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ABSTRACT

The place of relationships in moral development in adolescence is controversial both in the psychoanalytic and in the cognitive-developmental theories. Within each of these theoretical frameworks, there is a tension between, on the one hand, developmental models which assume that development goes in the direction of greater depersonalization and, on the other, those which assume that it goes in the direction of greater mutuality. In this project this question is examined, in particular, in the context of parent-child relations.

In Chapters IV to VI, a series of studies are reported, based on narratives of moral conflict situations. In Chapter IV, moral conflict situations described by 10-12, 14-16 and 17-21 year olds were examined for context, content and justifications offered for decisions taken in the situations. The results indicated that in all three age groups conflicts tended to be construed in the context of relationships. The most frequent context of moral dilemmas was relationships with significant others, especially parents. Age and gender differences were found both in relation to contextual and content issues. Justifications for the decisions taken mostly involved the self, self-other relationships or the other.

The importance of social-interactive contexts in moral development in adolescence was further highlighted by a second study carried out with two groups of 17-21 year olds, presented in Chapter V. One group was living with parents and the second matched group was living in halls of residence. The results showed that while the group living with parents mentioned much more conflicts involving parents than the group living in halls of residence, in the latter group conflicts with peers predominated.

In the third study, reported in Chapter VI, two groups were examined: 14-16 and 17-21 year olds. Subjects were asked to describe moral conflict
situations involving their parents, to say how they resolved the conflict and to indicate the reason why. The results highlighted a range of conflict issues involving especially parental interference in their lives. Some differences in the use of strategies of conflict resolution were found as a function of age, gender and the situation. Greater self agency was found to coexist alongside greater mutuality in parent-child relations in late adolescence.

The final study (Chapter VII) was an interview study carried out with parents and adolescents (15-16 year olds). The main aim of this study was to analyze parents' and adolescents' views on parental interference in everyday, potentially conflictual, situations. The results indicate that parental authority is not totally relinquished in adolescence, even though there are some areas of the adolescents' lives which both parents and children think should be preserved from parental interference, especially those having to do with adolescents' personal lives.

The findings of the studies point to the need for a social constructivist perspective in moral development in adolescence, which accounts for both changes and continuity in self and relationships during development.
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CHAPTER I

THE PSYCHOANALYTIC AND THE COGNITIVE-DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACHES TO MORAL DEVELOPMENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR ADOLESCENT DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

The place of relationships or social-interactive contexts in moral development is controversial both in the psychoanalytic and cognitive-developmental theories. In fact, internal contradictions are found within each of these theoretical frameworks. There is a tension between, on the one hand, developmental models which emphasize the mutuality of self and relationships in moral development, and on the other, those which assume that moral development goes in the direction of greater detachment from relationships.

The extent to which one follows one developmental model or the other has got important implications to the way one sees adolescent development as well. Whereas both assume that development goes in the direction of greater autonomy, autonomous morality is defined differently in these two models. In
the first, it is defined as an increasing capacity for self-regulation or self-reliance, whereas in the second it is defined as an increasing capacity for mutuality or cooperation.

Another important controversial issue is the nature of relationships with parents in adolescence. A tension is also felt between developmental models which emphasize continuity and those highlighting discontinuity in parent-child relationships. The main question is whether development goes in the direction of greater detachment from parents or of greater mutuality.

The questions raised here are the central tenets of this thesis. The psychoanalytic and the cognitive-developmental approaches to moral development have been chosen as the main point of departure for discussing these questions. The basic assumptions of these models are presented in the sections that follow. Their implications for adolescent development are then discussed, in light of recent approaches which have highlighted the importance of social-interactive contexts in moral development in adolescence.
1. The Psychoanalytic Approach to Moral Development

The psychoanalytic approach to moral development will be presented in two parts. First, Freud’s main contributions will be discussed, as well as the major controversies regarding his formulations. Second, the contributions of the post-Freudian literature to the subject will be highlighted.

Freud’s formulations on moral development: major contributions and controversies

Historically, since Freud’s early formulations on human development, psychoanalytic theory has placed a great emphasis on childhood experiences. As shown by Gallatin (1978), during its first thirty years or so, psychoanalysis ignored the importance of adolescence and concentrated mainly in childhood.

However, developmental thinking has been part of psychoanalytic theory since Freud’s early formulations. As pointed out in Settlage’s (1980) historical overview, psychoanalytic developmental thinking was evident, first, in Freud’s (1905) formulations of the oral, anal, phallic-oedipal, latency, and adolescent stages of psychosexual development. After 1923, the focus shifted to the development of ego capacities and defenses, still within the framework of psychosexual development.
It is difficult to present Freud’s theory of moral development, since he in fact presented more than one account of how the superego is formed (see Deigh, 1984). The superego concept is central in his theory. It was introduced in 'The Ego and the Id' (Freud, 1923), with the formulation of the structural theory. In this early conception, the conflicts of the oedipal phase were considered to play the largest role in superego formation. In 'Civilization and its Discontents' (Freud, 1930), a different account was given which made the oedipal conflict unessential to explaining how the superego and a conscience are acquired. The origins of the superego were assumed to be anchored, instead, in the early anxieties of the helpless child towards the caretaking figures who are, at the same time, a source of protection and of control over the child’s impulses. It is worth noting that yet another account of how a conscience is formed was presented by Freud before the introduction of the superego concept. It was formulated in 1913, in 'Totem and Taboo', and consisted of a phylogenetic explanation of how a conscience first came into existence through the primeval phylogenetic experience of patricide.

The fact that Freud presented different accounts of superego formation has apparently been ignored by Freud and subsequent writers who have mostly adopted Freud’s (1923) formulation of the superego as the "heir of the Oedipus complex". Melanie Klein (1933) has been appointed in the psychoanalytic literature as one of the few to have challenged the latter conception by postulating a preoedipal superego. However, as shown by Brickman (1983), she has been criticized by some authors (e.g. Sandler, 1960; Jacobson, 1964)
for condensing the affective and cognitive dimensions of ego development, in her contention that the dynamics observed in the first year of life reflect fixed intrapsychic structures rather than early functional precursors. In spite of her controversial assumptions, it has been suggested that she has stimulated the subsequent study of superego precursors in the preoedipal phase of development (Sandler, 1960).

Even if other authors have not gone so far as to postulate a preoedipal superego, there has been extensive support in the literature for the existence of preoedipal superego manifestations. For example, the notion that early superego manifestations exist as early as the anal phase has been widely accepted. The term "sphincter morality" (Ferenczi, 1925) has been used to describe the way in which the child complies with parental demands in the anal phase. According to Gillman (1982), the use of the adjective "anal superego" would be preferable to "sphincter morality", since it would better denote a stage of superego development. He feels that the latter term isolates these superego events from earlier and later stage. Further evidence for earlier internalization of prohibitions can be found in the internalization of the "no-experience" (Spitz, 1958) with the development of language capacities. Through child observation, Spitz has remarked that in the first half of the second year the child plays the mother's role and in identification with the aggressor applies the "no" prohibition to himself/herself. The "no-experience" is cathected with the aggressive energies of frustrated drive-discharge. As shown by Brickman (1983), Spitz distinguishes an initial phase of
"identification with the frustrator", without guilt, from the later "identification with the aggressor" (A. Freud, 1936), a reaction formation which implies the presence of guilt. Sandler's (1960) notion of "preautonomous superego schema", a preoedipal organization reflecting the idealized and desirable qualities of the parents, is also used to denote the way the child complies with parental demands prior to the formation of the superego as an autonomous structure.

In spite of the accumulating observational and clinical evidence supporting the existence of pre-oedipal superego manifestations, they have often been labelled 'precursors'. The criticisms related to the use of this term concentrate basically on the fact that the importance of these early superego manifestations is diminished more than is justifiable (Bernstein, 1983) or that a developmental discontinuity is often assumed between precursors and superego proper (Gillman, 1982).

The main criteria psychoanalysts have used to differentiate between precursors and later oedipal superego, has apparently been the lack of autonomy of precursors in comparison to the superego proper. As stated by Holder (1982): "they cannot possess anything like the degree of autonomy which we associate with mature superego functioning" (p. 257). Superego autonomy has often been defined as a gradual detachment of moral imperatives from the original object.
Superego autonomy is said to be achieved with the resolution of the oedipus complex. This view needs revision, however, as indicated by Holder (1982), in light of the findings in connection with the indexed analytic material at the Hampstead Clinic (see Sandler, 1962). As reported by Holder, a comparison of relevant analytic material indexed in the Instinctual and Superego sections has revealed that a number of children of latency age were in the middle of the oedipal struggles and yet at the same time were found to possess a fully internalized and developed superego which was functioning autonomously.

The controversies reported above, relating to the genesis of the superego as an autonomous structure, have been confirmed by A. Freud's (1981) remarks in a scientific forum on the superego. She noted: "this mental structure is well-known to us in its mature form. However, as analysts of adults, we know much less about its antecedents, its gradual formation and its various vicissitudes in the path towards independence" (p. 77). Similarly, Sandler (1981) has stressed that we still have to ask about the specific factors which cause a change from the sphincter morality, for example, to internalized morality.

A last debatable issue relating to the genetic roots of the superego concerns the role played by reality in superego development. While the state of object relations in the first years of life is acknowledged by the more recent psychoanalytic literature as having a great impact on later object relations and
on superego and ego development, the question of whether it is the child’s phantasy in the relationship with the parental figure (Freud, 1930) or whether it is the reality of the child’s relationship with the parental figure (Kohut and Seitz, 1963) which is the decisive factor in superego formation is still an open question.

Later developments in psychoanalytic theory have tended to place greater emphasis on the impact of reality on development. The orientation towards a reality-based model has been identified in particular in Kohut’s (1971) self psychology. However, analysts who follow Freud’s (1930) formulations support the view that the child’s phantasy is the decisive factor, for example, in what is seen or not seen as punishment, rather than whether the parents are forbidding or indulgent in reality (Brenner, 1982).

Apart from the controversies related to how and when a superego is formed, another debatable issue concerns the definition of the term superego. Sandler (1960) referred to the "conceptual dissolution" of the superego which has apparently led psychoanalysts to sort out their clinical material in other-than-superego terms, e.g. in terms of object relationships, ego activities, and the transference. Examination of cases indexed in the Hampstead Clinic Index has revealed, in Sandler’s words, a "quite striking example of an understocked section" (p. 129) relating to the superego.

Sandler (1960) has maintained that one can trace the origins of this
"conceptual dissolution" to later developments of the concept. Attempts to clarify the concept through the understanding of its genetic roots have, to his mind, blurred it to some extent. He contrasted these later developments with the internal consistency observed in Freud's early formulations, especially in the fifteen years following the publication of 'The Ego and the Id'.

However, the genesis of a conceptual confusion can be traceable throughout the history of the superego concept, particularly with regard to the distinction between the superego and the ego ideal. When Freud introduced the term in 1923, in 'The Ego and the Id', it was taken in a "broad and rather undifferentiated sense" (Laplanche and Pontalis, 1983), including both the functions of prohibition and of the ideal. The term 'superego' had, in fact, replaced the earlier notion of 'ego ideal', put forward by Freud in 1914, in the context of his theory of narcissism. The ego ideal was then referred to as an institution of the mind which watches the ego and which compares it with an ideal standard, and the same term was used to include the ideal image (Sandler, 1960). In 1923, the superego was used synonymously with the ego ideal. It was differentiated from the latter in 1933, the function of the ideal being ascribed to the ego ideal and the function of prohibition to the superego. It is worth noting, however, that the ego ideal and the superego were distinguished mainly functionally, for in this later conception, the ego ideal was seen as a part of the superego system. The controversy surrounding the relationship between these two institutions has persisted in the later literature. The literature has been divided between those who distinguish, to a greater or
lesser extent, between the superego and the ego ideal, and those who adopt
mainly Freud’s (1933) formulations and support the view of the ego ideal as
part of the superego.

One of the ways in which writers have distinguished between the
superego and the ego ideal has been in terms of the drives, the superego being
associated with aggressive drives and the ego ideal with libidinal drives.
Freud’s (1914) emphasis on the importance of the libidinal, erotic aspect of the
attachment to the parents in the formation of the ego ideal and his later stress
on the aggressive, sadistic root of the superego (Freud, 1930), has probably
contributed to this later division.

The view that aggression plays the largest role in superego formation
has been followed by many psychoanalysts (e.g. Jones, 1926; Eder, 1929;
Nunberg, 1932; Hartmann, Kris and Loewenstein, 1946; Lampl-de-Groot,
1961; Bibring, 1964). However, it has been directly challenged by some
writers who have considered the role of libidinal drives in superego formation
(e.g. Schafer, 1960; Kramer, 1958). It has been pointed out, nevertheless, that
even these authors have kept the majority view to the extent at least that they
have assigned to aggression an exclusive role in superego formation during the
oedipal period, while the origins of the loving aspects of superego functioning
have been assigned to the preoedipal phase of development (Brenner, 1982).

Apart from trying to clarify some controversial issues in Freud’s
formulations on superego development, the post-Freudian literature has brought new theoretical formulations which can be considered as indirect but significant contributions to the subject of moral development. These contributions will now be discussed.

**Contributions from the post-Freudian literature**

As shown by Settlage’s (1980) historical overview, developmental thinking and object relations were fundamental aspects of post-Freudian formulations. The combination of ego psychology theory with object relations theory can be clearly found in theorists such as Mahler and collaborators (Mahler, 1963; Mahler, Pine and Bergmann, 1975), who explored issues of separation-individuation, and Erikson (1950) with his theory of identity development across the life-span.

Mahler’s (1963, 1975) formulations play a central role in theories of development in general. As indicated by Behrends and Blatt (1985), "the individual’s major existential task throughout the life cycle is one of continued separation-individuation" (p. 34). The progressive internalizations of need-gratifying aspects of relationships with significant others is what enables this process. Separation-individuation is also an important step in superego development. In relation to superego formation, Freud (1938) stressed: "a portion of the external world has, at least partially, been abandoned as an
object and has instead, by identification, been taken into the ego and thus become an integral part of the internal world” (p. 205). In the same passage, Freud goes on to say that the functions which were previously performed by the people in the world continues to be performed by this new psychic agency.

Early superego determinants were also identified by other ego psychology-based theorists. The role which early identifications play in superego formation was stressed by A. Reich (1954). The qualities of the early ideals (predominantly archaic, or more mature and realistic) are seen to play a crucial role in whether a harmony between self-representation and the ego ideal may be attained. Later identifications which have customarily been seen only as ego defenses (Gillman, 1982) have also been spelled out as important superego precursors. These identifications, viewed as "the primordia or building blocks of the superego" (Spitz, 1958) include A. Freud’s (1936) notion of "identification with the aggressor" and Spitz’s (1958) notion of "identification with the frustrator", which according to him precedes the former developmentally. Other identifications on the side of aggression include role playing in which there is active repetition of passive experiences, turning aggression on the self, and also reaction formation against aggression. On the side of the 'loving and beloved superego', there are identifications with the provider and with the comforter (Gillman, 1982).

A developmental line of structure, from less differentiated structure to superego structure, was proposed by Sandler (1960). He postulated a
"preautonomous superego schema", a preoedipal organization which reflects the idealized and desirable qualities of the parents and which prompts the child to object-related behaviour. A developmental line of conflict (from outer to inner conflict) was highlighted by Kennedy and Yorke (1982) as a normal superego precursor. The role of the mother during infancy is emphasized by these authors. By satisfying the child’s needs, the mother functions as both guardian and auxiliary ego. In this way, the mother helps the child to tolerate unavoidable frustrations and to build up his/her representational world. Increasing cognitive and motor development and self/object differentiation feature as important factors in the building up of intrapsychic controls in the child.

Ego psychology theorists have therefore expanded on Freud’s later theory concerning the development of the ego and the mechanisms of defense. Their main contribution to the study of moral development has been their formulations concerning superego precursors. For these theorists, cognitive development is seen to play a crucial role in structure differentiation and ego maturation. The incorporation of the theory of object relations into the scope of psychoanalytic ego psychology has also brought important additions to the psychoanalytic formulations of moral development. The development of self- and object-representations, attained with greater cognitive and ego maturation, are viewed as normal superego precursors.

The impact of the mother-infant relationship on the building up of the
self/ego structure has been under consideration within the British object
relations school. M. Klein can be distinguished, however, from the other
theorists in that she concentrated on the infant's unconscious phantasies
regarding the mother, whereas authors such as Fairbairn, Balint, Guntrip,
Winnicott were more concerned with reality experiences in the mother-infant
relationship. Also, the object (the mother) plays a more active role in the latter
theories. Winnicott's (1960a) concept of 'good-enough mother', for instance,
implies that "the mother holds the infant, sometimes physically and all the time
figuratively" (p. 145). Furthermore, he attributes the genesis of the 'false self',
which conforms superficially and protects the 'true self', to environmental
failure. Guntrip (1968), like Fairbairn, was interested in schizoid patients who
suffer from emptiness, alienation, isolation. He believed these symptoms to be
connected with a lack of good-enough mothering, in Winnicott's sense (cf.
Bacal, 1987). Balint (1968) suggested the existence of an area of pre-oedipal
configurations occurring within a two-person relationship, in contrast to the
oedipal area characterized by conflict, with experiences arising in a triangular
relationship. He designated the former the area of the 'basic fault'. It is derived
from the disruption of the state of 'primary love', or primary object
relationships, in which the needs of the infant and the mother are perceived as
identical. The failure on the part of the 'primary objects' to fulfil their function
of satisfying the child's needs at this stage produces structural defects.

As far as issues of morality and moral development are concerned,
object relations theorists do not seem to have made direct contributions as, for
instance, ego psychology theorists did. However, their findings concerning early mother-infant relationship bring to attention the importance of establishing satisfactory relationships with objects for the formation of a cohesive ego/self structure. The quality of object relationships also plays a role in later superego structure formation. Object relations conflicts imply ego and/or superego defects (Dorpat, 1976). Superego functioning (moral self-regulation) is distinguished from moral regulations mediated by object representations (e.g. introjects) by the depersonalized quality of superego activity.

More recent historically, self psychology theory is mainly represented by the work of Kohut (1971). The literature which has compared self psychology and object relations models (e.g. Bacal, 1987; Grotstein, 1983) suggests that many of Kohut's ideas are to be found in the thinking of object relations theorists who preceded him, notwithstanding the fact that he himself does not seem to have recognized it (cf. Bacal, 1987). His theory wanted to recapture what he calls "experience-near" (empathic) phenomenology, in contrast to the "experience-distant" (detached) trend observed in ego psychology models and in some object relations models, especially in Klein (see Grotstein, 1983). He introduces an interactional viewpoint to psychoanalytic theory, i.e. the interaction between the self and the environment. The need for an interactional theory emerged from considerations of technique with vulnerable patients whose psychic organization is more dependent on the environment (London, 1985). This tradition, London adds, began with
Sullivan’s (1962) interpersonal theory.

The point of departure for the development of Kohut’s theory was a specific illness, namely narcissistic character disorders. According to him, narcissistic disorders involve a structural deficit in the organization of the self relating to maternal empathic failure. Therefore, his theory concentrates on deficits in the organization of the ‘self’ and archaic idealizations of the self and the object. The term ‘archaic’ in self psychology seems to designate normal pre-oedipal or preverbal behaviours persisting in the adult (London, 1985).

The importance of reality experiences in the mother-infant relationship is taken to the extreme in Kohut’s model. In contrasting Kohut and Klein, for example, Bacal (1987) notes: "the self of self psychology develops in consequence of the infant’s internalization of function of self-objects which are generally experienced as empathically responsive, and the self of Kleinian psychology develops as a result of the internalization of repaired objects whose goodness thus survives the infant’s enviously destructive unconscious phantasies" (p. 85). Kohut therefore emphasizes the reality of the empathic failure of the object rather than the infant’s unconscious fantasies about the object.

Although Kohut did not expand on issues of morality, when considering superego formation, he also put a great emphasis on reality experiences, as
suggested by Tyson and Tyson (1985). The critical and punishing features of the superego are seen as residues of real experiences with parental authority (Kohut and Seitz, 1963). Similarly, superego approval is viewed as direct replacement for parental approval and solely dependent on the original parents' capacity to be loving and approving.

Some final remarks on the psychoanalytic approach to moral development

This section has presented an overview of Freud's early formulations on the subject of moral development, as well as the major post-Freudian psychoanalytic contributions. Object relations theory, as we have seen, played a crucial role in the later formulations. Not only did it represent a distinct psychoanalytic school, it also provided a new developmental framework for looking at psychic phenomena. In the latter sense, it was incorporated by other psychoanalytic schools, such as, for example, Ego Psychology.

In terms of the morality conception, the later literature, with the exception of Klein (1933), has not really challenged Freud's 1923 conception of the superego as a structure formed during the oedipal phase. In fact, the superego concept has not been a subject of later contributions (Arlow, 1982). A greater emphasis on preoedipal/object relations/dyadic conflicts has been
observed in the post-Freudian literature. Oedipal/structural/triadic conflicts and, consequently, Freud's 1923 tripartite model, have been made secondary.

One can, therefore, conclude that recent contributions to the subject of morality have only been indirect. On the other hand, unlike Freud's earlier formulations, the later literature has truly strengthened the understanding of moral development per se. Freud did not really propose a theory of how morality is developed, but rather, of how morality is acquired (Deigh, 1984). The later literature has advanced the study of moral development by spelling out superego precursors and in that way has helped to bridge the gap between precursors and later structure found in Freud's early formulations. Ego psychology models have concentrated on the development of the ego and the mechanisms of defence as normal steps in superego development. Object relations theory and self psychology, by focusing on structural deficits prior to superego formation, have also helped us understand how a deficit in pre-oedipal structure may lead to a deficit in later structure.

Superego functioning requires, first, the formation of self- and object-representations, i.e. the transformation of interpersonal relations into psychic structures (Dorpat, 1976). Moral regulations which were before contingent on an external authority, are then mediated by object representations (e.g. introjects). The aim in moral development is a progressive depersonalization of moral activity until moral self-regulation, characteristic of superego functioning, is attained.
By de-emphasizing the importance of the development and vicissitudes of the drives in the development of moral regulation, object relations theory has concentrated, instead, in the quality of the mother-infant relationship. The implication of attributing a greater emphasis to object relations was that reality experiences in the mother-infant interaction were brought into focus, with the exception of Klein’s model, as shown elsewhere. In addition, the role of the mother/parental figure was highlighted. The importance of reality experiences is also emphasized by ego psychology models. More than in any other theory, however, it became central in Kohut’s formulations.

To conclude, one can argue that later psychoanalytic models of the mind have, in a sense, recaptured Freud’s very first (pre-1897) model of the mind. The reality of the patients’ experience was then the focus of attention in psychoanalysis. The reality of the infant’s relationship with the mother and its impact on later development again becomes the focus of attention of later contributions. Reality is also central in the current conception of defense in ego psychology models, as Freud’s pre-1897 defense conception (Rapaport, 1958). It is important to consider the implication of a reality-based model for the study of moral development. For example, the conception of the superego’s critical and punishing functions as being residues of real experiences with the parents (Kohut and Seitz, 1963) are, in fact, contrary to Freud’s (1930) conclusion that the child’s superego does not reflect the severity with which the child has been treated, ie. that it can be strict even in cases where education has been lenient or tolerant.
2. The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Development

In this section, a historical overview of the cognitive-developmental approach to morality is presented. In contrast with psychoanalytic formulations, largely based on data derived from patients’ private experiences in the clinical setting, cognitive-developmental theory is based on evidence from empirical research. Initially, Piaget’s and Kohlberg’s theory of moral development are presented. Recent formulations on moral development are then discussed.

Piaget’s theory of moral development

As pointed out by Freitag (1992), there are few publications on the subject of morality by Piaget. Its most famous work on the subject was published in 1932, in 'The Moral Judgment of the Child'. Piaget was much more interested in the genesis of structures of logical thinking than in the genesis of morality. He saw a parallel between these two, assuming the former to be a necessary condition for the latter. In Piaget’s model, moral development is thus closely tied to cognitive development.

Cognitive development is assumed to progress through qualitatively different stages following an invariant and universal sequence (Inhelder and Piaget, 1958). The main principle governing development is equilibration, i.e.
the reorganization of thought patterns in the direction of increased differentiation and organization when prior thought structures lead to conflict or disequilibrium. Developmental stages are thus assumed to be hierarchically organized, i.e. as the individual progresses through different stages there is an increasing capacity to process the problems in a more coherent and logical way. Development follows from concrete to more abstract reasoning.

The development towards abstract reasoning had in fact already been identified by other theorists or by philosophers. For instance, Gallatin (1978) showed that back in the eighteenth century, Rousseau had already observed the emergence of a new kind of reasoning by 12 years of age, which was in sharp contrast with children's early thinking, dominated by the child's perception. This new cognitive capacity had also been noted by developmentalists such as Hall (1904), A. Freud (1958) and Sullivan (1953).

Piaget was, however, the first to elaborate a conceptual system to explain how these cognitive changes take place. He assumed that by early adolescence the child acquires the ability to do certain logical operations. What differentiates the adolescent from the child is the ability to transcend what is perceived, enabling the child to go from the real to the possible. According to Piaget, the transition from a primitive to a more mature thinking occurs through four stages (Inhelder and Piaget, 1958): sensorimotor, preoperational, concrete operational and formal operational. In the sensorimotor stage (up to 2 years of age), the child's ability to resolve problems is limited to what can
be done through his/her own body. In the preoperational stage (ages 2 to 7), the development of language enables an increasing interiorization of action, and this new ability to think gives the child a greater flexibility compared to the earlier stage. However, even though the child is able to understand the meaning of certain words, his/her thinking is still subject to perception, i.e. dominated by appearances (e.g. if a child is shown a row of dots, and is asked to make another row with the same number of dots, he/she will be more concerned with making a row the same size as the other rather than with the same number of dots). It is during the stage of concrete operations (7-12) that the child’s thinking becomes more decentred and less limited to appearances. But it is only in the stage of formal operations (from 12 onwards) that thinking is freed from perception with the emergence of hypothetical-deductive reasoning.

As can be seen, adolescence is distinguished in Piaget’s theory as an important period during which more abstract reasoning is developed. However, adolescence was not the main focus of his investigations on moral development. Working with children aged four to thirteen years, Piaget (1932) used the clinical method to investigate children’s reasoning over two main themes: social rules and the idea of justice. He found that children tend to progress through two broad forms of morality, from heteronomous to autonomous morality. As shown by Weinreich-Haste (1982), Piaget’s finding of a parallel relationship between conceptual and moral development was based on the observation of a unity of conceptualization in the heteronomous
phase. Objective conceptualizations dominate all areas of thinking in this phase and limit the definition of morality. In contrast, the characteristic of the autonomous phase is diversity.

Apart from the development of the child’s cognitive capacities, another factor which is assumed to facilitate the development from a heteronomous to an autonomous morality is the child’s interpersonal attitude. The importance of the interpersonal factor in Piaget’s theory is illustrated by Piaget’s assumptions concerning the development of the child’s relationship with rules (Wright, 1982). At the beginning, the child’s relationship with rules is one of unilateral respect of parental authority. At this stage, morality is thus heteronomous, i.e. something external to be obeyed. Piaget (1932) relates the emergence of the later morality of autonomy to the experience of mutual respect with peers. The nature of the respect involved is also distinguished in the two kinds of morality. As Wright (1982) has put it, Piaget distinguishes between the love and quasi-physical fear associated with unilateral respect from the love and moral fear present in mutual respect.

Therefore, even though acknowledging the role of cognitive maturational processes in moral development, Piaget (1932) has stressed that the major factor in the progression from a morality of constraint to a morality of cooperation is the experience of interaction with peers. This has been considered one of the most provocative of Piaget’s thesis and one of the most difficult to assess empirically (Tomlinson, 1978). It has been called Piaget’s
social-psychological theory (Weinreich-Haste, 1982) and has arisen out of Piaget’s attempt to explain the paradox involved in the issue of how a morality largely based on authority is able to later acquire autonomy. This is a paradox which Piaget claims sociologists like Durkheim had failed to solve.

As pointed out by Tomlinson (1978), the undervaluation of the role of parents in detriment to the role of peers in moral development has been challenged by research findings (see Hoffman, 1970; Hoffman and Saltzstein, 1967). Child-rearing practices have been shown to have an impact on the child’s moral cognition and actions. Parental power assertion is assumed to correlate negatively with moral indices such as guilt and internalization of moral principles. Love-withdrawal techniques were found to be uncorrelated with these moral indices. Use of induction techniques, ie. pointing out the consequences of actions, were found to correlate positively with such measures.

It has been argued that, in fact, the assumption of a change from a morality of constraint to a morality of cooperation has not been substantiated by research findings. What the findings do demonstrate instead is a change from a morality of egocentric absolutism to a morality based on a relativistic conception (Weinreich-Haste, 1982). The implication, as Weinreich-Haste has stressed, is that Piaget’s cognitive-developmental thesis has been supported, but not his social-psychological one.
Kohlberg’s theory of moral development

Kohlberg’s theory of moral development undoubtedly overlaps in many respects with Piaget’s theory. It has been suggested, for example, that there is a unity between Kohlberg’s first two stages and Piaget’s heteronomous and autonomous morality (Weinreich-Haste, 1982). Both Kohlberg and Piaget are structuralists. They both contend that moral development is based on development through different qualitative stages. Furthermore, they both assume that advanced moral reasoning depends upon logical reasoning, even though it is acknowledged (Kohlberg, 1976) that most individuals are higher in logical than in moral stage. In sum, Kohlberg’s thinking forms part of what is known as the cognitive-developmental approach to morality, the germs of which are to be found in Piaget’s theory. As Kohlberg (1976) has put it, "the most obvious characteristic of cognitive-developmental theory is their use of some type of stage concept, of some notion of age-linked sequential reorganizations in the development of moral attitudes" (p. 48).

There are, however, some important distinctions between their theories which should be borne in mind. Piaget has worked essentially with children, whereas Kohlberg’s research has extended over a life span to include even adults. It has been argued that Kohlberg’s work demonstrates the ongoing nature of moral development, i.e. a life-span process, as opposed to being a matter of changes at about the age of eight (Weinreich-Haste, 1982). Consequently, it has been argued that Kohlberg’s theory is perhaps more
adequate for describing adolescent development than Piaget's theory (Damon, 1983). The most important part of Kohlberg's theory concern the main transitions from adolescence to adulthood. It is the transition phase to Kohlberg's stages 5 and 6, which belong to a truly autonomous level of development, in which the individual is able to transcend societal rules and adopt a real moral point of view.

Kohlberg identified six stages of moral development grouped into three major levels: preconventional level (stages 1 and 2), conventional level (stages 3 and 4), and postconventional level (stages 5 and 6). The first level characterizes the person for whom rules and social expectations are external to the self. The person in the conventional level has internalized the rules and expectations of others. Finally, in the postconventional level, the person's values are guided by self-chosen principles.

Kohlberg (1976) proposed a unifying construct which generates the major structural features of each stage. He called it the sociomoral perspective. He argues that this construct is more general than Selman's (1976) role-taking. For each moral development level there would be a corresponding sociomoral perspective. The sociomoral perspective corresponding to the preconventional level would be the concrete individual perspective. This means that the preconventional individual would be thinking about his/her interests or those of a few people around him/her. The conventional level relates to the member-of-society perspective. The conventional person would therefore be concerned
with issues such as the welfare of people, loyalty to persons, groups and authority. Finally, the postconventional level would relate to the prior-to-society perspective. Kohlberg argues that this level would be like the preconventional perspective in that it returns to the point of view of the individual rather than that of a member of the society. The individual point of view taken at this level can, however, be universal.

Kohlberg has also found differences in social perspective between the stages within each level. He argued that the second stage in each level completes the development of the social perspective entered at the first stage of the level (Kohlberg, 1976, p. 38). For example, within the preconventional level, stage 1 (obedience and punishment orientation) would involve the concrete individual’s point of view, whereas in stage 2 (instrumental purpose and exchange) the person would be aware of other individuals and be able to anticipate their reaction in serving his/her own interests. Within the conventional level, while in stage 3 (interpersonal accord and conformity) the person sees things from the point of view of relationships between two or more individuals, in stage 4 (social accord and system maintenance) he/she takes the perspective of institutional wholes, or member-of-society perspective. At last, within the postconventional level, stage 5 (social contract, utility, individual rights) individuals find it difficult to define a moral perspective independent of the perspective behind contractual-legal rights. For stage 6 (universal ethical principles) individuals, obligation is defined in terms of universal ethical principles of justice.
The emphasis on social perspective in Kohlberg’s theory is clear in his assumption of moral stages as being defined by structures of interaction between the self and others (Kohlberg, 1976). He contrasts cognitive-developmental theory with social-learning theories which assume that moral development is growth of behavioural and affective conformity to moral rules rather than cognitive-structural change. In Freudian theory, he argues, although stages of development are postulated, like in cognitive-developmental theory, they are libidinal-instinctual rather than moral. Morality, as expressed by the superego, is considered to be formed or fixed early in development through internalization of parental norms. He further argues that research based on Freudian theory has, as a result of this, focused mainly on the internalization aspect of the theory and has ignored stage components of moral development.

As far as environmental stimulation is concerned, Kohlberg (1976) argues that although moral development depends upon cognitive stimulation, social stimulation is essential. He writes: "pure cognitive stimulation is a necessary background for moral development, but does not directly engender moral development" (Kohlberg, 1976, p. 49).

The interactive emphasis of Kohlberg’s theory is another point of concordance with Piaget’s theory of moral development. As shown by Tomlinson (1978), for Kohlberg the most influential feature of a social situation in moral judgment is its role-taking opportunities and this is also the main reason why Kohlberg placed so much emphasis on the developmental
potential of discussion and dialogue regarding moral issues. However, in contrast with Piaget, Kohlberg assumes that development goes in the direction of greater detachment from relationships towards impersonal reasoning.

One of the main criticisms against Kohlberg's theory focuses on his claim for the cross-cultural universality of moral development, i.e. that it follows a universal invariant sequence, toward the same universal principles in all cultural settings (Simpson, 1974; Shweder, 1982a, 1982b; Bloom, 1977; Sullivan, 1977). However, a critical review of the cross-cultural universality of his theory of stage development (Snarey, 1985) did give support to his invariant sequence proposition to a large extent. Forty-five studies (38 cross-sectional and 7 longitudinal) carried out in 27 countries, with a sufficient range of cultural diversity, were examined. Snarey concluded that: i) Kohlberg's interview is reasonably culture fair when content is creatively adapted and the subject is interviewed in his/her native language; ii) the invariant sequence was supported, since stage skipping and regressions were rare (below the level that could be attributed to measurement error); iii) stages 1 to 3/4 or 4 were in evidence virtually universally when taking into consideration age range and sample size; iv) stages 4/5 or 5 was rare in all populations, but was evident in approximately 2/3 of the subcultures sampled that included subjects in the 18-60 range (note that stages 5 and 6 were not distinguished for scoring purposes, as the current scoring manual does not score for stage 6); v) nearly all samples from urban or middle-class populations exhibited some principled reasoning but all folk cultures failed to do so; and vi) with regard to the general
applicability of his theory, i.e. the extent to which all instances of moral reasoning will correspond to one of the modes or stages of moral reasoning described by Kohlberg, the main conclusion is that other values, such as collective solidarity, commonly stressed in folk cultures or working-class communities, are missing from the theory's explication and the scoring manual's examples of reasoning at the higher stages. In view of these findings, Snarey concludes: "...the only clearly problematic area of the data, in terms of its empirical support of Kohlberg's universality claim, involves the relative absence of postconventional reasoning in many populations" (p. 226). One possible explanation for the low frequency of stage 5 is that while stages 1 to 4 were empirically derived, descriptions of higher stages were primarily based on philosophical ethical systems (Kant, Rawls, and others). Snarey suggests that future research should concentrate on the cross-cultural elaboration of postconventional principles so that stage 5 can be revealed as a more common empirical phenomenon.

In fact, in another paper, Snarey and Keljo (1991) attempted to build a model which would account for what was felt to be missing in Kohlberg's theory, i.e. a communitarian or 'Gemeinschaft' voice. Snarey and Keljo's model was built on the work of Ferdinand Tonnies, one of the founders of modern social theory, who developed a typology of 'Gemeinschaft' (community) and 'Gesellschaft' (society). According to Snarey and Keljo, Tonnies views all forms of social relations as creations, or as existing because of, human thought and will. However, he distinguished between two types of will: 'wesenwille'
(natural or essential) and 'kurwille' (artificial or rational). The first wills an action for its own sake, whereas the latter wills an action towards a certain end. These two forms of will lead to the creation of different types of social entities, a community, or 'Gemeinschaft' and a society, or 'Gesellschaft'. Relationships are assumed to be construed differently in these two types of social entities. In 'Gemeinschaft', they are construed as ends in themselves, whereas in 'Gesellschaft' they become a means to an end. 'Gemeinschaft' is related to the intimate, private, whereas 'Gesellschaft' refers to the public. 'Gemeinschaft' and 'Gesellschaft' are based on differently shaped norms, the first being held together by concord, and the second on normative power or convention. Even though these distinctions are useful for descriptive purposes, Tonnies argued that neither 'Gemeinschaft' or 'Gesellschaft' exists in pure form. Even though one can refer to 'Gemeinschaft-like' or 'Gesellschaft-like' societies or persons, these two are to be understood as ideal types, and both elements may be present in all societies and individuals.

Snarey and Keljo (1991) examined the cases that were reported to be unscorable in research conducted in Israel (kibbutz), India, Kenya (rural village), Papua New Guinea (Maisin village), Taiwan, Turkey, and the United States (working class). Using excerpts from actual interviews with subjects in each cultural group, they have highlighted the 'Gemeinschaft' values that were missing from descriptions of postconventional reasoning in Kohlberg’s scoring manual. This further analysis of the cross-cultural validity of Kohlberg’s theory has again suggested that whereas quantitatively there seems to be a support to
Kohlberg's invariant stage sequence of moral development, his theory and scoring system need revision in view of the legitimate forms of conventional and postconventional reasoning that are currently unrepresented.

Another area of criticism of his theory concentrates on gender differences in moral development. In fact, the issue of gender differences also relates to the issue of cross-cultural validity, since gender differences can be seen as sub-culture variations within the same culture (Snarey, 1985). A strong claim for gender differences in moral reasoning was made by Carol Gilligan (1977, 1982). Her approach to moral development shall now be presented.

Recent approaches to moral development: Gilligan's care-oriented theory

Gilligan's (1977, 1982) initial formulations on the subject of moral development stemmed from a basic dissatisfaction with Kohlberg's conception of morality, based on concepts of justice, rights and obligation. The main focus of criticism was on the sex bias in Kohlberg's theory. Kohlberg's studies were carried out with male subjects only. It was argued that his justice-oriented approach described only male morality (Gilligan, 1982). To give support to her argument, Gilligan cited research (Gilligan, 1982; Haan, Smith and Block, 1968; Holstein, 1976) which indicated that women had a lower score than men in Kohlberg's stage sequence; men were usually at stage 4 and women at stage 3. The former is oriented towards the social system, i.e. the existing laws and
rules that maintain the social order, whereas the latter is based on the mutual expectations deriving from interpersonal relations.

Gilligan (1982) stated that the reported gender differences do not attest for the moral superiority of men and may be attributable to the failure in recognizing that there may be gender differences in moral decision taking. The inattention to girls and women in the moral development literature was stressed by Gilligan. She claimed (Gilligan, 1988) the need to reconsider adolescent development. She argued that psychologists have placed too much value on separation, individuation and autonomy. A developmental model built on the distinction between inequality and attachment as two dimensions of relationships was proposed. Gilligan and Wiggins (1988) argued that the dimension of inequality stems from the child’s feelings of helplessness and powerlessness in relation to others, i.e. from his/her dependence on others who are more powerful. This would give rise to justice concerns. Through attachment the child discovers the capacity to love, to care for and to hurt one another, enabling the emergence of care concerns. These authors further argued that the experience of attachment and inequality in early childhood may be different for boys and girls. Men are usually stimulated from infancy to separate from others when forming their identities. They may be more strongly attached to their mothers but have to identify with their fathers. Therefore, men search for moral codes that emphasize individual rights. Women are stimulated to value relationships with others. They identify with their mothers, to whom they are attached. Their identity originates from relating rather than separating
from others. Therefore, women prefer a moral code based on care for others.

Since Gilligan (1982) provided only descriptive data to support her claim, and her original study of moral orientations was limited to women and a single-context dilemma (abortion), there have been different attempts to examine the empirical evidence for her claims (Walker, 1984; Snarey, 1985; Walker, 1991).

In an early review study, Walker (1984) concluded that only a minority of studies reported gender differences. Fifty-four North American studies that used Kohlberg’s interview were reviewed and gender differences were found in only eight of those. He further reported that gender differences were often confounded with differences in levels of education and occupation in those studies which did find gender differences. However, in those studies in which gender differences were reported, they always favoured men.

In Snarey’s (1985) review study, similar results were found, i.e. there was little empirical support for gender differences in responses to Kohlberg’s interview. Seventeen studies, including both males and females in 15 countries, were reviewed and only three reported gender differences. A clear gender difference favouring men was found in only one case, and no study that used the most reliable scoring system reported any significant gender differences.

Walker’s more recent review on gender differences (Walker, 1991) has
addressed the issue of gender differences in moral development by distinguishing between the two implicit claims in Gilligan's (1982) argument, i.e. that there are two gender-related moral orientations (rights/justice x response/care), and that Kohlberg's theory is insensitive to females' "different voice" on morality.

As shown by Walker (1991), the concept of "moral orientation" assumes that there are conceptually different frameworks for organizing and understanding the moral domain. Gilligan (1982) claimed that males have a 'justice/ rights orientation', because of their individualistic and separate conception of the self, whereas females would have a 'care/ response orientation', because of their conception of the self as connected and interdependent. The findings from studies which have investigated moral orientations are inconsistent. While some of them did give support to gender-related moral orientations (Lyons, 1983; Gilligan and Attanucci, 1988), others did not find consistent differences (Ford and Lowery, 1986; Friedman, Robinson and Friedman, 1987; Forsyth, Nye and Kelley, 1988; Walker, de Vries and Trevethan, 1987). Another question examined in Walker's (1991) review was the extent to which there are differences in orientations according to the type of dilemma. He argued that if gender differences in moral orientations are pervasive, as Gilligan claims them to be, then they should also be evident in responses to standard moral dilemmas, not only to real-life dilemmas. He cited the findings from two studies which did suggest that content may influence moral orientations (Lyons, 1983; Rothbart, Hanley and
Albert, 1986). The findings from his own study (Walker et al., 1987) also gave support to the notion that the content of the dilemma influences orientations. In his study, no gender differences were found in responses to hypothetical dilemmas. These findings indicate that a gender-related pattern in moral orientations might be "an artifact of the different moral problems the sexes encounter or choose to relate, rather than a basic difference in orientation in solving moral problems" (p. 336). In order to further examine this issue, Walker et al. (1987) carried out a content analysis of the nature of the relationship involved in the real-life conflict situations (either personal or impersonal). Two main questions were explored, i.e. if there is a relation between dilemma content and moral orientation, and if there are gender differences within each type of dilemma content. The nature of the dilemma was found to be a better predictor of moral orientation than the individual's gender. Similar findings were reported in a study by Pratt, Golding, Hunter and Sampson (1988). Walker (1991) concluded by saying that "the classification of individuals on the basis of modal moral orientation may be misleading and inaccurate, and the term 'orientation' inappropriate" (p. 344).

In relation to the second question, i.e. Gilligan's claim that Kohlberg's theory is insensitive to females' "different voice" on morality, Walker's (1991) review focused on two aspects. First, studies which have reported findings concerning Kohlberg's (1976) proposed typology of four moral orientations were examined. This typology of four moral orientations is associated to the content, rather than the structure, of the individual's reasoning, and has been
included in the current scoring manual (Colby and Kohlberg, 1987). The orientations are divided into: i) normative- emphasizes maintenance of the normative order, adherence to rules; ii) fairness- emphasizes justice, equity and equality, reciprocity, contract; iii) utilitarianism- emphasizes welfare and happiness consequences of moral actions for self and others; and iv) perfectionism- emphasizes attainment of dignity and autonomy, good conscience, harmony with self and others. In keeping with Gilligan’s claim, Walker (1991) predicted that females would use more utilitarianism and perfectionism, whereas males would use more normative and fairness orientations (focus on rights and duties). The findings from the studies regarding Kohlberg’s typology were equivocal. However, in the most comprehensive study analyzing this issue (Walker, 1989), in which children, adolescents and adults were asked to respond to a set of hypothetical dilemmas and also to discuss a real-life dilemma, no gender differences were revealed. Differences in responses were found mainly in relation to the type of dilemma. Hypothetical dilemmas elicited more normative and fairness (rights-like) orientations, whereas real-life dilemmas elicited more utilitarianism and perfectionism (response-like). This finding does give support to Gilligan’s criticism against the use of hypothetical dilemmas, for their depersonalized quality. However, as shown by Walker (1991), it is interesting to note that differences were found only when Kohlberg’s typology was used. He further correlated Kohlberg’s and Gilligan’s typologies, and the correlations were very weak, indicating that their typologies are tapping different aspects of moral reasoning.
The other aspect which was the focus of Walker's (1991) review concentrated on gender differences in moral reasoning development, as assessed by Kohlberg's interview. He included the studies reviewed in his 1984 paper, and added other recent studies, with a total of 80 studies and 152 samples. The findings indicated that 85.5% of the studies revealed a nonsignificant difference. In 5.9% of these, females had higher scores and in 5.6% males had higher scores.

It is important to note that even though the present findings led Walker (1991) to conclude that "there is only limited support for Gilligan's claim of different moral orientations for females and males, and no support for the claim that Kohlberg's theory down-scores the moral thinking of females or those with a response orientation" (p.356), Gilligan's contention that there is a missing developmental ethic of care in Kohlberg's model has not been refuted (Baumrind, 1986).

Turiel's domain theory of moral development

Another important recent contribution to the subject of moral development stems from Turiel's (1978, 1983) theoretical formulations. The social context is fundamental in his theory of moral development. As pointed out by Kelley and Power (1992), even though the social context has been taken into consideration by early theorists such as Piaget and Kohlberg, their main
concern was with universal laws of development. These earlier approaches have been called context-free approaches.

In Turiel's contextual approach, it is assumed that qualitatively different social experiences lead to the construction of different domains of social knowledge (Turiel, 1978, 1983; Smetana, 1983; Nucci, 1981). The main contribution from Turiel's model was the shift in focus from descriptions of age-related levels of thought (vertical organization) to "descriptions of conceptual systems that coexist and which are not developmentally ordered (horizontal organization)" (Turiel, Killen and Helwig, 1987, p. 169). In other words, whereas Kohlberg's model assumes that true morality is attained when one reaches a level of development which transcends conventions, in Turiel's model morality does not follow convention in development. Both moral and conventional concepts are assumed to be differentiated from childhood.

Three basic domains of knowledge are distinguished: moral, conventional and personal. According to Turiel's theory, the moral domain is constructed from children's experience of harm to others (Turiel, 1983). It involves physical or psychological harm and violation of rights. It is viewed as nonarbitrary, independent of rules to regulate it. In contrast, the social conventional domain is based on rules that are arrived at by consensus. Therefore, social conventions may vary from one place to another. Still another domain should be distinguished from the other two, i.e. the personal domain (Nucci, 1981). This entails personal preferences or any personal matters that
are distinct from the social domain.

Turiel, Killen and Helwig (1987) made reference to the findings of different studies (twenty-eight), conducted in the United States, which seem to give support to the notion that children do distinguish between prototypical moral and conventional situations. The methodological procedure of these studies usually involves the presentation of prototypical stimuli, i.e. stimuli which are assumed to represent each one of the domains, and the request for subjects to make judgments concerning the extent to which they are wrong and why, whether it would be alright to perform the act in another country, whether there are negative consequences to someone, etc.

The recent findings from studies with young children and adolescents have challenged Piaget's (1932) and Kohlberg's (1969) views that morality would emerge relatively late, with an increasing moving away from the commands of authority and a progressive focus on the consequences of acts for others. There is an indication that children at early ages form concepts distinguishable by domain (Smetana, in press; Smetana, 1986). Recent studies have also questioned the view of authority as a unitary concept. Conceptions of parental authority seem to be differentiated according to the type of situation involved, both among children and adolescents (Laupa and Turiel, 1986; Tisak, 1986; Smetana, 1988). Children and adolescents seem to judge parental authority to be more legitimate in moral situations than in personal situations (Tisak, 1986).
The main objection to Turiel’s theory comes from cross-cultural anthropological research (Shweder, Mahapatra and Miller, 1987). These authors carried out a study with Americans and Indians and found little evidence for the existence of social conventions in Indian culture. They argue that the notion that individuals have the right to define acceptable behaviour and go against societal rules may not be found in group-oriented cultures where individuals are subordinated to group needs. These cultures would be characterized by a duty-based moral code which would be in contrast with a rights-based one, characteristic of the American culture.

Shweder et al. (1987)'s theory of moral development is a 'social communication theory', according to which social and moral judgments are acquired especially in early childhood, through cultural messages communicated by parents. An example of research conducted within this theoretical framework is the observational study of social interactions among children and adults in Kenya, carried out by Edwards (1985). Changes in children's behaviour following statements of parents or older siblings to children in situations of moral transgressions were observed.

Turiel, Killen and Helwig (1987) replied to Shweder et al. (1987)'s findings, challenging their assumption of homogeneity in cultural orientations and a perspective on morality that encompasses most, if not all, social practices. Turiel et al. also challenged this top-down view of development,
calling attention to a common pitfall, i.e. the "exposure fallacy", i.e. "the assumption that if children were exposed to that which they acquire, then it was acquired through direct learning and internalization" (p. 221). They go on to say that "...this view does not include developmental processes such as assimilation and construction through the child's interpretive activities" (p. 222).

A brief summary of the cognitive-developmental approach to moral development

In this section an attempt was made to present a historical overview of the cognitive-developmental theory of moral development. While both Piaget and Kohlberg considered the role of interactive contexts in moral development, the main tenets of their theories concerned cognitive processes. Interactions were seen as mainly a means for further cognitive development, rather than as ends in themselves. The importance of social experiences for cognitive development was highlighted by both Piaget and Kohlberg. The main processes involved in social experiences which were assumed to promote cognitive development were, for Piaget, cognitive disequilibrium, and for Kohlberg, the role-taking opportunities. Social-interactive contexts as ends in themselves have received more attention from the recent literature on moral development.

An important recent contribution to the study of moral development is
Gilligan’s (1982, 1988) work, which has highlighted the importance of relationships in moral development, by pointing to a missing dimension of morality in Kohlberg’s model, apart from justice/rights, i.e. the dimension of care. Turiel (1983; Turiel et al., 1987) proposed a model which highlights the social contextual interactions as essential for the construction of social judgments. Turiel’s theory also challenges Kohlberg’s developmental theory from convention to morality, by proposing that convention and morality follow parallel lines of development. The importance of relationships in moral development is also highlighted in Shweder et al.’s (1987) theory. The context of early parent-child relations is especially emphasized, as social judgments are assumed to be acquired through cultural messages communicated by parents.

In terms of conceptions of morality, these authors stress that they are culture-specific, related to either rights-based or duty-based moral codes. Cultural factors in moral development were also emphasized in Snarey and Keljo (1991)’s attempt to build up a model of moral development to account for different types of social entities, a community, or ‘Gemeinschaft’ and a society, or ‘Gesellschaft’. Relationships are assumed to be construed differently in these two types of social entities. In the ‘Gemeinschaft’, they are construed as ends in themselves, whereas in ‘Gesellschaft’ they become a means to an end.

The contrast between relationships as means and as ends will still be considered in the section that follows, when the contributions of both psychoanalytic and cognitive-developmental approaches to adolescent development shall be examined. It is felt that this distinction is useful, since
each perspective lies on different implicit assumptions concerning developmental processes.
3. The psychoanalytic and cognitive-developmental views of moral development in adolescence

Having presented the psychoanalytic and the cognitive-developmental approaches to moral development, one should now focus on their main contributions to our understanding of the transitions that take place from childhood to adolescence, which was one of the aims of this chapter. Even though both approaches emphasize that development goes in the direction of more autonomy, different developmental paths are assumed. Recent formulations are also presented which have proposed a revision of the concept of autonomy in adolescent development.

At least two psychoanalytic writers should be mentioned for having made important contributions to our understanding of development in adolescence, Anna Freud (1958) and Peter Blos (1962, 1967, 1979). Their approaches to adolescent development were very influential in the psychological literature, especially up to the late seventies, when empirical research started to question some of their basic theoretical assumptions.

Anna Freud (1958) pointed out that the psychoanalytic study of adolescence began in 1905 with Freud’s 'Three Essays on Sexuality'. Puberty was assumed to be the time in which changes would take place so as to give the infantile sexual life its final shape, i.e. the subordination of the erotogenic zones to the primacy of the genital zone, the setting up of new sexual aims
Anna Freud assumed a discontinuity in development during the adolescent years, and that adolescence was marked by intense emotional distress. She claimed adolescence to constitute "...an interruption of peaceful growth ..[and that] the adolescent manifestations come close to symptom formation of the neurotic, psychotic or dissocial disorder and merge almost imperceptibly into borderline states, initial, frustrated or fully fledged forms of all the mental illnesses" (p. 267). In the same passage, she concluded that "...the differential diagnosis between the adolescent upsets and true pathology becomes a difficult task". She also claimed that conflict in adolescence was necessary and inevitable. She wrote: "...the upholding of a steady equilibrium during the adolescent process is itself abnormal" (p. 275). A discontinuity was also assumed in parent-child relations in adolescence. She claimed adolescents' main task to be the detachment from parents and the cathecting of new objects, i.e. peers or other adults outside the family. She assumed that in this process some mourning for the objects of the past was inevitable.

Similar assumptions regarding discontinuity in development during
adolescence were implied in Peter Blos's approach to adolescent development. As shown by Tyson and Tyson (1990), he saw the principal object relations task of adolescence as a process of "second individuation" (Blos, 1967), which includes two processes: separating from and giving up the parents as primary love objects, and relinquishing parents as authority figures. A crucial aspect of this process is the deidealization of infantile parental object representations. In this process, adolescents are assumed to be left with a sense of emptiness, which makes them turn to their peers, to relieve their sense of emptiness and to support their self-esteem. Distress and torment are also assumed to be inherent to this process. When the process of individuation or disengaging from infantile objects, which may last into late adolescence and early adulthood, is successful, the painful ambivalence of preoedipal and oedipal ties is assumed to lessen, and progressively more mature, mutually satisfying relationships with parents are assumed to emerge.

As far as superego in adolescence is concerned, Tyson and Tyson (1990) pointed out that superego functioning is essential for determining whether individuals will realize their potential, in terms of taking increased responsibility for their actions. This requires the superego to become fully internalized and parental authority to be relinquished. This process of detachment from parental authority is again assumed to be stressful and painful for the adolescent (Freud, 1905; Jacobson, 1961; Loewald, 1979; A. Freud, 1958). It is also important to note that this process is assumed to occur intrapsychically, and external conflicts with parents are assumed to be a
"regressive personification of the superego" (Tyson and Tyson, 1990). As Tyson and Tyson have put it: "Rather than feeling the conflict to be an internal one, [the adolescent] feels himself to be in a constant battle with his parents" (p. 224).

Internal processes in adolescent development are also emphasized by cognitive-developmental theory. As shown by Youniss and Smollar (1985), cognitive theory centres on the adolescent's capacity for self-reflection, i.e. to make sense of experience and reach valid conclusions about reality. Autonomy is coupled with formal operations and defined as "self-guided reasoning used for self-understanding" (p. 167). According to Youniss and Smollar, it is not clear how or whether for cognitive theory relationships have a central role in adolescent development. If reasoning is a means to autonomy, the means are individualistic, in the sense of being the self's rational reflections on experience. They concluded that relationships in adolescent development are seen in cognitive theory as means rather than as ends in themselves, i.e. they are "... one of many elements that help adolescents gain information about themselves as they strive for self-growth and identity" (p.160).

Development towards self-reliance is especially emphasized in Kohlberg's (1969) theory of moral development. Relationships are assumed to be more important in earlier stages of development. Through an increasing capacity for logical reasoning and self-reliance, adolescents are assumed to develop the capacity to go beyond intimate relationships and to think about
broader societal issues.

The extreme value placed on self-reliance as the hallmark of maturity was especially criticized by Gilligan (1988). She proposed that what is missing from this model of adolescent development is the dimension of attachment, representing the interdependence of adult life. She wrote: "As the balance of power between child and adult shifts with the child's coming of age, so too the experience and the meaning of connection change" (p. xxvii). She also questioned the effects of the growth of formal operational thinking, generally considered as the hallmark of cognitive and moral development, as being double-edged. While there is an increasing capacity to think critically about thinking, there is also a potential for becoming self-centred.

As far as Piaget's (1932) definition of autonomy is concerned, it has been recently argued (Youniss and Smollar, 1985) that it differs from Kohlberg's, even though it is has been usually confounded with it. Autonomy is defined in a relational context, rather than being equated with individualism. It is assumed to be developed in cooperative construction rather than individually.

Piaget's view of development has been more recently expanded through the work of Youniss and collaborators, employing a Piagetian-Sullivan perspective (Youniss, 1980; Hunter and Youniss, 1982; Youniss, 1983; Youniss and Smollar, 1985). Two concepts are assumed to be fundamental in
this perspective: cooperative co-construction and the individual-in-relations. It assumes that the process of development takes place through cooperative co-construction, i.e. that the person is formed through relationships, that relationships develop, as well as individuals, and "the outcome is an individual who is still definitionally dependent on relationships" (Youniss and Smollar, 1985, p. 14).

This view of development in the context of relationships assumes that there is a continuity in relationships, apart from changes, during development. As far as adolescent development is concerned, instead of a major breach in parent-child relations, there is increasing empirical support to the view that parent-child relationships change and further develop during adolescence. Friendship is also assumed to be another important relational context in adolescence, and changes in the function of this relationship are also assumed to take place during adolescence. Even though there is a move toward greater individuality in adolescence, experienced as the self's agency and coming to know the self more clearly and fully, the findings of recent studies do not give support to the notion that self-development is contingent upon the emancipation from relationships, picturing autonomy as self-reliance. Rather than stepping back into the privacy of self-reflection, the adolescent is assumed to cooperate with others in constructing reality.

This view of adolescent development in the context of relationships will be further elaborated and discussed in the chapter that follows. Consistent with
the aim of this thesis, the context of parent-child relations will be the main focus of concern.
CHAPTER II

THE CONTEXT OF PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS IN MORAL DEVELOPMENT FROM EARLY CHILDHOOD TO ADOLESCENCE

INTRODUCTION

As pointed out in the previous chapter, social interactional processes in development have received special attention in recent approaches to moral and autonomy development. It was also argued that this theoretical shift has enabled a reconceptualization of the role of relationships in development.

The context of parent-child relations, which has been neglected by cognitive-developmental research, has also gained more attention from recent research. Its unique character, such as the history of social relationships and the affective nature of these relationships, has been highlighted as evidence of its unique contribution to moral development (Powers, 1988).

This chapter focuses on the context of parent-child relations in moral development, from early childhood to adolescence. Initially, the contributions
from the clinical field, especially family therapy, for the understanding of child
development are presented. Recent studies which have highlighted the
importance of parent-child relations in development, from early childhood to
adolescence, are then examined.

**Contributions of family therapy to developmental psychology**

The interface between developmental psychology and family therapy
has been well captured by P. Minuchin's (1985) statement: "both disciplines
regard the family as a primary focus for understanding human behaviour and
must find some way of conceptualizing the relationship between the family and
the individual" (p. 289). Even though there is this basic commonality between
these two fields, different assumptions and theories underlie their approaches
to human development. In order to understand these differences, a brief history
of the family therapy movement will be presented.

The beginnings of the family therapy movement coincided with a basic
shift in the theoretical field, from an intrapsychic to an interpersonal
framework. Different authors (see Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark, 1973,
Boszormenyi-Nagy and Ulrich, 1980; Stierlin, 1976; Lowenstein-Freud, 1980)
emphasized the strength of the intrapsychic model in the past of clinical
psychology, since Freud's rejection of his theory of seduction in 1897. From
this point, the pathology has been referred to unconscious, conflicting wishes
and fantasies (the intrapsychic drama), and the family drama (the relationships between family members) has been neglected (Stierlin, 1976). We have seen thus, for a long time, clinical psychology concerned with the inside, the individual. In social psychology, although different contexts were examined, studies were usually centred in ad hoc groups of strangers, and studies with the family group have been largely ignored (Framo, 1979).

The first family psychotherapists seem to have received a great influence from American analysts with an interpersonal orientation, such as Fromm (1941) and, especially, Sullivan (1962). Framo (1979) shows the gradual shift from the traditional diagnosis model, that is, the child being assessed alone, to the child guidance model, where the mother is seen collaterally to the child, by a social worker. In this approach, fathers were rarely included and when it happened that both parents were seen, the focus was on the child's problem. As we can see, this model still carries the legacy of what is labelled by Minuchin, Rosman and Baker (1978), the linear model, represented by the medical, psychodynamic and behavioural approaches.

It was systems theory which mainly contributed to change the focus from the individual patient to the patient in context (Minuchin et al., 1978). The context (the family) is viewed as a system whose components are interdependent. This brings the patient to a position where he is only the symptom bearer of the family psychopathology. As part of the system, he is himself/herself active in the process. There are no victims.
In Minuchin’s approach, the 'context' is, basically, the context of the nuclear family. There are, however, other authors who expanded this context to include the original or extended family (see Boszormenyi-Nagy, 1965, 1966, 1979; Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark, 1973; Boszormenyi-Nagy and Ulrich, 1980; Boszormenyi-Nagy and Krasner, 1980, 1981; Framo, 1976; Spark, 1974; Stierlin, 1974, 1976; Bowen, 1981; Braverman, 1981).

An insightful work on family dynamics was that of Boszormenyi-Nagy and co-authors, detailed in the book entitled 'Invisible loyalties' (Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark, 1973). In Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark’s model, labelled 'contextual approach', 'context' is defined as 'the dynamic connectedness of a person with his or her significant relationships' (Boszormenyi-Nagy and Krasner, 1981, p. 767). These 'significant relationships' have to do with the multigenerational linkages which create a nonsubstitutive bond among family members, through a legacy of loyalty, transmitted from generation to generation. This legacy builds up a context of ethical responsibility between family members which, by its turn, will increase loyalty commitment and ties between family members. The essence of this approach is its ethical or justice orientation.

Boszormenyi-Nagy calls his theory a 'dialectic theory of relationships'. It concerns mainly the dialectical nature of the relationships between the individual and the family. This model has also been described by Stierlin (1969). The issue of identity of self or differentiation is, thus, one involving
self-other relationships. The identity of self is inseparable from its counterpart, the other, as differentiating ground. This emphasis on self-other relationships, where the other is the existential ground for individual differentiation, draws heavily on the existential theoretical framework. Among the philosophers of existentialism, it has been Buber (1957) who has greatly influenced Boszormenyi-Nagy’s model of relationship. According to Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark (1973), the individual is the centre of his universe, but ontologically dependent on his past. The emphasis is not on functional, here-and-now dependence, related to basic needs, but rather on the ontic dependence of the individual on his relationships. Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark (1973) argue that "the family therapist should conceive of a social group whose members all relate to one another according to Buber’s I-Thou dialogue" (p. 43).

In this dialectic perspective, the child in his/her development is bound to two opposite movements, one towards loyalty commitments and the other, towards autonomy or differentiation (Boszormenyi-Nagy and Ulrich, 1980). Autonomy pushes the individual to new commitments outside the family, and individuation implies a balance of old and new commitments (Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark, 1973).

As shown by P. Minuchin (1985), the basic assumptions of family systems theory bring a special challenge to developmental psychology. For example, the conception of the individual-in-the-system assumes that all the parts in a system are interdependent. This changes the focus from
unidirectional to a relational perspective on development. At the same time, this model points to the locus and specificity of relationships, i.e. that the family system comprises subsystems, that the father-child subsystem is different from the mother-child subsystem, or that the sibling subsystem is different than the parental subsystem, etc. In addition, it highlights the powerful homeostatic forces within the system, i.e. a resistance to change, but at the same time the continuous changes that take place in the system. One important contribution from the field of family therapy is the notion of a family life cycle and the concept of transition. The latter is also familiar to developmental psychologists. As we have seen in the previous section, cognitive-developmental theorists work with the notion of stage sequences as a series of disequilibrations. From a family systems perspective, developmental transitions (e.g. entering school, leaving home, retiring) have an impact on the whole family system. They cause disequilibrium, imbalance (Prigogine, 1973) and the whole family must reorganize its patterns. Minuchin concludes then that "it remains for psychologists ... to study the meshing of the psychological needs of family system members at different stages of the life cycle" (p. 296).

The focus of interest in this thesis shall be on the stage of the family life cycle in which the child moves into adolescence. Recent research on the adolescent's family focuses more today than previously on development based not on breaking the bond with parents, but in transforming it, as well as the persons within it (Youniss, 1983). Maccoby and Martin's (1983) review on socialization in the context of the family also points to how developmental
Psychology has recently tended to assume a relational, bidirectional framework. The process of development is assumed to be based on coconstruction, i.e. the child/adolescent with the parents, with peers or other adults. Earlier views of adolescence have emphasized primarily the growth of separation, autonomy or independence. More recently, attachment and closeness have been included as an important and neglected dimension of family relations both in child and adolescent development. As shown by Allen, Hauser and Bell (in press), "although achieving autonomy and maintaining relatedness with parents have sometimes been placed at opposite ends of a continuum, there is growing evidence that a state of 'autonomous-relatedness', a term coined by John Bowlby, is an optimal outcome for the adolescent-parent relationship" (p. 3).

It is assumed, in fact, that the changes in approaches to adolescent development follow changes in views of childhood. For example, Gilligan (1988) wrote: "Since adolescence denotes the transition from childhood to adulthood, what constitutes 'development' in adolescence hinges on how one views the childhood that precedes it and the adulthood that follows" (p. viii). She called special attention to the findings of research on infancy and early childhood which have suggested that the child is much more social than psychologists had imagined them to be. Similarly, recent studies in the area of moral development have challenged the stage theory description of the child as "asocial" and "amoral". Observations of children in the context of different interactions (with parents, peers or other adults) have highlighted the social and moral nature of the young child's relationships with others. In the sections that
follow, recent findings from research on early and adolescent development in the context of parent-child relations will be presented.

**Parent-child relations and moral development in early childhood**

An important area which has stimulated a great deal of research on parent-child relations in early childhood in the past decade is attachment theory. Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1982) suggested that there is a 'control system' in mother-infant relationship, which would lead the child to search for contact or proximity with mother. Another significant contribution stems from Ainsworth's work (Ainsworth and Bell, 1970; Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall, 1978), emphasizing that mother's presence facilitates the child's exploration of the environment. An important notion in Bowlby's theory is that of "internal working models", constructed from relationships with attachment figures at the beginning of life, which guide future relationships (Bowlby, 1969, 1979). It is a mental representation of aspects of the world, the others, the self, or of relationships with others, which guides behaviour. Studies carried out in the last decade have largely supported the view that the establishment of a secure pattern of attachment in early infancy promotes healthy development.

As far as moral development is concerned, Wolff (1991) noted: "the
childhood origins of moral behaviour and moral judgment have so far been much less thoroughly explored than the development of attachment and early affectional relationships" (p. 187). Even though this may be true, a number of recent studies have brought important contributions to our understanding of moral development in early childhood. By emphasizing the social contextual determinants of development, they have challenged existing assumptions from cognitive-developmental theory. As shown by Killen (1989), children's interactions with others may differ according to the type of issue involved in an exchange (Smetana, 1988; Turiel, 1983). In toddlerhood, moral and social-conventional issues are characteristic of parent-child interaction, whereas only moral conflicts are observed in early peer exchanges.

A number of recent home observational studies of families have been conducted to try and understand the relationship between socialization and moral development in early childhood (e.g. Smetana, 1989a; Power, MacGrath, Hughes and Manire, 1987; Power, Kelley, Ritter and Bourg, 1987). The main idea supporting these studies is that moral development should be a function of both the child's cognitive development and the social context (Kelley and Power, 1992). In these studies, mothers' reactions to child transgressions were assessed in a number of domains to see how they vary according to domain.

The results of some studies carried out in the home suggest that there is already some understanding of rules by the end of the second year of life. Smetana (in press) cited two studies in which 14- to 36-month old infants were
observed interacting with their mothers and children (Dunn and Munn, 1985, 1987). Dunn and Munn (1987) identified different conflict issues in children's interactions with mothers and siblings. They found that conflicts with siblings tended to involve more specific issues (rights, property, possessions), whereas conflicts with mothers involved a wider range of issues. Similarly, in Smetana's (1989a) observation study of 3-year olds' interactions with mothers and familiar peers, it was found that conflicts with peers occurred primarily over moral issues (possessions, rights, taking turns, hurting, aggression and unkindness), whereas conflicts with mothers focused on conventional issues (manners, politeness, household rules, cultural conventions). Smetana (in press) concluded that these findings give support to Piaget's (1932) notion that moral rules are developed primarily from children's interactions with peers. However, this does not mean that parents have a less important role in moral development. In fact, in the same article, Smetana argued: "children appear to receive information about the consequences of their moral violations for others' rights and welfare from two sources: first, they receive feedback in the form of directly experienced or observed negative reactions from the victims of moral transgressions, and complementary, adults also provide explanations as to why the acts are wrong. In contrast, the wrongness of conventional events cannot be inferred directly from the acts themselves, and adults provide fewer explanations regarding these acts" (p. 26).

The results of these studies suggest that apart from age and cognitive development an important factor in the development of moral understanding
is the acquisition of knowledge pertaining to social roles and relationships (Kelley and Power, 1992). Children receive considerable communication and instruction concerning moral understanding from their parents. Much of children’s knowledge is constructed from in-home experiences involving various types of transgressions.

One has also witnessed a greater concern in psychoanalytic research in expanding the early theorizing of psychoanalysis on superego development, stressing the four to six age span, to include infancy and toddlerhood. Emde, Johnson and Easterbrooks (1987) presented data from home observations concerning the steps in the early internalization of do’s and dont’s. These studies have also highlighted the importance of in-home experiences in the development of early internalizations. Two streams of early moral development, centered on emotions, have been proposed, one arising outside the arena of conflict and the other arising within the arena of conflict: the emergence of empathy and the internalization of prohibitions. The results of observations carried out during the second year have indicated that early internalizations first occur under the watchful eyes of the care-giver.

**Parent-child relations and moral development in adolescence**

As far as family at adolescence is concerned, it is interesting to note
that there was not much research on the topic for a whole decade (from early 70's to early 80's). It was only recently that an upsurge of interest in the area was revealed, as shown by Steinberg (1987). This author thinks much of the absence of interest in the area was related to the findings from empirical research which were totally at variance with the then dominant psychodynamic view of the inevitability and desirability of stormy and stressful family relations during adolescence (A. Freud, 1958)

At least three dominant themes can be identified in the earlier literature on the family during adolescence: parent-child conflict (the "generation gap" hypothesis), individual differences in parenting styles and their impact on adolescent development, and the absence of closeness between parents and adolescents.

In relation to parent-child conflict, if we look at the literature from the 60's and 70's, three main positions can be found in relation to the generation gap hypothesis, which were summarized by Troll and Bengston (1979). The first gives full support to the existence of a generation gap, stating that parent-adolescent conflict entails a complete divergence of values between parents and children. The second is an opposite view that generation gap is a myth. Finally, the third is an intermediate position which emphasizes that conflict occurs in relation to secondary issues, not to basic values.
The more recent literature has suggested that parent-adolescent conflict occurs mainly in everyday situations, such as those involving choice of relationships, disobedience, personality/behavioural style and less frequently involves aspects such as religion, politics, profession, sex and drugs (see Montemayor, 1990, for a review). Therefore, these findings give support to the intermediate position presented before that conflict is not related to divergence of basic values.

In spite of the opposing empirical evidence, the notion of a generation gap has tended to perpetuate for a long time. Steinberg (1989) offered some possible reasons as to why that happened. At least three sources of confusion were mentioned. First, many researchers have failed to distinguish between quality of family relationships, values and attitudes, and personal tastes, when considering intergenerational gap. As far as the quality of relationship with parents is concerned, studies have shown that the majority of adolescents feel close to their parents (Kandel and Lesser, 1972; Offer, Ostrov and Howard, 1981). In terms of values and attitudes (e.g. importance of work, educational and occupational ambitions), again there is little support for a generation gap (Conger, 1977). Where there seems to be more divergence between parents and adolescents is on matters of personal taste (e.g. styles of dress, preferences in music, and patterns of leisure activities). These tend to be the predominant issues of conflict between parents and adolescents. Another source of confusion is the view of adolescents as a homogeneous group. The difficulty in deriving generalizations about parent-child relations stems from the
difficulty in making generalizations about adolescents as a group. Finally, there has been a tendency to extrapolate findings based on emotionally disturbed or delinquent adolescents to adolescents as a whole.

As far as individual differences in parenting styles are concerned (Baumrind 1967, 1973, 1977), research has focused on the relationship of different patterns of parental behaviour to children's success at different tasks. Two aspects of parental behaviour are considered central: parental responsiveness and demandingness. These two aspects are relatively independent from each other and can be combined into four basic patterns of parental behaviour: authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and indifferent. Authoritative parents are warm but firm, placing a high value on autonomy development. Authoritarian parents place a high value on obedience and conformity and do not encourage autonomy. Indulgent parents are warm and accepting but make few demands on their children. Indifferent parents are neither demanding nor responsive. As shown by Steinberg (1989), the results of studies which have examined the relationship between parenting styles and adolescent development have tended to show that authoritative style is frequently associated with healthy adolescent development (Baumrind, 1978b; Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Hill, 1980; Maccoby and Martin, 1983). Steinberg (1989) offers four possible explanations for this. First, there is the better balance between autonomy and restrictiveness offered by authoritative parents. Second, they are more likely to engage their children in discussions, which stimulate adolescent's development of reasoning abilities. Third, authoritative
parenting may help identification with parents. Finally, there seems to be a reciprocal cycle in which the child’s psychosocial maturity resulting from authoritative parenting may further strengthen the parents’ interactional patterns.

Finally, another area of earlier research on the family at adolescence focused on the alleged absence of closeness between parents and adolescents. Parental influence was assumed to decrease while peer influence was assumed to increase in adolescence (see Hartup, 1970, for a review). This view was also prevalent in the psychoanalytic writings on adolescent development.

The more recent literature on parent-adolescent relations has challenged the psychoanalytic assumptions of a discontinuity in parent-child relations in adolescence. Grotevant and Cooper (1986) have distinguished between three different conceptualizations regarding parent-adolescent relationships. The first suggests that the task of the adolescent is to become independent of parental influence. The need to relinquish dependency on parents and to seek emotional support from peers is emphasized. This view is espoused by both sociological studies of family power, focusing on autonomy development (Bowerman and Kinch, 1959; Rollins and Thomas, 1979), and the clinical, psychoanalytic literature (A. Freud, 1958; Blos, 1979). Grotevant and Cooper argued that the view of autonomy entailing a shift from family to peer affiliations is reflected in the assessment methods used. In sociological studies, family power has often been studied through a group decision-making task in which only one
person can win. Therefore, it is not surprising that conflict and dominance patterns, rather than more equalitarian interactions, are often observed. By the same token, clinicians deal with troubled adolescents who may consequently have a more troubled relationship with parents.

The second conceptualization of parent-child relationship stems from research largely based on large-scale survey or interview studies (e.g. Douvan and Adelson, 1966; Rutter, Graham, Chadwick and Yule, 1976). Contrary to the sociological and the clinical studies, these studies have suggested that parent-child relations are rather harmonious or continuous in quality from childhood through adolescence. Again, possible methodological constraints, such as the instrument’s sensitivity to identify feelings and points of conflict in the adolescent are raised in relation to these studies.

Finally, a third way of conceptualizing parent-child relationship is emphasized, which assumes both continuity and change in parent-child relationship (Youniss, 1980; Youniss, 1983; Youniss and Smollar, 1985). Parent-child relationship is assumed to be an enduring bond throughout the life span, but special changes are assumed to take place in adolescence and young adulthood, as the patterns of relatively unilateral authority are renegotiated and transformed into patterns of mutuality. Independence and compatibility are assumed between influences from parents and peers. Friendship and parent-child relations are assumed to fulfil different functions during adolescence. Age-related changes in some important functions of these relationships are also
assumed to take place.

Recent research on family at adolescence have tended to draw on the latter conceptualization, emphasizing both changes and continuity in relationships during development. This recent trend was well summarized by Steinberg (1987), who emphasized the "shifts in perspective away from unidirectional models of parent-child relations toward the more reciprocal and systemic approaches to the study of the family popularized in the family process and family therapy literatures" (p.193).

As mentioned before, an important concept from the family systems perspective is that of a family life cycle, which assumes that there are important transitions in the family context at different developmental stages. The family system is often challenged by changes in individual members. Developmental changes such as the ones that take place in adolescence are good examples. As shown by Youniss (1980), an important transition in adolescence seems to be the shift from a complementary relationship, characteristic of childhood, in which the child obeys in exchange for parental love and support, to a reciprocal relationship, in which obedience is still considered as necessary but is subject to negotiation instead of meaning submission to authority. Some studies have identified age-related changes in descriptions of parent-child relations (e.g. Youniss, 1980; Hunter and Youniss, 1982), changes in assertiveness and influence in family decision making associated to puberty (e.g. Jacob, 1974; Steinberg, 1981; Steinberg and Hill, 1978), power shifts in
late adolescence (Feldman and Gehring, 1988) or changes in strategies or styles of power (Cowan, Drinkard and MacGavin, 1984; Hunter, 1985; Youniss and Smollar, 1985).

Autonomy development in adolescence has remained an important research issue in the recent literature on family at adolescence. Different authors (e.g. Steinberg and Silverberg, 1986; Ryan and Lynch, 1989) have pointed to the confusion often associated with the concept of autonomy in theories of adolescent development. As shown by Steinberg and Silverberg (1986), it is sometimes defined in terms of detachment from parents or from peers, as self-governance or as related to independent reasoning. Ryan and Lynch (1989) proposed a definition of autonomy as "self-governance and self-regulation", as opposed to heteronomy, i.e. "being controlled by external forces or compulsions". They contrasted the concept of autonomy with that of independence, concerning "self-reliance or the ability to care for oneself". The opposite would be dependence, which describes "relationships in which one relies on another for satisfaction of needs". The other concept which is often mixed with the other two is detachment, which describes "the adolescent’s withdrawing from the family and the moving towards new attachments and social bonds in the wider community". Ryan and Lynch also point to the different connotations of detachment. It can be seen as a "necessary but not sufficient step towards independence and/or autonomy", but it can also represent loss and separation, being associated with "an experienced lack of parental support and acceptance". These authors argue that detachment in the
latter sense does not conduce to independence and autonomy and may also interfere with the consolidation of identity. They suggest that individuation during adolescence is facilitated not by detachment, but by attachment, as defined by Bretherton (1987), i.e. a relationship that, from the beginning, permits optimal autonomy in the context of emotional support. Similarly, Grotevant and Cooper (1986) propose a model of individuation, in which individuation is defined as "a quality of dyadic relationships generated by both its members, and is seen as the interplay between the individuality and connectedness of the partners" (p. 87)

Consistent with the idea that there is continuity in parent-child relations during development, the focus of recent research has been on the relationship between attachment and autonomy in adolescent development. As shown by Feldman and Gehring (1988), earlier views of adolescent development emphasized primarily the growth of separateness during adolescence. More recently, relatedness has also been emphasized. The findings from some of these studies have helped to highlight the notion that attachment and autonomy/independence may be positively rather than negatively correlated. For example, in a study carried out by Sullivan and Sullivan (1980), comparing a group of college commuters and a group of boarders, commuters reported a greater level of independence from parents, but at the same time a greater level of satisfaction and communication with them. In another study carried out by Grotevant and Cooper (1986), family discussions in a family interaction task (planning a 2-week holiday) were taped. It was hoped this task
would enable the family to express individuality (suggestions for activities and disagreements) and connectedness (agreements, questions and compromises). The results suggested that both individuality and connectedness in family relationships are predictors of psychological competence in adolescence.

In the context of moral development, it is worth mentioning the findings of Walker and Taylor's (1991) longitudinal study which give support to the notion that it is the combination of both challenging and supportive parent-child interaction which best predicts developmental change in childhood and adolescence. Sixty-three families (fathers, mothers and children- mean ages: 6.8, 9.8, 12.4, 15.7) were interviewed individually and then asked to take part in a family session. In the interview they were asked to respond to the Moral Judgment Interview (MJI) and in the family session they were asked to discuss a hypothetical dilemma, extracted from the MJI, and a real-life dilemma proposed by the children. The entire procedure was repeated 2 years later. The results showed that parental discussion style and level of reasoning were predictive of the child's moral reasoning development over the subsequent 2-year interval and the context that better predicted moral growth was the discussion of the child's real-life dilemma. The parental style which predicted the greatest moral development was the representational (elicit the child's opinion, ask clarifying questions, paraphrase and check for understanding) and supportive interaction.

The relevance of affective behaviours to moral development in
adolescence has also been assessed through semi-structured interviews with adolescents (Powers and Speicher, 1985; Speicher and Powers, 1985). Advanced adolescent moral judgement was found to be associated to mothers’ lovingness and responsiveness to the adolescents’ needs, and high emotional cohesiveness and concern among family members.

An important contribution to the study of adolescent development in the context of parent-child relations is the research carried out by Youniss and Smollar (1985), with a total of 1,049 adolescents, ranging from 12 to 19 years. Using both interview and questionnaires, a total of eight studies were carried out, in order to assess different aspects of adolescents’ relationships with their parents. The findings of these studies have helped to highlight some important dimensions of parent-child relations and have contributed to a redefinition of the concept of autonomy, to account for a dual process of separation and connectedness. They offered a few indications from their data to show that while separation is occurring, a large proportion of adolescents still maintain connections with their parents. They wrote: "First, they feel respect for, and respected by, their parents. Second, they clearly desire to please their parents, to meet the expectations that parents have for them, and to seek parents’ approval. Third, although parents grant them freedom through privacy, many adolescents keep parents informed about their lives and even consider parents as advisors on personal matters. Fourth, the majority of adolescents appreciate both parents' roles- insofar as they view them as an expression of concern for their own well-being" (p. 77). They proposed that the concept of individuation,
as defined by Cooper, Grotevant and Condon (1983), would in fact be a better expression of this dual process than the concept of autonomy.

Another interesting line of research which is of relevance to the study of moral development in adolescence tries to relate the sociocognitive changes in adolescence to changing patterns of family relationships (Smetana, 1988, 1989b). This line of research has paved the way for the exploration of the relationship of autonomy development to parent-child conflict in adolescence. The findings of the studies which have followed this line of research have shown that autonomy development may have a social-cognitive component, involving the prioritization of self and personal issues, sometimes at the expense of maintaining parental and cultural conventions. Even though there seems to be a parallel social-cognitive reorganization in parents, the course of development may be disjunctive between parents and adolescents, with children questioning more the legitimacy of parental authority over some issues.

This hypothesis was further explored in a study (Smetana, 1989b) with 102 children (mean ages: 11.1, 13.2, 15.2 and 17.1) and their parents examining parents' and children's reasoning about actual family conflict. She concluded that parents and children reasoned about the conflict situations in conceptually different terms. While parents tended to view these situations in conventional terms, children tended to define them in personal terms. Conventional reasoning was found to be related to age and sex, however. She found that adolescent boys were more likely to reason conventionally about conflicts than pre- or early adolescent boys. An
interpretation to this finding is that as adolescents’ social-cognitive abilities increase, they find it easier to take their parents’ perspective. Finally, even though children’s reasoning tended to be predominantly personal there were boundaries to the types of issues they treated as under their personal jurisdiction. There were some conflict situations, particularly those involving interpersonal relationships (getting along with others, fighting with siblings), which were treated by parents and children as moral (pertaining to welfare or fairness).

To conclude, recent research on adolescent development has tended to emphasize interactive processes in the development of autonomy. This view is therefore somewhat closer to family systems than to traditional psychoanalytic or cognitive-developmental theories of development. By emphasizing the dimension of attachment apart from autonomy in parent-child relations, this framework has helped to redefine the concept of autonomy development, and to highlight the importance of relationships in development from childhood to adolescence and beyond. However, this interactive framework, as well as the family systems notion of change in the system and of the uniqueness of each system, brings a special challenge to developmental psychology, i.e. the question of what is internalized and carried by the individual.
Methodological considerations

The classical procedure in moral development research has been the use of hypothetical moral dilemmas. According to Harding (1985), moral dilemmas deal with conflict situations which require moral judgments.

In Piaget's (1932) early experiments evaluating intentions and consequences in moral judgement, the typical procedure involved a pair of stories with transgression situations. For example, in one story a boy tries to get some jam out of the cupboard whilst his mother is out. He climbs up on a chair and as he was trying to get it he knocks over a cup and breaks it. In the corresponding story a boy is called to dinner. He goes into the dining room but behind the door there was a chair, and on the chair there was a tray with fifteen cups. He breaks all the cups. After being told the stories, children were asked which of the two actors of the stories was the naughtiest. The intentionality and the consequences were manipulated in the stories.
With a similar methodological orientation, Kohlberg (1969, 1984) also based his research on hypothetical dilemmas. His studies brought important methodological contributions, since it was based on them that Kohlberg devised an instrument to measure developmental stages in moral judgment, the "Moral Judgment Interview" (MJI), which is still nowadays the main instrument for assessing moral judgment. Several studies have tried to assess the cross-cultural validity of Kohlberg's six-stage model using the MJI. The main studies which have used Kohlberg's MJI in Brazil were recently reviewed by Biaggio (1988). The results of these studies have shown that there is very little use of stage 4 and frequent use of stage 3 thinking among Brazilians.

The basic methodological procedure of the MJI consists of asking subjects to respond to hypothetical moral dilemmas, such as 'Heinz's Dilemma'. In this classical dilemma, only an expensive drug can save Heinz's dying wife, but Heinz cannot afford the price demanded by the pharmacist. People are required to judge what should be done in the situation presented, in this particular case, whether or not he should steal the drug to save his wife's life, and to justify their answers. The answers are then classified according to Kohlberg's six stages of moral development.

One can see at least one main difference between Piaget's and Kohlberg's types of dilemmas and that concerns the content and nature of the dilemmas. Piaget worked with conflicts which are likely to occur in children's
daily experience, whereas Kohlberg's dilemmas were much more improbable to occur. Kohlberg's neglect of content in favour of reasoning is in fact in accordance with his deontological ethical position, as pointed out by Shelton and McAdams (1990). His main concern was with broad societal issues and not necessarily the experiences encountered in everyday moral situations.

Research based on Turiel's (1978, 1983) domain theory has also tended to use hypothetical situations. The basic assessment technique involves the use of prototypical stimuli (Turiel et al., 1987). For example, a prototypical moral stimulus would be hitting another person. A prototypical conventional stimulus would be not wearing school uniform. For each stimulus presented, people are asked whether, if there were no rule prohibiting that particular behaviour, the behaviour would still be okay to perform. According to Turiel, this methodology is useful for eliciting general, abstract concepts. However, another useful methodology is the use of multifaceted or mixed situations. This implies the application of concepts in contextualized situations which often involve the coordination of different domains of social concepts (e.g. Killen, 1985; Turiel, 1983; Smetana, 1982, 1983; Turiel and Davidson, 1986).

In contrast with Kohlberg's methodological orientation, some recent studies have used real-life dilemmas, inspired especially by the work of Gilligan (1982), involving women who were pregnant and thinking of having an abortion.
In Gilligan’s study, as in other studies involving real-life dilemmas (e.g. Yussen, 1977; Lyons, 1983; Ford and Lowery, 1986; Walker, 1986a; Walker, DeVries and Trevethan, 1987; Johnston, Brown and Christopherson, 1990), moral judgments were based on conflict situations really experienced by subjects. In this sense, these situations can also be distinguished from Piaget’s types of moral dilemmas, which were chosen by the investigator rather than offered by subjects themselves.

This tendency to use real-life dilemmas observed in some recent studies originates mainly from a basic dissatisfaction with Kohlberg’s hypothetical dilemmas. They have been criticized for dealing with a small sample of moral conflicts (Yussen, 1977), and a narrow conception of morality, more applicable to males (Gilligan, 1982). According to Gilligan, the dilemmas proposed by Kohlberg retain only the justice orientation (assumed to be male-oriented) and do not take into consideration the care orientation (assumed to be female-oriented). It is interesting to note, however, as stressed by Walker and Taylor (1991), that the Kohlbergian moral education paradigm itself has shifted from classroom discussion of hypothetical dilemmas to real-life and political dilemmas (Power, Higgings and Kohlberg, 1989).

The question of whether Kohlberg’s interview reveals something about morality in real life remains (Damon, 1983). To what extent responses to hypothetical dilemmas give an indication of how people will handle everyday dilemmas and experiences?
Some studies have tried to answer this question by investigating the consistency of moral judgment in real-life conflict situations and in hypothetical situations. The results are contrasting. Some studies did find differences in moral judgment as a function of the situation (e.g. Gilligan and Belenky, 1980; Haan, 1975; Kohlberg, Scharf and Hickey, 1971; Higgins, Power and Kohlberg, 1984; Walker and Taylor, 1991), whilst others did not (Walker et al., 1987).

The greater emphasis on the contextual determinants of development observed in the more recent literature has helped to expand the research methodology to include observation in special contexts. As pointed out by Rogoff (1982), the growing concern with context in development has arisen from at least two problems identified in developmental psychology, the generality of people's performance across situations, particularly from laboratory to naturalistic settings (the so-called problem of ecological validity), and the generality of related cognitive skills across situations (decalage). In relation to the first issue, Rogoff calls attention to the fact that the solution is not to look for a natural situation which will reveal people's "real" capacities, since there is no such thing as the most 'natural' context. The important thing is to investigate the role of particular contexts rather than to look for the ideal context.

Observational studies in special contexts have covered a large age span, ranging from early childhood to adolescence. These studies are often derived
from the hypothesis that children's rule understanding is actively constructed through children's social interactions (Turiel, 1979, 1983). As shown by Smetana (in press), children's or adults' responses to naturally-occurring violations of moral and conventional rules are examined in different contexts, such as the home (Dunn and Munn, 1987; Smetana, 1989a; Smetana and Braeges, 1990), day care centres and nursery schools (Nucci and Turiel, 1978; Tisak, Nucci, Baskind and Lamping, 1991), school classrooms (Blumenfeld, Pintrich and Hamilton, 1987; Nucci and Nucci, 1982a) and playgrounds (Nucci and Nucci, 1982b).

In a study aimed at examining the relationship of family interaction to moral development, Walker and Taylor (1991) found out that parents' moral reasoning varied according to context. Parents used a lower level of reasoning when discussing moral issues in a family session, particularly for real-life dilemmas. Conversely, a higher level of moral reasoning was found for children in the family session. Differences in family interaction patterns were also found in the real-life and the hypothetical situation. Parents tended to be more representational (elicit the child's opinion, ask clarifying questions, paraphrase and check for understanding) and supportive when discussing real-life than when discussing hypothetical moral dilemmas.

There seems to be no doubt that context effects should be taken into consideration in moral judgment research. From a developmental point of view, it is especially important to consider children's or adolescents' moral
judgments in real-life interactive contexts, such as the family context or the peer context. The assessment of people's moral judgments in everyday situations is a big challenge for research in the area of moral development. The intimate, personal involvement in these situations brings to the fore powerful affective factors which cannot be as easily identified in the more detached context of hypothetical situations.

The initial investigations based on narratives of moral conflict situations were mainly concerned with either applying Kohlberg's stage coding scheme to real-life situations, to see the extent to which people's moral judgements differ in real-life versus hypothetical situations, or with assessing gender differences in justice and care orientations. In fact, this was the trend observed in the literature by the time this research project was being carried out. However, a shift has been observed in the more recent literature towards an interest in the analysis of narratives in themselves. This is partly a result of the recent upsurge of interest in narrative thinking (Bruner, 1986) in moral development research (Vitz, 1990; Tappan and Brown, 1989; Brown, Debold, Tappan and Gilligan, 1991). As shown by Vitz (1990), narrative thinking is context-dependent, based on the description of concrete human experiences. It is contrasted with the context-independent propositional thinking, based on logical argumentation. To the extent that hypothetical dilemmas pull for abstract reasoning, they are based on the latter.

A method for analyzing narratives of individuals' lived experiences of
moral conflict and choice is being constructed. Brown, Debold, Tappan and Gilligan (1991) have proposed a "relational" method for reading and interpreting narratives, which focuses on the relationship between the reader's and the narrator's perspective. It acknowledges the interpretive nature of the reading process. Four different readings of individuals' narratives are proposed, each attending to a different aspect of the narrative: a reading for the story, a reading for the self (the narrator), a reading for care and a reading for justice.

The first three studies reported in the chapters that will follow are based on narratives of moral conflict situations. However, at the time of the carrying out of this project, there was no clear methodology for analyzing narratives of conflict and choice. Both the methodology of data gathering and of data analysis used in this project differ from the methodology described above. Questionnaires, rather than interviews, were used and the method of data analysis was content analysis.
**Research Aim and Presentation**

This project investigated the relationship between parent-child conflict and moral development in adolescence. The social contextual determinants of moral development have become a major source of concern in recent investigations. Despite the recognition of the importance of the context of parent-child relations in moral development, there are still relatively few studies in the area. It is believed that the study of moral development requires a social interactional perspective, in which individual development can be redefined as a concomitant developmental process in parent-child relations (Sullivan and Sullivan, 1980).

A series of studies were developed with the aim of evaluating adolescents' moral judgment in real-life conflict situations. Kelley and Power (1992) emphasized the need for descriptive studies which can provide data on social experiences relevant to specific areas of child functioning. Otherwise one runs the risk of putting forward theories which have little relevance to the development of children in real-life contexts. One can well extend Kelley and Power's assertions to adolescent development. In fact, it was with this view in mind that the studies presented here were carried out.

In Chapter IV three age groups are examined: 10-12, 14-16 and 17-21. The aim of this study is to check possible developmental changes from prior to adolescence to late adolescence concerning the context and issues involved
in real conflict situations. Subjects are initially asked to mention moral conflict situations they have experienced. They are also asked to say how difficult it was for them to decide about what to do in the conflict situations they have experienced, to indicate their decision and to justify their answers. In Chapter V two groups of 17-21 year olds are investigated (one living with parents and the other living in halls of residence) in order to determine the extent to which the amount of daily contact with parents is related to parent-child conflict. In Chapter VI two groups are examined: 14-16 and 17-21 year olds. Subjects are asked to think of moral conflict situations specifically involving their parents, to say how they resolved the conflict and to indicate the reason why they resolved it in that particular way. The main aim of this study is to examine developmental trends in the strategies used for dealing with conflict situations involving the parents. In Chapter VII an interview study carried out with parents and adolescents (15-16 year olds) is presented. The main aim of this study is to analyze parents’ and adolescents’ views on parental interference in different areas of adolescents’ lives as a source of potential conflict between parents and adolescents. Finally, in Chapter VIII the major findings of these studies are presented, as well as their implications for future studies focusing on parent-child context in moral development in adolescence.
CHAPTER IV

THE INTERPERSONAL CONTEXT IN MORAL CONFLICT SITUATIONS EXPERIENCED BY PRE-ADOLESCENTS, MID-ADOLESCENTS AND LATE ADOLESCENTS

INTRODUCTION

The role played by interpersonal relationships in moral development is controversial both in the psychological and in the psychoanalytic literature. While Kohlberg (1969) acknowledged the importance of interactive contexts in moral development, in particular the context of peer relations, he assumed that moral development implies going beyond intimate relationships towards more autonomous and impersonal reasoning. As stressed by Damon (1983), the most important part of Kohlberg’s theory concerns the main transitions from adolescence to adulthood. It is the transition phase to Kohlberg’s stages 5 and 6, which belong to a truly autonomous level of development, in which the individual is able to transcend societal rules and adopt a real moral point of view. Similarly, psychoanalytic theory also stresses the importance of early social interactions, especially parent-child relationships, in moral development. However, superego development is characterized as the gradual detachment
from external objects, which become part of the internal world (Freud, 1938). Superego precursors and superego proper are distinguished through the depersonalized character of the latter (Holder, 1982).

One of the most influential and controversial recent research contributions to the subject of morality and interpersonal relationships is the work of Gilligan (1982), emphasizing a sex bias in Kohlberg’s theory and research. Her main dissatisfaction with Kohlberg’s theory lies in his having undermined the importance of the interpersonal, allocating it to less mature stages of development (mainly stage 3). Stage 3 reasoning is based on the mutual expectations deriving from interpersonal relations. She argued that his theory is based on a justice-oriented type of morality. Consequently, it puts women in an underprivileged position, insofar as in her view they have a more interpersonal, care-oriented morality. She went on to develop a care-oriented approach to morality.

Even though the gender differences reported by Gilligan have not received total support from research (e.g. Blatt and Kohlberg, 1975; Rest, 1979, 1983; Ford and Lowery, 1986; Walker et al., 1987; see Walker, 1991, for a review), she has helped to stress the importance of interpersonal relationships in moral development. In her view, current psychological theories of adolescent development place too much emphasis on autonomy, individuation and separation and undermine the role of attachment, an important aspect of relationships (Gilligan, 1988).
It is believed that the role played by the context of interpersonal relationships in moral development in adolescence can be better understood through descriptive studies focusing on adolescents' reasoning in real-life conflict situations. In fact, following Gilligan's (1982) first attempts to study moral development through narratives of real-life conflict, there has been a tendency in the recent literature on moral development to focus on subjects' narratives of their own experiences of moral conflict (e.g. Lyons, 1983; Ford and Lowery, 1986; Walker et al., 1987; Johnston, Brown and Christopherson, 1990). The recent upsurge of interest in narrative thinking has also helped to expand the use of this methodology (Vitz, 1990; Tappan and Brown, 1989).

Through a semiclinical interview (Brown, Argyris, Attanucci, Bardige, Gilligan, Johnston, Miller, Osborne, Ward, Wiggins and Wilcox, 1987), the moral dilemmas adolescents face are explored, as well as the way they are resolved and evaluated. Even though this interview protocol has been widely used in research, there has been some dissatisfaction with the fact that there has been little effort to try and describe the content of the moral dilemmas elicited through this procedure, as well as the context within which the moral dilemmas are described (Johnston et al., 1990).

In the present study, a special emphasis is given to the context of the conflict situations experienced by preadolescents, mid-adolescents and late adolescents. By the time this study was designed, no previous studies had addressed the issue of context in real-life moral dilemmas. An exception to this
trend was the study conducted by Walker et al. (1987), in which a content analysis of the dilemmas was proposed, differentiating between the 'issues' that were the focus of the dilemmas and the 'nature of the relationship' that they entailed. Even though these authors did not refer to the word 'context', their analysis of the 'nature of the relationship' suggested an analysis of the context of the moral dilemmas. The 'nature of the relationship' was classified as either personal (involving significant others) or impersonal (involving strangers or involving primarily the self). In a more recent study (Johnston et al., 1990), which I came across after the present study had already been completed, the 'context' was directly addressed. These authors proposed that the 'conflict', the 'content' and the 'context' should be distinguished in order to better understand the complexity of adolescents' descriptions of moral conflict. They defined the 'conflict' as the problem presented by adolescents (e.g. whether or not to drink). They found that these conflicts were usually embedded in relationships which influenced the way adolescents reported the conflict and the issue that was the focus of the conflict. They called these relationships the 'context' of the moral dilemmas. The 'context' could also sometimes involve primarily the self. Finally, the 'content' was defined as the central focus of the conflict. The same 'conflict' can have different 'contents'.

As in the studies reported above, in the present study the 'context' was differentiated from the 'issue' that was the focus of the conflict situation. Apart from the context and the issue, the difficulty they faced in deciding about what to do in the conflict situation, as well as the justifications offered for the
decisions taken in these situations were also assessed.

As far as the context of the moral conflict situations is concerned, it was predicted that the interpersonal context, especially the context of personal relationships, would be predominant. This prediction was formulated based on the findings of previous studies (e.g. Walker et al., 1987; Yussen, 1977) which showed that adolescents tended to mention conflicts involving personal relationships. The more recent study of Johnston et al. (1990) also gave support to these findings. It is interesting to note that in Walker et al.’s (1987) study developmental differences were found in terms of the predominance of the context of personal relationships. This study was carried out with 80 family triads, and the authors found that children mentioned proportionately more conflicts involving personal relationships than their parents. Based on these findings, and on both psychoanalytic and cognitive-developmental theory, which assume that moral development entails a move towards greater depersonalization or impersonality, a developmental trend towards more individual conflicts, i.e. conflicts involving primarily the self, was also hypothesized.

Within the context of personal relationships, another question addressed by this study concerns the relative importance of the context of parent-child and peer relations in the moral conflict situations, from preadolescence to late adolescence. Since Piaget (1932), there has been a tendency to stress the importance of peers and to undermine the importance of parents in moral
development. The psychoanalytic literature has also assumed that during adolescence there is a progressive decathecting of parents, i.e. a detachment from early infantile representations of parents, and the cathecting of nonincestuous genital sexual relationships with peers (A. Freud, 1958). Some recent studies (e.g. Youniss, 1980; Hunter and Youniss, 1982; Youniss and Smollar, 1985) have shown, however, that friendship and parent-child relations may fulfill different functions during adolescence. They have also indicated age-related changes in some of the important functions of these relationships. As far as parent-child relations are concerned, instead of a major breach, what seems to happen is that parent-child relations change across different developmental periods (see Hill and Holmbeck, 1986, for a review). In line with these recent findings, it was predicted that the context of parent-child relations would be as frequent as the context of peer relations in the moral conflict situations described. It was also hypothesized that there would be quantitative differences in the frequency of conflicts involving parents across the three age groups. The findings of recent studies on parent-child conflict have shown that the pattern of conflict with parents, from preadolescence to late adolescence, follows an inverted U-shaped function: it increases by early adolescence, is relatively stable during mid-adolescence and declines in late adolescence (Montemayor, 1990). It was therefore predicted that conflicts involving the parents would be more frequent in the group of mid-adolescents. Qualitative differences in the issues of parent-child conflict from preadolescence to late adolescence were also predicted, based on research findings which have emphasized the changes that take place in parent-child
relations at different developmental periods (Youniss, 1980; Hunter and Youniss, 1982; Youniss and Smollar, 1985; Collins and Russell, 1988).

Another issue which is addressed by the present study is that of gender differences in moral development in adolescence. Females are assumed to be more interpersonally oriented than males in their development (Gilligan, 1982). It was therefore hypothesized that the context of interpersonal relationships would be more prominent in females' than in males' moral dilemmas.

Finally, in relation to the justifications offered for the decisions taken in the conflict situations, the present study aimed to assess the use of impersonal reasoning in subjects' responses, i.e. reasoning based on abstract rules or principles. According to Kohlberg (1969), this kind of reasoning would be the ultimate goal of moral development and its attainment would be made possible through an important transition that takes place in adolescence, i.e. the transition to formal thinking. The development of formal operations enhances the child's ability to see different sides to a problem, to reason about it in logical terms and to make more detached judgements. Gilligan and Wiggins (1988) and Bardige (1988) point out to the risk of fostering detachment in adolescents at the expense of "face-value thinking". The latter would be based on more direct, immediate perception or feelings. Even though the onset of formal operations opens up the possibility of new understanding of others and probably of their rights and welfare, Bardige questions whether the moral sensibilities are at risk in adolescence, since this new capacity can also serve
to rationalize inaction and evade decisions. Gilligan recalls Piaget's (1932) question concerning what happens to the generosity of the eleven-year-old (the "sovereign" in the childhood world) that is so unfamiliar in adults, as something that challenges the assumption of incremental progress implicit in theories of moral development.

Another aspect which has not been addressed in this discussion but which adds to the question of whether development implies a move towards more impersonal reasoning concerns the likelihood of the use of this kind of reasoning in situations in which one is personally involved. The main question here concerns the extent to which reasoning varies according to the content of a moral conflict situation a person is faced with. Kohlberg's hypothetical dilemmas were phrased in such a manner as to pull for abstract principles of reasoning, since their content involved broader societal issues. A question remains, however, concerning moral reasoning in situations in which one is personally involved.
METHOD

Design

Three age groups took part in this study: 10-12, 14-16 and 17-21. They were asked to write down three moral conflict situations they had experienced. Five main variables were considered in this study: i) the types of context involved in the conflict situations; ii) the types of context in situations involving personal relationships; iii) the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations; iv) the difficulty experienced in deciding about what to do in the conflict situations; and v) the types of justification offered for the decisions taken in the conflict situations. The data were analyzed through content analysis.

Subjects

Four hundred and ten subjects were selected from four highly comparable private schools and from student populations of the university to which the investigator belongs in Porto Alegre, located in the south of Brazil. They comprised three age groups: 10-12 (78 males and 78 females), 14-16 (37 males and 60 females) and 17-21 (75 males and 82 females). The first two groups were all year 6 and 9, respectively, and the latter were college students. Due to their locations, the schools selected are attended mainly by middle class students. Altogether 453 subjects were examined. The total number of subjects
excluded for failing to answer the questionnaire or to give meaningful answers was 43. The majority of subjects excluded belonged to the 14-16 age group.

Instrument

In order to examine the content of moral conflicts experienced by pre-adolescents, adolescents and young adults and the justifications offered for their decisions in each situation a structured questionnaire was used. The instrument consisted of two parts. The first part was an adaptation of Ford and Lowery's (1986) procedure. Subjects were asked to describe three situations in which they had been in doubt, wondering whether something was right or wrong, fair or unfair. In order to make sure what the conflict was for them, for each situation presented they were also asked to say the doubt/conflict they had had in that situation. For each situation the degree of difficulty in deciding what to do was also assessed according to a five-point scale, from 1 'not difficult' to 5 'very difficult'. In the second part, they were asked about the decision taken for each situation and the reason why they took that decision. A copy of the questionnaire used is presented in Appendix 4A. A slightly different questionnaire version was presented to the 10-12 age group and is also included in Appendix 4A.

Similar questionnaire/interview protocols have been widely used to collect situations of moral conflict and choice from children, adolescents and adults (e.g. Lyons, 1982; Pratt, 1985; Ford and Lowery, 1986; Walker, de
Vries and Treverthan, 1987; Brown et al., 1987; Johnston et al., 1990). With the upsurge of interest in narrative thinking and narrative approaches to moral development (see Vitz, 1990), they have been proposed as the main strategy to be used in moral education programmes as well (Tappan, 1989).

The protocols usually focus on three components of people's reasoning about moral dilemmas: construction (what is the problem?), resolution (what decision was taken?) and evaluation (why was that decision taken? was it the right thing to do?) of the dilemma.

Most of the studies which have used this type of protocol are based on interviews rather than on questionnaires, as proposed here. One of the reasons why it was decided that a questionnaire should be used instead of an interview was to get a bigger sample. In addition, it was felt that subjects would feel more at ease to tell their moral conflicts if they wrote them down.

The scoring procedures used in these studies have tended to vary, but most studies based on real-life moral dilemmas have assessed people's moral orientation (care x rights orientation) and level of moral development. The content of the moral conflict situations has not been frequently examined, and no special attention has been given to the context of the moral conflict situations (see Johnston, Brown and Christopherson, 1990, for an exception to this trend), which is the main focus of the present study. In fact, as reported by Johnston, Brown and Christopherson (1990), even though Brown et al.'s
(1987) interview method has been shown to be a reliable method for identifying dilemmas adolescents face, as well as the way they are resolved and evaluated, one limitation which has been often reported is that little has been done to describe the context of the real-life dilemmas.

**Procedure**

Subjects were asked to answer the questionnaire in classrooms. The investigator explained briefly the aims of the study, saying that she was studying situations in which people are sometimes in doubt about what to do, wondering whether something is right or wrong, fair or unfair, and that she was looking at different age groups. The average duration of the whole procedure was 30 minutes.
RESULTS

The data are examined in five parts. The first three focus on the content of the conflict situations mentioned and the last two on the decisions taken (difficulty in deciding what to do and the justifications for the decisions). As far as the first part is concerned, it examines the context of the conflict situations with the aim of checking the proportion of conflicts involving the interpersonal context, especially those involving personal relationships, by age and gender. In the second, the context of the conflicts involving personal relationships is examined in order to assess in particular the proportion of conflicts involving parents and peers by age and gender. The third presents a descriptive analysis of the issues which were the focus of the conflict situations to see the extent to which they differ according to context and age. The fourth focuses on the difficulty experienced in deciding what to do in the conflict situation. Finally, the fifth part examines the justifications offered for the decisions taken in each situation to see whether they differed according to gender, age and context.
i) Types of context involved in the conflict situations

A content analysis of the types of context involved in the conflict situations was performed. The classification system proposed was inspired by Walker, de Vries and Treverthan's (1987) typology. Their typology was proposed for assessing real-life dilemmas and is based on the nature of the relationship that each dilemma entails—either personal or impersonal. The first comprises those situations involving a specific person or group of people with whom the subject has a significant relationship. The second concerns situations involving a person or group of people whom the subject does not know well, or is generalized or involving institutions or issues related to the self. The problem with this typology is that issues primarily intrinsic to the self, in which there is no interpersonal relationship directly involved (e.g. missing a class), are also classified under 'impersonal relationship'. For this reason an adaptation of their typology was developed. The contexts were divided into 'interpersonal' (involving another person) and 'individual' (not involving another person). The former was further divided into 'personal relationships' and 'impersonal relationships'. The latter was divided into 'actions/choices' and 'ideas/values'. The latter division was felt to be necessary because there were some conflicts which did not involve any direct action/decision but were more abstract, involving questioning of ideas/values. A definition of each category is given in Table 4.1 below.
Table 4.1

Types of context involved in the conflict situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal context</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationship: a conflict involving a person or a group of people with whom the subject has a significant relationship, i.e. a continuous relationship (e.g. a conflict involving a family member, a friend, a neighbour, a mate, a partner);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal relationship: a conflict involving a person or group of people with whom the subject has no significant relationship, i.e. strangers. Included are also conflicts involving generic groups (e.g. students, teachers).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual context</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual actions/choices: the individual is directly involved in the conflict, but the context refers to actions which do not explicitly involve other people (e.g. transgressions not involving directly other people, conflicts related to profession or to academic course, etc.);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/values: a conflict of ideas and values in which the individual is not necessarily involved (e.g. questions concerning abortion, homosexuality, justice, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these categories, a content analysis of the context of the conflicts mentioned by subjects was performed. The assignment to categories was done by consensus together with two other coders.

The percentage of conflicts mentioned within each type of context by age and gender is presented in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2
The types of context of moral conflict situations as a function of age and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Context</th>
<th>Percentage for each group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-12 Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal...</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships...</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal relationships..</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual......</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions/choices</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/values....</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts. N=78, 10-12 males; N=78, 10-12 females; N=37, 14-16 males; N=60, 14-16 females; N=75, 17-21 males; N=82, 17-21 females.

Table 4.2 shows that the 'interpersonal' context, comprising 'personal relationships' and 'impersonal relationships', was predominant in the conflict situations mentioned in all three age groups. Of all conflicts mentioned the proportion classified as 'interpersonal' was 77% for 10-12 year olds, 82% for 14-16 year olds and 60% for 17-21 year olds. It is interesting to note that within the 'interpersonal', the most salient was the context of 'personal relationships', especially for the 14-16 age group (78% of all conflicts, compared to 67% for the 10-12 and 51% for the 17-21 year olds). In relation to the 'individual' context, the older group showed the highest proportion of conflicts in this type of context (39% of all conflicts, compared to 21% in the 10-12 and 19% in the 14-16 age group). Within the 'individual' context, there were very few conflicts involving 'ideas/values' (1% for 10-12, 4% for 14-16 and 6% for 17-21 year olds). This is partly due to the instrument used, since subjects were asked to
think of a conflict they had experienced and then to say what they had decided to do in that situation. But even so it is interesting that there were some conflicts involving 'ideas/values', especially in the two older groups.

As far as gender differences are concerned, they appeared only in the two younger groups. As it can be seen from Table 4.2, females tended to mention more conflicts in the 'interpersonal' context than males both in the 10-12 age group (82% compared to 75%) and the 14-16 age group (88% compared to 72%). Conversely, the 'individual' context was more frequently mentioned by males than by females in both the 10-12 age group (25% and 19%, respectively) and the 14-16 age group (28% and 12%, respectively).

In order to examine the tendency to mention the 'interpersonal' versus the 'individual' context, the responses were scored on a seven-point scale (-3 to +3). The scoring scheme (Appendix 4B) shows all possible combinations of 'interpersonal' and 'individual' context across the conflict situations mentioned by subjects. The subject's derived score represents the difference between the number of conflicts in the interpersonal and in the individual context. The higher a score the greater was the number of conflicts in the interpersonal context and the smaller the number of conflicts in the individual context.

1 Note that subjects were asked to mention three conflict situations but in a few cases only two or even one was mentioned. If the subject mentioned three conflict situations in the interpersonal context his/her final score was '3'. If he/she mentioned only two conflicts both in the interpersonal context the score was '2'. If the subject mentioned two in the interpersonal and one in the individual context the score was '1'. If he/she mentioned only one conflict and that was classified under the interpersonal context the score was also '1'. If only two conflicts were mentioned, one in each context, the score was '0'. If only one conflict was mentioned and that was classified under the individual context the score was '-1'. If three conflicts were mentioned, two in the individual and one in the interpersonal context the score was also '-1'. If two conflicts were mentioned and they both were classified under the individual context, the score was '-2'. Finally, if the subject gave three conflicts in the individual context, his/her final score was '-3'. 
The influence of age and gender on the subjects' tendency to mention conflicts in the interpersonal or individual contexts was investigated by analysis of variance. Table 4.3 presents the mean scores and standard deviations representing the difference in the number of conflicts in the interpersonal and individual context as a function of age and gender.

### Table 4.3

Mean responses and standard deviation (in brackets) representing the difference in the number of conflicts in the interpersonal and the individual context by gender and age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>17-21</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.43)</td>
<td>(1.37)</td>
<td>(1.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
<td>(1.73)</td>
<td>(1.99)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher the mean the more subjects mentioned conflicts in the interpersonal and less in the individual context.

A gender x age (2x3) analysis of variance was performed on the derived score. A main effect for age was revealed (F=14.27, d.f.= 2, 404, p<0.001). In order to analyze the differences between the three groups, selected comparisons of means were performed using the Tukey Honestly Significant Differences (Q) test. The results indicate that of all three age groups the 17-21 mentioned significantly less conflicts in the interpersonal context than the 10-12 (p< .01) and the 14-16 age groups (p< .01). There were no significant differences between the 10-12 and the 14-16 age groups. A marginal effect for gender was also revealed (F=3.30, d.f.=1,404, p<0.07), with females stressing more than males the interpersonal context. Finally, a gender x age interaction effect was
revealed (F=3.15, d.f.=2,404, p< 0.05). Selected comparisons with the Tukey Test indicated that females mentioned more conflicts in the interpersonal context than males both in the 10-12 (p< .05) and in the 14-16 (p< .01) age groups, but not in the 17-21 age group. Even though gender differences were not consistent across groups, the differences found in the younger groups partly support Gilligan’s notion that females are more interpersonally oriented than males.

Since one of the aims of the study was to assess the significance of 'personal relationships' as a context within which moral development takes place, a further analysis was performed only in the 'interpersonal' context scores in order to examine the subjects' tendency to mention conflicts involving 'personal' as opposed to 'impersonal relationships'. A similar scale to the one proposed above was used (see Appendix 4B), except that this time the scores represent the difference in the number of conflicts involving 'personal relationships' as opposed to 'impersonal relationships'. Table 4.4 presents the means and standard deviations of the derived scores by gender and age. A gender x age (2x3) analysis of variance was performed on the derived scores. The results revealed main effects for gender and age (F=9.33, d.f.= 1, 404, p<0.003; F=12.77, d.f.= 2, 404, p<0.001, respectively). As can be seen from Table 4.4, females mentioned significantly more conflicts involving personal relationships than males. As for age differences, selected comparisons using the Tukey Test indicated that the 14-16 age group mentioned more conflicts involving personal relationships than both the 10-12 (p< .01) and the 17-21 age group (p <.01).
Table 4.4

Mean responses and standard deviation (in brackets) representing the difference in the number of conflicts involving personal relationships and those involving impersonal relationships by gender and age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>14-16</th>
<th>17-21</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.12)</td>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher the mean the more subjects mentioned conflicts involving personal relationships and less involving impersonal relationships.

In addition, the latter mentioned less conflicts involving personal relationships than the 10-12 (p < .01). There was also a significant age x gender interaction effect (F=4.38, d.f.=2, 404, p<0.02). Selected comparisons with the Tukey Test revealed significant differences between females’ and males’ scores both in the 10-12 (p < .01) and the 14-16 (p < .01) but not in the 17-21 age group. In both age groups females tended to mention more conflicts involving 'personal relationships' than males.
ii) Types of context in conflict situations involving personal relationships

As mentioned elsewhere, a controversial issue in the literature concerns the role of parents and peers in development during adolescence. This section aims to evaluate the relative importance of the context of parents and peer relationships in each age group and gender.

After examining all the conflict situations involving 'personal relationships', seven main contexts were identified. They comprised mainly the categories family (parents, siblings, 'the family', other family members) and the peer group (friends, 'colleagues', boyfriend/ girlfriend). Note that there is a category called 'The family'. In conflicts classified as such subjects did not mention any specific person, using the expression 'my family', in a generic way. The category called 'colleagues' was translated from 'colegas' in Portuguese. In fact, there is no similar word in English for the word 'colegas'. It does not include only people working together, as it is employed in English. It includes peers in different contexts, such as at school, neighbours, etc. The expression is used mostly for peers who are not as close as friends. An 'other' category was included to account for a small proportion of conflicts involving different people who do not fall under any of the categories mentioned above (e.g. a teacher, a boss).

Assignment of the conflict situations to the above categories was done
together with two other coders, by consensus. Table 4.5 shows the results of the content analysis of the context of moral conflicts involving 'personal relationships' as a function of age and gender. The percentages were calculated out of the total number of conflicts involving personal relationships in each group.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>14-16</th>
<th>17-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(104) (143) (63) (128)</td>
<td>(96)</td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The family</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts involving personal relationships.

As can be seen from Table 4.5, conflicts involving the family (parents, siblings, other family members and 'the family') were predominant in all three age groups. They were more frequent in the 14-16 (74%) than in the 10-12 (57%) or in the 17-21 age group (57%). Conflicts involving parents represented a high proportion of the conflicts involving personal relationships in all three age groups, especially in the 14-16 age group (41% for the 10-12, 55% for the 14-16, and 45% for the 17-21 age group, respectively). Conflicts involving
siblings and other family members were more frequent in the 10-12 (9% and 7%, respectively) and in the 14-16 (8% and 4%, respectively), when compared to the 17-21 age group (2% and 1%, respectively). Conflicts involving the generic 'the family' category were mentioned by the two older groups only (6% and 9%, respectively).

The proportion of conflicts involving the peer context (friends, colleagues and boyfriend/girlfriend) was greater in the 10-12 (34%) and in the 17-21 (35%) than in the 14-16 age groups (22%). Conflicts involving 'colleagues' were more frequent in the 10-12 (11%) than in the 14-16 (3%) or 17-21 age groups (4%). Conflicts involving boyfriend/girlfriend were more frequent in the 17-21 (17%), followed by the 14-16 (11%) and the 10-12 age groups (6%).

As far as gender differences are concerned, females tended to mention more conflicts involving parents than males, especially in the 10-12 (45% and 35%, respectively) and in the 17-21 age groups (51% and 38%, respectively). In addition, females tended to mention more conflicts involving 'boyfriend/girlfriend' in the 10-12 (9% and 2%, respectively) and in the 14-16 (13% and 6%, respectively) age groups. This trend was reversed in the older group, with males mentioning more conflicts involving boyfriend/girlfriend than females (23% and 11%, respectively). Males also mentioned more conflicts involving 'colleagues' than females in all three groups (13% and 10%, 5% and 2%, 6% and 3%, respectively). In addition, males mentioned more conflicts involving 'friends' than females, but only in the two younger groups (24% and 11%, 14%
and 5%, respectively). In the older group females mentioned more conflicts involving friends than males (19% and 8%, respectively).

In order to check the tendency to mention conflicts involving parents, as opposed to peers by females and males across the three age groups, the data were transformed into a seven-point scale, from -3 to +3, using a scoring scheme similar to the one described previously (see Appendix 4B). The derived scores represent the difference in the number of conflicts involving parents and those involving peers.

Table 4.6 shows the mean scores and standard deviations representing the difference in the number of conflicts involving parents and those involving peers as a function of age and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>14-16</th>
<th>17-21</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.26)</td>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher the mean the more subjects mentioned conflicts involving parents and less involving peers.

A gender x age (2x3) analysis of variance was performed on the derived scores. Main effects for age and gender were revealed (F=5.94, d.f.=2,404,
p<0.02; F=6.34, d.f.=2,404, p<0.003, respectively). As can be seen from Table 4.6, females mentioned more conflicts involving parents than males. In addition, the 14-16 age group mentioned more conflicts involving parents than either the 10-12 (p <.01) or the 17-21 (p <.01). No significant differences were found between the 10-12 and the 17-21 age groups. There was no significant interaction effect.

iii) **The issues involved in the conflict situations**

So far only the context of the conflict situations mentioned by subjects has been examined. The purpose of this section is to present the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations. The analysis of the issues is presented separately, as a function of each type of context involved: a) personal relationships; b) impersonal relationships; c) individual actions/choices; and d) ideas/values.

a) **The issues in conflict situations involving personal relationships**

Since there are different contexts in conflict situations involving personal relationships (i.e. parents, siblings, friends, etc.), separate content analyses were carried out for each context. The contexts 'other family members' and 'other' were excluded from these analyses since they were too diverse to be analyzed. Gender differences were also excluded from these analyses since the data would
otherwise be too fragmented.

A thematic structure was constructed for each context separately. All of the material was examined in order to search for the main issues of conflict. Assignment to issue categories was done together with two other coders, by consensus. The analyses focused on the family context ('parents', 'the family' and 'siblings') and on the peer context ('friends', 'colleagues' and 'boyfriend/girlfriend'), separately (see Appendix 4C).

As far as conflicts involving 'parents' are concerned, twelve main categories emerged out of the analysis. A broad category of issues was identified concerning 'parental interference' (demands and prohibitions from parents). Conflicts classified under this category involved complaints about parental interference in issues such as social life, academic/professional life, sexuality, personality/behavioural style, choice of relationships, different kinds of decisions, leaving home, etc. 'Lying/keeping secrets' referred to conflicts in which subjects were not sure about whether to lie to parents or not tell them things. Another category involved 'quarrels with parents'. In this category the conflicts involved whether or not to quarrel with parents, whether or not to answer them back in a dispute, etc. 'Parental divorce/arguments between parents' comprised conflict issues such as taking sides in parental arguments/divorce. 'Obedience to parents' involved whether or not to go against a rule set by the parents. 'Fear of parental punishment/reaction' entailed not knowing whether or not to do something because of the potential punishment
as a consequence of the act. 'Divergence of ideas/values' involved situations in which the main theme of conflict had to do with the fact that parents and children had different views on specific issues, such as sexuality, use of drugs, politics, etc. 'Criticism of parental attitudes' referred to conflicts in which parents were under attack because of their behaviour or attitudes, such as smoking, being inconsistent in their treatment to their children, etc. 'Sibling jealousy' focused on complaints about unequal treatment between siblings. 'Meeting parental expectations' involved feeling obliged to do things which they felt parents expected them to do. 'Concern about parents' referred to conflicts in which they felt concerned about the potential effects of their acts on their parents. 'Asking parents for gifts/money' involved conflict issues such as not knowing whether or not to ask parents for money/gifts. Finally, an 'other' category was included, comprising conflict issues not classifiable in any of those categories.

As already mentioned before, a context called 'the family' emerged out of the analysis of the context of the conflict situations involving personal relationships. For conflicts involving 'the family', four main issues emerged, which were similar to some of the issues mentioned for conflicts involving 'parents': 'family interference', 'quarrel', 'divergence of ideas/values' and 'lying/keeping secrets'.

The issues of conflicts involving siblings were somewhat different and comprised five main themes. 'Quarrels' had to do with whether or not to quarrel
with siblings, issues of retribution, etc. 'Loyalty/faithfulness' included issues such as betrayal, taking sides, etc. 'Justice' referred to issues such as assuming the blame for some acts or putting the blame on siblings. 'Sharing' included disputes over personal belongings, such as clothes or objects. 'Looking after younger siblings' involved feeling responsible for looking after siblings.

Table 4.7 presents the frequency distribution of the issues that were the focus of conflict situations involving 'parents', 'the family' and 'siblings', as a function of age.

From Table 4.7 one can see some clear age differences in the issues mentioned by the younger group and the two older groups. In the 10-12 age group the most frequent issues were 'obedience to parents' (33%) and 'lying/keeping secrets from parents' (32%). They both accounted for a small percentage of the issues mentioned by the other two groups. In both the 14-16 and the 17-21 age group the majority of conflicts involved 'parental interference' (43% and 50%, respectively), followed by 'quarrels with parents' (12% and 10%, respectively), 'divergence of ideas/values' (6% and 9%), conflicts involving 'parental divorce/arguments between parents' (9% and 5%) and 'lying/keeping secrets' (7% and 5%, respectively).
Table 4.7
The issues in conflicts involving parents, 'the family' and siblings by age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>14-16</th>
<th>17-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involving parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(demands/prohibitions)................</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying/keeping secrets</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrels with parents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental divorce/arguments between parents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience to parents</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of parental punishment/reaction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence of ideas/values</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of parental attitudes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling jealousy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting parental expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking parents for gifts/money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family interference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrels</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence of ideas/values</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying/keeping secrets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrels</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty/faithfulness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after younger siblings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts.

The most frequent issues mentioned in the context called 'the family' are also presented in Table 4.7. Note that this context was only mentioned by the two older groups. 'Family interference' was the most frequent, both in the 14-16 (50%) and in the 17-21 (65%) age groups. 'Quarrels' was also a frequent issue,
especially in the 14-16 age group (42%). Some issues were mentioned by the 17-21 age group only, such as 'divergence of ideas/values' (18%).

As far as conflicts involving siblings are concerned, some different issues were mentioned, as can be seen in Table 4.7. It is important to note that there were very few conflicts involving siblings in the older group, with no evident cluster around any specific issue. 'Quarrels' and 'loyalty/faithfulness' were the two most frequent issues in the 10-12 and the 14-16 age groups (61% and 31%; 17% and 31%, respectively). 'Sharing' was mentioned only by the two younger groups (9% and 6%, respectively).

A further analysis was carried out of the issues in conflicts involving peers ('friends', 'colleagues' and 'boyfriend/girlfriend'). In relation to conflicts involving 'friends', eight main issues emerged out of the analysis. Three of these issues ('loyalty/faithfulness', 'quarrels', 'lying/keeping secrets') have already been described, as they appeared in conflicts involving 'siblings' or 'parents'. Other issues included 'group pressure', 'helping', 'trust' and 'feeling rejected'. Conflict issues involving 'group pressure' comprised not knowing whether to go along with friends in some situations, such as missing classes, using drugs, etc. 'Helping' entailed issues such as feeling obliged to help a friend in need. 'Trust' had to do with a concern about keeping trust in the relationship. 'Feeling rejected' was related to fears of being rejected by friends, of not being liked by them, etc. Finally, 'relationship problems' included concerns with some specific issues in the relationship which are not working
well (issues such as personality/behavioural style of the friend).

Most of the conflict issues involving 'colleagues' were similar to those involving 'friends'. Apart from the seven issues described above, three other issues emerged out of the analysis: 'cheating', 'justice' and 'divergence of ideas/values'. 'Cheating' involved not knowing whether or not to allow a colleague to copy their answers in exams. 'Justice' had to do with assuming the blame for one's action or putting the blame on a colleague (such as, for example, in classroom settings). 'Divergence of ideas/values', as in the case of parents, referred to divergence over specific issues, such as politics.

Finally, the issues of conflicts involving 'boyfriend/ girlfriend' were different from the conflicts involving friends and 'colleagues' were grouped under eight main categories. 'Loyalty/faithfulness' conflicts focused mainly on betrayals, i.e. whether to go out with another person when one has got a boyfriend/girlfriend. 'Ending a relationship' entailed not knowing whether or not to end a relationship with a boyfriend/girlfriend, especially due to the potential harm that may be caused to him/her. 'Sexual involvement' had to do with fears of sexual intimacy with a boyfriend/girlfriend. 'Starting a relationship' referred to doubts over whether or not to start a relationship with someone. 'Relationship problems', as in the case of conflicts involving friends, had to do with things that were not working well in the relationship. 'Fear of involvement' had to do with fear of getting too involved with boyfriend/girlfriend. 'Confessing love' had to do with fear of saying one is in love with someone. Finally, 'mixed
feelings' referred to ambivalent feelings, not knowing whether one is in love, etc.

The issues of conflicts involving 'friends', 'colleagues' and 'boyfriend/girlfriend' are presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8
The issues in conflicts involving friends, colleagues and boyfriend/girlfriend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Percentage for each group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty/faithfulness</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrels</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group pressure</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying/keeping secrets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling rejected</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship problems</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group pressure</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrels</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence of ideas/values.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling rejected</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying/keeping secrets</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty/faithfulness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty/faithfulness</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending a relationship</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual involvement</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a relationship</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship problems</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of involvement</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confessing love</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed feelings</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts.
As can be seen from Table 4.8., 'quarrels' were frequent issues in conflicts involving 'friends' and 'colleagues' in the two younger groups only. In relation to conflicts involving 'friends', 'loyalty/faithfulness' issues were frequent in all three groups, particularly in the oldest group (46%). 'Group pressure' was evident only in the 10-12 and the 17-21 age groups (10% and 11%, respectively).

As far as conflicts involving 'colleagues' are concerned, they appeared mainly in the 10-12 age group. As in the case of conflicts involving 'friends', there was a high proportion of the issue 'quarrels' in conflicts mentioned by both the 10-12 and the 14-16 age group (32% and 33%, respectively), but no conflicts of this sort were mentioned by the 17-21 age group. 'Group pressure' was mentioned especially by the 10-12 (32%) and in the 17-21 age group (33%).

Finally, in relation to the issues mentioned in conflicts involving 'boyfriend/girlfriend', some age differences can be identified from Table 4.8. It is interesting to note that conflicts around 'starting a relationship' (40%), 'fear of involvement' (13%) or 'confessing love' (13%), were typical of the 10-12 age group only. The other two groups did not mention these issues. The two most frequent issues mentioned by the 14-16 age group were 'ending a relationship' (38%), and 'sexual involvement' (19%), In the 17-21 age group the most frequent issues were 'loyalty/faithfulness' (39%) and 'sexual involvement' (21%).
b) The issues in conflict situations involving impersonal relationships

As already mentioned before, conflicts involving impersonal relationships included those types of conflict in which the people involved were either strangers or were referred to in a generic way (generic others). As in the case of conflicts involving personal relationships, the issues of conflicts involving impersonal relationships were content analyzed. Two other coders took part in the analysis, and the categories were extracted through consensus.

Fifteen main categories emerged out of this analysis. The first one comprised 'acts with actual or potential harm to others'. Under this category were included conflict issues having to do with a concern about the possible consequences of one's acts for other people, mainly activities that may be pleasurable for the person doing them but which might cause harm to the other person involved. Included were also conflicts involving potential harm to animals just for the sake of one's own pleasure. 'Arguments/retaliation' referred to conflicts in which the main focus was on issues of retribution or on quarrels. 'Interference of others in personal life' included a concern that some people (referred to in a generic way) were interfering in their lives. 'Helping others' referred to those situations in which they were in doubt whether to help someone in need (e.g. helping an old lady to cross the street). 'Fear of punishment' involved transgression situations (e.g. stealing) in which there was a fear to be caught by someone. 'Justice' referred to those situations in which
the main concern was with fairness in treating other people or with being treated fairly. 'Giving to charity' included mainly doubts about whether or not to give money to beggars in the street. 'Divergence of ideas/values' had to do with clash of ideas with other people on some specific issues. 'Prejudice against others' included mainly conflicts having to do with racial prejudice (feeling excluded from a group or a concern that someone might be excluded). 'Speaking one's mind' referred to doubts about whether to tell people what one thinks. 'Concern about others' image of oneself' referred to a concern about the possible effects of one's acts on the image that people hold of oneself. 'Pressure of others' was related to feelings of being pressurized by people to do certain things. 'Reporting someone' had to do with doubts about whether to report someone when one has seen this person committing an offense. 'Keeping commitments' referred to feelings of obligation of keeping commitments to people.

The frequency distribution of the issues mentioned in the conflict situations involving impersonal relationships is presented in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9

The issues in conflicts involving impersonal relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Percentage for each group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts with actual or potential harm to others</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments/retaliation</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference of others in personal life</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of punishment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving to charity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence of ideas/values</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice against others</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking one's mind</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about others' image of oneself</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure of others</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting someone</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping commitments</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts.

It is important to note from Table 4.9 that the issues of conflict differed according to the age group. The major issue of conflict in the 10-12 age group was 'acts with actual or potential harm to others' (37%), followed by 'arguments/retaliation' (21%) and 'fear of punishment' (13%). The 'others' in the 'acts with actual or potential harm to others' category included not only people, but also animals in this age group. In the 14-16 age group the main issue was 'interference of others in personal life' (40%), followed by 'speaking one's mind' (20%). In the 17-21 age group there was no clear predominant issue. Issues such as 'helping others' (20%), 'interference of others in personal life' (11%) and 'giving to charity' (11%), were amongst the most frequent.
c) **The issues in conflict situations involving individual actions/choices and ideas/values**

This section analyzes the issues in conflicts involving the 'individual' context, i.e. 'actions/choices' and 'ideas/values'. As already mentioned elsewhere, these conflicts did not involve another person, i.e. they were more internal. The content analysis of the issues involved in these situations was carried out together with two other coders and the categories were extracted by consensus.

A content analysis of the issues in conflict situations involving 'individual actions/choices' revealed eleven main categories. 'Academic life' referred to issues such as school work, doing well, missing classes, cheating, responsibility. 'Professional choice' entailed a concern with finding a profession that fulfils personal interests and abilities. Sometimes they were caught in a dilemma of whether to fulfil personal or collective ideals in choosing a profession. 'Politics' involved mainly choice of candidate in the presidential elections. 'Personal insecurity' included identity issues, such as not knowing who one is or who one likes, one's interests, etc. 'Corruption/transgressions' involved acts of transgression such as stealing or keeping quiet about being undercharged. 'Responsibility' referred to a concern with not having an easy life. 'Sexual behaviour' involved issues such as homosexuality, having sex, etc. 'Use of drugs' was related to doubts about whether or not to try drugs. 'Religion' usually referred to not wanting to follow any religion, not wanting to go to church, etc. 'Leaving home' involved the hopes and fears associated with
leaving home. Finally, 'abortion' involved the decision to have an abortion.

As for conflicts involving 'ideas/values', six main categories were derived from the content analysis. 'Social problems' included issues such as social class differences, what to do about the underprivileged, etc. 'Religion' involved a questioning of basic religious values, the existence of God, etc. 'Sex' focused on issues such as whether sex is important in a relationship, etc. 'Fashion' had to do with whether to follow fashion or whether to be original. 'Prejudice' involved the questioning of different kinds of prejudice, such as racial prejudice, prejudice against women, etc. Finally, 'justice' referred to questioning of the juridical system, of unjust laws, etc.

Table 4.10 presents the results of the content analysis of the moral issues in conflicts involving 'individual actions/choices'.
Table 4.10

The moral issues in conflicts involving individual actions/choices and ideas/values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>14-16</th>
<th>17-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*{ (77) (34) (129)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving actions/choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic life</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional choice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal insecurity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption/transgressions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual behaviour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of drugs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving home</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*{ (1) (10) (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving ideas/values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social problems</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts.

As can be seen from Table 4.10, there were some age differences in the types of issues that were the focus of conflict situations involving 'actions/choices'. In the 10-12 age group the main issue of conflict was 'academic life' (65%). In the 14-16 age group the main issues were 'academic life' (23%), 'professional choice' (15%) and 'use of drugs' (15%). In the 17-21 age group the main issues were 'professional choice' (35%) and 'academic life' (15%).

As for conflicts involving 'ideas/values', it was mainly the 14-16 and the 17-21 age groups who mentioned this type of conflict. There were no evident
clusters around a specific issue, but the category of conflicts involving 'social problems' was frequent both in the 14-16 and in the 17-21 age groups (20% and 25%, respectively).

iv) **Degree of difficulty experienced in making a decision about what to do in the conflict situations**

The degree of difficulty experienced by the subjects in making a decision about what to do in the conflict situation was used in this study as an indication of the intensity of the conflict for the person. Each subject got only one score for each type of context. If a subject mentioned more than one conflict involving a particular context, a mean was calculated for that context.

Table 4.11 presents the mean difficulty and standard deviation experienced in making a decision about what to do in each type of context by gender and age.

---

2 For example, if we were assessing the mean difficulty in deciding about what to do in conflicts involving parents and if a subject mentioned two conflicts involving parents, his/her score was calculated as the mean of the two.
Mean difficulty and standard deviation (in brackets) experienced in making a decision about what to do in each context by gender and age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>14-16</th>
<th>17-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* (175) (188)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal relationships</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions/choices</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/values</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( - )</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>( - )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In brackets, the total number of conflicts.

In order to assess the effect of gender and age on subjects' responses, two-way analyses of variance were performed on the data for conflicts involving 'personal relationships' and for those involving 'individual actions/choices'. For conflicts involving 'impersonal relationships' and for those involving 'ideas/values', one-way analyses of variance were used, i.e. only age differences were tested. This was because there would not be enough subjects in each group if we considered the effect of gender. For conflicts involving 'ideas/values' the 10-12 age group was also excluded due to lack of subjects.

No significant gender differences were observed in any context. However, significant age differences were observed between the younger group.
17-21 age groups (p< .01) but no significant differences were found between the two older groups. For conflicts involving 'personal relationships' the mean scores were 2.9, 3.4 and 3.5. Again, significant differences were found between the 10-12 and the 14-16 age groups (p< .01) or between the 10-12 and the 17-21 age groups (p< .01), but no significant differences between the last two were found. For conflicts involving 'impersonal relationships', the scores were 2.4, 4.1 and 3.1. Significant differences were found between the 10-12 and the 14-16 age groups (p<.01) or between the 10-12 and the 17-21 age groups (p< .01) and no significant differences were found between the 14-16 and the 17-21 age groups. For conflicts involving 'individual actions/choices' the mean scores were 2.7, 3.7 and 3.4. As in the case of the other contexts, selected comparisons indicated differences between the 10-12 and the 14-16 age groups (p< .01) and between the 10-12 and the 17-21 age groups (p< .01) only. Finally, in conflicts involving 'ideas/values' a one-way analysis of variance revealed no significant difference between the 14-16 and the 17-21 age groups.

Taken together, these findings indicate that the intensity of the conflict situations mentioned by the older groups was considered to be greater than that of the younger group. In addition, the two older groups mentioned conflicts of similar intensity.

Further two-way analyses of variance were carried out in order to assess the mean difficulty experienced in deciding about what to do in conflicts involving specifically peers and parents. The results are presented in Table 4.13.
Table 4.13
Mean difficulty and standard deviation (in brackets) experienced in making a decision about what to do in conflicts involving parents and peers by gender and age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>14-16</th>
<th>17-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as conflicts involving parents are concerned, significant main effects for age and gender were obtained (F=4.2, d.f. = 2, 193, p <0.02; F=4.5, d.f.=1, 193, p<0.04). The mean difficulty in conflicts involving parents was greater for females than for males (3.5 and 3.1, respectively). In addition, the 14-16 and the 17-21 age group’s scores were higher than those of the 10-12 age group (3.4, 3.7 and 3.0, respectively). In relation to conflicts involving peers, there was only a main effect for age (F=3.0, d.f.=2, 154, p<0.05). Again, the 14-16 and the 17-21 age group’s scores were higher than those of the 10-12 age group (3.1, 3.6 and 3.7, respectively).
v) **Justifications offered for decisions taken in the conflict situations**

This section aims at examining one aspect of Kohlberg's (1969, 1976) theory of moral development. According to his theory, moral development implies a change from personal to impersonal reasoning. However, his theory was not based on everyday social experiences. Kohlberg's main interest was on broader societal issues such as respect for rules and laws, the value of life, etc. As a result, one may question the adequacy of Kohlberg's model for everyday situations. What is the likelihood of impersonal reasoning in situations in which one is personally involved?

In an attempt to answer this question, a content analysis was performed on the subjects' justifications offered for decisions taken in the conflict situations. The categories were established by the investigator together with two other coders after reading all the justifications. Besides the two categories that were of major interest to the study ('personal' and 'impersonal') two other categories of justification were identified: 'external factors' and a 'confusing/not justified' category. The 'personal' category was subdivided into: 'self', 'self/other relationship' and 'other'. The 'impersonal' category was subdivided into: 'rules', 'jargon', 'duty/responsibility' and 'values/principles'. The 'external factors' category included such things as 'influence of time', 'inevitability of the action', and 'external influence'. A definition of the justification categories is presented in Table 4.14. An example of each category by context is given in Appendix 4C.
Table 4.14

Justification Categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
<td>Justifications involving personal feelings (e.g. fear, anger, guilt, shame), concern about personal well-being (e.g. personal gains/losses, fear of the consequences of the action for oneself, search for autonomy/independence) or other things like personal rights, unintentionality of the action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self/other relationship</strong></td>
<td>Justifications focusing on concern about self/other relationship (e.g. avoiding conflict, affective ties to the other) or other relational aspects such as reciprocity, fear of punishment/retaliation, loyalty, obedience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The other</strong></td>
<td>Justifications focusing on concern about the other’s well-being or things like the other’s rights, values and personality characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impersonal</strong></td>
<td>Rules: appeal to general rules/norms of conduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jargon: use of popular expressions with no further reflexion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duty/responsibility: appeal to sense of duty or obligation; emphasis on the need to be responsible for one’s actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values/principles: feeling that something is right or wrong, fair or unfair, appeal to general principles of conduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External factors</strong></td>
<td>Emphasis on the inevitability of the action, the influence of time, influence of others, consideration of the circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confusing/not justified</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The content analysis was performed for each context separately to see the extent to which subjects’ answers would be affected by the context. The results of the content analysis are presented in Table 4.15.
As can be seen from Table 4.15, 'personal' justifications tended to be predominant in all contexts except in 'ideas/values'. In the latter, 'impersonal' justifications were more frequent, especially in the older group (50%). Even though the number of conflicts involving 'ideas/values' mentioned was small, the highest proportion of conflicts involving 'impersonal' justifications found in this context was expected in view of the fact that this was the most impersonal of all contexts. In the 10-12 age group only one subject mentioned a conflict involving 'ideas/values' and that was not justified. In the 14-16 age group the proportion of conflicts involving 'ideas/values' that were not justified was also high (70%). This is because these conflicts did not involve any decision. They involved ideas rather than actions. Therefore when faced with the question "what did you decide to do and why" they didn’t answer it.

It was also expected that subjects would mention a higher proportion of 'impersonal' justifications in conflicts involving 'impersonal relationships' than

### Table 4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal...</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal...</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External factors...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusing/not justified.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In brackets the total number of justifications. PR= personal relationships; IR= impersonal relationships; AC= action/choices; IV= ideas/values.
in those involving 'personal relationships', but in fact this was only found in the older group. However, it was felt that one should differentiate between the different types of 'personal' justification offered within each of these contexts, i.e. justifications involving 'the self', 'self/other relationship' and 'the other'. A higher proportion of justifications involving 'self/other relationship' was expected in conflicts involving 'personal relationships' than in those involving 'impersonal relationships'.

Table 4.16 presents the types of 'personal' justification (i.e. 'the self', 'self/other relationship' and 'the other') offered in conflicts involving 'personal' and 'impersonal relationships'. Supporting our initial expectation, in all three age groups justifications involving 'self/other relationship' were more frequent in conflicts involving 'personal relationships' than in those involving 'impersonal relationships'. It is also interesting to note that justifications involving 'the self' were predominant in conflicts involving 'impersonal relationships'. This indicates that people can be more concerned with themselves in situations in which there is less intimacy with the other involved in the situation.
In order to focus again on the initial aim of this section which was to examine the tendency to mention 'personal' as opposed to 'impersonal' justifications, a further analysis was carried out. Subjects' responses were scored on a seven-point scale (-3 to +3). The scoring scheme (see Appendix 4D) shows all possible combinations of 'personal' and 'impersonal' justifications for each conflict situation mentioned by subjects. The first three justifications were used for this analysis. The subject's derived score represents the difference between the number of 'personal and impersonal justifications mentioned for the conflict situation. The higher a score the greater was the number of 'personal' justifications and the smaller the number of 'impersonal' justifications. The subject’s final score was calculated based on the sum of the scores obtained for each situation. Therefore it depended on the number of situations and justifications mentioned.

Note: Suppose we were analyzing the number of personal justifications mentioned for conflicts in the interpersonal context. Suppose also that a subject mentioned three conflicts, two in the interpersonal and one in the individual context. His/her score was calculated based on the justifications given to the two conflicts in the interpersonal context only. If in one conflict he/she mentioned two justifications, both personal ones, his/her score for that conflict was '+2'. If in the other conflict he/she mentioned only one justification, an impersonal one, his/her score for that conflict was '-1'. Therefore, his/her final score (total number of personal justifications in the interpersonal context) would be '+1'.

---

Table 4.16
Types of personal justification offered in conflicts involving personal and impersonal relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>10-12 PR</th>
<th>14-16 PR</th>
<th>17-21 PR</th>
<th>10-12 IR</th>
<th>14-16 IR</th>
<th>17-21 IR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self..........</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/other...</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The other...</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In brackets the total number of justifications.
PR = personal relationships; IR = impersonal relationships.
The influence of age and gender on the subjects' tendency to mention 'personal' as opposed to 'impersonal' justifications was investigated by analysis of variance. Separate analyses were carried out for each type of context.

Table 4.17 presents the mean responses and standard deviation representing the difference in the number of 'personal' and 'impersonal' justifications mentioned in each context by gender and age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>14-16</th>
<th>17-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal...</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Relationships.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal relationships.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual...</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions/choices...</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/values...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher the mean the more subjects mentioned personal justifications and less impersonal ones.

Gender x age (2 x 3) analyses of variance were performed on subjects' justifications for conflicts in the 'interpersonal' and in the 'individual' context. A significant interaction effect was found for the former (F=3.88, d.f.=2, 354,
p<0.03). Selected comparisons using the Tukey Test indicated that whereas no
gender differences were observed in either the 10-12 or the 17-21 age group, in
the 14-16 age group females mentioned more 'personal' justifications than males
(p < .01). No significant effects of gender or age were found for conflicts in the
'individual' context.

Gender x age (2x3) analyses of variance were also performed specifically
for conflicts involving 'personal relationships' and for those involving
'actions/choices'. For conflicts involving 'impersonal relationships' and
'ideas/values' only the effect of age was considered, since there would be a
small number of subjects in each cell if we also considered the effect of gender.
The results of the analysis of variance for conflicts involving 'personal
relationships' revealed a significant interaction effect (F= 4.56, d.f.= 2,340, p<
0.03). Selected comparisons using the Tukey Test revealed gender differences
in the 14-16 age group only. In this group, females emphasized significantly
more 'personal' justifications than males (p < .05).

As for conflicts involving 'impersonal relationships', a one-way analysis
of variance performed on the data revealed significant differences between the
groups in the tendency to mention 'personal' justifications (F= 5.26, d.f.= 2, 68,
p <0.008). Selected comparisons using the Tukey Test revealed that the 14-16
age group mentioned more 'personal' justifications than either the 10-12 or the
17-25 age group (1.11, .66 and .17, respectively). The latter mentioned the
smallest number of personal justifications of all groups.
A gender x age (2x3) analysis of variance performed on the data for conflicts involving 'individual actions/choices' revealed no significant main effects or interaction effect. Similarly, a one-way analysis of variance performed on the data revealed no significant effect of age on the tendency to mention personal justifications in conflicts involving ideas/values.
DISCUSSION

The interpersonal context, in particular the context of personal relationships, was predominant in the conflict situations mentioned by all three age groups. This gives support to previous studies (e.g. Walker et al., 1987; Yussen, 1977; Johnston, Brown and Christopherson, 1990) and to Gilligan's (1982) claim that when asked to talk about real-life moral dilemmas people tend to describe them in the context of relationships.

Also in support of Gilligan (1982) were the gender differences observed. The results of this study showed that girls were more interpersonally oriented than boys and their conflicts involved more the context of personal relationships than those mentioned by boys. But this was observed only in the two younger groups (10-12 and 14-16), indicating a gender x age interaction effect.

Gender differences in orientation towards relationships have been observed since early childhood. In a review article on gender and relationships, Maccoby (1990) mentioned some of her studies developed with young children showing that as early as three years of age children prefer to play with same-sex partners rather than with a child of the opposite sex. She attributed these preferences to the different ways which boys and girls tend to play. She also argued that these differences lead to different orientations, with boys being more oriented towards competition and dominance and girls towards intimacy.
Contrary to the findings reported here, gender differences in orientation towards relationships have also been identified in late adolescence (see Paul and White, 1990, for a review). One possible factor which may have contributed to the observed lack of gender differences in the sample of late adolescents in this study is the college experience. Rest (1988) reviewed several studies which have indicate a college effect on moral development.

Gender differences were also observed in the tendency to mention conflicts involving parents. Girls tended to mention more conflicts involving parents than boys. This finding may be interpreted in light of Gilligan's (1988) model, based on the dimensions of autonomy and attachment. If girls are more oriented towards relationships and attachment, it is possible that the separation-attachment conflict is more intense in girls, increasing their perception of conflict with parents.

As far as the context of conflicts involving personal relationships is concerned, there was a greater proportion of conflicts in the family context than in the peer context in all three age groups, especially in the 14-16 age group. Conflicts involving parents were predominant in all three age groups. It is also interesting to note that in the two older groups there was a generic category called 'the family'. The conflict issues in this type of context were very similar to the issues involved in conflicts with parents, i.e. interference, divergence of ideas/values, quarrels, which suggests that by mid- or late adolescence, relationship with parents can be referred to in a more abstract way. Conflicts
with siblings were more frequent in the 10-12 age group, which suggests that the importance of siblings is much greater in earlier stages of development and tends to decrease by late adolescence.

The findings reported in this study do not give support to the idea that peers become the main reference group with the onset of adolescence. In fact, parents figured in many moral conflicts involving personal relationships described by subjects from all three age groups, even though conflicts involving parents and peers were qualitatively different. The former centred mainly on parental authority (prohibitions, demands, control), whereas the latter focused on interpersonal relationships (loyalty/faithfulness, quarrels, group pressure).

According to Piaget (1932), the unilaterality of parent-child relations and the symmetry of peer relations would lead to the development of two kinds of morality: a morality of constraint or of unilateral respect and a morality of cooperation or of mutual respect. The psychological literature usually supports this adult x peers distinction, emphasizing that children’s interaction with the peer group are qualitatively different from parent-child relations, as they serve different purposes and reflect different mutual expectations (Damon, 1983; Youniss, 1980; Youniss and Smollar, 1985). Damon (1983) distinguished parent-child from child-child relations as follows: "In an adult-child relation, the source of power and constraint is usually the adult. Cooperation on the part of the child often means obedience and respect for the adult’s authority... In comparison, peer interactions normally are more directly reciprocal in a symmetrical way.
Cooperation between peers means sharing or helping: only rarely does it mean following or obeying" (p. 148).

As far as the issues in conflicts involving parent-child relations are concerned, the findings from the present study indicated some qualitative differences from preadolescence to late adolescence. Whereas preadolescents' conflicts with parents focused on rule violations (obedience, lying/keeping secrets), mid-adolescents' and late adolescents' conflicts centred on parental interference, i.e. instead of wondering whether or not to go against a certain rule, which seems to be the main dilemma of preadolescents, adolescents seem to go beyond and question the legitimacy of the rules itself, and parental injunctions are perceived as interference in their personal lives. These findings may be interpreted in the light of recent studies which have shown the shifts that take place in conceptions of parental authority in the transition to adolescence (Youniss and Smollar, 1985; Smetana, 1988). These studies have suggested that adolescents tend to view parental authority as more restricted during adolescence. Smetana (1988) argued that these changes may be related to social-cognitive factors, such as the increasing prioritization of self and personal issues, sometimes at the expense of maintaining parental and cultural conventions. She also suggested that this process may be seen by parents as directly in conflict with the maintenance of family conventions.

Another interesting finding concerns the age differences in the frequency of conflicts involving parents from preadolescence to late adolescence. Mid-
adolescents reported more conflicts with parents than preadolescents and late adolescents. No significant differences were found between the last two. This finding gives support to the notion that the pattern of conflict with parents from preadolescence to late adolescence follows an inverted U-shaped function: it increases by early adolescence, is relatively stable during mid-adolescence and declines in late adolescence (Montemayor, 1990). The findings of the study reported before, looking at adolescents’ conceptions of parental authority (Smetana, 1988) have suggested that this increase in parent-child conflict during adolescence may be associated with parents’ and children’s differing conceptions regarding the legitimacy of parental authority, with parents judging that they retain greater legitimate authority over some issues than adolescents do.

The proportion of conflicts in the peer context was found to vary with age. The 14-16 age group mentioned less conflicts involving peers than either the 14-16 or the 17-21 age groups. This finding, together with the finding that this age group also mentioned more conflicts involving parents than the other two, indicates that mid-adolescents are more caught up in conflicts with parents than with peers. In the peer context, conflicts involving friends tended to be the most frequent in all three age groups, suggesting that the importance of friendship cuts across different developmental stages. It is also interesting to note another context which appeared in the conflict situations mentioned, called ‘colleagues’. As mentioned before, conflicts in this context involved peers who are usually not as close as friends. They appeared mainly in the younger group. Conversely, conflicts involving boyfriend/girlfriend appeared mainly in the two
older groups. The fact that the context of less close relationships such as those involving 'colleagues' were not so frequent in the two older groups coupled with the finding that friends and boyfriend/ girlfriend were frequent contexts in the conflict situations mentioned by these two groups gives support to the notion that intimacy are more characteristic of relationships during adolescence (Selman, 1976; Youniss, 1980).

As far as the issues in conflicts involving peers are concerned, some qualitative differences were found between the more intimate context of relationships with friends or boyfriend/girlfriend and the context of relationships with 'colleagues'. Loyalty/faithfulness appeared mainly in the former and was especially evident in the two older groups. This gives support to the notion that loyalty is one of the basic qualities of friendship in adolescence (Selman, 1976; Youniss, 1980; Bigelow and LaGaipa, 1975). It is interesting to note the decreasing proportion of conflicts involving quarrels with peers with age. This may be a result of the adolescent's growing awareness of the unique personality of others, leading to the recognition that disagreements may occur without affecting the quality of relationships (Damon, 1983). Qualitative differences were also found in the conflict issues involving boyfriend/ girlfriend from preadolescence to late adolescence. Whereas the main dilemma for preadolescents centred around whether or not to start a relationship or to confess their feelings, for mid-adolescents and late adolescents the main issue concerned sexual involvement, ending a relationship or loyalty/ faithfulness. The latter was much more frequent in the 17-21 age group.
Even though conflicts in the interpersonal context involved mainly personal relationships, there were some conflicts involving impersonal relationships, i.e. conflicts in which the other person involved was either a stranger or was generalized. Qualitative differences were also found in the types of issues mentioned from preadolescence to late adolescence, with the 10-12 age group emphasizing more acts with actual or potential harm to others, arguments/retaliations or fear of punishment. It is interesting that some of the conflicts involving acts with actual or potential harm to others in this age group involved harm to animals. In the 14-16 age group, others were referred to in a generic way and the predominant issue was interference of others in personal life. In the 17-21 age group there was no clear predominant issue.

Having focused on conflicts in the interpersonal context, one should now turn to conflicts in the individual context. Even though the interpersonal context was predominant in all three age groups, a much higher proportion of conflicts in the individual context was identified in the group of late adolescents (17-21). Conflicts in the individual context involved issues primarily intrinsic to the self, i.e. there was no other person involved in these types of conflicts. The fact that the older group mentioned more conflicts of this kind than the two younger ones suggests a developmental progression towards more internal conflicts. In a study assessing parents’ and children’s reasoning over real-life dilemmas, Walker et al. (1987) also identified more conflicts in the context of relationships in the children than in the parents.
It is also important to note that the conflicts mentioned within the individual context focused on the more immediate context, i.e. the conflicts tended to focus on personal rather on broader societal issues, even though there was a greater proportion of conflicts of the latter sort in the older group. The personal issues in these types of conflict involved mainly their academic life (doing well, school work, responsibility), especially in the conflicts mentioned by the 10-12 age group. In the two older groups, but especially in the 17-21 age group, there was also a great proportion of conflicts involving their professional choice. Damon (1983) pointed to one important development that takes place during adolescence, i.e. an increasing awareness of collective social realities beyond the confines of intimate interpersonal relations. The reduced frequency of conflicts involving broader societal issues observed in this study may be related to historical circumstances. It seems that one is going through an "individualistic revolution" (Dumont, 1983), in which the part (the individual) tends to predominate over the whole (the society). Society is seen as an instrument for the individual’s happiness.

So far the discussion has centred mainly in the content of the conflict situations, i.e. the context and the issues involved. One can now concentrate on two other aspects examined in this study which were the difficulty experienced in deciding about what to do in the conflict situations and the justification offered for the decisions taken in them. The difficulty experienced in deciding about to do in the conflict situations was used as a measure of the intensity of the conflict for the subjects. Age differences were found. Independent of the
context, the two older groups reported more difficulty in deciding about what to do in the conflict situations than the younger one. This indicates that the conflicts reported by the two older groups were of greater intensity than those reported by the younger group.

As for the justifications offered for decisions taken in the conflict situations both in the interpersonal and in the individual context centred on the immediate context, involving issues primarily intrinsic to the self, self/other relationships or the other. In all three age groups, justifications involving self/other relationships were more frequent in conflicts involving personal relationships than in those involving impersonal relationships. This is probably due to the greater affective involvement of personal relationships. The predominance of justifications involving primarily the self found in situations involving impersonal relationships suggests that people can be more concerned with themselves in situations in which there is less intimacy with the other involved.

Impersonal justifications, i.e. those involving rules, principles, were more frequent in conflicts involving ideas/values, especially in the older group. This is interesting, since this was the most impersonal of all contexts, which suggests that the justifications varied according to the context. This finding suggests that subjects' reasoning over choices in the conflict situations was more affected by context than by age, giving support to recent claims (Turiel et al., 1987) that social judgements vary according to the type of situation involved.
As far as gender differences in the justifications offered are concerned, the findings from the present study showed that gender differences were observed mainly in the context of the conflict situations. Females were more interpersonally oriented in their conflicts than males. This gives support to previous findings (Walker et al, 1987) suggesting that females' reasoning does not differ from males' in similar types of context. Gender differences seem to be more evident in the types of moral conflict that males and females encounter in their everyday experiences rather than in their reasoning over conflict situations.

To conclude, one must turn back to the initial question addressed by this study, i.e. the extent to which moral development entails a progressive movement towards more impersonal reasoning and towards internal as opposed to external, interpersonal conflicts. As we have seen, these are the main positions assumed by both the psychoanalytic (A. Freud, 1958) and the cognitive-developmental approaches (Kohlberg, 1969) to moral development. The findings from the present study do not give support to this idea. Even though there was a greater proportion of conflicts in the individual context, i.e. not involving other people, the findings showed that the moral conflict situations construed by subjects in all three age groups centred mainly on interpersonal relationships, and especially on personal as opposed to impersonal relationships.

It is felt that the assessment of people’s thinking over hypothetical dilemmas, as in Kohlberg’s model of moral development, fails to respond to
much of the adolescent's mental life. Based on Bruner's (1986) characterization of two qualitatively different modes of thought, narrative and propositional, Vitz (1990) pointed out that Kohlberg's approach is based on propositional thinking, i.e. the "logical argumentation aimed at convincing one of some abstract, context-independent truth" (p. 710). He goes on to say that "by contrast, narrative thinking presents concrete human and interpersonal situations in order to demonstrate their particular validity. It is a description of reality that aims at verisimilitude".

The other point addressed initially by this study concerned the extent to which parents would be replaced by peers as the main reference group in adolescence, something which is also assumed to take place, especially from the psychoanalytic perspective. The findings from the present study did not give support to the notion that there is a discontinuity in parent-child relations in adolescence. Instead of a discontinuity in parent-child relations, qualitative differences in the types of conflict issues experienced were found from preadolescence to late adolescence. This gives support to the notion that development takes place in the context of both changes and continuity (Youniss and Smollar, 1985). This also gives support to the notion that sociocognitive changes are associated with changing patterns of parent-child relations, an aspect which is already being explored by recent research (Smetana, 1989b).

Even though it was clear from the present study that the context of
parent-child relations continued to be important during adolescence, one aspect
which must be taken into consideration, however, is the fact that all subjects
who took part in this study were living with their parents. What happens in late
adolescence when adolescents leave their parents' home? What is the impact of
leaving home on parent-child relations and on moral development in
adolescence? It is felt that this question is important and may help to shed
further light on the importance of social-interactive contexts in moral
development in adolescence. For this reason, another study was designed to
evaluate this question, which shall be presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER V

THE CONTEXT OF PARENT-CHILD AND PEER RELATIONS IN MORAL CONFLICT SITUATIONS EXPERIENCED BY LATE ADOLESCENTS: DOES IT MAKE A DIFFERENCE WHETHER THEY LIVE WITH THEIR PARENTS?

INTRODUCTION

The present study gives continuity to the study reported in the previous chapter. In that study, an analysis of the context of moral conflict situations experienced by preadolescents, mid-adolescents and late adolescents revealed that the context of parent-child relations tended to be more frequent than the context of peer relations in all three age groups. Furthermore, qualitative changes in the issues of parent-child conflict were found from preadolescence to late adolescence. Therefore, rather than detachment from parents what seems to happen is that relationships with parents change with development. However, all subjects who took part in the previous study were living with their parents. Therefore one question remains concerning the impact of leaving home on parent-child relations and on development in late adolescence.
Some studies have investigated the effect of leaving parents' home during the transition phase to adulthood on parent-child interaction and on autonomy and attachment (e.g. Sullivan and Sullivan, 1980; Kenny, 1987; Berman and Sperling, 1991). Autonomy development is assumed to be an important developmental task. It is also emphasized in the context of sociomoral development by theoreticians such as Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1969).

Separation from parents or leaving home represents an important transition in late adolescence, being considered as "one of the universals of the adolescent experience" (Douvan and Adelson, 1966). Some authors have emphasized the special conflicts that this transition period may bring to parent-child relations. The adolescent is faced with the double and contradictory goal of increasing autonomy while maintaining affectional bonds to parents, which can lead to conflict (Hansburg, 1972).

Most studies assessing parent-adolescent conflict have not confirmed the existence of major parent-child conflict during adolescence (see Montemayor, 1990, for a review). Also, some studies (e.g. Sullivan and Sullivan, 1980) have shown that separation from parents does not necessarily reduce but may, in fact, increase feelings of affection and communication with parents. Therefore, autonomy from parents does not necessarily imply detachment.
There has been extensive empirical support for the notion that there are transformations in parent-child relations across the life span. A number of studies have concentrated on the effects of the onset of puberty on power shifts in parent-child relations (Jacob, 1974; Steinberg and Hill, 1978; Steinberg, 1981; Hunter and Youniss, 1982). Some studies (e.g. Feldman and Gehrung, 1988) have also shown that changes in perceptions of power in parent-child relations tend to continue in mid- and late adolescence.

However, as shown by Montemayor (1990), little is known about the nature of parent-child conflict in late adolescence/early adulthood. The findings of some studies suggest that moving away from home tends to reduce parent-child conflict. In a study carried out with 242 male adolescents and their parents, Sullivan and Sullivan (1980) found a greater level of independence, satisfaction and communication with parents in a group of adolescents who had left home to board at college compared to a group who commuted to college. These findings make one think of what happens in Brazilian society in which most middle-class adolescents do not usually leave their parents' home to go to college, compared to the majority of European and American adolescents.

It would be important to investigate the developmental implications of living in special social settings such as halls of residence in late adolescence. Damon (1983) pointed out to one important development that takes place during adolescence, i.e. an increasing awareness of collective social realities beyond the confines of intimate interpersonal relations. The experience in the
peer world of college students living in halls of residence must have different developmental implications than the experience of college students who continue to live with their parents. In fact, any experience beyond the confines of family relationships may lead to developmental changes. Haaken and Korshgen (1988), for example, focused on the effect of work on adolescents' social cognitive learning, i.e. the ability to think about social processes and social institutions. They suggested that "...by entering a new social setting, one requiring cooperation with others and some understanding of organizational processes, the adolescent experiences the increased dissonance conducive to new learning" (p. 2).

It is also important to note that halls of residence are a peer context. There is some controversy in the literature concerning the relative influence of parents and peers in late adolescence. Psychoanalytic theory of adolescent development (A. Freud, 1958; Blos, 1962, 1979) assumes a discontinuity in parent-child relations by late adolescence. Adolescents are required to detach themselves from parents and to invest on nonincestuous relationships with peers. In this transition period, parent-child conflict is held to be inevitable and necessary for growth.

It is believed that one factor which has to be taken into consideration when assessing the relative importance of parents or peers in late adolescence is the extent of daily contact with parents and peers. In the present study, the extent of conflict with parents in late adolescence was assessed in situations
of moral conflict experienced by two groups of college students, one living with parents and the other living in halls of residence. As in the study reported in the previous chapter, a special emphasis is placed on the context of the conflict situations. In line with the findings from previous research (Sullivan and Sullivan, 1980), it was hypothesized that the group living with parents would report more conflicts in the context of parent-child relations than the group living in halls of residence. Conversely, it was expected that the group living in halls of residence would report more conflicts in the context of peer relations. Apart from the context, the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations, the difficulty in deciding about what to do, and the justifications offered for decisions taken in the conflict situations were also assessed.
METHOD

Design

The study was carried out with two groups of college students, one living with parents and the other living in halls of residence. The variables examined in this study were the same used in the previous one, as well as the method of data analysis.

Subjects

Two hundred and fifty eight college students with an age range of 17-21 took part in the study. They comprised two groups: those who were living with parents (75 males and 82 females) and those who were living in halls of residence (71 males and 30 females). The first group also participated in the previous study and was selected from the university to which the investigator belongs in Porto Alegre, located in the south of Brazil. The second belonged to the same university and was selected from three halls of residence. Altogether 269 were examined. The total number of subjects excluded for failing to answer the questionnaire or to give meaningful answers was 11.

Instrument

The instrument used was identical to that described in the previous chapter.
Procedure

The procedure was also identical to that described in the previous chapter.
RESULTS

As in the previous chapter, five separate content analyses were performed on the data. The first three focus on the content of the conflict situations (the context of the conflicts, the context of the conflicts involving personal relationships and the issues involved in the conflict situation) and the last two on the decisions taken (difficulty in deciding about what to do and justifications for the decisions).

i) Types of Context involved in the Conflict Situations

This analysis aimed at identifying the proportion of conflicts in the 'interpersonal' context mentioned by each group. The classification system used was the same one employed in the previous chapter. The contexts were divided into: a) interpersonal - personal relationships and impersonal relationships; and b) individual - actions/choices and ideas/values. The results of the content analysis of the context of the moral conflicts by group and gender are presented in Table 5.1. As can be seen from Table 5.1, the 'interpersonal' context was predominant both in the group living with parents (60%) and in the group living in halls of residence (58%). Within the 'interpersonal' context, there was a slightly higher proportion of conflicts involving 'personal relationships' in the first group (51%) compared to the second (43%). Conversely, there was a slightly higher proportion of conflicts involving 'impersonal relationships' in the second group (15%) compared to
the first (9%). Within the 'individual' context the second group also mentioned more conflicts involving 'ideas/values' than the first (10% and 6%, respectively). No clear gender differences could be identified.

**Table 5.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Percentage for each group</th>
<th>Live with parents</th>
<th>Live in halls of residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males (184)</td>
<td>Females (203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males (166)</td>
<td>Females (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal....</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal relationships..</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual.......</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions/choices.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/values....</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts. N=75, males living with parents; N=82, females living with parents; N=71, males living in halls of residence; N=30, females living in halls of residence.

In order to check the tendency to mention conflicts in the interpersonal context, derived scores were calculated using the same scoring system proposed in the previous chapter (see Appendix 4B). The derived mean scores are presented in Table 5.2 and represent the number of conflicts in the 'interpersonal' as opposed to the 'individual' context mentioned by each group.
Table 5.2

Mean responses and standard deviation (in brackets) representing the difference in the number of conflicts in the interpersonal and the individual context by gender and group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Live with parents</th>
<th>Live in halls of residence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.45 (1.86)</td>
<td>0.53 (2.06)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.63 (1.99)</td>
<td>0.35 (1.96)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher the mean the more subjects mentioned conflicts in the interpersonal and less in the individual context.

A gender x group (2x2) analysis of variance performed on the data revealed no main effects or interaction effect.

A further analysis was carried out within the interpersonal context in order to check the proportion of conflicts involving 'personal relationships', as opposed to conflicts involving 'impersonal relationships'. A similar scoring system to the one proposed above was used. The derived mean scores are presented in Table 5.3.
Table 5.3

Mean responses and standard deviation (in brackets) representing the difference in the number of conflicts involving personal relationships and those involving impersonal relationships by gender and group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Live with parents</th>
<th>Live in halls of residence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.02 (1.13)</td>
<td>0.87 (1.17)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.08 (1.18)</td>
<td>0.61 (1.29)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher the mean the more subjects mentioned conflicts involving personal relationships and less involving impersonal relationships.

A gender x group (2x2) analysis of variance was employed. A main effect for group was observed (F=5.15, d.f.=1, 254, p <.03). The group of college students living with parents mentioned significantly more conflicts involving personal relationships than the group of college students living in halls of residence. No significant gender differences were observed.

Since there was some indication of differences between the two groups in the percentage of conflicts involving 'ideas/values', an analysis was carried out focusing on conflicts within the individual context. The number of conflicts involving 'individual actions/choices' as opposed to 'ideas/values' was assessed by group and gender and is presented in Table 5.4.
Table 5.4

Mean responses and standard deviation (in brackets) representing the difference in the number of conflicts involving actions/choices and those involving ideas/values by gender and group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Live with parents</th>
<th>Live in halls of residence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.68 (1.06)</td>
<td>0.67 (1.18)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.68 (1.10)</td>
<td>0.45 (1.20)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher the mean the more subjects mentioned conflicts involving actions/choices and less ideas/values.

A group x gender (2x2) analysis of variance performed on the data revealed no main effects or interaction effect.

ii) Types of context in conflict situations involving personal relationships

As in the previous chapter, the aim of this section is to examine the types of context in conflicts involving 'personal relationships' and to identify the proportion of conflicts involving parents and peers in the group of college students living with parents and in the group living in halls of residence.

Table 5.5 presents the results of the content analysis of the context of the conflicts involving 'personal relationships' by group and gender. Note that there is a context called 'colleagues' and another called 'the family' in Table 5.5. As already mentioned in the previous chapter, the word 'colleagues' was translated from the word 'colegas' in Portuguese which has no similar
expression in English. It usually means peers who are not as close as friends.

The context 'the family' was created to account for those conflicts in which subjects referred to 'my family' in a generic way. Finally, it is interesting to note the other peer group which appeared in the group of college students living in halls of residence, that of other hall residents.

Table 5.5

The types of context of moral conflicts involving personal relationships as a function of group and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Live with parents</th>
<th>Live in halls of residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents ........</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings .......</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The family ....</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members ......</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends ........</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall residents.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues.....</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriend/ girlfriend.....</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ........</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts involving personal relationships.

The proportion of conflicts involving the family context (parents, siblings, other family members and 'the family') was much greater in the group of college students living with parents than in the group living in halls of residence (57% compared to 25%). Conflicts involving parents represented a high proportion of the conflicts involving 'personal relationships' only in the first group (45% compared to 9%). Conversely, college students living in halls of residence mentioned a higher proportion of conflicts involving peers
(friends, colleagues, hall residents and boyfriend/girlfriend) than the group living with parents (69% compared to 35%). Conflicts involving hall residents\(^1\) in the group of college students living in halls of residence represented a significant proportion of conflicts involving personal relationships (24%). No clear gender differences were identified.

As mentioned in the Introduction to this chapter, one important aim of this study was to analyze the relative importance of parents and peers in the two groups of college students. In order to assess the tendency to mention conflicts involving parents as opposed to conflicts involving peers in each group, the scores were transformed into a seven-point scale, as described elsewhere (see Appendix 4B). Table 5.6 shows the means and standard deviations by group and gender.

\(^1\) Sometimes hall residents were referred to in a personal way, in which case the conflict was classified as involving personal relationships, and other times they were mentioned in a more impersonal way, such as when they had to decide whether a resident, who they had no special relationship with should be allowed to stay after finishing his/her degree, which would go against the regulations. In the latter case, they were classified as involving impersonal relationships.
Table 5.6

Mean responses and standard deviation (in brackets) representing the difference in the number of conflicts involving parents and those involving peers by gender and group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Live with parents</th>
<th>Live in halls of residence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.21 (1.11)</td>
<td>-0.60 (1.10)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.01 (1.21)</td>
<td>-0.46 (1.00)</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher the mean the more subjects mentioned conflicts involving parents and less involving peers.

A group x gender (2x2) analysis of variance was employed. The results revealed a main effect for group (F=5.1, d.f.=1, 254, p<0.03). As expected, there was a greater proportion of conflicts involving parents in the group of college students living with parents than in the other one. No gender effect or group x gender interaction effect were observed.

iii) The Issues involved in the Conflict Situations

A descriptive analysis of the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations is presented by context: a) personal relationships; b) impersonal relationships; c) individual actions/choices; and d) ideas/values.
a) The issues in conflict situations involving personal relationships

As in the previous chapter, the content analysis of the issues in conflict situations involving 'personal relationships' is presented by context and group. Gender differences were excluded from this analysis. Table 5.7 shows the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations involving the family context (parents, the family and siblings), as a function of age (for a definition of the categories, see Chapter IV).

As can be seen from Table 5.7, the high proportion of conflicts involving 'parental interference' found in the group of college students living with parents was not identified in the group of college students living in halls of residence. In fact, in the latter group the number of conflicts involving parents was very small, with no evident cluster around specific issues.

As far as the context called 'the family' is concerned, again the most frequent issue in the second group was not 'family interference' as in the first group but 'leaving the family'. In both groups the number of conflicts involving siblings was very small. The issue that coincided in both groups was 'quarrels'. 
Table 5.7
The issues in conflicts involving parents, the family and siblings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Percentage for each group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live with parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*( 90) ( 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Involving parents**
- Parental interference (demands/prohibitions) ..... 50 20
- Lying/keeping secrets ........ 5 20
- Quarrels with parents .......... 10 -
- Parental divorce/arguments between parents .......... 5 10
- Obedience to parents .......... 3 -
- Fear of parental punishment/reaction .......... 1 -
- Divergence of ideas/values .......... 9 -
- Criticism of parental attitudes .......... 4 20
- Sibling jealousy .......... 2 -
- Meeting parental expectations .......... 2 -
- Concern about parents .......... 1 10
- Asking parents for gifts/money .......... 1 -
- Other .......... 4 20

**Involving the family**
- Family interference .......... 65 -
- Leaving the family .......... 50 -
- Quarrels .......... 12 -
- Divergence of ideas/values .......... 18 12
- Lying/keeping secrets .......... - 12
- Guilt .......... 6 12
- Death in the family .......... - 12

**Involving siblings**
- Quarrels .......... 20 50
- Loyalty/faithfulness .......... 20 -
- Justice .......... 20 -
- Looking after younger siblings .......... 20 -
- Other .......... 20 50

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts.

A further analysis was carried out of the issues that were the focus of conflicts involving peers (friends, colleagues, boyfriend/girlfriend and hall residents). The results of this content analysis are presented in Table 5.8. A definition of the issues is given in Chapter IV. The only issue not defined
previously was 'rules x affection', which appeared in conflicts involving hall residents. Issues classified under this heading focused on whether to adhere to standards of fairness and to housing regulations, not allowing a student/friend who has finished his/her degree to stay in the house, or whether to take into consideration the friendship towards him/her.

Table 5.8
The issues in conflicts involving friends, colleagues, boyfriend/girlfriend and hall residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Percentage for each group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage for each group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live with parents</td>
<td>Live in halls of residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving friends</td>
<td>*(28)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty/faithfulness</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group pressure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying/keeping secrets</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship problems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving colleagues</td>
<td>*(9)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group pressure</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence of ideas/values</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty/faithfulness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship problems</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>*(33)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty/faithfulness</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending a relationship</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual involvement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with no affective...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with married person</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall residents</td>
<td>*(0)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship problems</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules x affection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence of ideas/values</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts.
In both groups the predominant issue in conflicts involving friends was 'loyalty/faithfulness' (46% and 50%, respectively). As far as conflicts involving 'colleagues' are concerned, the primary issues did not coincide in both groups. In the group of college students living with parents the main issues were 'divergence of ideas/values' (33%) and 'group pressure' (33%). In the group of college students living in halls of residence the most frequent issues involved 'relationship problems' (36%) and 'loyalty/faithfulness' (27%). In conflicts involving boyfriend/girlfriend, 'loyalty/faithfulness' was the predominant issue both in the group of college students living with parents (39%) and the group of college students living in halls of residence (27%). Other frequent issues in the first group included 'sexual involvement' (21%) and 'ending a relationship' (12%). The latter was also frequent in the second group (19%). Another frequent issue in the last group was 'relationship with no affective involvement' (23%). Finally, in conflicts involving hall residents the most frequent issue was 'relationship problems' (68%).
b) The issues in conflict situations involving impersonal relationships

Tale 5.9 presents the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations involving 'impersonal relationships'. It is important to remember that this type of conflict involved people who were either strangers or who were generalized as 'people'. A definition of each type of issue is given in Chapter IV. The only two types of issues which had not appeared before were 'being sexually approached by someone' and conflicts 'involving authority'. The first concerned not knowing what to do when being sexually approached by someone, and the second entailed conflicts with the police.

As can be seen from Table 5.9, there were no clear predominant issues in either group. Amongst the most frequent issues in both groups were 'helping others' (20% and 11%), 'giving to charity' (11% and 8%), 'justice' (9% and 17%), 'divergence of ideas/values' (9% and 8%). A higher proportion of conflicts involving 'interference of others in personal life' was identified in the group of college students living with parents (11% compared to 3%).
Table 5.9
The issues in conflicts involving impersonal relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Percentage for each group</th>
<th>Live with parents</th>
<th>Live in halls of residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts with actual or potential harm to others</td>
<td><em>(35)</em> (36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference of others in personal life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving to charity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence of ideas/values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice against others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking one's mind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about others’ image of oneself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being sexually approached by someone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts.

c) The issues in conflict situations involving individual actions/choices and ideas/values

In this section the issues that were the focus of conflicts in the 'individual' context, i.e. conflicts involving 'actions/choices' and 'ideas/values', were analyzed. As already mentioned before, conflicts in the 'individual' context involved issues primarily intrinsic to the self, i.e. there was no other person involved in these types of conflict. Table 5.10 shows the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations involving 'individual actions/choices'. The issues in conflicts involving 'actions/choices' were similar to the ones described in Chapter IV, except for 'living in halls of residence'. In this type of conflict subjects reported their concern with whether
or not to go and live in halls of residence, since there is some prejudice about living in halls. In conflicts involving 'ideas/values', two issues have appeared, which had not been mentioned before: 'politics' and 'values'. Conflicts involving 'politics' focused on criticism of governmental actions, unemployment, etc. Conflicts of 'values' included the questioning of basic values such as love, the value of life, etc.

Table 5.10
The issues in conflicts involving actions/choices and ideas/values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Percentage for each group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live with parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving actions/choices</td>
<td>*(129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic life</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional choice</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal insecurity</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption/transgressions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual behaviour</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of drugs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving home</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in halls of residence</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Involving ideas/values             | *(24) | (24) |
| Social problems                    | 25 | 21 |
| Religion                           | 17 | 25 |
| Prejudice                          | 12 | 12 |
| Politics                           | - | 21 |
| Values                             | 17 | - |
| Sex                                | 17 | - |
| Fashion                            | 12 | 9 |
| Other                              | 17 | 4 |

(*) In brackets the total number of conflicts.

In conflicts involving 'actions/choices' the most frequent issues in both groups involved their 'professional choice' (50% and 40%) and their 'academic
life' (15% and 10%). There was a higher proportion of conflicts involving 'politics' in the group of college students living in halls of residence (9% compared to 3%).

In relation to the issues involving 'ideas/values', no evident clusters of issues were identified. A frequent issue in both groups involved a concern with 'social problems' (25% and 21%). Other frequent issues included 'religion' (17% and 25%) and 'prejudice' (12% in each group). 'Politics' was also a frequent issue in the group of college students living in halls of residence (21%).

iv) **Degree of difficulty experienced in making a decision about what to do**

As already stated in the previous chapter, the degree of difficulty experienced in deciding about what to do in the conflict situation was used as an indication of the intensity of the conflict. Table 5.11 shows the mean difficulty experienced in each context by gender and age.
Table 5.11

Mean difficulty and standard deviation (in brackets) experienced in making a decision about what to do in each context by gender and group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Live with parents Male</th>
<th>Live with parents Female</th>
<th>Live in halls of residence Male</th>
<th>Live in halls of residence Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>3.4 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td>3.6 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.6 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal relationships</td>
<td>2.9 (1.6)</td>
<td>3.2 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.0 (1.7)</td>
<td>2.2 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>3.1 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.2 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.5)</td>
<td>4.2 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions/choices</td>
<td>3.3 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.3)</td>
<td>3.3 (1.5)</td>
<td>4.2 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/values</td>
<td>2.6 (1.8)</td>
<td>2.4 (1.3)</td>
<td>3.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>4.3 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender x group (2 x 2) analyses of variance were performed for all contexts, except for conflicts involving 'ideas/values', since there would not be enough subjects if we also considered the effect of gender. A significant main effect for group was found for conflicts in the 'individual' context (F=5.9, d.f.=1,149, p <0.02). The conflicts in the 'individual' context mentioned by the group of college students living in halls of residence were more difficult to resolve than those mentioned by college students living with parents (3.6 compared to 3.1). The other significant difference observed between the groups was revealed from a one-way analysis of variance.
performed for conflicts involving 'ideas/values' (F= 10.0, d.f.=1,30, p <0.005). Again the conflicts involving 'ideas/values' mentioned by college students from halls of residence were more difficult to resolve than those mentioned by the other group (4.0 and 2.4, respectively). No other significant differences were observed.

Since our main interest was in conflicts involving parents and peers, the mean difficulty in deciding about what to do in these two contexts was also assessed. Table 5.12 presents the means and standard deviations by gender and group.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed for conflicts involving parents, since there were not enough subjects in the group of college students living in halls of residence for gender comparisons. No significant differences were found between the groups. Similarly, a 2x2 (gender x group) analysis of variance performed for conflicts involving peers revealed no significant main effects or interaction effect.
Table 5.12

Mean difficulty and standard deviation (in brackets) experienced in making a decision about what to do in conflicts involving parents and peers by gender and group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Live with parents</th>
<th>Live in halls of residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3.5 (1.6)</td>
<td>3.8 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>3.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
v) Justifications offered for decisions taken in the moral conflict situations

As in the previous chapter, the justifications offered for decisions taken in the conflict situations were analyzed in terms of the personal x impersonal distinction proposed elsewhere (see Table 4.14). 'Personal' justifications involved 'the self', 'self/other relationship' or 'the other', whereas 'impersonal' justifications involved rules, principles, responsibility, jargons. Two other categories were also included from the content analysis performed on the data, i.e. 'external factors' (influence of time, of others) and 'confused/not justified'. The results of the content analysis are presented in Table 5.13 by group and context.

As can be seen from Table 5.13, personal justifications were the most frequent in all contexts except in conflicts involving 'ideas/values'. They were especially frequent in conflicts involving 'personal relationships'. As for impersonal justifications, in both groups they were more frequent in the two most impersonal contexts, i.e. 'impersonal relationships' and 'ideas/values'.
Table 5.13

Types of justification offered as a function of group and context of the conflict situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Live with parents PR IR AC IV</th>
<th>Live in halls PR IR AC IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Total (302) (48) (181) (30)</td>
<td>(93) (43) (89) (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal......</td>
<td>69 44 49 20</td>
<td>87 60 54 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal....</td>
<td>10 31 18 50</td>
<td>6 30 17 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External factors.......</td>
<td>10 14 14 10</td>
<td>4 2 7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusing/not justified.</td>
<td>9 10 20 20</td>
<td>2 7 22 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In brackets the total number of justifications. PR= personal relationships; IR= impersonal relationships; AC= action/choices; IV= ideas/values.

The types of 'personal' justifications offered for conflicts involving 'personal relationships' and 'impersonal relationships' were also examined and are presented in Table 5.14. It was expected that justifications involving self/other relationship would be more frequent in conflicts involving 'personal relationships' than in those involving 'impersonal relationships', since under this heading were classified, among other types of justification, those emphasizing the special affective ties to the person involved.
Table 5.14 shows that justifications centred on 'self/other relationship' were more frequent in conflicts involving personal relationships, than in those involving impersonal relationships. Conversely, justifications focusing on the 'self' were more frequent in conflicts involving impersonal relationships, than in those involving personal relationships.

Comparisons between the two groups on the use of personal and impersonal justifications as a function of gender and context were made through analyses of variance. Derived scores were calculated using a similar scoring procedure to the one proposed in the previous chapter (see Appendix 4C). Separate analyses were carried out for each type of context.

Table 5.15 presents the mean number of personal justifications mentioned in each context by gender and age.
Table 5.15

Mean responses and standard deviation (in brackets) representing the difference in the number of personal and impersonal justifications mentioned in each context by gender and age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Live with parents</th>
<th>Live in halls of residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal....</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.1) (1.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships..</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0) (0.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal relationships..</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.9) (0.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual......</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0) (0.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions/choices..</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.9) (0.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/values.....</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0) (0.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher the mean the more subjects mentioned personal justifications and less impersonal ones.

Gender x group (2x2) analyses of variance were performed for all contexts except for conflicts involving ideas/values; due to a lack of enough subjects, gender effects were not taken into consideration and a one-way analysis of variance was employed. A significant main effect for gender was found for justifications in the individual context (F= 4.8, d.f.= 1,149; p<0.03). Females mentioned more personal justifications in this context than males (0.6 compared to 0.3). Similarly, in conflicts involving individual actions/choices there was also a significant main effect for gender (F= 6.4, d.f.=1,131; p<0.02) with females mentioning more personal justifications than males (0.7 compared to 0.4).
DISCUSSION

The moral conflict situations construed by late adolescents in this study involved primarily the interpersonal context. No significant differences were found between the group of college students living with parents and the group living in halls of residence in this respect. Therefore, in this study separation from parents does not seem to have influenced the tendency to construe conflicts in the context of relationships. However, the findings do suggest that separation from parents did have an influence on the tendency to mention conflicts involving the context of parent-child as opposed to peer relations. As predicted, conflicts involving parents were much more frequent in the group of college students living with parents, whereas conflicts involving peers were more frequent in the group of college students living in halls of residence.

As far as the issues reported in parent-child conflicts are concerned, parental interference was the main issue in the group living with parents, whereas in the other group no evident clusters around specific issues were found. The generic category called 'the family' appeared in both groups. As already mentioned in the previous chapter, this seems to be an alternative and more abstract way of referring to parents. The issues involved in this context differed according to the group. The group living with parents reported more issues having to do with family interference, whereas for the other group the predominant issue was leaving the family. What this finding seems to suggest is that living with parents in late adolescence may increase autonomy-related
conflicts, whereas separation from parents may increase attachment-related conflicts. However, the proportion of attachment-related conflicts in the group living in halls of residence was small. Therefore, whereas the findings of the present study give support to the idea that living with parents tends to increase parent-child conflict over autonomy-related conflicts, one cannot be sure about the second point raised. It is believed that in order to answer the last question one would have had to control for the time of separation from parents, which was not done in the present study.

As for conflicts involving peers, an interesting finding from this study was the high level of conflict with peers observed in the group of college students living in halls of residence, especially conflicts involving the hall context. The high proportion of conflicts involving halls of residence could reflect the immediate research context, since they were asked to answer the questionnaires in halls, but it can also help us to think about the social contextual determinants of development. What is the effect of a prolonged stay at parents' home or of a closer contact with peers in moral development during late adolescence?

The fact that the group of college students with more daily contact with parents reported more conflicts with parents while the group living in halls of residence, with more daily contact with peers, reported more conflicts with peers suggests that conflict may be found in any situation in which two or more people are living together or in close contact. In fact, in a study carried
out with 64 adolescents investigating parent-adolescent conflict, Montemayor and Hanson (1985) questioned whether quarrels with parents are really about independence or whether they are about interpersonal issues.

However, conflicts involving parents were qualitatively different from those involving peers. Whereas conflicts involving parents centered mainly on parental authority, conflicts involving peers centered on interpersonal relationships. In both groups, conflicts involving friends, for instance, were mainly centered around loyalty/faithfulness issues. Conflicts involving colleagues focused on different issues, such as divergence of ideas/values, group pressure, etc. Conflicts involving boyfriend/girlfriend were equally frequent in both groups and there was no single issue which coincided in both groups. It is interesting to note that conflicts concerning sexual involvement in relationships with boyfriend/girlfriend appeared only in the group living with parents. One possible explanation for these differences could be that living with parents inhibits adolescents' sex life, whereas being away from parents makes them feel freer as far as their sexuality is concerned. However, the greater sexual freedom experienced by the other group may be coupled with other dilemmas, such as the affective involvement in relationships. The predominant issue of conflict involving boyfriend/girlfriend in the group living in halls of residence was having relationships with no affective involvement. Finally, in relation to the conflicts involving hall residents found in the group of college students living in halls of residence, the main issue reported had to do with 'relationship problems' (lack of privacy, being disturbed, etc.). In part,
the latter issue reflects things that happen when one is living with another

person.

Another point to be discussed are the differences found in the
proportion of conflicts involving personal as opposed to impersonal
relationships in each group. The group of college students living with parents
reported more conflicts in the context of personal relationships than the group
living in halls of residence. As already stressed before, an important
development that takes place during adolescence is an increasing awareness of
collective social realities beyond intimate interpersonal relations (Damon,
1983). The halls of residence selected for this study were all run by students.
Students take part in all decisions regarding the house and they are also bound
to housing regulations. They are therefore sometimes exposed to very difficult,
but at the same time, very enriching dilemmatic experiences, such as having
to decide whether or not to adhere to standards of fairness and to housing
regulations and not allow a student who has finished his/her degree to stay in
the house. This was a common theme of conflict in the group of college
students living in halls of residence.

Kohlberg (1969, 1973) argued that personal experiences involving
responsibility and moral decision-making promote moral development. As
shown by Walker (1986b), "these experiences stimulate moral reasoning by
providing role-taking opportunities in conflict situations, and arise through
interpersonal relationships with family and friends and through involvement in
the economic, political and legal institutions of society (through education, occupation, and citizenship activities)” (p. 114).

The effect of social experiences such as living with parents on late adolescents' moral reasoning, which are of relevance to the present study, was assessed in a study carried out by Haan, Smith and Block (1968) with 510 college students. They reported that principled morality groups were more likely to live in apartments and houses of their own.

In the present study, differences between the group living with parents and the group living in halls of residence were found in relation to the context of the conflict situations, not to reasoning over choices in these situations. Both groups tended to use more personal justifications than impersonal ones in their justifications for decisions taken in the conflict situations. Impersonal justifications were more used in impersonal contexts, such as those involving impersonal relationships and those involving ideas/values. These findings give support to recent claims (see Turiel, Killen and Helwig, 1987) that social judgements vary according to context. Contextual factors (content, as opposed to structure) should therefore be given more emphasis in the study of moral development.

To conclude, the findings of the present study do highlight the importance of social-interactive contexts in moral development in adolescence.
They do not give support to the notion that development goes in the direction of greater depersonalization, as both cognitive-developmental and psychoanalytic theory would assume. They also indicate that in order to understand the effects of leaving home on sociocognitive development one must also attend to experiences young adults have in the peer world once they leave home. The findings of this study show that the coming into closer contact with peers after adolescents leave home makes peers an important interactive context within which different kinds of conflicts take place.

Now the next important question which was not addressed in this study concerns the way parent-child conflict might influence moral development in adolescence. Conflict with parents is assumed to be important in the development of autonomy, whereas conflict-free family situations could lead to fear of separation, exploration and independence (Silverberg and Steinberg, 1987). In a longitudinal study with parents and children, Walker and Taylor (1991) found that high levels of conflict or of disparity in moral development were associated with developmental gains for children but only in families with high levels of supportive interactions.

One way of examining the relationship of parent-child conflict to moral development in adolescence would be to focus on moral conflict situations involving the parents and assess the particular ways in which they are dealt with by adolescents and their parents. With this aim in mind, another study was designed, which is presented in the next chapter, focusing on the strategies
used by adolescents to deal with moral conflict situations involving the parents.

It is felt that the strategies used will reflect important developmental issues, such as the ability to negotiate, compromise, etc.
CHAPTER VI

STRATEGIES USED BY MID- AND LATE ADOLESCENTS FOR THE RESOLUTION OF MORAL CONFLICT INVOLVING THE PARENTS

INTRODUCTION

In the studies presented in the last two chapters, the importance of the context of parent-child relations in moral development in adolescence was highlighted through the analysis of moral conflict situations experienced by adolescents. Developmental changes were found in parent-child conflict from preadolescence to mid- and late adolescence. As far as late adolescents are concerned, living with parents was shown to be an important factor in parent-child conflict. It was felt that in order to better understand the relationship of parent-child to moral development in adolescence, a further study should be carried out with mid- and late adolescents living with their parents, focusing specifically on moral conflict situations involving the parents. It was with this aim in mind that the present study was carried out.

In a literature review on parent-adolescent conflict, Hall (1987) pointed out that adolescence has been frequently considered as a stressful period, in
which conflict is seen as natural, inevitable and even necessary. This view was prevalent in the psychological literature up to the 70's (see Steinberg, 1987) and was disseminated mainly by the writings of psychodynamic theorists such as A. Freud (1958) and Blos (1962, 1979). In the context of parent-child relations, again these theorists emphasized primarily the growth of separateness, detachment or individuation. Separation from parents and the growth of autonomy were assumed to occur through major storm and stress in parent-child relations.

The view of adolescence as a period of storm and stress has not been supported by research findings (Offer and Offer, 1975; Rutter, Graham, Chadwick and Yule, 1976), and separation from parents and autonomy development appear to occur gradually, rather than abruptly (Bandura and Walters, 1959; Douvan and Adelson, 1966; Hill and Holmbeck, 1986).

These research findings have led to a new line of investigation in which continuity rather than discontinuity in parent-child relations is assumed (e.g. Youniss, 1980; Youniss and Smollar, 1985; Feldman and Gehring, 1988). It is believed that the study of development during adolescence requires an social interactional perspective, in which aspects of adolescents' development can be redefined in terms of a reciprocal process of development in adolescent-parent relationship (Sullivan and Sullivan, 1980). The nature and dynamics of interpersonal relationships have influence on a number of areas in psychology, as pointed out by the British ethologist Robert Hinde (Hinde and Stevenson-
Hinde, 1987). An example of this is the area of moral development, in which a growing interest in the role of interpersonal relationships in moral development was observed, especially through the work of Gilligan (1977, 1982). The interpersonal also gained importance from the sixties with the field of family therapy which brought important contributions to our understanding of child development (see Minuchin, 1985, for a review of the major contributions of family therapy to our understanding of child development).

The study of moral development towards autonomy may benefit from a social interactional perspective. Not enough is known about children’s perception of their relationship with their parents in different periods of development (for an exception to this trend, see Youniss, 1980; Hunter and Youniss, 1982; Youniss and Smollar, 1985). Parent-child relationship is assumed to be bound to implicit contracts of mutual obligation, in Elkind’s (1979) view, as well as in the view of family theoreticians such as Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark (1973) and Stierlin (1976), and to make increasing demands to the child during her development. As pointed out by Elkind (1979), parents normally require responsibility from their children in exchange for the support and care given to them. During adolescence, parental control over children is reduced, given that adolescents can take certain liberties independent of parental consent, but even so parents can establish certain limits, such as not lending the car or not giving money in case their children transgress. In this phase, demands for achievement also increase, insofar as youngsters get ready for independence and financial support from
parents is also diminished.

In the present study, the strategies used by mid- and late adolescents for the resolution of moral conflict involving the parents are examined, as well as the justifications offered for each type of strategy. As in the studies reported in the two previous chapters, the methodology of this study involves the assessment of adolescents' reasoning in real-life moral dilemmas. However, in contrast with the previous studies, in the current study they were asked to think about moral conflict situations involving specifically their parents. Even though previous research has focused on real-life moral dilemmas (e.g. Gilligan, 1982; Lyons, 1983; Walker et al., 1987; Ford and Lowery, 1986; Johnston et al., 1990), the present study was the first to look at moral conflicts in the context of parent-child relations. A new methodology for analyzing adolescents' reasoning in these conflict situations is also proposed, based on the strategies used by adolescents to deal with the conflict situations.

Changes in assertiveness and influence in family decision-making have been reported to take place with the onset of puberty (Jacob, 1974; Steinberg and Hill, 1978; Steinberg, 1981; Newman, 1989). Strategies or styles of power have also been assumed to change in the transition to adolescence. Decreases in parental unilateral power and increases in children’s and parents’ use of mutual power strategies have been identified (Hunter, 1985; Youniss and Smollar, 1985). Children’s conceptions of the legitimacy of parental authority over certain issues have also been observed to change in adolescence.
(Smetana, 1988). There is an increasing inclusion of actions within the personal domain (Nucci, 1981), which may represent an important aspect of the development of autonomy or distinctiveness from others. These sociocognitive changes seem to be related to parent-child conflict in adolescence (Smetana, 1988, 1989b). Even though it is assumed that there is a parallel social-cognitive reorganization in parents in the transition to adolescence, parents' and childrens' development can be disjunctive. As shown by Smetana (1988), adolescents can see themselves as having more authority over decision-making than parents are willing to grant them.

Even though most studies have concentrated on changes in parent-child relations during early adolescence, some studies have suggested that changes are perceived to continue in mid- and late adolescence as well. Changes in perceptions of cohesion and power have been observed during mid- and late adolescence (Feldman and Gehring, 1988). In addition, even though the literature on parent-child conflict during adolescence indicates increases in conflict in early adolescence, parent-child conflict has been also identified during mid- and late adolescence (Douvan and Adelson, 1966; Montemayor and Hanson, 1985; Smetana, 1989b). The study reported in chapter IV also gives support to these findings.

Based on the findings of the studies reported above, it was hypothesized that there would be developmental changes from mid- to late adolescence in the types of strategy used for dealing with conflicts involving
parents. More self-related strategies are expected to be used by the older group. In addition, in the light of recent findings concerning adolescents’ conceptions of parental authority (Smetana, 1988), it was hypothesized that the strategies used would vary according to the type of conflict issue involved.
METHOD

Design

The study was carried out with two age groups: mid-adolescents (14-16) and late adolescents (17-21). They were asked to write down three moral conflict situations involving their parents that they might have experienced. Four measures were obtained from an analysis of the conflict situations mentioned by subjects: i) the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations; ii) the difficulty experienced in deciding about what to do in the conflict situations; iii) the strategies used for the resolution of the conflict situations; and iv) the types of justification offered for the strategies used in the conflict situations. The data were analyzed through content analysis.

Subjects

Two hundred and sixty-seven subjects took part in this study. They comprised two groups: college students (91 females and 74 males) and year 9 students (60 females and 42 males). The first group was selected from the university to which the investigator belongs in Porto Alegre, located in the south of Brazil. The second was selected from four highly comparable private schools. The age range of the participants in the first group was 17-21 and in the second 14-16. Altogether 294 were examined. The total number of subjects excluded for failing to answer the questionnaire or to give meaningful
answers was 27. They belonged mainly to the 14-16 age group.

Instrument

In order to examine the content of moral conflicts involving parents, the strategies used for their resolution and the justifications offered for each type of strategy, a structured questionnaire was used. The structure of the questionnaire was very similar to the one used in the two previous studies (see Chapter IV). The only difference was that in this study subjects were required to think of moral conflict situations involving specifically their parents. In the first part of the questionnaire they were asked to describe three situations involving their parents in which they had been in doubt, wondering whether something was right or wrong, fair or unfair. After mentioning the conflict situation they were asked to specify the conflict they had had in that situation. In the second part they were asked first to indicate, on a five-point scale (from 1 'Not difficult' to 5 'Very difficult'), the difficulty they had in deciding what to do in the conflict situation. Then they were asked about the decision they had taken and, finally, they were requested to say the reason why they took that decision. Appendix 6A presents a copy of the instrument used.

As already reported in Chapter IV, this methodology based on the description of real-life moral dilemmas has been used in different studies and is mainly based on semiclinical interviews (Brown et al., 1987). However, no
previous studies have focused on real-life moral conflict situations involving specifically the parents. The method of data analysis proposed in this study is also new, in that it will be based on the strategies adolescents use for dealing with these conflict situations involving their parents.

Procedure

Subjects were asked to answer the questionnaire in classrooms. The investigator explained briefly the aims of the study, saying that she was studying situations involving parents in which people are sometimes in doubt, wondering whether something is right or wrong, fair or unfair, and that she was looking at different age groups. The average duration of the whole procedure was 30 minutes.
RESULTS

The data are examined in four parts. The first one focuses on the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations mentioned. The second examines the difficulty experienced in deciding about what to do in the conflict situations. The third investigates the strategies adopted for the resolution of the conflicts. Finally, the fourth focuses on the justifications offered for the strategies used.

i) Issues that were the focus of the conflict situations

In order to examine the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations mentioned by the subjects, a content analysis was performed on the data. A similar thematic structure used in the previous chapter was used for this one. Altogether, eight main categories were identified. Note that the category 'parental interference' has been divided into eleven sub-categories. Examples of each category are shown in Appendix 6B.

Table 6.1 presents the frequency distribution of the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations mentioned as a function of age and gender.
In order to test for developmental trends, the number of subjects who mentioned at least one conflict in a particular content category was contrasted across the two age groups using Fisher’s exact probability statistics. Because there were clear gender differences, statistics were performed separately for males and females, and gender differences were examined at each age group separately. Although there may well be a systematic association between categories, i.e. that contribution to one category decreases or increases the likelihood of issues being raised in other categories, the frequency of contributions to most categories was too low for a systematic examination of this relationship. Fisher’s tests were used to contrast the frequency of contributions to one category at the two age groups compared with the frequency of contributions to all other categories for each category in turn. Due to the number of statistical tests performed, the significance criterion is set at .01, and .05 significance only suggests a tendency towards significance.

Table 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>14-16 Female</th>
<th>14-16 Male</th>
<th>17-21 Female</th>
<th>17-21 Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental interference (demands/prohibitions).....</td>
<td>46(91)</td>
<td>35(64)</td>
<td>80(148)</td>
<td>66(119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence of ideas/values..</td>
<td>9(12)</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
<td>21(28)</td>
<td>14(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling jealousy/arguments..</td>
<td>7(8)</td>
<td>5(6)</td>
<td>6(6)</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental divorce/arguments between parents.......</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>4(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrels with parents...</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family quarrels</td>
<td>4(5)</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of parental attitudes</td>
<td>4(5)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying/keeping secrets...</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=60, 14-16 female; N=42, 14-16 male; N=91, 17-21 female; N=74, 17-21 male.
The results of the Fisher's test indicated that 'quarrels with parents' was an issue in which significant differences were found between the 14-16 and the 17-21 age group (p<.0002). Proportionately more subjects mentioned this type of conflict in the 14-16 than in the 17-21 age group. However, when this test was performed separately for males and females, this tendency was statistically significant only in the female group (p<.002). Another significant age difference was observed for conflicts involving parental interference (p<.03). When analyses were performed separately for gender, there was a trend towards significance only in the female group (p<.05).

Since 'parental interference' is a broad category, involving different types of conflict, a further analysis was carried out on the issues that were the focus of the conflicts classified in this category. The results of this content analysis are presented in Table 6.2, as a function of age and gender.
Table 6.2

Issues that were the focus of the conflicts involving parental interference by age and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>14-16</th>
<th>17-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social life (going out/travelling with friends)...........</td>
<td>33(45)</td>
<td>13(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/professional life.................................</td>
<td>6(6)</td>
<td>10(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality..................................................</td>
<td>9(11)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality/behavioural style...............................</td>
<td>10(14)</td>
<td>6(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of relationships.....................................</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference in decisions...................................</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
<td>9(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving without a licence...................................</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of drugs................................................</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving home................................................</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive care/protection from parents.....................</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands for doing things with the family.................</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other demands...............................................</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=60, 14-16 female; N=42, 14-16 male; N=91, 17-21 female; N=74, 17-21 male.

To test for developmental trends, the number of subjects who mentioned at least one conflict in each category was contrasted across the two age groups using Fisher's exact probability statistics. Statistics were performed separately for males and females and gender differences were examined at each age group separately.

There was a trend towards significance in conflicts involving 'social life'. The proportion of subjects who mentioned conflicts involving 'social life' was greater in the younger than in the older group (p<.05). This tendency was statistically significant only in the female group (p<.03). In addition, significantly more females than males mentioned this type of conflict in the 14-16 age group (p<.01). Conversely, a trend towards significance was
observed in conflicts involving 'academic/professional life'. More males than females mentioned this type of conflict in this age group (p<.05). As far as conflicts involving 'sexuality' are concerned, significantly more females mentioned conflicts of this kind than males in the 17-21 age group (p<.01). 'Personality/behavioural style' was more frequently mentioned by the younger than by the older group of females (p<.03). In the 17-21 age group proportionately more males than females mentioned this type of conflict (p<.01). The proportion of subjects who mentioned 'choice of relationships' was greater in the 17-21 age group (p<.007). This tendency was statistically significant only in the female group (p<.03). In addition, a trend towards significance was found when gender differences were analyzed in the 17-21 age group. More females than males mentioned this type of conflict in the 17-21 age group (p<.04). 'Interference in decisions' was proportionately more mentioned by the 14-16 than by the 17-21 age group in the male group only (p<.005). 'Driving without a licence' was more frequently mentioned by the 17-21 than by the 14-16 age group (p<.01). Significantly more males than females mentioned this type of conflict in the 17-21 age group (p<.0004). 'Use of drugs' was also more frequently mentioned by males than females in the 17-21 age group (p<.006).
ii) **Degree of difficulty experienced in making a decision about what to do in the conflict situations**

The degree of difficulty experienced in deciding about what to do in the conflict situations was used as an indication of the intensity of the conflict. Table 6.3 shows the mean difficulty experienced in the conflict situations by gender and age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=60, 14-16 females; N= 42, 14-16 males; N= 91, 17-21 females; N= 74, 17-21 males.

A 2 x 2 (gender x age) analysis of variance performed on the data revealed no significant main effect or interaction effect, i.e. there were no significant differences between the two age groups or between males and females in the degree of difficulty experienced in deciding about what to do in the conflict situations, indicating that the conflicts mentioned were of similar intensity.
iii) Strategies used for the resolution of conflicts

A content analysis of the strategies used for the resolution of the conflict situations was performed in order to examine the most frequent strategies in each age group. Only conflicts involving 'parental interference' and 'divergence of ideas/values' were selected for this analysis. This is because in both types of conflict there was some kind of confrontation between parents and children over certain issues. In addition, these two categories accounted for the greatest proportion of conflicts in each group.

An analysis of the responses indicated seven main types of strategy which were generated together with two other coders after reading all of the material (for examples of each type of strategy, see Appendix 6C). The strategy 'follow own decisions/wishes' referred to those responses in which subjects indicated that they had decided to do what they wanted to do (in the case of conflicts involving parental interference) or in which they had decided to stick to their own ideas/values (in the case of conflicts involving divergence of ideas/values). Under 'dialogue/try to convince' were classified those responses in which they indicated that they had decided to talk to their parents to try and convince them about their own views. 'Give in' related to those responses in which they indicated that they had decided to do what their parents expected them to do. 'Compromise' involved those situations in which they indicated that both themselves and their parents had given in a little bit. 'Withdrawal' concerned those situations in which they had decided to ignore
their parents or the conflict situation. 'Keep secret/lie' referred to those situations in which they had decided to do what they wanted to do but did not tell their parents or lied to them about their decision. Under 'wait for time to bring a solution' were classified those situations in which they indicated that they had decided to wait and see what happens. Finally, in some situations they said they had not resolved the conflict, and for this reason a category called 'unresolved' was included. An 'other' category was also included to account for those situations in which they said the conflict was either resolved by the parent (e.g. the parent gave in) or by external factors (e.g. external help from a friend). The results of the analysis are presented in Table 6.4 as a function of age an gender.

### Table 6.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>14-16</th>
<th></th>
<th>17-21</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow own decision/wishes.</td>
<td>14(15)</td>
<td>14(17)</td>
<td>43(56)</td>
<td>26(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue/try to convince...</td>
<td>21(29)</td>
<td>10(11)</td>
<td>26(48)</td>
<td>25(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give in</td>
<td>23(31)</td>
<td>15(22)</td>
<td>27(29)</td>
<td>20(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>14(16)</td>
<td>14(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>6(6)</td>
<td>10(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep secret/lie</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>2(4)</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
<td>6(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait for time to bring a solution</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresolved</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9(9)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>5(5)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=49, 14-16 female; N=37, 14-16 male; N=89, 17-21 female; N=71, 17-21 male.

Fisher’s exact probability statistics were used in order to test for developmental differences. The number of subjects who mentioned a particular strategy was contrasted across the two age groups. Separate analyses were also
carried out for males and females, and gender differences were examined at each age group separately.

Significantly more subjects in the 14-16 than in the 17-21 age group mentioned the strategies 'dialogue/try to convince' and 'give in' (p < .01). Conversely, 'compromise' was more frequently mentioned by the older than by the younger group (p < .006). When the strategies were analyzed for each gender separately, 'follow own decisions/wishes' was more frequent in the 17-21 than in the 14-16 age group, in the female group only (p < .003). A trend towards significance was observed for the strategy 'give in' in the female group as well (p < .04). More females in the 14-16 than in the 17-21 age group mentioned this strategy.

In order to examine if particular types of conflict were associated with specific strategies, contingency tables were constructed for each age group with the frequency distribution of strategies across conflicts. The most frequent conflicts involving 'parental interference' in each age group and conflicts involving 'divergence of ideas/values' were selected for this analysis. In addition, only the three most frequent strategies were included in the analysis. Given the limited number of subjects, gender differences were not analyzed. Note that some types of conflict included in the 17-21 age group were not included in the 14-16 age group, as there were would not be enough subjects for an analysis of the strategies used in the latter group. The results of this analysis are shown in Tables 6.5 and 6.6.
Partial chi-square statistics were computed for each type of conflict to assess if the distribution of strategies deviated from the overall distribution of strategies across all other types of conflict.

As far as Table 6.5 is concerned, the results of partial chi-square statistics revealed that the strategy 'follow own decision/wishes' was significantly less used in conflicts involving 'social life' than in other types of conflict ($X^2 = 14.74, p < .001$). Conversely, it was significantly more used in conflicts involving 'academic/professional life' ($X^2 = 7.21, p < .03$). Finally, compared to other types of conflict, 'give in' was significantly less used in conflicts involving 'divergence of ideas/values' ($X^2 = 8.94, p < .02$).
In relation to Table 6.6., the results of partial chi-square statistics revealed a trend towards significant deviation of strategies from expected distribution in conflicts involving 'social life' ($X (2)= 6.89, p < .05$). The strategy 'dialogue/try to convince' was more frequent in this type of conflict than in other types, and the strategy 'follow own decision/wishes' was less frequent. Conversely, in conflicts involving 'academic/professional life' the latter strategy was more frequently used and the strategy 'dialogue/try to convince' was less frequently used ($X (2)= 16.49, p < .001$). In conflicts involving 'personality/behavioural style', the strategy 'follow own decision/wishes' was less frequently used, and 'give in' was more frequently used than in other types of conflict ($X (2)= 18.05, p < .001$). In conflicts involving 'choice of relationships' a trend towards significance was also identified ($X (2)= 6.46, p < .05$). 'Dialogue/try to convince' was less frequently used in this type of conflict than in other types. Finally, significant differences were found in conflicts involving 'divergence of ideas/values' ($X (2)= 14.40, p < .001$). In this type of conflict the strategy 'give in' was less frequently used than in other types. In addition, the strategy 'dialogue/try to convince' was more frequently used.
iv) **Justifications offered for the strategies used in conflicts involving 'parental interference' and 'divergence of ideas/values'**

As part of the procedure adopted in this study, subjects were asked not only to say what they decided to do (strategy) but also to justify why they took that decision. It is believed that not only the strategies but also the justifications for the strategies adopted give an important indication of autonomy-related issues.

The justifications offered for the strategies used in conflicts involving 'parental interference' and 'divergence of ideas/values' were also investigated through content analysis. The three most frequent types of strategies reported in section iii, i.e. 'follow own decision/wishes', 'dialogue/try to convince' and 'give in', were selected for this analysis. The categories of justification were defined together with two other coders after reading all subjects' responses. Twenty-one main categories of justification were identified. Examples of each justification category are shown in Appendix 6D. Table 6.7 presents the percentage of justifications offered as a function of age and gender. Considering the number of categories of justification identified, only descriptive statistics are provided.

One can see from Table 6.7 that some types of justification offered varied according to the type of strategy adopted. More individual justifications, i.e. justifications involving primarily the self, were offered for the strategy
'follow own decision/wishes' which was also the most individual of all the strategies. The most frequent justifications for this type of strategy were 'personal satisfaction', 'personal convictions' and 'right to choose/decide'. As far as the strategy 'dialogue' is concerned, even though it is more interpersonal than the first strategy, the focus of justifications was also primarily the self. The most frequent justifications involved 'defend personal convictions', 'personal satisfaction', as well as the popular expression 'dialogue is the best alternative', particularly in the 14-16 age group. Finally, Table 6.7 shows that for the strategy 'give in' the most frequent justification offered was 'to keep a nice atmosphere in the family' in both groups.

In contrast with the most frequent justifications offered for the first two types of strategies, in this case the most frequent justification involved family relationships. This contradicts our initial expectation that 'dependence' on parents would be the main reason for giving in. On the other hand, a significant proportion of the justifications in the 14-16 age group involved the feeling that there was no other alternative, which may be related to financial dependence on parents.
Table 6.7

Justifications offered for the strategies 'follow own decision/wishes', 'dialogue' and 'give in' by age and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justifications</th>
<th>Own decision 14-16</th>
<th>Dialogue 14-16</th>
<th>Dialogue 17-21</th>
<th>Give in 14-16</th>
<th>Give in 17-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal satisfaction</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows what wants/personal convictions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to choose/decide</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for independence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defend personal convictions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To keep a nice atmosphere in the family</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue is the best alternative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for parents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The thing was important</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impossibility of dialogue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels mature/responsible</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ counterarguments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not convincing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopes parents will change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels there was no other alternative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about parents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks parents were right</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of losing parental support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It brings personal benefits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The thing was not important</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much parental pressure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/not justified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In brackets the total number of conflicts.
DISCUSSION

The issues of parent-child conflict in this study centred on parental interference in different aspects of mid-adolescents' and college students' lives, such as their social life, academic/professional life, personality/behavioural style, sexuality, choice of relationships. With the exception of academic/professional life and sexuality, these findings give support to previous studies, reviewed by Montemayor (1990), which have reported that the majority of conflicts between parents and adolescents focuses on everyday, mundane family matters. The second most frequent issue was divergence of ideas/values with parents. This finding does not give support to Montemayor's (1990) view that parents and adolescents rarely argue over differences in attitudes or opinion. Even though they were much less frequent than conflicts involving parental interference, there was a significant proportion of conflicts involving divergence of opinion.

As far as age differences in the issues mentioned are concerned, the results of this study show that the areas of parental control seem to change with development. This gives support to the notion that changes in parent-child relations continue in mid- and late adolescence (Feldman and Gehring, 1988). But it is also interesting to note that some of these developmental trends were related to gender. Parental interference in social life, personality/behavioural style and decisions were more frequent in the younger group. Interference in choice of relationships and driving without a licence were more frequent in the
older group. When age trends were examined as a function of gender, significant age differences were found for social life, personality/behavioural style and 'choice of relationships' in the female group only.

Some significant gender differences were identified when the issues mentioned were examined for each age group separately. In the younger group, while females tended to mention more conflicts involving interference in social life than males, males tended to mention more conflicts involving interference in academic/professional life than females. In the older group, while females mentioned more conflicts involving choice of relationships and sexuality than males, males mentioned more conflicts involving driving without a licence and use of drugs than females. These age x gender interactions, together with those reported before, suggest that developmental changes in the issues of parent-child conflict from mid- to late adolescence should be considered as a function of gender. Some of the gender differences observed in this study support the findings reported in a sociological study of parent-child conflict in late adolescence, carried out with eight Brazilian families with young adults from 18-25 years of age. Salem (1980b) argued that the family themes of conflict are part of the "family project of biological and social reproduction". With the coming of adulthood, the success or failure of this project is put under test. She further argued that even though both sexes have equally important roles in the family project, the expectations are different for each one. For males the control is exerted mainly over their academic/professional lives whereas for females it focuses on sexuality and relationships. These two are seen as
equivalent, since it is mainly males who have the responsibility for preserving the family status, be it the son or the son-in-law. Therefore, the gender differences in the area of sexuality and in the academic/professional area found in the present study support Salem’s notion that there are different gender role expectations in Brazilian middle-class families.

In terms of the strategies adopted by both mid-adolescents and college students for the resolution of conflicts involving parental interference and divergence of ideas/values, 'follow own decisions' was the most frequent in both groups, followed by 'dialogue/try to convince' and 'give in'. This indicates that even though the subjects felt a high level of parental interference they could still exercise relative control over their lives, especially in areas such as their academic/ professional life. These findings contrast with Montemayor and Hanson’s (1985) findings. In their study carried out with adolescents they found that withdrawal was the main strategy used by adolescents for the resolution of conflicts with parents. These discrepancies may be due to cultural differences.

As for the strategies used in issues involving divergence of ideas/values, it is interesting to note the high frequency of the strategies 'dialogue/try to convince' and 'follow own decision/ wishes'. Contrary to the idea proposed by Montemayor (1990) that the way families deal with divergence of ideas is by ignoring them, this study supports the idea that these intergenerational differences are not ignored, at least in Brazilian middle-class
families, and that adolescents try to deal with them either through direct confrontation (dialogue) or by each time reaffirming his/her own ideas (follow own decisions/wishes).

As far as age differences in the use of strategies are concerned, it is important to note that 'give in' was more frequent in the younger (14-16) than in the older (17-21) group. This indicates developmental differences in terms of control over their lives in each group and in the use of strategies to deal with parental interference. The higher frequency of the strategy 'compromise' observed in the older group also suggests that more mutual strategies are used in late adolescence. Even though different factors may be involved in these transitions from mid- to late adolescence, one important aspect seems to be sociocognitive development. As indicated by Levya and Furth (1986), if cooperation is essential for reaching mature levels of development, then the ability to resolve conflicts through compromise ought to be positively correlated to moral development. The finding that there was a decrease in the use of the strategy 'give in' and an increase in the use of more mutual strategies gives support to Youniss and Smollar's (1985) claim that greater self agency tends to coexist alongside greater mutuality in parent-child relations.

Gender x age differences were found in relation to the use of the strategies 'follow own decisions/ wishes' and 'give in'. Significant age differences in the use of these strategies were found only for the female group. Older females used more the strategy 'follow own decision' than younger
females, whereas younger females used more the strategy 'give in' than older females. The fact that no significant developmental differences were observed in the use of these strategies in the male group could be interpreted in terms of there being different orientations towards autonomy according to gender.

Gilligan (1982, 1988) interpreted gender differences in the way the self-concept is constructed as being a function of differences in their experiences in relationships throughout child development. This is also the position held by psychoanalytic theory (Chodorow, 1978). Since girls identify with their mothers, to whom they are attached, their self-concept is constructed through the experience of connectedness. Boys, on the other hand, are more strongly attached to their mothers but have to identify with their fathers, so their self-concept is constructed through the experience of separation and differentiation.

Having discussed the strategies of conflict resolution used by adolescents in this study, one should now concentrate on the justifications offered for the most frequent strategies adopted, i.e. 'follow own decisions', 'dialogue' and 'give in'. The results show that the types of justification offered were related to the types of strategies used. The focus of the justifications offered for 'follow own decisions' was clearly hedonistic, involving primarily the self. In the strategy 'dialogue' there was also a certain degree of hedonistic justifications, together with the wish to defend personal convictions. The most interesting finding, however, concerned the justifications offered for the strategy 'give in'. It was expected that dependence on parents would be the
main reason for giving in. However, in both groups the most frequent justification was 'to keep a nice atmosphere in the family', an interpersonally oriented justification. These findings point to the need of a systemic and dynamic view of parent-adolescent conflict.

Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark (1973) suggested that the individual is bound to two opposite movements during development, one towards autonomy and the other towards loyalty commitments. As far as the development of autonomy is concerned, some research findings suggest that individuation in adolescence is facilitated not by detachment but by attachment to parents (Ryan and Lynch, 1989). Attachment is seen as a context of emotional support which enables the development of autonomy (Bretherton, 1987). Drawing on Elkind's (1979) notion of implicit contracts of mutual obligations between parents and children, it is the parents' duty to give support to their children and it is children's duty to give something back in terms of responsibility. These "contracts of mutual obligations" or the "project of biological and social reproduction", to use the sociological frame of reference (Salem, 1980b), remain throughout life in the form of invisible loyalties between family members (Boszormenyi-Nagy and Spark, 1973) and serve to keep the family homeostasis.

A final point should be made concerning the association found between some types of strategy and the issue that was the focus of the conflict situation. For example, in situations involving parental interference in social
life and in personality/behavioural style, 'follow own decision/wishes' tended to be less frequently used. It was most prominent in conflicts involving parental interference in academic/professional life. It is also interesting to note that 'give in' was very infrequent in situations involving divergence of ideas/values. 'Dialogue' tended to be the most frequent strategy in the latter type of conflict. These findings suggest that there are some areas which are more likely to be seen by adolescents as under their personal jurisdiction, which makes it probably easier for them to exercise control over. The findings are in fact consistent with those reported in recent studies (e.g. Smetana, 1988), showing that instead of being a global construct, parental authority seems to be context-dependent, i.e. instead of rejecting parental authority altogether, adolescents may consider parental authority as legitimate in some areas, while they may question its legitimacy in others.

In order to further examine the question of whether adolescents' perception of personal jurisdiction depends on the issue involved, another study was designed in which adolescents' views on parental interference in some of the situations reported in the present study were assessed. It was felt that parents' views on the same issues should also be examined, as recent studies (Smetana, 1989b) have shown that parent-child conflict may be due to discrepant views on the issues over which conflict occurs. The results of this study will be reported in the next chapter.
CHAPTER VII

AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN PARENTS AND ADOLESCENTS: WHAT PARENTS SHOULDN'T INTERFERE IN?

INTRODUCTION

The findings from the study reported in the previous chapter showed that when asked to mention moral conflict situations involving the parents, most mid-adolescents and late adolescents described situations involving parental interference in different areas such as social life, academic/professional life, personality/behavioural style, choice of relationships, etc. In addition, developmental trends from mid- to late adolescence were observed in the use of strategies of conflict resolution. The results indicated that compared to mid-adolescents, late adolescents were less likely to give in and were able to use more mutual strategies, such as compromise, in the conflict situations.

Another important finding concerned the association between some types of strategy and the issues that were the focus of the conflict situations. In issues such as 'social life', more self-related strategies ('follow own
decision/ wishes') were infrequently mentioned by either age group. Conversely, they were frequently used in conflicts involving 'academic/professional life'. In conflicts involving 'personality/behavioural style', the strategy 'follow own decision/wishes' was infrequently used by the older group, while the strategy 'give in' was frequently used. In conflicts involving 'divergence of ideas/values', the second most frequent issue of conflict after parental interference, the strategy 'give in' was very infrequently used. These findings suggest that adolescents appear to retain parental authority in some areas, whilst challenging it in other areas.

A number of studies have shown that children's perception of power and control increases during adolescence (Hunter and Youniss, 1982; Steinberg and Hill, 1978; Jacob, 1974; Steinberg, 1981; Selman, 1980; Pipp, Shaver, Jennings, Lamborn and Fischer, 1985; Youniss and Smollar, 1985; Feldman and Gehring, 1988). A significant change in parent-child relationships in adolescence seems to be the shift from a complementary relationship, characteristic of childhood, in which the child obeys in exchange for parental love and support, to a reciprocal relationship, in which obedience is still considered as necessary but is subject to negotiation instead of meaning submission to authority (Youniss, 1980).

As shown by Smetana (1988), the problem with most of these studies is that they have treated parental authority as a unitary construct. This was also
the view taken by Piaget (1932), who assumed that children would have a unilateral view of adult authority. In psychoanalytic theory (Freud, 1905; A. Freud, 1958; Blos, 1967) parental authority is also viewed as a global construct. One of the major steps in superego development in adolescence is assumed to be the relinquishing of parental authority. However, recent research findings have shown that children's and adolescents' conceptions of parental authority are differentiated according to the type of situation involved (Laupa and Turiel, 1986; Tisak, 1976; Smetana, 1988). Studies which have concentrated on children's conceptions of the legitimacy of parental authority have shown that children as young as 6 years of age judge parental authority as more legitimate in some situations than in others. In a study carried out by Tisak (1986), 6-, 8- and 10-year-olds were asked to make judgments about transgressions concerning stealing, chores and friendship. They regarded parental rules about both stealing and chores as more obligatory than rules regarding friendship choices. Issues such as friendship choice tend to be typically considered as under personal jurisdiction, beyond societal regulation and moral concern, and are considered as part of the personal domain (Nucci, 1981). Acts pertaining to the personal domain are assumed to be qualitatively different from those pertaining to the moral or conventional domain. The moral domain concerns rights and welfare of others, while the conventional domain is based on arbitrary and agreed-upon behavioural uniformities that structure social interactions in social systems (Turiel, 1979, 1983).

As far as conceptions of parental authority during adolescence are
concerned, the findings of a study carried out with adolescents and their parents (Smetana, 1988) revealed shifts in parents’ and children’s conceptions of parental authority in the transition to adolescence, but these shifts were differentiated according to the conceptual domain. They were especially evident in personal or multifaceted issues (issues pertaining to more than one domain). Whereas adolescents questioned the legitimacy of parental authority over personal issues, they judged that parental authority over moral and conventional issues should be retained.

An interesting finding from Smetana’s (1988) study was that, unlike adolescents’, parents’ reasoning regarding personal issues did not increase as their children moved through adolescence. This finding may have important implications for our understanding of parent-child conflict in adolescence. As Smetana herself argued, increases in parent-child conflict in early adolescence reported in the literature may be a result of adolescents’ and parents’ differing conceptions of the legitimacy of parental authority over some issues.

In another study carried out with parents and adolescents, Smetana (1989b) assessed parents’ and adolescents’ views of actual family conflict. Her findings supported the hypothesis that parent-child conflict is a result of different meanings ascribed to conflict situations. While parents tended to reason about these conflict issues in conventional terms (i.e. by reference to authority, customs), adolescents tended to view these situations as personal matters.
The present study aims to shed further light on the relationship of moral development to parent-child conflict in adolescence. In the studies reported in the previous chapters, sociocognitive changes during adolescence were assessed essentially through adolescents' judgments. However, the findings of the above mentioned studies have highlighted the importance of relating sociocognitive changes to changing patterns of family relations in adolescence. These studies have suggested that parents of adolescents face a parallel social-cognitive reorganization as their children grow older, but that their course of development may be disjunctive, with adolescents viewing themselves as having more authority over certain issues than parents (Smetana, 1988).

In the present study, the perceptions of fathers, mothers and their mid-adolescent children about the extent to which parents should interfere in some potentially conflicting everyday situations are examined. Based on the findings of the studies mentioned before, it was hypothesized that both parents and children's judgments would differ according to the type of situation. It was predicted that they would agree more with parental interference in situations of potential harm either to the adolescent, to the parents or to others. In addition, it was predicted that they would disagree with parental interference in situations seen as under personal jurisdiction. In view of the finding that parents' and adolescents' views may be discrepant during adolescence, with children viewing more issues as under personal jurisdiction than parents (Smetana, 1988), it was also hypothesized that there would be discrepancy
between parents' and children's views over personal or multifaceted (pertaining to more than one domain) issues.

Apart from the perceptions regarding parental interference in the situations presented, parents' and adolescents' perceptions of the extent to which these situations would generate conflict in the case of their particular family were also assessed. This question aimed to check the extent to which parents and children have similar perceptions on the types of issues that may generate conflict.
METHOD

Design

A group of fourteen mid-adolescents (15-16) and their parents were interviewed. They were presented with 31 potentially conflictual situations written in cards. Four main variables were considered in this study: i) the level of agreement with parental interference in each situation; ii) the justifications offered for agreement or disagreement with parental interference in each situation; iii) the level of parent-child discord each situation would generate; and iv) the justifications offered for high or low discord in each situation.

Subjects

Fourteen middle-class families, comprising fathers, mothers and adolescent children of 15-16 years of age (7 females and 7 males) took part in the study. Twelve of these had at least three children, one had four and the other had five. In addition, twelve out of the fourteen adolescents who took part in the study had older siblings and the other two were the oldest child in the family. The mothers’ mean age was 45.1 (s.d.=3.7) and the fathers’ mean age was 48.5 (s.d.=4.5). Eight mothers and eight fathers had attended university. Twelve fathers and ten mothers had completed secondary education. The families were contacted through students from the university to which the investigator belongs in Porto Alegre, Brazil, who helped to find families who
met the following basic criteria: i) the families should be intact; ii) they should have at least one son or one daughter with 15-16 years of age; and iii) the adolescents should attend private schools. The latter criterion was a means of controlling for socioeconomic level.

**Materials**

A semi-structured interview was used. Subjects were presented with 31 cards describing situations which usually generate disagreement between parents and adolescents (see Appendix 7A for a list of the situations used). These situations were extracted from the conflict situations mentioned by adolescents in the previous study (see Chapter VI). Some of them are also the situations described in the literature as the most frequent issues in parent-adolescent conflict, such as choice of friends, boyfriend/girlfriend, profession, studies, personality/behavioural style, health, etc. (see Montemayor, 1990). Issues such as sex, politics, religion, drugs, reported in the literature as less frequent, were also included in this study.

The cards describing the situations were presented one at a time. Initially, the subject was asked to indicate, on a 4-point scale, the extent to which he/she agreed or disagreed with parental interference in each of the situations. The subject was asked to sort the cards into four piles (1=Disagree; 2=Disagree a little bit; 3=Agree a little bit; 4=Agree). Once the sorting of all situations was over, the subject was asked to justify his/her answers and
then we went on to the next question. The cards were shuffled and the same cards were presented again. This time the subject was asked to sort the situations according to the level of discord they would generate. He/she was presented with 4 piles (1= No discord; 2= Little discord; 3= Some discord; 4= Much discord). Once they had finished the sorting, they were asked to justify their answers. It is important to note that the number of sortings differed for adolescents and parents. In the last question, instead of one sorting, the adolescents had to do two sortings: one assessing the level of discord with their fathers and the other with their mothers. After finishing the interview subjects were asked to answer a brief questionnaire asking for personal information and assessing parent-child relationship and closeness. A full description of the instructions given to adolescents and their parents is presented in Appendix 7B.

**Procedure**

The family was first contacted by telephone and after they had all agreed to take part an appointment was made with the family. Each family member (father, mother and adolescent child) was interviewed individually on the same day. The interview was taped and had a duration of 40-60 minutes.
RESULTS

Two sets of analysis were performed, one on the quantitative data (sortings) and the other on the qualitative data (justifications). This section is divided into four parts. The first part examines subjects’ responses to the first sorting task, i.e. level of agreement with parental interference in each situation. The second focuses on the justifications offered for the sortings according to the level of agreement with parental interference in the situations presented. The third presents subjects’ responses to the second sorting task, i.e. level of discord each situation would generate in the case of their particular family. Finally, the fourth examines the justifications offered for the sortings according to the level of discord the situations presented would generate.

i) **Level of agreement with parental interference in each situation**

The aim of this section is to assess parents’ and children’s opinion about which situations parents should interfere in and which they shouldn’t. Possible discrepancies between parents’ and children’s views are important for understanding parent-adolescent conflict, since recent studies (e.g. Smetana, 1989) have indicated that it is related to discrepant views on everyday family issues.

Table 7.1 presents each family member’s mean sortings according to
the level of agreement with parental interference in each of the 31 situations presented.

The results gave support to the initial prediction that parents' and children's judgments would differ according to the type of situation. In fact, fathers', mothers', and children's answers were similar in many situations. They all tended to agree (means above 3) with parental interference in situations such as (8) 'driving without a licence', (11) 'not telling parents where one is going and when one is coming back', (16) 'not taking care of health', (17) 'using drugs', (19) 'being careless about studies or work', (22) 'getting pregnant', (24) 'saying one is going to see a friend and going to a party'. They all tended to disagree (means below 2) with parental interference in situations such as (2) 'going out with friends at night', (3) 'not joining parents in visits or gatherings when one doesn't feel like it', (4) 'not following parents' religion', (9) 'choosing a profession not valued by parents' and (21) 'adhering to a different political party'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>F-Values</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>F-Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Going out with friends at night</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Not joining parents in family gatherings</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Not following parents’ religion</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Listening to loud music</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Having a boy/girlfriend from another social class</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Leaving the bedroom untidy</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Driving without a licence</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Choosing a profession not valued by parents</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Having sex with boyfriend/girlfriend and the time one is coming back</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Not telling where one is going and the time one is coming back</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Wearing clothes parents do not approve of</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Not getting together on special occasions</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Associating with people parents do not approve of</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Buying unnecessary things</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Not taking care of one’s health</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Using drugs</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Travelling with boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Being careless about studies or work</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Inviting strangers home</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Adhering to a different political party</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Getting pregnant</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Getting home late at weekends</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Saying one is going to see a friend and going to a party</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Going out several times on week days</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Not taking care of one’s physical appearance</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Getting home late on week days</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1

Means, standard deviations (in brackets) and F-values obtained from the analysis of the level of agreement with parental interference in each situation as a function of the family member (for all subjects) and gender (for children only).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>F-Values</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>F-Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 Spending more time with friends</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Having a boy/girlfriend of another ethnic group</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>(.8)</td>
<td>(.8)</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Not taking notice of parents' advices</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td>(.9)</td>
<td>(.4)</td>
<td>(.4)</td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td>(.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Arguing with siblings</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td>(.9)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Not helping in domestic activities</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.6)</td>
<td>(.8)</td>
<td>(.6)</td>
<td>(.4)</td>
<td>(.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a = p < .05; \ b = p < .01; \ c = p < .001; \ z = p < .08 \)

The higher the mean, the more subjects agreed with parental interference.

In order to examine the situations in which there was discrepancy between parents' and children's evaluations a one way analyses of variance was performed for each situation. Due to the number of statistical tests performed, the significance criterion is set at .01, and .05 significance only suggests a tendency towards significance. Some significant differences related to parental interference emerged, involving issues such as (12) 'wearing clothes parents do not approve of' \( (F=8.3, \ d.f.=2, 41, p < .001) \), (14) 'associating with people parents do not approve of' \( (F=7.5, \ d.f.=2, 41, p < .01) \). A trend towards significance was also observed in situations (6) 'having a boyfriend/girlfriend from another social class' \( (F=5.1, \ d.f.=2, 41, p < .02) \), (7) 'leaving the bedroom untidy' \( (F=3.3, \ d.f.=2, 41, p < .05) \), and (17) 'using drugs' \( (F=3.9, \ d.f.=2, 41, p < .05) \). Marginally significant differences were observed in situations (9) 'choosing a profession not valued by parents' \( (F=3.1, \ d.f.=2, 41, p < .06) \), (10) 'having sex with boyfriend/girlfriend' \( (F=2.6, \ d.f.=2, 41, p < .09) \), (23) 'getting home late at weekends' \( (F=3.1, \ d.f.=2, 41, p < .06) \) and (26) 'not taking care of one's physical appearance' \( (F=2.7, \ d.f.=2, 41, p < .09) \). Parents' mean scores
tended to be higher than adolescents' mean scores in all these situations, except in situation 17, i.e. parents tended to agree more with parental interference than children. Selected comparisons between means were carried out using the Tukey Test. The results indicated that both fathers' and mothers' scores were significantly higher than children's scores at the .05 level in the situations (6) 'having a boyfriend/ girlfriend from another social class' and (14) 'associating with people parents do not approve of'. In the situations (12) 'wearing clothes parents do not approve of' and (23) 'getting home late at weekends' only fathers' scores were significantly higher than children's scores. In the situation (17) 'using drugs' both mothers' and children's scores were higher than fathers' scores. The other comparisons revealed no two groups significantly different at .05 level.

Since some of these situations depict characteristics usually related to sex roles representations, a second analysis was carried out to check for gender differences in adolescents' responses only. The children's mean scores by gender are also presented in Table 7.1.

From Table 7.1 one can see that males' and females' scores tended to be similar in most situations. In order to test for gender differences, oneway analyses of variance were carried out for each situation. Significant gender differences were found in situation (10) 'having sex with boyfriend/ girlfriend' (F=22.7, d.f.=1, 41, p <.001). A trend towards significance was observed in situations (12) 'wearing clothes parents do not approve of' (F=4.5, d.f.=1, 41,
p < .05) and (18) 'travelling with boyfriend/girlfriend' (F = 6.0, d.f. = 1, 41, p < .05). Marginally significant differences were found in situation (28) 'spending more time with friends or boyfriend/girlfriend than with parents' (F = 4.2, d.f. = 1, 41, p < .07). In all these situations females' scores tended to be higher than males' scores, i.e. they tended to agree more with parental interference. These results suggest that males assumed a more independent position than females.
ii) Justifications offered for the sortings according to the level of agreement with parental interference

In order to examine the justifications offered for agreeing or disagreeing with parental interference in the situations presented, a content analysis was performed on the subjects' responses. The justification categories used were adopted from coding schemes employed in previous research (Smetana, 1989b). The categories are presented in Table 7.2. They were further collapsed into domains, i.e. moral, conventional, psychological, personal or prudential/pragmatic. Justifications concerning others' welfare, obligation, fairness/reciprocity were labelled **moral**. Those involving authority, custom/norm, role duties and responsibility were called **conventional**. Those involving interpersonal issues such as affection, divergence of opinion, etc. and those appealing to psychological-dispositional characteristics or egoistic reasons were seen as **psychological**. As in Smetana's (1989b) study, two other aspects of the psychological domain were considered separately, the **personal**, involving issues of personal choice and autonomy seeking, and the **prudential/pragmatic**, involving issues of personal comfort or health, as well as practical implications of the act. The reason why these aspects were considered separately is because they tend to be significant in parent-child conflict in adolescence.
Table 7.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MORAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ welfare</td>
<td>Appeal to the negative consequences of the act on other people, including parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness/reciprocity</td>
<td>Reference to maintain a balance of rights between people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligation</td>
<td>References to feelings of obligation, including personal conscience, trust and duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVENTIONAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to authority</td>
<td>Appeal to the approval of specific authority figures or to the existence of rules or laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role duties</td>
<td>Appeal to role-related duties (e.g. father, child)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural/not natural</td>
<td>References to the fact that the act is natural/not natural, that all adolescents do it/don’t do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom/norm</td>
<td>Appeal to personal, family and peer-group customs, as well as to social customs and traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Appeal to the need for the child to be responsible for his/her own behaviour or to the importance of developing a sense of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jargons</td>
<td>Use of popular expressions with no further reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Appeals to friendship, interpersonal relationships, affective bonds, divergence of opinion or to the effects of acts on interpersonal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cont.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parents' and children's justifications for agreeing or disagreeing with parental interference were analyzed based on the justification categories presented in Table 7.2, together with two other coders. Separate analyses were carried out for each level of agreement, i.e. 'agree', 'agree a bit', 'disagree a bit' and 'disagree'. In order to check the predominant justifications offered for each level of agreement, the proportion of responses in each level was calculated for each family member (father, mother and child). The mean proportion of each justification category is presented in Table 7.3, as a function of the family member and of the level of agreement with parental interference.
Table 7.3
Mean proportion and standard deviation (in brackets) of each justification category as a function of the level of agreement with parental interference and the family member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family member</th>
<th>Justification Category</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree a little bit</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree a little bit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of agreement parental interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree a little bit</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree a little bit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>.22(.36)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>.39(.40)</td>
<td>.07(.18)</td>
<td>.10(.17)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.07(.27)</td>
<td>.55(.39)</td>
<td>.76(.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>.16(.22)</td>
<td>.13(.19)</td>
<td>.11(.29)</td>
<td>.14(.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>.31(.28)</td>
<td>.34(.42)</td>
<td>.27(.37)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>.11(.27)</td>
<td>.05(.12)</td>
<td>.02(.09)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>.40(.40)</td>
<td>.25(.38)</td>
<td>.17(.36)</td>
<td>.09(.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.44(.48)</td>
<td>.65(.44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>.07(.15)</td>
<td>.12(.27)</td>
<td>.16(.36)</td>
<td>.11(.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>.34(.40)</td>
<td>.22(.37)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>.17(.23)</td>
<td>.06(.15)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>.41(.32)</td>
<td>.10(.19)</td>
<td>.09(.27)</td>
<td>.07(.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01(.04)</td>
<td>.88(.28)</td>
<td>.83(.23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>.07(.16)</td>
<td>.15(.31)</td>
<td>.02(.09)</td>
<td>.10(.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>.34(.35)</td>
<td>.31(.41)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 7.3 one can see that in all three groups (fathers, mothers and children) there was a predominance of conventional and prudential justifications in situations in which they agreed either totally or partially with parental interference.

Informal inspection of subjects' responses revealed that as far as conventional justifications are concerned, some qualitative differences between parents and children were observed. Parents emphasized more 'role duties' or 'custom/norm' justifications whereas children focused more on 'responsibility'. Also 'authority' justifications were only emphasized by children.
Table 7.1 indicates that moral justifications were offered mainly when there was total agreement with parental interference. Informal inspection of this justification category showed that their predominant focus was 'others' welfare' and feelings of 'obligation/trust'.

Another interesting finding to be highlighted from a qualitative analysis of the data is that when agreeing with parental interference, parents and children, but especially parents, tended to make comments such as "these are serious" or "that would be terrible". For situations in which there was partial agreement, many parents and children also said that they thought parents should talk to their children in those situations but not quarrel.

Oneway analyses of variance were employed in order to compare fathers', mothers' and children's justifications when they agreed with parental interference either totally ('agree') or partially ('agree a little bit'), as presented in Table 7.3. No significant differences were found at the .01 level.

One interesting finding was the high proportion of adolescents' conventional justifications (.41) when they agreed with parental interference, which was even greater than mothers' (.27). This indicates that they were probably identified with parental authority when answering this question.

As far as justifications for disagreeing with parental interference are concerned ('disagree a little bit' and 'disagree'), there was much less
variability of responses, with a clear tendency towards personal justifications (see Table 7.3). Informal inspection of the responses showed that they focused mainly on matters of 'personal choice', with very few 'autonomy/individuation' issues. Associated with personal justifications were also frequent comments that those situations were "not serious", that they were "simple things". As far as differences between parents and children are concerned, it is interesting to stress that only mothers mentioned prudential justifications for 'disagree a little bit'.

Oneway analyses of variance performed for each category ('disagree' and 'disagree a little bit') revealed a trend towards significance in the mean proportion of personal justifications for 'disagree a little bit' ($F= 4.8, d.f.=2, 41, p <.02)$. Selected comparisons using the Tukey Test revealed that the mean proportion of fathers' and mothers' personal justifications was significantly lower than children's at the .05 level.

These findings suggest that parents and children tended to disagree with parental interference in situations which tended to be seen as a matter of personal choice.
iii) **Level of parent-child discord each situation would generate**

While the previous section dealt with parents' and children's more generic views on which situations parents should or shouldn't interfere in, this section focuses on the level of discord each situation would generate in the case of each particular family. The level of discord generated is analyzed both from parents' and children's perspective. The effect of the child's gender on subjects' responses is also examined.

Table 7.4 presents each family member's mean sortings according to the level of discord each of the 31 situations presented would generate. While parents were requested to do only one sorting, children were requested to do two, one for father and the other for mother.

As can be see from Table 7.4, parents and children seemed to have a fairly similar perception of what would generate discord in the case of their particular family. In fact one can see that most situations in which parents and children tended to agree with parental interference (see section i) were also considered to generate high level of discord (means above 3), such as for example, situation (8) 'driving without a licence', (11) 'not telling where one is going and when one is coming back', (17) 'using drugs', (19) 'being careless about studies or work', (22) 'getting pregnant' and (24) 'saying one is going to see a friend and going to a party'. Similarly, those situations in which they
tended to disagree with parental interference were judged to generate low level of discord (means below 2), such as situation (2) 'going out with friends at night', (3) 'not joining parents in visits or gatherings', (4) 'not following parents' religion', (9) 'choosing a profession not valued by parents' and (21) 'adhering to a different political party'.

**Table 7.4**

Means, standard deviations (in brackets) and F-values obtained from the analysis of the level of discord each situation would generate from the father's and the child's perspective, and from the mother's and the child's perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Father w/father</th>
<th>Child w/father F-value</th>
<th>Mother w/mother</th>
<th>Child w/mother F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Going out with friends at night</td>
<td>1.4 (.6)</td>
<td>1.4 (.6)</td>
<td>1.6 (.7)</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Not joining parents in family gatherings</td>
<td>1.7 (.7)</td>
<td>.0 (.7)</td>
<td>1.4 (.7)</td>
<td>1.7 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Not following parents' religion</td>
<td>1.4 (.6)</td>
<td>1.6 (.9)</td>
<td>1.5 (.7)</td>
<td>1.6 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Listening to loud music</td>
<td>2.0 (.7)</td>
<td>2.0 (.8)</td>
<td>1.8 (.7)</td>
<td>2.0 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Having a boy/girlfriend from another social class</td>
<td>2.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>1.6 (.9)</td>
<td>2.2 (.7)</td>
<td>1.7 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Leaving the bedroom untidy</td>
<td>2.4 (.8)</td>
<td>1.6 (.6)</td>
<td>2.6 (.8)</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Driving without a licence</td>
<td>3.7 (.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (.7)</td>
<td>3.8 (.6)</td>
<td>3.3 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Choosing a profession not valued by parents</td>
<td>1.3 (.5)</td>
<td>1.6 (.5)</td>
<td>1.4 (.6)</td>
<td>1.8 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Having sex with boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>2.8 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.6 (.4)</td>
<td>3.0 (.6)</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Not telling where one is going and when one is coming back</td>
<td>3.4 (.6)</td>
<td>2.8 (.9)</td>
<td>3.8 (.6)</td>
<td>3.1 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Wearing clothes parents do not approve of</td>
<td>2.1 (.8)</td>
<td>2.1 (.0)</td>
<td>1.9 (.9)</td>
<td>1.9 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Not getting together on special occasions</td>
<td>2.4 (.8)</td>
<td>2.6 (.9)</td>
<td>2.5 (.1)</td>
<td>2.9 (.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Associating with people parents do not approve of</td>
<td>3.2 (.5)</td>
<td>2.5 (.5)</td>
<td>3.0 (.6)</td>
<td>2.6 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Buying unnecessary things</td>
<td>1.5 (.8)</td>
<td>1.7 (.9)</td>
<td>1.4 (.6)</td>
<td>1.8 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Not taking care of one's health</td>
<td>3.1 (.7)</td>
<td>2.5 (.0)</td>
<td>3.4 (.7)</td>
<td>3.0 (.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Using drugs</td>
<td>3.8 (.4)</td>
<td>4.0 (.0)</td>
<td>3.9 (.8)</td>
<td>4.0 (.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Travelling with boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>2.6 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.5 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.3 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Being careless about studies or work</td>
<td>3.4 (.7)</td>
<td>3.3 (.6)</td>
<td>3.6 (.6)</td>
<td>3.3 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Inviting strangers home</td>
<td>2.1 (.9)</td>
<td>2.0 (.8)</td>
<td>3.6 (.6)</td>
<td>3.3 (.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cont
In order to check whether there were any significant differences between parents' and children's responses one way analyses of variance were performed for each situation. As far as differences between fathers' and children's evaluations are concerned significant differences were found in situation (7) 'leaving the bedroom untidy' (F=7.7, d.f.=1, 27, p <.01). A trend towards significance was identified in situation (14) 'associating with people parents do not approve of' (F=6.7, d.f.=1, 27, p <.05). Marginally significant differences were also found in situations (11) 'not telling parents where one is going and when one is coming back' (F=3.9, d.f.=1, 27, p <.06) and (31) 'arguing with siblings' (F=3.4, d.f.=1, 27, p <.08). In all these situations fathers' scores were higher than children's scores. As for differences between

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Father w/father</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Mother w/mother</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adhering to a different political party</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting pregnant</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting home late at weekends</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saying one is going to see a friend and going to a party</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out several times on week days</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not taking care of one's physical appearance</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting home late on week days</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending more time with friends or boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a boy/girlfriend of another ethnic group</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not taking notice of parents' advices</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguing with siblings</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not helping in domestic activities</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a = p <.05; b = p <.01; c = p <.001; z = p .10

The higher the mean, the greater the level of discord the situation would generate.
mothers' and children's evaluations, oneway analyses of variance performed on mothers' and children's responses indicated significant differences in situation (11) 'not telling where one is going and when one is coming back' (F=9.3, d.f.=1, 27, p < .01). Marginally significant differences were found in situations (8) 'driving without a licence' (F=3.0, d.f.=1, 27, p < .10), (14) 'associating with people parents do not approve of' (F=3.3, d.f.=1, 27, p < .09) and (26) 'not taking care of one's physical appearance' (F=3.5, d.f.=1, 27, p < .08). Mothers' scores were higher than children's scores in all of these situations.

Taken together, these results suggest that compared to parents children tended to underestimate the level of discord the situations would generate. They also indicate that there seem to be some areas which are seen by both parents and adolescents as the adolescent's prerogative and are therefore less likely to generate conflict, whereas other are clearly likely to generate conflict. However, contrary to expectations, the situations in which there was divergence of opinion between parents and children regarding parental interference reported in the previous section were not associated with high level of conflict. This gives support to the hypothesis that parent-adolescent conflict occurs mainly over minor, but persistent issues.

The analysis also intended to examine gender differences in subjects' responses. Gender differences were assessed both according to adolescents' and parents' judgements. As far as adolescents are concerned the question
examined was whether judgments differed according to the adolescents' gender. Since they had to make two judgements of the level of discord each situation would generate, one for fathers and the other for mothers, the parent involved was also part of the analysis. The mean levels of discord are presented in Table 7.5, as a function of adolescents' gender and the parent involved. A 2 x 2 (gender x parent) analysis of variance was performed for each situation with the last variable as repeated measure.

As can be seen from Table 7.5, females' and males' responses tended to be similar in many situations. However, there were significant main effects for gender in some situations such as (10) 'having sex with boyfriend/girlfriend' (F=96.3, d.f.=1, 12, p <.001) and (18) 'travelling with boyfriend/girlfriend' (F=34.2, d.f.=1, 12, p <.001). A trend towards significance was observed in situation (6) 'having a boyfriend/girlfriend from another social class' (F=5.4, d.f.=1, 12, p <.04). In all of these situations females' scores were greater than males'. This indicates that compared to boys girls tended to see these situations as generating higher level of discord with both fathers and mothers. Significant main effects for parent were found for situations (7) 'leaving the bedroom untidy' (F=21.0, d.f.=1, 12, p <.001), (28) 'spending more time with friends or boyfriend/girlfriend than with parents' (F=9.8, d.f.=1, 12, p <.01). A trend towards significance was observed in situation (19) 'being careless about studies or work' (F=4.8, d.f.=1, 12, p <.05), and (32) 'not helping in domestic activities' (F=6.8, d.f.=1, 12, p <.05).
Table 7.5
Means and standard deviations (in brackets) obtained from the analysis of the level of discord each situation would generate from the child's perspective as a function of child's gender and the parent involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Child w/father</th>
<th>Child w/mother</th>
<th>F-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (M)</td>
<td>Male (F)</td>
<td>Gender (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent (P)</td>
<td>GxP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Going out with friends at night</td>
<td>1.5 (.8)</td>
<td>1.2 (.4)</td>
<td>.2 .4 .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Not joining parents in visits or gatherings</td>
<td>1.8 (.9)</td>
<td>2.0 (.8)</td>
<td>1.4 .5 .9 .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Not following parents' religion</td>
<td>1.7 (.7)</td>
<td>1.4 (1.1)</td>
<td>1.6 .1 .0 .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Listening to music loudly</td>
<td>1.8 (.7)</td>
<td>2.1 (.9)</td>
<td>.5 .0 .0 .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Having a boy/girlfriend</td>
<td>2.1 (1.1)</td>
<td>2.1 (1.2)</td>
<td>5.4 a 1.0 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Leaving the bedroom untidy</td>
<td>1.4 (.5)</td>
<td>1.7 (.7)</td>
<td>.8 21.0 c .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Driving without a licence</td>
<td>3.6 (.8)</td>
<td>3.3 (1.1)</td>
<td>.1 .4 .4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Choosing a profession not valued by parents</td>
<td>1.8 (.4)</td>
<td>1.4 (.5)</td>
<td>1.8 .1 .6 .6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Having sex with boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>4.0 (.0)</td>
<td>1.3 (.5)</td>
<td>3.7 1.6 96.3 c .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Not telling where one is going and when one is coming back</td>
<td>3.1 (.7)</td>
<td>2.6 (.9)</td>
<td>.7 3.7 s 3.7 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Wearing clothes parents do not approve of</td>
<td>2.3 (1.9)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.1)</td>
<td>.0 1.2 .1 .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Not getting together on special occasions</td>
<td>2.8 (.9)</td>
<td>2.3 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.1 .4 2.0 .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Associating with people parents do not approve of</td>
<td>2.7 (.8)</td>
<td>2.3 (1.1)</td>
<td>.5 2.7 1.1 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Buying unnecessary things</td>
<td>1.4 (.5)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.1)</td>
<td>.6 1.2 .1 .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Not taking care of one's health</td>
<td>2.1 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (1.2)</td>
<td>.6 7.3 a 3.7 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Using drugs</td>
<td>4.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>4.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>.0 .0 .0 .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Travelling with boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>3.6 (1.3)</td>
<td>3.1 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.1 .4 1.6 .3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Being careless about studies or work</td>
<td>3.1 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>.2 4.8 a .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Inviting strangers home</td>
<td>2.1 (.9)</td>
<td>1.8 (1.0)</td>
<td>.4 .9 .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Adhering to a different political party</td>
<td>1.1 (.4)</td>
<td>1.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>.0 .0 .0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Getting pregnant</td>
<td>4.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.1)</td>
<td>.0 .0 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Getting home late at weekends</td>
<td>2.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>1.7 (1.1)</td>
<td>.0 1.2 3.3 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Saying one is going to see a friend and going to a party</td>
<td>3.1 (1.1)</td>
<td>2.8 (1.1)</td>
<td>.0 4.7 s 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Going out several times on week days</td>
<td>3.1 (1.3)</td>
<td>2.8 (1.0)</td>
<td>1.7 .5 .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Not taking care of one's physical appearance</td>
<td>2.1 (.7)</td>
<td>2.4 (1.1)</td>
<td>.0 .9 .0 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Getting home late on week days</td>
<td>2.6 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (1.1)</td>
<td>.0 .1 .0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cont.
The higher the mean, the greater the level of discord the situation would generate.
with girls judging this situation to generate a higher level of discord than boys. In situation (16) 'not taking care of one's health' (F=3.7, d.f.=1, 12, p < .08), girls tended to differentiate more between fathers and mothers than boys, judging this situation to generate a higher level of discord with mothers than with fathers. Also gender differences appeared in subjects' mean scores for fathers but not for mothers. Compared to girls boys tended to say that this situation would generate a higher level of discord. In situation (18) 'travelling with boyfriend/ girlfriend' (F=4.2, d.f.=1, 12, p < .06) both girls and boys differentiated between fathers and mothers. However, the differences are in opposite directions. Girls tended to say that this situation would generate a higher level of discord with fathers than with mothers, whereas boys tended to say the opposite, i.e. that the situation would generate a higher level of discord with mothers. Finally, in situation (23) 'getting home late at weekends' (F=3.3, d.f.=1, 12, p < .10), girls differentiated more between fathers and mothers than boys, judging the situation to generate a higher level of discord with fathers than with mothers. In addition, girls' scores were higher than boys' when fathers were judged and boys' scores were higher than girls' when mothers were at focus.

The extent to which parents' judgements differed according to child's gender was also examined together with differences between fathers' and mothers' judgements. A 2 x 2 (child's gender x parent) analysis of variance was performed for each situation. Fathers' and mothers' mean scores are presented in Table 7.6 by child's gender.
Table 7.6
Means and standard deviations (in brackets) obtained from the analysis of the level of discord each situation would generate from father's and mother's perspective as a function of child's gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Father w/ child</th>
<th>Mother w/ child</th>
<th>F-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Male</td>
<td>Female Male</td>
<td>Gender Parent Gxp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Going out with friends at night</td>
<td>1.7 (1.7) 1.1 (1.4)</td>
<td>1.7 (1.9) 1.6 (1.5)</td>
<td>1.9 .7 .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Not joining parents in visits or gatherings</td>
<td>2.0 (1.8) 1.4 (1.2)</td>
<td>1.7 (1.9) 1.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>6.2a 1.9 .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Not following parents' religion</td>
<td>1.6 (1.8) 1.1 (1.4)</td>
<td>1.6 (1.8) 1.4 (1.8)</td>
<td>1.1 .3 .3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Listening to loud music</td>
<td>1.9 (1.7) 2.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>1.9 (1.7) 1.7 (1.7)</td>
<td>.1 .6 .6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Having a boy/girlfriend from another social class</td>
<td>2.3 (1.9) 1.7 (1.9)</td>
<td>2.4 (1.9) 2.0 (1.9)</td>
<td>1.9 .3 .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Leaving the bedroom untidy</td>
<td>2.6 (1.8) 2.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>2.9 (1.8) 2.4 (1.8)</td>
<td>1.8 .8 .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Driving without a licence</td>
<td>3.6 (1.5) 3.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.7 (1.7) 3.9 (1.7)</td>
<td>1.1 .1 .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Choosing a profession not valued by parents</td>
<td>1.3 (1.5) 1.4 (1.5)</td>
<td>1.3 (1.5) 1.6 (1.8)</td>
<td>.9 .1 .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Having sex with boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>3.7 (1.5) 1.9 (1.9)</td>
<td>3.7 (1.7) 2.3 (1.7)</td>
<td>34.5c .6 .6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Not telling where one is going and when one is coming back</td>
<td>3.6 (1.5) 3.3 (1.7)</td>
<td>4.0 (1.0) 3.6 (1.8)</td>
<td>2.4 2.4 .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Wearing clothes parents do not approve of</td>
<td>2.0 (1.6) 2.3 (1.9)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.0) 1.7 (1.0)</td>
<td>.0 .7 .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Not getting together on special occasions</td>
<td>2.9 (1.7) 2.0 (1.8)</td>
<td>2.6 (1.0) 2.4 (1.1)</td>
<td>2.1 .0 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Associating with people parents do not approve of</td>
<td>3.4 (1.8) 3.0 (1.8)</td>
<td>3.3 (1.7) 2.9 (1.7)</td>
<td>2.2 .2 .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Buying unnecessary things</td>
<td>1.4 (1.5) 1.7 (1.5)</td>
<td>1.7 (1.7) 1.1 (1.4)</td>
<td>.5 .5 4.1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Not taking care of one's health</td>
<td>3.1 (1.9) 3.0 (1.6)</td>
<td>3.3 (1.9) 3.6 (1.9)</td>
<td>.1 1.5 .5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Using drugs</td>
<td>3.9 (1.4) 3.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>4.0 (1.0) 3.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>.3 .3 .3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Travelling with boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>3.3 (1.7) 1.9 (1.2)</td>
<td>3.1 (1.2) 1.9 (1.2)</td>
<td>11.9b .0 .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Being careless about studies or work</td>
<td>3.7 (1.7) 3.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>3.6 (1.5) 3.7 (1.5)</td>
<td>.8 .8 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Inviting strangers home</td>
<td>2.3 (1.1) 1.9 (1.1)</td>
<td>1.6 (1.8) 1.9 (1.2)</td>
<td>.0 .8 .8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Adhering to a different political party</td>
<td>1.0 (1.0) 1.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>1.0 (1.0) 1.1 (1.0)</td>
<td>1.0 1.0 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Getting pregnant</td>
<td>3.6 (1.8) 3.4 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.7 (1.5) 4.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>.1 3.1s 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Getting home late at weekends</td>
<td>2.1 (1.7) 1.6 (1.5)</td>
<td>1.6 (1.5) 1.9 (1.1)</td>
<td>.2 .2 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Saying one is going to see a friend and going to a party</td>
<td>3.6 (1.5) 3.1 (1.8)</td>
<td>3.9 (1.5) 3.1 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.0s .2 .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Going out several times on week days</td>
<td>3.1 (1.7) 2.6 (1.0)</td>
<td>3.1 (1.7) 3.1 (1.1)</td>
<td>.7 .7 .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Not taking care of one's physical appearance</td>
<td>2.1 (1.7) 2.3 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.1 (1.7) 3.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>.0 9.0b .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Getting home late on week days</td>
<td>3.1 (1.7) 2.4 (1.0)</td>
<td>2.6 (1.0) 3.1 (1.2)</td>
<td>.0 .0 3.3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As can be seen from Table 7.6, fathers’ and mothers’ responses to girls and to boys tended to be similar in many situations. However, significant main effects for gender were obtained in situations (10) ‘having sex with boyfriend/girlfriend’ (F=34.5, d.f.=1, 24, p <.001), (18) ‘travelling with boyfriend/girlfriend’ (F=11.9, d.f.=1, 24, p <.01), and (28) ‘spending more time with friends or boyfriend/girlfriend’ (F=12.0, d.f.=1, 24, p <.01). A trend towards significance was observed in situations (3) ‘not joining parents in visits or gatherings’ (F=6.2, d.f.=1, 24, p <.05) and (32) ‘not helping in domestic activities’ (F=6.8, d.f.=1, 27, p <.05). Marginally significant differences were found in situations (24) ‘saying one is going to see a friend and going to a party’ (F=3.0, d.f.=1, 24, p <.10) and (29) ‘having a boyfriend/girlfriend of another ethnic group’ (F=3.0, d.f.=1, 24, p <.10). Both fathers and mothers judged these situations to generate higher level of discord when the child was a girl than when the child was a boy. These findings are consistent with the gender differences found in children’s judgements reported earlier. There was coincidence between parents’ and children’s judgements in
two situations, (10) and (18), both having to do with the child's sexuality. A significant main effect for parent was found in situation (26) 'not taking care of one's physical appearance' (F=9.0, d.f.=1, 24, p <.01). A marginally significant main effect was revealed in situation (22) 'getting pregnant' (F=3.1, d.f.=1, 24, p <.10). In both situations mothers' mean scores were higher than fathers'. Again parents' judgments were consistent with children's judgments reported earlier even though there was no coincidence in any specific situation. Finally, marginally significant interaction effects were revealed in two situations. In situation (15) 'buying unnecessary things' (F=4.1, d.f.=1, 24, p <.06), fathers of boys tended to say that this situation would generate a higher level of discord than fathers of girls. Conversely, mothers of girls tended to say that this situation would generate a higher level of discord than mothers of boys. In addition, whereas mothers of girls tended to judge the situations to generate a higher level of discord than fathers of girls, fathers of boys tended to judge the situations as generating a higher level of discord than fathers of girls. In situation (27) 'getting home late at weekends' (F=3.3, d.f.=1, 24, p <.09) fathers of girls tended to say that this situation would generate a higher level of discord than fathers of boys. Conversely, mothers of boys tended to judge this situation to generate more discord than mothers of girls. Finally, whereas fathers of girls' judgement of the level of discord generated by this situation was higher than mothers', mothers of boys' judgements were higher than fathers'.
iv) Justifications offered for the sortings according to the level of discord the situations would generate

In this section children's and parents' justifications offered for the sortings according to the level of discord is examined. A content analysis was performed on the data using a similar coding scheme to the one presented in Table 7.2. Justifications were coded as 'moral', 'conventional', 'psychological', 'personal' or 'prudential'.

Separate analyses were carried out for each level of discord, i.e. 'much discord', 'some discord', 'little discord' and 'no discord'. In order to check the predominant justifications offered for each level, the proportion of responses in each category was calculated for each family member (father, mother and child), as in section ii. Two other coders took part in the content analysis. The mean proportions of each justification category are presented in Table 7.7 as a function of the family member and the level of discord.
### Table 7.7

Mean proportions and standard deviations (in brackets) of each justification category by family member and level of discord.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family member</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Much discord</th>
<th>Some discord</th>
<th>Little discord</th>
<th>No discord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>Prudential/ Pragmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother w/child</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17 (.22)</td>
<td>.17 (.22)</td>
<td>.25 (.38)</td>
<td>.33 (.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child w/mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36 (.35)</td>
<td>.29 (.41)</td>
<td>.11 (.29)</td>
<td>.11 (.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father w/child</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39 (.49)</td>
<td>.39 (.49)</td>
<td>.07 (.19)</td>
<td>.32 (.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39 (.49)</td>
<td>.39 (.49)</td>
<td>.07 (.19)</td>
<td>.32 (.47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 7.7, 'prudential/pragmatic' justifications tended to be offered in those situations which were judged to generate discord between parents and children, independent of the intensity of discord (from 'much discord' to 'little discord'). 'Conventional' justifications were also frequent in those situations. 'Personal' justifications were offered mainly for situations which would generate no discord. These findings are consistent with those reported in section ii. In those situations in which there was agreement with parental interference, the justifications offered were mainly 'prudential' and 'conventional' and in those in which there was disagreement the
justifications were predominantly 'personal'. What is interesting and different from the responses shown in section ii is the high proportion of 'psychological' justifications found in responses to this second question, showing the more personal quality of responses in this case.

In order to compare fathers' and children's, as well as mothers' and children's mean proportion of responses for each rating presented in Table 7.7 oneway analyses of variance were employed. As far as fathers and children are concerned significant differences were found in the proportion of conventional justifications mentioned by them for situations judged to generate much discord (F=13.6, d.f.= 1, 26, p<.002). A trend towards significance was observed in the proportion of psychological justifications mentioned for situations judged to generate some discord (F=4.9, d.f.= 1, 26, p<.04). In both situations children's scores were higher than fathers'. Marginally significant differences between fathers and children were found in the proportion of conventional justifications for situations judged to generate some discord (F=3.6, d.f.= 1, 26, p<.07) and for situations judged to generate little discord (F=3.0, d.f.=1, 26, p<.10). In both cases fathers' scores were higher than children's. As far as mothers and children are concerned, a trend towards significance was found in the proportion of moral justifications offered by mothers and children (F=5.2, d.f.= 1, 26, p<.04). Mothers offered more moral justifications than children. A marginally significant difference was also revealed in the proportion of conventional justifications for situations judged to generate little discord (F=3.4, d.f.= 1, 26, p<.08). Mothers' scores were
Informal inspection of the 'psychological' justifications revealed that they focused mainly on 'interpersonal' justifications which were especially evident in adolescents' responses. In relation to fathers many adolescents emphasized that their fathers would get angry with them. In the case of mothers they mentioned more frequently that their mothers would feel disappointed with them. In the case of both fathers and mothers they also referred to 'difference of opinion' between them, as well as to 'fear of losing their trust', as an explanation for conflict. The more personal quality of their responses was also evident in 'conventional' justifications, especially those focusing on 'authority'. They would say things like "my father/ mother wouldn't like/accept/permit that". In 'prudential' justifications instead of saying, in a more impersonal way, that those situations were worrying or that they could bring a potential harm to themselves, they would say that their fathers/mothers would feel worried. This also puts the emphasis more externally on parents instead of on themselves. The fathers/mothers would also put the emphasis on themselves and say that they would feel worried when referring to prudential justifications or that they would feel disappointed or angry with their children. As far as feelings of anger are concerned, no fathers mentioned that they would feel angry and only a few mothers did so. This shows that adolescents overestimated the anger provoked by the situation in relation to fathers and underestimated it in the case of mothers. The personal emphasis found in the responses probably explains the relatively little use of
moral justifications in both parents' and children's justifications.

The personal involvement and the external focus were also evident in adolescents' personal justifications given especially in those situations which were judged to generate no discord. In the responses given when they disagreed with parental interference, reported in section ii, they would say things like "each one has got the right to choose whatever he/she wishes to do", whereas here they would say things like "my father/mother would let me choose" or "my father/mother wouldn't mind". The parents, on the other hand, continued to give more impersonal justifications in these instances.

The situations judged to generate higher level of discord were also considered to be serious and to require parental support. In the case of situations judged to generate lower level of discord they were considered to be not serious and that parents should give advice but not quarrel.

v) Quality of parent-child relationship

It is important to remember that on the whole there were more similarities than discrepancies between parents' and children's views both in relation to the question of which situations parents should and should not interfere in and to the question of the level of discord each situation would generate. One important aspect that may have contributed for these similarities is the fact that father-child and mother-child relationship were judged to be of
good quality both from the parents' and from the children's perspective. In the brief questionnaire given at the end of the interview subjects were asked to indicate, on a 5-point scale ranging from 'very bad' to 'very good', the quality of their relationship. Children's mean scores are presented in Table 7.8 by gender. The responses to other three questions presented to adolescents are also shown in Table 7.8. They were 'similarity of interests', i.e. the extent to which parents' and children's interests were similar, assessed on a four-point scale, from 'very little similar' to 'very similar', 'can tell personal things', i.e. the extent to which they felt they could tell personal things to parents, on a five-point scale, from 'never' to 'always' and 'prohibitions', i.e. the extent to which they felt parents did not allow them to do what they wanted to do, on a five-point scale, from 'never' to 'always'.

Table 7.8

Adolescents' mean responses and standard deviations (in brackets) to four questions assessing parent-child relationship by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent-child relationship</th>
<th>Child's gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With mother</td>
<td>4.1 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With father</td>
<td>4.3 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity of interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With mother</td>
<td>2.8 (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With father</td>
<td>2.7 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can tell personal things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To mother</td>
<td>3.3 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To father</td>
<td>2.4 (.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel prohibitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From mother</td>
<td>2.7 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From father</td>
<td>2.8 (.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from Table 7.8, both girls and boys judged their relationship with their parents to be of good quality (means above 4), especially their relationship with fathers, as revealed by a 2x2 (gender x parent) analysis of variance performed on the data. The results of the analysis of variance revealed a trend towards significance in relation to the assessment of the quality of the relationship (F=5.3, d.f.=1, 12, p <.05). The relationship with fathers was judged to be better than the relationship with mothers (means= 4.4 and 4.1). Even with regard to the level of similarity of interests, the means tended to be high. The mean responses to the last two questions were somewhat lower. As far as the question 'can tell personal things' is concerned, the lower scores indicate that even though they felt their relationship with their parents to be good they didn’t always confide in them. Between both parents, they tended to confide more in mothers than in fathers, as indicated by a 2 x 2 (gender x parent) analysis of variance performed on the data (F=6.6, d.f.=1, 12, p <.03). The lower scores on this question are in fact not surprising, since at this age the peer group is more likely to act as confidant. The last question was slightly different than the other three, since it evaluated the general level of control exerted by parents. The level of control was judged by adolescents to be somewhat low, even though a 2 x 2 (gender x parent) analysis of variance performed on this question revealed significant gender differences. Females more than males felt they were not allowed to do what they wanted to (means= 2.8 and 2.1). The latter finding is consistent with the gender differences reported in sections i and iii. In the situations in which there were gender differences girls’ scores tended to be higher than boys’.
Girls more than boys tended to agree with parental interference in some situations and their evaluation of the level of discord generated by some situations was higher than boys'.

As far as parents' judgements are concerned only the 'quality of relationship' and the 'similarity of interests' were assessed. Table 7.9 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of mothers and fathers as a function of child's gender.

Table 7.9

Fathers' and mothers' mean responses and standard deviations (in brackets) to two questions assessing parent-child relationship as a function of child's gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent-child relationship</th>
<th>Child's gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>4.6 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>4.0 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity of interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>2.8 (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>3.0 (.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 7.9, both fathers and mothers judged their relationship with their children to be of good quality (means above 4). They also tended to judge their interests to be similar. Analyses of variance performed on the data did not reveal any significant main effects or interaction effect. However, a marginally significant interaction effect was revealed for 'quality of relationship' (F=3.5, d.f.= 1, 24, p <.08). Mothers of girls tended
to say their relationship with their children was better than mothers of boys. Conversely, fathers of boys tended to say their relationship with their children was better than fathers of girls. In addition, mothers of girls judged their relationship to be better than fathers of girls, whereas fathers of boys tended to say their relationship was better than mothers of boys. No significant differences were found between parents' and children's evaluations either.
DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicated that parents’ and children’s views tended to be similar in many situations. They all tended to agree with parental interference in situations in which there was a potential harm to the adolescent, the parents or to others (e.g. driving without a licence, not taking care of health, using drugs, getting pregnant, lying, etc.). In addition, they tended to disagree with parental interference in situations seen as a matter of personal choice (e.g. choice of profession, of religion, politics, not joining parents in family visits, etc.).

As far as the justifications offered for their judgements are concerned, both parents and children tended to use mainly conventional (reference to authority, customs/norms) or prudential (reference to negative consequences to the child) justifications in situations in which they agreed either totally or partially with parental interference. Moral justifications (reference to others’ welfare) were used mainly when there was total agreement. In those situations in which they disagreed with parental interference the justifications were mainly personal ones, focusing on issues of personal choice.

These findings give support to previous studies (Smetana, 1988) which have shown that adolescents’ judgment of the legitimacy of parental authority differs according to the situation. In a study carried out with 102 children and their parents, Smetana (1988) reported that instead of viewing parental
authority as declining unilaterally during adolescence, both parents and children judged that parents should retain authority over moral and conventional issues. It was mainly in relation to personal issues that shifts in reasoning regarding parental authority were observed in the transition to adolescence.

The present study also examined the extent to which the situations would generate parent-child conflict in the case of their particular families. The results indicated that the situations in which there was agreement with parental interference were also judged to generate high level of conflict in the case of their particular family. As we have seen, those situations were related mainly to prudential, moral or conventional concerns. The situations in which there was disagreement with parental interference tended to be judged to generate low level of conflict in the case of their particular family. These situations were judged to be under the child's personal jurisdiction. These findings suggest that there seems to be some areas which are seen by both parents and children as the child's prerogative as are thus less likely to generate conflict, whereas others are clearly likely to generate conflict due to the potential harm they may cause to the adolescent, to parents or to others.

There is increasing evidence that parent-adolescence conflict may be associated to differing conceptions of the legitimacy of parental authority over certain issues (Smetana, 1988; 1989b). For this reason, in this study particular attention was given to discrepancies in parents' and adolescents' perceptions
of the extent to which parents should interfere in some situations. But in fact, there were few situations in which there was discrepancy between parents' and children's views (e.g. choice of boyfriend/girlfriend, choice of friends, appearance.). However, as predicted, in these situations parents tended to agree more with parental interference than children. This gives support to the notion that in some situations conflict may be due to difference in meanings ascribed to the conflict situations. In fact, if one thinks of those situations in which there were discrepancies between parents' and children's views, while parents viewed the situation as a source of prudential or moral concern, or as a matter of convention, the child saw it as a matter of personal choice. This can be well illustrated through an example extracted from an interview. In relation to 'travel with boyfriend/girlfriend', the son disagreed with parental interference in that situation and offered a personal justification "...it would be something personal, that has to do with my girlfriend and I, and nobody has got the right to say anything about it". The father agreed with parental interference with a prudential justification "...I see more the consequences of what could happen to them, mainly because of their immaturity, both the boy's and the girl's, they wouldn't know how to deal with what might happen and it's better to prevent it, isn't it?" or the mother also agreed with a conventional justification "...perhaps because of old values, of society, etc., I still don't accept this liberalism".

The results of the present study indicated, however, that the situations in which there were discrepancies between parents' and children's views were
not associated with the highest level of conflict. One has to bear in mind that
the situations in which there were discrepancies were more likely to be
everyday situations which one could find in any family (e.g. choice of friends,
appearance). The situations judged to generate the highest level of conflict on
the whole were not everyday situations (e.g. getting pregnant, use of drugs, not
taking care of health). They tended to be less likely to happen, with a few
exceptions (e.g. driving without a licence). Therefore, it is not surprising that
those situations in which there were discrepancies were not associated with a
high level of conflict. In addition, the fact that they were not associated with
a high level of conflict gives support to the idea that parent-adolescent conflict
may occur over minor, but persistent issues (Montemayor, 1990).

Still in relation to the assessment of parents’ and children’s perceptions
of the extent of parent-child conflict each situation would generate, the
justifications offered were similar to those offered for agreeing or disagreeing
with parental interference in each situation. There was a high proportion of
conventional and prudential justifications, as well as some moral justifications,
for situations which were judged to generate high level of conflict and a high
proportion of personal justifications for situations which were judged to
generate low level of conflict. However, the interesting finding was the high
proportion of psychological justifications, mainly interpersonal ones, given in
those situations which were judged to generate conflict, independent of its
intensity. This shows that when they were asked to think about the case of
their particular family, there was a greater personal involvement in their
responses.

As for gender differences, even though they were not pervasive, some clear differences emerged, especially in situations having to do with the child’s sexuality (have sex with boyfriend/girlfriend, travel with boyfriend/girlfriend). In these situations, girls agreed more with parental interference than boys. They also tended to say these situations would generate a higher level of conflict with parents. Therefore, compared to girls, boys assumed a more independent position. When responses of parents of girls and of parents of boys were compared concerning the level of discord the situations would generate, parents of girls also judged these situations to generate a higher level of conflict than parents of boys. These findings suggest that the control exerted over girls is greater, especially in areas such as their sexuality. This gives support to previous findings in the sociological literature (Salem, 1980b) showing that parental control of girls is exerted mainly over their sexuality. It does not support, however, Salem’s findings that parental control over boys’ professional life is greater than that exerted over girls’ professional life. In fact, there was no situation of greater control over boys in boys’ or in parents’ evaluations.

A surprising finding from this study was the high frequency of conventional justifications mentioned by adolescents. In a study carried out by Smetana (1989b), parents’ and children’s reasoning about actual family conflict was examined and she concluded that parents and children reasoned about the
conflict situations in conceptually different terms. While parents tended to reason about them in terms of conventions, children tended to reason about them in terms of personal issues. When asked to take their parents' views they focused primarily on prudential/pragmatic justifications. However, adolescents were able to take their parents' conventional views in some situations such as chores, appearance and interpersonal relationships. She concluded by saying that even though they are able to understand their parents' conventional views they reject them and reinterpret them in terms of personal issues. In the present study, adolescents were not reasoning about actual family conflict, but about hypothetical situations, some of which are, nevertheless, part of families' everyday experiences. This may be a point from which to discuss the differences in conventional reasoning found in adolescents from this study and in those from Smetana's study. It is possible that in a hypothetical conflict situation adolescents are able to distance themselves more from the situation and to be more attuned to their parents' views. However, these findings can also be discussed in light of Youniss and Smollar's (1985) conclusions that parental authority is restricted to some areas of adolescents' lives, and that adolescents perceive parental authority in these areas as benevolent and legitimate. They wrote: "Its legitimacy stems from the parents' greater experience and knowledge of society. Benevolence is based on the belief that parents generally act from a concern that applies to adolescents' immediate happiness and long-term welfare" (p. 140).

A final point should be made about the multifaceted character of
subjects' responses. Instead of basing their responses on one domain, their responses tended to fall under different domains. They could, for instance, say that they agreed with parental interference in some situations because these situations could bring bad consequences for the adolescent (prudential justification) and eventually for the parents or other people (moral justifications) and because it is the parents' duty to look after their children (conventional justifications). These findings supports Smetana's (in press) remarks concerning the complexity of the social world. In her view, one should pay more attention to issues of domain overlap which are likely to be part of everyday judgements. It is important to add to this another aspect which is the personal involvement in the conflict situation. In situations in which one is personally involved there is much more emotion involved. As we saw in this study, when asked to think about their own families, their responses were much more interpersonally oriented and sometimes it becomes difficult to disentangle moral from more personal issues.

To conclude, the results of the present study do not give support to the notion that parental authority is relinquished in adolescence, as psychoanalytic theory would assume (Freud, 1905; A. Freud, 1958; Blos, 1967). In fact, they suggest that parental authority should not be viewed as a global construct, as both psychoanalytic and cognitive-developmental theories (Piaget, 1932) would assume. They do give support to previous findings (Smetana, 1988; Youniss and Smollar, 1985) that parental authority is kept in some areas, especially those having implications for adolescents' or others' well-being, and seems to
coexist alongside greater self agency. Few discrepancies were found between parents' and children's views, but when these happened they were in the direction predicted (Smetana, 1989b), with parents emphasizing more prudential or moral justifications and children more personal ones. The finding that there was more agreement than discrepancy between parents' and children's views can be an indication that moral development is a co-constructive process.
CHAPTER VIII

GENERAL DISCUSSION

This chapter presents a general summary of the major findings reported in Chapters IV to VII. Their theoretical and methodological implications are highlighted, and suggestions for future research are proposed.

I. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

1.1. Social-interactive contexts in moral development from preadolescence to late adolescence

The studies reported in the previous chapters clearly indicated the importance of social-interactive contexts in moral development from preadolescence to late adolescence. When asked to describe moral conflict situations, 10-12, 14-16 and 17-21 year-olds tended to construe them in the context of personal relationships, especially parent-child and peer relations (see Chapter IV). The importance of social-interactive contexts in moral development in adolescence was further highlighted by the finding that the highest proportion of conflicts involving parents was found in the groups living with parents, whereas the highest proportion of conflicts involving peers was
found in a group living in halls of residence (see Chapter V).

While the findings reported in Chapter IV indicated that the context of parent-child and peer relations are equally important in adolescence, qualitative differences were found between the two, and developmental changes in their functions were found from preadolescence to late adolescence. While parent-child conflict tended to be described in the context of authority relations, peer conflict focused mainly on interpersonal relationships, i.e. quarrels, loyalty/faithfulness. A developmental shift from preadolescence to late adolescence was observed in the context of peer relations, towards a greater concern with loyalty/faithfulness and a reduced emphasis on quarrels as a source of conflict. It is also important to stress that loyalty/faithfulness appeared mainly in the context of intimate peer relationships, i.e. friendship relationships. This gives support to the notion that loyalty is one of the basic qualities of friendship in adolescence (Selman, 1976; Bigelow and LaGaipa, 1975; Youniss and Smollar, 1985).

These findings suggest that moral development processes in adolescence are interactive rather than intrapsychic. They do not give support to the notion that moral development goes in the direction of increasing detachment from relationships, as both psychoanalytic or cognitive-developmental theories would assume. Whereas a greater proportion of conflicts in the individual context was mentioned by late adolescents (see Chapters IV and V), subjects' reasoning over conflict choices in these situations seems to have been more affected by
context than by age. The justifications given for decisions taken in these contexts tended to focus on the immediate context, i.e. on issues primarily intrinsic to the self, self/other relationships or the other. Impersonal justifications, i.e. those emphasizing abstract rules, principles, etc, were mainly offered for the most impersonal of all contexts, i.e. that involving ideas/values.

1.2. The context of parent-child relations in moral development in adolescence

As far as the context of parent-child relations is concerned, which is the main focus of interest in this thesis, transformations rather than detachment were observed from preadolescence to late adolescence. Whereas preadolescents' conflicts with parents focused on rule violations (challenging prohibitions, lying/keeping secrets), mid-adolescents' and late adolescents' conflicts centred on parental interference in their lives. These age differences are probably due to the greater prioritization of personal, as opposed to conventional issues, which is assumed to take place during adolescence (Smetana, 1988).

The findings of the study reported in Chapter VI also give support to the notion that development goes in the direction of greater self agency. However, self agency does not exclude mutuality in parent-child relations. In fact, greater self agency seems to help rather than hinder development towards
greater mutuality. When the strategies of resolution of parent-child conflict were examined in a group of mid- and late adolescents, it was interesting to note that while the frequency of the strategy 'give in' decreased, the frequency of more mutual strategies, involving 'compromise', increased by late adolescence. As indicated by Levya and Furth (1986), if cooperation is essential for reaching mature levels of moral development, then the ability to resolve conflict through compromise ought to correlate positively to moral development.

Another interesting notion highlighted from the findings reported in Chapter VI is that authority is not antithetical to mutuality in parent-child relations. The most frequent justification offered for the use of the strategy 'give in' in both groups of mid- and late adolescents was related to the family context, and not to dependence on parents. The predominant concern was with keeping a nice family atmosphere or avoiding further conflict. This finding suggests that attachment is another important dimension of parent-child relations, that should be given more attention in the study of moral development in adolescence.

Finally, it is also important to stress that while greater self agency is observed in adolescence, parental authority is not relinquished. In fact, in the study reported in Chapter VII, while both parents and adolescents judged that some areas of adolescents' lives should be preserved from parental interference, especially those having to do with their personal lives, in other
areas they thought parental authority should be retained, especially those having implications for the adolescent's or others' well-being.

The fact that parents' and children's views concerning parental interference coincided in many situations is another indication that moral development is a co-constructive process. Not only do children seek greater independence from parents, but also parents recognize that there are some areas of their children's lives that should be preserved from parental interference. This does not mean that the process of development is not conflictual. In fact, the findings of the studies reported in Chapters IV and VI showed that development usually takes place in the context of conflict situations.

1.3 Gender differences in moral development

The findings reported in the previous chapters did point to some gender differences, as well as to gender x age interactions which should be highlighted. In Chapter IV, gender differences were observed mainly in relation to context, not to reasoning about choices in the conflict situations mentioned. Females' moral conflicts were more interpersonally-oriented and involved predominantly personal as opposed to impersonal relationships. However, these gender differences tended to disappear in late adolescence.
The notion that there are gender differences in interpersonal orientation has been supported by studies carried out in early childhood. Maccoby (1990) reviewed the findings from her studies with young children which have shown gender differences in interactional styles in play activities of three-year-olds, with boys tending more towards competition and girls towards intimacy. Contrary to the findings of the study reported in Chapter IV, differences in orientation towards relationships have also been identified in late adolescence (see Paul and White, 1990, for a review of these studies). It is possible that the lack of gender differences in the group of late adolescents in this study is associated with the college experience. Rest (1988) reviewed several studies which have indicated a college effect on moral judgement development.

It is also interesting to note that girls tended to mention more conflicts involving parents than boys. This finding may be interpreted in light of Gilligan's (1988) developmental model based on two essential dimensions: autonomy and attachment. If girls are more oriented towards relationships and attachment it is possible that the separation-attachment conflict is more intense in girls than in boys, increasing girls' perception of conflict with parents. Gender differences reported in Chapter VI are also interesting and consistent with this view. In that study, the strategies used for dealing with conflicts involving parents were investigated in a group of mid- and late adolescents. Some age differences in the use of strategies of conflict resolution were observed only in the female group. For instance, age differences in the use of self-related strategies ('follow own decisions/wishes') were identified in the
female group only, with older females emphasizing more this strategy than younger females. Finally, gender differences were further corroborated by the findings of the study reported in Chapter VII. When asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with parental interference in situations depicted in cards, mid-adolescent girls tended to agree more with parental interference in some situations than boys. Girls' judgments of the level of conflict generated by these situations also tended to be higher than boys'. Similarly, parents' judgments also varied according to the child's gender, perceiving more conflict with girls than with boys in some situations. Parents' and girls' judgments coincided in situations involving girls' sexuality. The conclusion drawn from these findings was that not only boys assumed a more autonomous position than girls but also parents granted them more autonomy. By the same token, not only parents perceived a greater need for interfering in girls' lives but also girls perceived a greater need for parental interference in some situations. Again, these finding attests for the interactive quality of developmental processes in adolescence.
Adolescence has been the focus of interest of different theories, especially for the important developmental changes assumed to take place during this period. However, there are divergent views concerning the extent and nature of these changes. One area in which consensus seem to be particularly difficult to achieve is parent-child relationships. As we have seen, three main conceptualizations of parent-child relationships can be found, which differ according to the extent to which they assume a continuity or discontinuity in development. The first, represented to a large extent by the sociological and psychoanalytic literature, assumes a discontinuity in parent-child relations. Children are assumed to shift from family to peer affiliations during adolescence. The second, based on large-scale survey or interview studies, assumes a continuity, i.e. parent-child relations are assumed to be harmonious and continuous in quality from childhood to adolescence. Finally, the third conceptualization assumes both continuity and change in parent-child relationships. A continuous relationship is assumed to exist throughout the life span, but special changes are also assumed to take place, as patterns of relatively unilateral authority give way to more mutual patterns.

The latter seems to be the view towards which most recent research on parent-child relations at adolescence is converging. The results of the studies presented in Chapters IV to VII also give support to this notion. Whereas previous studies have concentrated on issues such as identity, ego and
autonomy development in the context of parent-child relations, the studies reported here have focused on morality as the main issue of interest. However, one cannot ignore the different aspects that contribute towards the development of an autonomous morality. Just as the adolescent strives to keep a coherent sense of self, a search that remains throughout one’s life, we as researchers are also caught up in a struggle to keep the integrity of one’s subject of study. The easiest solution is denial of disintegration through compartmentalization, but I believe that it is still better to face disintegration, aiming at further integration.

I cannot therefore deny the difficulty I find in proposing a model of moral development in adolescence, while keeping the integrity of human development in its multifaceted quality. But I also believe that human development is an interactive process, and so is the process of development of science. Therefore, this is an opportunity for exchanging ideas concerning developmental processes in morality in adolescence. And there are at least two important aspects involved in exchanges: cooperation and conflict. Disagreements are not antithetical to cooperation. It is through cooperation in the context of disagreements that new integrations may emerge.

The findings of the studies reported in Chapters IV to VII, as well as the findings of recent research in moral development, suggest that interactions are fundamental in moral development processes. Now, it is important to try and establish a cooperative dialogue with the different models of adolescent
development discussed at the beginning, with special emphasis on the place of interaction in development. This dialogue will be selective, however, as one is always limited by ignorance and our own biases, and will concentrate on the psychoanalytic, cognitive-developmental, and the emerging social constructivist models of moral development.

2.1. The psychoanalytic model

There is no consensus among psychoanalytic writers on the importance of interactions in development, as it depends on the extent to which the reality of experiences is stressed. As we have seen, the reality of experiences has been more emphasized by the post-freudian literature. Consequently, two different approaches to human development can be identified, which have been recently referred to as the classical and the romantic (Strenger, 1989). The classical view, represented by Freud, assumes that the main goal of development is rationality. The romantic view, on the other hand, represented by the object relations school and self psychology, stresses the striving to sustain a sense of coherence, of meaning.

There is thus a tension within the psychoanalytic literature between these two models of development, one stressing continuity (object relations and self psychology), and the other stressing discontinuity (classical Freudian theory) in development. The psychological literature on adolescent
development does not usually take into account this distinction. Critics usually focus on the classical view of development, which assumes that by adolescence there is an increasing detachment from parents, both as love objects and as authority figures (Freud, 1905; A. Freud, 1958). Even though Blos’s (1967) views are usually confounded with A. Freud’s (1958) views on adolescent development, it is important to distinguish them on the basis of the dimension of continuity in development. Perhaps it would not be wrong to say that Blos’s theory assumes both continuity and changes in development, and in this sense his views are closer to social constructivist views on development. In common with the classical view is the notion that adolescents are required to relinquish parents as love objects and as authority figures. The crucial aspect of this developmental process is, according to Blos, the de-idealization of infantile parental object representations. Adolescents are also assumed to turn to their peers, to make up for the loss of parental support. However, at the same time these changes are assumed to take place, continuity in parent-child relationship is also assumed, since Blos emphasizes that through this process of disengaging from infantile ties, progressively more mature, mutually satisfying relationships with parents may emerge. It is important to stress, however, that even though the assumption of changes and continuity brings Blos’s views closer to social constructivist theory, they are distinct in the sense that development is assumed to take place through intrapsychic rather than interactive processes.

The findings of the studies presented in Chapters IV and V give more
support to Blos's than to A. Freud's views on adolescent development. They do not give support to A. Freud's (1958) assumption of a progressive detachment from parent-child relations and an increasing cathecting of peers in adolescence. In fact, both interactive contexts were found to coexist in adolescence, with important qualitative differences between them. In all three age groups examined in the study reported in Chapter IV (pre-, mid- and late adolescents), the proportion of conflicts involving parents tended to be greater than the proportion of conflicts involving peers. The only group in which there was a lower proportion of conflicts involving parents and a higher proportion of conflicts involving peers was the group of late adolescents not living with parents. As will be discussed later, the latter finding gives support to the notion that moral development in adolescence takes place in social-interactive contexts, rather than intrapsychically. It is interesting to note in this respect that even though A. Freud assumed development to take place intrapsychically, there is some contradiction in her thinking to the extent that she also assumed adolescents to shift from parents to peers in adolescence. In the latter assumption, there is an implicit recognition of the role of social-interactive contexts in development.

Therefore, the findings of the studies reported in the previous chapters suggest that rather than being progressively detached, parent-child relations are transformed in the direction of greater mutuality (this point will be better discussed in the section focusing on the social constructivist model). To the extent that they indicate transformations towards greater mutuality in parent-
child relations, the findings do give support to Blos's (1967) assumptions. It is important to note, however, that Blos has not developed a model of moral development in adolescence, but a model of adolescent development in general. He did assume superego development in adolescence to be related to a progressive relinquishing of infantile parental representations and of parental authority. The relinquishing of parental authority during adolescence had already been emphasized by Freud (1905) and A. Freud (1958), as an important aspect of superego development in adolescence. However, the findings of the studies reported in Chapters VI and VII do not give support to the notion that parental authority is relinquished in adolescence. As will be discussed later, parental authority is retained in some areas and seen to coexist alongside greater self agency.

Even though the findings of the studies reported in the previous chapters do not give support to the classical model of moral development, it is believed that a major contribution from psychoanalysis to our understanding of moral development could come from object relations theory, which accounts for relationships, as an enduring bond throughout one's life. A promising avenue seems to be attachment theory (Bowlby 1969, 1973, 1982), which is partly derived from object relations theory. Internal working models, constructed from relationships with attachment figures at the beginning of life, are assumed to guide future relationships. The important contribution of attachment theory is that it points to what remains in terms of relationships throughout life. The extent to which internal working models built up during
early childhood determine the course of future development is a debatable issue, which has been the focus of recent research. But assuming that something remains, i.e. that there is a continuity apart from changes, especially in the context of parent-child relations, then it is important to think of how this relationship that remains interacts with the changes. In addition, one should also think about the extent to which this enduring bond is reconstructed through current interactions. Psychoanalytic practice does, in fact, work with the assumption that past relationships can be reconstructed through analytic work. However, another question arises, concerning the processes through which reconstructions take place: are they intrapsychic or interactive? Psychoanalysis tends to work with the assumption that it is mainly intrapsychic processes which are involved in development. But one could wonder whether they are not, in fact, essentially interactive, i.e. co-constructions between the patient and the analyst, the parent and the child, and so on.

As far as adolescent development is concerned, classical psychoanalytic models have assumed adolescent development to be a recapitulation of childhood. Parent-child relationships in adolescence are also assumed to be a repetition of early parent-child relationships. The reconstruction of past parent-child relationships through current interactions with parents, as well as the construction of new types of relationships during development, are not given due emphasis in classical psychoanalytic models. Therefore, even though psychoanalysis has helped to highlight the importance of relationships, defined as an enduring bond, during development, it is felt
that interactions have been somewhat neglected, and it would perhaps be important to redefine some of the core psychoanalytic concepts in co-constructive terms, such as for instance, the concept of transference, counter-transference, identification, projection, projective identification.

2.2. The cognitive-developmental model

Unlike psychoanalytic theory, cognitive-developmental theory of moral development does emphasize the importance of interactions, as opposed to relationships, in development. It is important to stress, however, that interactions are not usually differentiated from relationships in the moral development literature, as it is being differentiated here. But I am not alone in making these differentiations, as they have been proposed before (Hinde, 1979).

The role of interactional processes in moral development is felt to be unclear in cognitive-developmental theory. This is probably due to the fact that it is difficult to reconcile cognitive maturational processes, which are assumed to determine development, with the notion that interactions are also important in development. But interaction as a context for moral development was emphasized by both Piaget and Kohlberg. However, important distinctions between Piaget’s and Kohlberg’s theory should be made. In fact, one can argue that a similar tension felt in the psychoanalytic literature between two
developmental lines can also be found in the cognitive-developmental literature. Even though Kohlberg recognizes the importance of interactions in moral development, they are thought to be a means for cognitive development. For Kohlberg, moral development implies going from personal to impersonal reasoning. In the context of relationships, it also implies going beyond personal relationships towards more impersonal societal concerns. In Kohlberg’s model, autonomous morality is defined in the context of a greater detachment from relationships. The rational self is the main goal of development. For Piaget, however, development goes from egocentrism to cooperation. Autonomous morality is defined in the context of relationships, as an increasing capacity for mutuality and reciprocity. The outcome of development is a self-in-relationships.

Now, it is important to go back to the findings reported in the previous chapters, and especially those reported in Chapters IV and V, to try and see the extent to which they give support to these models of moral development. The findings did not give support to Kohlberg’s views regarding a developmental progression towards more impersonal reasoning in adolescence. In fact, developmental differences were found more in relation to the content of the moral conflict situations than to reasoning, an aspect which Kohlberg did not emphasize in his theory. In addition, subjects’ reasoning in these situations seemed to be more affected by the content of the conflict situations than by age, i.e. impersonal reasoning was more used in the context of impersonal conflicts, such as those involving questioning of ideas/values, than
in other contexts. This gives support to recent models (see Turiel, Killen and Helwig, 1987, for a review) which have emphasized the importance of contextual factors (content, as opposed to structure) in moral development.

To the extent that the results of the studies reported in Chapters IV to VII highlighted the importance of relationships in moral development, they do give more support to Piaget's than to Kohlberg's theory. Furthermore, one has identified developmental changes towards greater mutuality and reciprocity in strategies of conflict resolution from mid- to late adolescence, indicating that perhaps development goes in the direction of greater cooperation, not only in the peer context but also in the context of parent-child relations. Also in support of Piaget were the qualitative differences found between the context of parent-child relations and the context of peer relations. Parent-child relations were, to a large extent, defined in the context of authority relations. However, the findings of the studies reported in Chapters VI and VII do give support to Smetana's claim for the need to reconceptualize the concept of parental authority, as contextual variations were found in relation to the conflict situations. The results from Chapter VI showed that strategies of conflict resolution varied according to the type of conflict situation. In addition, in Chapter VII, variations in parents' and adolescents' judgments were also found according to the type of situation being judged. This leads to the conclusion that parental authority should not be viewed as a global construct.
Finally, one should concentrate on another issue which has often been at the centre of controversies in the moral development literature, i.e. gender differences in moral development. As already stressed before, it was mainly Gilligan (1982) who claimed that genders follow different developmental pathways. She claimed that while males would have a 'justice/rights orientation', because of their individualistic and separate conception of self, females would have a 'care/response orientation', because of their perception of self as connected to and interdependent on others. However, according to her, these orientations are gender-related, but not gender-specific. Their origins are to be found in the young child's experiences of inequality/equality and attachment/detachment.

It would now be useful to discuss Gilligan's claim in light of the findings reported in the previous chapters. In Chapter IV, gender differences were found more in relation to the context of the conflict situations mentioned than to reasoning about choices in these situations. However, these differences were observed in the two younger groups only (pre- and mid-adolescents). No gender differences were found in the group of late adolescents living with parents or in the group living in halls of residence (see Chapter V). Therefore, one question remains in relation to these gender x age interactions. In the study reported in Chapter VI, again gender x age interactions were found in relation to the strategies of conflict resolution used. Age differences were observed more in the female than in the male group. For instance, self-related strategies were more used by older than younger females. Finally, in the study reported
in Chapter VII, when parents and adolescents were asked to judge the extent to which parents should interfere in some situations which may generate parent-child conflict, it is interesting to note that in some situations, especially those having to do with the adolescent’s sexuality, gender differences were observed in both parents’ and children’s judgments. Both parents of girls and adolescent girls agreed more with parental interference in those situations than parents of boys and adolescent boys.

In order to interpret these gender differences, one has to think about the concept of autonomy in adolescence. Gilligan (1988) claimed the need to reconsider development in adolescence, and the concept of autonomy. She argued that autonomy may be defined differently according to gender. Autonomy as self-reliance, or detachment from relationships, may be more characteristic of men, whereas for women autonomy may be defined in the context of relationships. It is important to note that autonomy in the latter sense would be closer to Piaget’s notion of self-in-relationships. Therefore, Gilligan opens the way for interpreting gender differences in qualitative, rather than quantitative, terms. This is also the position I would assume, in view of the findings reported here. Both men and women have equal capacity for reasoning, but their development may be construed differently, as a consequence of the different experiences in relationships throughout their lives.

However, one cannot forget the other important pathway opened up by Gilligan in the area of moral development, which goes beyond gender issues,
i.e. a developmental line of care, as opposed to justice. This in fact parallels in some sense the two developmental lines found in the psychoanalytic theory, discussed before. On the one hand, there is a developmental line which focuses on inequality, and on the rational self as the outcome of development, and on the other, there is one which emphasizes attachment, the outcome being always a self-in-relationships. Whereas there has been little attempt as yet to build up a model of moral development based on a developmental line of care, which takes into account the importance of relationships as an enduring bond between individuals, it is believed that such a model would be most useful.

2.3. The social constructivist model

As we have seen, whereas interactions or relationships do have an important role in both psychoanalytic and cognitive theories, both of them have tended to give greater emphasis to internal processes in development. Social constructivist theories, on the other hand, seem to be attempting to bridge the gap between internal and interpersonal processes in development. The term "social constructivist" is being used here to account for those approaches which emphasize mutuality between the individual and social-interactive contexts. The focus of interest is not the individual nor the social context, but the relations between the individual and social context. In these approaches, relationships are seen as ends, rather than as means. Different terms are used to denote those approaches, such as "co-constructivist", "transactional", "social
interactional".

It has been argued (e.g. Rogoff, 1990; Youniss and Smollar, 1985) that Piaget's theory does, in fact, stress the mutuality of the individual and the environment. However, as shown by Rogoff (1990), the social context was not a central tenet of Piaget's theory. Even though he stressed the role of social factors, especially peer interactions, in middle childhood, it remained mainly speculative, as his research devoted little attention to it. It has been mainly his followers (e.g. Doise, Perret-Clermont) who have investigated children's cognitive development in the context of peer interaction.

Social constructivist approaches go beyond the nature/nurture debate, which has always been part of the history of psychology. As pointed out by Rogoff (1990): "most developmentalists... are no longer trying to figure out if development is "more nature" or "more nurture". Instead, they view nature and nurture as interacting to produce development, arguing that development does not occur solely through individual effort or preprogramming, nor does it occur entirely under the direction of the environment" (p. 27). She stressed the importance of considering the mutuality of individuals and context in development, arguing that "human activity involves the roles of both the individual and the social world, inseparably involved in the meaningful and purposeful events of life" (p. 28).

The results of the studies reported in the previous chapters do give
support, to a large extent, to a social constructivist model of moral development, as described by Youniss and collaborators (Youniss, 1980; 1983; Youniss and Smollar, 1985), which places a greater emphasis on social-interactive, as opposed to individual processes in development. As we have seen, in Chapters IV and V, moral conflict situations were described especially in the context of interactions with parents or peers. Important qualitative differences were found between these two relational contexts, and developmental changes were observed in the functions of these relationships from preadolescence to late adolescence.

The notion that moral development in adolescence takes place in social-interactive contexts, rather than mainly individually, was further highlighted by the finding reported in Chapter IV that parent-child conflict was predominant in relation to peer conflict from preadolescence to late adolescence, but only in the groups living with parents. When a separate sample of late adolescents living in halls of residence was studied (see Chapter V), the proportion of conflicts involving parents was found to be much lower, while the proportion of conflicts involving peers was much higher.

The findings of the study reported in Chapter IV showed that conflicts with parents tended to be described in the context of authority relations, from preadolescence to late adolescence. However, qualitative differences were found in the types of conflict reported by preadolescents and the two older groups. Whereas preadolescents were mainly concerned about whether or not
to go against parental rules, the two older groups expressed their dissatisfaction with parental authority in some areas to the extent that it was felt to interfere in their personal lives. These changes may be explained in terms of a greater prioritization of personal issues at the expense of parental conventions during adolescence (Smetana, 1988).

The findings show that there is a continuity in parent-child relations that extends into late adolescence. There are transformations in parent-child relations rather than detachment. Giving support to Youniss and Smollar's (1985) findings, the results of the studies reported in Chapters VI and VII showed that parental authority is retained in some areas and coexist alongside greater agency for the self.

In the study reported in Chapter VII, it became clear that while there are some areas of adolescents' lives which both adolescents and parents think should be preserved from parental interference, there are also other areas in which it is felt that parental authority should be retained. The areas which both parents and adolescents thought should be preserved from parental interference usually involved the personal domain (Nucci, 1981), whereas the areas which both parents and adolescents thought parental authority should be retained involved mainly moral, prudential or conventional concerns. This indicates that parental authority in some areas is viewed by both adolescents and their parents as contributing to adolescents' well-being.
The findings from the previous studies do give support to the notion that authority and mutuality in parent-child relations are not antithetical, a fact that had already been stressed by Youniss and Smollar (1985). While adolescents may sometimes resent parental authority to the extent that it interferes in their lives, they are also able to understand that parents act for the sake of their well-being. Similarly, while parents may feel concerned when their adolescent children do things they think should not be done, they also recognize that there are some areas of the adolescents' lives which should be preserved from parental interference. This mutuality does not preclude conflict, however. And one also comes to the conclusion that mutuality is not antithetical to conflict either. In the study reported in Chapter VI it was clear that even though adolescents complained about parental interference in their lives, mutual strategies of conflict resolution (dialogues, compromises) were frequently used by both mid- and late adolescents. It is therefore in the context of conflict that cooperation or mutual agreements usually take place.

Finally, it is important to note that mutuality is not antithetical to self agency. In the study reported in Chapter VI, shifts in the types of strategies of conflict resolution were observed from mid- to late adolescence. It is interesting to note that while there was an increase with age in the use of self-related strategies ('follow own decisions/wishes'), as well as a decrease in the use of 'give in', indicating a more independent attitude, there was also an increase in the use of mutual strategies (e.g. compromise). Therefore, these findings indicate that an increasing self agency seems to increase, rather than
reduce, mutuality in parent-child relations.

These findings have thus implications for another important issue in moral development, i.e. the relationship between identity and moral development. Davidson and Youniss (1991) suggested that "the construction of morality and the construction of identity are aspects of the same construction" (p. 112). It would perhaps be better to say that they are aspects of the same co-construction. If the self is to be seen as always existing in the context of relations then, as argued by Piaget (1954/1981), "consciousness of self is both a product and a condition of cooperation" (p. 394; quoted in Davidson and Youniss, 1991).
2.4. **Final remarks**

The results of the studies reported in the previous chapters do not give support to the notion that moral development processes in adolescence are mainly intrapsychic or internal, as both psychoanalytic and cognitive-developmental theories would assume. It is true that a greater proportion of conflicts in the individual, as opposed to the interpersonal context, was found in the group of late adolescents (see Chapters IV and V). The increased cognitive competence of late adolescents (Piaget, 1972) may partly explain these differences. However, the difference between internal and interpersonal seems to get blurred if one thinks about these ‘internal dialogues’ as really social in origin, i.e. internalized from social interaction. As shown by Rogoff (1990), the idea of reflection as internalized dialogue was actually emphasized by Piaget (1928/1977): "Reflection is an internal discussion... In social conflict is born discussion, first simple dispute, then discussion terminating in a conclusion. It is this last action which, internalized and applied to oneself, becomes reflection" (p. 219; quoted in Rogoff, 1990). Similarly, it has been argued (Cavell, 1991) that to the extent that Freud gives a special emphasis to a second person, an interpreter, and to the therapeutic value of transference and countertransference, the individual mind may be pictured by him as more interpersonal than it is usually portrayed.

The importance of social-interactive contexts in moral development in adolescence was highlighted by the findings of the studies reported in the
previous chapters. Parent-child relations is assumed to be a special interactive context, in which there is a continuing relationship which is always being transformed through current interactions throughout the life cycle. Transformations seem to go in the direction of greater mutuality, rather than detachment from relationships. Conflict seems to be an important factor in these transformations towards greater mutuality, as it is through conflict that mutual agreements may be reached.

While the findings of the studies reported here do suggest that one should attend to the specificity of different kinds of interactive contexts in development, a special challenge for research on moral development is how these distinctive developmental processes within different interactive contexts contribute towards development. As shown by Rogoff (1990), Piaget’s theory assumed that development was based on a general capacity, rather than being context-dependent. Children’s cognitive activities were assumed to be general across different domains. However, in the past decade there has been increasing recognition that cognitive processes may differ according to the domain of thinking and to the specifics of the task context.

It is interesting that while Piaget assumed cognitive activities to be general across domains, he also recognized disparities in children’s thinking across different tasks, which he named ‘decalage’. In addition, he also recognized the specificity of different social-interactive contexts, when he differentiated between the context of parent-child relations, as a context of
authority relations, and the context of peer relations, as a context of cooperation (Piaget, 1932). It is important to note that these qualitatively different social-interactive contexts coexist during childhood, and the findings of the studies reported in the previous chapters show that, even though transformed, qualitative differences between these two interactive contexts remain in adolescence. Whereas peers are viewed as persons, parents continue to be viewed in their authority roles in late adolescence. It has been argued (Youniss and Smollar, 1985) that the changes in perception of parents as persons as opposed to figures are processed very slowly, and that during adolescence neither parent has the degree of individuality found in friendship relations, for instance. A theory based on cognitive maturational processes cannot account for these differences.

The fact that different interactions take place in different social-interactive contexts has been emphasized not only by developmentalists but also by family systems approach. Even though the focus of this study was on the context of parent-child relations, this should be viewed as one subsystem among many others, such as the father-child, mother-child, father-mother, sibling, male-female. There are also subsystems composed by triads, rather than dyads, such as, for instance, father-mother-child. The interactions that take place within each subsystem are different, and these different patterns of interaction influence the types of resolution in conflict situations. It is interesting in this respect, for example, that there has been a recent upsurge of interest, in the literature on cognitive development, in patterns of conflict
resolution, or problem-solving strategies, in triads as opposed to dyads, with the understanding that dyads are different from triads. In fact, psychoanalytic theory also differentiates between dyads and triads, and different developmental lines are emphasized, depending on whether one looks at dyads (especially mother-child relationships) or triads (the Oedipus constellation).

To conclude, while the findings reported in the previous chapters highlighted the notion that moral development takes place in different interactive contexts, a question remains as to the relative contribution of these different interactive contexts to development. If one assumes that development implies changes but also continuity, one also assumes that there is something that is kept in the internal world.

A final point should also be made about the contribution of culture to moral development. The present discussion has centred mainly in the interpersonal context. However, it is felt that a model of moral development in adolescence should also take into account the broader cultural context in which the individual and interpersonal relations are mutually embedded. Whereas cultural context in development is not emphasized by either psychoanalytic or cognitive-developmental models of moral development, social constructivist theories do leave space for a consideration of cultural context. Vygotsky’s (1978, 1987) theory can be said to be an example of a model which takes into account the mutuality between individual and environment, and also the cultural context in which the child is embedded.
The next section discusses some aspects of Brazilian culture and proposes a reading of some of the findings of the studies reported here from the perspective of culture.
III. DEVELOPMENT WITHIN CULTURAL CONTEXT: SOME NOTES ON BRAZILIAN CULTURE

This section aims to provide a reading of the data from the perspective of culture. The fact the adolescents who took part in the studies reported in the previous chapters were all Brazilians suggest the possibility that they may be bound by specific cultural norms which should also be taken into consideration in the analysis of their responses. The considerations that will be made here are speculative, however, and will serve mainly to contextualize adolescents' responses from the point of view of the culture in which they are embedded.

There are a number of studies on Brazilian culture carried out in the field of psychology, as well as in the fields of anthropology and sociology, which may help the discussion of the present findings within cultural context. Most of these studies have concentrated on social institutions in Brazil, i.e. the family, political and other social systems.

In the field of anthropology it is worth mentioning the work of DaMatta (1979, 1985), who paved the way for the study of everyday social phenomena, or as he himself put it "...an investigation of ourselves through the systematic reflexion on our own system". Perhaps it wouldn't be wrong to say that the fundamental aim of his studies is to call attention to the specificity of the Brazilian culture through the analysis of its main rituals, as well as its coexisting contradictory identities. Among his most recent and thought-
provoking work is "A Casa e a Rua" [The House and the Street], which may help to reflect on some of the findings from the studies presented here. The 'house' and the 'street' are good metaphors for understanding the interplay between the intimacy of personal relationships (the house) and the impersonality of laws (the street) in Brazilian culture. He defines Brazil as an essentially relational society, i.e. a society in which relationships rather than individuals are fundamental. He contrasts it with the American culture, which is mainly centred on individuals. In a conflict situation there is always the expectation for a solution that "humanizes and personalizes" the situation (this tendency to seek personal solutions to conflicts was very well examined by another Brazilian anthropologist; see Barbosa, 1992). The concept of 'house' itself in this culture gives support to this idea: "it is conceived not only as a space which may host peers (as in the case of the American culture) and is subject to the same norms from the street, but as a special area: where there are no individuals and everybody is a person, i.e. all those who live in a Brazilian house relate to one another through blood ties, age, sex and bonds of hospitality and sympathy which makes the house a metaphor for the Brazilian society itself" (p. 45). The 'house' metaphor had in fact already been used before by a Brazilian sociologist (Freyre, 1933). But in that work the 'house' or 'casa grande' (the big house), was opposed to 'senzala', the place reserved for slaves in Brazilian feudal culture. The 'house' was thus conceived as a space which mirrored the internal social conflicts of a society dominated by patriarchal, feudal and slavery families.
But going back to DaMatta's (1985) work, in reflecting on the relationship between the individual and the society, he points to the fact that historically in Brazilian society the hierarchical whole has predominated over the part (the individual). He further argues that due to its historical processes, the individualism in Brazil is negative, i.e. it is created against the laws, the political, legal and religious centralism, whereas in the United States, the individualism is positive, i.e. it creates laws to safeguard even greater totalities, more inclusive than the local systems. Community in the U.S.A is egalitarian, whereas in Brazil it is hierarchical, based on relationships, families and special groups of friends or relatives. But in fact DaMatta questions whether Brazilian society is only hierarchical or whether there isn't also a liberal tradition that goes side by side with this hierarchical tradition, since all Brazilian institutions are subject to two kinds of pressure, one from the universal rules to which they are bound and the other to the personal relationships system. He stresses the importance of taking into account these multiple sources of influence and concludes that in his view these are the essentials of a society which has not abandoned its past and is looking at the future.

These internal contradictions within the Brazilian culture were also explored through the work of a Brazilian psychoanalyst, Figueira (1985, 1986). He worked with what he called "the sociologically invisible", i.e. the subjective dimension of the social changes. He distinguished between a hierarchical model of family which tended to predominate in the 50's and an egalitarian model, characteristic of the 80's. The former is marked by intrinsic differences,
such as those between men and women, parents and children, whereas in the latter these differences disappear in favour of a homogenous idea of individuals who can be idiosyncratically different but who are equals as individuals. He relates these changes in the family to the rapid process of modernization and the diffusion of the ideology of egalitarianism. The consequence of this rapid modernization is, in his view, what he calls 'desmapeamento' (de-mapping), which according to his definition "is not the absence of 'maps' for orientation, but the existence of different and contradictory maps, relatively dissociated from the subject" (p. 22). The solution usually sought for the 'de-mapping' is what he calls 'reactive modernization', a process in which the content is modern but the mechanism is archaic. For example, he cites the nowadays widely spread notion that virginity is out. He shows that not being a virgin is modern but the implicit rule which says that women should not be virgins is archaic in that it does not leave space for personal choice, a condition for true modernization.

The current writings and research on Brazilian family structure do give support to the notion that the "new" family structure comprises, as described by Figueira (1986), coexisting contradictory values of the traditional family and of the modern family. This new notion tends to predominate over the descriptions of the Brazilian family structure as authoritarian, father-dominated, the mainstream of most thinking and research up to the 70's. As shown by Correa (1981), the notion of the patriarchal family is very much attached to Brazilian's colonial past, as shown in Freyre's (1933) work, translated to
An example of a study carried out in the 60's may help to illustrate this then dominant Brazilian family model. In a cross-cultural study comparing Brazilians and Americans, Rosen (1962) examined the relationship of family structure to socialization and achievement motivation. The Brazilian sample consisted of 346 boys (age 9 through 11) and the American sample comprised 794 boys matched for age and socioeconomic level. Achievement motivation was measured through the TAT, and observation, interviews and questionnaires were used to gather data on family structure, child-rearing practices and the boys' perceptions of their parents. The Brazilian family structure was described in Rosen's study as essentially authoritarian and father-dominated. He observed, at the same time, that parent-child relationships in Brazil were "ordinarily warm and openly affectionate, perhaps more so than in the United States" (p. 615). He was struck by the fact that a high degree of nurturance was associated with a high degree of authoritarian control and overprotectiveness. Based on this, he hypothesized that Brazilian boys would be less likely to perceive their parents as stressing independence training which, together with achievement training (setting goals and imposing standards of excellence), would be the most important socialization practice for the development of achievement motivation. The results did give support to this hypothesis and he concluded that "the combination of authoritarianism, excessive protectiveness and early indulgence which boys experience in a type of structure very common in Brazil - the authoritarian, father-dominated family-"
must be considered as partly responsible for the finding that Brazilian boys, on the average, have markedly low achievement motivation when compared with their American peers" (p. 624).

The present Brazilian family structure with strong influences from a traditional patriarchal and authoritarian past and with equally strong modern egalitarian principles, is the main point of departure for a discussion of the findings reported in the previous chapters. Even though not directly focused on the family, DaMatta's (1985) work on Brazilian culture is in fact in accordance with the notion that there is a singularity in some social processes in Brazil that cannot be apprehended without taking into account the internal contradictions and dilemmas of a society with apparently strong juridical institutions which nevertheless operates on the level of personal relationships.

The strong influence of personal relationships in social processes in Brazil may partly explain the predominance of the context of personal relationships over the context of impersonal relationships in the conflicts mentioned by all three age groups, reported in Chapter IV. However, in a study carried out by Walker, DeVries and Trevethan (1987) with eighty American family triads, children selected from four age groups (mean ages 6.8, 9.8, 12.4 and 15.7, respectively) also reported a high proportion of dilemmas involving personal relationships. Similarly, in a study carried out by Yussen (1977) with 149 American subjects, comprising three age groups (mean ages 12.6, 14.4 and 17.3), in which subjects were asked to write a story entailing
a moral dilemma, he observed that in all three age groups most stories involved a protagonist which had some kind of relationship with the subject (a family member, a friend). Finally, in a study with 148 adolescents (14-18 year-olds), Johnston, Brown and Christopherson (1990) also reported that conflicts tended to be described in the context of relationships. However, in contrast with the findings of the studies reported in Chapter IV, most conflicts involved friends rather than parents. One cannot attribute these differences to cultural factors, as they may be a function of the sample used in Johnston et al.'s study, which consisted of students from boarding schools, with little daily contact with parents.

The reduced proportion of conflicts beyond personal relationships and other personal issues (primarily intrinsic to the self) may be a result of cultural factors, as well as historical circumstances. It is very surprising, for example, that there were so few conflicts involving broader political or social issues when the studies reported in Chapters IV and V were carried out in 1989, prior to the presidential elections, the first one after almost thirty years. It is as if their private lives were running totally parallel to these public events.

The justifications offered for the resolution of conflicts did not seem to go beyond personal issues either, and were related primarily to the self, self/other relationship or the other. This could be a function of the context of the conflict situations which tended to be personal as well. However, the findings from studies carried out in Brazil using Kohlberg’s dilemmas, which
entail broader societal issues, also show that subjects’ responses even in this context tend to be typically stage 3 (see Biaggio, 1988, for a review of these studies). Stage 3 is the moral development stage related to special obligations towards the family, friends or other members of the more immediate social context (Kohlberg, 1984).

Apart from the tendency to value personal relationships observed in Brazilian culture, the lack of confidence in social institutions may also contribute to these findings. Some empirical studies were carried out by social psychologists on the image of the Brazilian politician in Brazil. In a study developed by Rodrigues, Lobel, Jablonski, Monnerat, Corga, Diamico, Pereira and Ferraz (1988), 533 subjects from Rio de Janeiro, of both sexes, were either contacted by telephone or requested to answer a questionnaire, one month before the elections for State Governors and deputies and senators in 1986. The ones who were requested to answer a questionnaire were 273 college students. The main aim of the study was to assess stereotypes in relation to Brazilian politicians. The results indicated that politicians were seen by subjects as ambitious, insincere, opportunists, not concerned with people’s welfare, and corrupt. Therefore, the negative aspect was revealed especially in relation to moral attributes. The same trend was observed in a study carried out three years later by D’Amorim, Oliveira, Gonçalves and Melo (1991), prior to the presidential elections. This study was carried out with 325 subjects living in Brasília who were predominantly students. Some differences were revealed concerning the importance attributed to morality which was somewhat reduced
in relation to the findings reported in the Rodrigues et al. (1988) study. The authors interpreted this reduced concern with morality as probably part of the historical moment in which candidates were stressing in their campaigns the need for moral improvement.

As far as the context of parent-child relations is concerned, which was the main focus of the studies reported in the previous chapters, its predominance in conflicts involving personal relationships in all groups from preadolescence to late adolescence, with the exception of the group of late adolescents not living with parents, could also be discussed within cultural context. Conflicts involving parents tended to focus on parental interference in their lives (demands/prohibitions), especially in mid- and late adolescence. They often complained about the excessive protectiveness and demands of their parents. Furthermore, in the last study reported in Chapter VII, mid-adolescents also tended to offer prudential reasons for agreeing with parental interference in some situations. Prudential justifications were also associated to parental protectiveness, concern. In addition, the high frequency of conventional or authority-based justifications offered by mid-adolescents for agreeing with parental interference in some situations also points to a certain deferential and submissive attitude towards their parents. These findings could perhaps be interpreted in light of the findings reported in the 60’s that Brazilian parents tend to couple their nurturance with a high degree of authoritarian control, and children are taught to be submissive and deferential to their parents (Rosen, 1962).
However, it seems that side by side with authoritarian principles also emerge egalitarian ones, in which respect for the individual is given higher priority. This was evident in the studies reported in Chapters VI and VII. In Chapter VI, for example, the frequent use of the strategy 'follow own decisions/ wishes' in conflicts involving parents gives support to this idea. Also, in Chapter VII there were many situations in which both parents and children thought parents should not interfere in because they considered these situations to be under the child's personal jurisdiction. At the same time, parents' and children's responses varied in some situations according to the child's gender, perhaps indicating some influence of the traditional hierarchical family model, defined by Figueira (1986), with clear-cut age and gender boundaries. To start with, preadolescent and mid-adolescent girls reported more conflicts involving parents than boys, as shown in Chapter IV. Furthermore, the results reported in Chapter VII indicated that in some situations both parents and children tended to agree more with parental interference when the child was a girl than when the child was a boy. Similarly, an evaluation of the strategies used by mid-adolescents and late adolescents for the resolution of conflicts involving parents, reported in Chapter VI, revealed that boys assumed an autonomous position in relation to their parents sooner than girls.

Apart from the inconsistencies found in relation to gender differences, another aspect which may suggest the co-existence of egalitarian and hierarchical principles in Brazilian families is the fact that even though in the study reported in Chapter VI many adolescents and young adults reported
conflicts involving parental interference in choice of profession or in social life, for example, when confronted with the question of whether or not parents should interfere in these situations (Chapter VII), most parents thought they should not interfere. Therefore, there could be a discrepancy between a felt need to respect their children’s individuality and the wish to keep controlling their children’s lives.

Even though one cannot reach a conclusion about the contribution of cultural factors to the findings reported here, it is hoped that the considerations presented above have contributed as a further reading of the data from the perspective of culture.
IV. METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Having discussed the main theoretical implications of the findings reported in the previous chapters, one should now turn to their methodological implications. The main criticism surrounding the use of hypothetical dilemmas, widely used in research on moral development, relates to the question of what they reveal about morality in real-life situations. In hypothetical situations the investigator manipulates some variables in order to produce a story-stimulus and assess subjects' thinking over that situation. Kohlberg's standard dilemmas, for example, reflect broader social issues and, as emphasized by Damon (1983), pull for principles that reflect a societal perspective. Research based on Turiel's social-interactional theory has also tended to use hypothetical dilemmas to assess subjects' judgments concerning prototypical issues in different domains: moral, conventional or personal. However, as shown by Smetana (in press), it is also important to assess people's judgments in everyday situations. Real-life social situations are much more complex and usually entail components of different domains. Issues of domain overlap are therefore very important and represent a big challenge for research in the area. Another important challenge for research in the area is how people deal with conflict situations in which there is a high personal or emotional involvement, such as in parent-child relations, and how the social knowledge constructed within that context relates to other societal contexts in which people are less deeply emotionally involved. Whereas the ability to resolve conflicts seem to be an important aspect of social development, as has been explored in the
context of close relationships such as parent-child and peer relations by
different authors (e.g. Youniss and Smollar, 1985; Montemayor and Hanson,
1985; Selman, 1980), it is important to investigate patterns of conflict
resolution in different contexts, and especially to compare patterns of conflict
resolution in the context of personal relationships with those encountered in
situations with less personal involvement.

The studies reported in Chapters IV to VI were based on peoples's
narratives of moral conflict situations. The use of narratives in moral
development research is consistent with the assumption that narrative thinking
(Bruner, 1986) is an important mode of thinking which should be given more
attention in moral development research. Until recently, most research on
moral development had tended to concentrate on another dimension of
thinking, i.e. propositional thinking, which focuses on people's capacity to
make abstract, detached, logical judgments.

The main limitation of the studies presented in Chapters IV to VI
concerns the use of questionnaires as the main method of data collection. As
shown by Tappan and Brown (1989), stories elicited in interviews differ in
fundamental ways from stories told in written form. In an interview, the
interviewer asks questions, interrupts, sometimes directs the narrator, so that
stories told in the context of interviews are co-constructed between the
interviewer and interviewee. The main reason for using questionnaires instead
of interviews in the studies presented here was that it was felt that people
might feel freer to talk about personal experiences in written rather than in oral form, as they might feel inhibited by the presence of the interviewer. On the other hand, it is understood that there are limitations with this kind of methodology in terms of the depth of responses, i.e. responses tend to be shorter. In addition, it does not leave space for clarifying subjects' responses.

But perhaps the most fundamental limitation of questionnaires as compared to interviews as a method of gathering narratives of moral conflict and choice is the fact that relationships are excluded from the former. As pointed out by Brown, Debold, Tappan and Gilligan (1991), "...it is only by bringing ourselves, as researchers, into relationships with the narrator of a moral story that we can possibly understand and maintain the integrity of his or her experience" (p. 27). This passage reminded me of a subject who returned a 'blank' questionnaire with the following question: "Do you know the difference between a relationship and a non-relationship?"

It is hoped, however, that this limitation on the level of data gathering may have been compensated on the level of data analysis. It is believed that the use of content analysis as the main method of data analysis has contributed towards an understanding of adolescents' thinking in real-life moral conflict situations. In line with Brown et al.'s (1991) argument, subjects' narratives were submitted to more than one reading, i.e. a reading for the context, a reading for the content, a reading for justifications. An within each of these readings, many readings were necessary for keeping, as much as possible, the
integrity of subjects' writings. Another important aspect of the method of data analysis was that the content categories were always generated through discussions between the investigator and two other coders until a consensus was reached. It is felt that this process of data analysis is very useful and should in fact be incorporated in the method of data analysis of narratives. It is consistent with the social constructivist framework, which assumes that the process of knowledge construction is essentially interactive. Finally, it is believed that through this approach these studies have helped to show the importance of considering sociomoral development from a social constructivist perspective. As already stressed before, the ability to resolve conflicts in special interactive contexts such as parent-child or peer relationships, is an important aspect of social development and more attention should be given to development within these social-interactive contexts.
V. DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The moral development literature seems to be converging towards a common ground, i.e. the importance of relationships in morality. Cooperation has been recently highlighted by different authors as an essential aspect of moral development (e.g. Youniss and Smollar, 1985; Haan, 1991; Kurtines, 1991). While there is a clear common theoretical ground that unites these different perspectives, there is a striking tendency to ignore these commonalities. The disparity between what people say and do, a common concern in the moral development literature, then suddenly becomes an issue of concern in the scientific sphere. An examination of these emerging theories clearly show that the very thing that is being preached on a theoretical level, i.e. the need for a co-constructivist perspective on moral development, is not being carried out in practice. This makes one wonder about the pervasive notion in the moral development literature that cooperation can only take place in the context of peer relations.

One would be stuck if one considered cooperation to be antithetical to competition. However, as shown by Korthals (1992), "contradiction and criticism is an essential part of symmetrical cooperation" (p. 20). If one accepts conflict to be an essential part of relationships, there is no reason to expect that at a certain stage of development (e.g. adolescence) one would become wise enough so as to eliminate conflict with parents or with other people. As pointed out by Haan (1991): "...the need for new resolutions [in moral conflict..."
situations] never cease—new considerations always arise. Thus, moral tensions are ubiquitous, and moral resolutions are constantly achieved" (p. 225).

In the context of parent-child relations, one important question raised in the literature, since Piaget (1932), is the extent to which there can be cooperation in the context of inequality. It is felt that the negative answer to that question, which has tended to prevail in the writings of developmental psychologists, has been partly a consequence of a neglected dimension of parent-child relations, i.e. attachment, highlighted in the writings of Gilligan (1982, 1988).

One possible direction for future research would be to construct a theoretical model of moral development around the converging concept of cooperation. This model should also take account of attachment. As we have seen, the concept of autonomy has been recently reformulated to account for the dimension of attachment, and the more accurate concept of 'autonomous-relatedness', derived from Bowlby's theory, has been proposed. This concept is also implied in the description of the psychoanalytic theorist, Winnicott (1960b), concerning 'the capacity to be alone'. He wrote: "The capacity to be alone is a paradox; it is the experience of being alone while someone is present" (p. 30). Similarly, Youniss (e.g. Davidson and Youniss, 1991), has helped to clarify Piaget's (1932) concept of autonomy, which implies going beyond egocentrism, but not beyond relationships. Davidson and Youniss (1991) wrote: "...cooperative activities are impersonal specifically because ego
involvement is superseded by a logic of mutuality and reciprocity" (p. 118).

Towards the aim of building a model of moral development that integrates the dimensions of attachment and autonomy, a few empirical studies may be suggested. One interesting line of research is already being followed by the Parent-Infant Research Project (University College London). It consists of a longitudinal study, in which mothers and fathers' internal working models of attachment were initially assessed before their infants were born. They were then assessed in the Strange Situation (Ainsworth et al., 1978) with their 1 year-old children. Now they are being reassessed with their 5 year-old children, in a modified version of the Strange Situation. In this new phase of the project, measures of children's moral development are also being taken. This project has potentially important implications, especially if it is extended to adolescence, in terms of identifying the changes, as well as the continuities, in self, morality and relationships from early childhood to late adolescence. It would be especially interesting to note changes in the context of parent-child relations in terms of cooperation or mutuality at different phases of development.

Another project which it is hoped will help to highlight the dimensions of attachment and autonomy in moral development is also a longitudinal study which will be carried out by this investigator, concentrating on the development from preadolescence to late adolescence and beyond. This project will also focus on the relationship between attachment and autonomy
development, and special attention will be given to the dimension of cooperation in parent-child relations. A similar methodology used in the study reported in Chapter VII will be used in this study to examine changes in parents' and children's views concerning parental interference in their lives from preadolescence to late adolescence. In addition, a developmental line of care in the context of parent-child relations will also be considered. It is interesting that while attachment is an important dimension which allows for mutuality in parent-child relations from early childhood, the process of development towards viewing parents as persons, as opposed to authority figures or roles, seems to be slow, and it would be interesting to know at what points these transitions take place. Assuming that this process of development is co-constructed between parents and children, both adolescents and their parents will be interviewed at different developmental stages (preadolescence, mid-adolescence and late adolescence) in order to examine their special concerns and obligations towards each other.

Finally, as the historical truth will never be discovered, since truth is but a narrative (Spence, 1982), it is useful to think of the scientific enterprise as a search, as well as a re-search, with no end. And here one can try and make a parallel with human development. It seems that one of the most difficult developmental tasks is to keep one's integrity in the context of constant changes. In the scientific sphere, keeping the integrity of one's subject of study is a similarly difficult enterprise. Tendencies towards disintegration, or else compartmentalization, as a defense mechanism against disintegration,
are always present. However, cooperation may be the process by which new
integrations will be constructed, such as, for instance, the integration between
female and male, 'gemeinshaft' and 'gesellshaft', care and justice, voices.
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APPENDIX 4A

Questionnaire versions used for the three age groups.

Version used for the 14-16 and 17-21 age groups:

Please read the instructions below and try to answer all the questions. It is not important for us to know your name. But please make sure you indicate below your age and that you provide the information requested at the end of the last page. Thank you for your co-operation.

Age:_______ Sex: F ( ) M ( )

- I would like you to give me 3 examples of moral conflict situations which you may have experienced recently. Moral conflict situations are usually situations in which we are in doubt about what to do, wondering whether something is right or wrong, fair or unfair, etc.

SITUATION 1:

- What was the conflict you had in this situation?

  a) How difficult was it for you to decide what to do in this situation? Look at the numbers below. If you think it was not difficult, circle number 1, if you think it was a little difficult, circle number 2, if somewhat difficult, circle number 3, if you think it was difficult, circle number 4 and if you think it was very difficult, circle number 5.

    NOT A LITTLE SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT VERY
    DIFFICULT DIFFICULT DIFFICULT DIFFICULT
    1 2 3 4 5

  b) What did you decide to do?

  C) Why did you take this decision?

SITUATION 2:

- What was the conflict you had in this situation?
a) How difficult was it for you to decide what to do in this situation? Look at the numbers below. If you think it was not difficult, circle number 1, if you think it was a little difficult, circle number 2, if somewhat difficult, circle number 3, if you think it was difficult, circle number 4 and if you think it was very difficult, circle number 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>A LITTLE DIFFICULT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>VERY DIFFICULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What did you decide to do?

C) Why did you take this decision?

SITUATION 3:

- What was the conflict you had in this situation?

a) How difficult was it for you to decide what to do in this situation? Look at the numbers below. If you think it was not difficult, circle number 1, if you think it was a little difficult, circle number 2, if somewhat difficult, circle number 3, if you think it was difficult, circle number 4 and if you think it was very difficult, circle number 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>A LITTLE DIFFICULT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>VERY DIFFICULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What did you decide to do?

C) Why did you take this decision?

Finally:

- Do you have both parents? ( )yes ( )father only ( )mother only
- Do you live with your parents? ( )yes ( )no
  ( )mother only ( )father only
Version used for the 10-12 age group:

Please read the instructions below and try to answer all the questions. It is not important for us to know your name. But please make sure you indicate below your age and that you provide the information requested at the end of the last page. Thank you for your co-operation.

Age: _____  Sex: F ( ) M ( )

- Sometimes we are in doubt about what to do, wondering whether something is right or wrong, fair or unfair. I would like you to give me 3 examples of recent situations in which you felt like that.

SITUATION 1:

- What was the doubt you had in this situation?

a) How difficult was it for you to decide what to do in this situation? Look at the numbers below. If you think it was not difficult, circle number 1, if you think it was a little difficult, circle number 2, if somewhat difficult, circle number 3, if you think it was difficult, circle number 4 and if you think it was very difficult, circle number 5.


b) What did you decide to do?

C) Why did you take this decision?

SITUATION 2:

- What was the doubt you had in this situation?
a) How difficult was it for you to decide what to do in this situation? Look at the numbers below. If you think it was not difficult, circle number 1, if you think it was a little difficult, circle number 2, if somewhat difficult, circle number 3, if you think it was difficult, circle number 4 and if you think it was very difficult, circle number 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>A LITTLE DIFFICULT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>DIFFICULT</th>
<th>VERY DIFFICULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What did you decide to do?

C) Why did you take this decision?

SITUATION 3:

- What was the doubt you had in this situation?

a) How difficult was it for you to decide what to do in this situation? Look at the numbers below. If you think it was not difficult, circle number 1, if you think it was a little difficult, circle number 2, if somewhat difficult, circle number 3, if you think it was difficult, circle number 4 and if you think it was very difficult, circle number 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>A LITTLE DIFFICULT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>DIFFICULT</th>
<th>VERY DIFFICULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What did you decide to do?

C) Why did you take this decision?

Finally:

- Do you have both parents? ( )yes ( )father only ( )mother only
- Do you live with your parents? ( )yes ( )no
  ( )mother only ( )father only
**APPENDIX 4B**

Coding scheme showing the possible combinations of interpersonal and individual context. The derived score represents the difference between the use of interpersonal and individual context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal context</th>
<th>Individual context</th>
<th>Final score (Int-Ind)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4C

Examples of the types of issues involved in the conflict situations.

I- PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

A) PARENTS

Parental interference
-My father and my mother won't let me go to a party in a club. I don’t understand why they won’t let me go (16 year-old girl).
- I had an argument with my mother because she would always come into my room and arrange things on my desk in a way I don’t really like (11 year-old boy).

Lying/keeping secrets
-I got bad marks in my exams. I didn't know whether or not to show my parents my school records (11 year-old boy).

Quarrels with parents
-Arguments with my parents; I can’t put up with their criticisms, I lose control and I often argue with them (18 year-old girl).
-When I had an argument with my mother. I didn’t know whether I should make up with her or not (12 year-old boy).
-My mother argued with me. I didn’t know whether I should answer her back (11 year-old girl).

Parental divorce/arguments between parents
-When my parents got divorced. I didn’t know who I was going to live with (11 year-old girl).
-My parents had a serious argument and they thought about separating. They both tried to make me take sides and I don’t know very well what made them argue (18 year-old girl).

Obedience to parents
-My parents went away on a trip and I stayed with my grandmother. I didn’t want to obey her. I wanted to go out and do all sorts of things and I think that was wrong (11 year-old girl).

Fear of parental punishment/reaction
-I wanted to do an experiment, but I needed to take some things from my mother’s wardrobe (cotton wool, mercury). I didn’t know whether to pick them up or not because my mother could be upset (11 year-old boy).

Divergence of ideas/values
-My parents are too reactionary; they want to impose old-fashioned moral values on me (16 year-old boy).

Criticism of parental attitudes
-My mother smokes. Now she’s feeling the consequences of her smoking. She’s got pneumonia and heart problems. I hate cigarettes (15 year-old boy).

Sibling jealousy
-When my sister was my age she started to drive and even though I ask my parents to let me drive they won’t let me do it. The conflict has to do with the different treatment towards me and my sister (14 year-old girl).

Meeting parental expectations
-My parents wanted me to do Law and I didn’t do it. I was afraid to go against what is expected from you (18 year-old boy).

Concern about parents
-To continue living with my mother or to go and live with my girlfriend; should you stay with someone you’re in love with and not help your mother financially? (20 year-old boy).

Asking parents for gifts/money
-I wanted to buy something (a videogame) and I didn’t know whether I should ask my parents (14 year-old boy).

Other
-To depend on my parents’ money for a living. Do I have the right to be here spending their money? (20 year-old girl).
-To steal my mother’s jewels. (conflict) Dishonesty, lie (15 year-old boy).

B) THE FAMILY

Family interference
-I like to live isolated, to be as independent as I can; my family don’t want me away from home for long periods of time (19 year-old boy).

Quarrels
-In my family we have frequent quarrels over money issues; my brother and I want money and my parents cannot buy the things we want (15 year-old girl).

Divergence of ideas/values
-There are certain decisions we take that may generate conflict with the family because we think differently about certain things (e.g. drugs) (20 year-old boy).

Lying/keeping secrets
-I started to smoke marijuana and I didn’t tell my family; I don’t know how they would react to it (15 year-old girl).
Guilt
- I feel like leaving home but at the same time I feel guilty about leaving my family (17 year-old girl).

C) SIBLINGS

Quarrels
- My sister and I once had a serious quarrel; I wanted to beat her, but at the same time I didn't want to (12 year-old girl).

Loyalty/faithfulness
- My brother's girlfriend got pregnant; I was the only person who knew about the situation; my parents or other relatives didn't know about it. I didn't know whether or not to tell my parents that (16 year-old girl).

Justice
- I broke my father's cup and I said my brother had done it; I think I should have said it was me (11 year-old boy).

Sharing
- The other day I was at home on my own and there wasn't enough coke in the refrigerator; I didn't know whether I should save some for my brother (12 year-old girl).

Looking after younger siblings
- In the school I used to go to there was a group of girls and boys, of 12-16 years of age, who used to smoke; my sister was part of that group but apparently she didn't smoke; I felt obliged to keep her away from this kind of friendship (17 year-old boy).

Other
- I was playing chess with my brother; as he is a bad player and does not come to visit very frequently I felt I should let him win; I feel sorry for him and I don't see him often, but I wanted to win really (15 year-old boy).

D) FRIENDS

Loyalty/faithfulness
- A friend of mine told me a secret and another friend wanted to know what the secret was about. I thought I shouldn't tell him because that was important for the person who had confided in me (11 year-old boy).

Quarrels
- A friend of mine started to provoke me. I didn't know whether or not to have an argument with him (11 year-old boy).

Group pressure
- Two years ago I started Electrical Engineering and this year I decided to change. Some friends thought I was changing courses because I was not competent enough to do it, but for me it was a very important decision to take (18 year-old boy).

Helping
- A friend of mine told me he was in love with a girl I knew. He wouldn't talk to her because he was very shy, and as a friend I thought that I should help him (15 year-old boy).

Trust
- A friend of mine asked me to lend him some money. It was a reasonable amount of money. I didn't know whether or not to lend him the money (20 year-old girl).

Lying/keeping secrets
- A very intimate friend of mine goes out with a guy who I know only wants to have sex with her (he still hasn't succeeded). Should I tell her what I know about him or just let things happen? (17 year-old boy).

Feeling rejected
- I don't feel I'm really important for my friends. I try to be friends with them because I think friendship is important (14 year-old boy).

Relationship problems
- Conflict with a friend because of his education and some different values with which we were raised (18 year-old boy).

Other
- I took my friend's car when I wasn't in a condition to drive. I knew I wasn't well, but I wanted to drive her car (21 year-old boy).

D) COLLEAGUES

Group pressure
- My colleagues decided to miss a class. The class was relatively important. I didn't know whether to adhere to the opinion of the group or to stay in class (19 year-old boy).

Quarrels
- To argue with my colleague. I didn't know whether that was right or wrong (11 year-old girl).

Divergence of ideas/values
- The other day there was a discussion with my colleagues in the classroom about capitalism v. socialism, right v. left; some of them just could not admit that their views were wrong (20 year-old boy).
Cheating
-A colleague asked me to let him copy my answers in the exam. I didn't know whether or not to let him do it (21 year-old boy).

Justice
-I was playing chess with my colleague, and he left the room to go to the toilet. I didn't know if I should cheat, because that would not be fair (11 year-old boy).

Helping
-I didn't know whether or not to lend my pen to my colleague, Helena. She needed a pen to write a composition. I didn't want to lend her my pen but I thought it would be impolite if I didn't (11 year-old girl).

Feeling rejected
-Sometimes I try to get closer to my colleagues and they do not accept my company. I feel isolated (16 year-old boy).

Trust
-Sometimes I feel in doubt about my colleagues. I don't know whether they like me and whether I can tell them my secrets (11 year-old girl).

Lying/keeping secret
-When a colleague once gave me a questionnaire to answer I didn't know whether or not to tell the truth (the questionnaire asked who I liked) (11 year-old girl).

Loyalty/faithfulness
-The teacher told my colleague to go and see the headmaster. He didn't tell his mother what happened and the teacher asked me to talk to his mother. If I told his mother my colleague would never talk to me again (12 year-old boy).

Other
-I found something that belonged to a friend and I did not give him back. I didn't know whether or not to keep it (11 year-old girl).

F) BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND

Loyalty/faithfulness
-I used to go out with a girl; I liked her, but I felt attracted to another person and wanted to have an affair with her; I was afraid I would betray the person I loved (19 year-old boy).

Ending a relationship
-My girlfriend and I split up; I was afraid I wouldn't have her affection anymore (16 year-old).

Sexual involvement
-I'm going out with someone who I like very much and we've started to have more intimate sexual involvement. I don't know whether I should do that (15 year-old girl).

Starting a relationship
-I didn't know whether or not to ask a girl I liked to go out with me (11 year-old boy).

Relationship problems
-I've been going out with someone, but there are certain things which are not working in our relationship; I don't know what to do about that (20 year-old girl).

Fear of involvement
-I didn't know whether I should kiss a girl who was always ringing me. I was afraid that we would have a greater involvement later on (12 year-old boy).

Confessing love
-When I was in the classroom the other day I had a big doubt. I didn't know whether or not I should tell Pedro I loved him (10 year-old girl).

Mixed feelings
-I've been going out with a girl for a while and I'm not sure whether I like her or not (15 year-old boy).

Other
-I've got a boyfriend who has got problems with his parents. I don't know how to help him. He goes through some phases which are not very nice (15 year-old girl).

II. IMPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Acts with actual or potential harm to others
-I took a 7 and I was going to kill a bird. I didn't kill it because I thought that wasn't right (11 year-old boy).

Arguments/retaliation
-A boy hit me. I didn't know whether I should hit him back (11 year-old boy).

Interference of others in personal life
-Discussions concerning life projects. I want to do some things in my life and some people are against that (16 year-old girl).

Helping others
-A blind person was crossing the street and nobody was helping her. I felt I should go and help her (20 year-old boy).
Fear of punishment
- I went into somebody's garden to take some fruits and somebody came in. I didn't know whether I should run or hide (10 year-old boy).

Justice
- I got involved in an incident with the police. Nobody wanted to hear what I had to say and I was sent to a police station where I stayed for 2 hours. That wasn't fair (19 year-old boy).

Giving to charity
- Giving money to beggars in the street; I don't know whether I should give them money or not (21 year-old boy).

Divergence of ideas/values
- Presidential elections; there is some divergence of ideas with some people around me (15 year-old girl).

Prejudice
- The prejudice that I feel on the part of some people (racial, and maybe social prejudice as well); I tend to rebel against that (20 year-old girl).

Concern about others' image of oneself
- The teachers wanted me to stop messing around because that was bad for me. If I stopped people would say I was boring (14 year-old girl).

Speaking one's mind
- Sometimes I feel in doubt whether I should tell someone what I think (11 year-old girl).

Pressure of others
- People pressurize me to pass my exams. At the beginning it wasn't very easy, but now I feel that I've got to pass because I know the 7 and not because other people impose that on me (15 year-old girl).

Reporting someone
- I was once in a bus when I saw a man opening a lady's handbag and taking her money; I didn't know whether I should tell the conductor about it or not (11 year-old boy).

Keeping commitments
- I had an important meeting with someone (I had to work with her) and I was too tired to go because I had just moved house. I got conflicted about the commitment to work on that day (19 year-old girl).

Other
- I was robbed the other day. I felt that I was like a prey and the thief was a hunter (16 year-old boy).

ACtIONS/CHOICES

Academic life
- I wanted to miss a class of maths but I didn't know if I should do that (11 year-old boy).

Professional Choice
- The conflict is whether it is worthwhile going to college and getting a degree considering the present situation of the university and of the country (17 year-old girl).

Politics
- Presidential elections. To choose the best candidate (21 year-old boy).

Personal insecurity
- Adolescence; to accept how one is, to know what one wants or expects from life, to have a minimum knowledge about oneself and to "find yourself" (19 year-old girl).

Transgressions
- I invented data and lied in order to get a job I needed and wanted very much. I lied, but a lot of people did that, so I was in the same situation as everyone else (19 year-old boy).

Responsibility
- I had to be at a certain day in my employment and I didn't show up (20 year-old boy).

Sexual behaviour
- I get in doubt whether I should have lost my virginity. I wonder if that was good for me or if I am going to regret it later on (15 year-old girl).

Use of drugs
- I decided to do something I had never done before which I used to think was an awful thing to do (to try cocaine). I did something wrong; for me that was terrible (14 year-old girl).

Religion
- To abandon the religion (religious institution) I belonged to. The absence of a notion of what is true makes me afraid and, above all, makes me feel insecure (18 year-old boy).

Leaving home
- I got an invitation to go and live abroad. I don't know whether or not I should accept it (18 year-old girl).

Abortion
- I thought I was pregnant. I didn't know whether or not to have an abortion (21 year-old girl).
Other
-I felt like committing suicide. There is a total lack of future perspective and much despair, having to do with being distant from a very important person (17 year-old boy).

IDEAS/VALUES

Social problems
- Thefts in which street children are involved. I am in favour of the theory of environmental determinism. They steal because they haven't got anything to eat (20 year-old girl).

Religion
- To believe in God. Is he the creator? Is it worthwhile to have faith and to pray for a better life? (18 year-old boy).

Sex
- Is it alright to have sex when you're 15 years old? (15 year-old girl).

Fashion
- Fashion is a determinant factor in society. If you follow fashion then you are well adjusted to society and to small social groups (15 year-old boy).

Prejudice
- I feel like going out on my own, at any time, like men do, but I cannot do it because society has made women dependent. Everybody should have the freedom to go wherever they want to (19 year-old girl).

Justice
- Is it fair to let people die when one knows the government steals money from people? (18 year-old boy).

Other
- Why can't I miss a class if I don't feel like attending it? The conflict is between the student and school regulations which impose certain conditions on students (15 year-old boy).
APPENDIX 4D

Examples of each justification category by context.

FRIENDS

1- Personal
Self: A 12 year-old (girl): I was afraid they would discover it. (Decision) I decided to go. (Justif.)

Self-other: A 15 year-old (boy): My parents’ separation. (Decision) Dialogue. (Justif.)

Values/principles: A 19 year-old (girl): I don’t like to live in a conflicting atmosphere. I love and respect my family.

2- Impersonal
Jargon: A 12 year-old (boy): I had an argument with my friend I started to be angry with him. I wanted to beat him or fight with him. (Decision) I decided to be friends with him again. (Justif.)

Values/principles: A 19 year-old (girl): I was asked not to tell something to a friend. (Decision) Talk about the problem with this friend indirectly.

3- External Factors
A 18 year-old (girl): I was walking with my friend when a boy stole my friend’s golden necklace. I decided to stay quiet. (Decision) The stealing was inevitable.

PARENTS

1- Personal
Self: A 12 year-old (girl): I went to a party and I did not tell my parents. I was afraid they would discover it. (Decision) I decided to go. (Justif.)

Self-other: A 15 year-old (boy): I was driving my father’s car and I hit it. It is not fair to disregard his work and effort with a silly attitude. (Decision) I gave my key to him and I promised not to drive for some time. (Justif.)

Values/principles: A 19 year-old (girl): My parents did not allow me to travel with my boyfriend and friends. (Decision) I didn’t go. (Justif.)

FRIENDS

1- Personal
Self: A 12 year-old (boy): I had a friend who was very jealous of me; she would always judge me, think badly of me. (Decision) I decided not to talk to her anymore. (Justif.)

Self-other: A 16 year-old (girl): I was going out with a guy who wanted to have sex with me. I didn’t know whether or not I should have sex with him. (Decision) I didn’t have sex with him. (Justif.)

Values/principles: A 15 year-old (girl): I have a “friend” who I like very much. Once we stayed together at a party. We remained friends after that.

2- Impersonal
Rules: A 12 year-old (boy): I didn’t know whether or not to kiss a girl who was always phoning me. I was afraid in case we would have a greater involvement later on. (Decision) Not to kiss her. (Justif.)

Values/principles: A 15 year-old (girl): I have a “friend” who I like very much. Once we stayed together at a party. We remained friends after that.

3- External Factors
A 11 year-old (girl): I once broke my mother’s pot and I didn’t know what to do, whether or not I should tell her. (Decision) I decided not to tell her that I broke her pot. (Justif.)

BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND

1- Personal
Self: A 19 year-old (boy): I had a girlfriend who I loved, but I felt attracted to another woman and wanted to have an affair with her. I was afraid I would lose the person I loved but wanted to go out with the other. (Decision) I stayed with both of them and did not tell my girlfriend. (Justif.)

Self-other: A 16 year-old (boy): I was going out with a guy who wanted to have sex with me. I didn’t know whether or not I should have sex with him. (Decision) I didn’t have sex with him. (Justif.)

Values/principles: A 15 year-old (girl): I have a “friend” who I like very much. Once we stayed together at a party. We remained friends after that.

2- Impersonal
Rules: A 12 year-old (boy): I didn’t know whether or not to kiss a girl who was always phoning me. I was afraid in case we would have a greater involvement later on. (Decision) Not to kiss her. (Justif.)

Values/principles: A 15 year-old (girl): I have a “friend” who I like very much. Once we stayed together at a party. We remained friends after that.

3- External Factors
A 18 year-old (girl): Whether or not to continue a relationship of 2 1/2 years, me being 19 years old and her being 18 years old. I don’t know whether life will be better with her or whether it would be better for me to live like a normal 19 year old. (Decision) I will continue until the summer and see if I can live fully with her or if I really need more experience before I can decide whether to stay with her. (Justif.)
3-External Factors
A 15 year-old (boy): An affair with a girl. I don't know whether I'm in love with her. (Decision) I will wait and see what happens. (Justif.) Because only with time will I know what I feel for her.

COLLEAGUES
1- Personal
Self: An 11 year-old (boy): Once it was hot, there was a lot of work to do and many people would miss the class. I didn't know whether or not to go with my colleagues. (Decision) To miss the class. (Justif.) Because there would be too much work in class, I was tired and feeling hot.
Self-other: A 19 year-old (boy): When I was at high school my colleagues decided to miss a relatively important class together. I didn't know whether or not to adhere to the group's opinion. (Decision) I decided to adhere to the group's opinion. (Justif.) Respect for my colleagues. Even though I didn't have the same opinion of the group, being one of them I couldn't go against their opinion.
Other: An 11 year-old (boy): Once my colleague and I were talking and the teacher told us to leave. I didn't know whether or not to go and see the headmaster. (Decision) Not to go. (Justif.) Because may colleague had already been sent to the headmaster many times.

2- Impersonal
Rules: An 11 year-old (girl): I wanted to donate my eyes and my family didn't agree. (Decision) I donated my eyes without my family's permission. (Justif.) I think it's fair that children starve because of parents' ignorance and society's indifference. I think that we will always be a bit responsible if we fail to help a human being close to us.

OTHER FAMILY MEMBERS
1- Personal
Self: A 16 year-old (girl): Discussion about doing theatre. My grandmother on the one side not wanting me to do it and I on the other wanting to do it. (Decision) I decided to take acting classes. (Justif.) Because I love to perform and my grandmother doesn't want me to do it because she says that soap operas are immoral. (Grandmother's view), that theatre is a silly thing, that I should worry about more important things.
Self-other: An 11 year-old (boy): I was invited to spend a few days on a farm and my cousin wanted me to go to his birthday party. I didn't know whether to go to the farm or to my cousin's birthday party. (Decision) Go to my cousin's birthday party. (Justif.) Because I like my cousin very much and it was his 10th birthday.
Other: A 25 year-old (boy): My cousin asked me to help her to have an abortion because she was pregnant (the father was another person). I wanted to help her, because she was in a difficult situation, but I'm against abortion. (Decision) I helped her to do what she wanted (abortion). (Justif.) Even though I was against her decision I couldn't leave her alone.

3- External Factors
A 14 year-old (boy): My colleagues left me out of the football team. (Decision) I had to accept it. (Justif.) It wasn't me who took that decision.

OTHER FAMILY MEMBERS
1- Personal
Self: A 16 year-old (girl): I saw my cousin having sex and I knew it wasn't correct. (Decision) I didn't know whether to tell somebody that (Decision) I decided not to go. (Justif.) Because I'm too young and so is he.
Jaron: A 12 year-old (girl): I saw my cousin having sex and I knew it wasn't correct. I didn't know whether to tell somebody that. (Decision) I didn't tell anybody. (Justif.) Because one shouldn't interfere in people's lives.
Duty/responsibility: A 21 year-old (girl): Some years ago my cousin had a black boyfriend whom her parents didn't accept. The conflict was the fact that her parents were racist and didn't have a dialogue with their daughter. (Decision) I tried to talk to her and see if that was really what she wanted and if that was the case she should try and solve the problem with her family. (Justif.) I thought I should give my opinion because she had confided in me.
Values/principles: A 14 year-old (girl): My cousin and I were discussing abortion. She thinks abortion should be allowed and I'm against it. (Decision) She totally agrees with abortion and I'm against it. (Justif.) Because it goes against my principles, I'm against everything that isn't natural.

2- Impersonal
Rules: A 12 year-old (girl): My cousin and I were at my aunt's when my cousin invited me to go to sleep. I didn't know whether to go because he could abuse me. (Decision) I decided not to go. (Justif.) Because I'm too young and so is he.
Jarson: A 12 year-old (girl): I saw my cousin having sex and I knew it wasn't correct. I didn't know whether to tell somebody that. (Decision) I didn't tell anybody. (Justif.) Because one shouldn't interfere in people's lives.
Duty/responsibility: A 21 year-old (girl): Some years ago my cousin had a black boyfriend whom her parents didn't accept. The conflict was the fact that her parents were racist and didn't have a dialogue with their daughter. (Decision) I tried to talk to her and see if that was really what she wanted and if that was the case she should try and solve the problem with her family. (Justif.) I thought I should give my opinion because she had confided in me.
Values/principles: A 14 year-old (girl): My cousin and I were discussing abortion. She thinks abortion should be allowed and I'm against it. (Decision) She totally agrees with abortion and I'm against it. (Justif.) Because it goes against my principles, I'm against everything that isn't natural.

3- External Factors
A 15 year-old (boy): My cousin escaped with her boyfriend and they took shelter in my house. She returned home after 3 months. (Decision) I tried to convince them that it was a crazy thing to do but I let them stay over without my parents knowing it. (Justif.) Because they would escape anyway, there was nothing I could do.

THE FAMILY
1- Personal
Self: A 17 year-old (boy): Choice of career. My family pressured me to take a course (Medicine) and I chose another one (Law). (Decision) I decided to take Law, even going against my family. (Justif.) My passion for the course and ability in this area, as well as financial benefits.
Self-other: A 15 year-old (boy): Disagreements in the family. The family is falling apart. (Decision) We got together and discussed why we argued. (Justif.) So that the family can live better together with greater harmony.
Other: A 19 year-old (girl): I wanted to travel to Nicaragua. My family didn't agree because there was too much political conflict there. (Decision) I decided not to travel. (Justif.) Because my family was right, they would be worried.

2- Impersonal
Duty/responsibility: A 19 year-old (girl): I wanted to donate my eyes and my family didn't agree. (Decision) I donated my eyes without my family's authorization. (Justif.) If I die and don't need my organs anymore I should donate them.
Values/principles: A 15 year-old (girl): My family tries to influence my choice of profession. (Decision) I chose a profession thinking about the advantages and disadvantages, what would satisfy me most. (Justif.) I think that one should try and find out what one really likes and nobody should interfere in that decision.

3- External Factors
An 18 year-old (boy): To miss classes in order to stay longer on the beach. To go against my family’s principles: first one’s duty, then leisure. (Decision) To stay on the beach. (Justif.) The improbability of having good days during the winter.

1- Personal

Self: An 11 year-old (girl): I was in doubt whether I should argue with my brother or make it up with him. (Decision) I decided to make it up with him. (Justif.) Because if I wanted to ask him for something I wouldn’t be able to because we had quarrelled.

Self: A 14 year-old (girl): I was going out with a slightly older guy. My brother didn’t like that. (Decision) I decided to leave my boyfriend. (Justif.) I think it wasn’t very nice really, it was just a silly thing. I prefer my brother to a temporary boyfriend.

Other: A 15 year-old (boy): I was playing chess with my brother. As he is a bad chess player and rarely comes to visit I felt like letting him win the game. But I wanted to win. (Decision) I let him win (but only once). (Justif.) I wanted to make him a bit happy, we almost never see each other. His marriage isn’t going very well and I feel even more sorry for him.

2- Impersonal

Jargon: A 17 year-old (girl): Quarrels with my sister for lending clothes. (Decision) To lend her my clothes. (Justif.) Because I’m very possessive and this does not lead to anything.

Values/principles: An 11 year-old (boy): I had an argument with my younger brother. I wonder whether that was right or wrong to beat him. (Decision) I decided not to beat him. (Justif.) Because I think it is unfair to beat someone who is younger, it would be cowardice.

3- External Factors

An 18 year-old (girl): Interference of others in my choice of area. (Decision) To choose what fascinated me: Architecture. (Justif.) My interest in this profession.

Self: A 12 year-old (girl): One day my teacher asked whether there was anyone who wanted to leave the classroom to talk. She would say that in every class. (Decision) I left the classroom. (Justif.) Because I was too impatient.

Self-other: A 16 year-old (boy): I wrote bad words in the Portuguese exam. My teacher scolded me in front of the classroom. I didn’t know whether or not to apologise to her. (Decision) I apologised to her and the following day I missed her class. (Justif.) I missed the class to see if things would get better between us.

Other: An 18 year-old (girl): The barman didn’t charge me for what I had consumed and I left the bar. I didn’t know whether or not to give him the money back. (Decision) I gave it back. (Justif.) He is very nice, he always serves me well and the money is probably more important for him than it is for me.

1- Personal

Self: A 12 year-old (girl): I had a cat and he was already 19 years old. My doubt was whether to take away his life. (Decision) I decided not to take away his life. (Justif.) Because I think only God has the power to take away somebody’s life.

Values/principles: An 18 year-old (girl): I wanted my boss to pay me a better salary. (Decision) I talked to him without aggressiveness. (Justif.) I thought that I shouldn’t accept the situation as it was. One shouldn’t let other people demoralize us.

2- Impersonal

Rule: A 10 year-old (boy): I had a cat and he was already 19 years old. My doubt was whether to take away his life. (Decision) I decided not to take away his life. (Justif.) Because I think only God has the power to take away somebody’s life.

Values/principles: A 18 year-old (girl): I wanted my boss to pay me a better salary. (Decision) I talked to him without aggressiveness. (Justif.) I thought that I shouldn’t accept the situation as it was. One shouldn’t let other people demoralize us.

3- External Factors

An 18 year-old (girl): To miss classes in order to stay longer on the beach. To go against my family’s principles: first one’s duty, then leisure. (Decision) To stay on the beach. (Justif.) The improbability of having good days during the winter.

INDIVIDUAL ACTIONS/CHOICES

1- Personal

Self: A 17 year-old (girl): Quarrels with my sister for lending clothes. (Decision) To lend her my clothes. (Justif.) Because I’m very possessive and this does not lead to anything.

Values/principles: An 11 year-old (boy): I had an argument with my younger brother. I wonder whether that was right or wrong to beat him. (Decision) I decided not to beat him. (Justif.) Because I think it is unfair to beat someone who is younger, it would be cowardice.

3- External Factors

A 15 year-old (girl): I wanted to beat the boy who used to steal my pen. He was too little (7-8 years old) and had problems at home. (Decision) I asked my mother (who is his teacher) to ask him to give my pen back. (Justif.) Because his parents are very angry and it’s easier for my mother to convince him to give my pen back to me,

IMPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

1- Personal

Self: A 14 year-old (girl): The conflict has to do with drugs, the imposition of certain people, prejudice, way of interpreting things. (Decision) I didn’t accept that kind of thing, I think it’s appalling. (Justif.) I will be doing the best for myself.

Values/principles: An 11 year-old (boy): A boy beat me. I didn’t know whether or not to beat him back. (Decision) Not to beat him. (Justif.) Because one has to respect other people in order to be respected.

Values/principles: An 18 year-old (girl): Some people think it is strange to go out with a friend when one has a boyfriend. These people criticize things without knowing what is really going on. (Decision) I believe in friendship. I went out with my friend and will do that many times. (Justif.) Friendship is very important and should be preserved. We need friends even when we have a boyfriend.

2- Impersonal

Jargon: An 11 year-old (boy): A boy beat me. I didn’t know whether or not to beat him back. (Decision) Not to beat him. (Justif.) Because one has to respect other people in order to be respected.

Values/principles: An 18 year-old (girl): Some people think it is strange to go out with a friend when one has a boyfriend. These people criticize things without knowing what is really going on. (Decision) I believe in friendship. I went out with my friend and will do that many times. (Justif.) Friendship is very important and should be preserved. We need friends even when we have a boyfriend.

3- External Factors

A 20 year-old (boy): A year ago I didn’t help someone who had an accident. I didn’t know whether to stop to help her or go to my class. (Decision) I didn’t help her. (Justif.) I was very sorry but I was on foot and didn’t have money to pay for a taxi.
Self: A 15 year-old (boy): I got home after a trip and I had an exam the next day. I hadn’t had time to study. I didn’t want to cheat because I would be betraying myself. (Decision) I decided to cheat. (Justif.) Because I didn’t want to fail.

An 11 year-old (girl): I was in doubt whether to miss my Geography class. (Decision) To miss the class. (Justif.) Because I didn’t feel like attending the class.

A 23 year-old (boy): I should be at work on a certain day. I didn’t know whether or not to be there on the appointed day. (Decision) I didn’t go on the appointed day. (Justif.) My interests first, then the interests of the bank where I work.

2- Impersonal

Rules: An 11 year-old (girl): I didn’t know whether or not to go on a diet. (Decision) That I wouldn’t go on diet. (Justif.) Because I’m too young.

Jargon: A 16 year-old (girl): Use of drugs. Whether it’s right or wrong, fear of being caught. (Decision) I stopped consuming drugs. (Justif.) Because I think using drugs lead to nothing.

Duty/responsibility: A 16 year-old (boy): Vote. I didn’t know who to choose. (Decision) I will decide when I have the vote. (Justif.) I think it’s the duty of each Brazilian to choose the best for the country.

Values/principles: 17 year-old (girl): Choice of career. I didn’t know which of two colleges to choose. (Decision) I decided to attend both colleges this year so that I could choose better. (Justif.) A profession is for the rest of one’s life. It is important to enjoy one’s professional activity, to be satisfied with it.

3- External Factors

A 12 year-old (boy): I didn’t know whether or not to miss my Maths class. (Decision) I decided to miss it. (Justif.) It was too hot.

IDEAS/VALUES

1- Personal

Self: An 18 year-old (girl): I’m a catholic. It’s difficult nowadays not to follow the fashion. (Decision) To act according to my own conscience. (Justif.) Religion is very important in my life. I don’t think I should abandon it just because people nowadays don’t believe in anything.

2- Impersonal

Values/principles: A 15 year-old (boy): Each time I travel on my own I need a legal permission. I think that minors should be able to travel without a permission. (Decision) I think of fighting for my rights. (Justif.) That way one can demand responsibility from the adolescent, making him take his decisions and assume the consequences of his acts. (407) An 18 year-old (boy): Giving money to beggars. Does he/she deserve it? (Decision) I rarely give them money. (Justif.) I don’t think it’s educational for them. I think that a friendly word, a caring attitude would be better than millions in money.

3- External Factors

An 18 year-old (girl): A girl I know got pregnant and she wasn’t married. The conflict is about pregnancy when one is not married. (Decision) She got married. (Justif.) Pressure from society.

HALL RESIDENTS

1- Personal

Self: A 24 year-old (boy): I share my room with a girl who is totally different from me. (Decision) I told her I’m going to change rooms. (Justif.) The lack of privacy (to study).

Self-other: A 19 year-old (boy): Changing rooms in the hall of residence. Whether or not to go along with my room mate’s decision to change rooms. (Decision) To change rooms with him. (Justif.) Out of consideration for our friendship.

Other: A 20 year-old (girl): My room mate leaves her clothes all over the room; she also leaves empty packages and papers over the furniture or on the floor and that annoys me. I don’t want to create a bad atmosphere, for I had already talked to her two or three times before. (Decision) I decided to keep my things tidy because I know she observes it and maybe she will want to discipline herself. (Justif.) It would be very bad to openly criticize her attitude. She gets hurt very easily.

2- Impersonal

Rules: A 20 year-old (girl): Whether it’s fair to go against the hall’s statute and accept that a hall resident who has already finished his degree (but who doesn’t have anywhere to go) remain in the hall of residence. The conflict is to go against the hall’s laws or against a friendship. (Decision) To be on the side of the laws. (Justif.) Since I’m doing Law I have to observe and respect the laws; if they exist it’s because they were thought of before.

Values/principles: A 19 year-old (boy): Some residents wanted all residents to pay for the weekend meals, even those who don’t stay for the weekend. (Decision) I support those residents who defend the idea that those who don’t stay don’t pay. (Justif.) It is not fair to pay for something that one does not benefit from.
APPENDIX 4E

Coding scheme showing the possible combinations of personal and impersonal justifications for each conflict situation. The derived score represents the difference between the use of personal and impersonal justifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal justification</th>
<th>Other justifications</th>
<th>Impersonal justifications</th>
<th>Final score (P-I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6A

Questionnaire version used.

Please read the instructions below and try to answer all the questions. It is not important for us to know your
name. But please make sure you indicate below your age and that you provide the information requested at the
end of the last page. Thank you for your co-operation.
Age:_______ Sex: F ( ) M ( )

- I would like you to give me 3 examples of moral conflict situations involving your parents which you may have
experienced recently. Moral conflict situations are usually situations in which we are in doubt about what to do,
wondering whether something is right or wrong, fair or unfair, etc.

SITUATION 1:

- What was the conflict you had with your parents in this situation?

a) How difficult was it for you to decide what to do in this situation? Look at the numbers below. If you think
it was not difficult, circle number 1, if you think it was a little difficult, circle number 2, if somewhat difficult,
circle number 3, if you think it was difficult, circle number 4 and if you think it was very difficult, circle number 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT</th>
<th>A LITTLE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT</th>
<th>DIFFICULT</th>
<th>VERY DIFFICULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What did you decide to do?

C) Why did you take this decision?

SITUATION 2:

- What was the conflict you had with your parents in this situation?
a) How difficult was it for you to decide what to do in this situation? Look at the numbers below. If you think it was not difficult, circle number 1, if you think it was a little difficult, circle number 2, if somewhat difficult, circle number 3, if you think it was difficult, circle number 4 and if you think it was very difficult, circle number 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>A LITTLE DIFFICULT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>VERY DIFFICULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What did you decide to do?

C) Why did you take this decision?


SITUATION 3:

- What was the conflict you had with your parents in this situation?

a) How difficult was it for you to decide what to do in this situation? Look at the numbers below. If you think it was not difficult, circle number 1, if you think it was a little difficult, circle number 2, if somewhat difficult, circle number 3, if you think it was difficult, circle number 4 and if you think it was very difficult, circle number 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>A LITTLE DIFFICULT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>VERY DIFFICULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What did you decide to do?

C) Why did you take this decision?


Finally:

- Do you have both parents? ( )yes ( )father only ( )mother only
- Do you live with your parents? ( )yes ( )no
  ( )mother only ( )father only
APPENDIX 6B

Examples of conflict issues.

I-PARENTAL INTERFERENCE:

SOCIAL LIFE: A 16-year-old girl: "During holidays or at weekends I want to go to the beach with my friends and my parents won't allow me to; they don't give any justification for that, they simply say 'no' and that's it".

ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL LIFE: A 15-year-old boy: "My father complained that I've been spending more time painting than studying; it's not that he doesn't allow me to paint but he wants me to dedicate more time to my studies"; or an 18-year-old girl: "My parents tried to induce me to choose a certain profession because they thought I had the right kind of abilities for it".

SEXUALITY: A 21-year-old girl: "My mother complains when I go to my boyfriend's; he has just left home and is now living on his own; she doesn't want me to go".

PERSONALITY/BEHAVIOURAL STYLE: A 15-year-old girl: "Leaving the bedroom untidy... my mother doesn't like it and tells me to tidy it up" or a 20-year-old boy: "I started to wear an earring in my left ear; they thought that was something for homosexuals".

CHOICE OF RELATIONSHIPS: A 19-year-old girl: "I'm going out with a guy who has got a different religion from mine. My mother doesn't accept that I will change religions after I get married"; or a 15-year-old girl: "My mother likes to tell me things about my friends; I don't like that, because it's my own business who I choose to be friends with".

INTERFERENCE IN DECISIONS: A 17-year-old boy: "A few months ago I wanted to redecorate my room; my parents weren't favourable to this idea".

DRIVING WITHOUT A LICENCE: A 15-year-old boy: "I wanted to drive my father's car at night; he doesn't allow me to drive at night".

USE OF DRUGS: A 20-year-old girl: "I want to try marijuana but my mother is against it; she is too repressive".

LEAVING HOME: A 19-year-old boy: "I wanted to leave home but there was no support on their part; they are not interested in their children's becoming independent".

EXCESSIVE CARE/PROTECTION FROM PARENTS: An 18-year-old girl: "My parents think that I should only belong to them and that I only do what they think is good for me".

DEMANDS FOR DOING THINGS WITH THE FAMILY: A 16-year-old girl: "When they want me to go out with them... they think it is important for us to be together; I also do, but sometimes I want to be alone".

OTHER DEMANDS: A 19-year-old boy: "My parents make many demands on me; they think one cannot make mistakes".

II-DIVERGENCE OF IDEAS/VALUES:

IDEAS/VALUES: An 18-year-old girl: "In relation to homosexuality, my position is one of acceptance of this kind of choice; my parents' opinion is that this is inconceivable". A 15-year-old girl: "The other day I was talking to my mother and I told her that if I loved some guy and if he loved me I would like to live with him before I get married; my mother preserves old principles that are of no value to me". A 21-year-old boy: "I think that some people are oppressed, exploited; my parents think that these people don't want to work".

POLITICS: A 16-year-old boy: "The elections for president are stirring up the house; even though I still don't vote I support a candidate and they support a different one". A 19-year-old boy: "Political divergence; my parents are more right wing and I am left wing".

RELIGION: A 15-year-old boy: "I don't like religion and don't want to follow any religion; my parents think it's important to go to church and to pray, but I don't like that". An 18-year-old girl: "I don't accept religion anymore, I don't accept its dogmas; I decided not to go to church anymore and my father tries to convince me that religion is a good thing".

III-SIBLING JEALOUSY/RIVALRY:

A 20-year-old boy: "My sister left home and they want her to come back; they do everything they can to try and satisfy her, to do what she wants, and I feel I'm at a disadvantage". A 15-year-old girl: "Two years ago a new little sister was born; at the beginning I liked the idea, but now I feel she is invading my space; she sleeps in my bedroom; my parents don't want me to change rooms because they think that she needs my company". A 17-year-old girl: "My parents raised my younger brothers differently from the way I was raised; things that they never tolerated for me they now think is normal for them". A 14-year-old boy: "My sister and I argue a lot; my parents get very upset with us".

IV-PARENTAL DIVORCE/ARGUMENTS BETWEEN PARENTS:

A 15-year-old girl: "I want my parents to separate; they seem not to want it, but I think that they have already noticed that I want that". A 21-year-old boy: "Discussion between them; I tend to take sides with the weakest". A 15-year-old boy: "When my father asked my brother and I if we wanted him to continue living at home in that awful atmosphere".

V-ARGUMENTS/DISAGREEMENTS WITH PARENTS:

A 15-year-old boy: "I asked my father to take me to a party a long distance away from home; he didn't want to take me, so we had an argument". A 19-year-old boy: "I work with my father and once I had to hear many unfair accusations from my father; there is no separation between home and work".

VI-FAMILY ARGUMENTS:
- A 15 year-old boy: "After dinner I washed my dishes. My parents and sisters left and did not wash theirs, as agreed before; I didn't wash their
dishes; when my mother got home she asked: 'Why didn't you wash the rest of the dishes?'"
- A 21 year-old girl: "My involvement in my sister's decision to leave home; they did not admit my opinion".

VII-Criticism of parental attitudes

- An 18 year-old girl: "My father smokes a lot and I'm against that".
- A 15 year-old boy: "The money I get every month from my father is not enough; my father is too mean".

VIII-Lying/keeping secrets from parents

- A 14 year-old boy: "I told my parents I was going to go to one place and I went to another one; they got really upset with this lie". An 18 year-old
girl: "I got pregnant and decided to have an abortion; I didn't know whether or not to tell them".

IX- Other

- A 17 year-old boy: "The possibility of being better than my parents, professionally or personally; I do believe that is possible, but they don't".
APPENDIX 6C

Examples of strategies.

1- Follow own decision/wishes: A 15 year-old girl: "(conflict) I wanted to spend one month on the beach and they didn't like that; (strategy) I went to the beach".

2- Dialogue/try to convince: An 18 year-old boy: "(conflict) I want to have more freedom, to be able to go out at night and have fun; I wanted to go out at any time I wished to and my father would tell me to come back at a certain time; (strategy) Dialogues and pressures".

3- Conform: A 19 year-old girl: "(conflict) I can't go out in the evening as any other normal young person; I want to enjoy my youth and my mother doesn't allow me to; (strategy) When there is an important celebration, such as a wedding, I go even if she doesn't allow me to; in other occasions I stay home".

4- Withdraw: A 14 year-old girl: "(conflict) My mother and I discussed because she says I'm always talking on the telephone; I think it's ridiculous that she controls me over the telephone; (strategy) I decided to sort of ignore it, after all my friends call me and I can't just hang up".

5- Keep secret/lie: A 15 year-old boy: "(conflict) Sex... once I got home with lipstick stains on my neck and they wanted to know what had happened; (strategy) I lied".

6- Give in: A 15 year-old girl: "(conflict) My mother would always move my things about and I don't like that; she says I should be more organized (strategy) I decided to try and leave my things organized".

7- Wait for time to bring a solution: An 18 year-old girl: "(conflict) I like technology very much and my parents are very conservative; they don't like my modern things and it was very difficult to buy certain things; (strategy) When I start working I will buy everything I want".
APPENDIX 6D

Examples of justifications.

1- Personal satisfaction
- A 15 year-old boy: "(conflict) I told my parents that when I finish high school I am going to stop studying and dedicate myself only to music and they didn’t agree with that; (strategy) I decided that I’m going to dedicate myself to music, there’s no doubt about that; (justification) Because that’s what I like most".

2- Knows what wants/personal convictions
- A 17 year-old girl: "(conflict) I want to go to my friend’s and my parents don’t allow me to because he lives on his own; (strategy) I go and don’t tell them anything; (justification) I don’t see there is anything wrong with visiting a friend".

3- Right to choose/decide
- A 14 year-old boy: "(conflict) I wanted to do open a software company with my cousins; I was very enthusiastic over the idea and my father told me it was a silly thing; (strategy) I still want to open this company even though I feel a bit insecure; (justification) Because this is my own business and although I ask for his opinion, because I trust him, I don’t think of giving up".

4- Desire for independence
- A 15 year-old girl: "(conflict) My first boyfriend; they didn’t want me to go out with him; (strategy) I decided to go out with him; (justification) Because otherwise I will never be free and they will always tell me what to do".

5- Defend personal convictions
- A 21 year-old boy: "(conflict) I take my girlfriend to sleep with me at home and my parents don’t like that; (strategy) I talked to them and convinced them that they were wrong; (justification) My principles; if you think that you are right you should stick to your views regardless of the consequences".

6- To keep a nice atmosphere in the family
- A 18 year-old girl: "(conflict) Until recently my parents didn’t want to let me go out at night; I thought there was nothing wrong with that; (strategy) I ended up accepting the imposed situation; (justification) I didn’t want to have more quarrels with my parents; the atmosphere at home becomes too bad when you argue with your parents".

7- Dependence
- A 15 year-old girl: "(conflict) I wanted to go to a party and my parents didn’t want to let me do because of the people who would be there; (strategy) I simply accepted it, even though first I discussed with them trying to show that the people around didn’t matter; (justification) Because I wouldn’t go without their permission; after all, I depend on them for everything.

8- Dialogue is the best alternative
- A 21 year-old boy: "(conflict) My mother found out that I had already consumed drugs and this generated a conflict of ideas about drugs; (strategy) I talked to my mother and even though she did not agree with me, she accepted my opinion on the subject; (justification) Dialogue is always the best solution".

9- Respect for parents
- A 20 year-old boy: "(conflict) To go out with a girl who was once my girlfriend and not tell my current girlfriend; (strategy) I explained to him that there was nothing wrong with that; my ex-girlfriend is just a friend, there’s nothing else between us; (justification) Respect for him, I could simply say ‘it’s my life and I can go out with anyone I want’, but I talked to him out of respect".

10- The thing was important
- A 17 year-old girl: "(conflict) I’ve got some friends who are older than me and they don’t want me to be friends with them; they think I might be influenced by them; (strategy) I am not going to stop seeing them because if they were a bad influence on me I would be the first to want to keep distance from them; (justification) I have a very strong affection for them.

11- Impossibility of dialogue
- A 18 year-old girl: "(conflict) I’ve got a group of friends who my parents don’t approve of; I always defend them and they accuse them; (strategy) I continued to see my friends, but I did not tell my parents; (justification) They would never understand or accept it; they have a ‘single’, ‘solid’ idea about many matters and there is no space for dialogue".

12- Feels mature/responsible
- A 16 year-old boy: "(conflict) My parents don’t want me to go out in the evening with my friends; I don’t agree with them because I think they are not in touch with reality; (strategy) I talked to them and try to show them that I can take care of myself; (justification) I think their worries and fears have no basis on reality".

13- Parents’ counterarguments not convincing
- A 17 year-old boy: "(conflict) My parents are excessively worried about me and make too many demands on me; (strategy) I talk to them and try to show them that I can take care of myself; (justification) I think their worries and fears have no basis on reality".

14- Hopes parents will change
- A 19 year-old boy: "(conflict) My parents still don’t consider me responsible for choosing the places where I go; (strategy) I discuss with them and try to show them that I am responsible; (justification) I hope that with time they will be able to change.

15- There was no other alternative
- A 15 year-old girl: "(conflict) I wanted to go to a party, but my mother only allows me to go if someone older than me goes with me; I think I’m responsible enough to go on my own and my mother thinks that I’m too young; (strategy) I decided to wait until she allows me to go; (justification) Because I have no other choice".

Examples of justifications.
17- Concern about parents
-An 18 year-old boy: (conflict) My mother found out that I was taking drugs; she wanted me to stop taking drugs; (strategy) I decided to tell her that I had already stopped even though that was not true; (justification) Because this conflict caused psychological and even physical problems to my mother.

18- Thinks parents were right
-A 17 year-old boy: "(conflict) When I'm with them they don't allow me to drive; they think it's wrong to drive because I am not 18 years old; (strategy) I accept their 'no'; (justification) They are right to a certain extent".

19- Fear of losing parental support
-A 17 year-old girl: "(conflict) I don't know whether to get married or to live with my boyfriend without getting married; my parents think it is important to get married but I don't; (strategy) My boyfriend and I decided that we are going to get married; (justification) To have our parents' support".

20- It brings personal benefits
-A 14 year-old girl: "(conflict) My parents always complain that I leave my bedroom untidy; (strategy) I decided to try and find some time and tidy it up; (justification) Because that helps to get me organized.

21- The thing was not important
-A 15 year-old girl: "(conflict) When I had my first boyfriend; they thought I was too young; (strategy) I decided to continue seeing him even against their wishes and then I broke up with him; (justification) I thought I liked him but when I saw that it wasn't so important I broke up".

22- Too much parental pressure
-A 19 year-old boy: "(conflict) Some time ago my father did not allow me to wear long hair; I wanted to, all my heroes had long hair; (strategy) I tried to keep it long for a while but then I gave up; (justification) He complained too much, I couldn't stand that anymore".

23- Other
-A 17 year-old girl: "(conflict) I wanted to go abroad with a friend but they didn't want me to go unless my sister went with me; (strategy) I agreed to go with my sister; (justification) She's a good company".
APPENDIX 7A

Situations presented on cards.

2- Going out with friends at night
3- Not joining parents in family gatherings
4- Not following parents' religion
5- Listening to loud music
6- Having a boyfriend/girlfriend from another social class
7- Leaving the bedroom untidy
8- Driving without a licence
9- Choosing a profession not valued by parents
10- Having sex with boyfriend/girlfriend
11- Going out and not telling parents where one is going and the time one is coming back
12- Wearing clothes parents do not approve of
13- Not getting together on special occasions (e.g. Christmas)
14- Associating with people parents do not approve of
15- Buying unnecessary things
16- Not taking care of one's health
17- Using drugs
18- Travelling with boyfriend/girlfriend
19- Being careless about studies or work
20- Inviting strangers home
21- Adhering to a political party different from that of parents

cont.
22- Getting pregnant from boyfriend or impregnating girlfriend

23- Getting home late at weekends

24- Saying that one is going to visit a friend and go to a party instead

25- Going out several times on week days

26- Not taking care of physical appearance

27- Getting home late on week days

28- Spending more time with friends or boyfriend/girlfriend than with parents

29- Having a boyfriend/girlfriend of another ethnic group

30- Not taking notice of parents’ advice

31- Arguing with siblings

32- Not helping in domestic activities
APPENDIX 7B

Instructions used during the interview.

Instructions for adolescents

a) I'm going to show you a list of situations, most of which are part of families' everyday experiences and I would like to know what you think of them. These situations show some behaviors of children which may generate discord between parents and children. After reading each of the situations I would like to know whether you agree or disagree that parents should interfere or argue with their children in these situations. There are four groups here (THE FOUR GROUPS ARE LAID OUT IN FRONT OF THE SUBJECT SO THAT HE/SHE CAN READ THEM).

(1= Agree that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations; 2= Agree a little bit that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations; 3= Disagree a little bit that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations; 4= Disagree that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations).

I would like you to read each of these cards and to assign it to one of these groups.

Once the sorting is over, the investigator asks the subject to examine the groups to see whether he/she is satisfied with the sortings in each group.

Do you think this is all right? If you want you can move the cards until you are satisfied with the result.

The investigator takes note of the corresponding numbers referring to the behaviors assigned to each group.

Finally, the investigator should ask the reason for sorting the behaviors in that particular way.

Now I would like to talk to you a little bit about this group (e.g. "disagree that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations"). Why do you disagree that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations? (This question was asked for each group).

The sorting plural criteria used by the subject are recorded, together with comments made by subjects that may be relevant for the comprehension of the values involved in each sorting.

Once this part is over, the cards are shuffled and the investigator goes on to the next question.

(b) Now I would like to know if you think these situations would generate discord between you and your father.

The question is: In your opinion which of these situations would generate a lot of discord? Which would generate some discord? Which would generate little discord? Which would generate no discord? I would like you to sort these situations into four groups, depending on the extent to which they would generate discord between you and your father.

(1= Generates/would generate no discord; 2= Generates/ would generate little discord; 3= Generates/would generate some discord; 4= Generates/ would generate a lot of discord).

The investigator takes note of the corresponding numbers referring to the behaviors assigned to each group and then asks the reason for sorting the situations in that particular way.

Let's take this group (e.g. "would generate much discord with my father"). Why do you think these situations would generate much discord with your father? (Repeat the same procedure for each group).
The sorting criteria used by the subject are recorded together with the comments made by subjects that may be relevant for the comprehension of the values involved in each sorting.

Once this part is over, the cards are shuffled and the investigator goes on to the next question.

c) Now I would like to know if you think these behaviors would generate discord between you and your mother.

Repeat the same procedure reported above.

Once the sorting is over the subject is thanked for his/her participation and a brief questionnaire is given for him/her to answer.
PERSONAL INFORMATION (for adolescents)

- Age: ............. Sex: ( ) Female ( ) Male

- Grade: .............

- Place of birth: ____________________

  How long lives in Porto Alegre: ____________

- School: .................

- Present situation: ( ) Only study
  ( ) Study and work - works on what? ____________

- How is your relationship with your mother?
  Very Bad     Bad     Regular     Good     Very good
  ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

- How is your relationship with your father?
  Very Bad     Bad     Regular     Good     Very good
  ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

- Do you consider your interests and opinions and your
  mother's interests and opinions:
  Very little     Little     Very similar     Similar     Similar
  ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

- Do you consider your interests and opinions and your
  father's interests and opinions:
  Very little     Little     Very similar     Similar     Similar
  ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

- Do you feel you can tell your mother personal things?
  Never     Rarely     Sometimes     Frequently     Always
  ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

- Do you feel you can tell your father personal things?
  Never     Rarely     Sometimes     Frequently     Always
  ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

- Do you feel your mother forbids you to do what you wish
to do?
  Never     Rarely     Sometimes     Frequently     Always
  ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

- Do you feel your father forbids you to do what you wish
to do?
  Never     Rarely     Sometimes     Frequently     Always
  ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Instructions for parents

a) I'm going to show you a list of situations, most of which are part of families' everyday experiences and I would like to know what you think of them. These situations show some behaviours of children which may generate discord between parents and children. After reading each of the situations I would like to know whether you agree or disagree that parents should interfere or argue with their children in these situations. There are four groups here (THE FOUR GROUPS ARE LAID OUT IN FRONT OF THE SUBJECT SO THAT HE/SHE CAN READ THEM).

(1= Agree that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations; 2= Agree a little bit that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations; 3= Disagree a little bit that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations; 4= Disagree that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations).

I would like you to read each of these cards and to assign it to one of these groups.

Once the sorting is over, the investigator asks the subject to examine the groups to see whether he/she is satisfied with the sortings in each group.

Do you think this is all right? If you want you can move the cards until you are satisfied with the result.

The investigator takes note of the corresponding numbers referring to the behaviours assigned to each group. Finally, the investigator should ask the reason for sorting the behaviours in that particular way.

Now I would like to talk to you a little bit about this group (e.g. "disagree that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations"). Why do you disagree that parents interfere or argue with their children in these situations? (This question was asked for each group).

The sorting criteria used by the subject are recorded together with the comments made by subjects that may be relevant for the comprehension of the values involved in each sorting.

Once this part is over, the cards are shuffled and the investigator goes on to the next question.

b) Now I would like to know if you think these situations would generate discord between you and your son/daughter.

The question is: In your opinion which of these situations would generate much discord? Which would generate some discord? Which would generate little discord? Which would generate no discord? So I would like you to sort these situations in four groups depending on the extent to which they would generate discord between you and your son/daughter.

(1= Generates/would generate no discord ; 2= Generates/ would generate little discord; 3= Generates/would generate some discord; 4 = Generates/would generate much discord).

The investigator takes note of the corresponding numbers referring to the behaviours assigned to each group and then asks the reason for sorting the situations in that particular way.

Let's take this group (e.g. "would generate much discord with my son/daughter"). Why do you think these situations would generate much discord with your son/daughter? (Repeat the same procedure for each group).

The sorting criteria used by the subject is recorded together with the comments made by subjects that may be relevant for the comprehension of the values involved in each sorting.

Once the sorting is over the subject is thanked for his/her participation and a brief questionnaire is given for him/her to answer.
PERSONAL INFORMATION (for parents)

- Age: ............. Sex: ( )Female ( )Male

- Place of birth: ______________________
  How long lives in Porto Alegre: __________

- No. of children: ____________

- Education: _________________

- Do you work? ( )No ( )Yes
  professional occupation: ______

- Have you ever worked? ( )No ( )Yes
  occupation: ________________

- How is your relationship with your son/daughter?
  Very Bad   Bad   Regular   Good   Very good
  ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

- Do you consider your interests and opinions and your son/daughter's interests and opinions:
  Very dissimilar   Little similar   Very similar
  ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )