in moral reasoning, Amer. J. Social., 1937, 43, 249-269.

- LINCOLN, E. and SHIELDS, F., An age scale for the measurement of moral judgements, J. Educ. Res., 1931, 23, 193-197.
- McCORD, Wm. and McCORD, Joan, Psychopathy and Delinquency, New York, Greene and Stratton, 1956, 136-138, 215-216.
- McGRATH, M. C., A study in the moral development of children, Psychol. Monog., 1923, 32, No. 2.
- McNEMAR, Q., Psychological Statistics, New York, John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1949.
- McRAE, D., Jr., A test of Piaget's theories of moral development, J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1954, 49, 14-18.
- PIAGET, J., The moral judgement of the child, trans. M. Gabain, London, Paul, Trench Trubner, 1932.
- PRESSEY, S. L., Changes from 1923 to 1943 in the attitudes of public school and university students, J. Psychol., 1946, 21, 173-188.
- PRESSEY, S. L. and JONES, A. W., 1923 to 1953 and 20 to 60 age changes in moral codes, anxieties and interests as shown by the "X-O" test, J. Psychol., 1955, 39, 485-502.
- SIEGEL, S., Nonparametric statistics for the behavioural sciences, Toronto, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.
- THOMPSON, G. C., Age trends in social values during the adolescent years, Amer. Psychol., 1949, 4, 250.
- VOELKER, P. F., The functions of ideals and attitudes in social education, Teachers College, Columbia University, contributions to education, New York, 1921, No. 112.
- WACK, D. J., A psychological study of conscience, Stud. Psychol. Psychiat. Cathol. Univ. Amer., 1952, 8, No. 3.
- WHITLOW, C. M., Attitudes and behaviour of high school students, Amer. J. Social., 1935, 40, 489-495.

APPENDIX A

CATEGORY HEADINGS

APPENDIX A

Category Headings

Anger

Arguing

Avarice

Avoiding Blame

Boasting

Breaking Promises

Bribery

Carelessness

Cheating

Cowardice

Cruelty to Animals

Deception

Defamation

Destructiveness

Discourtesy

Dishonesty

Disloyalty

Disobedience

Disrespect

Domination

Embarrassment

Envy

Error

Failure

Favouritism

Forgetfulness

Harshness

Hating

Hypocrisy

Ignorance

Illegal Behaviour

Impatience

Impiety

Indifference

Ingratitude

Injuring

Injustice

Intolerance

Irresponsibility

Killing

Lack of Effort

Loss of Self-respect

Loss of Self-control

Lying

Negligence

Non-cooperation

Non-fulfillment of Social Expectations

Non-fulfillment of Social Obligations

Objectionable Behaviour

Overindulgence

Poor Personal Attributes

Personal Obligations

Poor Influence

Prejudice

Procrastination

Rudeness

Selfishness

Showing Off

Slander

Snobbery

Stealing

Striking

Stubbornness

Tactlessness

Uncleanliness

Unfairness

Unkindness

Untidiness

Violation of Privacy

Wastefulness

Weakness (other than physical)

Withholding Information from authority

APPENDIX B

NUMBER OF ITEMS DERIVED FROM EACH CATEGORY AND
THE FREQUENCY OF REPORT OF EACH ITEM AS SHOWN
IN THE ORIGINAL DATA

APPENDIX B

The following is a list of the items derived from each category, the scale in which each of the items appears and the frequency of report of each item.

The first column lists the category heading, the second column the item number as it appears in the questionnaire, the third column the questionnaire in which the item is to be found and the fourth column the frequency of report of each item as derived from the original data.

APPENDIX B

<u>Category</u>	<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Frequency of Report</u>
Anger	1	1	55
	8	11	13
	74	1	9
	81	11	55
	128	1	15
	134	11	10
Arguing	2	1	16
	9	11	10
	75	1	13
	82	11	8
	129	1	26
	135	11	32
	146	1	40
	138	11	40
Avarice	3	1	26
	10	11	21
	76	1	17
	67	11	17
	83	11	8
	130	1	8
	136	11	14
Avoiding Blame	4	1	8
	11	11	6
	77	1	11
	68	11	11
Boasting	5	1	43
	12	11	11
	78	1	6
	84	11	7
	131	1	4
	120	11	4
Breaking a Promise	6	1	23
	13	11	9
	79	1	6
	85	11	4
	132	1	7
	121	11	7

<u>Category</u>	<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Frequency of Report</u>
Bribery	7	1	16
	14	11	16
	80	1	7
	86	11	10
Carelessness	8	1	27
	15	11	10
	81	1	12
	114	1	12
	87	11	22
Cheating	9	1	13
	16	11	6
	82	1	5
	88	11	7
	136	1	13
	125	11	13
Cowardice	10	1	53
	17	11	25
	83	1	6
	89	11	12
	134	1	6
	123	11	6
Cruelty to Animals	11	1	22
	18	11	26
	84	1	28
	90	11	12
	135	1	3
	124	11	3
Deception	12	1	19
	19	11	15
	85	1	9
	69	11	9
Defamation	13	1	25
	20	11	17
	86	1	5
	91	11	5

<u>Category</u>	<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Frequency of Report</u>
Destructiveness	14	1	23
	21	11	14
	87	1	12
	92	11	7
Discourtesy	15	1	32
	22	11	26
	88	1	10
	93	11	3
Dishonesty	16	1	29
	23	11	18
	89	1	8
	94	11	5
Disloyalty	17	1	42
	24	11	11
	147	11	42
	90	1	5
Disobedience	18	1	23
	25	11	16
	91	1	15
	95	11	9
Disrespect	19	1	23
	26	11	16
	92	1	8
	96	11	13
Domination	20	1	16
	27	11	16
Embarrassment	21	1	12
	28	11	13
Envy	22	1	12
	29	11	9
	93	1	25
	70	11	25

<u>Category</u>	<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Frequency of Report</u>
Error	23	1	21
	30	11	22
	94	1	22
	71	11	22
Failure	24	1	24
	31	11	22
	95	1	5
	97	11	12
Favoritism	25	1	12
	32	11	10
	96	1	18
	98	11	18
Forgetfulness	26	1	37
	33	11	37
	97	1	3
	99	11	2
Harshness	27	1	39
	34	11	24
	98	1	15
	100	11	23
Hating	28	1	50
	35	11	41
	99	1	5
	101	11	10
Hypocrisy	29	1	12
	36	11	12
	100	1	6
	72	11	6
Ignorance	30	1	36
	37	11	32
	101	1	3
	102	11	12
Illegal Behaviour	31	1	60
	34	11	60
	102	1	8

<u>Category</u>	<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Frequency of Report</u>
Impatience	32	1	29
	38	11	39
	103	1	44
	104	11	22
	138	1	2
	127	11	2
Impiety	33	1	19
	140	11	19
Indifference	34	1	24
	39	11	24
	104	1	4
	73	11	4
Injuring	36	1	10
	41	11	11
	106	1	10
	106	11	8
	139	1	3
	128	11	3
Injustice	37	1	27
	42	11	18
	107	1	15
	107	11	32
	136	1	5
	125	11	5
Intolerance	38	1	28
	43	11	20
Ingratitude	35	1	33
	40	11	27
	105	1	4
	105	11	4
Irresponsibility	39	1	33
	44	11	16
	108	1	4
	108	11	10
	140	1	2
	129	11	2

<u>Category</u>	<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Frequency of Report</u>
Killing	40	1	71
	141	11	71
	109	1	2
	109	11	19
Lack of Effort	41	1	7
	42	1	17
	45	11	18
	110	1	39
	74	11	39
Loss of Self-Control	43	1	37
	47	11	19
	111	1	2
	110	11	2
	134	11	8
Loss of Self-Respect	44	1	25
	48	11	20
	112	1	2
	75	11	2
Lying	45	1	41
	49	11	45
	113	1	2
	111	11	2
Negligence	46	1	49
	142	11	49
	114	1	6
	112	11	10
	141	1	2
	130	11	2
Non-Cooperation	47	1	62
	143	11	62
	50	11	9
	115	1	7
	142	1	2
	131	11	2
Non-fulfillment of Social Obligations	48	1	7
	1	11	7

<u>Category</u>	<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Frequency of Report</u>
Objectionable Behaviour	49	1	3
	51	11	2
	116	1	27
	113	11	3
Overindulgence	50	1	6
	2	11	6
Poor Personal Attributes	51	1	6
	3	11	6
Personal Obligations	52	1	10
	4	11	10
Poor Influence	53	1	5
	52	11	4
Prejudice	54	1	30
	53	11	25
Procrastination	55	1	5
	5	11	5
Rudeness	56	1	15
	54	11	38
	114	11	8
	145	1	3
	132	11	3
Selfishness	57	1	22
	55	11	26
	117	1	8
	145	1	2
	136	11	14
Showing Off	58	1	19
	56	11	17
	118	1	7
Slander	59	1	19
	144	11	19

<u>Category</u>	<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Frequency of Report</u>
Snobbery	60	1	13
	57	11	7
	119	1	6
	77	11	6
Stealing	61	1	63
	145	11	63
	120	1	7
	115	11	7
	144	1	3
	133	11	3
Striking	62	1	69
	146	11	69
	121	1	10
	78	11	10
	134	11	8
Stubbornness	63	1	26
	58	11	20
	122	1	4
	79	11	4
Tactlessness	64	1	2
	6	11	2
Tardiness	65	1	31
	59	11	31
Uncleanliness	66	1	41
	60	11	19
	123	1	3
	116	11	20
Unfairness	67	1	44
	61	11	44
	124	1	35
	117	11	30
Unkindness	68	1	49
	62	11	22
	125	1	2
	118	11	20

<u>Category</u>	<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Frequency of Report</u>
Untidiness	69	1	27
	63	11	15
	126	1	9
	119	11	18
Violation of Privacy	70	1	9
	64	11	12
Wastefulness	71	1	24
	65	11	19
	127	1	2
	80	11	2
Weakness	72	1	5
	7	11	5
Withholding Information	73	1	11
	66	11	13

APPENDIX C

ITEMS PRESENTED TO SUBJECTS
TO CHECK FOR UNDERSTANDING

APPENDIX C

PLEASE INDICATE WITH A CHECK MARK THOSE STATEMENTS
YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND

- If I were to get mad at someone for something they have done to me
- If I were to talk back to my elders
- If I were to be greedy
- If I were to make up excuses when I have done something wrong
- If I were to bragg about myself
- If I were to say that I would do something and then not do it
- If I were to give someone something so that they will not tell on me
- If I were to be clumsy
- If I were to do something unfair
- If I were to be frightened by things
- If I were to hit animals when they haven't done anything wrong
- If I were to fool someone
- If I were to spread untrue things about someone
- If I were to break things
- If I were not courteous to people
- If I were to lie about things
- If I were not loyal to someone I should be
- If I were not to obey someone I should obey
- If I were not to show respect for my elders
- If I wanted to be boss all the time
- If I were to do something that made a fool of me
- If I were to wish for something that someone else has and I do not
have
- If I were to make a mistake when no one could see me
- If I were not a success in my work
- If I were umpiring a game and were to favour one side more than
another
- If I were always forgetting to do things I was supposed to do
- If I were to be mean to people
- If I were to dislike someone very much
- If I were to be a hypocrite
- If I were to find that I didn't know anything about something
I should have known about
- If I were to do something against the law
- If I were to lose all patience with someone
- If I were not to believe in anything that has to do with God
- If I were not to care about something that others care about
- If I were not grateful for something that was given to me

If I were to run into someone with my bike
If I were to treat someone unfairly
If I were not tolerant of other people
If I were to lack responsibility
If I were to murder someone
If I were to give up just because the job was hard
If I were lazy
If I were to lose control of myself
If I were to hate myself for something that I had done
If I were not to tell the truth
If I were to neglect to do something that I was supposed to do
If I were not willing to co-operate with other people
If I were not to do something that was expected of me by my friends
If I were not to behave as I should
If I were always eating too much
If I were to hear someone say that I was not good looking
If I knew I wasn't doing my best work
If my behaviour was a poor example for my younger brother
or sister
If I were to be against someone or something even though they had
never done anything bad to me
If I were to put off for another day something I was supposed to do
today
If I were to have no manners
If I were to be greedy
If I were to be a smart aleck
If I were to criticize someone in a big way
If I were to become a snob
If I were to take something that doesn't belong to me
If I were to hit someone
If I were to be stubborn
If I were not very tactful with other people
If I were to be late fairly often for school
If I were dirty
If I were to cheat at school
If I were to be mean to other people
If I were messy where my appearance is concerned
If I were to interrupt someone when they wanted privacy
If I were to waste things
If I were weak in some of my school subjects
If I couldn't be trusted to tell the whole truth
If I were to lose my temper and say something I shouldn't
If I were to discuss something on opposite sides from someone else
If I were to be selfish
If I were to turn the blame around so that someone else gets it
If I were to tell everyone all the good things about myself

If I were to lie
If I were to keep my mouth shut because I was paid to
If I were not careful about doing things
If I were not being fair to others
If I were to be afraid and not brave
If I were to hurt animals
If I were to give people a false idea about myself and things
 I have done
If I were to talk poorly about other people
If I were to break things just for the fun of it
If I were rude, not polite to other people
If I were to do something crooked
If I were to turn against my friend
If I were not to do as I was told to do
If I were to have no thought for other people
If I were to want to rule other people
If I were to say something when other people are around and
 embarrass the person I am talking about
If I were jealous of someone because they had something I didn't have
If I were to make a mistake in front of some people
If I were to fail to do something that I was supposed to be able to do
If I had some things to share with others in my family and were to
 give more to one of them than the others because I liked
 him better than the others
If I were to find that I was getting more favours than any of my
 classmates
If I were always forgetting things
If I were to be hard on someone
If I were to hate someone
If I were to pretend to like someone I really didn't like
If I were to be ignorant of something that others were not
If I were to find myself behaving wrongly
If I were to lose all patience with someone
If I were not to care one way or another about something someone
 else thought was important
If I were not grateful for something that was done for me
If I were to hurt something
If I were to do something that was not just
If I were to be mean to someone because I didn't agree with him
If I were not to do a job I was responsible for
If I were to take someone's life
If I were not to put enough effort into my work
If I were to take a job and then not do my best work
If I were to fly off the handle at someone
If I were to get into trouble with the police
If I were to lie to protect myself from a beating

If I were to be careless in my actions
If I were not to help with something that my whole class was doing
If I were to be disorderly in public
If I were to do something wrong in front of people who thought my
actions were to be copied
If I were to have a grudge against someone
If I were to be rude to someone
If I were to keep something all to myself and not share it
If I were to act spoiled
If I were to be stuck-up
If I were to take something without permission
If I were to have a chip on my shoulder
If I were to refuse to do something that others wanted me to do
If I were to promise to meet someone at a certain time and then
be late
If I were not clean when I came to school
If I were to cheat when playing a game
If I were not kind to other people
If I were not tidy
If I were to have no room of my own
If I were to throw things away when they were still good
If I were not to tell someone in authority all that I know about
something
If I were to get mad at someone for no real reason
If I were to quarrel with the people around me
If I were to want everything for myself only
If I never took the blame for something I did but let someone else
take it
If I were to make compliments about myself
If I were to make a promise and then not keep it
If I were to try to bribe someone into doing something
If I didn't care how I handled my own things
If I were to win by doing something wrong
If I were scared to do something
If I were to be mean to animals
If I were to take other people's things when I was told not to,
even though I know I won't be caught
If I were to gossip about people behind their backs
If I were to destroy my own things
If I were to be very impolite to people
If I were to tell people untrue things
If I were not very loyal
If I were to do something I was told not to do
If I were not very respectful to other people
If I were jealous of other people because they could do things
I couldn't

If I were to make a mistake through carelessness
If I were to fail my grade in school
If I were to find that I was getting more favours than any of my
 brothers or sisters
If I were absent-minded
If I were to be cruel to others
If I were to despise someone or something
If I were to pretend to like something I really didn't like
If I were to not understand something I should understand
If I were to catch myself in behaviour that is unlawful
If I found myself unable to wait for something
If I were not fussy about something other people thought was
 important
If I were not thankful for something that was done for me
If I were to cause someone bodily harm
If I were to be unfair in a game
If I were to do things that people trusted me not to do
If I were to kill an animal
If I were not to try hard enough to finish my work
If I were to get mad and say things that I didn't mean
If I were not to care how I look or act
If I were to bragg and tell untruths
If I were not to care for my things
If I had not co-operated with the rest of the people doing a job
If I were to be impolite
If I were to want everything to myself
If I were to act smart in front of others
If I were to think I was better than someone else
If I were to take something away from someone else
If I were to hit my brother or sister
If I always wanted my own way
If I were not clean when I went out
If I were not fair to others
If I were to pick on someone smaller than myself
If I were sloppy in my dress
If I were not to make use of something that could be used
If I were to get mad and say something which later I was sorry for
If I were to disagree with someone else
If I were to take more than my share of things
If I were to show off
If I were to break an agreement
When I pay someone to do something that they are not supposed to do
When I don't care how I handle someone else's things
When I do something that is sneaky
If I were to back out of doing something that I had promised to do
If I were to take my hate out on animals

If I were to spread rumours about people or happenings
If I were to destroy other people's things
If I were to be unkind to older people
If I were to be untrustworthy
If I were not to be faithful or true to people to whom I should be
If I were to be naughty or bad
If I were not to respect my father or mother
If I were to make poor marks in an exam
If I were to find that I was getting more favours than any of my
classmates.
If I were to forget to meet someone I had promised to meet
at a certain time
If I were to be stern and strict to someone under my control
If I were to despise someone because this person had taken
something of mine and didn't return it
If I were to find myself not paying attention when I should be
If I were to rob someone
If I were to lose my temper quickly
If I were not to say "thanks" for something
If I were to hurt myself
If I were to punish someone for something they did not do
If I did something and then did not take the blame for it
If I were to kill someone even though it wasn't on purpose
If I were to lose my temper in an argument
If I were to cheat on a test
If I were not to pay attention to what I was doing when I was
doing a job
If I were not to pay attention when someone else was talking
If I were not to behave
If I were to bragg about myself or my class
If I were to take something away from someone else
If I didn't wash often enough
If I were punished even though I was right
If I were to be cruel to someone
If I were not neat in my ways
If I were to get mad at someone and shout and yell at them
If I were to fight with words only, with someone, no matter
what the reason is
If I were stingy
If I were to tell about the good things I have done and not the bad
If I were not to keep my word
If I were sloppy
If I were to be chicken
If I were to mistreat animals
If I were to do something unfairly
If I were to smoke even though I knew I shouldn't

If I were to be restless instead of patient
If I were to cut someone or something
If I were to do something wrong and then not admit it
If I were not to look after someone I had promised to look after
If I were to refuse to take part in a class project
If I were to be discourteous to other people
If I were to pinch stuff
If I were to get more than someone else
If I were to get mad at someone or something and as a result
 use physical violence
If I were to have a difference of opinion with someone
If I were not to share something with a friend
If I were to blame someone for something they didn't do
If I were to fight with words only, with someone, because of a
 difference of opinion

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FORMS

APPENDIX D

SCALE 1

Please read the following statements very carefully and circle the number that best shows how these actions would make you feel if you were to do them. (Note: If you do not understand any of these statements please do not put any mark near them.)

MEANING OF THE NUMBERS

- 1 Not bad at all
2 Not too badly
3 Quite badly
4 Terrible

EXAMPLE. -

If I were to rob a store, I would feel

If this would make you feel not too badly, you should circle number 2. But if it would make you feel terrible, you should circle number 4.

REMEMBER - There are no right answers or wrong answers. Just show how you would feel about each of these things by circling the proper number.

Now begin with the following statements:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. If I were to get mad at someone for something they have done to me, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. If I were to talk back to my elders, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. If I were to be greedy, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

4. If I were to make up excuses when I have done something wrong, I would feel	1	2	3	4
5. If I were to bragg about myself, I would feel	1	2	3	4
6. If I were to say that I would do something and then not do it, I would feel	1	2	3	4
7. If I were to give someone something so that they will not tell on me, I would feel	1	2	3	4
8. If I were to be clumsy, I would feel	1	2	3	4
9. If I were to do something unfair, I would feel	1	2	3	4
10. If I were to be frightened by things, I would feel	1	2	3	4
11. If I were to hit animals when they haven't done anything wrong, I would feel	1	2	3	4
12. If I were to fool someone, I would feel	1	2	3	4
13. If I were to spread untrue things about someone, I would feel	1	2	3	4
14. If I were to break things, I would feel	1	2	3	4
15. If I were not courteous to people, I would feel	1	2	3	4
16. If I were to lie about things, I would feel	1	2	3	4
17. If I were not loyal to someone I should be, I would feel	1	2	3	4
18. If I were not to obey someone I should obey, I would feel	1	2	3	4
19. If I were not to show respect for my elders, I would feel	1	2	3	4
20. If I wanted to be boss all the time, I would feel	1	2	3	4
21. If I were to do something that made a fool of me, I would feel	1	2	3	4
22. If I were to wish for something that someone else has and I do not have, I would feel	1	2	3	4

23. If I were to make a mistake when no one could see me, I would feel	1	2	3	4
24. If I were not a success in my work, I would feel	1	2	3	4
25. If I were umpiring a game and were to favour one side more than another, I would feel	1	2	3	4
26. If I were always forgetting to do things I was supposed to do, I would feel	1	2	3	4
27. If I were to be mean to people, I would feel	1	2	3	4
28. If I were to dislike someone very much, I would feel	1	2	3	4
29. If I were to be a hypocrite, I would feel	1	2	3	4
30. If I were to find that I didn't know anything about something I should have known about, I would feel	1	2	3	4
31. If I were to do something against the law, I would feel	1	2	3	4
32. If I were to lose all patience with someone, I would feel	1	2	3	4
33. If I were not to believe in anything that has to do with God, I would feel	1	2	3	4
34. If I were not to care about something that others care about, I would feel	1	2	3	4
35. If I were not grateful for something that was given to me, I would feel	1	2	3	4
36. If I were to run into someone with my bike, I would feel	1	2	3	4
37. If I were to treat someone unfairly, I would feel	1	2	3	4
38. If I were not tolerant of other people, I would feel	1	2	3	4
39. If I were to lack responsibility, I would feel	1	2	3	4
40. If I were to murder someone, I would feel	1	2	3	4

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 41. If I were to give up just because the job was hard,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 42. If I were lazy, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 43. If I were to lose control of myself, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 44. If I were to hate myself for something that I had
done, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 45. If I were not to tell the truth, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 46. If I were to neglect to do something that I was
supposed to do, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 47. If I were not willing to co-operate with other
people, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 48. If I were not to do something that was expected
of me by my friends, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 49. If I were not to behave as I should, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 50. If I were always eating too much, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 51. If I were to hear someone say that I was not
good looking, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 52. If I knew that I wasn't doing my best work,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 53. If my behaviour was a poor example for my
younger brother or sister, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 54. If I were to be against someone or something even
though they had never done anything bad to me,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 55. If I were to put off for another day something I
was supposed to do today, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 56. If I were to have no manners, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 57. If I were to be greedy, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 58. If I were to be a smart aleck, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

59. If I were to criticize someone in a big way, I would feel	1	2	3	4
60. If I were to become a snob, I would feel	1	2	3	4
61. If I were to take something that doesn't belong to me, I would feel	1	2	3	4
62. If I were to hit someone, I would feel	1	2	3	4
63. If I were to be stubborn, I would feel	1	2	3	4
64. If I were not very tactful with other people, I would feel	1	2	3	4
65. If I were to be late fairly often for school, I would feel	1	2	3	4
66. If I were dirty, I would feel	1	2	3	4
67. If I were to cheat at school, I would feel	1	2	3	4
68. If I were to be mean to other people, I would feel	1	2	3	4
69. If I were messy where my appearance is concerned, I would feel	1	2	3	4
70. If I were to interrupt someone when they wanted privacy, I would feel	1	2	3	4
71. If I were to waste things, I would feel	1	2	3	4
72. If I were weak in some of my school subjects, I would feel	1	2	3	4
73. If I couldn't be trusted to tell the whole truth, I would feel	1	2	3	4
74. If I were to get mad at someone for no real reason, I would feel	1	2	3	4
75. If I were to quarrel with the people around me, I would feel	1	2	3	4
76. If I were to want everything for myself only, I would feel	1	2	3	4

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 77. If I never took the blame for something I did
but let someone else take it, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 78. If I were to make compliments about myself,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 79. If I were to make a promise and then not keep it,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 80. If I were to try to bribe someone into doing
something, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 81. If I didn't care how I handled my own things,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 82. If I were to win by doing something wrong,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 83. If I were scared to do something, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 84. If I were to be mean to animals, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 85. If I were to take other people's things when I
was told not to, even though I know I won't
be caught, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 86. If I were to gossip about people behind their
backs, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 87. If I were to destroy my own things, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 88. If I were to be very impolite to people,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 89. If I were to tell people untrue things, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 90. If I were not very loyal, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 91. If I were to do something I was told not to do,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 92. If I were not very respectful to other people,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 93. If I were jealous of other people because they
could do things I couldn't, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 94. If I were to make a mistake through carelessness,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 95. If I were to fail my grade in school, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 96. If I were to find that I was getting more favours
than any of my brothers or sisters,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 97. If I were absent-minded, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 98. If I were to be cruel to others, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 99. If I were to despise someone or something,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 100. If I were to pretend to like something I really
didn't like, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 101. If I were to not understand something I should
understand, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 102. If I were to catch myself in behaviour that is
unlawful, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 103. If I found myself unable to wait for something,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 104. If I were not fussy about something other people
thought was important, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 105. If I were not thankful for something that was done
for me, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 106. If I were to cause someone bodily harm,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 107. If I were to be unfair in a game, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 108. If I were to do things that people trusted me not
to do, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 109. If I were to kill an animal, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 110. If I were not to try hard enough to finish my work,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 111. If I were to get mad and say things that I didn't mean,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 112. If I were not to care how I look or act, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 113. If I were to bragg and tell untruths, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 114. If I were not to care for my things, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 115. If I had not co-operated with the rest of the people
doing a job, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 116. If I were to be impolite, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 117. If I were to want everything to myself,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 118. If I were to act smart in front of others,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 119. If I were to think I was better than someone
else, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 120. If I were to take something away from someone
else, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 121. If I were to hit my brother or sister, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 122. If I always wanted my own way, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 123. If I were not clean when I went out, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 124. If I were not fair to others, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 125. If I were to pick on someone smaller than
myself, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 126. If I were sloppy in my dress, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 127. If I were not to make use of something that could
be used, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 128. If I were to get mad at someone and shout and yell
at them, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 129. If I were to fight with words only, with someone,
no matter what the reason is, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

130. If I were stingy, I would feel	1	2	3	4
131. If I were to tell about the good things I have done and not the bad, I would feel	1	2	3	4
132. If I were not to keep my word, I would feel	1	2	3	4
133. If I were sloppy, I would feel	1	2	3	4
134. If I were to be chicken, I would feel	1	2	3	4
135. If I were to mistreat animals, I would feel	1	2	3	4
136. If I were to do something unfairly, I would feel	1	2	3	4
137. If I were to smoke even though I knew I shouldn't, I would feel	1	2	3	4
138. If I were to be restless instead of patient, I would feel	1	2	3	4
139. If I were to cut someone or something, I would feel	1	2	3	4
140. If I were to do something wrong and then not admit it, I would feel	1	2	3	4
141. If I were not to look after someone I had promised to look after, I would feel	1	2	3	4
142. If I were to refuse to take part in a class project, I would feel	1	2	3	4
143. If I were to be discourteous to other people, I would feel	1	2	3	4
144. If I were to pinch stuff, I would feel	1	2	3	4
145. If I were to get more than someone else, I would feel	1	2	3	4
146. If I were to fight with words only, with someone, because of a difference of opinion, I would feel	1	2	3	4

SCALE 11

Please read the following statements very carefully and circle the number that best shows how these actions would make you feel if you were to do them. (Note: If you do not understand any of these statements please do not put any mark near them.)

MEANING OF THE NUMBERS

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 1 | Not bad at all |
| 2 | Not too badly |
| 3 | Quite badly |
| 4 | Terrible |

EXAMPLE -

If I were to rob a store, I would feel

1 2 3 4

If this would make you feel not too badly, you should circle number 2.
But if it would make you feel terrible, you should circle number 4.

REMEMBER - There are no right answers or wrong answers. Just show how you would feel about each of these things by circling the proper number.

Now begin with the following statements:

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 1. If I were not to do something that was expected of me by my friends, I would feel | 1 2 3 4 |
| 2. If I were always eating too much, I would feel | 1 2 3 4 |
| 3. If I were to hear someone say that I was not good looking, I would feel | 1 2 3 4 |
| 4. If I knew I wasn't doing my best work, I would feel | 1 2 3 4 |

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. If I were to put off for another day something I was supposed to do today, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. If I were not very tactful with other people, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. If I were weak in some of my school subjects, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. If I were to lose my temper and say something I shouldn't, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. If I were to discuss something on opposite sides from someone else, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. If I were to be selfish, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. If I were to turn the blame around so that someone else gets it, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. If I were to tell everyone all the good things about myself, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. If I were to lie, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. If I were to keep my mouth shut because I was paid to, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. If I were not careful about doing things, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. If I were not being fair to others, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17. If I were to be afraid and not brave, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18. If I were to hurt animals, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19. If I were to give people a false idea about myself and things I have done, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20. If I were to talk poorly about other people, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21. If I were to break things just for the fun of it, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22. If I were rude, not polite to other people,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23. If I were to do something crooked, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 24. If I were to turn against my friends, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25. If I were not to do as I was told to do,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26. If I were to have no thought for other people,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 27. If I were to want to rule other people, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 28. If I were to say something when other people are
around and embarrass the person I am
talking about, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 29. If I were jealous of someone because they had
something I didn't have, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 30. If I were to make a mistake in front of some
people, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 31. If I were to fail to do something that I was
supposed to be able to do, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 32. If I had some things to share with others in my
family and were to give more to one of them
than the others because I liked him better
than the others, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 33. If I were always forgetting things, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 34. If I were to be hard on someone, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 35. If I were to hate someone, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 36. If I were to pretend to like someone I really
didn't like, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 37. If I were to be ignorant of something that others
were not, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 38. If I were to lose all patience with someone,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 39. If I were not to care one way or another about something someone else thought was important, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 40. If I were not grateful for something that was done for me, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 41. If I were to hurt something, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 42. If I were to do something that was not just, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 43. If I were to be mean to someone because I didn't agree with him, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 44. If I were not to do a job I was responsible for, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 45. If I were not to put enough effort into my work, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 46. If I were to take a job and then not do my best work, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 47. If I were to fly off the handle at someone, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 48. If I were to get into trouble with the police, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 49. If I were to lie to protect myself from a beating, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 50. If I were not to help in something that my whole class was doing, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 51. If I were to be disorderly in public, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 52. If I were to do something wrong in front of people who thought my actions were to be copied, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 53. If I were to have a grudge against someone, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 54. If I were to be rude to someone, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 55. If I were to keep something all to myself and not share it, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 56. If I were to act spoiled, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 57. If I were to be stuck-up, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 58. If I were to refuse to do something that others wanted me to do, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 59. If I were to promise to meet someone at a certain time and then be late, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 60. If I were not clean when I came to school, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 61. If I were to cheat when playing a game, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 62. If I were not kind to other people, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 63. If I were not tidy, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 64. If I were to have no room of my own, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 65. If I were to throw things away when they were still good, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 66. If I were not to tell someone in authority all that I know about something, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 67. If I were to want everything for myself only, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 68. If I never took the blame for something that I did but let someone else take it, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 69. If I were to take other people's things when I was told not to, even though I knew I wouldn't be caught, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 70. If I were to be jealous of other people because they could do things I couldn't, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 71. If I were to make a mistake through carelessness, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 72.. If I were to pretend to like something I really didn't like, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 73.. If I were not fussy about something other people thought was important, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 74.. If I were not to try hard enough to finish my work, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 75.. If I were not to care how I look or act, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 76.. If I were to want everything to myself, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 77.. If I were to think I was better than someone else, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 78.. If I were to hit my brother or sister, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 79.. If I always wanted my own way, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 80.. If I were not to make use of something that could be used, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 81.. If I were to get mad and say something I was sorry for, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 82.. If I were to disagree with someone else, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 83.. If I were to take more than my share of things, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 84.. If I were to show off, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 85.. If I were to break an agreement, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 86.. If I were to pay someone to do something that they were not supposed to do, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 87.. If I were not to care how I handled others' things, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 88.. When I do something that is sneaky, I feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 89. If I were to back out of doing something that I had promised to do, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 90. If I were to take my hate out on animals, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 91. If I were to spread rumours about people or happenings, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 92. If I were to destroy other people's things, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 93. If I were to be unkind to older people, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 94. If I were to be untrustworthy, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 95. If I were to be naughty or bad, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 96. If I were not to respect my father or mother, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 97. If I were to make poor marks on an exam, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 98. If I were to find that I was getting more favours than any of my classmates, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 99. If I were to forget to meet someone I had promised to meet at a certain time, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 100. If I were to be stern and strict to someone under my control, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 101. If I were to despise someone because this person had taken something of mine and didn't return it, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 102. If I were to find myself not paying attention when I should be, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 103. If I were to rob someone, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 104. If I were to lose my temper quickly, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 105. If I were not to say "thanks" for something, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

106. If I were to hurt myself, I would feel	1	2	3	4
107. If I were to punish someone for something they didn't do, I would feel	1	2	3	4
108. If I were to do something and then did not take the blame for it, I would feel	1	2	3	4
109. If I were to kill someone even though it wasn't on purpose, I would feel	1	2	3	4
110. If I were to lose my temper in an argument, I would feel	1	2	3	4
111. If I were to cheat on a test, I would feel	1	2	3	4
112. If I were not to pay attention to what I was doing when I was doing a job, I would feel	1	2	3	4
113. If I were not to behave, I would feel	1	2	3	4
114. If I were to brag about myself or my class, I would feel	1	2	3	4
115. If I were to take something away from someone else, I would feel	1	2	3	4
116. If I didn't wash often enough, I would feel	1	2	3	4
117. If I were punished even though I was right, I would feel	1	2	3	4
118. If I were to be cruel to someone, I would feel	1	2	3	4
119. If I were not neat in my ways, I would feel	1	2	3	4
120. If I were to tell about the good things I had done and not the bad, I would feel	1	2	3	4
121. If I were not to keep my word, I would feel	1	2	3	4
122. If I were sloppy, I would feel	1	2	3	4
123. If I were to be chicken, I would feel	1	2	3	4
124. If I were to mistreat animals, I would feel	1	2	3	4

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 125. If I were to do something unfairly, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 126. If I were to smoke even though I knew I shouldn't,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 127. If I were to be restless instead of patient,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 128. If I were to cut someone or something,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 129. If I were to do something wrong and then not
admit it, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 130. If I were not to look after someone I had promised
to look after, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 131. If I were to refuse to take part in a class project,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 132. If I were to be discourteous to other people,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 133. If I were to pinch stuff, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 134. If I were to get mad at someone and use
physical violence, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 135. If I were to have a difference of opinion with
someone, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 136. If I were not to share something with a friend,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 137. If I were to blame someone for something they
didn't do, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 128. If I were to fight with words only, with someone,
because of a difference of opinion,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 139. If I were to do something against the law,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 140. If I were not to believe in anything that has
to do with God, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 141. If I were to murder someone, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 142. If I were to neglect to do something that I was
supposed to do, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 143. If I were not willing to co-operate with other
people, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 144. If I were to criticize someone in a big way,
I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 145. If I were to take something that doesn't belong
to me, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 146. If I were to hit someone, I would feel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

APPENDIX E

OUTLINE OF SUGGESTED SCALE TO MEASURE
CONSCIENCE IN CHILDREN OF THE AGE RANGE
FOUND IN GRADE EIGHT IN VANCOUVER SCHOOLS

APPENDIX E

The items listed on the following pages are arranged so that no two items from the same category appear consecutively. This is the same order that was used in the original questionnaires.

The item numbers are listed in the first column and the questionnaire in which they are to be found, in the second column.

APPENDIX E

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Questionnaire (Scale) From Which Item is to be Taken</u>
1	1
2	1
3	1
4	1
5	1
6	1
7	1
8	1
9	1
10	1
18	11
12	1
13	1
14	1
15	1
16	1
17	1
18	1
19	1
20	1
22	1
23	1
24	1
25	1
26	1
27	1
28	1
29	1
30	1
31	1
32	1
33	1
34	1
35	1
36	1
37	1
38	1
39	1
40	1

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Questionnaire (Scale) From Which Item is to be Taken</u>
41	1
43	1
45	1
46	1
47	1
48	1
49	1
50	1
51	1
52	1
53	1
54	1
55	1
56	1
57	1
58	1
59	1
60	1
61	1
62	1
63	1
64	1
65	1
66	1
67	1
68	1
69	1
70	1
73	1
8	11
9	11
10	11
11	11
12	11
13	11
80	I
15	11
16	11
17	11
135	I
19	11
20	11
21	11

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Questionnaire (Scale) From Which Item is to be Taken</u>
22	11
23	11
24	11
25	11
26	11
29	11
30	11
31	11
32	11
97	1
34	11
35	11
100	1
37	11
38	11
104	1
41	11
42	11
43	11
40	11
44	11
109	1
42	1
47	11
112	11
49	11
114	1
50	11
51	11
52	11
53	1
55	11
56	11
57	11
120	1
121	1
58	11
123	1
124	1
62	11
63	11
64	11
65	11

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Questionnaire (Scale) From Which Item is to be Taken</u>
--------------------	---

66	11
74	1
75	1
76	1
77	1
78	1
79	1
86	11
81	1
82	1
83	1
85	1
86	1
87	1
88	1
147	11
91	1
92	1
93	1
94	1
95	1
96	1
99	11
98	1
99	1
101	1
103	1
106	1
107	1
105	1
108	1
45	11
111	1
113	1
112	11
115	1
116	1
114	11
117	1
118	1
119	1
144	1
134	1

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Questionnaire (Scale) From Which Item is to be Taken</u>
122	1
116	11
117	11
125	1
126	1
127	1
81	11
82	11
83	11
84	11
85	11
87	11
88	11
89	11
92	11
93	11
90	1
95	11
96	11
97	11
100	11
101	11
102	11
104	11
106	11
136	1
108	11
110	11
134	11
141	1
142	1
113	11
145	1
118	11
119	11
128	1
135	11
136	11
131	1
132	1
134	1
148	1
139	1
140	1

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Questionnaire (Scale) From Which Item is to be Taken</u>
134	11
146	1