

RULES DIFFERENTIATION ABILITY AMONG PAKISTANI ADOLESCENTS

Pervaiz Naeem Tariq

National Institute of Psychology, Islamabad

120 adolescents, aged 13, 15, and 17 years paired two brief stories of rule violations of one rule domain against a third one which belonged to another rule domain. The explanations for pairing were classified into three categories depicting the level at which the adolescents understand the basis and rationale of the differences between five rule systems studied: moral, legal, conventional, ascriptive and interpersonal. Where a gradual advance in adolescents' ability to explain the differences between various rule domains was discovered, the differentiation ability in itself seemed to have well established before adolescence. Moreover, though adolescents perceive rules as belonging to various domains of social life, they tend to interpret the violations of these rules as having moral implications. Some measures for better experimental controls have been suggested.

Recently, there has emerged a domain of knowledge based on empirical studies on the development of the concepts of morality and social conventional rules among young children. Earlier researchers maintained that the acquisition of the concepts of morality requires higher levels of reasoning and that initially children have only global concepts of social rules out of which, gradually in a stepwise manner, develop the concepts of morality (see, for example, Kohlberg, 1969, 1976; Piaget, 1965). To them, rules differentiation was a developmental phenomenon, i.e., children gradually become able to differentiate between morality and social conventional rules. Earlier studies, thus, made no distinction between morality and social conventions in their explanation of moral development (also see Aronfreed, 1968; Hogan, 1973).

Recent studies, on the other hand, have shown that very young children have at least an intuitive understanding of morality and that they can discriminate moral from non-moral (social conventional) rules (see, for example, Much & Shweder, 1978; Nucci & Nucci, 1982; Shweder, Turiel & Much, 1981; Smetana, Kelly & Twentyman, 1984; Turiel, 1977).

Some studies have further shown that young adolescents are able to discriminate within various forms of social conventional rules like legal, ascriptive, interpersonal and conventional rules (see, for example, McConville & Furth, 1981).

An earlier draft of this article was read by Josef Perner of Sussex University, H. G. Furth of the Catholic University of America, Judith Smetana of University of Rochester, and Z. A. Ansari of National Institute of Psychology. The author gratefully acknowledges their critical remarks.

This line of evidence is based on a theoretical perspective which assumes that 'knowledge' develops in independent domains. Morality and conventions are not necessarily parts of one domain and can develop independent of each other (for details, see Turiel, 1975, 1977, 1978).

In the light of above, it is important to note that whether a rule pertains to a social conventional category or to a moral domain, in actual life, children at very early stage in life quite often conform to it. This they are capable of doing even before they are fully aware of what a rule is. Perhaps the best example of this kind of rule following is speech: children learn to speak grammatically long before they learn the rules of grammar. Wright (1971), for example, remarks "... though in some sense the product of man's intelligence, rules are not always the fruit of conscious and deliberate reasoning ... tuning in to the rules operative in any social setting is an intuitive art" (p.12).

Thus, understanding moral and conventional principles or/and adherence to them seems to be a different thing from the ability to explain and articulate those principles. In most of the previous studies on moral development, this difference was not kept in mind. Shweder et al. (1981), for example, remark: "It appears that some (e.g., Piaget and Kohlberg) have traced the ontogenesis of reflective understanding and the ability to articulate the formal principles that define morality" (p. 289). Therefore, young children may show some developmental trend in their ability to articulate the principles which define morality or conventional rules but the understanding of morality and social conventional rules is likely to be present at early age. Similarly, young adolescents may show, at different age levels, a varied quality of explanations given by them for their differentiation between, say, moral and social conventional rules, but the differentiation ability in itself may be present by or even before early adolescence. McConville and Furth (1981) showed that by early adolescence though a global recognition of different rule systems is well established, yet the explanations given by young adolescents for the differences in various rule systems are quite poorly articulated and change substantially between ages 13 to 19.

The present study probes into the rules differentiation ability in young adolescents and thus further tests earlier findings using Pakistani adolescents. The study is first of its type in Pakistan and its findings are likely to have a cross cultural significance.

Various Domains of Social Rules

Five rule systems which govern individual's relations were used to explore adolescents' understanding and ability of articulating these rules. These are moral, legal, conventional, ascriptive and interpersonal rules. Moral

rules are defined by principles of justice and adherence to them is deemed obligatory whether or not these are enforced by specific instructions, orders or regulations. The violations of moral rules are deemed 'bad' universally. Hence they are not context bound. They are judged as such because of the intrinsic consequences of the acts violating moral prescriptions. Contrary to the moral prescriptions, social conventional rules are context bound. The violations of such rules do not involve anything intrinsically wrong or bad. They serve some functions in the social life, they facilitate interpersonal living and as such are defined as expected modes of conduct or "behavioral uniformities" in a given society. Unlike moral prescriptions, they are arbitrary and can be changed or/and replaced by other rules to serve the same or similar functions. In the present study, social conventional rules were further classified into five types of rules. These are legal, ascriptive, conventional (in the sense of traditions and mores) and interpersonal rules. Legal rules are well-defined and explicitly formulated modes of conduct, violations of which are usually cognizable offences. Ascriptive rules pertain to modes of juvenile conduct in home and school settings. Conventional rules are the traditions prevalent in a given society which have a strong impact on the behaviour of its members. Violations of these traditions are deemed undesirable and at times quite bad. Interpersonal rules are those rules violations which result in damage to the interpersonal relationships between peers in particular and person to person in general.

METHOD

Sample

120 young adolescents participated in the study. There were 20 male and 20 female subjects each from grades 8, 10 and 12. The students of grades 8 and 10 were randomly selected from girls' and boys' high schools of Islamabad, and students of grade 12 were taken from girls' and boys' colleges of Islamabad. The average ages of these groups of students were 13, 15, and 17 years, for the three grades, respectively.

Instrument

Thirty situations (six for each rule area) depicting violations of various moral prescriptions and social conventional rules were constructed in Urdu. Most of these were written in brief story form. While writing these, Pakistani socio-cultural milieu was kept in mind (See Annexure -A).

The findings of McConville and Furth's (1981) study had indicated that their subjects tended to interpret violations of many rules in terms of the moral implications involved. It was thought to have happened probably because most of the situations used by McConville and Furth seemed to be conceptually not distinct from each other in terms of various rule domains.

Though it is quite a convincing argument that violations of all types of social conventional rules may have moral consequences (McConville and Furth, 1981, p. 158), yet it is felt that where some violations have obvious moral implications, the others may not have such implications at all or have only implicit ones. Therefore, in the present study, an effort was made to keep each situation as distinct as possible. For this, about 50 carefully constructed situations were given to 15 psychologists working at the National Institute of Psychology, Islamabad, who independent of each other, classified them in 5 rule domains according to a set of given definitions. Only those 30 situations were selected each one of which was unanimously (minimum 95% agreement), considered to belong to one particular rule domain.

Procedure

Each subject was presented with a set of 10 cards (items) on each of which there were written 3 situations depicting violations of various rule systems. Two situations on each item belonged to one type of rule system which contrasted with the third situation illustrating a violation of a different rule system. Each subject was individually asked to read the three situations on each of the ten items, and then point out those two situations which to him or her were similar or alike and together differed from the third in some way or the other. After that the subject was asked to explain his pairing of the two situations.

Two sets (set I: items 1 to 10; set II: items 11 to 20) were used to avoid fatigue and to save time. From a list of randomly chosen 20 subjects of each age and sex group, odd numbers were given set I and even numbers were given set II. Items were arranged in such a way that each rule system got contrasted with the remaining four types of rules one by one.

One of the two same contrast items was included in each of the two sets. (The same contrast involved those two items in which two rules were contrasted with each other turn by turn). For example, if set I had a contrast of ascriptive (two situations) vs conventional (one situation) rules then the contrast of conventional (two situations) vs ascriptive (one situation) was put in set II. The 30 situations used in preparing items 1 – 20 is given in Annexure-B.

RESULTS

Correct Pairing

The percentages of correct pairing of two situations belonging to the same rule system on each item are given in table 1. The items and scores on them are listed in an order that permits an easy comparison between scores on items involving the same contrast.

Table 1

Percentages of correct pairing of two situations belonging to same rule system on each item for each age group ($n=20$)

Item No.	Rule system	Contrast Rule	Age, Years		
			13	15	17
1	Ascriptive	Conventional	80	80	95
15	Conventional	Ascriptive	95	90	90
10	Ascriptive	Legal	70	90	70
14	Legal	Ascriptive	70	55	65
16	Ascriptive	Moral	95	100	95
7	Moral	Ascriptive	75	85	85
17	Ascriptive	Interpersonal	85	95	95
8	Interpersonal	Ascriptive	30	35	50
2	Interpersonal	Legal	95	80	75
18	Legal	Interpersonal	90	90	90
13	Interpersonal	Conventional	95	90	90
6	Conventional	Interpersonal	60	75	55
19	Interpersonal	Moral	65	35	30*
3	Moral	Interpersonal	90	75	75
11	Moral	Conventional	20	10	10
9	Conventional	Moral	25	35	25
12	Moral	Legal	65	60	70
4	Legal	Moral	85	65	50*
5	Legal	Conventional	100	100	100
20	Conventional	Legal	70	35*	60

*Age differences between ages 13 and 15 on item 20 and between ages 13 and 17 on items 19 and 4 were significant at .05 level. On all other items the differences were non-significant.

Tests of significance between percentages revealed that, barring a few exceptions, there were no significant differences between ages 13 & 15 & 17, and 13 & 17. Thus, it seems that adolescents generally discriminate between various types of moral prescriptions, traditional practices and other rules pertaining to various domains of social life. This ability of rules differentiation seems to have well established before adolescence as, in the study, 13 years old subjects performed as good as did 14 and 15 years old'and that the subjects of all ages performed quite well on most of the items (exceptions are discussed in the next section).

The Relevance of Explanations

The explanations which were given by subjects as reasons for their pairing of various rule systems were classified into three categories: Irrelevant, Partially Relevant, and Relevant. In the Irrelevant category were the explanations which tended to evaluate the events only in terms of 'something bad and wrong, which one should not do'. Partially Relevant explanations had only an indirect reference to the rule system involved, with an implicit hint to the relevant common points which put the rules in the same domain. In the Relevant category of explanations, similarities between the two rules of the same domain, and their differences from the contrasting rule system were clearly articulated usually with a rationale which puts the two rule systems in the same domain. To illustrate from an example of actual responses item 1 is referred to where situation 1 and 2 belong to the ascriptive rules violations and situation 3 involves conventional rule violation. While classifying the responses into three categories, an explanation like 'in 1 and 2 they do things which they should not do' was classified as Irrelevant. But an explanation such as 'in these two (situations 1 and 2) children do not listen to what their parents say' was put in the Partially Relevant category. In contrast, an explanation which reads: 'In these two situations (1 and 2), parents are not obeyed by the children, whereas in the situation 3, there is no order from the parents, it is just a thing which is usually not done', was considered to be a Relevant explanation. The Relevant explanations usually not only had a reference to the similarities between two situations of one rule system, but also an explicit mentioning of the contrasting rule by way of pointing out the differences between them. However, at times, a response was put in the Relevant category even if it was restricted to the two situations of the rule system involved without any mentioning of the contrasting rule at all. This was done only when the explanation given was very clear and explicitly referring to the rationale involved. The classification process was done by two persons independently of each other. Initial agreement between the two classifiers was 93%.

As regards the explanations given by subjects on each item, table 2 presents the percentages of three categories (Irrelevant, Partially Relevant,

and Relevant) in three age groups studied.

Table 2

Percentages of Irrelevant, Partially Relevant and Relevant explanations on each item for each age group ($n=20$)

Item Nos.	Rule System	Contrast Rule	Age, Years								
			13			15			17		
			I	PR	R	I	PR	R	I	PR	R
1	Asc.	Con.	40	40	20	25	10	65	10	5	85**
15	Con.	Asc.	45	50	5	50	30	20	15	35	50**
10	Asc.	Leg.	40	45	15	25	55	20	45	25	30
14	Leg.	Asc.	60	20	20	60	10	30	35	30	35
16	Asc.	Mor.	30	60	10	5	30	65	5	25	70**
7	Mor.	Asc.	45	35	20	30	35	35	25	35	40
17	Asc.	Int.	25	55	20	15	35	50	10	20	70**
8	Int.	Asc.	75	10	15	70	0	30	60	5	35
2	Int.	Leg.	75	20	5	45	10	40	50	20	30*
18	Leg.	Int.	15	40	45	10	25	65	5	15	80
13	Int.	Conv.	65	30	5	25	40	35	20	40	40*
6	Conv.	Int.	60	40	0	40	30	30	45	15	40**
19	Int.	Mor.	80	20	0	75	5	20	70	15	15
3	Mor.	Int.	40	50	10	40	40	20	40	40	20
11	Mor.	Con.	80	15	5	80	15	5	85	15	0
9	Con.	Mor.	95	0	5	75	15	10	35	10	5
12	Mor.	Leg.	75	25	0	40	35	25	40	35	25*
4	Leg.	Mor.	25	30	45	35	10	55	40	10	50
5	Leg.	Con.	15	60	25	0	35	65	20	20	60*
20	Con.	Leg.	60	35	5	65	20	15	40	30	30*

Age differences between 13 and 17 years on the category of Relevant explanations was significant at *.05 and **.01 level.

Tests of significance between percentages revealed that generally in all the three categories, and particularly in Relevant category, there were significant age differences. Seventeen-year-olds, the oldest group of subjects, gave more Relevant explanations than did either 15 or 13 year olds.

DISCUSSION

The results of the study indicate that the adolescents of 13, 15, and 17 years of age discriminate between various types of social rules. They generally performed well on items which tested their rules differentiation ability. As no significant age differences were found in the performance of three age groups, it was believed that understanding of social rules establishes before adolescence. The ability to articulate and explain the differences between social rules, however, develops during the adolescent years.

A scrutiny of subjects' responses indicates that older subjects gave explanations which referred to the basis of the two situations belonging to particular domain. This basis was most frequently either the source of authority being violated or the common consequences of the two violations. For example, older adolescents paired two legal violations by referring to the legal dictates common to the two situations. Similarly, they paired two interpersonal violations by explaining that interpersonal relationships between friends, etc., would get affected by the relevant acts of the protagonists in the situations.

The younger age groups, in contrast, generally failed to articulate the reasons for their correct pairing. They most frequently gave Irrelevant or at times just Partially Relevant explanations which visualized the violations from the concept of global badness involved and referred to some obvious facts, as the only basis of their pairing, such as "in both the situations the protagonists should not have done what they were shown to be doing". At times the younger subjects made the degree of badness a basis of their grouping. For example, from among the three situations, they grouped two which were seriously wrong and could cause a big damage and left alone the one which to them appeared less serious and did not involve that big a damage.

Unexpected significant age differences on the task of correct pairing of certain items (e.g., items 4, 19 and 20 in table 1) were found. Interesting is to note that the younger subjects performed better on these items than the older ones. Examining the subjects' responses carefully, one finds that the subjects paired the items mostly in terms of the implications and consequences of violations involved. To them interpersonal (item 19), legal (item 4) and conventional (item 20) had moral implications like hurting others' feelings and damaging the trust of others, etc. As their pairing was affected

by their interpretation of certain situations, unexpected results on pairing particularly by the older group were found.

This means that despite initial rigorous efforts made to keep the situations used in the instrument as distinct as possible in terms of five rule areas, still there were situations which were seen by adolescents as having moral implications. This bears out McConville and Furth's (1981) observations that theoretically it may be important to know that adolescents discriminate between moral and conventional rules, but practically all types of rules and violations thereof have an impact on others, and hence are perceived as having moral implications.

On certain items involving specific contrasts, the subjects' performance was quite poor across the three ages studied. Relevant explanations on these items were also less frequent (see, for example, items 8, 9, 11 and 19 in tables 1 and 2). The probable reasons of these unexpected results could be two: (a) the correct pairing (as well as the Relevant explanation) was a function of the particular domains of the rules in each item. We have seen, for example, that when moral rules were contrasted with the conventional one, the subjects scored quite low in the task of pairing and the Relevant explanations were also quite infrequent. On the contrary, when moral rules were contrasted with, say, ascriptive, legal or even interpersonal rules, the subjects performed quite well; (b) The correct pairing (as well as the Relevant explanation) was also a function of the particular situations used for depicting violations in each rule area. Each item involved different situations having varied story material. Now the varied story material in each situation affected the "distinctness" of the domain of the rule to which the situations pertained. In other words, because of the varied contents of the stories the "distinctness" of each rule domain varied from situation to situation. Thus the use of different situations belonging to one rule domain did not allow a uniform or equal level of distinctness of that domain in different items. Thus, we believe that in the study a particular contrast got confounded with the story material used in the situations resulting in some unexpected data.

Comparison between Domains of Rules

In comparing different rule areas, no significant differences between areas within each age and between ages within each area were found as far as the task of correct pairing was concerned. This was seen by adding and then getting average of the percentages of scores on the four items involving the contrast of one rule system with all the four remaining rules (see table 3).

However, significant differences were found between five areas within each age group on the task of explanation (see table 4). These differences indicate that legal and ascriptive rules are best explained.

Table 3

Average percentages of correct pairing of two situations on four items involving one rule system contrasted with the remaining four rules for each age group ($n=20$)

Item Nos.	Rule System	Age, Years		
		13	15	17
1,10,16,17	Ascriptive	83	91	89
8,2,13,9	Interpersonal	71	60	61
7,3,11,12	Moral	62	60	55
14,18,4,5	Legal	87	78	76
15,6,9,20	Conventional	63	59	58

Differences between percentages across ages in each area and across areas in each age group were non-significant.

Table 4

Average percentages of Irrelevant, Partially Relevant, and Relevant explanations on four items involving one rule system contrasted with the remaining four rules for each age group ($n=20$)

Item Nos.	Rule System	Age, Years								
		13			15			17		
		1	PR	R	1	PR	R	1	PR	R
1,10,16,7	Asc.	34	50	16*	18	32	50*	17	19	64*
2,8,13,19	Int.	74	20	6	55	14	31	50	20	30
3,7,11,12	Mor.	60	31	9	48	31	21	48	31	21
4,5,14,18	Leg.	29	37	34*	26	20	54*	25	19	56*
6,9,15,20	Con.	65	31	4	57	24	19	46	23	31

*Differences between percentages across areas within each age group were found to be significant at .05 level.

This confirms McConville and Furth's (1981) findings that as legal and ascriptive rules involve concrete formulations of certain sanctions, the adolescents explain them in a better way.

But interesting point to note in the findings of the present study is that when the legal and ascriptive rules got contrasted with each other, the quality of explanations given was relatively poor (see items 10 and 14 in table 2). The older adolescents, who, in particular, were expected to give Relevant explanations, failed to do so in high frequencies. They seem to mix up the two rule domains as regards to the different sources of authority involved.

Findings of the present study regarding interpersonal rule domain were not exactly in accord with the findings of McConville and Furth (1981) who found out that interpersonal domain was most difficult to recognize or explain in a systematic fashion. McConville and Furth, in fact, had contrasted interpersonal rules only with ascriptive and moral rules. On these contrasts, their study, like the present one, indicated that interpersonal rules are relatively poorly recognized. But the present study found out that when interpersonal rules are contrasted with legal and conventional rules, subjects recognized the interpersonal domain quite well (see items 2 and 13 in table 1).

The relatively less developed ability of explaining the moral, conventional and interpersonal rules among adolescents is most probably due to the abstract nature of these rules. Unlike specific prescriptions and sanctions in legal and ascriptive domains, these rule areas do not involve explicit formulations of the modes of conduct and sanctions.

Probable reasons of subjects' poor performance on items involving interpersonal vs. ascriptive and moral rules (items 8 and 19, tables 1 & 2) both on the task of correct pairing as well as Relevant explanation is again the subjects' tendency to think of situations in terms of the implications and consequences of various situations. Both interpersonal and ascriptive violations were interpreted to have moral consequences.

CONCLUSIONS

The study has provided an insight into children's understanding of social rules in a relatively "conservative" social and cultural setting of Pakistan.

The study further confirms the difficulty in conceptualizing the various rule systems as being distinct and totally different from each other. Despite

making initial efforts to construct situations which would depict violations of five distinct rule systems, the subjects interpreted most of the violations as having moral implications. Therefore, in any further study, more rigorous efforts are needed to construct, if at all possible to do so, situations depicting various rule systems as distinctly as possible.

In one rule domain, namely, "conventional", the subjects, particularly the older ones, interpreted most of the violations as having moral implications. We know that most of the conventional violations used in the study, in fact, depicted violations of certain traditions. As many subjects paired together moral and conventional violations, both in moral vs. conventional and conventional vs. moral contrasts of the study, it could mean that adolescents perceived them to be similar to each other as regards to their judgement of seriousness of these transgressions. It is interesting to note, however, that the violations of traditional practices used in this study (under the name of conventional violations) do not entail any serious consequences at all. Thus, it does not seem probable that the subjects paired moral and "conventional" violations according to the degree of the seriousness and nature of consequences involved, particularly when we know that moral violations are generally considered to be more serious than the violations of social conventions (Smetana, et al. 1984). The findings of this study, thus, invite further research on "traditions" prevalent in a society, particularly how these are perceived in relation to other moral and social conventional rules.

It may also be pointed out that most of the unexpected data can perhaps be avoided if the situations used in the instrument are kept as constant as possible. For instance, instead of having six different situations in each rule system (as was the case in the present study) only two situations in each rule area would have sufficed. One of the reasons for unexpected data in the present study could be that in various contrasts, different situations (story material) were used. Thus, a particular contrast got confounded with the story material used in that contrast. For a better experimental control, it would be advisable to use same situations in various contrasts.

Finally, the present study showed significant age differences in ability to articulate various rules mostly between 13 and 17 years. There were found few such differences between 13 & 15 years. Between 15 & 17 years of age, however, there were found no significant age differences at all. Therefore, concluding that the ability changes substantially between 13 and 17 years of age, it may be recommended that in further research, a wider age range may be included so that a fuller developmental perspective is viewable.

REFERENCES

- Aronfreed, J. (1968). *Conduct and conscience: The socialization of internalized control over behaviour*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hogan, R. (1973). Moral conduct and moral character: A psychological perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 79, 217–232.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.). *Handbook of socialization theory and research*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: the Cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.). *Moral development and behaviour: Theory, research and social Issues*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.
- McConville, K. & Furth, H. G. (1981). Understanding of social rule systems in adolescence. *Contributions to human development* (Vol. 5). 145–159.
- Much, N.C., & Shweder, R.A., (1978). Speaking of rules: the analysis of culture in breach. In W. Damon (Ed.). *New directions for child development*. (Vol. 2: Moral development). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Nucci, L.P., & Nucci, M.S. (1982). Children's responses to moral and social conventional transgressions in free-play settings. *Child Development*, 53, 1342–1376.
- Nucci, L.P., & Turiel, E. (1978). Social interactions and the development of social concepts in pre-school children. *Child Development*, 49, 400–407.
- Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral judgement of the child*. New York: Free Press.
- Shweder, R.A., Turiel, E., & Much, N.C. (1981). The moral intuitions of the child. In J.H. Flavell and L. Ross (Eds.). *Social cognitive development: Frontiers and possible futures*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Smetana, J.G., Kelly, M. & Twentyman, C.T. (1984). Abused, neglected, and non-maltreated children's conceptions of moral and social conventional transgressions. *Child Development*, 55, 277–287.
- Turiel, E. (1975). The development of social concepts, customs and conventions. In D.J. DePalma and J.M. Foley (Eds.). *Moral development: Current theory and research*. New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum.

- Turiel, E. (1977). Distinct conceptual and developmental domains: social convention and morality. In C.B. Keasey (Ed.). *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (Vol. 25). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Turiel, E. (1978). Social regulations and domains of social concepts. In W. Damon (Ed.). *New directions for child development*. (Vol. 2: Moral Development). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Wright, D. (1981). *The Psychology of moral behaviour*. London: Penguin Books, Ltd.

THIRTY SITUATIONS USED IN ITEMS 1–20

- | No. | Situations |
|-----|--|
| 1. | Salma's mother wants Salma to get her younger sister ready for school every morning, but Salma usually avoids doing that (Ascriptive). |
| 2. | Naeem often stays late outside home without telling his parents who want that he should inform them before leaving (Ascriptive). |
| 3. | Kausar's mother likes her to wear boys clothes (Conventional). |
| 4. | The lights of Akbar's motor-bike are out of order since long but even then he drives it at night (Legal). |
| 5. | Afzal was going on a joy trip with his friends. On the way he met his friend Anwar who asked him if he could join them. Afzal refused to take him along (Interpersonal). |
| 6. | Khalid asked Aslam for his pen in the classroom. The latter refused to lend though he had an extra pen to spare (Interpersonal). |
| 7. | A boy lost his way back to home. He knew the address only. As it was getting dark he told a man the address of his house and requested him to either help him find his house or just tell him the way. The man did not help him at all (Moral). |
| 8. | Majid was travelling in a train. He had a letter which he had written to his mother but had forgotten to post that. When the train stopped at a station he gave the letter to a man going outside and requested him to post it. The man took the letter but did not post it (Moral). |
| 9. | Pervaiz and Anwar are two friends. They make a program to visit together some day an exhibition in the city. One Friday, Anwar goes to Pervaiz and asks him to go to exhibition as that was the last day of it. But Pervaiz refused to go to the exhibition (Interpersonal). |
| 10. | Zeba often talks about people in such a way that hurts them (Interpersonal). |
| 11. | A man buys a camera extremely cheap, knowing that it is a stolen good (Legal). |

12. Two boys lift somebody's motorbike and after riding it whole day leave the bike somewhere and go away (Legal).
13. Asghar knows that red signal at a crossing means that he should stop his motorbike and wait for the green signal. But he often crosses the red signal (Legal).
14. Nawaz knows that smoking is prohibited in a cinema hall but he often smokes there (Legal).
15. Aftab's wife does a job whereas he looks after the children at home (conventional).
16. One day Yaqoob feels like riding a bicycle. He goes to his friend Bilal to borrow the bike from him but Bilal refuses to lend the bike (Interpersonal).
17. Riaz avoids embracing people while greeting them Eid (Conventional).
19. Anwar's pocket was picked in a city where he did not know anybody. Being extremely perturbed he went to a shopkeeper and after narrating the whole story, he requested for one hundred rupees with the promise that as soon as he reaches his own city, he would send the money back. The shopkeeper gave him one hundred rupees, but Anwar never returned the money (Moral).
20. Sabir often absents himself from school despite his teacher's repeatedly telling him not to do so (Ascriptive).
21. A passerby asked Tariq the way to the hospital. Tariq told him the way to the zoo, despite the fact that he knew the way to the hospital (Moral).
22. Akhtar's friend has not been coming to the school since many days, but Akhtar does not go to him to enquire the reasons for not coming to the school (Interpersonal).
23. Azra is a pretty girl but she always brags about her beauty with her friends (Interpersonal).
24. Arshad's parents desire that he does his homework before evening T.V. programs. But Arshad often does not do so (Ascriptive).
25. Nawaz's family does not put on new clothes at Eid (Conventional).

26. An old man going somewhere with his wife fainted after a heart attack. As his life was in danger, the wife went to a shopkeeper and after narrating the incident requested him to let her use his telephone to call for some medical help. The shopkeeper refused to allow the use of his telephone (Moral).
27. Amjad goes to Aslam's house. On his knocking at the door, he sees that Aslam's father has come out. Amjad does not greet Aslam's father (Conventional).
28. Despite Arshad's parents repeated advice to clean his teeth before going to bed at night, Arshad often does not do so (Ascriptive).
29. Javaid knows that he should reach school in time, but he often comes late (Ascriptive).
30. Akbar has a television, but he has not obtained the licence for that (Legal).

Annexure B

INDEX OF SITUATIONS USED IN ITEMS 1-20

Item No.	Rule system	Situation Nos.	Contrast Rule	Situation No.
1	Ascriptive	1, 2	Conventional	3
15	Conventional	25, 18	Ascriptive	29
10	Ascriptive	28, 29	Legal	30
14	Legal	11, 14	Ascriptive	2
16	Ascriptive	24, 20	Moral	7
7	Moral	19, 21	Ascriptive	20
17	Ascriptive	1, 28	Interpersonal	23
8	Interpersonal	22, 23	Ascriptive	24
2	Interpersonal	5, 6	Legal	4
18	Legal	15, 30	Interpersonal	9
13	Interpersonal	6, 22	Conventional	3
6	Conventional	17, 18	Interpersonal	16
19	Interpersonal	5, 16	Moral	26
3	Moral	7, 8	Interpersonal	9
11	Moral	8, 10	Conventional	27
9	Conventional	25, 27	Moral	26
12	Moral	19, 21	Legal	4
4	Legal	2, 12	Moral	10
5	Legal	13, 14	Conventional	15
20	Conventional	15, 17	Legal	12