

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINOLOGY

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENDER, MORAL INTITUTION, AND PARTY
BEHAVIOR AMOUNG COLLEGE STUDENTS

BRITTANY DIVVER
SPRING 2020

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Criminology and Sociology
with honors in Criminology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Eric Silver
Professor of Sociology and Criminology
Thesis Supervisor

Stacy Silver
Associate Professor of Sociology and HDFS
Honors Adviser

* Electronic approvals are on file.

ABSTRACT

Through the analysis of data derived from 1,488 college students and applying the Moral Foundation Theory, I examined the relationship between moral intuitions and party behaviors (including hookups, drug use, and alcohol consumption) and how these behaviors relate to the participant's sex (male and female). Through my research, I found that moral intuitions involving care, fairness, loyalty, and sanctity had a significant relationship to these deviant behaviors. Additionally, there was a significant coefficient in the data that revealed females used drugs less frequently than males. The other two party behaviors (hookups and alcohol consumption) revealed no significant differences between the sexes. This study builds on prior research in suggesting that a student's decision to participate in potentially dangerous deviant behaviors is linked to their morality, which further suggests that to reduce such dangers our society should focus on strengthening the morals that correlate to better decision-making.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| LIST OF TABLES | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iv |
| Chapter 1 Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 2 Literature Review | 2 |
| Chapter 3 Methods and Data | 9 |
| Chapter 4 Results | 13 |
| Chapter 5 Discussion | 22 |
| Chapter 6 Conclusion | 25 |
| Appendix A Moral Foundation Questionnaire | 28 |
| Appendix B Self-control Questionnaire | 29 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 30 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Descriptive Statistics (n=1,488)..... | 14 |
| Table 2: Correlation Matrix | 16 |
| Table 3: Regression Table | 17 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would love to thank my boyfriend first and foremost because he has been with me through every step of my research and thesis journey. He was always up for a late night proofread or just someone to bounce ideas off of. He was encouraging and supportive whenever I needed it. I would also like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Eric Silver. He was a great resource and mentor through my two-year thesis expedition. He always was quick to respond to my emails and available for a quick face-to-face to make sure I was on track. I would like to thank his graduate student Ryan Richmond for helping with the statistics of my research. I would have been lost in STATA without his help. I would like to thank my roommates, Hannah and Rachel and my best friend Anya for moral support and for listening to me talk about this project for two years. Thank you, best mom ever, for the extra proofreading during the Corona Virus Pandemic. I would like to thank my amazing younger sister Ashley because she figured out how to hyperlink the list of tables which took me 2 hours prior to trying to figure out. Finally, I would like to thank my family for financially supporting me for the past 4 years at school. I love you all for making this thesis project happen. Thank you!

Chapter 1

Introduction

Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) has become an influential framework for studying our moral decision-making processes in recent years. Based on this theory, studies have shown that moral intuitions correlate to deviant behaviors, such as excessive drinking, drug use, and promiscuous sex (Silver and Abell 2017; Silver 2019). Additionally, studies have shown that the influence of peer pressure and self-control on an individual's decision-making process can be linked to the strength of certain moral foundations (Antonaccio and Tittle 2008). If morality is shown to contribute to better decision making with regard to deviant behavior, this could support the continued instilment of moral values for the betterment of our society.

The 2017 Monitoring the Future National Survey on adolescent alcohol use found no significant decline in alcohol use for the first time since 2001. In light of recent concerns (bordering on moral panic) about college students engaging in excessive and dangerous party behaviors, additional research could provide an explanation for why some students engage in these behaviors and why others do not. Students' moral intuitions and their sex (male or female) could prove to be important links to their involvement in deviant behaviors. Adolescent drinking is a culturally normative behavior and Moral Foundations Theory could provide valuable insight into the connection between party behaviors, moral intuitions, and respondent's sex.

Moral Foundation Theory asserts that all individuals show certain patterns of moral intuitions, and that these patterns vary across cultures as well. For research purposes, the theory provides a scale measuring five moral intuition categories (care, fairness, loyalty, authority, and

purity) that show characteristic adaptations of an individual. In my research, I will examine whether MFT can help to explain why students participate in excessive party behaviors. Up until now this field of study has been relatively untouched and is ready for further exploration.

The goal of this study is to determine if there is a significant relationship between moral foundations, party behavior, and respondent's sex. To achieve this goal the study will address the following questions: Do moral intuitions predict party behaviors? Does the respondent's sex predict party behavior? Do moral intuitions mediate the relationship between sex and party behaviors? Specifically, I hypothesize that the moral intuitions described in MFT will be significantly related to students' involvement in party behaviors. I also hypothesize that respondent's sex will significantly relate to party behaviors. Through my study I aim to determine whether or not moral intuitions are a significant mediator of the relationship between respondent's sex and party behaviors.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Studies that test whether a person's morality can predict his or her deviant behavior can help us to understand which aspects of our moral beliefs correlate with which types of deviant

behavior, including excessive drinking, drug use, and promiscuous sex (Silver and Abell 2017; Silver 2019). Examining different aspects of our moral beliefs can provide a more multifaceted assessment of morality than is found in past research, where morality is usually measured based on a single idea: how wrong a person considers the deviant behavior in question to be.

This study will use a more nuanced approach to predicting a person's deviant actions by measuring his or her moral intuitions in different domains. If the strength of a person's moral intuitions in a particular domain is shown to contribute to better decision making regarding deviant behavior in that domain, this could support the continued instilment of moral values for the betterment of our society. With the recent concern regarding college students' excessive partying behavior, this research could provide much-needed insight into why some students engage in deviant behaviors while others do not. By providing a better understanding to the public, we may be able to reduce moral panics and disprove common myths that often lead to counterproductive solutions. The sample consists of Pennsylvania State University undergraduate students and includes measures of their morality and their deviant behaviors. The research questions to be addressed are as follows: Do rates of involvement in party-related deviant behaviors differ by respondent sex and, if so, are these differences explained by differences in the moral concerns of males and females?

Conceptualizing Morality

Situational Action Theory (SAT) is currently the most well-studied criminological theory focusing on the relationship between morality and offending. The theory conceptualizes morality in terms directly linked to the law and argues that one can measure morality by asking respondents how wrong they think it is to engage in various criminal or deviant acts (Wikstrom and Treiber, 2007). SAT also explains the conditions under which self-control, which has proven

to be a strong predictor of deviant and criminal behaviors, even across cultures, influences offending (Antonaccio and Tittle 2008; Brauer and Tittle, 2017). Specifically, self-control is only expected to reduce crime when the individual has weak morality because only individuals with weak morality would entertain crime as an “action alternative.” In contrast, when an individual’s morality is strong, self-control is assumed not to matter because the possibility of engaging in crime or deviance does not even occur to the individual (Wikstrom and Treiber 2007). Similarly, when the individual is in the habit of either engaging in or not engaging in crime, self-control is believed to matter less because “habit” implies that different action alternatives are not considered.

SAT has been very influential in advancing our understanding of the relationship between morality and deviance. However, SAT is limited in that it conceptualizes morality in terms of a single dimension: the wrongness of offending. In addition, SAT focuses on intentional decisions and as a result does not consider that intuitions rooted in a complex self may influence deviant behavior; nor does it acknowledge that these intuitions may occur in different moral domains.

To fill these gaps, scholars have begun using Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) as a framework for explaining crime and deviance. Studies using MFT have shown that moral intuitions in different domains correlate to different types of deviant behavior, such as excessive drinking, drug use, and promiscuous sex (Silver and Abell 2017; Silver 2019). There has been a continuous debate regarding what domains should fall under the heading of morality. MFT has broken down morality into five dimensions, referred to as moral foundations. These moral foundations are care and justice (our individual-oriented morals), authority and loyalty (our group-oriented morals), and purity (our body-oriented morals). In other words, our morality is not solely based on how we treat others and ourselves but also on how we relate to groups, and

whether we believe it's important to subordinate our interests to the group (Haidt 2007). In short, MFT offers a new framework for studying deviant behavior that is not directly connected to a person's attitudes about following the law, as in Situational Action Theory.

Deviance and the College Party Scene

Deviant behavior is embedded in the college party scene. Party behaviors include but are not limited to drinking alcohol (often underage), smoking tobacco, using illicit drugs, engaging in promiscuous sex, and getting into physical fights. Party behaviors have been a part of the "college experience" for a long time. For example, in the 1960s, college students were highly involved in drug use, including acid and methamphetamine (Johnston, Miech, O'Malley, and Bachman 2018). These students were considered part of a counterculture, which is exactly what deviance is. More recently, binge drinking has become an excessive and dangerous party behavior among college students. Although alcohol use among adolescents has declined in recent years (Johnston, Miech, O'Malley, and Bachman 2018; Twenge, 2017), there is still a very active and prominent excessive drinking culture on college campuses today. Fighting is a relatively frequent occurrence at college parties particularly when excessive drinking is involved (Silver and Abell 2016). And studies show a positive relationship between attending college parties and the occurrence of alcohol-related, promiscuous sex with a stranger or acquaintance (Bersamin, Paschall, Saltz and Zamboanga 2011; Wade, 2017; Vander Ven, 2011). While the types of deviant behaviors that tend to arise within the college party culture are well-documented, the question of why some students participate in these activities while others do not has yet to be fully answered.

Morality and the College Party Scene

Silver and Abell's (2016) study, *Beyond Harm and Fairness: A Study of Deviance and Morality*, examined college students' moral foundations and their involvement in deviant behaviors. They found that the ability to predict deviant behavior significantly increased when looking at a student's self-reported moral foundations, over and above their self-control, political ideology, and religiosity. In an earlier study, the *Dynamics of Moral Beliefs and Minor Deviance*, Matsueda (1989) elaborates on the importance of a person's morality rather than their self-control when considering their participation in deviant behaviors.

Within Moral Foundations Theory, the Care/Harm and Fairness/Cheating foundations are categorized as individual-oriented moral concerns because they emphasize the wellbeing of other individuals. Those who scored high in the Harm and Fairness categories were significantly less likely to engage in a fight that resulted in the harm of another person (Silver and Abell 2016). Purity/Sanctity, Loyalty/Ingroup, and Authority/Respect are categorized as group-oriented moral concerns because they emphasize the importance of upholding group norms and expectations (Hadit 2007). Silver and Abell (2016) found that college students who scored high on the Loyalty, Authority, and Purity foundations were less likely to steal, smoke pot, consume other illicit drugs, and view pornography. Silver and Abell's research marked an important first step in revealing that different aspects of morality can be connected to different forms of deviance, including behaviors among college students. However, Silver and Abell's study did not examine whether the moral foundations can account for differences in the males' and females' involvement in deviant behavior. Therefore, we do not yet know the degree to which gender differences in party-culture deviance are due to gender differences in morality.

Gender, Morality, and Party Behaviors

Males have historically engaged in more crime than women, especially violent crimes and college males' fighting is no exception (Silver and Abell 2016; Kruttschnitt and Uggens 2013; Broidy and Agnew 1997). Female college students, however, have been found to drink to extremes at a significantly higher rate than males (Silver and Abell, 2016). In general, the gender gap for offending is larger for more serious offenses and has a smaller gap for less serious offenses, in all areas of crime except for prostitution (Broidy and Agnew 1997). Along these lines, college women have been found to attend more fraternity parties and engage in more consensual sexual activity while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, than males (Silver, 2019).

In the study, *Explaining the Gender Gap in Delinquency: Peer Influence and Moral Evaluations of Behavior*, researchers focused on finding out why gender is such a great predictor of certain deviant behaviors (Mears, Ploeger, & Warr 1998). They hypothesized that differences in moral priorities could be an important cause of gender differences in deviance, and their results supported this hypothesis. First, they found that males were more likely to engage in a range of deviant acts, including self-reported burglary, vandalism, drug selling, and theft. Then, they examined self-reported theft and found that, among females, when moral disapproval of theft was high, the effects of peer influence was reduced to zero. But for males, moral disapproval of theft did not diminish the effects of peer influence. They concluded that females who morally disapprove of theft are "immune" to the effects of peer influence, but that the same cannot be said of males, suggesting that the influence of morality on behavior may be different for males and females. The results of Mears et al.'s (1998) study show that males and females tend to have different rates of involvement in deviant behavior and suggest that morality is an

important variable to consider when trying to understand differences in male and female involvement in deviant behavior.

There has been considerable debate in the psychological literature about whether and to what extent males and females have different moral priorities (Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1981). Gilligan (1982) argued that female morality places a greater emphasis on relationships and caring, while male morality places a greater emphasis on rules and attaining justice. And within Moral Foundations Theory, researchers have found that women tend to endorse the Care/Harm and Purity/Sanctity foundations more strongly than men. However, the extent to which these different moral concerns can explain gender differences in involvement in different types of deviant behavior has received little attention, and no studies have addressed this question within the college party scene in particular.

Goal of this Study

The goal of this study is to determine if there is a significant relationship between moral foundations, party behavior, and respondent's gender. I hypothesize that the five moral intuitions described in MFT will be significantly related to students' involvement in party behaviors. I also hypothesize that respondent's sex will significantly relate to party behaviors. Through my study, I aim to determine whether moral intuitions help to explain the relationship between respondent's sex and party behaviors.

Chapter 3

Methods and Data

Sample

The study is interested in party-related deviant behaviors. Data from college students is ideal for answering questions on this topic. The data were collected in 2017 from students in general education classes in sociology and criminology at a large, public university (Silver 2019). The survey was administered via email with personalized links to an online survey platform. Students were given extra credit in their courses for participating in the survey. All personal information was kept confidential and removed before analysis. A total 1,608 out of 2,143 students completed the survey, putting the response rate at around 75%. After removing the missing information, the sample became 1,447 students. Random sampling was not used; however, the data were collected in general education classes, which are large and consistently diversified in terms of majors and student demographics.

Measures

Party Behaviors

Respondents were asked to report on their involvement in certain party behaviors. This study focuses on two of those behaviors. A question regarding the number of hookups the student has had in the past 3 months was asked with five possible answer choices; 0 times, 1 time, 2 times, 3-5 times, and 6 or more times, and data on the frequency of recreational drug use (other than alcohol) was gathered with 8 answer choices; never, less than once a year, less than once a month, less than once a week, at least once a year, at least once a month, at least once a week, and at least three times a week.

Sex

Respondents were asked what their gender was. They were given a choice between male, female, and 'other', with an option to write in an answer. Sex was measured with a dummy variable coded 0 = female and 1 = male.

Moral Foundations

Respondents were asked to complete the two-part, 30-item Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ-30), which measures the strength of five moral foundations in each person. In the first part of the questionnaire, respondents rated themselves on a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 = not at all relevant to 5 = extremely relevant based on the degree to which specific behaviors are relevant to their moral-decision making. An example of a part one question is "whether or not someone suffered emotionally", which measured the Care/Harm foundation. In the second part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to rate their feelings of agreement on a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree with a range of morally charged statements. An example of a statement is "when the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly," measuring the Fairness/Cheating foundation. All of the items included in the MFQ-30 are shown in Appendix A.

Control Variables

This research controls for variables that might be correlated with morality and participation in party behaviors. They consisted of the following: self-control, class year, importance of religion, race, and sexual orientation. Through the use of control variables, we are able to reduce the risk that the results are due to spuriousness.

To measure self-control, respondents were asked 24 questions with response options ranging from 0 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree (the 24 questions are shown in Appendix B). Class year included the categories Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Super Senior (more than four years as an undergraduate), and Graduate Student. Importance of religion was determined by responses to two questions. The first question was how often one attends religious services, measured from 1 = never to 8 = more than once a week. The second question was how important religion is in one's daily life with 1 = not at all important and 4 = extremely important. Race was measured as a dummy variable comparing White to Black, Asian, and other races. Sexual orientation was measured by a dummy variable categorizing all sexual minorities (gay, lesbian, homosexual, bisexual, and other) into one group with heterosexuals as the reference category.

Analysis

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and percentages) are provided for each variable in the study (Table 1). Following the descriptive table, bivariate correlations are provided, which gives a preliminary idea about my hypotheses (Table 2). Finally, an OLS regression table is presented with one regression model for each dependent variable: frequency of hookups, excessive drinking, and drug use (Table 3). Regression analyses are used to show the association between sex, moral foundations, and party behaviors. There are 3 models in each regression analysis. Model 1, 4, and 7 shows the multivariate associations between the control variables and the party behavior, model 2, 5, and 8 shows the multivariate association between sex and the party behaviors (with controls), and model 3, 6, and 9 shows the multivariate associations between sex, the moral foundations and the party behaviors (with controls). Models

1 through 3 were the party behavior, hookup frequency. Models 4 through 6 analyzed drug use and frequency and models 7 through 9, alcohol consumption frequency. Comparing the results of these models will enable me to determine whether sex is related to each party behavior and whether the association between sex and the party behaviors is mediated by the moral foundations.

Chapter 4

Results

Table 1 shows the means/percentages, standard deviations, and ranges of the independent, dependent, and control variables for my research. The mean drug use frequency was on the lower end of the range at 1.425 out of 5, with hookup frequency at 2.103 and then the highest mean being alcohol consumption at 2.397 out of 5. This suggest that on the whole students are more likely to drink than hookup and more likely to hookup than use recreational drugs (other than alcohol). When looking at the moral foundations, we see that people self-rated the importance of care and fairness very high at about 5 out of 6. Loyalty and Authority means were at about 4 out of 6. Sanctity was rated the lowest at 3.4 out of 6. Table 1 also shows that 58% of respondents were female and 42% were male. Self-control's mean was above average at 2.848 out of 4. The sample was mostly white (71.6%). Freshmen made up 41.4% of the sample and religiosity was below the scale midpoint at 1.889 out of 4.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics (n=1,488)

| | Mean/ Percentage | Standard Deviation | Range |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Hookup Frequency | 2.103 | 1.409 | 1-5 |
| Drug Use Frequency | 1.425 | 1.673 | 0-5 |
| Alcohol Consumption Frequency | 2.397 | 1.443 | 0-5 |
| Moral Foundations | | | |
| <i>Care/Harm</i> | 4.594 | 0.796 | 1.5-6 |
| <i>Fairness/Cheating</i> | 4.745 | 0.710 | 1.4-6 |
| <i>Loyalty/Betrayal</i> | 3.858 | 0.768 | 1-5.83 |
| <i>Authority/Subversion</i> | 3.968 | 0.724 | 1-6 |
| <i>Sanctity/Degradation</i> | 3.414 | .855 | 1-6 |
| Gender | | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 42.27% | -- | -- |
| <i>Female</i> | 57.73% | -- | -- |
| Self-Control | 2.848 | 0.356 | 1.125-4 |
| Race | | | |
| <i>White</i> | 71.58% | -- | -- |
| Black | 7.82% | -- | -- |
| Other Race | 5.87% | -- | -- |
| College Year | | | |
| Freshman | 41.4% | -- | -- |
| Sophomore | 24.87% | -- | -- |
| Junior | 17.54% | -- | -- |
| Senior | 14.72% | -- | -- |
| Super Senior | 1.48% | -- | -- |
| Sexual Minority | 5.11% | -- | -- |
| Religiosity | 1.889 | 0.916 | 1-4 |

Table 2 provides the bivariate correlation and significance levels for each variable in the study. The independent variables had many significant correlations. Being female is positively and significantly correlated with Care and Fairness and negatively associated with drug use frequency when compared to males. Females also report higher levels of self-control and religiosity. Care/harm is positively correlated with all of the other moral foundations as well as self-control and religiosity. Fairness/cheating is positively correlated with all of the other moral foundations as well as self-control. Loyalty/betrayal is positively correlated with all of the other moral foundations, as well as hookup frequency and religiosity. It is negatively correlated with drug use and self-control. Sanctity/degradation is positively correlated with all other moral foundations and religiosity. Sanctity/degradation is negatively correlated with drug use and alcohol consumption, as well as with being white and having a sexual preference other than heterosexual.

Table 2: Correlation Matrix

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|----------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|---------|-----------|----------|--------|---------|----|
| 1. Female | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Care/Harm | 0.260*** | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Fairness/Cheating | 0.209*** | 0.683*** | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Loyalty/Betrayal | -0.149 | 0.145*** | 0.138*** | -- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Authority/Subversion | -0.0211 | 0.175*** | 0.202*** | 0.629*** | -- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Sanctity/Degradation | 0.021 | 0.229*** | 0.186*** | 0.494*** | 0.569*** | -- | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Hookup Frequency | -0.05 | -0.004 | -0.031 | 0.103*** | 0.060* | 0.041 | -- | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Drug Use Frequency | -0.068** | 0.030 | 0.017 | -0.071** | -0.077** | -0.149*** | 0.232*** | -- | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Alcohol Consumption Frequency | -0.014 | 0.046 | -0.034 | 0.047 | -0.004 | -0.065* | 0.359*** | 0.418*** | -- | | | | | | | |
| 10. Self-Control | 0.145*** | 0.182*** | 0.171*** | -0.071** | -0.040 | -0.035 | -0.152*** | -0.192*** | -0.218*** | -- | | | | | | |
| 11. College Year | -0.079*** | 0.026 | 0.014 | -0.098*** | -0.080** | -0.083** | -0.104*** | -0.007 | 0.053* | -0.023 | -- | | | | | |
| 12. White | 0.023 | 0.042 | -0.071** | 0.072** | 0.062* | -0.099*** | 0.172*** | 0.044 | 0.317*** | 0.034 | -0.061* | -- | | | | |
| 13. Black | 0.050 | 0.039 | 0.104*** | -0.140*** | -0.052* | 0.104*** | -0.050 | -0.002 | -0.121*** | -0.025 | 0.068** | -0.465*** | -- | | | |
| 14. Other Race | 0.0045 | -0.002 | 0.032 | -0.032 | -0.043 | -0.023 | -0.026 | 0.065* | -0.099*** | -0.003 | 0.036 | -0.404*** | -0.071** | -- | | |
| 15. Sexual Minority | 0.013 | 0.022 | 0.006 | -0.169*** | -0.153*** | -0.139*** | -0.021 | 0.041 | -0.066* | -0.009 | 0.041 | -0.062* | 0.082** | -0.019 | -- | |
| 16. Religiosity | 0.060* | 0.068** | 0.023 | 0.183*** | 0.222*** | 0.431*** | 0.001 | -0.199*** | -0.154*** | 0.040 | -0.065* | -0.078** | 0.165*** | 0.033 | -0.059* | -- |

* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

With regard to the dependent variables, hookup frequency is positively correlated with drug use, alcohol consumption, and being white, and it is negatively correlated with self-control. Drug use is positively correlated with alcohol consumption and being in the “other” race category. Drug use is negatively correlated with self-control and religiosity. Alcohol consumption is negatively correlated with self-control, sexual minority, and religiosity, but positively correlated with being white.

Table 3 shows regression results predicting each of the three dependent variables: hookup frequency (models 1-3), drug use frequency (models 4-6), and alcohol consumption frequency (models 7-9). The table shows the effects of the independent variables (each moral foundation and female gender), as well as the controls.

Table 3: Regression Table

| | Hookup Frequency | | | Drug Use Frequency | | | Alcohol Consumption Frequency | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 | Model 5 | Model 6 | Model 7 | Model 8 | Model 9 |
| Moral Foundations | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Care/Harm</i> | -- | -- | ▾ 0.092 | -- | -- | 0.250*** | -- | -- | 0.293*** |
| <i>Fairness/Cheating</i> | -- | -- | ▾ -0.075 | -- | -- | 0.015 | -- | -- | -0.176* |
| <i>Loyalty/Betrayal</i> | -- | -- | 0.139* | -- | -- | -0.078 | -- | -- | 0.114 |
| <i>Authority/Subversion</i> | -- | -- | ▾ -0.001 | -- | -- | 0.032 | -- | -- | -0.033 |
| <i>Sanctity/Degradation</i> | -- | -- | ▾ -0.017 | -- | -- | -0.217*** | -- | -- | -0.106 |
| Female gender | -- | ▾ -0.098 | ▾ -0.082 | -- | ▾ -0.119 | -0.236** | -- | ▾ 0.108 | ▾ 0.067 |
| Self-Control | -0.616*** | -0.597*** | -0.588*** | -0.861*** | -0.837*** | -0.939*** | -0.875*** | -0.897*** | -0.942*** |
| Race (White) | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | ▾ -0.261 | ▾ -0.251 | ▾ -0.0171 | ▾ .200 | ▾ 0.212 | ▾ 0.197 | -0.607*** | -0.617*** | -0.525*** |
| Other Race | ▾ -0.164 | ▾ -0.162 | ▾ -0.131 | .534** | 0.537** | 0.504** | -0.653*** | -0.655*** | -0.630*** |
| College Year | -0.125*** | -0.129*** | -0.124*** | -0.043 | ▾ -0.047 | ▾ -0.068 | 0.068* | 0.072* | 0.065* |
| Sexual Minority | ▾ -0.093 | ▾ -0.090 | ▾ -0.038 | ▾ 0.213 | ▾ 0.217 | ▾ 0.076 | -0.460** | -0.464** | -0.494** |
| Religiosity | ▾ 0.014 | ▾ 0.015 | ▾ -0.006 | -0.364*** | -0.361*** | -0.279*** | -0.196*** | -0.198*** | -0.185*** |
| R^2 | 0.038 | 0.039 | 0.045 | 0.081 | 0.082 | 0.101 | 0.098 | 0.099 | 0.115 |
| n | 1,487 | 1,487 | 1,487 | 1,487 | 1,487 | 1,487 | 1,487 | 1,487 | 1,487 |

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

¹ Standardized

My first key dependent variable is hookup frequency. In Model 1, hookup frequency is regressed on the control variables: self-control, race, college year, sexual minority, and religiosity. Self-control and year in college are both significantly associated with lower hookup frequency ($b=-.616$, $p<.001$ and $b=-.125$, $p<.001$, respectively). This means that the higher one's self-control and higher one's year in college the less frequently one is to hook up. In model 2, female is added to the equation. The coefficient for female is not significant indicating that females are no more likely to hook up than males. Self-control and college year continue to be significant. In model 3, the moral foundations are added to the equation. The only moral foundation with a significant association with hookup frequency is loyalty/betrayal at 0.139, which means that higher scores on loyalty/betrayal are associated with more frequent hooking up. Self-control is still significant ($p<.001$), however, the association decreased to -0.588, indicating that some of the effect of self-control is due to its association with morality. Model 3 is the best fitting model for predicting hookup frequency because it has the highest r-squared, 0.045, indicating that 4.5% of the variation in hooking up frequency is explained by the variables in the model.

My second dependent variable is drug use frequency. In model 4, drug use frequency is regressed on all of the controls: self-control, race, college year, sexual minority, and religiosity. Self-control is negatively and significantly associated with drug use frequency at -0.861 ($p<.001$). This means that as self-control goes up a person's likelihood of recreational drug use goes down significantly. Members of races other than white or black reported more frequent recreational drug use when compared to whites ($b=0.534$, $p<.01$). This result is consistent with the bivariate correlation table. Religiosity is negatively associated with recreational drug use frequency at -0.364 ($p<.001$), indicating that the more religious one is the less frequently one is

to use drugs recreationally. In model 5, the female variable is introduced however, as with hooking up, female is not significantly associated with drug use frequency. Self-control, other races, and religiosity remain about the same in terms of significance and associations with female in the equation. In model 6, the moral foundations were added. Care/harm is associated with greater drug use frequency at 0.250 ($p < .05$), while sanctity/degradation is associated with lower drug use frequency at -0.217 ($p < .05$). In addition, the coefficient for female became significant when the moral foundations were added ($b = -.236$, $p < .01$). This indicates a suppressor effect because the female variable did not matter until the moral foundations were added. This will be discussed in more detail in the discussion section. Self-control's negative association increases in model 6 after adding moral foundations. The coefficients for religiosity and "other" race, however, decrease when the moral foundations are added to the equation. Model 6 is the best model for explaining drug use frequency because it has the highest r-squared. The r-squared for model 6 is 0.101, meaning that 10.1% of the variation in recreational drug use frequency is explained by the variables in the equation.

My last dependent variable is alcohol consumption frequency. In model 7, alcohol consumption frequency is regressed on the controls: self-control, race, college year, sexual minority, and religiosity. Self-control, black, other race, sexual minority, and religiosity are all significantly associated with lower alcohol consumption frequency. College year is associated with a slight increase in alcohol consumption frequency. This means upper classmen tend to consume alcohol more frequently. In model 8, Female is added to the equation. As with hookup frequency and drug use frequency, the coefficient for female is not statistically significant with respect to alcohol consumption frequency. In model 9, the moral foundations were added to the equation predicting alcohol consumption frequency. Care/harm is associated with greater alcohol

consumption frequency ($b=0.293$, $p<.001$). Fairness/cheating is associated with lower alcohol consumption frequency ($b=-0.176$, $p<.05$).¹ Self-control is associated with lower alcohol consumption frequency ($b=-0.942$, $p<.001$) after the moral foundations are taken into account, which is a slight increase from models 7 and 8. The coefficients for the other controls slightly decrease from model 7 and 8, except for sexual minority, which increases slightly. Model 9 is the best model for explaining alcohol consumption frequency because the r-squared was the highest (0.115), which means 11.5% of the variation in alcohol consumption frequency is being explained by the variables in model 9.

To summarize, my first hypothesis was that the moral intuitions described in Moral Foundation Theory would be significantly related to students' involvement in party behaviors. The hypothesis was supported through the regression table with a .139 increase in hookup frequency by the loyalty/betrayal foundation, a .250 increase in drug use frequency by the care/harm foundation, a .217 decrease in drug use frequency by the sanctity/degradation foundation, a .293 increase in alcohol consumption frequency by the care/harm foundation, and a .176 decrease in alcohol consumption frequency by the fairness/cheating foundation. My second hypothesis was that the respondent's sex would be significantly related to party behaviors. This hypothesis was not supported in any of the regression. My last hypothesis was that the moral foundations would make the respondent's sex non-significant. This hypothesis also was not supported since the sex measures was not significant in any of the controls-only models. In fact,

¹ In additional analyses, I found that the care/harm coefficient stayed positive and significant when the fairness/cheating measure was removed from the equation but that the fairness/cheating coefficient became non-significant when the care/harm coefficient was removed.

the female variable became a significant for recreational drug use frequency only after adding the moral foundations in model 6.

Chapter 5

Discussion

This study was conducted to analyze party behaviors among college students and how they might vary by morality and sex. The goal of this research was to determine the significant relationships between party behaviors, moral foundations, and sex. By conducting this study, the field can use this information to propose certain actions to stop dangerous party activity in the college environment. As a result, we can find ways to predict what increases participation in party behaviors. Policymakers and educators can use this insight develop programs and curriculums that prioritize the morals that promote healthy life choices. This information can be used to help save lives from alcohol poisoning and overdoses as we start to understand what societal aspects increase their likelihood. This study also furthers the Moral Foundations Theory as it expands the different connections between our morals and actions. Past research has focused on self-control and peer pressure when determining what influences a person's decision making but with this study, we examined how much our morality might influence our actions.

I hypothesized that the morals described in MFT would be significantly related to students' involvement in party behaviors. Furthermore, I hypothesize that the respondent's sex would significantly relate to those party behaviors. Finally, I aimed to determine whether moral intuitions would help to explain the relationship between respondent's sex and party behaviors. My results revealed many significant relationships between the independent variables, dependent variables and the controls. For the first dependent variable, hookup frequency, the study showed significant, negative relationships with self-control and college year in every model. The three

models were the controls only, controls and sex, and the moral foundations, controls, and sex. Hookup frequency had a significant positive association with the moral foundation of loyalty, and a significant negative association with self-rated self-control and year in college.

For the next dependent variable, drug use frequency, my results showed a significant and negative association to self-control and religiosity in every model. Drug use frequency had a positive and significant relationship with other races and the moral foundation for care. It also had a significant relationship with the moral foundation of sanctity and females; however, this was a negative association. Drug use frequency had the greatest number of significant relationships with the independent variables. For the final dependent variable, alcohol consumption, the study showed a significant and negative association with fairness, self-control, black, other races, sexual minority, and religiosity. It had a positive and significant association with care and year in college.

Overall, loyalty, care, and fairness are significantly associated with these party behaviors. Sex only seemed to affect drug use frequency and be insignificant when it came to hook ups and drinking alcohol. Some might be surprised by these results because society suggest that males are hooking up and drinking more alcohol than females, but in this study of college students, they seem to be participating at similar rates. Corresponding with prior research, certain of the moral foundations tended to be correlated. The individualizing moral foundations, Harm/Care and Cheating/Fairness were moderately to highly correlated; as were the binding moral foundations (Ingroup/Loyalty, Authority/Respect, and Purity/Sanctity). To ensure that these correlations did not invalidate my multivariate analyses, Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) were examined for all measures of my regression table. In no instance did the VIF exceed 2.0, meaning collinearity was not a problem in my models. Due to the high correlation between the

fairness and care moral foundations, I paid special attention (and ran additional analyses) to examine their relationship with the alcohol consumption variable. Specifically, I took out the fairness variable and re-ran the variables to see how it would affect the care variable. Care stayed significant, however, when I took out the care variable and re-ran the data, I found that fairness became insignificant. This would mean we can be more certain about the care coefficient than we can be about the fairness co-efficient.

In sum, my first hypothesis was supported by the significant relationships between the party behaviors and a couple of the moral foundations. The second hypothesis was supported only by the drug use frequency variable, because it was the only dependent variable with a significant coefficient for females. The third and last hypothesis was not supported because the female variable was not significant in any of the control only models and only became significant once the moral foundations were added (and only for the recreational drug use variable). I hypothesized that the opposite would occur.

This study could be important in how we understand the partying culture in college. We see now that certain moralities might be influential in students' participation in dangerous party behaviors. The study sheds light on society assumptions and provides evidence against them. This is certainly true for the differences not found between the sexes and races of this study. As more research is conducted, sociologists and criminologists will be further able to myth bust stereotypes, such as that males drink and hookup more than females in college. The genders seem to be more similar than not. In the real world, people can use this research to understand the true differences that exist and with more accurate information develop more effective policies and messaging aimed at encouraging students of both sexes to behave more responsibly.

This study has several limitations. First, the sample and population were college students at Penn State University. This means the results are likely only generalizable to college students at big public universities in the northeast. Future studies should expand the population to include young adult and professionals and compare the age groups since party behaviors are still very prevalent in people's mid and late twenties. Future studies should also examine college students in other parts of the country and at smaller schools. There were also limitations in the fact that the survey was conducted by convenience sampling. A convenience sample means that people were selected because they were accessible to the researcher. The sample may thus not be truly representative of the population from which it was drawn. In addition, the morality questions might have been better if they had been developed specifically for this study. Since the study used the Moral Foundations Questionnaire, which was developed for adults, the questions may not have been perfectly suited for my research questions regarding college students. Future studies should explore the development of morality measures that are designed specifically for the college setting. It is my hope that future research by criminologists, sociologists and gender scholars might improve upon these limitations and continue to advance society's knowledge of the influence of sex and morality on college party behaviors.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) was the framework for this study on deviant behavior which focuses on a person's moral intuitions and their ability to predict dangerous party

behavior. In prior research on deviant behaviors, self-control has been the main focus in studying what influences the way people act. In this study, I asked the same question of what influences our actions; however, I used MFT to focus on the role of moral foundations. These moral foundations are care, fairness, authority, loyalty, and sanctity (Silver and Abell 2017; Silver 2019). The research was conducted to see how moral foundations might relate to party behaviors among college students and the sex of the participants. In our American society, morals are fundamentally taught to make us better people, but I wanted to see if morals actually prevented us from participating in deviant behavior. My research questions were as follows: Do moral intuitions predict party behaviors? Does the respondent's sex predict party behavior? Do moral intuitions mediate the relationship between sex and party behaviors? I hypothesized that moral institutions would significantly relate to party behaviors. I hypothesized that sex would significantly relate to party behaviors. Lastly, I hypothesized that moral foundations would help explain the relationship between sex and party behaviors.

My results showed that some moral intuitions significantly related to certain party behaviors. The study found that only drug use frequency had a significant correlation to the sex of the participant. The last hypothesis was not supported by my study because the female coefficient only became significant once the moral foundations were added and my hypothesis predicted the opposite would occur. Overall, there seemed to be little gender differences and some surprising findings regarding which moral foundations significantly related to which party behaviors. Specifically, I found that the Loyalty foundation was positively associated with hooking up, the Care foundation was positively associated with recreational drug use frequency and alcohol consumption, the Sanctity degradation foundation was negatively associated with recreational drug use frequency, and the Fairness foundation was negatively associated with

alcohol consumption. That some moral foundations were positively associated with some party behaviors is surprising and should be of interest to both researchers and college administrators. Given the limitations of sampling and population, however, this study also calls for more research in the criminology, sociology, and gender studies community regarding the relationship between morality and party behaviors among college students.

Appendix A

Moral Foundation Questionnaire

| Part 1: How relevant/irrelevant? | Moral Foundations |
|---|-------------------|
| Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society | Authority |
| Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority | Authority |
| Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder | Authority |
| Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group | Loyalty |
| Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country | Loyalty |
| Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty | Loyalty |
| Whether or not someone did something disgusting | Sanctity |
| Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency | Sanctity |
| Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of | Sanctity |
| Whether or not someone suffered emotionally | Care |
| Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable | Care |
| Whether or not someone was cruel | Care |
| Whether or not someone acted unfairly | Fairness |
| Whether or not some people were treated differently than others | Fairness |
| Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights | Fairness |
| Part 2: Agree/Disagree | |
| Respect for authority is something all children need to learn. | Authority |
| Men and women each have different roles to play in society. | Authority |
| If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty. | Authority |
| I am proud of my country's history. | Loyalty |
| People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong. | Loyalty |
| It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself. | Loyalty |
| People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed. | Sanctity |
| I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural. | Sanctity |
| Chastity is an important and valuable virtue. | Sanctity |
| Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue. | Care |
| One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal. | Care |
| It can never be right to kill a human being. | Care |
| When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly | Fairness |
| Justice is the most important requirement for a society. | Fairness |
| I think it's morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing. | Fairness |

Appendix B

Self-control Questionnaire

| |
|--|
| Part 1: agree/disagree |
| I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think |
| I don't devote much thought or effort to preparing for the future |
| I often do whatever brings me pleasure here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal |
| I'm more concerned with what happens to me in the short run than in the long run |
| I frequently try to avoid projects that I know will be difficult |
| When life gets complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw |
| The things in life that are easiest to do bring me the most pleasure |
| I dislike really hard tasks that stretch my abilities to the limit |
| I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky |
| Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it |
| I sometimes find it exciting to do things for which I might get in trouble |
| Excitement and adventure mean more to me than security |
| If I had a choice, I would almost always rather do something physical than something mental |
| I almost always feel better when I am on the move than when I am sitting and thinking. |
| I like to get out and do things more than I like to read or contemplate ideas |
| I seem to have more energy and a activity than most other people my age |
| I try to look out for myself first, even if it means making things difficult for other people |
| I'm not very sympathetic to other people when they are having problems |
| If things I do upset people, it's their problem, not mine |
| I will try to get the things I want even when I know it's causing problems for other people |
| I lose my temper pretty easily |
| Often, when I am angry at people I feel more like hurting them than talking to them about why I am angry |
| When I am really angry, other people better stay away from me |
| When I have a serious disagreement with someone, its usually hard for me to talk calmly about it without getting upset |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antonaccio, O., & Tittle, C. R. (2008). Morality, self-control, and crime. *Criminology*, 46(2), 479-510.

Bersamin, Melina & Paschall, Mallie & Saltz, Robert & Zamboanga, Byron. (2011). Young Adults and Casual Sex: The Relevance of College Drinking Settings. *Journal of sex research*. 49. 274-81. 10.1080/00224499.2010.548012.

Broidy, L., & Agnew, R. (1997). Gender and crime: A general strain theory perspective. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 34(3), 275-306.

Gilligan, Carol (1982): *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press

Haidt, J. (2007). The new synthesis in moral psychology. *science*, 316(5827), 998-1002.

Ishoy, G. A. (2017). Exploring morality as a mediator of the association between parenting practices and violent and property offending among a sample of juvenile delinquents. *Crime & Delinquency*, 63(2), 113-136.

Johnston, L. D., Miech, R. A., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., Schulenberg, J. E., & Patrick, M. E. (2018). Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use, 1975-2017: Overview, key findings on adolescent drug use.

Kohlberg, L. (1931). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice* (Vol. 1). San Francisco: harper & row.

Matsueda, R. (1989). The Dynamics of Moral Beliefs and Minor Deviance. *Social Forces*, 68(2), 428-457. doi:10.2307/2579255

Mears, D. P., Ploeger, M., & Warr, M. (1998). Explaining the gender gap in delinquency: Peer influence and moral evaluations of behavior. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 35(3), 251-266.

Silver, E., & Abell, L. (2016). Beyond harm and fairness: A study of deviance and morality. *Deviant Behavior*, 37(5), 496-508.

Silver, E., (2019): Students' Attitudes Toward College Drinking: A Moral Intuitionist Approach, *Deviant Behavior*

Uggen, C., & Kruttschnitt, C. (1998). Crime in the breaking: Gender differences in desistance. *Law & Soc'y Rev.*, 32, 339.

Wikström, P. O. H., & Treiber, K. (2007). The role of self-control in crime causation: Beyond Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime. *European Journal of criminology*, 4(2), 237-264.

ACADEMIC VITA

Brittany Divver

- EDUCATION

- **Penn State University, State College, PA**

- **Schreyer Honors College & Liberal Arts Undergraduate Paterno Fellows Program** —
Bachelor of Arts in Criminology & Sociology -

August 2016 – May 2020

Thesis Topic: *The relationship between gender, moral intuition, and party behaviors among college students*

- AWARDS

Awarded full Academic Scholarship and admission to Liberal Arts Honors College (Paterno Fellows Program) from Penn State

- INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCES

- **The US Department of Homeland Security, Office of policy, Cybersecurity, Infrastructure, and risk - Policy Intern**

July 2019 - August 2019

- Conduct research about the emerging risk from Artificial Intelligence
- Think strategically about homeland security issues
- Work on teams to develop actionable solutions to strategic challenges
- Exercise written and oral communication at high levels

- **US Senator Ted Cruz, Houston, TX — Intern**

May - July 2018

- Work with and support Texas constituency of over 28 million residents with challenges and concerns
- Run errands for Senator and complete daily task for the success of the office
- Attend and represent the Senator at several events
- Speak with constituents about current and relevant concerns and matters

- **US Representative Pete Olson, Washington D.C. — Intern**

June - August 2017

- Work with and support Tx-22 constituency of over 720K residents with challenges and concerns
- Run errands for Congressman and conduct congressional tours for constituents as requested
- Attend briefings; Provide detailed research on current and past legislation
- Write to constituents about current and relevant concerns and matters

- OTHER RELATED EXPERIENCES

- **Turning Point USA, Pennsylvania State University — President/Campus Coordinator**

April 2017 - January 2019

- Preside over all chapter and Executive Board meetings
- Coordinate activities within the chapter
- Report to the national organization
- Attend University functions which require a club representative
- Acted as a liaison between the chapter and outside entities
- **Republican National Convention, Cleveland, OH** — *Alternate Delegate*

July 2016

- Youngest member of the Texas Delegation
- Successfully campaigned and won delegation position via grassroots Congressional District election against 16 candidates at the Texas Republican Convention
- Active member of the Republican Youth Caucus (for delegates/alt. delegates) meeting daily to develop a millennial republican platform with small group presentations/insight from Senator Mike Lee, Texas Lt. Governor Dan Patrick, and others
- Served as Delegate during many of the general sessions, including the confirmation of the VP nomination
- **ACTIVITIES/INTERESTS**
 - Gamma Phi Beta Sorority Sept 2016 - Present
 - -Positions Held: Assistant Vice President of Panhellenic Affairs, Scholarship Committee Member
 - Turning Point USA Jan 2017- Present
 - -Positions Held: President, Vice President, CPAC Ambassador, Treasurer
 - College Republicans Aug 2016-Present
 - Young Republicans May 2016 – May 2017
 - West Pearland Republican Women’s (WPRW) Club - Nov 2015- Nov 2017
 - -Positions Held: Board Member, Get Out the Vote Chairwoman