

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY & CRIME, LAW, AND JUSTICE

DOES MORALITY PREDICT STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AT PENN STATE
UNIVERSITY?

JESSICA LYNN SKOCIK
SPRING 2013

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Crime, Law, and Justice & Sociology
with honors in Sociology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Eric Silver
Professor of Sociology and Crime, Law, and Justice
Associate Department Head
Thesis Supervisor

Jeffery Ulmer
Professor of Sociology and Crime, Law, and Justice
Director, Undergraduate Program in Criminology
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

The current study is an exploration of Jonathan Haidt's Moral Foundations Theory as it applies to student participation in extra-curricular activities at Penn State University. The key questions in the research are (1) whether or not morals are a factor in the decisions students make about what activities they participate in and (2) which aspects of morality align with which types of groups students become involved in. The research involved a quantitative survey conducted online as well as qualitative interviews conducted using a convenience sample of Penn State undergraduate students. Findings indicate that morality plays a role in both current and desired student involvement in extracurricular activities at Penn State University. In addition, my second hypothesis was partially supported by the findings; students' involvement in activities aligned with predicted aspects of morality some of the time. Overall, the research supports Haidt's moral foundations theory in the context of student involvement at Penn State and opens up avenues for further research related to morals as a predictor of general human behavior as well as education policy implications at the collegiate level.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	2
Moral Foundations Theory	2
Student Involvement	6
Chapter 3 CURRENT STUDY	20
Chapter 4 METHOD	12
Chapter 5 RESULTS	15
Survey	15
Personal Interviews	24
Chapter 6 DISCUSSION	30
Student Involvement	30
Penn State Students	31
Chapter 7 CONCLUSION	33
Appendix A Moral Foundations Questionnaire	34
Appendix B Interview Protocol	36
REFERENCES	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics	13
Table 2. Frequency of Current Activity Involvement and Desired Activity Involvement.	17
Table 3. Descriptives of Moral Foundations Scores.	18
Table 4. Correlations Between Current Involvement and Moral Foundations	19
Table 5. Correlations Between Desired Involvement and Moral Foundations.....	23
Table 6. Strongest Predictive Relationships Between Moral Foundations Scores and Student Involvement.....	24

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As we get older, the line between our own genius and madness gets blurrier and blurrier. It has been a distinct pleasure to work with Dr. Eric Silver who for the past three years, has guided, supported, and cheered me on while always encouraging the madness lurking within me. Thank you for teaching me how to think. For indulging in that madness, I would like to thank Leslie Abell for her statistical prowess and willingness to teach me the art of table-making. For solving every academic problem I have had at Penn State and always believing in my genius I would like to thank Dr. Jeffery Ulmer who helped me navigate the murky waters of honors student life. For giving me the opportunity to sail those waters, I would like to thank the Schreyer Honors College. For telling me everyday how brilliant I am even though I hardly ever believed her, I have to thank Caren Bloom-Steidle for her extraordinary empathy, and willingness to listen. To the students who participated in many hours of interviews and discussion, thank you for your patience and candidness. And finally to my family, who have always told me that I can do anything, have indulged in every passion I have ever had whether it be madness or genius, and helped me find the balance between the two, thank you. I dedicate this small bit of exploration and thought to all of you, who have inspired me to reach for something better, change the status quo, and have truly enriched my every day.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

When students decide to attend college, they are most often asked, “So why did you go to X University? The myriad responses include: loyalty to sports teams, family legacies, academic programs, opportunity, and the hope that they will come out after four years with a job. No one ever looks proudly at their family members and says, “I am going to college to do community service, or to join a fraternity, or to be a part of Homecoming, or to make a change.” And yet, university students do all of these things once they find themselves at X University. Walking around the HUB at Penn State University, University Park, it is commonplace to hear students saying, “I wish I could major in extra-curricular activities.” In fact, many Penn State students log more hours in meetings, events, planning, and participating than they do in class and doing homework combined.

The purpose of this research is to decipher why students often become involved in activities that have no explicit connection to their studies and determine if morality plays a role in their decision making about what activities they choose to participate in. Jonathon Haidt’s moral foundations theory (Haidt 2012) was developed to understand differences in the perspectives of various groups in the United States, including most notable liberals and conservatives. In this research, I apply Haidt’s moral foundations approach to Penn State, University Park undergraduate students. Using survey and interview data, I examine the moral foundations of Penn State students in order to understand whether or not the moral foundations approach can be used to predict student involvement in extra-curricular activities.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Moral Foundations Theory

Jonathan Haidt's Moral Foundations Theory emerged out of an attempt to understand cultural differences in international populations and eventually became a method for explaining why good, morally sound people disagree so vehemently on political issues in the United States. The hypothesis that Haidt developed provides the theoretical framework for this research and functions as its central independent variable. Haidt and Graham's 2007 paper, "When Morality Opposes Justice: Conservatives Have Moral Intuitions that Liberals may not Recognize," argued that "from an anthropological perspective, the moral domain is usually much broader, encompassing many more aspects of social life and valuing institutions as much or more than individuals," (Haidt and Graham, 2007:98). Haidt and Graham presented theoretical and empirical reasons for believing that five psychological systems exist that provide the foundations for the world's many moralities (Haidt and Graham, 2007:98). These five psychological foundations of morality were labeled as harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, ingroup/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity.

The harm/care foundation is predicated on the notion that "all normally developed individuals dislike seeing suffering in others, and have the potential to feel the emotion of compassion in response," (Haidt and Graham, 2007:104). The fairness/reciprocity foundation, which refers to a

history of “alliance formation and cooperation among unrelated individuals,” has evolved into emotions that motivate reciprocal altruism such as anger, guilt, and gratitude. It is because people feel these emotions that cultures have developed virtues involving justice and fairness, (Haidt and Graham, 2007:104). The ingroup/loyalty foundation refers to values including patriotism, heroism, and loyalty. This foundation originates from a history of living in kin-based groups where individuals trust and cooperate with one another (Haidt and Graham, 2007:105).

Authority/respect originates from a history of living in hierarchical structures where dominant individuals are given respect and privilege in exchange for protection. This foundation relates to values including respect, duty, and obedience (Haidt and Graham, 2007:105). The purity/sanctity foundation refers to the emotion of disgust which functions to guard the body against disease but serves also as a social emotion that emerges when individuals encounter things or situations that evoke a feeling of queasiness (Haidt and Graham, 2007:105-106).

Haidt and Graham further categorize the moral foundations into ethical concerns. Harm/care and fairness/reciprocity motivate the moral concerns of the ethic of autonomy, ingroup/loyalty and authority/respect motivate the moral concerns of the ethic of community, and purity/sanctity is the psychological foundation of the ethic of divinity (Haidt and Graham, 2007:107). One of the main suppositions of this Haidt and Graham’s (2007) study was that liberal morality originates primarily from the harm/care and fairness/reciprocity moral foundations whereas conservatives rely on all five moral foundations. Further, the authors suggested that recognizing “the latter foundations as moral can open up a door in the wall that separates liberals and conservatives when they try to discuss moral issues,” (Haidt and Graham, 2007:112).

In 2009, Graham, Haidt, and Nosek put Moral Foundations Theory to the test by conducting four studies in the paper “Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations”. The hypotheses remained the same as the 2007 paper:

Political liberals construct their moral systems primarily upon two psychological foundations - Harm/care and Fairness/reciprocity - whereas political conservatives construct moral systems more evenly upon five psychological foundations - the same ones as liberals plus Ingroup/loyalty, Authority/respect and Purity/sanctity (Graham et.al, 2009:1029).

The researchers conducted four separate studies using multiple methods in order to test the reliability and validity of the theory. Graham and his fellow researchers were most concerned with the political climate in the United States and developed their research within the rhetoric of the “culture war” that has historically been waged in U.S. society. This war stems from a “clash of visions about such moral issues as the authority of parents, the sanctity of life and marriage, and the proper response to social inequalities” (Graham et. al, 2009:1029).

Study 1 was concerned with Moral Relevance. Researchers “asked participants to rate how relevant various concerns were to them when making moral judgments” (Graham et. al, 2009:1031). The investigators predicted that concerns related to the individualizing foundations, or those having to do with the ethic of autonomy would be more relevant to liberals while the binding foundations, or those related to the ethic of community would be more relevant to conservatives. This study included 1,613 adult respondents who participated in an online survey. The results of this first study provided early support for the moral foundations hypothesis. Differences in moral foundations scores were a function of self-reported political identity (Graham et. al, 2009:1032-1033). Study 2 examined Moral Judgments. Researchers developed four areas of judgment for each moral foundation; one normative ideal, one statement about government policy, one hypothetical scenario, and one positive virtue. Participants were required to make moral judgments about situations that violate certain moral foundations. Study 2 included 2,212 volunteers who did not participate in Study 1 (Graham et. al, 2009:1033-1035). The results of Study 2 also supported the moral foundations hypothesis with political

conservatives agreeing with judgments based on individualizing foundations less and judgments based on binding foundations more.

Study 3 involved Moral Trade-Offs. The researchers predicted that “liberals would be less likely to see trade-offs related to the binding foundations as violations of sacred values and, therefore, would be more willing to perform these actions for some amount of money,” (Graham et. al, 2009:1036). Study 3 included 8,193 adults who volunteered at www.yourmorals.org. Participants were given options for what amount of money they would accept to perform certain tasks with \$0 (I’d do it for free) as the least amount of money and a million dollars as the upper limit. The response categories also included a “never for any amount of money” option. Overall, fairness violations were considered the most taboo among liberals and conservatives. The results of Study 3 also supported the moral foundations hypothesis. Liberals would not make trade-offs on most of the individualizing items, but were less hesitant to perform acts that violated the three binding foundations. Conservatives showed different results with a more even distribution of aversion to each of the foundations (Graham et. al, 2009:1036-1037). Study 4 examined speeches delivered to live audiences that could be analyzed in the moral foundations context. This particular study is not as relevant to the current research, but it is interesting to note that the study supported the hypothesis with the exception that Ingroup/loyalty words were used more often by liberal speakers than conservative speakers (Graham et. al, 2009:1038-1039). Each of the four studies individually supported the moral foundations hypothesis. The researchers found that “liberal morality was primarily concerned with harm and fairness, whereas conservative moral concerns were distributed more evenly across all five foundations” (Graham et. al, 2009:1040). The paper did however leave interesting avenues for further research. The investigators suggested moving beyond the political spectrum to determine what role moral foundations play in other areas of society. The most interesting question the researchers posed was:

“Do people first identify with the political left or right and then take on the necessary moral concerns, or do the moral concerns come first, or is there reciprocal influence or even an unidentified third variable at the root of both,” (Graham et. al, 2009:1042).

This sort of “which came first” scenario is the same question that the current study considers within the realm of university student participation in extra-curricular activities. Is morality a predictor of student involvement, and if it is, which moral foundations motivate students to participate in what types of activities?

Student Involvement

Much of the research involving university student participation is designed to measure the effects that such participation has on student performance. Astin and Sax (1998) investigated how undergraduate students are affected by participation in service related activities. The researchers collected data from 3,450 college students attending 42 institutions with federally funded community service programs (Astin and Sax, 1998:251). The results of their research indicated that participating in service during undergraduate years substantially enhances students’ academic development, life-skill development, and sense of civic responsibility. The researchers controlled for the individual characteristics that lead students to become involved in service and discovered some interesting relationships between student involvement and the reasons why students became involved in service.

The most important predisposing factor in determining whether or not students participated in service at the collegiate level was whether or not the student volunteered during high school (Astin and Sax, 1998:253). Other predictors of university student involvement in service included: leadership ability, involvement in religious activities, commitment to participating in community action programs, tutoring other students during high school, being a

guest in a teacher's home, and being a woman. The researchers also examined some personality characteristics as predictors of involvement. Entering freshmen who were most likely to become service participants during college tended to be less materialistic. Participants were prompted to think about why they became engaged in service and report what that reason was. "To help other people" was reportedly "very important" by 91% of service participants. The next most important reasons for participating in service were "to feel personal satisfaction (67%), and "to improve society as a whole" (61%). Less popular reasons given for service participation included, "to develop new skills" (43%), "to work with people different from me" (38%), "to enhance my academic learning" (38%), and "to fulfill my civic/social responsibility" (30%) (Astin and Sax 1998:254-255). The result that student participation in service is most frequently motivated by a desire to help other people indicates that participation in certain activities relates to morality. The desire to help other people could originate from any number of things, but to some extent helping others is related to a desire to prevent harm and unfairness, which are two of the moral foundations discussed in Jonathan Haidt's Moral Foundations Theory. This particular research, though not focused primarily on why students become involved in service activities, paves the way for further exploration into what motivates students to participate in other types of activities, which is the purpose of the current research.

Camp (1990) performed a similar study prior to Astin and Sax's (1998) research because of a concern with education reform policy changes occurring in the 1980s and 1990s. At this time, education policy was moving in a direction that sought to minimize student participation in extra-curricular activities due to a concern that such participation hindered academic performance. Camp's purpose in conducting this research was "to examine the effect of participation in student activities on overall student success in school, as measured by grades, while controlling for the effects of other variables that could reasonably be expected to affect those grades," (Camp, 1990:273). Camp studied a sample of high school students using an

existing large-scale database, High School and Beyond 1980 (HSB), Sophomore Cohort, Second Followup (Camp, 1990:274). The study involved more than 30,000 sophomores in 1,015 high schools in the United States. Most relevant to the current study was the finding that an important positive, causal, relationship between participation and achievement existed (Camp, 1998:278). Does this finding reveal that participation predicts levels of achievement, or that levels of achievement predict participation? To be sure, there is a relationship between the two. But if Astin and Sax's finding that "to enhance my resume" showed a negative correlation with "to help other people" when considering student motivation to participate in service is true, high levels of achievement should not predict student involvement, but in fact the relationship should be reversed (Astin and Sax, 1998: 255). Participation should be a predictor of high achievement. And if this relationship exists, and academic achievement does not predict student involvement, then we must consider what other factors motivate students to participate in activities on campus.

In an increasingly global society, students are crossing borders to find educational opportunities. Wang, Sedlacek, and Westbrook's (1992) concern for international students prompted them to conduct research on Asian Americans attitudes and participation in student organizations using a random sample of 189 undergraduate Asian American students from a large eastern university. Researchers mailed a 30-item questionnaire to complete as part of the research (Wang et. al, 1992:215). Wang and his colleagues took cultural differences into consideration when assessing Asian American student attitudes about involvement. Asian Americans seemed to be more concerned with academic and career issues than socio-emotional issues, because the prior concerns are more role-salient for Asian American students (Wang et. al, 1992:214). The results of this research indicated that Asian American students liked the idea of joining groups, but did not usually think they had enough time for such participation (Wang et. al, 1992:217). The current research addresses this concern for time by asking students what they would participate in if they did in fact have the time. Asian American students tended to agree

that associating with students who had a familiar background was a good thing about joining an ethnic student group (Wang et. al, 1992:218). Wang and colleagues asserted that “Asian American students’ feelings of marginality are manifested through their participation in groups,” meaning that these students may in fact choose to join the groups they do in order to feel more included and at ease in an American university setting. This motivation for joining ethnic groups revealed that students believed separate Asian groups detached them from the larger university community, but emotionally they valued their culture. These findings raise the question: Despite feeling further isolated, do Asian American students have a heightened sense of loyalty to their culture that motivates them to join ethnic groups? A sense of loyalty is one of the moral foundations present in Haidt’s Moral Foundations Theory and examined in the current study as a predictor of extracurricular involvement.

Chapter 3

CURRENT STUDY

Endeavoring to understand morality and human decision making requires a seemingly endless convergence of disciplines and research. Quantifying morality requires careful consideration of individual thought processes, as well as defining abstract concepts in idiomatic and understandable language. Jonathan Haidt accomplished this by combining moral psychology with sociological and political theory in what has become known as Moral Foundations Theory. His theory explains how morality predicts issues-driven behavior and contention between political liberals and conservatives.

Moral Foundations Theory is predicated on the notion that individuals are driven by intuition as opposed to strategic reasoning when making decisions (Haidt, 2012:52). Haidt successfully argues that an innate sense of morality or a “gut” feeling is a greater motivator than reasoning processes. He identifies five different aspects of morality that attempt to encompass all human morality. These include harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, ingroup/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity. Each of these foundations for morality emerges at varying levels across groups in the United States, particularly in political groups. The moral foundations are key in this theory. As such they are one of the primary variables in the current research. The moral foundations can be measured within the context of almost any decision making behavior which makes this theory incredibly useful.

To examine the applicability of Moral Foundations Theory on a micro level, I measured the moral foundations scores of students attending Penn State’s University Park campus using an online survey. These scores then functioned as a predictor of student involvement in

extracurricular activities on campus. To define the dependent variable, I categorized types of involvement using the sixteen categories offered on clubs.psu.edu and included questions regarding current and desired student involvement in clubs and activities. Measuring involvement simply required students checking off their activities of interest as part of the survey measure.

This study puts forth two simple questions: Does morality predict student involvement in extracurricular activities? And if it does, which aspects of morality predict student involvement in which activities? If the theory applies to the realm of student decision making, I believe that I can predict what types of activities students are likely to be involved in based on their moral foundations scores. For example, students who report high scores on the purity/sanctity foundation will most likely currently be involved or desire to be involved in some sort of religious or spiritual organization. Likewise, students who report high scores on the harm/care foundation will most likely be involved in service, philanthropy, and THON affiliated organizations. Students who report high loyalty/ingroup scores will most likely participate in student government and affiliate types of groups.

As a qualitative supplement to this research, I conducted fourteen interviews with undergraduate students on Penn State's University Park campus to gain a more in depth understanding of student interpretations of morality and reflections on their own motivations for getting involved at Penn State. Most students do not attend college to participate in extracurricular activities and yet almost all students do. Is it a sense of moral obligation that motivates students to participate in extracurricular activities or is it something else? Conducting student interviews gave me the opportunity to ask these questions and learn what students are actually thinking about when they decide to join clubs and groups.

Chapter 4

METHOD

The current study uses a mixed methodology consisting of two research approaches. The two approaches are a student survey reaching over 1400 Penn State students in the Criminal Justice and Sociology Departments and a series of personal interviews with Penn State students attending the University Park campus. In the Fall of 2012 Dr. Eric Silver and PhD candidate Leslie Abell collected survey data using an online survey that students accessed by clicking on a link embedded in an e-mail. The survey was sent out to large classes of students within the Crime, Law, and Justice and Sociology Departments at the Penn State University Park campus. Students were offered extra credit for participation and data from each survey completed was anonymously recorded and submitted online. This longitudinal study had 1433 respondents and an 80% response rate. The moral foundations scores used in the data were calculated using the algorithm and scoring methodology described at Jonathon Haidt's website, yourmorals.org.

Interviews were conducted with Penn State undergraduate students using a convenience sampling method as a qualitative supplement to the survey data collected. Interviews were conducted one-on-one and recorded using a digital recording device. To maintain anonymity, participant's names were omitted from the data reported in this paper. Interviewees answered questions regarding their participation and involvement in activities on campus. Participants also discussed why they became involved in certain activities and their interpretation of their own morals. Interviews were probative based on participants' answers to questions included on the Interview Protocol.

The purpose of the current study is to apply the moral foundations hypothesis to determine whether or not moral foundations will predict student activity in groups on Penn State's University Park campus. Items from the survey pertaining to these questions included those on the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (found at yourmorals.org) and those pertaining to group involvement at Penn State. Demographic characteristics of the sample were also collected including gender, race, political orientation, and age. Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the online survey results.

Variable	Valid %
<u>Gender</u>	
Female	41.5
Male	58.5
<u>Race</u>	
White/Caucasian	75.7
Black	10.0
Asian	6.7
Middle Eastern	1.4
Native American	0.5
Other	5.6
<u>Political Orientation</u>	
Conservative	29.6
Liberal	40.8
Moderate	26.1
Other	3.5
<u>Age</u>	
17-22	96.4
23-31	3.6

Of the respondents who completed the online survey, 41.5% were female. In this study, 75.7% of respondents identified as white, 10.0% as Black, 6.7% as Asian, 1.4% as Middle Eastern, 0.5% as Native American, and 5.6% indicated "Other" as their racial identity. Political orientation was measured at an ordinal level with responses ranging from "Very conservative" to

“Very liberal.” Of the respondents who reported a political orientation, 29.6% identified as some level of conservative, while 40.8% identified as some level of liberal. Those identifying as “Moderate” represented 26.1% of the sample, and 3.5% reported having “Other” political orientation. Respondents’ age was also reported. This study took place at Penn State University, so ages range from seventeen to thirty-one. Respondents ranging from seventeen to twenty-two represented 96.4% of the sample with those from the eighteen (22.7%), nineteen (22.9%), twenty (22.9%), and twenty-one (20.5%) age categories each representing about an equal proportion of the sample. Respondents ranging from ages twenty-three to thirty-one represented 3.6% of the sample.

The interviews conducted for this research included the use of a protocol with twelve questions where students were asked about their general involvement at Penn State, followed by how their involvement may connect to the moral foundations, and finally about how their own sense of morality developed and directly relates to their group memberships at Penn State. The interview protocol is provided in Appendix B. Fourteen interviews were conducted ranging in length from about ten minutes to almost sixty minutes. Seven women and seven men participated. Students were given ample time to respond to the questions and were encouraged to think about their responses before giving them. The interviews were informal and all answers were kept confidential. Interviews were recorded using a hand-held digital recording device that was later used to review the interviews for analysis. Each interview was individually scheduled and conducted at the interviewees’ location and time of choice. The interviewees consisted of a convenience sample that included members of a student service and leadership organization operating on Penn State’s University Park campus.

Chapter 5

RESULTS

Survey

The survey data pertaining to this study included moral foundations scores, current student involvement, and desired student involvement at Penn State. Moral foundations scores were measured using the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (Appendix A) and scoring methodology developed by Jonathan Haidt and outlined at yourmorals.org. The on-line survey measured current and desired student involvement at Penn State using self-reported current participation and desired participation in sixteen different categories of student activities. Because aspects of morality are used to predict student involvement, the moral foundations scores function as the independent variable in this study while current and desired involvement function as the dependent variable. The relationship found between these two variables indicates that morality does in fact play a role in student decision-making in addition to describing how morality functions as a predictor of current and desired participation in each of the sixteen activity categories.

The moral foundations scores measure how respondents scored on each of the five moral foundations identified in Moral Foundations Theory: harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, ingroup/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity. The sixteen activity categories include: Penn State THON¹, Academic/Professional, Sport/Physical Activity, International/Multicultural,

¹ THON is the Penn State IFC/PANHELLENIC DANCE MARATHON. It is a 46-hour dance marathon that raises money for pediatric cancer and research at the Hershey Medical Center through the Four Diamonds Fund. It is the largest student run philanthropy in the world and is supported by 15,000 student volunteers each year.

Media/Publication, Music/Performing Arts, Political, Service, Religious/Spiritual, Special Interest, Student Government, University Affiliate, Honor Society, Residence Hall Interest House, Philanthropy, and No Involvement.

Table 2 shows current student involvement and desired activity involvement reported by survey respondents. It is interesting to note that the highest percentage of students is currently involved in Penn State THON. It is also interesting to point out that 42.1% of students desire to join a Sport/Physical Activity. The smallest percentage of students (4.4%) is currently involved in Political groups while the smallest percentage of students (4.3%) desire involvement in Residence Hall Interest Houses. These frequencies could indicate any number of things, because students were allowed to interpret the meaning of the activity groups. Desired participation in a physical activity could simply be interpreted as going to the gym more often, or it could indicate a desire to join a team. Each of these would likely emerge out of a different moral motivation; one driven by a desire to be physically fit the other by a desire to be a part of a team. Likewise, the percentage of students who desire involvement in Residence Hall Interest Houses is directly affected by how many students who participated in the survey live on campus. There are also many reasons that one might join THON: to support the cause, to participate in the social atmosphere at the event, to achieve status within the realm of student activities, to enhance resumes.

In fact, participation and desired participation in each of the activities indicated on this table could be explained by any number of things, which is why the application of moral foundations theory is necessary. Investigating why these students participate and if morality is a predictor of their participation instead of any one of the spurious variables listed above will be important in determining how students make decisions about involvement in extracurricular activities. This particular analysis is quite useful, because it provides a starting point for this

research. It shows that students are participating in extracurricular activities and it directly addresses the dependent variable, while still leaving many questions unanswered.

Table 2: Frequency of Current Activity Involvement and Desired Activity Involvement

Activity	Been Involved With	Would Join
THON	55.1	39.2
Academic/Professional	26.8	29.3
Sport/Physical Activity	37.0	42.1
International/Multicultural	10.2	10.7
Media/Publication	4.9	11.6
Music/Performing Arts	6.7	18.2
Political	4.4	16.4
Service	12.4	27.7
Religious/Spiritual	8.7	9.5
Special Interest	19.0	29.3
Student Government	5.6	20.3
University Affiliate	8.3	19.9
Honor Society	10.1	21.1
Residence Hall Interest House	5.2	4.3
Philanthropic	17.5	25.8
No Involvement	12.1	7.1

Table 3 addresses the dependent variable in this study (moral foundations scores) by simply showing the descriptive statistics for each of the foundations. The maximum score for each foundation was six and the lowest scores ranged from 1.00-1.33. The average scores for each foundation are pretty consistent with the lowest average score reported for the Purity foundation and the two highest average scores reported for the Harm and Fairness foundations. This table indicates that there is something going on with morality for Penn State University Park students. The next analysis addresses just what that something is.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Moral Foundations Scores

Foundation	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Harm	1.17	6.00	4.5	.72
Fairness	1.00	6.00	4.5	.65
Loyalty	1.00	6.00	4.0	.75
Authority	1.33	6.00	4.1	.71
Purity	1.00	6.00	3.5	.87

The survey findings revealed relationships between many of the moral foundations and most of the groups. Recall that the main research question in this study is whether or not morality predicts student involvement in extracurricular activities. The involvement section of the survey included two specific questions. The first asked what students are currently involved in at Penn State and the second asked what students would be involved in if they had more time.

Bivariate-Pearson's r^2 correlations were run to examine the relationship among each type of involvement and moral foundations scores. As shown in Table 4, many of the moral foundations scores were significantly correlated with student involvement. This indicates that morality does have something to do with student involvement. The sheer number of significant relationships between the moral foundations scores and current student involvement reveals that this correlation does in fact exist. Thus, the first question regarding this research has been answered. Table 4 shows correlations between current student involvement and moral foundations scores that are significant at both the .05 and .01 levels.

A strong positive correlation exists between the harm/care foundation and current involvement in THON. It can be concluded from this that students who are interested in preventing harm and providing care are very likely to choose to participate in THON. This relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. A strong positive correlation (statistically significant at the 0.01 level) also exists between current involvement in other philanthropic organizations and the harm/care moral foundation. Positive correlations were also found between the harm/care

moral foundation and current involvement in service, religious/spiritual, special interest, university affiliate, and residence hall interest house groups. These relationships were significant at the 0.05 level. Negative relationships were also found between involvement and the harm/care foundation. There is a strong negative correlation between student involvement in sports and physical activities and the harm/care foundation. This type of relationship is particularly interesting because it suggests that students who are not particularly concerned with preventing harm become involved in sports and physical activities. This negative relationship was also significant at the 0.01 level. Negative correlations were found between harm/care and current involvement in political organizations as well as students who currently are not involved in anything. These relationships were significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 4: Bivariate Correlations Between Current Involvement and Moral Foundations

ACTIVITY	HARM	FAIRNESS	LOYALTY	AUTHORITY	PURITY
THON	.094**	-.030	-.028	-.028	.014
Academic/Professional	-.002	.018	-.013	-.020	-.017
Sport/Physical Activity	-.130**	-.092**	.079**	.004	-.020
International/Multicultural	.049	.114**	-.052	-.042	.046
Media/Publication	.069**	.075**	-.055*	-.069**	-.035
Music/Performing Arts	.032	.074**	-.032	-.013	-.013
Political	-.057*	.003	.042	-.033	-.035
Service	.055*	.020	-.073**	-.069**	-.050
Religious/Spiritual	.064*	.037	.013	.019	.146**
Special Interest	.055*	.044	.016	.015	-.028
Student Government	.024	.016	-.048	-.023	-.010
University Affiliate	.054*	.055*	-.098**	-.027	-.006
Honor Society	.002	.016	-.088**	-.012	-.011
Residence Hall Interest House	.056*	.017	-.048	.024	-.005
Philanthropic	.102**	.018	-.018	-.027	.021
No Involvement	-.059*	-.035	.002	.020	-.031

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The fairness/reciprocity foundation revealed some interesting results that relate to findings obtained from the personal interviews. The most interesting correlation and strongest relationship for the fairness/reciprocity foundation was current involvement in international/multicultural organizations. This positive relationship suggests that students at a primarily American university who get involved in international/multicultural organizations are interested in creating fairness for all members of a diverse population on campus. This relationship was significant at the 0.01 level. Strong positive correlations (significant at the 0.01 level) also existed between the fairness foundation and current involvement in media/publication and music/performing arts groups. The only significant negative relationship for the fairness foundation was found with student involvement in sports/physical activity. This seems a little strange, because one would think those involved in sports would have a vested interest in fairness. This particular finding could certainly be further researched.

The ingroup/loyalty foundation displayed a significant positive relationship with current involvement in sports/physical activity. Strong negative relationships (significant at the 0.01 level) were found between ingroup/loyalty and participation in service, university affiliate², and honor society groups. It is important to point out that my expectation about this particular foundation is not supported by this finding. I expected that there would be a positive correlation between loyalty and university affiliate involvement meaning that higher loyalty scores would predict more involvement in university affiliate groups. The opposite conclusion, however, is supported by the findings. A negative relationship (significant at the 0.05 level) was also found between loyalty and current involvement in media/publication groups.

² A University Affiliate group is one that is sponsored and funded by the university. These groups serve necessary functions for the university and are most often housed in the HUB/Robeson Center at Penn State. Examples include: Penn State Homecoming, FreshSTART, Lion Ambassadors, Students Engaging Students, etc.

The authority and purity foundations were less important to group involvement. Significant negative relationships (at the 0.01 level) were found between the authority foundation and current involvement in media/publication and service groups. The only significant relationship for the purity foundation was a strong positive correlation between current involvement in religious/spiritual organizations and purity. This particular finding supported my second hypothesis, which stated that student involvement in particular groups could be predicted by moral foundations scores. I predicted that high purity/sanctity scores would predict current involvement in religious/spiritual activities.

Overall, current involvement in extracurricular activities was most related to the first three foundations, with harm being the most predictive and loyalty being the least predictive of current student involvement. There were a total of 23 statistically significant relationships between the moral foundations scores and current student involvement.

Next I examine the kinds of activities students would become involved in if they had more time in their schedules, or “desired involvement”. This analysis is likely to be more pure in the sense that it provokes students to think about what they would choose to spend their time participating in if there were no time constraints or limits imposed on them. As shown in Table 5, high scores on the harm/care foundation predict that students would like to be involved in service, honor society, residence hall interest house, and philanthropic types of groups. These relationships were significant at the 0.01 level. Significant (at the 0.05 level) positive relationships also existed between the harm/care foundation and desired involvement in media/publication, performing arts, and religious/spiritual groups. Two negative relationships also existed for this foundation as well. It appears that students who do not desire involvement in politics and students who just want to be involved in something are particularly concerned with preventing harm or providing care based on their moral foundations scores.

High scores on the fairness/reciprocity foundation predict desired involvement in international/multicultural, music/performing arts, and philanthropic groups at a significant level (0.01). Significant relationships also exist between the fairness/reciprocity foundation and desired involvement in media/publication and residence hall interest house groups. Significant negative relationship existed between fairness and no desired involvement, suggesting that people who are concerned with fairness desire to be involved in something. High scores on the ingroup/loyalty foundation predicted desired involvement in sport/physical activity groups at a statistically significant level.

High scores on the authority/respect foundation predicted desired involvement in university affiliate groups at a statistically significant level. Desired involvement in residence hall interest house, and religious/spiritual groups also reflected a positive relationship with the authority/respect foundation. A negative relationship was found between the authority/respect foundation and desired involvement in international/multicultural groups. High scores on the purity foundation reflected desired involvement in religious/spiritual groups at a statistically significant level as well as desired involvement in honor society and residence hall interest house groups. I found significant correlations between the purity foundation and desired involvement in political groups and no desired involvement suggesting that people who have a high purity score are less likely to be involved in political groups and less likely to not be involved at all.

With the exception of the ingroup/loyalty foundation, the predictive power of moral foundations for desired involvement seemed to be more evenly distributed across each of the foundations than current involvement. With a total of 26 statistically significant relationships between moral foundations scores and student involvement in various activities, it certainly seems as though morality predicts what activities students would choose to be involved in if they had more time.

The survey results for this study partially support my hypotheses. The number of statistically significant relationships between both current and desired involvement and moral foundations scores certainly suggest that morality plays a role in student decision making concerning extracurricular involvement.

Table 5: Correlations Between Desired Involvement and Moral Foundations

ACTIVITY	HARM	FAIRNESS	LOYALTY	AUTHORITY	PURITY
THON	.006	.036	.017	.037	.039
Academic/Professional	.042	.021	-.005	.006	-.027
Sport/Physical Activity	.002	-.009	.074**	.020	.024
International/Multicultural	.044	.083**	-.022	-.053*	.032
Media/Publication	.054*	.052*	-.043	-.028	.004
Music/Performing Arts	.064*	.076**	-.038	-.063*	.026
Political	-.075**	-.035	-.017	-.049	-.069**
Service	.107**	.045	-.017	-.006	-.006
Religious/Spiritual	.055*	.020	-.014	.058*	.168**
Special Interest	.014	.027	.025	-.024	-.039
Student Government	.040	.016	.029	.028	.026
University Affiliate	.070**	.046	.048	.076**	.051
Honor Society	.069**	.007	.031	.013	.059*
Residence Hall Interest House	.102**	.056*	.022	.067*	.065*
Philanthropic	.129**	.071**	-.047	-.027	.003
No Involvement	-.123**	-.085**	-.024	-.033	-.063*

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

My second set of hypotheses, which postulate that relationships between the moral foundations and particular group involvement exist, can be addressed by looking at what positive relationships were the strongest for each moral foundation. For *current involvement*, high harm/care scores predicted involvement in philanthropic groups, high fairness/reciprocity scores predicted involvement in international/multicultural groups, high ingroup/loyalty scores predicted involvement in sports/physical activity groups, high authority/respect scores did not relate to activity involvement at a significant level for any activity category, and high purity scores

predicted involvement in religious/spiritual groups. For *desired involvement*, high harm/care scores predicted current involvement in philanthropic groups, high fairness/reciprocity scores predicted involvement in international/multicultural groups, ingroup/loyalty predicted involvement in sport/physical activity groups, authority predicted involvement in university affiliate groups, and purity predicted involvement in religious/spiritual groups. Table 6 illustrates these relationships.

Table 6: Strongest Predictive Relationships Between Moral Foundations Scores and Student Involvement

Foundation	Current Involvement	Desired Involvement
Harm	Philanthropy	Philanthropy
Fairness	International/Multicultural	International/Multicultural
Loyalty	Sports/Physical Activity	Sport/Physical Activity
Authority	N/A	University Affiliate
Purity	Religious/Spiritual	Religious/Spiritual

Overall, the relationships between current involvement and moral foundations and desired involvement and moral foundations are quite similar indicating that moral foundations predict with some level of consistency what activities students choose to participate in. Thus, my hypothesis regarding which foundations would predict involvement in which activities was partially supported.

Personal Interviews

Fourteen interviews were conducted using a convenience sample of Penn State University Park students involved in a service and leadership university affiliate organization (Students Engaging Students). Seven men and seven women participated in the interviews. Because the interviews were a supplemental piece of this research, I did not form specific hypotheses. Generally I expected to find that morality predicted involvement to the same extent

that it did in the survey, and that each student would have one or two driving moral foundations from which they made most of their decisions regarding their particular involvement. Students were given the opportunity to interpret the questions however they chose, which led to very insightful contributions to this research.

At Penn State, most participants were involved in some sort of service organization in addition to the university affiliate organization they all had in common. Participants reported being involved in myriad organizations at Penn State. Students were involved in UPUA, Freshstart, Essence of Joy choir, Theta Chi fraternity, Judo, THON, as well as many other activities. Reasons for involvement ranged from wanting to meet new people, to self-improvement. Most interviewees revealed that their friends were also a part of the activities they were involved in, but did not indicate that this was a reason they joined. The analysis for the interviews was also left to my own judgments based on the conversations I had with the interviewees. If the same moral foundation emerged as the reason why participants joined each of their organizations, I deduced that this aspect of morality would yield the highest score if they completed the Moral Foundations Questionnaire.

The interviews revealed a wide range of moral motivations for participating in activities. There were a few key findings from the interviews. First, students who are a part of the same organization join it for different reasons. Second, morality is not the only factor taken into consideration when students make decisions about joining groups. In fact, morality is not mutually exclusive with other motivators. And finally, the interview findings were consistent with the survey findings. Morality can be used to predict the types of groups students choose to become involved in. The interviews also covered topics including the origins of their own personal morality and what students would like to change about Penn State.

Each of the students who participated in the interviews shared membership in the same service and leadership, university affiliate organization, Students Engaging Students, but each

participant gave different reasons for joining. When prompted with specific questions about moral reasons for choosing to participate in this type of organization, participants said that they joined because it prevented oppression by addressing social justice issues, prevented harm by helping people learn more about themselves and one another, prevented unfairness and cheating by leveling the playing field for people through community service, celebrated liberty by giving students the freedom to choose what to do with their time, they had a respect for the advisor of the organization, it gave them a sense of loyalty by providing a family-like atmosphere, and by allowing them to take a more active role in their faith. Some students gave many moral reasons for being a part of Students Engaging Students and some gave only one. Some students joined for reasons that were not explained by the moral foundations. This finding is exceedingly important, because it supports my first hypothesis that morality plays a role in student decision making about organization participation. But it also shows that similarly involved people may not be similarly motivated. This finding actually challenges my expectation that you can predict with a certain level of accuracy which moral foundations will predict involvement in which activities, because the interviews revealed that any of the moral foundations could predict involvement in this particular organization.

The interviews revealed that students are motivated to join groups based on factors that have nothing to do with morality. For example, one participant was involved in Engineering House and chose to join that group because it provided a comforting and collective living and learning environment. Other students join groups to find balance, “feel whole,” and learn about themselves. Others participate because they want to be pioneers of some sort of change.

Several of the interview participants identified with one or two moral foundations and gave those as reasons for joining the organizations they are a part of. For this reason, my second hypothesis was supported by some of the interviews. Due to the structure of the interview protocol, students were prompted to explain why they joined each organization they are currently

a part of and then later given options for why else they may be involved based on the moral foundations. This ordering caused participants to think in a particular way, addressing first their group memberships (the dependent variable in this research) and then thinking about their motivations for joining (the independent variable). So this particular finding has a sort of “which came first” characteristic. Did students join groups because they had a predisposed sense of morality, or did they develop aspects of their morality after they joined?

One example of the first type of case is a participant who came to Penn State after growing up abroad. This participant shared that, “*international students aren’t integrated into this campus. There’s no real and efficient way to integrate them into the community.*” From her perspective, this is “implicit segregation.” This particular participant was most passionate about preventing oppression and facilitating equality, morals which she said originated from her parents who have always been advocates for equality. This particular interview was consistent with the survey finding that a strong fairness foundation motivates people with concerns about international and multicultural groups. However, one could argue that joining such groups just further segregates international students on a primarily American campus. This discovery addresses the results of Wang and colleagues (1992) study about Asian American students feeling marginalized in ethnic student groups.

Loyalty emerged as the most important moral foundation in another interview. This participant shared concerns about students becoming over-involved and not remaining loyal to an organization and really belonging to it. This participant is a part of Greek life, and said that, “it’s for the rest of your life,” indicating the strong sense of loyalty he felt towards his brotherhood. This participant also cited other reasons for joining organizations including celebrating liberty, and preventing unfairness and oppression. In another interview, the participant shared a unique take on preventing oppression as it related to her involvement in THON. “*The four diamonds fund provides emotional support to those families and without that there could be many families*

that would suppress their feelings whether it be guilt or depression or anything like that.” And yet another participant shared his passion for facilitating opportunities for students to freely choose what to become involved in through a heightened alignment with the “fairness” foundation. He shared that if he had not been involved in Students Engaging Students, *“Opportunities would be suppressed.”* He elaborated on how this organization has impacted his understanding of freedom. *“Students Engaging Students gives people the opportunity to see new things and I think that’s part of the whole freedom aspect. You come here with all these choices you can make and that’s freedom in itself. And then doing service that’s a whole different kind of freedom because you learn about yourself and you feel better about yourself and what you’re doing for the community and you choose to do that with your time.”*

The interviews proved to be an extremely informative supplement to the survey findings, because the emotional responses of the participants were recorded through voice inflection and clarity of explanation. While some participants cited several aspects of morality that drove them to participate, the interviews revealed which of these aspects was the most important to each participant based on their emotional and verbal responses to the questions. This is something that cannot easily be found by conducting more quantitative types of research, such as a survey.

Participants were asked to think about where their own sense of morality came from during the interviews as well. Surprisingly, many shared that their morality originated from their own experiences, some saying that their morals developed while they were in attendance at Penn State. Other participants talked about familial and religious origins as well. One particular participant shared quite an opposite moral development story. This participant had to *“pick that [morality] up from my environment, because I didn’t grow up in a house where I had parents saying ‘you need to be a good person or you need to live by this.’ I didn’t grow up with ‘treat others as you want to be treated.’”* And yet this young woman believed a great deal in the concept of morality describing it as a compass that guides you. So I asked how her sense of

morality developed without the foundation of a religious upbringing or direct moral structure. To which she thoughtfully replied, *“I would pick things up from other people’s parents or my grandparents or teachers and they would stick with me.”*

When I interviewed students who reported a strict religious morality I asked them if they would have chosen a different path of moral development if they had known then what they know now. I asked this participant the same question; now, looking back would she have rather had a morality that was developed from a strict moral structure or religious background. Quite eloquently, she shared that she is facing this now. *“One of the biggest things I’ve been focusing on now is self discipline, because I didn’t grow up with a lot of discipline. It kind of angers me now, because it’s really hard to learn that self discipline now.”* But as with most participants, she didn’t know if she would have chosen differently, but she reported a great sense of pride in having a hand in developing her own morality. She said, *“I feel like I worked really hard. I just did it all different I guess. I really believe that there’s more inner strength in myself for that because I really have to fight for it. I did pick those values and I’m proud of the ones that I’ve chosen.”* To be sure, there is no right or wrong way to raise children, develop morality, or even choose a path, but the importance lies in the fact that young adults are spending time thinking about these things and trying to make the right moral choices in their personal lives as well as in their participation in extra-curricular activities.

Chapter 6

DISCUSSION

Student Involvement

Perhaps the most fascinating part of this research includes the “tip of the iceberg” nature of the findings as they apply to potential future research and university policy implications. The results of this research offer strong support for moral foundations theory regarding student involvement at Penn State University and set the stage for further research at the university level. Student opinion is paramount in facilitating a positive and engaging experience for everyone who participates in higher education.

The interview participants voiced concerns about everything from access to professors and faculty to hazing policy in Greek life. Because this research was originally intended to address moral foundations as they pertain to social change, I got the chance to ask my peers what they thought about their school and what they would like to change about it. There are some limitations inherent in the interview responses, as I am well acquainted with the students who participated and each of them all shared a common membership in a service and leadership organization that I am also a part of. This, however, does not detract from the importance of the comments they made.

Research completed at all levels of education has concluded that participation in extracurricular activities improves academic achievement, but students do not participate with the intention of performing better in the classroom; this achievement is a byproduct. So the question remains: why do students get involved? I would argue that there is a reciprocal relationship between student involvement and morality, as well as a desire to make a positive impact on one’s

surroundings. As one participant said, *“I was there when, you know we weren’t just a partying school; it was more than that it was more than just socializing it was the academics but it was also what we did for the community; the good.”* Another student expressed a concern for the quality of recruitment and retention in fraternity culture. He desired to change the stigma of hazing by changing hazing all together. He shared, *“I think hazing can be done in a very constructive manner, like I wouldn’t mind running miles and doing pushups to be perfectly honest, because there is psychology behind ‘the harder you work for something the more you get out of it.’ I just think that when it becomes so detrimental where people are abused and neglected emotionally and physically that’s what they need to crack down on.”*

The policy implications of this research at the university level are impossible to ignore. Students pay thousands of dollars to get an education, and they want everything they can get out of it, because as much as the classroom teaches us, university life challenges, encourages, and sometimes disappoints us. Students are involved because they are driven by something; they strive for something. This something could be change, or it could be a great GPA, but it is clear that whatever the motivation, just sitting in a classroom is no longer enough for this generation of students.

Penn State Students

When they enter college, most students express a desire to “leave a mark” on the university they attend. This is no different at Penn State. Each interview participant was asked if there was something about Penn State specifically that they would like to change. The responses to this question are among the most interesting and unexpected contributions of this research. Students at Penn State want to improve campus by *“help[ing] improve sustainability on campus. We could do so much better.”* Students at Penn State want to change perspectives: *“I wish some*

people would be more open-minded.” Students at Penn State want to change their legacy: “I’d like to change the image of Penn State from the partying school.” “It would be nice if service was more encouraged. I wish there were other things to do like service or people were more interested in that, because a lot of the culture isn’t really interested in service. People are interested in just doing other things on the weekend like partying and stuff and the bars. I kind of feel like at Penn State there isn’t much to do besides that.” Penn State students want to change their access to educational opportunities: “I would like to see it become a smaller community.” Penn State students want to feel encouraged by their educators and supported by their peers. “I wish I could just open people’s eyes to the fact that as student groups it’s okay to be students and make mistakes and not always be such a corporate type thing and celebrating people’s mistakes and learning from them rather than criticizing or condemning people who do make mistakes or who are brave enough to speak out when they identify a problem.”

Most importantly, Penn State students want to be heard. At the university level, student voices are the most powerful, but unless someone listens to those voices they will never be heard. Regardless of the motivation compelling students to want to impact their universities or join the groups they participate in, student voices need to be heard by the administration, faculty, and staff at all universities, because students are motivated and do have goals. But students need support and the, *“faith in humanity that students can really make a difference in this world.”*

Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

This research began with two hypotheses: (1) Morality is a factor in student decision making about what extracurricular activities they become involved in and (2) Specific moral foundations can predict which types of activities students will choose to participate in. To address the hypotheses of this research, it can certainly be said that morality is indeed a predictor of student involvement at Penn State University. However, it is certainly not the only variable involved. In addition, morality is not mutually exclusive from other types of motivation for student involvement. As far as predicting certain types of involvement, certain moral foundations can predict student involvement to a certain extent, but there is no sure quantitative process to prove that everyone who is a part of a particular activity is motivated by the same moral foundation. As evidenced in the student interviews, several of the participants cited very different reasons for being a part of the same organization. Perhaps we can predict with more accuracy, the political orientation of people based on their moral foundations (Haidt and Graham, 2009) however there does exist a certain predictability in other things.

To explore moral foundations theory further, I would suggest using the moral foundations to predict human behavior on any number of different dependent variables, for example, social activism. In fact, it would be incredibly informative to complete a longitudinal study on a group of children and assess their changing perceptions of morality and their motivations for participating in activities as they develop their own moral agency with age. With a theory like this, the possibilities are unlimited with where the variables can be taken. This research is a perfect example of the applicability and relevance of moral foundations theory.

Appendix A

Moral Foundations Questionnaire

Part 1. When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking? Please rate each statement using this scale:

[0] = not at all relevant (This consideration has nothing to do with my judgments of right and wrong)

[1] = not very relevant

[2] = slightly relevant

[3] = somewhat relevant

[4] = very relevant

[5] = extremely relevant (This is one of the most important factors when I judge right and wrong)

_____ Whether or not someone suffered emotionally

_____ Whether or not some people were treated differently than others

_____ Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country

_____ Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority

_____ Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency

_____ Whether or not someone was good at math

_____ Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable

_____ Whether or not someone acted unfairly

_____ Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group

_____ Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society

_____ Whether or not someone did something disgusting

_____ Whether or not someone was cruel

_____ Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights

_____ Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty

_____ Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder

_____ Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of

Part 2. Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement:

[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

_____ Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue.

_____ When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly.

_____ I am proud of my country's history.

_____ Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.

_____ People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed.

_____ It is better to do good than to do bad.

_____ One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal.

_____ Justice is the most important requirement for a society.

_____ People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong.

_____ Men and women each have different roles to play in society.

_____ I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural.

_____ It can never be right to kill a human being.

_____ I think it's morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing.

_____ It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself.

_____ If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty.

_____ Chastity is an important and valuable virtue.

The Moral Foundations Questionnaire (full version, July 2008) by Jesse Graham, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian Nosek. For more information about Moral Foundations Theory and scoring this form, see: www.MoralFoundations.org

Appendix B

Interview Protocol

Part 1: Involvement at Penn State

1. What are you involved in at Penn State?
2. Why are you involved in this activity?
3. Are your friends a part of this activity?

Part 2: Connection between Involvement and Moral Foundations

4. Are you a part of this organization because it...
 - A. Prevents harm to others
 - B. Prevents unfairness or cheating
 - C. Prevents oppression
 - D. Celebrates liberty or freedom
 - E. Gives you a sense of loyalty
 - F. Respect authority
 - G. Has something to do with sanctity/faith
5. Is there something at Penn State that you wish to change?
6. Do you think your involvement in the activities/organizations you are a part of contribute to this effort?
7. What do you hope to accomplish by being involved?

Part 3: Broader Application of Moral Entrepreneurship as it Connects to Moral Foundations

8. Is there something about your hometown, school, state, country, that you would like to change?
9. Why do you want to change this?
10. How do you define morality?
11. Where did your morality come from?
12. How are your group memberships connected to your sense of morality?

REFERENCES

- Astin, A.W., and L.J. Sax. "How Undergraduates Are Affected by Service Participation." *Journal of College Student Development* 39 (1998): 251-63. Web.
- Barnartt, Sharon N. "Disability culture or disability consciousness?." *Journal of Disability Policy Studies* 7.2 (1996): 1-19.
- Becker, Howard. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: The Free Press, 1963.
- Camp, William G. "Participation in Student Activities and Achievement: A Covariance Structural Analysis." *The Journal of Educational Research* 83.5 (1990): 272-78. *JSTOR*. Web. 08 Mar. 2013.
- Dacin, Peter A., M. Tina Dacin, and Margaret Matear. "Social Entrepreneurship: Why We Don't Need a New Theory and How We Move Forward From Here." *The Academy of Management Perspectives* 24.3 (2010): 37-57.
- Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian A. Nosek. "Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 96.5 (2009): 1029.
- Haidt, Jonathan, and Jesse Graham. "When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize." *Social Justice Research* 20.1 (2007): 98-116.
- Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People are Divided by Politics and Religion*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2012..
- Mair, Johanna, and Ignasi Marti. "Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight." *Journal of world business* 41.1 (2006): 36-44.

Wang, Yuh-Yin, William E. Sedlacek, and Franklin D. Westbrook. "Asian Americans and Student Organizations: Attitudes and Participation." *Journal of College Student Development* 33 (1992): 214-21. Web.

ACADEMIC VITA

Jessica L. Skocik

432 Arlington Terrace Dr. Wildwood, MO 63040
jls6004@psu.edu

EDUCATION

- The Pennsylvania State University-University Park, PA.....2009-2013**
- ❖ Bachelor of Science, Crime, Law, and Justice Expected Graduation May 2013
 - ❖ Bachelor of Arts, Sociology Expected Graduation May 2013
 - Thesis: “*I Can’t, I’m Busy*”: *Does Morality Predict Student Involvement at Penn State University?*, Advisor: Dr. Eric Silver

HONORS, AWARDS, SCHOLARSHIPS

- ❖ Crime, Law, and Justice Student Marshal.....2013
- ❖ Fulbright Scholar.....2013
- ❖ Schreyer Ambassador Travel Grant.....2012
- ❖ Excellence in Communication Certificate.....2012
- ❖ ISE Merit Based Scholarship, *Semester at Sea*..... 2012
- ❖ College of the Liberal Arts Enrichment Award.....2012
- ❖ Paterno Fellow.....2010-present
- ❖ Schreyer Honors Scholar.....2009-present
- ❖ Academic Excellence Scholarship.....2009-present
- ❖ Dean’s List: all semesters

MEMBERSHIPS

- ❖ Phi Beta Kappa Honor Society.....2013-present
- ❖ Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society.....2013-present
- ❖ National Society of Collegiate Scholars.....2011-present
- ❖ Golden Key International Honor Society.....2011-present
- ❖ Student Engaging Students, Member.....2010-present

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

- ❖ Population Research Institute, *Penn State University*..... 2012
 - Undergraduate research assistant with the Association of Religion Data Archives. Duties include web searches, data entry, and working with graduate students as needed.
- ❖ Congregations Research Project, *Penn State University*.....2011

- Research assistant for the Congregations Project sponsored by the National Science Foundation. Responsibilities include manual data coding and reacting and cross referencing databases
- ❖ Sony Research Project, *Penn State University*..... 2009
 - Co-Investigator in the Sony Research Project in the English department at Penn State; included presentation of marketing strategy for new Sony Reader Product to members of Sony Inc.

LEADERSHIP

- ❖ Penn State LeaderShape Institute, *Penn State University*.....2010
 - Learned the skills necessary to find a passion, develop it into a vision for the future, and set attainable goals for achieving that vision as a result of leading with integrity.
- ❖ Penn State Homecoming 2010, *Penn State University*..... 2010
 - Corporate Relations Captain; Administrative Assistant; soliciting donations from local businesses to support Homecoming.
- ❖ Students Engaging Students, *Penn State University*.....2010-present
 - New Member Education Chair; facilitate peer-lead, experiential leadership development workshops, coordinate service learning opportunities, and support the success of all recognized student organizations; New Member Liaison for Outreach Committee.

SERVICE

- ❖ Into the Streets Team Leader, *Penn State University*.....2010-present
 - *Shaver's Creek*: Assisting in the maintenance of the Penn State Nature Center through digging ditches to re-route irrigation around roads, and helping coordinate volunteers for the Fall Harvest Festival.
 - *Elmcroft Assisted Living Center*: Spending time with Elmcroft residents listening to a piano recital, playing BINGO, making picture frames.
 - *PSPCA*: Volunteering with a group of Penn State students to help maintain kennels and exercise the animals currently residing at the PSPCA through experiential service learning.
 - *The Village Retirement Community*: Working with the residents of The Village to maintain landscaping through service learning.

STUDY ABROAD

- ❖ Semester at Sea.....2012
 - Semester study abroad voyage around the world.
 - Visited 11 countries. Ports of call included Brazil, Ghana, China, India, and Japan.
 - Fully accredited academic program sponsored by the University of Virginia.