

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1987

The Relationship Between the Content Component of Cognitive Moral Development and Premarital Sexual Standards

Janet H. Anderson
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Anderson, Janet H., "The Relationship Between the Content Component of Cognitive Moral Development and Premarital Sexual Standards" (1987). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2531.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2531>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CONTENT COMPONENT
OF COGNITIVE MORAL DEVELOPMENT AND
PREMARITAL SEXUAL STANDARDS

by

Janet H. Anderson

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family and Human Development

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my committee; D. Kim Openshaw, Associate Professor, Family and Human Development, Chairman; Jay D. Schvaneveldt, Department Head, Family and Human Development; and Donald V. Sisson, Professor, Mathematics Department, Experiment Station Statistician; for their support and the time they gave to this project. I would like to particularly thank Dr. Openshaw for his encouragement and his suggestions, for the hours he spent editing this manuscript, and for allowing me to use data he had previously collected.

I would also like to thank Maria Norton, Computer Lab Director, Colleges of Education and Family Life, and her staff, Setsuko Chiba, David Lundquist, and Pamela Sapyta. Without their patience and assistance this project would not have been possible.

Janet H. Anderson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF FIGURES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Purpose	1
Definitions of Terms	3
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Premarital Sexual Behavior	14
Cognitive Moral Development	27
III. METHOD	31
Sample	31
Instruments	31
Analyses	35
IV. RESULTS	38
Demographic Data	38
Classification	39
Preliminary Statistics	44
Discriminant Analysis	46
Summary	53
V. DISCUSSION	54
Preliminary Statistics	54
Discriminant Analysis	55
Application	58
Limitations	59
Future Directions	59

REFERENCES	61
APPENDIX	67

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Normative Ethics	11
2.	Group Means	45
3.	Correlation Matrix	45
4.	Summary Table: Direct Entry	48
5.	Summary Table: Step-wise Entry	49
6.	Classification	51

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. All groups stacked histogram	52

ABSTRACT

The Relationship Between the Content Component
of Cognitive Moral Development and
Premarital Sexual Standards

by

Janet H. Anderson, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1987

Major Professor: D. Kim Openshaw, Ph.D.
Department: Family and Human Development

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between the content of moral thought and premarital sexual standards. The sample used (n=159) was homogeneous and purposive; the majority of the sample was female, second year college students, and Caucasian. A discriminant analysis using the sexual standards of permissiveness with affection and the traditional standard as dependent variables, and the moral constructs of egoism, hedonism, nonhedonism, utilitarianism, deontology, rule-utilitarianism, act-utilitarianism, rule-orientation, and act-orientation as independent (predictor) variables was run. This analysis resulted in a final model in which egoism,

hedonism, nonhedonism, act-utilitarianism, and rule-orientation were found to be the polarizing variables between the traditional group and the permissiveness with affection group.

(95 pages)

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between the content component of cognitive moral development and four premarital sexual standards; permissiveness without affection, traditional, double, and permissiveness with affection. Historically the study of premarital sexual standards, both behavioral and attitudinal, has been addressed from an epidemiological perspective; that is, extant research has concerned itself mostly with the prevalence of the behavior in the context of a given society or a specific age group. This position has neglected, for the most part, the issue of development and developmental levels. It is posited that a more accurate understanding of premarital sexual standards can be obtained by examining the phenomenon from a developmental perspective, especially if the intent of the research is to provide a: a) more holistic understanding of the phenomenon; and b) valid foundation upon which interventive strategies (preventative and remedial) can be predicated.

Of particular interest is the relationship between cognitive moral development (Kohlberg, 1969) and

premarital sexual standards. An examination of this relationship should begin with defining the two dimensions of cognitive moral development; namely structure and content. According to Boyce and Jensen (1978:179) moral content is conceptualized as "the actual moral beliefs that one holds, for example, 'life is sacred,' 'laws are good,' 'pain is bad,' and so on." Such thinking can be readily applied to the area of premarital sexual standards through the use of such statements as "premarital sexual activity is wrong," or "thinking about sex and being single is evil." On the other hand, the structure of cognitive moral development is conceptualized as "the cognitive makeup, or the qualitative modes of thought, that lie behind those particular beliefs. The questions asked in this area include, "Are the particular moral beliefs autonomously or heteronomously adhered to? Are the espoused ethical principles universal and self chosen or are they narrow and inherited? What is the individual's social perspective? and so on" (Boyce & Jensen, 1978:179). Both content and structure are operationalized through the use of specific dilemmas that identify either the content or the structural elements of cognitive moral development (see, Boyce & Jensen, 1978; Gilligan, Kohlberg, Lerner & Belenky, 1971; Kohlberg, 1969).

One of the first studies focusing on the area of

cognitive moral development and premarital sexual standards, within the context of development, was that of Jurich and Jurich (1974). Their study specifically examined the relationship between the structural aspect of moral development and five premarital sexual standards; namely: a) permissiveness without affection; b) traditional; c) double standard; d) permissiveness with affection; and e) non-exploitative permissiveness without affection.

Outside of the study by Jurich and Jurich (1974), this researcher has found limited research that has specifically correlated various aspects of development with premarital sexual standards and no research that has directly examined the area of moral content as it relates to premarital sexual standards. The intent of this study is to examine the relationship between cognitive moral development (content) and four premarital sexual standards; namely, traditional, double standard, permissiveness with affection, and permissiveness without affection.

Definitions of Terms

Sexual Standards

Reiss (1960) first defined four sexual standards common to modern Western society. The "traditional standard" dictates complete sexual abstinence prior to

marriage (Reiss, 1960; Jurich & Jurich, 1974). The "double standard" means that premarital sex is acceptable for men and "bad" women. However, "good" women must abstain from sexual relations before marriage. "Permissiveness with affection" allows premarital sex when the couple involved is "in love". This standard has become more common among college students over the last twenty-five years (Reiss, 1962; Bell & Chaskes, 1970; Christensen & Gregg, 1970; Clayton & Bokemeier, 1980). "Permissiveness without affection" is a "hedonistic, fun morality" (Jurich & Jurich, 1974:797); sex is legitimate whenever the individuals involved desire it.

Cognitive Moral Development

Cognitive moral development can best be understood as a compound term that involves three inter-related constructs; the first two are explicit in the primary concept, cognitive development and moral development; whereas the third is only implied, social development. Cognitive development is defined as the development of human thought, language, and intellectual functioning and is perceived as developing in stages from birth (i.e., sensorimotor) through adolescence (i.e., formal operations) (Piaget, 1965). Moral development, on the other hand, refers to the process through which individuals learn to adopt the standards of right or

wrong as established by the culture in which they live. In other words, moral development involves attitudes, beliefs, and values on the one hand and actual behavior on the other (Helms & Turner, 1976). Two dimensions are relevant to our understanding of moral development; namely, structure and content. The structural dimension of cognitive development is concerned with the "organization of thinking" or the "cognitive constructions" which underly thought (Rest, 1979, p. 63). Content, on the other hand, "refers to the actual moral beliefs held by individuals" (Boyce & Jensen, 1978:179). For example, "life is sacred," "laws are good," and "pain is bad" (Boyce & Jensen, 1978:179).

As noted above, social development is implied in the primary concept. This is particularly evident when one realizes that a major aspect of social development involves coming to deal with other people in one's social environment in appropriate and effective ways. That which is considered appropriate depends on one's moral values. When broadly defined, "the moral sphere encompasses the whole range of interpersonal reactions" (Liebert & Wicks-Nelson, 1981:443). Thus, interpersonal behavior perceived as morally relevant and which benefits self and others is considered to be prosocial. Those actions of a moral nature which pose a threat or harm to self or others are perceived as antisocial.

In sum, it can be concluded that cognitive moral development refers to the thought schemas underlying the moral concepts of persons at different age levels, which have evolved within a social context, in order to define a general direction of movement (Hoffman, 1970).

Piaget (1965) was the first to suggest the possibility of a sequence of stages of moral growth which approximated his general theory of cognitive development. Kohlberg (1969) elaborated on Piaget's theory of moral development, within the context of cognitive development, by organizing moral development into stages which are qualitatively different and which form an invariant sequence, thereby producing a theory of the development of moral reasoning. He specified three different levels of cognitive moral development, each consisting of two stages. The first level is termed pre-conventional moral reasoning. In stage one, an act is judged to be right if there is no punishment connected with it, and wrong if the act results in punishment. The morality of a particular action is decided by an external force. At the second stage of pre-conventional moral reasoning, an act can be judged morally correct if it satisfies the subject's needs or the needs of someone close to her/him. In level two, conventional moral reasoning, the subject considers her/himself to be moral if s/he conforms to society's

expectations. A person at stage three believes that conforming to society's role expectations of her/him will assure that s/he is considered to be a moral person. At stage four, s/he becomes aware that rules and laws must be upheld so that an orderly society may continue. In level three, postconventional moral reasoning, the individual realizes that society's laws and mores may not always be moral. At stage five, s/he considers her/himself to have a contract with society. S/He behaves as society prescribes, and, in turn, is protected by those prescriptions. From this point, an individual goes on to stage six and the realization that each person's view of her/his contract with society is subjective, therefore, the only valid determination of morality is the individual's own of his/her personal acts. As the subject passes through these stages, s/he goes from complete reliance on an external definition of morality to an internal definition.

Dimensions of Moral Content

Boyce and Jensen (1978) have developed the Moral Content Test, an instrument designed to examine the philosophical and psychological constructs of cognitive moral development. They identify nine specific constructs; namely, egoism, rule-utilitarianism, act-utilitarianism, hedonism, nonhedonism, rule-orientation, act-orientation, utilitarianism, and

deontology. Before defining these constructs, it is necessary to briefly explain some of the theories upon which they are based. Normative ethics, or the study of morality, (See Table 1, p. 9) are "those moral assumptions or statements that are evaluative, they are one's basic underlying assumptions about what is good, bad, right, and wrong" (Boyce & Jensen, 1978:7). Within the study of normative ethics are two major groups of theories: those dealing with normative values, and those dealing with normative obligation. The area of normative values can further be divided into instrumental value and intrinsic value.

Instrumentalists argue that all actions are means to some remote end, which at another place in time could also be called a means. If there are no ends, there is nothing in which to place intrinsic value (Boyce & Jensen, 1978; Dewey, 1930). More commonly, philosophers accept the idea of intrinsic value, "the view that traits or experiences can be good in and of themselves; their goodness is not related to consequences or to any other values- separately and singly, apart from everything else, they are good" (Boyce & Jensen, 1978:15). Those who believe in intrinsic value can be divided into monists and pluralists. Monists believe there is only one thing that is intrinsically good; pluralists believe there are two or more. Aristotle was

Table 1

Normative Ethics

-
- I. Normative Values
 - A. Instrumental
 - B. Intrinsic
 - 1. Monism
 - a. Qualitative Hedonism
 - b. Quantitative Hedonism
 - 2. Pluralism
 - a. Nonhedonism
 - II. Normative Obligation
 - A. Teleological
 - 1. Utilitarianism
 - a. Act
 - b. Rule
 - B. Deontological
 - 1. Act
 - 2. Rule
-

a monist because he believed that happiness was the only intrinsic good. Hedonism has historically been the most popular form of monism and is the belief that pleasure is the only intrinsic good. Quantitative hedonism maintains that all types of pleasure are the same and, therefore, valued in the same manner. Qualitative hedonists believe that some pleasures are more valuable than others, for instance, John Stuart Mill (1863/1971) argues that intellectual pleasures are superior to sensual pleasures. Pluralists, as stated above, believe there are two or more things which are intrinsically good. In fact, these intrinsic goods are complementary in that together they compose "the good". Plato was a pluralist who believed the following list composed "the

good":

- "a) Measure moderation fitness (that which is in place)
- b) Proportion, beauty, completeness
- c) Intelligence and wisdom
- d) Sciences, arts, and true opinion (or true convictions)
- e) Pure pleasures of the soul" (Boyce & Jensen, 1978:18).

The third category of intrinsic value is nonhedonism, which simply denies the idea that pleasure is the only intrinsic good. Therefore all pluralists are nonhedonists. The most commonly used categories of normative value and the ones most pertinent to this study are qualitative hedonism, quantitative hedonism, and nonhedonism.

Normative value theories, as explained above, are concerned with "the good". The theories of normative obligation are concerned with "the right". These theories are considered to be either teleological or deontological. According to teleological theory, "the rightness of an act depends solely on its consequences" (Boyce & Jensen, 1978:21). Utilitarianism is a theory in which teleological thinking is used. Utilitarians believe that the end result determines the moral rightness of any action taken. Utilitarians also believe "the good" must be maximized. Therefore, every act is judged by the amount of good resulting from it. Conversely, the deontologist believes "that a given act is judged not only by the consequences it will elicit

but by the nature of the act itself" (Boyce & Jensen, 1978:45). Deontologists consider certain moral principles such as "stealing is wrong" to be absolute truths. Pure deontologists believe an act is moral if it conforms to these moral principles. The outcome is not considered. Mixed deontologists believe the act and its consequences must conform to these moral principles. A further distinction in deontology is that between act-deontology and rule-deontology. A rule-deontologist considers only how closely an act conforms to a moral principle or rule; an act-deontologist also considers the context of the action.

After discussing the theories and principles of normative ethics, one can now define each of Boyce and Jensen's nine constructs. The first construct is egoism. An egoist is "concerned with achieving his definition of the good primarily for himself" (Boyce & Jensen, 1978:185). S/he is not concerned with the effect her/his actions will have on others. Another construct is hedonism. The hedonist believes that pleasure is the only intrinsic good. Therefore, any act performed in the pursuit of pleasure is considered moral. Non-hedonism is the belief that the good is another state beyond pleasure. For example, Aristotle believed that happiness was the only intrinsic good, and Nietzsche gave that designation to power (Boyce & Jensen, 1978).

Non-hedonists (pluralists) also believe that several states or qualities can have intrinsic good (e.g., Plato).

The construct of utilitarianism has, as a major feature, concern with maximizing the good. Therefore, the utilitarianist is concerned mainly with maximizing the good. S/he may believe this is best done by adopting rules that will maximize the good, and then following them strictly; this is rule-utilitarianism. Or, in act-utilitarianism, s/he may not adopt such rules, but may judge each act according to its context, and to the amount of good resulting from it.

A deontologist considers the nature of the act itself to be as, or more, important than the consequences of that act. The means are evaluated as well as the ends. A rule-deontologist personally adopts certain rules that s/he considers moral truths and evaluates acts according to how closely they adhere to those rules. An act-deontologist considers only the morality of the act itself, within its context, without tying the act to any set of rules.

The constructs of rule-orientation and act-orientation are applicable to both utilitarianism and deontology, and have been defined above as they relate to each of these areas. Broadly, a person who is rule-oriented in her/his moral decisions will first define

those rules s/he believes to be moral or right, and then judge actions by how closely they conform to these rules. A person who is act-oriented will consider each act individually on its own merits. The act is considered just as important as the results.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Premarital Sexual BehaviorHistory: Epidemiology

Research about sexual standards (behavior and attitudes) has been mainly concerned with epidemiology (Bell & Chaskes, 1970; Christensen & Gregg, 1970; Ehrmann, 1964; Jessor & Jessor, 1975, 1977; Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Luckey & Nass, 1969; Packard, 1969; Reiss, 1966; Vener & Stewart, 1974; Zelnick & Kantner, 1972, 1977). This research has shown "1) an increase in the overall prevalence of premarital sexual behaviors, particularly coitus, 2) an increase in the number of sexual partners among those who are experienced, and 3) a decrease in the average age at the onset of coitus" as well as "a unilinear trend toward more liberal attitudes about sex before marriage" (Clayton & Bokemeier, 1980:764). That permissiveness and liberal sexual attitudes are increasing is further supported in a 1984 study done by Reed and Weinberg. They proposed that there exists a time lag between the emergence of facilitators of premarital coitus in the 1960's and the actual relaxing of the pre-existing

mores. These facilitators were identified as "increased freedom of youth from parental control, the development of a strong youth culture, and the development of the birth control pill" (Reed & Weinberg, 1984:129). They hypothesized that time was needed, particularly in the case of women, who had previously had no script concerning premarital sexual behavior, to develop a sexual script. " A script specifies a 'who,' that is, a type of person, and a 'does what,' that is, a set of behaviors appropriate for that type of person" (Reed & Weinberg, 1984:130). They found, in their study of college students, evidence to support their hypothesis of a sexual script. They also found, as had several other researchers (Bauman & Wilson, 1974; King, 1975; Lewis & Burr, 1975) that, for women, the incidence of coitus increased moderately in the late sixties, and more rapidly in the seventies. For men, coital rates held steady in the late sixties and then increased moderately in the seventies. Rates for both genders were found to be converging; women are gradually closing the gap that has been in existence between genders. In a related study, Roche (1986) studied the differences between the way people believe they should behave sexually, how they actually do behave sexually, and their perceptions of others' sexual behavior. He wanted to determine whether sexual behaviors and attitudes in

the 1980's are continuing to liberalize or becoming more conservative. His subjects were a group of 280 persons, consisting of college students and nonstudents. He found that "Persons are most restrictive in what they believe is proper, more permissive in their reported behavior, and most permissive in their perception of what others are doing" (Roche, 1986:119). Men are more permissive than women but only in the early stages of a relationship. Roche also found that overall levels of sexual behavior were much higher in this study than in studies done in the fifties and sixties. It can be concluded from the extant research that sexual attitudes and behaviors are continuing to liberalize.

History: Etiology

The etiology of premarital sexual standards has been studied to a lesser extent than the epidemiological perspective. Research addressing epidemiology has identified several important variables; among them: 1) the permissiveness of the reference group (Billy & Udry, 1985; Hornick, 1978; Miller, Christensen, & Olson, 1987; Teevan, 1972; Walsh, Ferrell, & Tolone, 1976); 2) quality and length of the current relationship; 3) the extent of past sexual experience (Carroll, Volk, & Hyde, 1985; DeLamater & MacCorquodale, 1979); and 4) developmental level (D'Augelli, 1971, 1972; Jurich & Jurich, 1974). The research dealing with sexual

standards and developmental levels, as they relate to cognitive moral development, is of particular interest to this study.

Permissiveness of the reference group. Over the past fifteen years, several studies have investigated the importance of the peer group in determining an individual's sexual standards. Testing the following hypotheses: 1) College students who were parent oriented would be less sexually permissive than students who were peer oriented; 2) Students who believed their peer reference group was permissive would be permissive themselves, Teevan (1972) found that while the data supported both hypothesis, the former was supported only weakly. Teevan (1972) concluded that the permissiveness of the peer group was the most important determinant of premarital sexual permissiveness. Hornich (1978) conducted a study of university and high school students (n= 800) using as measures Reiss' (1967) scale of premarital sexual permissiveness (attitudes) and another Guttman scale concerning actual sexual behavior. Using path analysis, Hornich found that the peer group and the frequency of dating were important factors in determining adolescents' sexual attitudes and behaviors. In a related study, also of college students, Walsh, Ferrell, and Tolone (1976) found that the initial selection of peer groups and the changes in sexual

standards that occurred within them after selection were more predictive of the subject's degree of permissiveness than the subject's degree of parent orientation. Also, the relationship between the reference group's perceived permissiveness and the subject's permissiveness was positive. Billy and Udry (1985) studied adolescents to determine what influence "best friends" have on premarital sexual behavior. Using a panel design, subjects consisting of junior high school students, they found that white males, black males, and black females were not influenced by the sexual activities of either their same gender "best friend" or the opposite gender "best friend". White females, on the other hand, were affected and influenced by both gender "best friends". It was found that the girl friend influences by modeling, possibly through persuasion, and by providing opportunities. The boy may become the girl's partner in her first coitus. This study supports in part the Planned Parenthood Poll (Louis Harris and Associates, 1986) which found that females were more likely than males to feel pressured at the time of their first coitus. Miller, Christensen, and Olson (1987) have also studied the determinants of premarital sexual behavior. The sample (n=2423) consisted of high school students in New Mexico, Utah, and California. The subjects completed surveys dealing

with their religious affiliation and activities, self esteem (Rosenberg, 1965), and attitudes toward premarital sex. The results suggested that sexual behavior is determined both by the normative context, and by the personal moral beliefs of the individuals involved.

Overall, the research in this area has shown the peer group, as well as the personal moral beliefs of the individual involved, to be important in determining premarital sexual standards.

Quality and length of present relationship; past sexual experience. Two studies typify the extant research in the area of quality and length of relationship, and past sexual experience; namely DeLamater and MacCorquodale (1979) and Carroll, Volk, and Hyde (1985). DeLamater and MacCorquodale (1979) developed a theoretical model that suggests how several relationship variables might interact to influence an individual's present sexual behavior. Testing this model with path analysis, they "concluded that four factors were consistently associated with current sexual behaviors: 1) more extensive past sexual experience, 2) number of friends who engage in various sexual activities, 3) the quality of one's current heterosexual relationship, and 4) the length of the current relationship" (Clayton & Bokemeier, 1980:771). Carroll,

Volk, and Hyde (1985) hypothesized that differences existed in males and females motives for engaging in coitus. They tested this hypothesis by administering a questionnaire investigating sexual attitudes, sexual behavior, and motives for coitus to 249 undergraduates, selected randomly. They found significant differences between genders on whether casual sex was approved, what constitutes the most important portion of sexual behavior, number of sexual partners, and what significance emotional involvement has in the decision to engage in coitus. Both men and women approved of coitus in a serious relationship; however, as Roche (1986) also found, men were more likely than women to engage in coitus when there was no emotional involvement. Women were unlikely to engage in coitus when not emotionally invested in a relationship with their partner.

In summary, this area of research has shown that current sexual behaviors are affected by past sexual experience, levels of permissiveness within the peer group, quality and length of the present relationship (DeLamater & MacCorquodale, 1979), and gender of the individual (Carroll, et al., 1985).

Development and developmental levels: Cognitive moral development. While all aspects of development, social, physical, spiritual, moral, etc., have an effect

on the establishment of sexual standards, this research was limited to the study of the effects of cognitive moral development upon sexual standards. Jurich and Jurich (1974) conducted a study that linked premarital sexual standards with levels of cognitive moral development. Their subjects were 160 upper division undergraduate students from eight northeastern institutions. Each subject was interviewed privately. They were asked the degree of their religiosity and then asked to state their beliefs about premarital intercourse. Following this, the subjects were asked to respond to questions about four moral dilemmas. The first two were Kohlberg dilemmas (cited in Jurich & Jurich, 1974) dealing with life vs. property. The third dealt with premarital sexuality, and the fourth with sexuality in a marital context (Gilligan, et al., 1971). The results suggested that permissiveness without affection was associated with the lowest level of cognitive moral development. This was followed by the traditional standard, the double standard, permissiveness with affection, and nonexploitive permissiveness without affection. The level of cognitive moral development associated with nonexploitive permissiveness without affection was higher than the level associated with permissiveness with affection. These two groups were different in

terms of moral development from the first three groups. Jurich and Jurich (1974) offered the following theory about these results. The permissiveness without affection standard is egoistic in that it requires only that the subject fulfill her/his own needs. This standard does not require a significant degree of cognitive development because it is a general rule that can be applied across all premarital sexual situations. The traditional standard can also be applied across all situations, but the individual who applies this standard is aware of the existing social order and is attempting to maintain it. The double standard requires a higher level of moral development because the male involved must decide in each situation whether the female involved is "good" or "bad". If he determines that she is "bad" then it is moral, by his code, to have intercourse with her. The permissiveness with affection standard requires a great deal more in terms of cognitive moral sophistication. The individual who applies this standard must make a decision based only on the feelings found within the relationship. There are no externals on which to rely. Therefore, this process requires a certain degree of empathy with the other person in the relationship. The fifth standard studied, nonexploitive permissiveness without affection, requires an even higher level of cognitive moral development.

The rights of each person involved in the relationship, and the current situation must be carefully analyzed. Jurich and Jurich (1974) emphasize that these standards are arranged in order pertaining to the level of cognitive moral development required for each. They make no argument about the relative morality of each standard.

D'Augelli (1971) hypothesized that an individual's level of moral development influences her/his decisions about premarital sexual activity, along with the other personality factors of sex guilt and sexual philosophy. She investigated the relationship of cognitive moral development, sex guilt and sexual philosophy to sexual experience by interviewing and testing 119 college women. The interview schedule included Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Scale. Central to D'Augelli's (1971) research is her typology of six different sexual philosophies. The first was labelled inexperienced virgin. Inexperienced virgins have little dating or sexual experience; as yet, they do not know very much about themselves or others. They are close to their parents and do not want to hurt them by becoming sexually active. Adamant virgins believe strongly that intercourse should be saved for marriage. Potential non-virgins believe that premarital intercourse is morally acceptable, but have not experienced intercourse

because they have not met the "right" person or been in the "right" situation. Engaged non-virgins have usually had intercourse with only one person with whom they share a serious, committed relationship. Typically, engaged non-virgins consider morality to be each individual's personal concern. Liberated non-virgins believe premarital sex is moral as long as each partner understands the meaning of coitus within the relationship. The security of the relationship is not as important as it is to engaged non-virgins. Confused non-virgins "engage in sex without real understanding of their motivation, the place of sex in their lives, or its effects on them" (D'Augelli & D'Augelli, 1977:53).

The results of this study suggest that adamant virgins were most often found at Kohlberg's Stage Four (Law and Order Reasoning). The actual relationship was less important to them than the degree the relationship fits within society's rules and laws. The subjects whose sexual philosophy fit into the category of inexperienced virgins did not correlate with any one stage of cognitive moral development. They did, however, feel that love was a prerequisite for coitus. Potential non-virgins were also not oriented to any particular stage of cognitive moral development. They believed that intercourse would be moral in the following situations: when "in love", when engaged, and

when mutually agreed upon. Most engaged non-virgins were in the Social Contract (5) or Personal Concordance (3) stages. A few were oriented at the Law and Order Stage (4). They believed, as did the adamant virgins, that the relationship was less important than whether society's laws were followed. Those at the Social Contract Stage (5) stressed that coitus should be a mutual decision, based upon discussion and thought. Those engaged non-virgins at the Personal Concordance Stage (3) considered the affection felt for the partner (that placed them in the role of lover) as an important factor in the decision to engage in coitus. Liberated non-virgins typically used Social Contract Reasoning (5). "Sex was acceptable if partners agreed on the nature of the relationship and on the role of sex within the relationship" (D'Augelli & D'Augelli, 1977:55). The majority of the confused non-virgins were at the Instrumental Relativist Stage (2) of cognitive moral development. They engaged in intercourse in an effort to gain affection or a supportive relationship. Communication within these relationships was generally not satisfying. D'Augelli concluded that the relationship, or context, was important in determining what sexual behaviors were appropriate. In 1972, D'Augelli conducted a study dealing with the association among sex guilt, moral reasoning, and sexual experience

within couples (n=76). The results of this study generally supported the 1971 study. The correlation for men between sexual philosophies and levels of cognitive moral development paralleled the findings for women.

To summarize, the research in this area suggests that an individual's level of cognitive moral development is related to her/his premarital sexual standards.

Conclusions

As is apparent from the preceding information, as a society we are becoming more sexually permissive for a variety of reasons and factors. It is also apparent that similar types of sexual behavior may be based upon different levels of cognitive moral development. D'Augelli's work (1971, 1972) and that of Jurich and Jurich (1974) are similar in results. Confused nonvirgins and persons adhering to the permissiveness without affection standard, who are similar in sexual philosophy and standards, are oriented to lower levels of cognitive moral development. Liberated nonvirgins and persons who follow the nonexploitative permissiveness without affection standard are oriented to higher levels of cognitive moral development. Therefore, the overt sexual behavior can be the same, but the underlying cognitive moral development is very different. This suggests a relationship between

premarital sexual standards and the structural levels of cognitive moral development. It is the purpose of this study to determine if a similar correlation exists between premarital sexual standards and the content component of cognitive moral development.

Cognitive Moral Development

Kohlberg's work (1969) has been tested and researched fairly extensively. Extant research has generally supported his original theory. Kohlberg (1973) suggested that persons stabilize in their moral development at age twenty-five. He called this stabilizing "crystallization". Marchand-Jodoin and Samson (1982) conducted a study that tested the concept of crystallization. They used the thirty-six members of an adult education sexology class as subjects. The class members were tested privately by interview both before and after taking the class. The plus-1 stage method (Samson, 1980) was used in the class. The interview consisted of four moral dilemmas, two that dealt with sexual moral judgment, and two that dealt with general moral judgment. Marchand-Jodoin and Samson (1982) found that subjects at stage two had difficulty progressing beyond that stage, and apparently had crystallized at that point. However, subjects whose original interview showed them to be at stage three or

four continued to advance in cognitive moral development. Subjects at stage five progressed very little, and in some cases, not at all, possibly because the more advanced a person's level of moral development, the more difficult it is to change, due to the increasing degree of cognitive sophistication that is required for stages five and six (Marchand-Jodoin & Samson, 1982). This study also indicated that the level of sexual moral development does not always lag behind the level of general moral development as has been found to occur in adolescence (Gilligan, et al., 1971; Stein, 1973). Finally, Marchand-Jodoin and Samson take issue with Turiel's (1978) idea that sexuality is determined by social convention, and link sexual attitudes and behavior to moral concepts. They believe that a person exercises her/his sexuality within a frame of reference determined by personal moral beliefs.

Kitchener, King, Davison, Parker, and Wood (1984) have conducted a longitudinal study of moral and ego development in young adults. Each subject (n=61) was given the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1979), the Sentence Completion Test of Ego Development (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970), and the Concept Mastery Test (Terman, 1973), in 1977, and in 1979. The results support the idea that principled moral reasoning continues to develop in post adolescence. Whether ego development

continues is not clear. It may level off as individuals enter college, as Loevinger (1979) has suggested. In this study, females generally scored higher than males on moral development; however, this difference appears to be explained by the females' higher verbal ability.

Bouhmama (1984) studied a group of Algerian students and a group of British students (age 14-15) to test Kohlberg's (1969) assertion that formal learning had little effect on cognitive moral development. He found that the majority of the Algerian children were at stage three in their cognitive moral development; the British children were mainly at stage two. He believed this could be explained by examining the cultures from which the children came. The Algerians were Islamic, and their moral reasoning process was greatly influenced by their traditional and religious values; the reasoning style of which happened to conform to Kohlberg's stage three. The British children, on the other hand, were brought up in a culture that emphasized the thought structure found in stage two, helping other people, perhaps in expectation of reciprocal action. Bouhmama, therefore, concluded that cultural and religious values have an effect on Kohlberg's stages of cognitive moral development.

In a study that supports Kohlberg's (1969) stage theory of cognitive moral development, Snarey, Reimer,

and Kohlberg (1985) investigated the development of social-moral reasoning among Israeli adolescents living in a kibbutz. The study was longitudinal and the results showed that the subjects progressed in the structure of their moral development gradually and in an upward direction. There were no significant regressions in social-moral reasoning.

Conclusion

The studies reviewed are generally supportive of Kohlberg's (1969) theory, particularly, that the stages are qualitatively different and form an invariant sequence. One major difficulty (Bouhmama, 1984; Rest, 1979) has been determining the extent that the structure of moral thought is affected by the content of moral thought, which is necessarily different within each culture. This study has not addressed that problem in particular, but has focused on the content of moral thought, and its possible relationship to individuals' decisions about premarital sexual standards.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Sample

The sample used in this study was collected between 1980 and 1982 and consisted of 159 college students from two universities, one located in the Midwest and one in the West. Both areas are considered to be conservative. The sample was purposive as students in Family and Human Development classes (General Education) were asked to volunteer for the study.

Instruments

Each subject completed a questionnaire (see Appendix) in the classroom consisting of measures of self-esteem, religiosity, moral development, sexual attitudes, and sexual behaviors. The method of using a self-administered questionnaire has been shown to yield more accurate information than an interview format when dealing with sensitive issues such as sexual attitudes and behavior (DeLamater & MacCorquodale, 1975).

Content of Moral Development

The content component of moral development was measured by the Moral Content Test developed by William

D. Boyce and Larry Cyril Jensen (1978). This test is similar to the one developed by James R. Rest (1979) to identify the structural component of cognitive moral development. Dilemmas are given, followed by reasoning statements which the subject ranks according to the degree of importance the statements have in her/his decision making. However, this test is different from Rest's Defining Issues Test both in the content of the dilemmas and in the personalization of them. Boyce and Jensen wrote this test in the first person thus directly involving the subject in the dilemma. This technique was found in a pilot study to increase the subject's difficulty in decision-making, because subjects are more concerned about, and become more involved in, their own actions than in those of others.

The five dilemmas included in the test all involve an end vs. the means situation (teleology vs. deontology). Under each dilemma are ten reasoning statements. The subject rated these statements according to the importance and relevance they have to her/his decision. There is a statement representing each of the eight types of reasoning: hedonistic egoism, nonhedonistic egoism, hedonistic rule-utilitarianism, nonhedonistic rule-utilitarianism, hedonistic act-utilitarianism, nonhedonistic act-utilitarianism, rule-deontology, act-deontology, a nonsense statement to

control for random marking, and a "just right" or "just wrong" statement to identify act-deontologists whose decisions are based on the "feel" of the situation. The deontological reasoning statements are pure; mixed forms must be determined from examining the total test scores.

There are only two categories of the good included in the reasoning statements about each dilemma; nonhedonism and hedonism. Nonhedonism includes both nonhedonism and qualitative hedonism. Hedonism is defined as quantitative hedonism.

The Moral Content Test was administered to undergraduate students by Boyce and Jensen twice with an interim of four weeks. There was no discussion, instruction, or treatment between administration of the two tests. Tests were discarded if a subject's check mark ratings for first and second rankings were inconsistent with her/his number rankings for more than two dilemmas. This follows a suggestion made by Rest (1979) for determining valid tests. The results of the test-retest stability analysis were as follows:

Hedonistic egoism	.32
Nonhedonistic egoism	.85
Hedonistic rule-utilitarianism	.75
Nonhedonistic rule-utilitarianism	.80
Hedonistic act-utilitarianism	.75
Nonhedonistic act-utilitarianism	.73
Rule-deontology	.60
Act-deontology	.75
	$\bar{X} = .69$

Boyce and Jensen (1978) were not concerned about the

reliability coefficient of .32 for hedonistic egoism because there were few responses to this category.

When these scores are collapsed across several dimensions it is possible to create broader, more conclusive scores that give a more precise idea of the subjects' moral content. For example, by combining nonhedonistic act-utilitarianism, non-hedonistic rule-utilitarianism, hedonistic act-utilitarianism, and hedonistic rule-utilitarianism a composite score for utilitarianism can be obtained. The following items were created by collapsing scores and are listed along with their reliability coefficients.

Egoism	.64
Rule-utilitarianism	.89
Act-utilitarianism	.84
Hedonism	.64
Nonhedonism	.65
Rule-oriented	.83
Act-oriented	.83
Utilitarianism	.82
Deontology	.68
	$\bar{X} = .76$

In this study, scores were collapsed into the above categories because these categories provide a more reliable measure of the content of each subject's moral thought.

Sexual Attitudes and Behavior

Each subject completed a modified version of Reiss' (1964) Guttman scale of premarital sexual permissiveness that encompassed both attitudes and

actual behavior. The original scale has been used in many studies and has always met the reliability criteria for a Guttman scale (Clayton & Bokemeier, 1980). There are some limitations to this scale; one is that as society becomes progressively more sexually permissive the items dealing with holding hands and kissing may have little real meaning. Further, the items dealing with "sexual intercourse" may need to be expanded to include other dimensions of sexuality (Gagnon, 1977; Hampe & Ruppel, 1974; Mirande & Hammer, 1974). While the subjects in this study completed the entire scale, in the analysis, only the dimensions pertaining to sexual intercourse at the different levels of commitment and emotional involvement were used.

Since this sample is nonrepresentative and relatively homogeneous, the reliability values of Reiss' scale may be artificially inflated (Clayton & Bokemeier, 1980).

Analyses

The data were analyzed by discriminant analysis. This procedure is used "to identify the variables that are important for distinguishing among the groups and to develop a procedure for predicting group membership for new cases whose group membership is undetermined" (Norusis, 1985:75). The procedure is similar to

regression analysis, in that it identifies the amount of variance contributed by a variable while controlling for the influence of the remaining variables in an effort to discriminate among the groups. However, discriminant analysis distinguishes and predicts group membership, instead of producing correlation coefficients, and it was developed for use with nominal variables, which were used in this study.

The assumptions of discriminant analysis are these:

1) each group is a sample from a multivariate normal population, and 2) the population covariance matrices are equal. Because of the nature of the sample and the instruments used, it was assumed that the data met the above assumptions.

The dependent variable in this analysis was sexual standards, which contained the following values: permissiveness without affection, traditional, double standard, and permissiveness with affection. The independent (predictor) variables were egoism, rule-utilitarianism, act-utilitarianism, hedonism, nonhedonism, rule-oriented, act-oriented, utilitarianism, and deontology. These independent variables were placed into linear combinations which distinguish membership in one of the four values (groups) of the dependent variable.

Before the discriminant analysis could be run, the

one hundred fifty-nine subjects were classified as adhering to the permissiveness without affection standard, traditional standard, double standard, or permissiveness with affection standard. This was accomplished by developing a series of logic statements and applying them to the data. For example, a subject answering "never" across all relationship categories (casually dating, dating steadily, going steady, informally engaged, formally engaged) to the question "How often have you had sexual intercourse with someone of the opposite sex ", would be classified as belonging to the traditional group, as the definition of the traditional standard is there are no premarital sexual relations prior to marriage, no matter what the circumstances.

After these classifications were made, preliminary statistics and tests of their significance were obtained. Finally, the discriminant analysis was run, consisting of two phases, analysis and classification.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Demographic Data

The sample consisted of one hundred fifty-nine subjects. The mean age fell within the range of 18-22 years; one hundred twenty-three subjects (77%) were in this category. One person was between the ages of 13 and 17; twenty-five (16%) were between the ages of 23 and 30; and 10 (6%) were between the ages of 31 and 50. One hundred fifty-two subjects (96%) were Caucasian, two were Black (0.01%), six (3%) were Hispanic, and one responded "other". The mean number of years of school completed was 13.6. There were 115 (71%) females and 44 (29%) males. The majority (128, 81%) of subjects were single, twenty-five (16%) were married, three (0.02%) were separated, and six (0.04%) responded "other". Sixty (38%) of the subjects grew up in a community of 2,500 to 30,000 population; sixteen (10%) were raised on a farm; nineteen (12%) in a small rural community; twenty-one (13%) in a small town less than 2,500 in population; thirty-two (20%) in a city of 30,000 to 100,000 persons; and ten (6%) in a larger city. One hundred twenty-three subjects (77%) came from intact

families in which the father's median income was over \$22,000 and the mother's median income was zero.

In summary, the majority of the sample was Caucasian, female, single, college sophomores, who were raised in towns populated by 2,500 to 100,000 persons, and whose parents remained married. It is important to be aware of the relative homogeneity of the sample as the results of the analyses are presented.

Classification

Attitude

The first step in the data analyses was to classify subjects according to their stated attitudes concerning sexual standards. This was accomplished by developing a series of logic statements from the data to distinguish between groups. All persons who agreed that sexual intercourse was permissible when partners were "not particularly affectionate" were considered to hold an attitude of permissiveness without affection. Out of the 159 subjects, none fell into this category. All persons who felt that intercourse was not permissible when partners were casually dating, dating steadily, going steady, informally engaged, formally engaged, in love, feeling strong affection, or not particularly affectionate were placed in the traditional category. Ninety-four persons (59%) fit this criteria. Subjects

were considered to adhere to the double standard if they agreed that intercourse was permissible at any relationship stage for the male but not for the female. One subject fell into this category. All persons who believed that coitus was permissible if the couple was "in love", or "felt strong affection", were placed in the permissive with affection category. Thirty-eight persons (24%) fit this criteria. Twenty subjects (13%) did not fit into any of the four categories, and examination of their individual responses revealed no commonalities, thus precluding the possibility of a new attitudinal category. These persons were excluded from the analysis portion of the discriminant analysis, but included in the classification. Six (0.04%) subjects responded "undecided" more than four times, and because of this, they were not classified. Four "undecided" responses constitutes twenty-five per cent of the sixteen variables used to determine attitudinal stance regarding sexual standards. More than 25% was considered excessive by this researcher, because those subjects whose "undecided" responses exceeded 25% had apparently not progressed very far in setting their sexual standards. Therefore, they could not be placed into any one of the four categories.

Behavior

Behavior groups were more difficult to classify than the attitudinal groups because of the large number of subjects who responded "not applicable". This was probably due to the relatively youthful, conservative sample (mean 18-22) whose life experiences had not yet included coitus. Persons who responded that they had participated in sexual intercourse while casually dating their partner were placed in the permissiveness without affection category. Six (0.04%) subjects fit this criteria. It is interesting to note that, while no subject was found to hold the permissive without affection standard attitudinally, six persons did so behaviorally. This supports Roche's (1986) findings. Persons who responded "never" across all relationship categories (casually dating, dating steadily, going steady, informally engaged, formally engaged) to the question "How often have you had sexual intercourse with someone of the opposite sex?", were classified in the traditional group. Thirty-two (20%) persons fit into this group. Since the double standard is a type of attitude, rather than an actual behavior, no behavior classification could be made. Persons who responded that they had experienced intercourse while dating steadily, going steady, being informally engaged, or formally engaged were placed in the permissiveness with

affection category. Twenty-four (15%) people fit this criteria. The remainder of the sample fell into six other groups: 1) those who answered "not applicable" to all five variables in question (engaging in intercourse while casually dating, dating steadily, going steady, informally engaged, formally engaged) - four subjects (0.03%); 2) those who answered "never" when asked if they had experienced coitus when casually dating their partner and then answered "not applicable" to the remaining four variables - three subjects (0.02%); 3) those who answered "never" when asked if they had engaged in coitus when casually dating or dating steadily and then answered "not applicable" to the remaining three variables - twenty subjects (13%); 4) those who answered "never" when asked if they had engaged in coitus while casually dating, dating steadily, or going steady, and then answered "not applicable" to informally engaged and formally engaged - twenty-seven subjects (17%); 5) those who answered "never" when asked if they had ever experienced intercourse when casually dating, dating steadily, going steady, and informally engaged, and answered "not applicable" for formally engaged - seven subjects (0.04%). The remaining thirty-six subjects (23%) did not fall into any of the above categories.

Originally, this researcher had planned to use all

four sexual standards with their associated behaviors; permissiveness without affection, traditional, double, and permissiveness with affection, as dependent variables in the discriminant analysis. However, due to the results of the classification, the only two groups represented attitudinally were traditional and permissiveness with affection. The groupings for behavior were even more difficult to categorize into the original four standards. A crosstabulation between attitude and behavior using the traditional and permissiveness with affection groups indicated little correlation. Twenty-nine persons whose responses placed them in the traditional group attitudinally were also in the traditional group behaviorally. Eleven persons who were attitudinally permissive with affection were also behaviorally permissive with affection. Because these groups of twenty-nine and eleven were too small to use satisfactorily in a discriminate analysis, the decision was made to use only the attitudinal groupings of traditional and permissiveness with affection in the analysis. The discriminant analysis was run using as dependent variables the attitudinal groups adhering to the traditional standard (group one), and to the permissiveness with affection standard (group two); and as independent (predictor) variables the nine constructs of moral content; egoism, hedonism, nonhedonism, rule-

utilitarianism, act-utilitarianism, utilitarianism, deontology, rule-orientation, and act-orientation.

Preliminary Statistics

To understand the differences between persons holding traditional standards (group one), and those who hold the standard of permissiveness with affection (group two), significance tests for the equality of group means for each variable were run. On the Wilk's Lambda and F-ratio test, egoism, rule-utilitarianism, act-utilitarianism, utilitarianism, deontology, rule-orientation, and act-orientation all had a significance level of less than 0.05. In other words, the two groups differ significantly on the above constructs of moral content. (See Table 2, p. 45)

The pooled within groups correlation matrix indicated that rule orientation and rule utilitarianism were the most highly correlated. This was logical, because these two constructs were fairly close in meaning; both have as a central feature a belief that rules must be made and followed. Act utilitarianism and act orientation were also highly correlated. Again, this was to be expected because both constructs are centered around the belief that acts must be judged on their own, and with consideration of their outcome. Hedonism and utilitarianism were correlated, as were

Table 2

Group Means

GROUP MEANS		N = 132 0							
ATTIT	EGDISH	HEDONISM	NONHEDON	RULUTIL	ACTUTIL	UTIL	DEON	RULORIEN	ACTORIEN
1	17 69149	25 27660	29 18085	23 29787	28 58511	36 72340	47 18085	38 13830	
2	11 60326	30 34211	29 47368	20 35263	42 42105	44 57895	36 73684	27 42105	
TOTAL	15 93939	26 73485	29 26515	22 50758	32 56818	38 98485	44 17424	35 05203	
SIGNIFICANCE	0 0492	0 0824	0 9221	0 4734	0 0018	0 0328	0 0231	0 0108	
ATTIT	ACTORIEN								
1	39 12766								
2	48 57895								
TOTAL	41 84848								
SIGNIFICANCE	0 0374								

Table 3

Correlation Matrix

POOLED WITHIN-GROUPS CORRELATION MATRIX									
	EGDISH	HEDONISM	NONHEDON	RULUTIL	ACTUTIL	UTIL	DEON	RULORIEN	ACTORIEN
EGDISH	1 00000								
HEDONISM	0 42710	1 00000							
NONHEDON	0 47479	0 41130	1 00000						
RULUTIL	-0 09139	0 30484	0 45219	1 00000					
ACTUTIL	0 18524	0 62801	0 44149	-0 19373	1 00000				
UTIL	0 09036	0 75011	0 70160	0 37007	0 69346	1 00000			
DEON	0 02386	0 20137	0 28320	0 25412	0 16204	0 32370	1 00000		
RULORIEN	-0 04997	0 30152	0 47617	0 87898	-0 10380	0 55916	0 59006	1 00000	
ACTORIEN	0 11911	0 56088	0 37874	-0 11337	0 85584	0 63359	0 51900	0 05125	1 00000

CORRELATIONS WHICH CANNOT BE COMPUTED ARE PRINTED AS 99 0.

utilitarianism and nonhedonism. Utilitarianism was correlated with both the hedonistic and the nonhedonistic definitions of "the good". In other words, a person from this sample who believed in maximizing the good may believe that the good is pleasure (hedonism), or that the good is another concept (e.g., happiness), or several concepts (e.g., happiness, power, pleasure), possibly including pleasure (nonhedonism). (See Table 3, p. 45)

Discriminant Analysis

Analysis Phase

The first step of the discriminant analysis was computing the discriminant function. The discriminant function is a linear combination of the unstandardized coefficients of the predictor variables multiplied by the values of the variables. These predictor values are then summed and added to the constant. The discriminant function so formed maximizes the differences between the two groups. In this study, one hundred thirty-two cases were included in this step. The other twenty-seven had missing data on at least one of the predictor variables and could not be used. The function (group centroid) for group one is 0.35634; for group two, it is -0.88147.

In the first run of the discriminant analysis, the direct method was used, in which all the predictor

(independent) variables for moral constructs were entered into the analysis directly, regardless of the discriminating power of each. This method resulted in a Lambda of 0.75 and a significance level of 0.000, indicating there is significant variability between the means of group one and group two. (See Table 4, p. 48)

In an effort to determine which predictor variables actually were most useful in distinguishing between groups, the analysis was run again utilizing a step-wise method designed to minimize the Wilk's Lambda and thus separate the groups as much as possible. Act-utilitarianism was entered into the analysis first due to its large F-value. This signifies that act-utilitarianism is the variable that, by itself, can discriminate between the two groups best. This was followed by deontology, which was added at step two; egoism, which was added at step three; hedonism, which was added at step four; rule-orientation, which was added at step five; act-utilitarianism, which was removed at step six; deontology, which was removed at step seven; nonhedonism, which was added at step eight; and act-utilitarianism, which was added at step nine. These variables were added and removed in this manner in an effort to find the model which would result in the smallest Lambda; in other words, to discover those variables that discriminated between the two groups

Table 4

Summary Table: Direct Entry

DN GROUPS DEFINED BY ATFIT

ANALYSIS NUMBER 1

DIRECT METHOD: ALL VARIABLES PASSING THE TOLERANCE TEST ARE ENTERED.

MINIMUM TOLERANCE LEVEL 0.00100

CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS

MAXIMUM NUMBER OF FUNCTIONS 1
 MINIMUM CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF VARIANCE... 100.00
 MAXIMUM SIGNIFICANCE OF WILKS' LAMBDA ... 1.0000

PRIOR PROBABILITY FOR EACH GROUP IS 0.50000

STANDARDIZED CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS

FUNC 1

EQOISM	1.10300
HEDONISM	-0.97680
NONHEDON	-0.84836
RULUTIL	0.49550
ACTUTIL	1.61733
UTIL	-1.82570
DEDN	-0.56608
RULORIEN	2.20922
ACTORIEN	0.42983

best. Egoism, hedonism, nonhedonism, act-utilitarianism, and rule-orientation were found to be the most polarizing (discriminating) variables. A Wilk's Lambda of 0.76 was obtained using this method, and the significance level was 0.000. (See Table 5, below)

Table 5
Summary Table: Step-wise Entry

SUMMARY TABLE					
STEP	ACTION ENTERED	REMOVED	VARS IN	WILKS' LAMBDA	SIG. LABEL
1	ACTUTIL		1	.92734	.0018
2	DEON		2	.87641	.0002
3	EGOISM		3	.83706	.0000
4	HEDONISM		4	.82887	.0001
5	RULGRIEN		5	.81297	.0001
6		ACTUTIL	4	.81906	.0000
7		DEON	3	.82253	.0000
8		NONHEDON	4	.77842	.0000
9		ACTUTIL	5	.75819	.0000

STANDARDIZED CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS	
	FUNC 1
EGOISM	1.31218
HEDONISM	-1.23422
NONHEDON	-1.11713
ACTUTIL	0.67928
RULGRIEN	1.44200

Classification Phase

In the classification phase of the analysis, actual group membership can be compared to predicted group membership. When prior probability of group membership was not specified, 70 percent of all cases were found to

be correctly classified. When prior probabilities were specified (group one= 0.71, group two= 0.29), the percentage of correctly classified cases was 78. On group one, 94 percent of subjects were originally grouped correctly, while 6 percent were grouped incorrectly. In group two, 58 percent of the subjects were grouped correctly and 42 percent incorrectly. (See Table 6, p. 51) These findings were echoed in the histogram (See Figure 1, p. 52) in which group one clustered fairly closely, and group two was more widely dispersed. The centroid for group one was 0.35534, and for group two was -0.88147.

Table 6

Classification

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS -

ACTUAL GROUP	NO. OF CASES	PREDICTED GROUP MEMBERSHIP	
		1	2
GROUP 1	94	88 93.6%	6 6.4%
GROUP 2	38	22 57.9%	16 42.1%
UNGROUPED CASES	27	19 70.4%	8 29.6%

PERCENT OF "GROUPED" CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED: 78.79%

CLASSIFICATION PROCESSING SUMMARY

159 CASES WERE PROCESSED.

0 CASES WERE EXCLUDED FOR MISSING OR OUT-OF-RANGE GROUP CODES.

159 CASES WERE USED FOR PRINTED OUTPUT.

Summary

The results of the study suggest that persons who are traditional in their premarital sexual standards will develop rules and then judge actions according to how closely those actions adhere to the rules. Persons who are permissive with affection will consider each act, and the nature of that act when judging morality. They will not rely on previously developed rules.

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Preliminary Statistics

The data present two portraits, one of the traditional group, and one of the permissiveness with affection group. Reviewing the means for the moral construct variables, it is apparent that persons holding the traditional standard of sexual behavior scored higher on the average on egoism, rule-utilitarianism, deontology, and rule-orientation than those persons who were classified as permissive with affection. These results suggest that persons who adhere to the traditional standard are concerned with: (a) achieving their definition of the good for themselves; (b) the nature of an act; (c) whether that act conforms to rules previously accepted; and (d) maximizing "the good". Persons adhering to the permissiveness with affection standard scored higher on hedonism, act-utilitarianism, utilitarianism, and act-orientation. These results suggest that persons who are permissive with affection believe: (a) pleasure is the only intrinsic good; (b) not only the act but the end result of that act must be considered when judging the act; and (c) in maximizing

"the good". Responses from both groups were the same on the construct of nonhedonism, which is the belief that pleasure is not the only intrinsic good. This is possibly due to the relatively conservative sample. Another similarity between groups is their common belief in maximizing the good (utilitarianism). However, the traditional group is rule-oriented in their utilitarianism, and the permissive with affection group is act-oriented.

The main difference between the groups observable from the means is whether they rely on rules or acts to judge if an action is moral. Traditional persons have accepted society's long held rule toward sexual behavior: that coitus is taboo prior to marriage. Persons who are permissive with affection judge the morality of their sexual actions on the level of perceived mutual affection present in the relationship. These findings parallel those of Jurich and Jurich (1974).

Discriminant Analysis

The discriminant analysis was first run by the direct entry method. From the results, rule orientation had the largest standardized coefficient (2.20922); that will result in a larger function value. The function is the defining range of numbers that discriminates between

groups. In this study, the centroid function for traditionalists (group one) is 0.35534, and for the permissive with affection group (group two) the centroid function is -0.88147. Therefore, larger function values are associated with the traditional group, (group one). It is likely that traditionalists tend to be rule-oriented, or to believe that rules must be made and followed, and that actions must be judged by how closely they adhere to those rules. Because the direct entry analysis provided information mainly about traditionalists, a step-wise procedure was followed next, in order to gain information about the permissive with affection group.

The step-wise discriminant analysis suggested, by entering act-utilitarianism first and alone, that this construct was the major polarizing variable between the traditional group and the permissiveness with affection group. Therefore, these groups must differ most in their beliefs concerning the importance of the act itself in determining the morality of an action. Since those in the permissiveness with affection group scored higher on the average on the construct of act-utilitarianism, it is probable that they believe actions, their nature and results, are important in judging morality. Traditionalists probably believe the converse, that it is important to decide upon rules

which will maximize the good and then judge an action according to how closely it adheres to those rules. This idea is supported by the traditionalists higher mean scores on rule-utilitarianism, rule-orientation, and deontology, and by the results of the direct entry analysis.

The final model presented by the step-wise method in discriminant analysis included the following five variables: egoism, hedonism, nonhedonism, act-utilitarianism, and rule-orientation. These variables are the ones which discriminate best between the traditional group (group one) and the permissive with affection group (group two). Apparently, these groups differ on their definition of "the good" as well as on their judgment of "the good". Those in the permissiveness with affection group scored higher than the traditionalists on the hedonism scale, which means they believe pleasure is the only intrinsic good. Holding pleasure in high regard is one explanation for their permissiveness. In addition, those adhering to the permissiveness with affection standard exhibited a wider range of variability within their group than those in the traditional group. This is possibly due to their tendency to place less importance on rules and, instead, individually judge actions according to the amount of good resultin from them. Greater variability is

derived from those situations wherein persons judge actions on an individual basis. Traditionalists, on the other hand, make rules and adhere to them, such as the rule of sexual abstinence prior to marriage, making their actions more predictable and low in variability.

Application

The purpose of this research was to study the relationship between sexual standards and the content component of moral structure. This area is important to our understanding of sexual behavior because a person's beliefs (content) about morality govern her/his behavior. Therefore, once these beliefs are known, behavior becomes more predictable (Boyce & Jensen, 1978). This is important from a therapeutic standpoint because information of this nature is helpful when assessing sexual behavior and its likely effects (positive and negative) upon the client, and society in general. For example, when working with an adolescent who states s/he holds traditional values, yet behaves permissively, it would be important to assess the content of the stated moral structure. With this information, the therapist could first assist the client in clarifying the stated values (beliefs). Next, the therapist could assist the client in bringing her/his behavior into consonance with her/his beliefs, thus

removing conflict, and enhancing self-awareness and self-esteem.

Limitations

This study is limited in generalizability by the relatively small, homogeneous, purposive sample. Further research in this subject area should utilize a larger, heterogeneous, random sample. This type of sample would result in representation of all five sexual standards; permissiveness without affection, traditional, double, permissiveness with affection, and nonexploitative permissiveness without affection. With representation of all five groups, it would be possible to discover the relationship of the five sexual standards to the nine constructs of moral content. Also, this type of sample, along with different information-gathering techniques, would allow the use of multiple regression analysis. Regression would provide more information about the extent of the differences between the groups on the moral content constructs.

Future Directions

Future research in this area should be directed toward discovering the extent of the differences among the groups on the moral content constructs. With a larger, random sample and a different method of

gathering information (e.g., interview), multiple regression analysis could be used to provide information relative to the degree of association between specific moral content constructs and various sexual standards. When this is accomplished, the next logical step would be to combine the areas of content and structure of moral thought and then correlate this information with the five sexual standards. This would provide valuable information for the therapeutic setting (diagnosis and treatment) and for the development of psycho-educational programs, addressing a vast array of sexual issues (e.g., basic sex education, heterosexual issues, incest, rape).

REFERENCES

- Bauman, K. E., & Wilson, R. R. (1974). Sexual behavior of unmarried university students in 1968 and in 1972. Journal of Sex Research, 10, 327-333.
- Bell, R. R., & Chaskes, J. B. (1970). Premarital sexual experience among coeds, 1958 and 1968. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 81-89.
- Billy, J. O. G., & Udry, J. R. (1985). The influence of male and female best friends on adolescent sexual behavior. Adolescence, 77, 21-32.
- Bouhmama, D. (1984). Assessment of Kohlberg's stages of moral development in two cultures. Journal of Moral Education, 13, 124-132.
- Boyce, W. D., & Jensen, L.C. (1978). Moral reasoning. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Carroll, J. L., Volk, K. D., & Hyde, J. S. (1985). Differences between males and females in motives for engaging in sexual intercourse. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 14, 131-138.
- Christensen, H. T., & Gregg, C. F. (1970). Changing sex norms in America and Scandinavia. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 616-627.
- Clayton, R. R., & Bokemeier, J. L. (1980). Premarital sex in the seventies. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 759-775.
- D'Augelli, J. F. (1971). Moral reasoning, sex guilt, sexual attitudes, and parental behaviors as related to women's premarital sexual behavior. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Connecticut.
- D'Augelli, J. F. (1972). The relationship of moral reasoning, sex guilt, and interpersonal interaction to couples' premarital sexual experience. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

- D'Augelli, J. F., & D'Augelli, A. R. (1977). Moral reasoning and premarital sexual behavior: toward reasoning about relationships. Journal of Social Issues, 33, 44-66.
- DeLamater, J. D., & MacCorquodale, P. (1975). The effects of interview schedule variations on reported sexual behavior. Sociological Methods and Research, 4, 215-236.
- DeLamater, J. D., & MacCorquodale, P. (1979). Premarital sexuality: attitudes, relationships, behavior. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dewey, J. (1930). Human nature and conduct. New York: Modern Library.
- Ehrmann, W. (1964). Marital and nonmarital sexual behavior. In H. T. Christensen (Ed.), Handbook of marriage and the family (pp.585-622). Chicago: Rand McNally and Co.
- Gagnon, J. H. (1977). Human sexualities. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Gilligan, C., Kohlberg, L., Lerner, J., & Belenky, M. (1971). Moral reasoning about sexual dilemmas. In Technical reports of the commission on obscenity and pornography, Vol. 1. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Press.
- Hampe, G. D., & Ruppel, H. J., Jr. (1974). The measurement of premarital sexual permissiveness: a comparison of two Guttman scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 451-463.
- Helms, D. B., & Turner, J. S. (1976). Exploring child behavior. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: W. B. Saunders Company.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1970). Moral development. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology, Vol. 2. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hornick, J. P. (1978). Premarital sexual attitudes and behavior. The Sociological Quarterly, 19, 534-544.

- Jessor, S. L., & Jessor, R. (1975). Transition from virginity to nonvirginity among youth: a social-psychological study over time. Developmental Psychology, 11, 473-484.
- Jessor, S. L., & Jessor, R. (1977). Problem behavior and psych-social behavior: a longitudinal study of youth. New York: Academic Press.
- Jurich, A. P., & Jurich, J. A. (1974). The effect of cognitive moral development upon the selection of premarital sexual standards. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 736-741.
- King, M. (1975). Sex on the college campus: current attitudes and behavior. Journal of College Student Personnel, 16, 205-209.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). Sexual behavior in the human male. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.
- Kitchener, K. S., King, P. M., Davison, M.L., Parker, C. A., & Wood, P. K. (1984). A longitudinal study of moral and ego development in young adults. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13, 197-211.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: the cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Kohlberg, L. (1973). Continuities in childhood and adult moral development revisited. In P. B. Baltes & R. W. Schaie (Eds.), Life-span developmental psychology, personality, and socialization (pp. 179-204). New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Lewis, R. A., & Burr, W. R. (1975). Premarital coitus and commitment among college students. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 4, 73-79.
- Liebert, R. M., & Wicks-Nelson, R. (1981). Developmental psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentiss Hall.
- Loevinger, J., & Wessler, R. (1970). Measuring ego development: construction and use of a sentence completion test, Vol. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Loevinger, J. (1979). Construct validity of the sentence completion test of ego development. Applied Psychological Measures, 3, 281-311.
- Louis Harris and Associates. (1986). The planned parenthood poll. New York, New York: Planned Parenthood Federation of America.
- Luckey, E. B., & Nass, G. D. (1969). A comparison of sexual attitudes and behavior in an international sample. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31, 364-379.
- Marchand-Jodoin, L., & Samson, J.-M. (1982). Kohlberg's theory applied to the moral and sexual development of adults. Journal of Moral Education, 11, 247-258.
- Mill, J. S. (1971). Utilitarianism (S. Gorovitz, Ed.). New York: Bobbs-Merrill. (Original work published 1863)
- Miller, B. C., Christensen, R. B., & Olson, T. D. (1987). Adolescent self esteem in relation to sexual attitudes and behavior. Youth and Society, 19, 93-111.
- Mirande', A. M., & Hammer, E. L. (1974). Premarital sexual permissiveness: a research note. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 356-358.
- Norusis, Marija J. (1985). SPSSx advanced statistics guide. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Packard, V. (1969). The sexual wilderness. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.
- Piaget, J. (1965). The moral judgment of the child, (M. Gabain, Trans.) New York: Free Press. (Originally published, 1932).
- Reed, D., & Weinberg, M. S. (1984). Premarital coitus: Developing and established sexual scripts. Social Psychology Quarterly, 47, 129-138.
- Reiss, I. L. (1960). Premarital sexual standards in America. New York: Free Press.
- Reiss, I. L. (1962). Consistency and sexual ethics. Marriage and Family Living, 24, 264-269.

- Reiss, I. L. (1964). The scaling of premarital sexual permissiveness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26, 188-198.
- Reiss, I. L. (1966). The sexual renaissance: a summary and analysis. Journal of Social Issues, 22, 123-137.
- Reiss, I. L. (1967). The social context of premarital sexual permissiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rest, J. R. (1979). Development in judging moral issues. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rest, J. R., Cooper, D., Coder, R., Masanz, J., & Anderson, D. (1974). Judging the important issues in moral dilemmas- an objective measure of development. Developmental Psychology, 10, 491-501.
- Roche, P. (1986). Premarital sex: attitudes and behavior by dating stage. Adolescence, 81, 107-121.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Samson, J.-M. (1980). Sex education and values: is indoctrination avoidable? In D. B. Cochrane & M. Manley-Casimir (Eds.), Development of moral reasoning: Practical approaches (pp. 232-268). New York: Praeger.
- Snarey, J. R., Reimer, J., & Kohlberg, L. (1985). Development of social-moral reasoning among kibbutz adolescents: a longitudinal cross-cultural study. Developmental Psychology, 21, 3-17.
- Stein, J. L. (1973). Adolescents' reasoning about moral and sexual dilemmas: a longitudinal study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Teevan, J. J., Jr. (1972). Reference groups and premarital sexual behavior. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 283-291.
- Terman, L. M. (1973). Concept mastery test: manual. New York: Psychological Corp.

- Turiel, E. (1978). The development of concepts of social structure. In J. Glick & K. A. Clarke-Stewart (Eds.), The development of social understanding (pp. 25-107). New York: Gardner Press.
- Vener, A. M., & Stewart, C. S. (1974). Adolescent sexual behavior in middle America revisited: 1970-1973. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 728-735.
- Walsh, R. H., Ferrell, M. Z., & Tolone, W. L. (1976). Selection of reference group, perceived reference group permissiveness, and personal permissiveness attitudes and behavior: a study of two consecutive panels (1967-1971; 1970-1974). Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 495-507.
- Zelnic, M., & Kantner, J. F. (1972). Sexuality, contraception and pregnancy among young unwed females in the United States. In C. F. Westoff & R. Parke, Jr. (Eds.), Commission on population growth and the American future, research reports, Vol. 1, demographic and social aspects of population growth. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office.
- Zelnic, M., & Kantner, J. F. (1977). Sexual and contraceptive experience of young unmarried women in the United States, 1976 and 1971. Family Planning Perspectives, 9, 55-71.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

PART I

1. How old are you? (Circle the number)
- | | | |
|------------------|-------------|----------------|
| 1. 12 or younger | 3. 18 to 22 | 5. 31 to 50 |
| 2. 13 to 17 | 4. 23 to 30 | 6. 51 or older |
2. What is your ethnic background?
- | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. White | 4. Alaskan Native | 7. Hispanic: Puerto Rican |
| 2. Black | 5. Asian | 8. Hispanic: Cuban |
| 3. American Indian | 6. Hispanic: Mexican | 9. Other: _____ |
3. Circle the highest grade you have completed in school.
- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Grade School/High School | College |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 + |
4. What is your sex?
1. Male 2. Female
5. What is your present marital status?
- | | | |
|------------|--------------|-----------------|
| 1. Single | 2. Separated | 5. Widowed |
| 2. Married | 3. Divorced | 6. Other: _____ |
6. Where did you live most of the time while you were growing up?
- | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. on a farm | 5. in a city of 30,000 to 100,000 |
| 2. in a small rural community | 6. in a city of |
| 3. in a small town less than 2,500 | 7. in a city of |
| 4. in a city of 2,500 to 30,000 | |
7. What is the marital status of your parents (parent)?
- | | | |
|------------|--------------|------------|
| 1. Single | 3. Separated | 5. Widowed |
| 2. Married | 4. Divorced | |
8. If your parents are separated, divorced, or widowed, with which parent are you living?
1. Father 2. Mother 3. Other: _____
9. What is your father's main occupation (please give a full answer, such as "welder in an aircraft factory," "salesman in a small clothing store," "owner and operator of a large dairy farm," etc.)?
- Occupation (title): _____
- Brief Description: _____
- _____

Pg. 2
Part I

10. Circle the highest grade in school completed by your father.

Grade School/High School

College

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 +

11. What is your father's annual income?

1. None

6. \$14,000 to \$15,999

2. Less than \$8,000

7. \$16,000 to \$17,999

3. \$8,000 to \$9,999

8. \$18,000 to \$19,999

4. \$10,000 to \$11,999

9. \$20,000 to \$21,999

5. \$12,000 to \$13,999

10. \$22,000 or above

12. What is your mother's main occupation (please give full answer, such as "homemaker for a family of 6," "professor of chemistry," "legal secretary," etc.)?

Occupation (title): _____

Brief Description: _____

13. Circle the highest grade in school completed by your mother.

Grade School/High School

College

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 +

14. What is your mother's annual income?

1. None

6. \$14,000 to \$15,999

2. Less than \$8,000

7. \$16,000 to \$17,999

3. \$8,000 to \$9,999

8. \$18,000 to \$19,999

4. \$10,000 to \$11,999

9. \$20,000 to \$21,999

5. \$12,000 to \$13,999

10. \$22,000 or above

Pg. 4
Part III

PART III

The following questions concern some attitudes of yours regarding dating behavior. We are interested in your own personal views about the questions we will ask. The questions all concern what you believe about dating.

On the following questions, check the degree of agreement or disagreement you have with each statement. Answer these statements on the basis of how you feel toward the view expressed. Your name will never be connected with these answers, so please be as honest as you can.

Most of the words we use have a common meaning to most people, but some may need definition:

Definitions of intimacy levels

necking—involves both embracing and kissing

light petting—involves necking and fondling of the breasts from either outside or inside the clothing

heavy petting—involves touching or fondling of genitalia from outside or inside of the clothing and may involve mutual fondling by both

petting to climax—involves one or both achieving an orgasm without penetration of vagina by the penis

Definitions of commitment levels

dating steadily—involves dating each other regularly but each has the freedom to date another if he or she desires

going steady—involves an understanding on the part of the partners that they will not go with others

informal engagement—an agreement made by a couple to accept each other as marriage partners in the future but no announcement has been made of their relationship (typically a ring has not been given)

formal engagement—involves an announcement having been made to parents and others and, in most cases, involves a ring for the girl

Pg. 7
Part III

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
17. I believe that heavy petting is acceptable for the male before marriage when he is:					
___ Casually Dating					
___ Dating Steadily					
___ Going Steady					
___ Informally Engaged					
___ Formally Engaged					
18. I believe that heavy petting is acceptable for the male before marriage when he is in love.					
19. I believe that heavy petting is acceptable for the male before marriage when he feels strong affection for his partner.					
20. I believe that heavy petting is acceptable for the male before marriage even if he does not feel particularly affectionate toward his partner.					
21. I believe that petting to climax is acceptable for the male before marriage when he is:					
___ Casually Dating					
___ Dating Steadily					
___ Going Steady					
___ Informally Engaged					
___ Formally Engaged					
22. I believe that petting to climax is acceptable for the male before marriage when he is in love.					
23. I believe that petting to climax is acceptable for the male before marriage when he feels strong affection for his partner.					
24. I believe that petting to climax is acceptable for the male before marriage even if he does not feel affectionate toward his partner.					

Pg. 8
Part III

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
25. I believe that sexual intercourse is acceptable for the male before marriage when he is:					
___ Casually Dating					
___ Dating Steadily					
___ Going Steady					
___ Informally Engaged					
___ Formally Engaged					
26. I believe that sexual intercourse is acceptable for the male before marriage when he is in love.					
27. I believe that sexual intercourse is acceptable for the male before marriage when he feels strong affection for his partner.					
28. I believe that sexual intercourse is acceptable for the male before marriage even if he does not feel particularly affectionate toward his partner.					
29. I believe that holding hands is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is:					
___ Casually Dating					
___ Dating Steadily					
___ Going Steady					
___ Informally Engaged					
___ Formally Engaged					
30. I believe that holding hands is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is in love.					
31. I believe that holding hands is acceptable for the female before marriage when she feels strong affection for her partner.					
32. I believe that holding hands is acceptable for the female before marriage even if she does not feel particularly affectionate toward her partner.					

Pg. 10
Part III

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
41. I believe that light petting is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is:					
___ Casually Dating					
___ Dating Steadily					
___ Going Steady					
___ Informally Engaged					
___ Formally Engaged					
42. I believe that light petting is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is in love.					
43. I believe that light petting is acceptable for the female before marriage when she feels strong affection for her partner.					
44. I believe that light petting is acceptable for the female before marriage even if she does not feel particularly affectionate toward her partner.					
45. I believe that heavy petting is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is:					
___ Casually Dating					
___ Dating Steadily					
___ Going Steady					
___ Informally Engaged					
___ Formally Engaged					
46. I believe that heavy petting is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is in love					
47. I believe that heavy petting is acceptable for the female before marriage when she feels strong affection for her partner.					
48. I believe that heavy petting is acceptable for the female before marriage even if she does not feel particularly affectionate toward her partner.					

Pg. 11
Part III

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
49. I believe that petting to climax is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is:					
___ Casually Dating					
___ Dating Steadily					
___ Going Steady					
___ Informally Engaged					
___ Formally Engaged					
50. I believe that petting to climax is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is in love.					
51. I believe that petting to climax is acceptable for the female before marriage when she feels strong affection for her partner.					
52. I believe that petting to climax is acceptable for the female before marriage even if she does not feel particularly affectionate toward her partner.					
53. I believe that sexual intercourse is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is.					
___ Casually Dating					
___ Dating Steadily					
___ Going Steady					
___ Informally Engaged					
___ Formally Engaged					
54. I believe that sexual intercourse is acceptable for the female before marriage when she is in love.					
55. I believe that sexual intercourse is acceptable for the female before marriage when she feels strong affection for her partner.					
56. I believe that sexual intercourse is acceptable for the female before marriage even if she does not feel particularly affectionate toward her partner.					

PART IV

Pg. 12
Part IV

The following questions concern your personal dating and courting behavior. Check the answer which most accurately describes your own behavior for each of the statements. If the statement does not apply to you, check "not applicable."

- | | Never | Seldom | Sometimes | Frequently | Very Frequently | Not Applicable |
|--|-------|--------|-----------|------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1. How often have you held hands with someone of the opposite sex while: | | | | | | |
| ___ Casually Dating | | | | | | |
| ___ Dating Steadily | | | | | | |
| ___ Going Steady | | | | | | |
| ___ Informally Engaged | | | | | | |
| ___ Formally Engaged | | | | | | |
| 2. How often have you kissed someone of the opposite sex while: | | | | | | |
| ___ Casually Dating | | | | | | |
| ___ Dating Steadily | | | | | | |
| ___ Going Steady | | | | | | |
| ___ Informally Engaged | | | | | | |
| ___ Formally Engaged | | | | | | |
| 3. How often have you necked with someone of the opposite sex while: | | | | | | |
| ___ Casually Dating | | | | | | |
| ___ Dating Steadily | | | | | | |
| ___ Going Steady | | | | | | |
| ___ Informally Engaged | | | | | | |
| ___ Formally Engaged | | | | | | |
| 4. How often have you engaged in light petting with someone of the opposite sex while: | | | | | | |
| ___ Casually Dating | | | | | | |
| ___ Dating Steadily | | | | | | |
| ___ Going Steady | | | | | | |
| ___ Informally Engaged | | | | | | |
| ___ Formally Engaged | | | | | | |

THE DRUG

Pg. 14
Part V

Suppose ...

Your closest loved one (e.g., mother, father, spouse) was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save him/her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in your town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging you ten times what the drug cost to make. You went to everyone you knew to borrow the money, but you could only get together about \$1,000, which is half the cost. You told the druggist that your loved one was dying, and asked him to sell it for less or let you pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." You tried every possible way to get the money, and when that failed, you tried every legal way to get the drug without paying the full amount of money. Nothing worked, so you got desperate and began to think about breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for your loved one.

Should you steal the drug? (Check one) _____ I should steal it _____ I can't decide

_____ I should not steal it

Very important
 Quite important
 To some extent
 Not very important
 Not at all important

REASONING ABOUT "THE DRUG"

On the left-hand side of the page check one of the spaces by each question to indicate its importance in the decision you made about whether or not to steal the drug. In other words, how important was each of these items in making your decision?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. If you let him/her die will you have someone to take care of you and provide for your physical needs? Or, if you steal, is it worth risking the discomfort of going to jail yourself? (Of these two statements, respond in the left-hand margin only to the one which was the more important in making your decision.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Sometimes in the past you've had to go downtown yourself.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Stealing is simply wrong, regardless of the results.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. If everyone stole when he wanted to, society would be so chaotic that there could be no happiness or peace of mind for anyone.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. In some cases stealing is justified because it allows an individual (in this case your loved one) to live and continue enjoying the companionship of loved ones and to fulfill his purpose in life.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Will your decision, whatever it may be, lead to some abstract goal for yourself (e.g., salvation, honor, fame, self-actualization, respectability, etc.)?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. In this case it is just right to steal.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. If everyone stole when he wanted to, society would crumble and wouldn't be able to meet the physical needs of its members.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In some cases stealing is justified because it allows another person (in this case your loved one) to overcome physical pain and suffering.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. In this case it is just wrong to steal.

From the list of items above, select the four that were the most important in making your decision about whether or not to steal the drug (do not list any items that you rated NOT AT ALL important; leave a blank instead):

Most important _____
 Second most important _____
 Third most important _____
 Fourth most important _____

THE MINE SHAFT

Pg. 15
Part V

Suppose ...

You and two other people are trapped underground in a deep mine shaft. You know that rescue operations will take three or four days, but the air supply will not last all three of you for that long. Two of you, however, could probably live long enough on the available air - but that means one of you must die for the other two to live. You begin to think about killing one among you in order that two may live and return to their families.

Should one of you be killed to allow the others to live? (Check one)

- _____ One should be killed
 _____ I can't decide
 _____ One should not be killed

Very important
 Quite important
 Fairly important
 Not very important
 Not at all important

REASONING ABOUT "THE MINE SHAFT"

On the left-hand side of the page check one of the spaces by each question to indicate its importance in the decision you made about whether or not one of you should be killed. In other words, how important was each of these items in making your decision?

				1. In this case it is just wrong to kill.
				2. In this case killing is justified because only one person suffers physically rather than all three. It is really a kind of self-defense for the two that live.
				3. Will you be one of the ones to live and thus avoid the pain of dying?
				4. What if everyone killed when he wanted to? Society would collapse and wouldn't be able to meet the needs of its members. There would be greater pain and physical suffering for everyone.
				5. In some cases killing is right because more people are then enabled to continue living and fulfilling their purpose in life.
				6. In this case it is just right to kill one of the people.
				7. If everyone killed when he wanted to, there would be no security and no one could have peace of mind.
				8. It is not right to take someone's life. Killing is wrong, regardless of the results.
				9. Sometimes it just doesn't pay to get up in the morning and that should be kept in mind.
				10. Will your decision, whatever it may be, lead to some abstract goal for yourself (e.g., salvation, honor, fame, self-actualization, respectability, etc.)?

From the list of questions above, select the four that were the most important in making your decision about whether or not one of you should be killed (do not list any items that you rated NOT AT ALL important; leave a blank instead):

- Most important _____
 Second most important _____
 Third most important _____
 Fourth most important _____

THE DESERTER

Pg. 16
Part V

Suppose ...

Your country was involved in a war a few years ago and during the war many soldiers deserted. Since the war ended your country has had a law that all such deserters, if caught, must go to prison and serve long sentences. Recently, you saw a man whom you know to be a deserter and who is the father of two children. By checking up on him, you have found that he has been a model citizen in every way and everyone in his town is very fond of him. The law says that anyone seeing a deserter must turn him in.

Should you obey the law and turn him in? (Check one)

- I should turn him in
 I can't decide
 I should not turn him in

Very important	Quite important	To some extent important	Not very important	Not at all important	
					1. In some cases the subjectiveness of living is less lenuous than the objectivity of life.
					2. In this case it is just right to break the law and not turn him in.
					3. Will your decision, whatever it may be, lead to some abstract goal for yourself (e.g., salvation, honor, fame, self-actualization, respectability, etc.)?
					4. If everyone broke the law when he wanted to, society would fall apart and wouldn't be able to meet the needs of its members. There would be a lot of physical pain and suffering for everyone.
					5. In some cases breaking the law is justified because it allows an individual (in this case the deserter) to avoid unnecessary physical suffering.
					6. In this case it is just wrong to break the law.
					7. Will you go to jail for not turning him in?
					8. If everyone broke the law when he wanted to, there would be only chaos and no one could have peace of mind or security.
					9. Sometimes breaking the law is justified because it leads to greater peace and tranquility for everyone involved. Making a good man go to jail does not increase peace or tranquility and is not best for society.
					10. Breaking the law is not right, regardless of the results. The law should be obeyed.

From the list of questions above, select the four that were the most important in making your decision about whether or not to obey the law and turn the deserter in (do not list any items that you rated NOT AT ALL important; leave a blank instead):

- Most important _____
 Second most important _____
 Third most important _____
 Fourth most important _____

THE DYING LOVED ONE

Pg. 17
Part V

Suppose ...

Your closest loved one is dying from an incurable disease. He/she is in a tremendous amount of pain and is expected to die in a matter of weeks. Your loved one is too sick to be able to give permission that he/she be administered a drug that will make him/her die sooner, but under the laws of your state, you are able to give such permission. You know that he/she is in a great deal of pain and that he/she will die soon, anyway.

Should you give your permission? (Check one) _____ I should give permission
 _____ I can't decide
 _____ I should not give permission

Very important
 Quite important
 To some extent
 Not very important
 Not at all important

REASONING ABOUT "THE DYING LOVED ONE"

On the left-hand side of the page check one of the spaces by each question to indicate its importance in the decision you made about whether or not to give your permission to have your loved one die sooner. In other words, how important was each of these items in making your decision?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. It is not right to take someone's life. Killing is wrong, regardless of the results.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. In some cases killing is right because it reduces suffering and pain.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. What if everyone killed when he wanted to? Society would absolutely fall apart and everyone would experience great pain and physical suffering.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Are you a member of the local rotary club or do you have a friend who is?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. In this case it is just right to allow killing.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Will you have someone to care for you and provide for your physical needs?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. If everyone killed when he wanted to there would be no peace and no one could be happy.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. In some cases killing is right because it brings peace of mind and comfort to those close to the dying person.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In this case, it is just wrong to kill.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Will your decision, whatever it may be, lead to some abstract goal for yourself (e.g., salvation, honor, fame, self-actualization, respectability, etc.)?

From the list of questions above, select the four that were the most important in making your decision about whether or not to give your permission (do not list any items that you rated NOT AT ALL important; leave a blank instead):

Most important _____
 Second most important _____
 Third most important _____
 Fourth most important _____

THE TAXES

Suppose ...

You are the breadwinner of a large family and the time of year has come when you are required by law to pay taxes to the government. Two things, however, make it hard for you to pay your taxes. First, a certain amount of your taxes goes to a government program you abhor, or dislike very, very much, because you think it is immoral. It bothers you very much that your money goes for this program. Second, having a large family, you need all the money you can get and your taxes are really more than you can afford to pay. Your family is already going hungry and, due to some detail, you are not able to get welfare. You have tried everything and cannot get help anywhere. You know a way in which you can lie about the amount of taxes you have to pay without getting caught. This would allow you to save the money that your family needs so much, and also, not as much of your money would go for the program you think is immoral. Furthermore, with so many millions of people paying taxes, the government would never miss the money you don't pay. You start to think about lying about your taxes.

Should you lie about your taxes? (Check one) _____ I should lie _____ I can't decide
_____ I should not lie

Very important
 Quite important
 Fairly important
 Not very important
 Not at all important

REASONING ABOUT "THE TAXES"

On the left-hand side of the page check one of the spaces by each question to indicate its importance in the decision you made about whether or not to lie about your taxes. In other words, how important was each of these items in making your decision?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. If everyone lied when he wanted to, no one would be able to trust anyone else so no one could really be happy or have peace of mind.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. In some cases lying is beneficial because it leads to more favorable conditions (i.e., money, food, clothes) for the people who need them, in this case your own family.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Will your decision, whatever it may be, lead to some abstract goal for yourself (e.g., salvation, honor, fame, self-actualization, respectability, etc.)?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Is it worth the risk of suffering the discomfort of going to jail?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. In this case it is just right to lie.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6. If everyone lied when he wanted to, society would crumble and everyone, not just one family, would end up in poverty and physical suffering.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. What if everyone proved the substantiality of taxation to be more transient than the cessation of essence?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Such dishonesty as lying is simply wrong, regardless of the results.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In this case it is just wrong to lie.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Sometimes lying is beneficial because it leads to better overall conditions—greater peace of mind and tranquility for those involved, in this case your family.

From the list of items above, select the four that were the most important in making your decision about whether or not to lie about your taxes (do not list any items that you rated NOT AT ALL important; leave a blank instead):

- Most important _____
 Second most important _____
 Third most important _____
 Fourth most important _____

Circle the number next to the statement which you think best applies.

- _____ 1. How often, if ever, in the last year did you attend Sunday Church services?
- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Never | 4. Two or three times a month |
| 2. A few times a year or less | 5. Once a week |
| 3. Once a month | 6. Twice a week or oftener |
- _____ 2. How often have you prayed in the last year?
- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Never | 4. Two or three times a week |
| 2. A few times a year or less | 5. Once or twice a day |
| 3. A few times a month | 6. Three times a day or oftener |
- _____ 3. How often in the last year have you taken part in any activities or organizations of your Church other than attending services?
- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Never | 4. Two or three times a month |
| 2. A few times a year or less | 5. Once a week or oftener |
| 3. Once a month | |
- _____ 4. Circle two of the following statements which come nearest to being two main reasons why you attend or have attended Church.
- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Because I want to go | 5. To make me feel better |
| 2. My friends expect me to go | 6. My mother expects it |
| 3. God wants me to attend | 7. To learn to be a better person |
| 4. My father expects it | 8. Other _____ |
- _____ 5. Which of the following statements comes closest to what you believe about God?
1. I don't believe in God.
 2. I don't know whether there is a God and I don't believe there is any way to find out
 3. I don't believe in a personal God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind.
 4. I find myself believing in God some of the time, but not at other times.
 5. Although I have doubts, I feel that I do believe in God.
 6. I know God really exists and I have no doubts about it.
- _____ 6. Which of the following statements comes closest to what you believe about Jesus?
1. Frankly, I'm not entirely sure there was such a person as Jesus.
 2. I think Jesus was only a man, although an extraordinary one.
 3. I feel that Jesus was a great man and very holy, but I don't feel Him to be the Son of God anymore than the rest of us are children of God.
 4. Although I have some doubts, I feel basically that Jesus is divine.
 5. Jesus is the Divine Son of God and I have no doubts about it.

- _____ 7. The Bible tells of many miracles, some credited to Christ and some to other prophets and apostles. Generally speaking, which of the following statements comes closest to what you believe about Biblical miracles?
1. I am not sure whether these miracles really happened or not.
 2. I believe miracles are stories and never really happened.
 3. I believe the miracles happened, but can be explained by natural causes.
 4. I believe the miracles happened and can be explained only partly by natural causes.
 5. I believe the miracles actually happened just as the Bible says they did.
- _____ 8. What do you think is the truth of the statement, "The Devil actually exists?"
1. Definitely not true.
 2. Probably not true.
 3. Probably true.
 4. Completely true.
- _____ 9. How sure are you that you have found the answers to the meaning and purpose of life?
1. I don't really believe there are answers to these questions.
 2. I am quite sure I have not found them.
 3. I am uncertain whether or not I have found them.
 4. I am quite certain although at one time I was uncertain.
 5. I am quite certain and I pretty much grew up knowing these things.