ALL DECISION MAKERS (TACITLY) ADDRESS SITUATIONS WITH:

- Personal Interest Schema (PIS)
  - What's in it for me and mine (in-group)?

- Maintaining Norms Schema (MNS)
  - What's my duty? What are the rules?

- Post-conventional Schema (PCS)
  - What ideals are shared? How can those shared ideals be operationalized? How can I cooperate?

HIERARCHY: POST CONVENTIONAL

DEFINING ISSUES TEST (DIT-2)

- The Center for the Study of Ethical Development
  - In use since late 1970s
- Tool designed to measure dominant moral schemas by activating them through ethical scenarios (5)
  - These preferences guide thinking & decision-making
DIT-2:

- Constructed of 5 ethical scenarios (macro-morality)
  - 1. Judgment question
  - 2. Five-point rating of 12 questions of reasoning or argumentation (great to no importance)
  - 3. Ranking of top four reasoning statements
- Extensive validity studies (44,000 internationally in the 1990s)

PERSONAL INTEREST SCHEMA FEATURES

- Arbitrary, compulsive cooperation
- Self-focused
- Advantage to self is primary
- Survival orientation
- Scope includes others who are known
- In-group reciprocity

MAINTAINING NORMS SCHEMA FEATURES

- Need for norms
- Society-wide view
- Uniform categorical application
- Partial society-wide reciprocity
- Duty orientation
POST-CONVENTIONAL SCHEMA FEATURES

- Appeal to an ideal
- Shareable ideals
- Primacy of moral ideal
- Full reciprocity
- Rights orientation

MEASURES OF THE DIT

- **P score**
  - The degree to which a respondent endorses items that are reflective of justice-reasoning through PCS.
- **Type indicator**
- **Utilizer score**

ASL-ENG INTERPRETER SAMPLE = 25

- 56% graduated from an ITP (2 yr.), 36% did not
- About ½ had 4 year degree; 1/3 had no degree
- All had certification or qualification except one
- The average years of experience as an interpreter was 14.3 years: Max = 31 and min = 3
- Average age was 49 (n = 22)
WHY THIS COHORT?

P score | Group
---|---
65.2 | Moral philosophy/political science graduate students
52.2 | Law students
50.2 | Medical students
49.2 | Practicing physicians
46.3 | Staff nurses
42.3 | College students in general
40.0 | Adults in general
33.6 | ASL-ENG Interpreter Sample
31.8 | Senior high school students

COMPARING P SCORES

Education Level

<p>| Grade 7–9 |
| Grade 10–12 |
| Freshman |
| 1st year undergrad |
| Senior |
| 4th year undergrad |
| MS/MA degree |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>PIS (Stage 2/3)</th>
<th>MNS (Stage 4)</th>
<th>PCS (Stage 5/6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7 - 9</td>
<td>35.21</td>
<td>41.69</td>
<td>15.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLJ Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 - 12</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>33.24</td>
<td>13.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman 1st year undergrad</td>
<td>28.53</td>
<td>33.57</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLJ Cohort</td>
<td>26.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior 4th year undergrad</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>37.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS/MA degree</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>32.64</td>
<td>41.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHY DO SL INTERPRETERS RESPOND LIKE ‘ADOLESCENTS’?

- Evidence for PIS-like reasoning in the field and in discourse
  - Criticism for the hearing person (stereotypically)
  - Ally model may implicate a need for an adversary
  - Expectations that hearing people should “know about ASL & Deaf culture/ community and interpreters”

- Evidence for MNS-like reasoning in the field and in discourse
  - “Not my job” or “not my role” responses to engagement
  - Retrieval and report of rules when asked to justify decision
  - Use of rule-based language as in ‘always and never’

- Evidence for PCS-like reasoning in the field and in discourse
  - Member of the team metaphor
  - But used often to mean “you do your job and I will do mine”
  - “It depends…”
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