

Value source, value priming, and social norms as predictors of engaging in minor  
moral/legal violations

by

Courtney J. Fea

B.A., California State University Sacramento, 2000  
M.S., Kansas State University, 2005

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychological Sciences  
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

2017

## **Abstract**

The current dissertation examined the role value sources and social norms play in people's likelihood to commit minor moral and/or legal violations. First, using the process of value acquisition as a general guideline, five value sources were hypothesized to influence an individual's tendency for minor moral/legal crimes. Second, based on social norms theory and social norm interventions, it was hypothesized strategically manipulating social norms may alter a person's willingness to partake in various immoral and/or illegal activities.

Two studies were conducted to test these suppositions. Participants randomly assigned to between-subjects design experiments completed questionnaires via the web. In Experiment 1, participants mindset primed with values from multiple value sources (parental, peer, media, religion, personal) indicated how they "personally would act" if provided the opportunity to commit minor moral/legal violations. Participants primed with personal, parental, and religious values were willing to act as the value source suggested in minor moral/legal violation situations. Participants primed with media values did not necessarily follow the value source's recommendations regarding minor moral/legal violations. In Experiment 2, participants exposed to low, actual, or high social norm (and severity perception) ratings reported how likely they were to commit the same minor moral/legal violations. Participants shown high norm ratings expressed a greater willingness to engage in minor moral/legal violations than those shown low norm ratings. Results suggested value sources and norm ratings differentially impacted participants' willingness to be involved in minor immoral and/or unlawful behavior.

Value source, value priming, and social norms as predictors of engaging in minor  
moral/legal violations

by

Courtney J. Fea

B.A., California State University Sacramento, 2000  
M.S., Kansas State University, 2005

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychological Sciences  
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

2017

Approved by:

Major Professor  
Laura A. Brannon, Ph.D.

# **Copyright**

© Courtney J. Fea 2017.

## **Abstract**

The current dissertation examined the role value sources and social norms play in people's likelihood to commit minor moral and/or legal violations. First, using the process of value acquisition as a general guideline, five value sources were hypothesized to influence an individual's tendency for minor moral/legal crimes. Second, based on social norms theory and social norm interventions, it was hypothesized strategically manipulating social norms may alter a person's willingness to partake in various immoral and/or illegal activities.

Two studies were conducted to test these suppositions. Participants randomly assigned to between-subjects design experiments completed questionnaires via the web. In Experiment 1, participants mindset primed with values from multiple value sources (parental, peer, media, religion, personal) indicated how they "personally would act" if provided the opportunity to commit minor moral/legal violations. Participants primed with personal, parental, and religious values were willing to act as the value source suggested in minor moral/legal violation situations. Participants primed with media values did not necessarily follow the value source's recommendations regarding minor moral/legal violations. In Experiment 2, participants exposed to low, actual, or high social norm (and severity perception) ratings reported how likely they were to commit the same minor moral/legal violations. Participants shown high norm ratings expressed a greater willingness to engage in minor moral/legal violations than those shown low norm ratings. Results suggested value sources and norm ratings differentially impacted participants' willingness to be involved in minor immoral and/or unlawful behavior.

# Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	ix
Chapter 1 - Literature Review.....	1
Values .....	1
Parental Values .....	3
Peer Values .....	9
Media Values .....	12
Religious Values .....	17
Personal Values.....	21
Value Priming.....	26
Social Norms.....	29
Alcohol Consumption .....	31
Tax Reporting .....	34
Sexual Activity.....	35
Driving Behavior .....	37
Purpose of Current Dissertation.....	39
Chapter 2 - Experiment 1 .....	41
Overview.....	41
Hypotheses.....	41
Method .....	41
Participants.....	41
Materials .....	42
Value Source.....	42
Personal Likelihood for Minor Moral/Legal Violations.....	43
Demographics .....	44
Procedure .....	45
Results.....	46
Discussion.....	50
Chapter 3 - Experiment 2 .....	54
Overview.....	54

Hypotheses.....	54
Method.....	55
Participants.....	55
Materials.....	55
Likelihood and Excusable Rating.....	55
Likelihood for Minor Moral/Legal Violations.....	59
Demographics.....	60
Procedure.....	61
Results.....	62
Discussion.....	65
Chapter 4 - General Discussion.....	70
Results.....	70
Limitations.....	71
Implications.....	74
References.....	77
Appendix A - Value Source Scale.....	106
Appendix B - “Personally Would Act” Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scale.....	110
Appendix C - Demographic Form.....	114
Appendix D - Experiment 1 Informed Consent.....	115
Appendix E - Experiment 1 Debriefing.....	116
Appendix F - Likelihood Scales.....	117
Actual Rating Scale.....	117
Low Rating Scale.....	122
High Rating Scale.....	127
Appendix G - Excusable Scales.....	132
Actual Rating Scale.....	132
Low Rating Scale.....	137
High Rating Scale.....	142
Appendix H - Likelihood of Committing Minor Moral and Legal Violations Following Students’ Likelihood Ratings Scale.....	147

Appendix I - Likelihood of Committing Minor Moral and Legal Violations Following Students’ Excusable Ratings Scale .....	151
Appendix J - Experiment 2 Informed Consent .....	155
Appendix K - Experiment 2 Debriefing.....	156

## List of Tables

Table 1 - <i>Experiment 1 One-way Analysis of Variance for Value Source and Likelihood to Commit Minor Moral and Legal Violations</i> .....	47
Table 2 - <i>Experiment 1 Means and Standard Deviations for One-way Analysis of Variance of Value Source on Likelihood to Commit Minor Moral and Legal Violations</i> .....	48
Table 3 - <i>Experiment 2 Two-way Analysis of Variance for Norm and Likelihood to Commit Minor Moral and Legal Violations</i> .....	63
Table 4 - <i>Experiment 2 Means and Standard Deviations for Two-way Analysis of Variance on Likelihood to Commit Minor Moral and Legal Violations</i> .....	64

## **Chapter 1 - Literature Review**

Minor moral and/or legal crimes carry hefty financial consequences for local, state, and federal governments when taken in aggregate. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA; 2014, 2015b) speed-related collisions on U.S. roadways carry an annual \$40.4 billion fiscal price tag. Alcohol-induced traffic incidents total approximately \$199 billion (NHTSA, 2015a). Internal Revenue Service (2012) figures document a \$450 billion gross tax gap, tax underreporting amounting to \$376 billion, tax underpayment \$46 billion, and non-filing \$28 billion. Yearly motion picture, music, and software piracy costs the U.S. economy at minimum a loss of \$58 billion in output, 373,375 jobs, \$16.3 billion in employee earnings, and \$2.6 billion in government tax revenue (Siwek, 2007). In 2014, the U.S. retail industry lost \$44 billion to theft, consumer shoplifting accounting for 38% and employee stealing 34.5% of total shrinkage (National Retail Federation, 2015). To combat the problem, retailers expended additional millions on security personnel and shoplifting prevention/detection equipment. Thus, understanding the role value sources and social norms play in seemingly small violations has positive implications for U.S. economics.

### **Values**

Theorists have defined values in different ways (Feather, 1995; Kluckhohn, 1951; Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 2012). A value can be defined as an enduring, guiding life principle that one behavior (e.g., honesty) is better than its opposite (e.g., dishonesty). Initially, young children learn values one at a time, leading them to believe one value (i.e., correct behavior) exists in a situation (Rokeach, 1973). However, as children grow older, they encounter situations which activate several values, requiring them to compare

one value against another to determine which value is most important (Rokeach, 1973). Over time, people integrate these values they have been taught from parents, peers, media, and religion into a hierarchically organized system (Rokeach, 1973). People use these resulting value rank-ordered systems to tell them how they should act.

Considerable research has examined different values and how they relate to attitudes, intentions, and behavior (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003; Homer & Kahle, 1988; Schwartz, 1996; Schwartz & Butenko, 2014; Tao & Au, 2014; Verplanken & Holland, 2002). For example, studying cooperative behavior, Schwartz (1996) had participants rate the importance of ten personal values “as a guiding principal in my life.” Next participants were paired with an unidentified student in their group to play a game. As part of the game, participants were to divide money between themselves and their anonymous game partner by selecting one of three options (cooperation, individualism, competition). Participants understood they would receive the money they allocated to themselves as well as the amount of money the other person allotted them. For the cooperative choice the participant took approximately 2.5 shekels for one’s self and gave 2 shekels to their fellow group member. This meant a self-sacrifice (.5 shekels) to give the maximum money to the other player. For each of the remaining two choices the participant would receive the maximum monetary gain. Benevolence values positively correlated with cooperation, power values negatively. Benevolence and power scores were then split at the median and the proportion who cooperated in the four subsamples compared. Eighty-seven percent of those in the subgroup that highly valued benevolence and assigned low importance to power cooperated, twice the rate of any other subgroup (35% – 43%). Currently, research shows values influence everyday activities:

occupational choice (Kopanidis & Shaw, 2014), shopping frequency (Sevgili & Cesur, 2014), dining in fast-food restaurants (Nejati & Moghaddam, 2013), internet use (Bagchi, Udo, Kirs, & Choden, 2015), recycling (Best & Mayerl, 2013), public transportation use (Jakovcevic & Steg, 2013), automobile purchases (Hahnel, Gölz, & Spada, 2014), voting (Caprara, Vecchione, & Schwartz, 2012), public activism (Vecchione et al., 2015), and charitable donations (Remple & Burris, 2015). However, research on how value sources impact people's intentional or actual behavior is relatively scant. This is important given parental, peer, media, religious, and personal values have been identified as possible contributors to people's likelihood to commit minor moral and/or legal violations.

### **Parental Values**

Typically, children spend the most time during the first 18 years of life with parents and siblings. Wittingly or not, parents select from their own values those they deem important to teach children. In and outside the home, parents transfer values to children through conversation, modeling, reward, and discipline.

Parental values can influence sexual behavior. McNeely et al. (2002) longitudinally examined the effect of maternal values on adolescents' first sexual experience. Using the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (NLSAH) database, they generated a list of 15,243 randomly selected adolescents (aged 14 and 15), 12,105 of whom completed in-home interviews. At Wave 1, each adolescent was queried as to whether they had had sexual intercourse. Mothers, interviewed separately from their teens, indicated if they approved or disapproved of their teen having sex. Adolescents sexually active before Wave 1 were excluded from further study. At Wave 2, Wave 1 virgins were re-asked in later follow-up interviews if they had now become

sexually active. Of the 2,006 adolescent self-declared virgins, 95 males (10.8%) and 162 females (15.8%) had sex in the ensuing 12 month interval. Moreover, mothers strongly disapproving of teen sex had daughters who delayed losing their virginity, albeit no difference emerged for sons [for discussion of son result see McNeely et al. (2002)]. Dittus, Jaccard, and Gordon (1996) reported similar results, namely mothers disapproval meant teenagers postponed sex. Dittus, Jaccard, and Gordon (1997) showed African-American inner-city youth (both males and females) with fathers firmly against teen sex abstained from sexual intercourse. Furthermore, Dittus and Jaccard (2000) studied 10,000 NLSAH adolescents (aged 14 to 15) and found that adolescents were 6.3 times less likely to be sexually active when maternal disapproval was high as opposed to low.

Parental values are also linked to alcohol use. Wood, Read, Mitchell, and Brand (2004) investigated if parental values were related to late adolescents' alcohol intake. Five hundred fifty-six (male  $n = 195$ ; female  $n = 361$ ; age  $M = 18$ ) incoming freshmen were recruited from a university orientation program the summer directly prior to entering college. Students completed a mail survey inquiring about their parents' alcohol values, specifically their disapproval of heavy drinking [e.g., how parents would feel if they "1) drank one or two drinks per day, 2) drank four or five drinks per day, 3) drank five or more drinks once or twice each weekend, 4) drove after having five or more drinks"] and permissiveness for drinking (i.e., number of alcoholic drinks mother/father considered acceptable for high school seniors to consume). In addition, students indicated the number of times they binge drank – had five alcoholic beverages in a row – during the preceding 14 days. Overall, 33% claimed to have binged in the interim period between graduating high school and starting college (of total sample males = 40%;

females = 30.1%). Men averaged nearly double the drinks per week that women did (male  $M = 6.83$ ,  $SD = 13.23$ ; female  $M = 3.08$ ,  $SD = 6.12$ ). Students with parents opposed to heavy drinking binge drank less frequently. Moreover, alcohol consumption was lowest among students whose parents set stringent limits on the amount of alcohol drunk.

Foxcroft and Lowe (1997) had 4,369 students (male  $n = 2,263$ ; female  $n = 2,106$ ; age range = 11 – 17) from 32 district schools fill out anonymous questionnaires. Students described their parents' drinking habits (regular, occasional, non-drinkers), their parents' alcohol values [e.g., “they don't think I should drink at all” (disapproving); “only when they say;” “they don't mind as long as I don't drink too much” (moderating); “they aren't bothered. I drink whatever, whenever I want to” (indifferent)] as well as their personal alcohol consumption. Approximately 14% of parents regularly drank, 81% occasionally drank, and 5% never drank. Sixteen percent of parents disapproved of drinking, 82% thought drinking was acceptable if done in moderation, and 2% were indifferent toward drinking. Children of regular drinkers drank the most while children of non-drinkers seldom drank. Children who classified their parents as indifferent consumed larger quantities of alcohol than children who said their parents disapproved. When regular parental drinking was paired with parental indifference, children drank the most.

Parental values may partially explain vehicular law obedience. In the first study of its kind, Carlson and Klein (1970) compared sons' traffic convictions to fathers' traffic convictions. Driving records on 8,094 licensed male undergraduates (age range = 18 – 20) at a state university and their fathers were acquired from the Michigan Motor Vehicle

Administration. Each driver's traffic convictions for the most recent 6 years, crashes excluded, were tallied and subsequently analyzed. Sons of fathers with traffic convictions had more convictions than sons having fathers without traffic convictions. Ferguson, Williams, Chapline, Reinfurt, and DeLeonardis (2001) examined parent and child driving records searching for similarities. Moving violation records (e.g., speeding, reckless driving, failure to yield, driving without a license) for 155,349 drivers 18- to 21-years-old (sons  $n = 83,021$  or 53%; daughters  $n = 72,328$  or 47%) and their parents were obtained from driver history files kept by the North Carolina State Division of Motor Vehicles. Parents' poor driving records were predictive of their children's poor driving records and vice versa. Compared to children whose parents were violation free, children having parents with one violation were 16% more likely, two violations were 29% more likely, and three or more violations were 38% more likely to have accrued violations within the last 5 years. Likewise, Bianchi and Summala (2004) surveyed 123 Brazilian university students (male  $n = 45$ ; female  $n = 78$ ; age  $M = 22.5$ ) and their parents (age  $M = 52.2$ ), all of whom held valid driving licenses. Both students and parents completed a pencil-and-paper Driver Behavior Questionnaire about their regular driving habits [e.g., "overtake a slow driver on the inside," "disregard speed limit on a motorway," "attempt to overtake someone turning left," "close(ly) following (another vehicle)," "shooting (through) lights"] and indicated their number of tickets during the preceding 3 years. After adjusting for demographic variables (e.g., participant age, sex), parent-child driving records were strikingly similar. Chen, Grube, Nyaard, and Miller (2008) analyzed data from 1,534 U.S. young adults aged 15 to 20 finding that children of adults who drove while intoxicated often had DUIs themselves.

Parental values may influence stealing. Though well researched in chronic juvenile offenders, studies of parental value effects on stealing in non-deviant youth are all but nonexistent, with one exception. Moncher and Miller (1999) looked at correlates of stealing for normal preadolescent and adolescent youth. Questionnaires were distributed to 167 non-delinquent 10- to 15-year-olds (male  $n = 82$ ; female  $n = 85$ ; age  $M = 12.7$ ) attending week-long 4-H summer camp. Subjects rated an anonymous peer's likelihood to steal in different situations as well as indicated whether parental values could foreseeably deter that theft. Additionally, subjects self-reported how frequently they had stolen from school, peers, or the community within the last year (e.g., "In the last school year, how often have you taken something from a desk or locker without permission?"). Approximately half (48.5%) of the youngsters denied stealing, 44.9% admitted to one theft, while 6.6% stole repetitively (i.e., more than eight times), with adolescents committing the most theft. For the sample as a whole, youths who stole the most believed the peer would steal despite his/her parents' values opposing such behavior. Likewise, older youths (aged 13 to 15) committing multiple thefts indicated parental values would not factor into the peer's decision to steal. According to Moncher and Miller, given preadolescents' low theft rates and parental values emphasis, stealing for youth 13 and up may occur partially from ignoring previously established parental values, especially when situational factors (e.g., financial need, peer pressure) are not an issue.

Parental values can encourage or discourage academic dishonesty. In a pioneering study, Koljatic, Silva, and Ardiles (2003) examined parental acceptance of student academic cheating. One hundred seventy-five Chilean business undergraduates

(male  $n = 96$ ; female  $n = 79$ ; age  $M = 20$ ) enrolled at a large university participated. Students filled out questionnaires asking whether they had engaged in any of 28 forms of cheating (e.g., submitted someone else's work as their own, compared answers during quizzes/exams) and if their parents approved of cheating (e.g., "my mother/father would understand that some form of academic dishonesty is necessary in order to survive in college;" "my mother/father would understand that academic dishonesty is something everybody does in college;" "my mother/father would realize that getting caught in academic dishonesty is something that can happen to anyone"). As anticipated, parental values influenced student cheating. Students were inclined to cheat when parental values toward cheating were lax or favorable, albeit parental approval was low overall. On average, students engaged in eight dishonest academic behaviors during the last school year.

In another study, Pollio, Humphreys, and Eison (1991) surveyed 6,165 individuals affiliated with 23 different colleges across the U.S. (faculty  $n = 854$ ; student  $n = 4,365$ ; student parent  $n = 584$ ; business official  $n = 362$ ). Questionnaires were distributed asking participants about their parents' typical reactions to good and bad grades they had received in grades 1 – 6 (elementary school), 7 – 9 (middle school), 10 – 12 (high school), and college. A single "yes/no" question assessed academic cheating – namely, "Did you ever cheat because you wanted a better grade?" Children of parents who valued good grades and responded negatively to poor grades were inclined to cheat. Negative parental reactions to poor grades included demanding an explanation, lecturing or verbal scolding, withdrawing privileges, and giving "the cold shoulder" among others. While parents' overt reactions diminished during college, cheating persisted.

## Peer Values

Children entering adolescence start spending more time outside the house in social and recreational activities with peers (Padilla-Walker, 2006). The importance adolescents assign to parental values declines slightly while the influence of peer values rises.

Peer values may impact sexual behavior. Young adults report their peers have permissive sexual values (Bleakley, Hennessy, Fishbein, & Jordon, 2009; Manago, Ward, & Aldana, 2015; Morgan & Zurbriggen, 2012; Trinh, Ward, Day, Thomas, & Levin, 2014). Morgan and Zurbriggen (2012) examined undergraduates' sexual values over the first year of college, finding peer sexual values took precedence over parental sexual values. Fewer students listed "relational sex" (i.e., the requirement of a committed relationship or marriage prior to intercourse) as a value at Time 2 (19%) than at Time 1 (32%). In addition, students' approval of "casual sex" (i.e., intercourse outside of a relationship) increased from 24% to 30% at Time 1 and Time 2 respectively. Along with changes in sexual values, the percentage of students reporting they had engaged in consensual sexual intercourse rose from 63% at Time 1 to 75% at Time 2. Manago, Ward, and Aldana (2015) found the more recreational sex messages university students heard from friends, the more likely they were to have one-night stands, peer values better predicting sexual behavior than parental values.

Peer values are associated with substance use. Curran, Stice, and Chassin (1997) longitudinally studied the relationship between peer alcohol use and adolescent alcohol use. Data was collected annually (Time 1, Time 2, Time 3) over a 3 year period from 363 adolescents (male  $n = 189$ ; female  $n = 174$ ). Peer alcohol use was assessed summing

two questions: “How many of [your] friends drank alcohol occasionally” in the last 12 months and “How many of [your] friends drank alcohol regularly” in the past 12 months. Participants’ alcohol use was determined by the number of times they consumed beer, wine, hard liquor, and drank heavily during the same time span. Peers’ alcohol use predicted participants’ alcohol use. Latent growth models showed that adolescents with more friends who drank alcohol at Time 1 significantly increased their usage compared to adolescents reporting fewer such friends at Time 1 (also see Andrews, Tildesly, Hops, & Li, 2002; Sieving, Perry, & Williams, 2000; Wills & Clearly, 1999). Analyzing data from 612 teens aged 13 to 19, Reifman, Barnes, Dintcheff, Farrell, and Uhteg (1998) found non-drinking adolescents who had drinking peers were at risk to become regular and heavy drinkers. Talbott et al. (2008) found first year college students with drinking peers often reported consuming alcohol in the last month, albeit all were again legally underage.

Brown (1998) examined the association between peer influence and adult drunk driving. Participants consisted of 785 adult drinkers (male  $n = 467$ ; female  $n = 318$ ) who had valid driver or motorcyclist licenses and which regularly drank alcohol at a location that was beyond easy walking distance from home. Participants reported their typical drinking habits (amount and frequency), how many of their peers drove when their blood alcohol level exceeded the legal limit, and their own drunk driving (e.g., “How many times in the last 3 months have you driven after drinking some alcohol;” “How many times in the last 3 months have you driven when you thought that your blood alcohol concentration was over .05”). Twenty-two percent of participants claimed not to have

driven after drinking, 55% only when under the .05 limit, and 23% while over .05.

Moreover, participants with friends who drove drunk were more likely to drink and drive.

Peer values can promote cheating. Given the large percentage of students who confess cheating, Robinson, Amburgey, Swank, and Faulkner (2004) studied situational factors that may encourage cheating at a Midwestern college. Questionnaires were distributed to 118 university undergraduates (male  $n = 53$ ; female  $n = 65$ ) in several academic disciplines as cheating is known to vary by major and department. Students were asked about their peers cheating (e.g., “Many of my friends cheat at college”), if they belonged to a sorority or fraternity, and how often they had cheated in the last academic year. Cheating included stealing glances at another student’s test without his/her knowledge, sneaking crib sheets into the exam, sharing notes on a take home test, helping someone else cheat on an exam, acquiring answers from a student who had taken the test, and making one’s answer sheet visible so another student could copy from it. Results showed that students surrounded by cheating peers, as is the case in many Greek societies, often cheated themselves (also see Eberhardt, Rice, & Smith, 2003; Williams & Janosik, 2007). McCabe and Bowers (1996) found students living in fraternity and sorority houses reported cheating on tests more than members with other living arrangements. Storch and Storch (2002) found fraternity and sorority members who participated in the most Greek sponsored activities also cheated the most. Storch, Storch, and Clark (2002) demonstrated college athletes, a group equally notorious for cheating, justified their cheating by claiming their peers cheated.

## Media Values

In 2014, 285 million U.S. residents watched an average of 149 hours 14 minutes of traditional TV each month (Nielsen, 2015). For 198 million, nearly 30 hours monthly were occupied surfing the internet from a computer (desktop/laptop), tablet or similar device, smartphones excluded (Nielsen, 2015). Two hundred fifty-eight million U.S. residents spent 58 hours and 36 minutes listening to AM/FM radio per month (Nielsen, 2015). In the U.S. and Canada, 68% of the population, or 229.7 million people, watched at least one movie at the cinema in 2014 (Motion Picture Association of America, 2015). Netflix U.S. customers viewed nearly 700 million movies and related videos monthly in 2013 (Statista, 2015a). Last year a total of 722.75 million items (DVD and Blu-ray movies, video games) were rented from self-service Redbox kiosks (Statista, 2015b). Video gamers aged 13 and over played 6.3 hours weekly in 2013, up 12% from 5.6 hours in 2012 (Nielsen, 2014). Extensive research shows people with more exposure to entertainment media have values similar to that media. Generally, entertainment mass media promotes less conventional values to the public.

Entertainment mass media sends the message sex is a casual, “recreational” activity. Overall 71% of prime-time TV programs aired on the four major broadcast networks ABC, CBS, NBC, and Fox have some sexual content (Farrar et al., 2003). In 2010, Americans’ favorite prime-time TV series were replete with sexual talk and sexual behavior; *How I Met Your Mother* had .73 sexual instances per minute, *Family Guy* .70 sexual instances per minute, *Desperate Housewives* .48 sexual instances per minute, and *Two and a Half Men* .33 sexual instances per minute (Bond & Drogos, 2014). MTV’s *Jersey Shore* contained more sexual material than the 20 most popular prime-time TV

programs with 1.2 sexual instances per minute or 48 sexual instances in one 40 minute episode (Bond & Drogos, 2014). In the most popular teen TV programs (e.g., *That 70s Show*, *Family Guy*), sexual intercourse scenes between characters in uncommitted relationships increased from 33% in 2001 – 2002 to 50% in 2004 – 2005 (see Wright, 2009). Nearly 85% of top-grossing U.S. movies released between 1950 and 2006 contained sexual content (G-rated = 68.2%, PG-rated = 82%, PG-13-rated = 85%, R-rated = 88.3%; Nalkur, Jamieson, & Romer, 2010; for teen-centered films see Callister, Stern, Coyne, Robinson, & Bennion, 2011). A study of 200 top films found most sexual acts involved unwed couples (87%) who were newly acquainted (70%; Gunasekera, Chapman, & Campbell, 2005). Sex was mentioned in 37% of *Billboard Magazine's* 279 most popular songs of 2005 (Primack, Gold, Schwarz, & Dalton, 2008). Tuner (2011) examined 120 music videos aired on five major music TV channels. Sexual content varied by genre from 82.9% (Rap R&B mixed) to 35.6% (Country; 78.9% R&B only, 78% Rap only, 52.9% Pop, 36.8% Rock). Joshi, Peter, and Valkenburg (2014) content analyzed the three most popular U.S. teen magazines *Seventeen*, *CosmoGirl*, and *Teen*, finding featured stories discussing casual sex outnumbered those on relational sex 2:1. Callister et al. (2012) counted 56 instances of sexual intercourse in 40 adolescent books on *The New York Times* Best Sellers List for 2008, of which 94% occurred among unmarried partners. In over 33% of those acts the partners were in a non-committed relationship. Peters (2012) examined if emerging adults' sexual media diet predicted attitudes regarding the hookup culture. Three hundred forty-eight college freshmen (male  $n = 112$ ; female  $n = 236$ ) partook in an online survey in which they indicated their overall media consumption (e.g., TV, movies, music, magazines, internet, social networking

sites) and completed a questionnaire on attitudes towards hookups (e.g., “Hooking up is harmless;” “Hooking up is just for fun;” “I hook up to have a good time”). Students exposed to media laden with sexual content tended to endorse the hookup culture. In an experimental study, Bryant and Rockwell (1994) reported 13- and 14-year-olds watching extensive prime-time TV dramas and sitcoms with sexual content rated pre-, extra-, and non-marital sexual relations as “less bad” than those viewing sex absent shows. Ward and Friedman (2006) found the more hours adolescents spent viewing “sexy” prime-time TV monthly, the more they thought of sex as a recreational activity.

Entertainment media sends the message that people drink alcohol for and/or when having fun. Alcohol is prevalent in the mass media. Russell and Russell (2009) analyzed 18 U.S. prime-time TV programs of the 2004 – 2005 season, finding all showed alcohol. Ninety-six percent of U.S. adults aged 21 and over each saw an average of 522 TV alcohol advertisements in 2009 (Center on Alcohol Marketing and Youth, 2010). Dal Cin, Worth, Dalton, and Sargent (2008) examined alcohol content in the 534 top-grossing U.S. box office movies from 1998 to early 2003, finding 83% depicted alcohol use. Eighty-six percent of the 300 highest earning U.K. Cinema Box Office films of 1989 to 2008 showed alcohol (Lyons, McNeill, Gilmore, & Britton, 2011). Twenty-three percent of *Billboard Magazine*’s 720 most popular U.S. songs of 2009 – 2011 made references to alcoholic beverages (Siegel et al., 2013). Herd (2014) content analyzed lyrics of 409 *Billboard* top-ranked rap music songs from 1979 through 2009. Sixty-three percent of songs released between 2006 and 2009 mentioned alcohol. Gruber, Thau, Hill, Fisher, and Grube (2005) content analyzed 539 music videos broadcast on MTV or BET (Black Entertainment Television) between November 4 and December 5, 2001. Alcohol

appeared in approximately one-third of the sampled videos. A recent study reported 45% of the top 32 U.K. music videos of 2013 – 2014 on YouTube contained alcohol imagery (Cranwell, Murray, Lewis, Leonardi-Bee, Dockrell, & Britton, 2014). Sargent, Wills, Stoolmiller, Gibson, and Gibbons (2006) examined movie alcohol exposure and early onset drinking. On-screen alcohol use was timed in 601 popular contemporary films considered box office successes by the Motion Picture Association of America. Each middle school student ( $N = 4,655$ ) indicated which films, if any, he/she had seen in a unique list of 50 movies randomly generated from the original 601. To determine movie alcohol exposure, the number of minutes of alcohol use depicted in each of the 50 watched films was compiled and summed. A single question assessed alcohol use, “Have you ever had beer, wine, or other drink with alcohol that your parents didn’t know about?” Overall, 92% of the movies contained some sort of alcohol use (G-rated = 52%, PG-rated = 89%, PG-13-rated = 93%, R-rated = 95%). Students watched a median of 16 films (IQR = 11 – 22) from the list of 50, median alcohol exposure being 8.3 hours (IQR = 4.6 – 13.5). Twenty-three percent of Time 1 students consumed alcoholic beverages without their parents’ knowledge. Students who had not tried drinking at Time 1 were interviewed by phone 13 to 26 months later (Time 2). An additional 15% of Time 1 non-drinkers had experimented with alcohol by Time 2. Moreover, adolescents’ drinking rose steadily as exposure to movie alcohol use increased. Van den Bulck and Beullens (2005) found watching TV and music videos predicted the amount of alcohol adolescents consumed when “going out” to bars, parties, discos, and similar settings, with more hours of exposure equaling more drinking.

Entertainment media sends messages about the acceptability of driving violations. Ren (2013) content analyzed 227 traffic scenes from three prime-time American TV dramas aired between October 2012 and May 2013. Of the total traffic scenes, 66% contained risky driving. Aggressive driving (e.g., tailgating, weaving through lanes, neglecting stop signs, etc.) comprised 73% of the total traffic scenes, speeding being depicted most frequently (38%). Speeding scenes in prime-time TV rose from 20% in 1989 to 38% in 2012 – 2013 (Ren, 2013). Beullens, Roe, and Van den Bulck (2011c), in a content analysis of 26 popular action movies of 2005 and 2006, recorded 624 reckless driving scenes, an average of 24 per movie. Speeding occurred in 35% of the incidents. Beullens, Roe, and Van den Bulck (2011b) found greater exposure to TV action movies and playing racing/drive'em up genre video games was associated with favorable attitudes toward speeding, intentions to speed, and actual road speeding (Beullens, Roe, & Van den Bulck, 2011a; also see Hull, Draghici, & Sargent, 2012). Arnett (1992) studied if adolescents' musical preferences could predict reckless behavior. Two hundred forty-eight 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students (male  $n = 113$ ; female  $n = 135$ ; age  $M = 16.4$ ) indicated their favorite type of music (e.g., acoustic pop, jazz, classical, mainstream rock, hard rock, heavy metal, "other"). In addition, each completed a 10-item questionnaire reporting the number of times they engaged in risky behaviors including driving while intoxicated, driving over 80 mph, and driving > 20 mph over the speed limit. Forty-four percent preferred mainstream rock (e.g., Bruce Springsteen, Tom Petty), 26% hard rock (e.g., Van Halen, Mötley Crüe), 9% heavy metal (e.g., Metallica, Megadeth, Ozzy Osbourne), 13% acoustic pop (e.g., Tracy Chapman, James Taylor), and 8% "other." As hypothesized, students preferring hard rock and heavy metal engaged in more reckless

driving than students favoring acoustic pop and mainstream rock. Beullens, Roe, and Van den Bulck (2012) found young adults ( $N = 426$ ) who frequently watched music videos self-reported more drink driving 2 years later.

Entertainment media has been known to glorify stealing. Fischer, Aydin, Kastenmüller, Frey, and Fischer (2012) had university students play for 20 minutes either a theft-reinforcing video game (Grand Theft Auto) or a neutral video game (Tetris). Afterwards, participants were left alone in the lab with the opportunity to easily steal petty items including pencils, pens, and chocolate candy bars. Players of the theft-reinforcing video game were significantly more likely to steal the laboratory supplies than players of the neutral video game. Whereas 7 of 16 theft promoting video players stole laboratory items (44%), only 1 of 12 neutral video game players swiped an item (8%). Among Canadian and Netherlands youth, listening to rap has been connected to shoplifting and theft (Miranda & Claes, 2004; Selfhout, Delsing, ter Bogt, & Meeus, 2008) as has hard rock and heavy metal music among U.S. adolescents (Arnett, 1992).

### **Religious Values**

Mainstream religion provides a conventional set of values for its members to abide by. Logically it would be expected high religiosity correlates with less immoral behavior. In an early test of this religiosity hypothesis, Middleton and Putney (1962) administered anonymous questionnaires to 260 male and 294 female college students at two state institutions. Subjects were asked to indicate whether they would violate their religious principles by engaging in any of seven anti-ascetic (i.e., pleasure seeking) behaviors or seven antisocial behaviors. Anti-ascetic acts included gambling on sporting events, gambling on card or dice games, smoking, premarital sexual touching, premarital

sexual intercourse, viewing pornographic pictures, and drinking alcoholic beverages. Comparatively, antisocial acts consisted of intentionally shoplifting from a store; stealing items (towels, spoons) from hotels, motels, and restaurants; striking another individual; lying to a teacher as to why one missed class or did not complete an assignment; deliberately stealing from an individual; cheating on exams; allowing another person to receive the blame and responsibility for an act that oneself committed. For each of the seven anti-ascetic behaviors, more “believers” than “skeptics” (atheists, agnostics, deists) considered the anti-ascetic act as wrong. Thus, predictably, “believers” reported that they were less inclined to participate in the action.

Mainstream religions oppose premarital sex. Research using college students shows religiosity (e.g., religious service attendance, religion importance) consistently predicts premarital sex. At Christian colleges Woodroof (1985) found 80% of freshmen attending church services three times weekly were virgins compared to 60% of those attending once or twice weekly and 37% of those attending less than once per week. Lefkowitz, Gillen, Shearer, and Boone (2004) reported sexually abstinent unmarried adults (age  $M = 20.5$ ,  $SD = 1.7$ ; age range = 18 – 25) attended church services almost weekly whereas sexually active unmarried adults did so less than once a month. Abstainers indicated religion had more influence in their daily lives than non-abstainers. Uecker (2008) nationally surveyed married young adults (18- to 25-years-old). Wedded adults who attended church services once or more weekly as an adolescent were nearly 8 times as likely to abstain from premarital sex as those who never attended. Likewise, wedded adults who said religion was “very important” during adolescence were nearly 8

times more likely to abstain from sex before marriage compared to those who replied religion was not important.

Mainstream religions often discourage alcohol consumption. Burke, Van Olphen, Eliason, Howell, and Gonzalez (2014) found alcohol consumption on secular college campuses was lower for religious students than non-religious students. Dennis, Cox, Black, and Muller (2009) discovered students at a Bible-belt university reported higher religiosity and less alcohol use than those at a nearby secular college. Similarly, Wells (2010) found students attending a private religious college exhibited greater religiosity than students attending a state university. Students at the religious college ingested fewer drinks per month than students from the university. Compared to the religious affiliated school students, university students were “4 times more likely to be moderate or heavy drinkers” (p. 295). The least religious students were “27 times more likely to be a heavy alcohol user and 9 times more likely to be a moderate alcohol user” than the most religious students (p. 295).

Mainstream religions object to stealing. Albrecht, Chadwick, and Alcorn (1977) mailed surveys to 244 Mormon teenagers (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints; LDS) residing in Utah, Idaho, and California. Teens’ religiosity (e.g., how frequently they attended Sunday School, Sacrament Meeting, non-Sabbath day church activities/organizations, prayed during the past year) and deviant behavior (e.g., “stole things costing more than \$2,” “shoplifted,” etc.) was assessed. Bivariate correlations showed that as Mormon teens’ religiosity rose, self-reported thefts declined. Chadwick and Top (1993) queried 2,143 U.S. Mormon youth about their LDS beliefs, regular religious practices, and whether they had committed any of 11 property crimes. More

adolescents admitted petty theft (boys 37%, girls 22%; e.g., “Stole anything less than \$5, between \$5 and \$50, more than \$50”) and shoplifting (boys 33%, girls 20%; e.g., “Took something from a store without paying for it”) than any other violation except trespassing (boys 53%, girls 34%). As a whole, highly religious LDS youths committed the fewest property crimes. Fernquist (1995), sampling 178 Utah college students (Mormon 52%, Catholic 12%, Protestant 12%, Other 11%, No affiliation 13%), published results similar to Albrecht et al. and Chadwick and Top.

Mainstream religions disapprove of cheating. Rettinger and Jordan (2005) surveyed 150 full-time undergraduates (male  $n = 84$ ; female  $n = 67$ ; age  $M = 20.5$ ; age range = 18 – 24) enrolled at a university with a dual Jewish studies/college curriculum. Each student was mandated to complete between four and eight academic credit hours of Jewish coursework per semester aside from normal, traditional college classes. Packets containing questionnaires assessing religiosity and cheating were disseminated in public areas on campus. For cheating, students indicated which, if any, of 17 different cheating behaviors (e.g., exam cheating, copying homework, plagiarism, etc.) they engaged in at least once during the previous semester. To determine religiosity, students were asked to rate the degree to which they truthfully observed 12 religious practices (e.g., Sabbath honoring, dietary laws, daily prayer, mourning, fasting, meal blessings, Sukkot, tithing). Among those sampled, religiosity was exceptionally high ( $M = 4.23$ ;  $SD = .74$ ; mode = 5; 5-point scale), the majority being scrupulously observant. Despite the restriction of range, extraordinarily religious students were less likely to cheat than the somewhat less religious students.

Allmon, Page, and Roberts (2000) examined if religious values influenced students' perceptions of cheating behavior. Two hundred twenty-seven business majors from U.S. ( $n = 120$ ) and Australian ( $n = 107$ ) universities received questionnaires measuring religiosity and ethical classroom behavior among other things. For religiosity, students reported their degree of involvement in religious doings (active, somewhat active, inactive, non-religious). For ethical classroom behavior, students were asked their personal opinions about the acceptability of 10 forms of academic dishonesty (e.g., cheating on exams, lying to be excused from an exam, stealing supplies from work to do a school assignment, plagiarism, etc.). Results revealed actively religious students rated three statements more immoral than students in other religious categories, specifically not telling a professor a mathematical error resulted in a higher grade than one actually earned, letting another pupil take blame for wrongs done by one's self, and achieving good grades was more important than being honest. Bloodgood, Turnley, and Mudrack (2008) found non-religious individuals, compared to religious individuals, more likely to doctor their scores on word search puzzles, consequently improving their chances to win prize money.

### **Personal Values**

Ultimately, individuals combine values taught by parents, peers, media, and religion to create personal value systems.

Personal values can impact sexual behavior. Paradise, Cote, Minsky, Lourenco, and Howland (2001) studied 197 girls (age  $M = 18$ ; age range = 14 – 25) receiving care at an urban, hospital-linked adolescent outpatient clinic. Girls were asked their sexual status (virgin, inactive, active), a single direct question about whether personal

values/beliefs influenced their sexual decision, and to select specific reasons why they did or did not have sex. Approximately 20% of girls were virgins, 13% inactive (i.e., no sexual intercourse within the preceding 3 months), and 67% active (i.e., had sexual intercourse during the last 3 months). Fifty-three percent of virgins indicated premarital sex went against their values and beliefs (e.g., “Waiting until I am married”). Among inactive girls, 24% reported values and beliefs brought about their current abstinence (e.g., “I tried sex and decided it was wrong for me now”). Of the active girls, only 24% explicitly stated they had sex because of values and beliefs, albeit 86% gave value-based explanations for their decision (e.g., “I love the person”). Donnelly et al. (1999) found for 839 northern New Jersey inner-city teens disagreement with the statement “It is alright for two people to have sex before marriage if they are in love” predicted sexual abstinence. In a longitudinal study, Patrick and Lee (2010) surveyed 637 incoming college freshmen (male = 41.4%, female = 58.6%) prior to their first quarter and again 6 months later. Approximately 45% of students were abstainers (i.e., never having penetrative sex at Time 1 and Time 2) and 44% actives (i.e., having penetrative sex at both Time 1 and Time 2). Abstainers indicated having sex would violate their personal values/beliefs whereas actives reported the opposite (also see Balkin, Perepiczka, Whitley, & Kimbrough, 2009).

Personal values may underlie stealing. Tonglet (2001) investigated determinants of consumer theft in a moderately trafficked retail district. Eight hundred sixty-one participants recruited from shopping centers, superstores (male  $n = 140$ ; female  $n = 277$ ; age median = 30 to 44), and nearby schools (male  $n = 214$ ; female  $n = 230$ ; age range = 13 – 18) completed questionnaires measuring personal morals, attitudes, past shoplifting,

and intentions to shoplift in the future. Fifty-eight percent of respondents had never shoplifted, 29% had shoplifted over 12 months ago (past shoplifters), while 13% shoplifted during the last year (recent shoplifters). Compared to non- and past shoplifters, recent shoplifters' lower morals (e.g., shoplifting is not "against my principles") predicted pro-shoplifting attitudes. Asked if they would steal in the future, 52% of recent shoplifters, < 10% of past shoplifters, and < 5% of non-shoplifters answered affirmatively.

Cronan and Al-Rafee (2008) surveyed 292 business students (male  $n = 164$  or 58.6%; female  $n = 116$  or 41.4%; age  $M = 23.5$ ) attending a Midwestern university. Questionnaires distributed in 11 classes during regular class hours measured, among other things, students' morals and intentions to pirate digital materials (i.e., illegally copy/download software, movies, music). Overall, 50.7% of students felt digital piracy was morally wrong; 23.6% felt that it was acceptable. Moreover, structural equation modeling showed highly moral students had fewer intentions to pirate digital materials. Similarly, Goles et al. (2008) surveyed 455 undergraduate and graduate business students (male  $n = 218$ ; female  $n = 237$ ; age  $M = 23$ ; age range = 17 – 51) from a state university. Questionnaires administered in pencil-and-paper form or via the internet assessed personal morals, attitudes, and intentions to duplicate copyrighted software. Participants who indicated softlifting violated their morals expressed negative attitudes toward copying software. In turn, anti-softlifting attitudes reduced future softlifting intentions.

Personal values can influence academic dishonesty. Passow, Mayhew, Finelli, Harding, and Carpenter (2006) sampled 643 engineering majors (male  $n = 522$ ; female  $n = 121$ ; age  $M = 21.6$ ; age range = 17 – 48) at 11 colleges in the U.S. and abroad.

Students' personal morals, homework cheating, and exam cheating were assessed. To determine personal morals, students rated the acceptability of cheating in various situations (e.g., to not fail a class). For homework cheating, students indicated if, and if "yes" the number of times, they engaged in four types of homework cheating (e.g., copying other students' term papers, lab assignments). For exam cheating, students reported which of nine types of test cheating they engaged in (e.g., copying from other students' tests), as well as how frequently they engaged in each behavior. Students considering cheating morally wrong, irrespective of circumstances, cheated less on both homework and exams. Harding, Mayhew, Finelli, and Carpenter (2007) studied 527 engineering and humanities undergraduates (male  $n = 356$ ; female  $n = 171$ ; age  $M = 20$ ) enrolled at three universities. Approximately 29% and 55% of students cheated on exams and homework at least once during the previous semester, respectively. Cheating was lowest among students with anti-cheating morals.

Personal values may contribute to traffic offenses. In their well-cited study, Parker, Manstead, and Stradling (1995) examined if personal morals factored into people's decisions to break traffic laws. Trained market researchers interviewed 600 adult drivers, acquired from four comparably sized British towns, in their own homes. Interviewers read three driving violation scenarios (e.g., abruptly cutting across lanes of traffic to exit a motorway, weaving in and out of slow-moving traffic, passing a vehicle on the right hand side) aloud after which participants indicated their intention to commit none to all of the violations. Participants espousing firm right and wrong values [e.g., as measured by the question "It would be quite wrong for me to (commit a specific traffic violation)"] and two anticipated regret items rated on a "likely – unlikely" scale: "Having

(committed the violation) would make me feel sorry for doing it” and “My (committing the violation) would make me feel good” (reverse scored)] reported fewer intentions to do anything illegal.

Conner et al. (2007) examined 83 adult drivers’ (male  $n = 56$ ; female  $n = 27$ ; age  $M = 35.4$ ; age range = 19 – 69) values as predictors of speeding. At Time 1, participants completed questionnaires assessing, along with other variables, personal morals (i.e., speeding wrongfulness) and intentions to speed (i.e., exceed posted speed limit by 10 mph or more). At Time 2, while in a driving simulator, participants drove cars on a pre-established 22 mile route over urban and rural roadways, where speed limits were clearly indicated. Drivers with anti-speeding values intended to uphold imposed speed limits. In addition, anti-speeding principled drivers sped less when in the simulator.

Åberg and Warner (2008) recruited 175 drivers (male  $n = 124$ ; female  $n = 51$ ; age  $M = 54.6$ ; age range = 24 – 88) from among 3,000 randomly selected Swedish car owners. Forms were mailed to the drivers asking about personal morals (i.e., how morally important is it to obey speed limits) and speeding (e.g., how often they exceeded the speed limit). Afterwards, drivers had their private vehicle’s speed monitored. Specially installed Intelligent Speed Adaptation devices continually recorded (i.e., logged) vehicle velocity, matching vehicle speedometer readings to digital maps containing speed limits for the driver’s current location. People whose morals advocated complying with speed limits sped less both in self-reports and on roadways. Similarly to Conner et al. (2007) and Åberg and Warner (2008), De Pelsmacker and Janssens (2007), hand delivering questionnaires to 334 Belgian participants’ homes, found personal morals

significantly affected speeding intentions as well as self-reported speeding (also see Conner, Smith, & McMillan, 2003).

## **Value Priming**

Psychology defines “mindset” as a person’s thoughts that affect how he/she interprets a situation. Numerous types of mindsets exist. For instance, Mindset Theory of Action Phases (Gollwitzer, Heckhausen, & Steller, 1990) explains the cognitive process a person passes through when making a decision and taking action to carry out that decision. Mindset theory distinguishes between two types of mindsets: deliberative and implemental. First, the person weighs the potential pros and cons of each decision option (deliberative mindset). Once a choice is made, the person enters a second phase, that of developing a detailed plan to implement his/her decision (implemental mindset). The theory contends the two phases use different thought processes, or mindsets, to reach a conclusion. On the other hand, according to Construal Level Theory (Eyal & Liberman, 2012), people use abstract mindsets (i.e., think about why an action is done) when considering events in the distant future (e.g., one year) and concrete mindsets (i.e., think about how an action is done) when thinking about events in the near future (e.g., one week). Mindset priming is the presentation of a stimulus is to activate a specific thought process.

Gollwitzer et al. (1990) were the first to demonstrate primed mindsets could influence a person’s performance on a follow-up task (also see Bargh & Chartrand, 2000). Participants assigned to the prime conditions were instructed to think about a problem. In the deliberative mindset condition, participants were asked to dwell on the pros and cons of one solution to settle the problem. In the implemental mindset

condition, participants were directed to design a detailed plan to accomplish the project. In the control group, participants passively viewed a book of nature photographs. Subsequently, as part of a purportedly unrelated experiment, participants were given the beginnings of “fairy tales” with instructions to continue each story. The protagonist depicted in each fairy tale experienced a decisional conflict. Those who received the deliberative mindset prime invented endings where the protagonist contemplated which action he should pursue. Those exposed to the implemental mindset wrote endings describing the action the protagonist took.

As with Gollwitzer et al. (1990), research on values shows mindset primes increase the likelihood a person will use that mindset when making decisions. Torelli and Kaikati (2009) primed university undergraduates with a set of values (individualism or collectivism) and immediately after with an abstract or concrete mindset. Participants in the abstract mindset condition were instructed to focus on why an action was done whereas those in the concrete mindset group were directed to focus on how an action was done. Next participants imagined browsing a webpage advertising a new Waverunner. Half the participants read a product description for the Waverunner tailored to individualistic consumers (e.g., “For unique individuals like you who want to go where others can’t”), the other half to collectivistic consumers (e.g., “For spending quality time with friends and family”). Participants indicated how likely they were to click a hyperlink to seek additional information regarding the Waverunner. Participants who read a product description congruent with their values intended to obtain more information about the Waverunner when primed with the abstract mindset than the concrete mindset.

Similarly, people are more likely to respond to a prime aimed at their core values than less important values. Verplanken and Holland (2002) showed priming environmental conscious people with environmental values leads them to make environmentally friendly choices. The study was separated into two sessions. During the first session, participants completed the Schwartz Value Survey to ascertain the importance they assigned to environmental values. Those participants scoring in the highest (high centrality) and lowest (low centrality) quartiles returned 1 week later. For the second session, half the participants received no prime and half were exposed to an environmental value prime. Lastly, participants were presented with 20 televisions varying in environmental-related attributes (e.g., electricity consumption, materials). Provided with lists of these attributes for each television, participants chose the television they would purchase if they were to buy one. Results showed priming environment values focused participants' attention on environmental information, with high centrality participants selecting more environmentally friendly televisions than low centrality participants.

In addition, value priming research shows values significantly impact behavior when controlling for social desirability. For instance, Rodriguez, Neighbors, and Foster (2014) tested if a religiosity prime would alter people's self-reported alcohol habits. College students completed an online religiosity survey either before or after indicating their alcohol use. Social desirability was included as a covariate to rule out the possibility the obtained findings resulted from participants providing responses that are considered acceptable by society. When adjusting for social desirability, participants

answering religiosity questions directly prior to those on alcohol consumption reported drinking less frequently and ingesting fewer drinks on normal and peak occasions.

### **Social Norms**

Social norms contribute to the number of minor moral and/or legal violations committed. Social norms theory (Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986) suggests human behavior “is influenced by misperceptions of how other people in our social group believe and act” (Berkowitz, 2004, p. 5). Our behavior is influenced more by “perceived norms” (i.e., percent of people we *think* approve, disapprove, and/or engage in a behavior) than “actual norms” (i.e., percent of people who *truly* approve, disapprove, and/or engage in a behavior).<sup>1</sup> The term “misperception” is used to describe this discrepancy between “perceived norms” and “actual norms.” A misperception occurs anytime we overestimate or underestimate the actual beliefs or actions of people in our social group. Consequently, as a result of this misperception, we may change our behavior to match the faulty “perceived norm.” When we overestimate the problematic behavior of our social group, our own problematic behavior will increase. When we underestimate the healthy behavior of our social group, our own healthy behavior will decrease. Further, the theory claims correcting misperceptions of perceived norms can discourage problem behavior or promote healthy behavior.

---

<sup>1</sup> The percentage of people *thought* to and who *truly* approve or disapprove of a behavior are commonly referred to as perceived and actual injunctive norms. The percentage of people *thought* to and who *truly* engage in a behavior are known as perceived and actual descriptive norms.

Contextual factors affect whether people alter their behavior to adhere with social norms. The salience of a social norm can impact behavior. Focusing people's attention on the prevailing social norm increases the likelihood people will adjust their behavior to comply with the norm (Cialdini, Reno, & Kallgren, 1990). However, conformity lessens when people's attention is not deliberately drawn to the social norm (Cialdini et al., 1990). A person's group membership relative to those who set the social norm can sway behavior. People are likely to change their behavior to approximate the perceived norm if the individual they witness violating the social norm is an in-group member (Gino, Ayal, & Ariely, 2009). Conversely, people's likelihood to imitate declines when the individual acting unethically is an out-group member (Gino et al., 2009). The degree to which a person identifies with a social group can influence behavior. Individuals who identify strongly with a social reference group are more likely to modify their behavior than those who feel little connection to the group (Phua, 2013). This holds true for both larger general social groups (e.g., typical college students) and smaller specific social groups (e.g., best friends). In sum, these findings suggest focusing on social norms set by an in-group one identifies strongly with increases an individual's likelihood to change his/her behavior to reflect the norm.

Properly developed interventions to reduce problematic behavior by correcting overestimated norms have met with a good deal of success. Social norms marketing campaigns combine social norms theory with commercial marketing techniques to correct a population's misperception of the norm. In step 1, current data for the designated social norm is obtained by conducting a survey. People in the survey are asked how often they do a particular behavior (actual behavior) and how often other people do that same

behavior (perceived norm). In step 2, public service announcements with a creditable source simply and clearly stating the actual norms for the behavior are created. In step 3, public service announcements containing the actual norms for the behavior are routinely disseminated via internet, TV, radio, magazines, newspapers, and other media frequently used by large numbers of people in the target population. In step 4, following presentation of the public service announcements a second study is conducted to monitor the intervention's progress. People in the survey are asked how often other people do the behavior (perceived norm). In step 5, steps 2 to 4 are repeated at regular time increments throughout the intervention. In personalized normative feedback interventions, a person receives information (via the web, standard mail, etc.) showing how his/her perceived norm for the behavior and his/her own behavior compare to the actual norm for the behavior. Essentially, social norm interventions for problematic behaviors inform people that contrary to popular belief, most people do not do the behavior, thereby reducing the number of people who do the behavior in the future. Social norm interventions effectively curb alcohol consumption, increase tax reporting, reduce unsafe sex, and improve driving behavior.

### **Alcohol Consumption**

Misperceived alcohol norms have been well-documented on college campuses. Pedersen, Neighbors, and LaBrie (2010) found undergraduates inaccurately estimated their fellow students' regular alcohol consumption upwards of 257%. Freshmen reported drinking an average of 7.50 alcoholic beverages per week, but believed the typical freshman consumed 17 drinks a week. Sophomores indicated they consumed 8.25 drinks weekly, but thought the typical sophomore ingested 18 drinks per week. Juniors' actual

weekly alcohol consumption was 7 drinks, lower than their perception of the typical juniors' weekly alcohol intake of 15 drinks. While seniors reported having 7.25 drinks per week, they estimated seniors typically drank nearly double that amount (14 drinks). In addition, the undergraduates held highly distorted drinking norms for students in class years other than their own [e.g., freshman overstated sophomores' (18 drinks), juniors' (18 drinks), and seniors' (15.5 drinks) alcohol use]. College students associate certain events (e.g., 21<sup>st</sup> birthdays, football tailgating parties, spring break) with especially high perceived alcohol norms.

College students exaggerated perceived drinking norms can lead to excessive alcohol intake. Students overestimating the average number of alcoholic beverages consumed by peers celebrating their 21<sup>st</sup> birthdays drink significantly more on their own 21<sup>st</sup> birthdays (Neighbors, Oster-Aaland, Bergstrom, & Lewis, 2006). Tailgaters report drinking more alcohol before intercollegiate football games when they believe peers are consuming multiple alcoholic beverages (Neighbors et al., 2006). Students taking spring break trips who overstate the alcohol consumption of their fellow partygoers often down additional drinks (actual norm = 13 drinks spring break week; perceived norm = 30 drinks spring break week; Geisner et al., 2015).

Neighbors, Dillard, Lewis, Bergstrom, and Neil (2006) evaluated the stability of alcohol norm misperceptions. At the outset, slightly more than half the students (54%) reported consuming alcohol two to three times per month or less, while the remaining students listed alcohol consumption one to four times per week (frequency). As for quantity, approximately half the students drank six or fewer drinks during a week, whereas the remaining students indicated they consumed 7 to 30 drinks during a single

week ( $M = 9.40$ ,  $SD = 10.24$ ). When reporting their peers weekly drinking, students overestimated both their peers quantity and frequency of alcohol consumption.

Measurement of perceived and actual norms at the end of the study 2 months later showed no significant difference in students' perceived norms or students' actual norms across that time span, suggesting normative misperceptions are stable and unlikely to change unless people are made aware of this discrepancy.

Social norm interventions have been used successfully to curb alcohol consumption on college campuses (Berkowitz, 2004). In one such intervention program, Mattern and Neighbors (2004) had 474 resident hall students (male  $n = 223$ ; female  $n = 251$ ) at a midsized Midwest university undergo a 5 week alcohol norm changing intervention. Pretest questionnaires asked students how much (quantity) and how often (frequency) they drank and to estimate the same for their peers. Afterwards, intervention messages prominently displayed on posters, a tent, jellybean packets, and postcards stated the quantity and frequency of drinking at that campus as well as other alcohol-related behaviors or consequences [e.g., "70% of (school name) students have never let drinking get in the way of academics;" "85% of (school name) students drink less than once a week;" "66% of (school name) students have refused an offer of alcohol in the past 30 days"]. At the campaign's end, posttests were administered to students who completed the earlier pretest. Students' perceptions of their peers drinking quantity and frequency decreased following intervention. In turn, students who believed their peers drank less alcoholic beverages drank fewer such beverages themselves. Additionally, students who believed their peers drank less frequently drank less often themselves. One to six month follow-up assessments suggest the observed changes in drinking habits persist following

termination of the initial social norm intervention (Agostinelli, Brown, & Miller, 1995; Alfonso, 2015; Dotson, Dunn, & Bowers, 2015; Neighbors, Larimer, & Lewis, 2004; Neighbors et al., 2016; Ridout & Campbell, 2014).

### **Tax Reporting**

Perceived tax norms are a consideration in decisions to commit tax evasion. Bobek, Roberts, and Sweeney (2007) examined social norms influence on tax compliance among Australian, Singapore, and U.S. taxpayers to determine if inter-country norms accounted for the three countries different compliance rates. Questionnaires administered to the Australian ( $n = 76$ ), Singapore ( $n = 45$ ), and U.S. ( $n = 54$ ) residents asked the subjects about their perceptions of their country's acceptance of tax evasion and whether they would conform to tax law or social norms when facing a tax dilemma. Singapore and U.S. residents believed important people in their lives (e.g., family, friends, coworkers) disapproved of tax evasion. Conversely, Australian residents reported important people in their lives condoned tax evasion. Singapore had the highest complete tax compliance rate at 53.3%, followed by the U.S. at 40.7%, while Australia had the lowest complete tax compliance rate at 30.3%. Further, the prevailing social norm predicted tax evasion, with Singapore and U.S. social norms opposed to evasion improving compliance and Australia's more accepting evasion norm lowering compliance (also see Welch et al., 2005). Misperceived tax norms are relatively stable across time (Wenzel, 2005b); consequently, those who have previously committed tax evasion are the most inclined to do so in the future (Welch et al., 2005).

Tax evasion is also changeable by interventions designed to reduce the discrepancy between actual and perceived norms. Testing this in a two part study,

Wenzel (2005a) asked university students ( $N = 64$ ; male  $n = 20$ ; female  $n = 44$ ; age  $M = 22$ ) about their personal taxpaying beliefs, their hypothetical taxpaying behavior, as well as other people's taxpaying beliefs. One week later, students in the experimental condition received feedback about other individuals' actual tax-related beliefs while those in the control condition were presented information about how knowledgeable taxpayers felt about a recent tax reform. The intervention corrected the misperceived norm that most taxpayers endorse tax evasion, thereby increasing students' self-reported tax compliance. Alm, McClelland, and Schulze (1999) investigated governmental interventions to curb tax evasion, demonstrating legislative policies send messages about tax norms; strict tax law enforcement increased compliance whereas lax implementation produced a substantial decline in compliance.

### **Sexual Activity**

College students have incorrect perceptions of their peers' sexual norms. Lynch, Mowrey, Nesbitt, and O'Neil (2004) found, in a survey of university undergraduates, 49% of participants reported not having sexual intercourse in the past month; however, participants believed only 6% of fellow students had been sexually inactive during that time span. Forty-six percent of participants reported having sexual intercourse 2 or more times in the last 30 days but perceived 81% of all students engaged in sex that frequently. While 80% of respondents indicated either having no or one sexual intercourse partner in the last academic year, participants thought 80% of college students had sex with multiple partners. Although 32% of sexually active participants replied they had "always" used a condom, they supposed only 4% of their peers "always" did so (also see Lewis, Litt, Crouce, Blayney, & Gilmore, 2014).

College students mistakenly high perceived sex norms can increase risky sexual behavior. Lewis, Patrick, Mittmann, and Kaysen (2014) examined college students' perceptions of their peers' spring break sexual behavior. Of the 32% of college students who had sex over spring break, 15.5% had a casual sexual partner and 46.7% drank alcohol prior to sex, the average number of drinks consumed being 4.17. Students believed the typical same-sex college student engaged in risky sexual behavior more often than themselves. The perceived number of times the typical college student had casual sex was more than participants' self-reported sex with a casual partner. The perceived number of typical students who drank alcohol before or during sex was higher than participants' self-reported alcohol use. The perceived number of alcoholic drinks ingested by the typical student before or during sex was greater than participants' own self-reported number of alcoholic beverages. Moreover, participants who overestimated their peers' spring break sexual norms were more likely to partake in risky sex.

Initial social norm interventions to increase college students' safe-sex practices have shown some promising outcomes. Lewis et al. (2014) tested a brief web-based personalized normative feedback intervention to reduce college students' alcohol-related risky sexual behavior. Upon completing a baseline survey, participants in the intervention group viewed personalized bar graphs comparing their behavior to the perceived and actual alcohol-related risky sexual behavior of the typical same-sex student at their university. At 3 months follow-up, participants were asked how many times they consumed alcohol before or during sex over the previous 3 months as well as how often the typical same-sex student did so. Intervention lowered normative misperceptions of risky sexual behavior. Frequency of drinking prior to sex was significantly lower at 3

months than at baseline. Mediation analysis showed presenting accurate norms reduced participants' misperceptions of how frequently their peers drank before having sex, which in turn decreased how often they drank prior to sex. By 6 months the effects were no longer evident. Lewis et al. (2014) suggest alcohol-related risky sexual behavior personalized normative feedback intervention outcomes may be shorter lived than those obtained for alcohol personalized normative feedback interventions as having sex is a decision involving two people whereas drinking is a decision often made by the individual alone. Thus, while spring break personalized normative feedback interventions reduce overestimated descriptive risky sexual behavior norms (Patrick, Lee, & Neighbors, 2014), changing sexual behavior in this event-specific situation has proved more difficult (for a personalized normative feedback intervention to prevent HIV risky sexual behavior see Chernoff & Davison, 2005).

### **Driving Behavior**

Efforts to reduce road traffic accidents have turned to social norms as a plausible explanation for drivers' noncompliance with traffic law (Åberg, Larsen, Glad, & Beilinson, 1997; Haglund & Åberg, 2000; Zaidel, 1992). Manstead, Parker, Strading, Reason, and Baxtor (1992) studied drivers' typical road behavior and perceived driving norms. Questionnaires were distributed to a national sample of drivers ( $N = 1,656$ ; male  $n = 847$ ; female  $n = 809$ ; age range = 23 – 68) via mail. Subjects indicated how often they engaged in a series of traffic violations (e.g., tailgating, speeding, illegal passing) as well as estimated the percentage of road users who commit each violation on a regular basis. Subjects who frequently engaged in traffic infractions reported a higher number of other drivers did so (perceived tailgating = 61.2%; perceived speeding = 78.3%;

perceived driving while intoxicated = 62.7%) than subjects who never or rarely committed violations (perceived tailgating = 57.7%; perceived speeding = 67.8%; perceived driving while intoxicated = 32.8%).

Social norm interventions that pair overestimated percentages with actual percentages can correct misperceptions regarding traffic violations. Van Houten, Nau, and Marini (1980) measured vehicle speed with concealed radar on a section of Canadian public highway with a 50 km/hr speed limit. A feedback sign erected alongside the road displayed the percentage of drivers not speeding. Speeding declined following installation of the sign, the effects being most pronounced for the fastest drivers. Van Houten and Nau (1983) examined the effects of altering the criterion of “drivers not speeding” on feedback signs as a means of decreasing speeding on the same Canadian suburban highway. In the lenient condition, a billboard sign reported the percentage of drivers traveling less than 70 km/hr, roughly 91% to 96%, whereas a billboard in the stringent condition posted the percentage of drivers traveling less than 60 km/hr, approximately 53% to 58%. Baseline levels of the number of speeders traveling at or over 70 km/hr and at or over 60 km/hr dropped after introduction of the signs from 48% and 9% to 36% and 7% in the lenient condition and, applying the same baseline, to 43% and 7% for the stringent condition. Although the percentages in both conditions were accurate, posting higher percentages of non-speeders (lenient condition) more effectively reduced speeding than posting lower percentages of non-speeders (stringent condition). In a recent variation of Van Houten and Nau’s (1983) experiment, Wrapson, Harre, and Murrell (2006) demonstrated billboards indicating the average speed of drivers on an especially troublesome roadway section reduced speeding by 19%. Follow-up research

finds the effectiveness of anti-speeding billboards lasts up to 4 years (Van Houten & Nau, 1983).

### **Purpose of Current Dissertation**

The current dissertation studied if value sources and social norms affected people's likelihood of engaging in minor moral/legal violations. Previous *correlational* studies have typically examined if *a few* value sources may influence a *single* minor moral/legal violation. However, the results of such studies only answer if *some* value sources are *related to the behavior* in question while ignoring other, potentially important, value sources. Experiment 1 was the first known *experiment using mindset priming* to compare the effects of a relatively *comprehensive* list of value sources on people's likelihood of committing *multiple* minor moral/legal violations. Conducting an *experimental* study allowed us to determine if value sources affected people's likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations. Studying a relatively *comprehensive* set of value sources in a single experiment, meant we could compare the contributions of each source on people's likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations. Studying *multiple* minor moral/legal violations let us test previously unexamined minor moral/legal offenses.

Much social norms and social norm interventions research has concentrated on a *limited* number of minor moral/legal violations highly applicable to college students. Consequently, studies showing social norms are relevant to a *wide range* of minor moral/legal violations known to be commonplace in the general population are lacking. Experiment 2 was the first *experiment* to examine the impact of *manipulated* social norms (and *severity* perception) ratings on people's likelihood to commit *multiple commonplace* minor moral/legal violations. Conducting an *experimental* study allowed

us to show social norms (and *severity* perceptions) affected people's likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations. By *manipulating* social norms (and *severity* perception) ratings we could demonstrate how people's likelihood of committing the violations can be changed. Studying *multiple commonplace* minor moral/legal violations permitted us to test minor moral/legal offenses which have received little attention in the social norms research literature.

## **Chapter 2 - Experiment 1**

### **Overview**

Experiment 1 examined the effects of a relatively comprehensive list of value sources on people's likelihood of committing multiple minor moral/legal violations. Seventy-six participants randomly assigned to 1 of 5 experimental conditions completed questionnaires administered via the web. Participants were first mindset primed with values from 1 of 5 value sources (parental, peer, media, religion, personal). The mindset priming manipulation was created by altering the order of the value source questionnaires. Upon receiving the value source scale, participants indicated how that value source thought the participant should act if he/she was presented the opportunity to commit various minor moral/legal violations. Afterwards, participants reported how they "personally would act" in the exact same situations. A one-way (Value Source: Parental/Peer/Media/Religion/Personal) between-subjects ANOVA found some value sources affected people's likelihood to engage in minor moral/legal violations. Other potential variables contributing to the results are discussed.

### **Hypotheses**

H1: Value sources will influence personal likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations.

### **Method**

#### **Participants**

Eighty-eight Kansas State University undergraduates were recruited using the Department of Psychological Sciences sign-up system SONA. Students received introductory psychology course credit in exchange for participation. Data cleansing

produced a final sample size of 76 participants (68% female; freshman = 44.7%, sophomores = 42.1%, juniors = 9.2%, seniors = 3.9%). Sample sizes for the five value source conditions varied (parental  $n = 15$ , peer  $n = 15$ , media  $n = 18$ , religion  $n = 12$ , personal  $n = 16$ ). Participants' mean age was 19.16 ( $SD = 1.27$ ; age range = 18 – 24). Students predominately self-identified as White/European (73.7%), followed by Hispanic-American (7.9%), Asian-American (6.6%), Other (3.9%), and African-American (2.6%). Five percent did not disclose ethnicity. Most participants (71%) reported a religious background (39.5% Protestant, 31.6% Catholic, 6.6% Religious/No Denomination).

## **Materials**

**Value Source.** The Value Source Scale, a modified version of the Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scale (Barnett, Sanborn, & Shane, 2005), assessed how a value source (parental, peer, media, religion, personal) believed the participant *should act* if he/she could commit minor moral/legal violations (see Appendix A). Forty-four types of minor moral/legal violations (e.g., cheating, stealing, driving offenses, etc.) were presented in list form on the inventory. Participants were instructed:

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine how *you personally, your parents, your peers, the media or your religion* think(s) you should act if you were given the opportunity to engage in a variety of moral violations. Using the scale below, please write in the blank to the left of each item the one number that best reflects *your personal, your parents', your peers', the media's or your religion's* opinion of how you should act if you were given the opportunity to engage in that moral violation.

Nineteen items described a single-level violation (e.g., provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty); twenty-five multiple-levels of a particular violation. The 25 multiple-level violations subdivided further into three categories: five two-level violations (e.g., turn in a term paper as your own that was *partially* or *completely* taken from another student's work), six three-level violations (e.g., drive a car after you had 1-2, 3-4, or 5 or more alcoholic drinks), 14 four-level violations (e.g., keep \$10, \$20, \$50, or \$100 or more extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account). Single- and multiple-level violations were intermixed throughout the scale. In total, participants made 103 ratings  $[(19 \times 1) + (5 \times 2) + (6 \times 3) + (14 \times 4)$ ; Barnett et al., 2005]. Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert format where 0 = *never acceptable to do* and 6 = *always acceptable to do*. All items were summed together to produce a total score, creating a maximum score range of 0 to 618. Higher scores indicate the value source believes it is more acceptable to engage in the violations.

***Personal Likelihood for Minor Moral/Legal Violations.*** The "Personally Would Act" Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scale, a modified version of the Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scale (Barnett, Sanborn, & Shane, 2005), assessed how the participant *would act* if he/she could commit minor moral/legal violations (see Appendix B). Forty-four types of minor moral/legal violations (e.g., cheating, stealing, driving offenses, etc.) were presented in list form on the inventory. Participants were instructed:

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine how you would act if you were given the opportunity to engage in a variety of moral violations. Using the scale below, please write in the blank to the left of each

item the one number that best reflects how you would act if you were given the opportunity to engage in that moral violation.

Nineteen items described a single-level violation (e.g., provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty); twenty-five multiple-levels of a particular violation. The 25 multiple-level violations subdivided further into three categories: five two-level violations (e.g., turn in a term paper as your own that was *partially* or *completely* taken from another student's work), six three-level violations (e.g., drive a car after you had 1-2, 3-4, or 5 or more alcoholic drinks), 14 four-level violations (e.g., keep \$10, \$20, \$50, or \$100 or more extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account). Single- and multiple-level violations were intermixed throughout the scale. In total, participants made 103 ratings [(19 x 1) + (5 x 2) + (6 x 3) + (14 x 4); Barnett et al., 2005]. Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert format where 0 = *not at all likely* and 6 = *extremely likely*. All items were summed together to produce a total score, creating a maximum score range of 0 to 618. Higher scores indicate the participant is more likely to engage in minor moral/legal violations if given the opportunity. Participants' Value Source Scale score was subtracted from their "Personally Would Act" Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scale score and the absolute value taken to produce the difference score used for analysis.

**Demographics.** Participants were queried about their age, sex, class level (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate), marital status (married, unmarried), ethnicity (African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic-American, Native-American, White/European-American, Other) and religion (Not religious, Catholic, Baptist, Pentecostal, Mormon, Presbyterian, Methodist, Lutheran, Episcopal, Jewish, Buddhist,

Hindu, Other, Religious/No denomination, Spiritual; see Appendix C). Following data collection, non-Catholic participants selecting Christian denominations were combined into a single category labeled Protestant.

## **Procedure**

Participants were informed the online experiment was examining Kansas State University students' and social organizations' attitudes toward minor moral violations. Before starting, participants electronically signed a Kansas State University Institutional Review Board approved informed consent stating the terms of participation:

This research is examining K-State students' and different social organizations' (e.g., parents, peers, media, religion) thoughts about minor moral violations. You will be asked to complete questionnaires about how you and various social organizations evaluate several of the *same* minor moral violations. Thus, do not be concerned that the surveys are very redundant.

There are no right or wrong answers to the questions, just your opinions. You can skip any questions you feel uncomfortable answering. If at any time during this experiment you decide you no longer want to participate, you can quit participating without penalty. All responses remain anonymous and confidential (see Appendix D).

After providing informed consent, all participants were randomly assigned to 1 of 5 experimental conditions (parental, peer, media, religion, personal). To create the priming manipulation the order of the independent variable questionnaires were altered. Each participant first received a Value Source Scale (parental, peer, media, religion, or personal; e.g., independent variable), followed by the "Personally Would Act" Minor

Moral and Legal Violation Scale (e.g., dependent variable), the four remaining Value Source Scales, and a demographic form. Participants were thoroughly debriefed before exiting the website:

We're studying how values influence behavior. All participants described different value sources' (personal, parental, peer/friend, media, religion) thoughts about committing moral violations. Some participants first reported how value sources thought they *should* act in moral situations, after which they indicated how they *would* act. Other participants indicated how they *would* act in moral situations, then reported how value sources thought they *should* act (see Appendix E).

## Results

Data were examined for ANOVA assumption violations prior to testing. Box plots detected 11 outliers which were excluded from further analyses. Shapiro-Wilks' test indicated the dependent variable was normally distributed for each independent variable group ( $p = .12 - .51$ ) except the peer values condition ( $S-W = .83$ ,  $df = 15$ ,  $p = .01$ ). Visual inspection of a histogram and Q-Q plot substantiated this finding. No correction was undertaken as one-way ANOVA tolerates some normality violation. Levene's test showed homogeneity of variance did not exist for the five groups,  $F(2, 71) = 16.91$ ,  $p < .000$ . Consequently, Welch and Brown-Forsythe tests were conducted along with the standard ANOVA and Games-Howell post hoc tests employed. In addition, both independent and dependent variable questionnaires had a minimal percentage of missing values. Hence, participant mean scale scores were calculated rather than sum scale scores.

Table 1 - *Experiment 1 One-way Analysis of Variance for Value Source and Likelihood to Commit Minor Moral and Legal Violations*

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	$\eta^2$
Value Source	8.59	4	2.15	9.75	.35
Error	15.65	71	.22		
Total	24.24	75			

\* $p < .05$ .

Table 2 - *Experiment 1 Means and Standard Deviations for One-way Analysis of Variance of Value Source on Likelihood to Commit Minor Moral and Legal Violations*

Value source	Source score	Personal score	Difference	Absolute value
<b>Parental</b>				
<i>M</i>	.84	.92	-.08	.17
( <i>SD</i> )	(.61)	(.63)	(.21)	(.14)
<i>n</i>	15	15	15	15
<b>Peer</b>				
<i>M</i>	2.11	1.71	.41	.50
( <i>SD</i> )	(1.00)	(.96)	(.63)	(.55)
<i>n</i>	15	15	15	15
<b>Media</b>				
<i>M</i>	1.71	1.37	.34	1.00
( <i>SD</i> )	(1.19)	(.84)	(1.25)	(.79)
<i>n</i>	18	18	18	18
<b>Religion</b>				
<i>M</i>	1.07	1.12	-.05	.15
( <i>SD</i> )	(.42)	(.41)	(.17)	(.08)
<i>n</i>	12	12	12	12

Table 2 (Continued) - *Experiment 1 Means and Standard Deviations for One-way Analysis of Variance of Value Source on Likelihood to Commit Minor Moral and Legal Violations*

Value source	Source score	Personal score	Difference	Absolute value
Personal				
<i>M</i>	1.61	1.68	-.07	.24
<i>(SD)</i>	(.65)	(.71)	(.30)	(.19)
<i>n</i>	16	16	16	16

*Note.* Higher scores indicate greater likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations.

Data were analyzed by a one-way (Value Source: Parental/Peer/Media/Religion/Personal) ANOVA for between-subjects design with personal likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations as the dependent variable. Results indicated a significant difference between the value sources on personal likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations,  $F(4, 71) = 9.75, p < .000$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .35$  (see Table 1).<sup>2</sup> Games-Howell post hoc tests showed media values ( $M = 1.01, SD = .79$ ) significantly affected participants' personal likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations compared to parental ( $M = .17, SD = .14, p < .002$ ), religion ( $M = .15, SD = .08, p < .002$ ), and personal ( $M = .24, SD = .19, p < .006$ ) values (see Table 2). No other significant differences were found.

## Discussion

Experiment 1 used mindset priming to examine the effects of a relatively comprehensive list of value sources on individuals' likelihood to commit various minor moral/legal violations. It was hypothesized value sources would influence personal likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations. Seventy-six participants mindset primed with values from 1 of 5 value sources (parental, peer, media, religion, personal) filled out questionnaires via the web. Participants first completed a value source scale indicating how 1 of the 5 value sources thought they should act if given the opportunity to engage in minor moral/legal violations. Afterwards, participants completed a questionnaire asking them to indicate how they personally would act if offered the chance to commit those exact same transgressions. Participants were willing to follow parental, religious, and personal value source suggestions when presented the opportunity to commit minor moral/legal violations. However, participants were not necessarily willing

---

<sup>2</sup> Welch's  $F(4, 34.28) = 6.60, p < .000$ ; Brown-Forsythe  $F(4, 33.59) = 11.23, p < .000$ .

to behave as the media recommended. Though peers did not affect participants' likelihood for minor moral/legal violations, peers fell between the media value source and the parental, religion, personal value sources. Thus, hypothesis 1 was partially supported.

People perceive the media as biased against their values and in favor of the opposite side (Everland & Shah, 2003). As such, people oftentimes consciously choose to expose themselves to media congruent with their values (Bobkowski, 2009). When completing the value source scale participants probably rated the minor moral/legal violations according to how they perceive the media in general suggests they should act, not the media they personally consume. Had participants been instructed to rate the minor moral/legal violations in terms of the media they select to watch, read, listen to, etc., we might have obtained a similar effect to the other value sources. Future research should compare participants' likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations when primed with general media values versus the values of the media they actually consume. To thoroughly explore this future research should examine the exact media participants frequently expose themselves to including types (e.g., TV), genres (e.g., TV: news, sports, reality shows, documentaries, sitcoms, etc.), as well as the amount of time spent in media related activities (e.g., watching TV and movies; listening to music or radio; reading magazines, newspapers, and books; using the internet; playing video games, etc.). Interestingly, though participants were least likely to follow the media's advice, media-based interventions (e.g., public service announcements) effectively reduce problematic behavior. Again, perhaps people are less receptive to general media messages but open-minded to messages disseminated through the media they personally select to consume.

Participants might consider parents and religion more important value sources than the media. Some existing research literature suggests this may be the case. Mitchell, Tanner, and Raymond (2004) found parents and religious value sources influential in adolescents' decisions to initiate premarital sex whereas the media was not. In a national survey, Armfield and Holbert (2003) found religiosity (e.g., "religion is an important part of my life") was a robust negative predictor of internet use among American adults. Davies (2007) found Mormon undergraduates who rated television as an unimportant aspect of their lives spent fewer hours watching entertainment programming. Future research should assess the importance of the value source to the participant.

One limitation of this experiment was the small sample size. Participants were recruited using standard psychology department procedure, but few signed up for the study. This dearth of participants was unanticipated given the research topic should have especially appealed to this institution's student body (see paragraph below). Perhaps participants postponed satisfying their research requirement until later in the academic semester when they could choose from multiple studies. Perhaps prior participants found the redundant questionnaires tedious, even boring, and somehow conveyed this to potential participants. In addition, potential participants may have been able to accrue the same number of research credit hours in other concurrent studies which took less time to complete. Participant feedback might provide further insight into this difficulty.

Caution should be taken generalizing these results. The Princeton Review (2017) has ranked Kansas State University in the top 20 U.S. colleges with the most conservative students the past three consecutive years. Conservatives and liberals ideological stance

on moral/legal issues can vary considerably. For instance, people with conservative attitudes toward sex typically consider sex acceptable only within an exclusive or marital relationship, whereas those with liberal attitudes toward sex approve of sex in multiple contexts including casual sex (Fugère, Leszczynski, & Cousins, 2014). Self-identified conservative adults also place a higher emphasis on respect and obedience to authority (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009) such as complete compliance with the law. In addition, in 2017, the Princeton Review ranked Kansas State University 10<sup>th</sup> nationwide for most religious students. Indeed, among westernized countries it is a well-documented fact conservatives are usually religious, oftentimes highly so, whereas liberals are frequently less religious or even non-religious (see Hayes, 1995). Thus, conducting the study using a more liberal and/or less religious sample could yield different results than those obtained here, especially with regard to the religion value source.

## **Chapter 3 - Experiment 2**

### **Overview**

Experiment 2 examined the effects of manipulated social norms (and severity perceptions) on people's likelihood to commit multiple commonplace minor moral/legal violations. One hundred seventeen participants randomly assigned to 1 of 6 experimental conditions completed questionnaires administered via the web. Participants in the likelihood conditions read low, actual, or high ratings of Kansas State University undergraduates' tendency to commit various common minor moral/legal violations. Participants in the excusable conditions read low, actual, or high ratings of how serious Kansas State University undergraduates considered multiple commonplace minor moral/legal violations. Following exposure to the ratings, participants in both conditions self-reported their likelihood to commit the same identical transgressions if given the opportunity. A 2 (Norm: Likelihood/Excusable) x 3 (Rating: High/Actual/Low) between-subjects ANOVA revealed ratings differentially affected people's willingness to engage in common minor moral/legal violations. Potential methodological and generalizability issues are discussed.

### **Hypotheses**

H1: Participants will be most likely to commit minor moral/legal violations in the high rating condition, followed by the actual rating condition, and lastly, the low rating condition.

H2: Participants in the high likelihood condition will be more willing to commit minor moral/legal violations than those in the high excusable condition; participants in the low likelihood condition will be less likely to

commit minor moral/legal violations than those in the low excusable condition.<sup>3</sup>

## **Method**

### **Participants**

One hundred seventeen Kansas State University undergraduates (70% female; freshman = 74.4%, sophomores = 12.8%, juniors = 7.7%, seniors = 5.1%) were recruited using the Department of Psychological Sciences sign-up system SONA. Students earned introductory psychology course credit for participating. Each experimental condition contained 20 participants except low likelihood ( $n = 17$ ). Ages ranged from 17 to 22 years, the average being 18.7 ( $SD = 1.0$ ). Over 73% of students self-identified as White/European-American, 7.7% Hispanic-American, 7.7% African-American, 2.6% Asian-American, 7.7% Other, and 1 did not specify ethnicity. Most (80.2%) expressed a religious or spiritual background (32.8% Protestant, 29.3% Catholic, 1.7% Hindu, 1.7% Muslim, 12.1% Religious/No Denomination, 2.6% Spiritual).

### **Materials**

***Likelihood and Excusable Rating.*** Two modified versions of the Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scale (Barnett, Sanborn, & Shane, 2005)<sup>4</sup> were administered to

---

<sup>3</sup> As severity is not a component of social norms theory, the interaction of severity ratings compared to likelihood ratings was pure speculation.

<sup>4</sup> Previously, Barnett, Sanborn, and Shane (2005) used this scale to identify variables correlated with people's likelihood to engage in minor moral/legal violations.

Undergraduate participants completed three versions of the questionnaire

Kansas State University psychology undergraduates during a previous semester as part of a larger mass testing session. One mass testing Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scale asked participants (part 1  $N=138$ , part 2  $N=133^5$ ) to rate on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *not at all likely* to 5 = *extremely likely*) how likely an American college student would be to engage in the behaviors:

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine how likely it would be for an American college student to engage in a variety of behaviors. For each of the behavioral descriptions listed below, we would like to know how likely you believe an American college student would be to engage in the behaviors listed.

Using the following scale, please write in the blank to the left of each behavioral description the one number that best reflects your opinion of how likely an American college student would be to engage in each behavior.

---

(counterbalanced) indicating 1) how likely they would be to commit each violation if given the opportunity on a 5-point Likert format from 1 (*not at all likely*) to 5 (*extremely likely*), 2) how serious it would be for an American college student to commit each violation on a 5-point Likert format from 1 (*not all serious*) to 5 (*extremely serious*), and 3) how likely American college students would be to commit each violation if given the opportunity from 0% to 100% (divided into 10% increments). The authors' recommended experimental studies be conducted to test variables that affect people's likelihood to engage in such transgressions.

<sup>5</sup> Scale was split into two parts to satisfy mass testing session requirements.

The second mass testing Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scale asked participants (part 1  $N = 148$ , part 2  $N = 143$ ) to rate on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1 = *not at all serious* and 5 = *extremely serious*) how serious it would be for an American college student to engage in the behaviors:

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine how serious it would be for an American college student to engage in a variety of behaviors. For each of the behavioral descriptions listed below, we would like to know how serious you believe it would be for an American college student to engage in the behaviors listed.

Using the following scale, please write in the blank to the left of each behavioral description the one number that best reflects your opinion of how serious it would be for an American college student to engage in each behavior.

Forty-four types of minor moral/legal violations (e.g., cheating, stealing, driving offenses, etc.) were presented in list form on the inventory. Nineteen items described a single-level violation (e.g., provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty); twenty-five multiple-levels of a particular violation. The 25 multiple-level violations subdivided further into three categories: five two-level violations (e.g., turn in a term paper as your own that was *partially* or *completely* taken from another student's work), six three-level violations (e.g., drive a car after you had 1-2, 3-4, or 5 or more alcoholic drinks), 14 four-level violations (e.g., keep \$10, \$20, \$50, or \$100 or more extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account). Single- and multiple-level violations were intermixed throughout the scale. In total, participants made 103 ratings  $[(19 \times 1) + (5 \times 2) + (6 \times 3) + (14 \times 4)]$ ; Barnett et al., 2005]. To keep

both the likelihood and excusable scales on a similar metric, items on the excusable condition scale were reverse scored prior to summation. Means were calculated for each of the 103 items on both mass testing Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scales. Low ratings were created subtracting one from the mean of each scale item (i.e., actual rating = 4, low rating = 3), high ratings adding one to the mean of each scale item (i.e., actual rating = 4, high rating = 5). The ratings were transferred to unfinished modified Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scales. The blanks where participants normally write their answers on the Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scale were replaced with one of the six sets of ratings, thereby producing six scales – three likelihood (low, actual, high) and three excusable (low, actual, high). Participants were instructed on the likelihood rating scales:

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In a previous semester, KSU students rated how likely they would be to engage in the following moral violations if given the opportunity to commit those violations. The ratings of the students from past semesters are listed after each item. The higher the number, the more likely the students were to engage in the moral violation. The lower the number, the less likely students were to engage in the moral violation. Read the following moral violations and the ratings of past students concerning how likely they are to occur and think about how likely you would be to engage in the violation. You will be asked some questions about this later (see Appendix F).

and on the excusable rating scales:

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In a previous semester, KSU students rated how serious they thought the following moral violations were. The ratings of students from past

semesters are listed after each item. The higher the number, the more serious the students thought the moral violation was. The lower the number, the less serious the students thought the moral violation was. Read the following moral violations and the ratings of past students concerning their severity and think about how serious you think the violation is. You will be asked some questions about this later (see Appendix G).

A 7-point Likert format scale (likelihood 0 = *not at all likely* to 6 = *extremely likely*; excusable 0 = *not at all serious* to 6 = *extremely serious*) appeared at the top of the page below the instructions to aid participants' understanding of the estimates.

***Likelihood for Minor Moral/Legal Violations.*** The Likelihood of Committing Minor Moral and Legal Violations Following Students' Ratings Scale, a revised Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scale (Barnett, Sanborn, & Shane, 2005), assessed participants' tendency to commit minor moral/legal violations following exposure to manipulated social norms and severity perceptions. Participants previously exposed to likelihood ratings were directed:

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The previous page showed KSU students' likelihood to engage in a variety of moral violations if given the opportunity to commit those violations. Using the scale below, please write in the blank to the left of each item the one number that best reflects how likely you would be to engage in that moral violation (see Appendix H).

Participants exposed to excusable ratings read:

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The previous page showed how serious KSU students thought a variety of moral violations were. Using the scale below, please write in

the blank to the left of each item the one number that best reflects how likely you would be to engage in that moral violation (see Appendix I).

Forty-four types of minor moral/legal violations (e.g., cheating, stealing, driving offenses, etc.) were presented in list form on the inventory. Nineteen items described a single-level violation (e.g., provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty); twenty-five multiple-levels of a particular violation. The 25 multiple-level violations subdivided further into three categories: five two-level violations (e.g., turn in a term paper as your own that was *partially* or *completely* taken from another student's work), six three-level violations (e.g., drive a car after you had 1-2, 3-4, or 5 or more alcoholic drinks), 14 four-level violations (e.g., keep \$10, \$20, \$50, or \$100 or more extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account). Single- and multiple-level violations were intermixed throughout the scale. In total, participants made 103 ratings [(19 x 1) + (5 x 2) + (6 x 3) + (14 x 4); Barnett et al., 2005]. For both scales, responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert format from 0 (*not at all likely*) to 6 (*extremely likely*). Items on the likelihood condition scale were added together to produce a total score. To keep both the likelihood and excusable scales on a similar metric, items on the excusable condition scale were reverse scored prior to summation. Total scores range from 0 to 618. Higher scores indicate the participant is more likely to engage in minor moral/legal violations if given the opportunity.

***Demographics.*** Participants were queried about their age, sex, class level (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate), marital status (married, unmarried), ethnicity (African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic-American, Native-American, White/European-American, Other) and religion (Not religious, Catholic, Baptist,

Pentecostal, Mormon, Presbyterian, Methodist, Lutheran, Episcopal, Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, Other, Religious/No denomination, Spiritual; see Appendix C). Following data collection, non-Catholic participants selecting Christian denominations were combined into a single category labeled Protestant.

## **Procedure**

Participants were informed the online experiment was examining Kansas State University students' attitudes toward minor moral violations. Before starting, participants electronically signed a Kansas State University Institutional Review Board approved informed consent stating the terms of participation:

This research is examining K-State student attitudes toward various minor moral violations. For this study, you will be asked to complete questionnaires about your attitudes on minor moral violations.

There are no right or wrong answers to the questions, just your opinions. You can skip any questions you feel uncomfortable answering. If at any time during this experiment you decide you no longer want to participate, you can quit participating without penalty. All responses remain anonymous and confidential (see Appendix J).

After providing informed consent, all participants were randomly assigned to 1 of 6 experimental conditions [3 likelihood (low, actual, high) + 3 excusable (low, actual, high)]. In the likelihood conditions, each participant first received 1 of the 3 likelihood ratings (low, actual, high; e.g., independent variable), followed by the Likelihood of Committing Minor Moral and Legal Violations Following Students' Likelihood Ratings Scale (e.g., dependent variable), and, lastly, a demographic form. In the excusable

conditions, each participant first received 1 of the 3 severity ratings (low, actual, high), followed by the Likelihood of Committing Minor Moral and Legal Violations Following Students' Excusable Ratings Scale, and a demographic form. Participants were thoroughly debriefed before exiting the website:

You were told you were reading how K-State students' rate minor moral violations. These ratings were not accurate. Some participants read K-State students were *more* or *less* likely to engage in a behavior than they actually are. Other participants read K-State students considered a behavior to be *more* or *less* serious than they actually do. K-State students' actual likelihood and severity ratings are presented at the end of this debriefing. We apologize for this deception (see Appendix K).

## **Results**

Data were screened for ANOVA assumption violations prior to testing. Box plots indicated no outliers. Shapiro-Wilks' test showed the dependent variable was approximately normally distributed for each combination of the independent variables ( $p = .29 - 1.00$ ) except low likelihood ( $S-W = .82, df = 17, p = .00$ ). Examination of skewness, kurtosis, and a histogram validated this result. No correction was undertaken as univariate ANOVAs with at least 20 degrees of freedom for error are fairly robust to normality deviations (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Levene's test confirmed homogeneity of variance across all independent variable group combinations,  $F(5, 111) = .75, p = .59$ . In addition, a minuscule number of values (< 1%) were missing on the dependent variable questionnaire. Missing values were randomly distributed throughout the sample.

Table 3 - *Experiment 2 Two-way Analysis of Variance for Norm and Likelihood to Commit Minor Moral and Legal Violations*

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	$\eta^2$
Norm	.02	1	.02	.02	
Rating	8.08	2	4.04	5.35*	.09
Norm x Rating	.62	2	.31	.41	
Error	83.91	111	.76		
Total	994.26	116			

\* $p < .05$ .

Table 4 - *Experiment 2 Means and Standard Deviations for Two-way Analysis of Variance on Likelihood to Commit Minor Moral and Legal Violations*

Norm	Rating			
	Low	Actual	High	Total
Likelihood				
<i>M</i>	1.50	1.81	1.96	1.77
( <i>SD</i> )	(.80)	(1.00)	(.93)	(.92)
<i>n</i>	17	20	20	57
Excusable				
<i>M</i>	1.33	1.85	2.16	1.78
( <i>SD</i> )	(.73)	(.92)	(.79)	(.87)
<i>n</i>	20	20	20	60
Total				
<i>M</i>	1.41	1.83	2.06	
( <i>SD</i> )	(.76)	(.95)	(.86)	
<i>N</i>	37	40	40	

*Note.* Higher scores indicate greater likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations.

However, to keep scoring consistent with Experiment 1, participants mean score on the dependent variable was calculated instead of a sum.

A 2 (Norm: Likelihood/Excusable) x 3 (Rating: High/Actual/Low) between-subjects ANOVA was used to analyze the data with likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations as the dependent variable. No main effect was found for norm,  $F(1, 111) = .02, p = .88$ . A significant main effect emerged for rating,  $F(2, 111) = 5.35, p = < .006$  (see Table 3). Ratings explained 9% of the variance in people's likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations, partial  $\eta^2 = .09$ .<sup>6</sup> Participants exposed to high ratings ( $M = 2.06, SD = .86$ ) reported a greater likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations than those exposed to low ratings ( $M = 1.41, SD = .76$ ; see Table 4). However, participants exposed to high or low ratings did not significantly differ from those exposed to actual ratings ( $M = 1.83, SD = .95$ ) in likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations. The norm x rating interaction was nonsignificant,  $F(2, 111) = .41, p = .67$ .

## Discussion

Experiment 2 examined the effect of manipulated social norms (and severity perception) ratings on people's likelihood to commit multiple commonplace minor moral/legal violations. First, we hypothesized high ratings would increase, actual ratings reduce, and low ratings furthest decrease participants' likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations. Second, we hypothesized participants in the high likelihood condition would be more willing to commit minor moral/legal violations than those in the high excusable condition and participants in the low likelihood condition would be less likely to commit minor moral/legal violations than those in the low excusable condition.

---

<sup>6</sup> Small effect size.

One hundred seventeen participants randomly assigned to 1 of 6 conditions completed questionnaires administered via the web. Participants in the likelihood conditions read 1 of 3 ratings (low, actual, high) of how likely Kansas State University students were to engage in minor moral/legal violations if given the opportunity. Participants in the excusable conditions read 1 of 3 ratings (low, actual, high) of how serious Kansas State University students thought each of the minor moral/legal violations were. After viewing the ratings participants in both conditions indicated their likelihood of committing the same identical common minor moral/legal violations. Participants exposed to high ratings self-reported the greatest likelihood for minor moral/legal transgressions while participants shown low ratings self-reported the least likelihood. That is, participants were more likely to commit minor moral/legal violations when many of their peers committed the minor moral/legal violations or when their peers did not consider the offenses serious (high ratings) than when fewer of their peers engaged in the minor moral/legal violations or when their peers considered the offenses severe (low ratings). However, participants in the high likelihood condition were not significantly more likely to engage in minor moral/legal violations than those in the high excusable condition. Nor were participants in the low likelihood condition less likely to engage in minor moral/legal violations than those in the low excusable condition. In other words, participants were not more willing to commit minor moral/legal violations because many of their peers committed the minor moral/legal violations (high likelihood) than because their peers did not consider the offenses serious (high excusable). Participants were not less likely to commit minor moral/legal violations because few of their peers committed the minor moral/legal violations (low likelihood) than because their peers considered the

offenses serious (low excusable). Thus, while hypothesis 1 received partial support, hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Social norms theory claims people's behavior is influenced by misperceptions of how members of their social group think and act (Berkowitz, 2004). A misperception occurs when people *perceive* their social group's thoughts or behaviors (perceived norm) to be different from how their social group *actually* thinks or behaves (actual norm). People can either overestimate or underestimate the actual beliefs or actions of people in their social group. If a person overestimates the problematic behavior of his/her social group, his/her own problematic behavior will increase. Our results support social norms theory; participants expressed more willingness to commit minor moral/legal violations when they believed many of their peers committed minor moral/legal violations than when they believed fewer of their peers did so.<sup>7</sup>

Encouragingly, people's likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations was only swayed slightly in either direction from the actual perceived norm. That is, the high and low rating groups significantly differed from each other but not from the actual rating group. The Likert scale on the two modified Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scales administered during the mass testing session may have contributed to this result. The mass testing Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scales to collect social norm ratings asked participants to indicate on a 5-point Likert format either 1) their opinion of how likely an American college student would be to engage in each of the 103 violations or 2) their

---

<sup>7</sup> Lack of support for hypothesis 2 suggests variables beyond just descriptive social norms explain undergraduates' willingness to engage in minor transgressions.

opinion of how serious it would be for an American college student to engage in each of the 103 violations. A range of scores from 1 to 5 may have been too narrow to produce a substantial difference between the three rating (low, actual, high) groups. To further verify this finding future research could adopt a more sensitive scale to make the ratings for the groups more distinct. Adding and subtracting one to the means on the actual rating scale, an arbitrarily chosen number, could also account for these results. As is, our results suggest people have a pre-existing perceived norm for minor moral/legal violations.

One variable not included in Experiment 2 that might affect people's willingness to engage in minor moral/legal violations are injunctive norms. While this study focused on descriptive norms (i.e., percentage of people thought to engage in a behavior) other types of norms exist, one of these being injunctive norms (i.e., percentage of people thought to approve or disapprove of a behavior). Injunctive norms also correlate with behavior, and in some instances are a stronger predictor of problematic behavior than descriptive norms (Larimer, Turner, Mallett, & Geisner, 2004). Future experiments should compare descriptive and injunctive norms influence on people's tendency to engage in multiple minor moral/legal violations. If injunctive norms have a greater effect on likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations than descriptive norms, social norm interventions using injunctive norms may be the better choice for reducing minor moral/legal violations.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> It has been suggested the variables injunctive norms and seriousness have some overlap. People may think society considers it acceptable to commit violations rated less severe

A note of caution should be taken when applying these results to non-college student populations. Younger and older adults' perceptions of what constitutes ethical and/or lawful conduct can differ. In a Gallup Poll (2003), 83% of people aged 13 to 17 stated downloading music from the internet for free was morally acceptable, 15% morally wrong (Hanway & Lyons, 2003). The Pew Internet & American Life Project (2003) reported 72% of young adults 18 to 29 were unconcerned about copyrights when downloading music, while 61% of adults 30 to 49 showed little regard for copyright status. In addition, younger and older adults' attitudes toward unlawful conduct differ. Whereas 75% of older drivers (55 years and over) strongly agree with the statement "Everyone should obey the speed limits because it's the law," only 60% of younger drivers (16 – 34 years) strongly agree (NHTSA, 2013). Among older drivers (65 years and over) 15% qualify as speeders and 38% as non-speeders (NHTSA, 2013). Comparatively, 50% and 17% of young drivers (16 – 20 years) classify as speeders and non-speeders respectively (NHTSA, 2013). Thus, college students may be more influenced by social norms for certain items on the minor moral/legal violation scale than older generations.

---

while unacceptable to commit violations rated highly severe (Barnett, Sanborn, & Shane, 2005).

## Chapter 4 - General Discussion

### Results

Experiment 1 was the first *experiment using mindset priming* to examine the effects of a relatively *comprehensive* list of value sources on people's likelihood of committing *multiple* minor moral/legal violations. It was hypothesized value sources would influence personal likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations. To test this hypothesis, participants mindset primed with 1 of the 5 value sources self-reported how they personally would act if presented the opportunity to commit various minor moral/legal violations. While participants were willing to act as parental, religion, and personal value sources suggested in minor moral/legal violation situations, they did not necessarily behave as the media recommended. Thus, hypothesis 1 was partially supported. These findings extended existing correlational research by demonstrating *some* value sources *affect* young adults' likelihood of committing *several* previously untested minor moral/legal violations.

Experiment 2 was the first *experiment* to examine the impact of *manipulated* social norms (and *severity* perceptions) on people's likelihood to commit *multiple* commonplace minor moral/legal violations. Two hypotheses were tested. First, high ratings would increase, actual ratings reduce, and low ratings furthest decrease participants' likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations. Second, participants in the high likelihood condition would be more willing to commit minor moral/legal violations than those in the high excusable condition; participants in the low likelihood condition would be less likely to commit minor moral/legal violations than those in the low excusable condition. To test these hypotheses, participants were exposed to 1 of 3

(low, actual, high) social norm or severity ratings after which they indicated if they would commit various minor moral/legal violations if given the opportunity. Participants' likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations was greater when they believed more people committed the violations (or considered the violations excusable/not severe) versus when fewer people committed the violations (or considered the violations less excusable/severe). Thus, hypothesis 1 received partial support. However, no support was found for hypothesis 2. These findings advanced existing research by demonstrating social norms *affect* young adults' willingness to commit *several* scarcely tested minor moral/legal violations.

### **Limitations**

Each experiment omitted a potentially significant variable. In Experiment 1, the importance of the value source to the participant was not assessed. Participants might regard parents and religion more important value sources than the media. It is likely the case people are more willing to follow advice from a value source important to them than one of lesser importance. Experiment 2 studied the effect of descriptive norms on people's likelihood to commit minor moral/legal violations. However, social norms theory mentions a second type of norm, injunctive norms, which were not included in the present study. Injunctive norms correlate with and in some instances better predict problematic behavior than descriptive norms.

Both experiments had possible measurement issues. In Experiment 1, participants were instructed on the value source scale to indicate the media's opinion of how they should act if given the opportunity to engage in minor moral/legal violations. Participants probably understood these directions as referring to media in general, not the

media they personally consume. Had the instructions specifically asked participants to indicate how the media they actually watch, read, listen to, etc., suggested they should behave, the media value source result may have been similar to that of the parental, personal, and religion value sources. Additionally, labeling the value source “faith” instead of “religion” (as some people are spiritual but not religious) might produce different results for some participants. Lastly, participants may have experienced fatigue that influenced their answers due to the length of the questionnaires. In Experiment 2, the Likert-type scale on the mass testing Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scales might explain why the actual rating group did not significantly differ from either the high or low rating groups. The two mass testing Minor Moral and Legal Violation Scales (Barnett, Sanborn, & Shane, 2005) to collect social norm ratings asked participants to indicate on a 5-point Likert format either 1) their opinion of how likely an American college student would be to engage in each of the 103 violations or 2) their opinion of how serious it would be for an American college student to engage in each of the 103 violations. This range of scores from 1 to 5 may have been too narrow to produce a substantial difference between the three rating (low, actual, high) groups. Creating the high and low rating scales by adding or subtracting one to the mean values on the actual rating scale, an arbitrarily chosen number, could also account for these results. Although a social desirability effect could have occurred in the studies, logically it should be the same across conditions, and thus would not affect the results. Floor effects were possible in both experiments. Further, items on the dependent variable scales were not analyzed. The Minor Moral and Legal Violations Scale contains several types of violations including, among others, digital piracy, theft, traffic violations, and academic dishonesty.

Future research should examine these different types of violations to see if the results are similar or different for different types of transgressions. The 25 multiple-level violations increase from a relatively low (e.g., keep less than \$1 extra change returned by a store clerk) to a relatively high (e.g., keep more than \$10 extra change returned by a store clerk) degree of severity. Analyses should be conducted comparing people's likelihood to commit lower and higher levels of the same violation.

Small sample size was a concern for both experiments. Experiment 1 used standard psychology department procedures to recruit participants, yet few students signed up. The low sign-up rate was unanticipated given the research topic should have especially appealed to this institution's student body. In addition, data cleansing detected 11 outliers, the removal of which further reduced sample size. Some of the excluded mild outliers may have been retained had the recommended number of participants been obtained. Experiment 2 had no recruitment or outlier issues; it simply had less than the ideal number of participants. Additional research with larger sample sizes to increase power is needed to verify the results of both experiments.

Caution should be taken generalizing the results of both experiments to other populations. For Experiment 1, Kansas State University students' high conservatism and religiosity makes the results generalizability questionable. Conservatives notion of what constitutes immoral behavior usually encompasses a larger range of behaviors (e.g., sex outside of marriage is wrong). Additionally, conservatives' higher emphasis on maintaining social order generally equates with law obedience. Thus, conservatives may consider more of the minor moral/legal violations as wrongful and law abidance so important that they have less tendency to engage in the minor moral/legal violations than

would liberals. As for Experiment 2, participant age may somewhat limit generalizability. Young adults can differ from their elders in perceptions of what constitutes ethical behavior and attitudes toward illegal behavior. Younger adults consider some behaviors moral (e.g., digital piracy) that older adults regard immoral. Younger adults also tend to have more approving attitudes toward minor legal violations (e.g., speeding) than older adults. Thus, college students may have greater initial willingness to participate in some behaviors deemed unacceptable by older generations. Consequently, college students could be more influenced by inflated social norms for certain minor moral/legal violations included on the dependent variable questionnaire than older generations. Future research using a more liberal, less religious (Experiment 1) and more age diverse (Experiment 2) sample is recommended.

### **Implications**

Parental, religious, and personal values should be considered in efforts to reduce minor moral/legal transgressions. An efficacious method of decreasing unwanted behavior is public service announcements. Public service announcements are messages disseminated via the media to inform or educate the public about a social issue with the intention of creating widespread behavior change. Creating public service announcements informing parents about issues effecting children is a commonplace practice. The Ad Council partnered with federal government agencies regularly release nationwide public service announcements addressing parenting topics including disease prevention, fatherhood involvement, and child safety among others. At state level, in 2013 California launched the “Talk. Read. Sing.” campaign informing parents verbally communicating with children under age 5 is necessary for normal brain development.

Given children first learn values at home, public service announcements might be created educating parents about their important role in children internalizing values discouraging problematic behavior.

Perceived social norms ratings affected a person's likelihood to commit multiple relatively unstudied minor moral/legal violations. Social norm interventions, especially social norms marketing campaigns, may be a viable option for reducing commonplace minor moral/legal violations. Social norms marketing campaigns use media channels to distribute actual norms to the public in order to correct misperceived norms. Properly designed social norms marketing campaigns can effectively change the public's perceived norms and resultant behavior (Perkins, Linkenbach, Lewis, & Neighbors, 2010). In Montana, researchers implemented a statewide social norms media marketing campaign aimed at reducing drunk driving among young adults (Perkins et al., 2010). Following intervention, young adults in the intervention counties thought the average Montanan their same age drove drunk significantly less often compared to those in the control counties. Self-reported drunk driving dropped in the intervention counties. Similarly, to reduce theft retail stores might benefit from social norms marketing campaigns emphasizing most customers do not shoplift. Social norms marketing campaigns reporting the number of drivers who stop for a pedestrian waiting to cross the street might lower both pedestrian fatalities and injuries.

In sum, minor moral and/or legal crimes cost local, state, and federal governments billions annually. Consequently, better understanding the role value sources and social norms play in minor moral/legal violations financially benefits the U.S. economy. Our two experiments found both value sources and social norms affected people's likelihood

of committing several commonplace minor moral/legal violations. These results suggest interventions targeting value sources (public service announcements) and social norms (social norms marketing campaigns) might effectively reduce such unwanted behavior. Both public service announcements and social norms marketing campaign interventions are capable of reaching large segments of the general public to produce widespread behavior change. However, given these are preliminary experimental findings, much additional research is necessary before designing interventions of either type to reduce minor moral/legal violations can be undertaken.

## References

- Åberg, L., Larsen, L., Glad, A., & Beilinsson, L. (1997). Observed vehicle speed and drivers' perceived speed of others. *Applied Psychological International Review*, 46, 287 – 302.
- Åberg, L., & Warner, H. W. (2008). Speeding – deliberate violation or involuntary mistake? *Revue européenne de psychologie appliquée*, 58, 23 – 30.
- Agostinelli, G., Brown, J. M., & Miller, W. R. (1995). Effects of normative feedback on consumption among heavy drinking college students. *Journal of Drug Education*, 25, 31 – 40.
- Albrecht, S. L., Chadwick, B. A., & Alcorn, D. S. (1977). Religiosity and deviance: Application of an attitude-behavior contingent consistency model. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion*, 16, 263 – 274.
- Alfonso, J. (2015). The role of social norms in personalized alcohol feedback: A dismantling study with emerging adults. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse*, 24, 379 – 386.
- Allmon, D. E., Page, D., & Roberts, R. (2000). Determinants of perceptions of cheating: Ethical orientation, personality, and demographics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 23, 411 – 422.

- Alm, J., McClelland, G. H., & Schulze, W. D. (1999). Changing the social norm of tax compliance by voting. *Kyklos*, *52*, 141 – 171.
- Andrews, J. A., Tildesley, E., Hops, H., & Li, F. (2002). The influence of peers on young adult substance use. *Health Psychology*, *21*, 349 – 357.
- Armfield, G. G., & Holbert, R. L. (2003). The relationship between religiosity and internet use. *Journal of Media and Religion*, *2*, 129 – 144.
- Arnett, J. J. (1992). Musical preferences and reckless behavior among adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *7*, 313 – 331.
- Bagchi, K. K., Udo, G. J., Kirs, P. J., & Choden, K. (2015). Internet use and human values: Analyses of developing and developed countries. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *50*, 76 – 90.
- Balkin, R. S., Perepiczka, M., Whitely, R., & Kimbrough, S. (2009). The relationship of sexual values and emotional awareness to sexual activity in young adulthood. *Adultspan Journal*, *8*, 17 – 28.
- Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength of structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*, 1207 – 1220.

- Bargh, J. A., & Chartrand, T. L. (2000). Studying the mind in the middle: A practical guide to priming and automaticity research. In H. Reis & C. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social psychology* (pp. 235 – 285). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Barnett, M. A., Sanborn, F. W., & Shane, A. C. (2005). Factors associated with individuals' likelihood of engaging in minor moral and legal violations. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 27*, 77 – 84.
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2004). *The social norms approach: Theory, research, and annotated bibliography*. Retrieved June 29, 2016, from [http://www.alanberkowitz.com/articles/social\\_norms.pdf](http://www.alanberkowitz.com/articles/social_norms.pdf)
- Best, H., & Mayerl, J. (2013). Values, beliefs, attitudes: An empirical study of the structure of environmental concern and recycling behavior. *Social Science Quarterly, 94*, 691 – 714.
- Beullens, K., Roe, K., & Van den Bulck, J. (2011a). Excellent gamer, excellent driver? The impact of adolescents' video game playing on driving behavior: A two-wave panel study. *Accident Analysis and Prevention, 43*, 58 – 65.
- Beullens, K., Roe, K., & Van den Bulck, J. (2011b). The impact of adolescents' news and action movie viewing on risky driving behavior: A longitudinal study. *Human Communication Research, 37*, 488 – 508.

- Beullens, K., Roe, K., & Van den Bulck, J. (2011c). The portrayal of risk-taking in traffic: A content analysis of popular action movies. *Journal of Communications Research, 2*, 21 – 27.
- Beullens, K., Roe, K., & Van den Bulck, J. (2012). Music video viewing as a marker of driving after the consumption of alcohol. *Substance Use & Misuse, 47*, 155 – 165.
- Bianchi, A., & Summala, H. (2004). The “genetics” of driving behavior: Parents’ driving style predicts their children’s driving style. *Accident Analysis and Prevention, 36*, 655 – 659.
- Bleakley, A., Hennessy, M., Fishbein, M., & Jordan, A. (2009). How sources of sexual information relate to adolescents’ beliefs about sex. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 33*, 37 – 48.
- Bloodgood, J. M., Turnley, W. H., & Mudrack, P. (2008). The influence of ethics instruction, religiosity, and intelligence on cheating behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 82*, 557 – 571.
- Bobek, D. D., Roberts, R. W., & Sweeney, J. T. (2007). The social norms of tax compliance: Evidence from Australia, Singapore, and the United States. *Journal of Business Ethics, 74*, 49 – 64.

- Bobkowski, P. S. (2009). Adolescent religiosity and selective exposure to television. *Journal of Media and Religion*, 8, 55 – 70.
- Bond, B. J., & Drogos, K. L. (2014). Sex on the shore: Wishful identification and parasocial relationships as mediators in the relationship between Jersey Shore exposure and emerging adults' sexual attitudes and behaviors. *Media Psychology*, 17, 102 – 126.
- Brown, S. L. (1998). Associations between peer drink driving, peer attitudes toward drink driving, and personal drink driving. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 423 – 436.
- Bryant, J., & Rockwell, S. C. (1994). Effects of massive exposure to sexually oriented prime-time television programming on adolescents' moral judgment. In D. Zillmann, J. Bryant, & A. C. Huston (Eds.), *Media, children, and the family: Social scientific, psychodynamic, and clinical perspectives* (pp. 183 – 195). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Burke, A., Van Olphen, J., Eliason, M., Howell, R., & Gonzales, A. (2014). Re-examining religiosity as a protective factor: Comparing alcohol use by self-identified religious, spiritual, and secular college students. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 53, 305 – 316.

- Callister, M., Coyne, S. M., Stern, L. A., Stockdale, L., Miller, M. J., & Wells, B. M. (2012). A content analysis of the prevalence and portrayal of sexual activity in adolescent literature. *Journal of Sex Research, 49*, 477 – 486.
- Callister, M., Stern, L. A., Coyne, S. M., Robinson, T., & Bennion, E. (2011). Evaluation of sexual content in teen-centered films from 1980 to 2007. *Mass Communications and Society, 14*, 454 – 474.
- Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., & Schwartz, S. H. (2012). Why people do not vote: The role of personal values. *European Psychologist, 17*, 266 – 278.
- Carlson, W. L., & Klein, D. (1970). Familial vs. institutional socialization of the young traffic offender. *Journal of Safety Research, 2*, 13 – 25.
- Center on Alcohol Marketing and Youth. (2010). *Youth exposure to alcohol advertising on television, 2001 – 2009*. Retrieved June 2, 2015, from [http://www.camy.org/research/ Youth Exposure to Alcohol Ads on TV Growing Faster Than Adults/ includes/TVReport01-09 Revised 7-12.pdf](http://www.camy.org/research/Youth%20Exposure%20to%20Alcohol%20Ads%20on%20TV%20Growing%20Faster%20Than%20Adults/includes/TVReport01-09%20Revised%207-12.pdf)
- Chadwick, B. A., & Top, B. L. (1993). Religiosity and delinquency among LDS adolescents. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 32*, 51 – 67.
- Chen, M. J., Grube, J. W., Nygaard, P., & Miller, B. A. (2008). Identifying social mechanisms for the prevention of adolescent drinking and driving. *Accident Analysis and Prevention, 40*, 576 – 585.

- Chernoff, R. A., & Davison, G. C. (2005). An evaluation of a brief HIV/AIDS prevention intervention for college students using normative feedback and goal setting. *AIDS Education and Prevention, 17*, 91 – 104.
- Cialdini, R. B., Reno, R. R., & Kallgren, C. A. (1990). A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 1015 – 1026.
- Conner, M., Lawton, R., Parker, D., Chorlton, K., Manstead, A. S. R., & Stradling, S. (2007). Application of the theory of planned behavior to the prediction of objectively assessed breaking of posted speed limits. *British Journal of Psychology, 98*, 429 – 453.
- Conner, M., Smith, N., & McMillan, B. (2003). Examining normative pressure in the theory of planned behavior: Impact of gender and passengers on intentions to break the speed limit. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, Social, 22*, 252 – 263.
- Cranwell, J., Murray, R., Lewis, S., Leonardi-Bee, J., Dockrell, M., & Britton, J. (2014). Adolescents' exposure to tobacco and alcohol content in YouTube music videos. *Addiction, 110*, 703 – 711.
- Cronan, T. P., & Al-Rafee, S. (2008). Factors that influence the intention to pirate software and media. *Journal of Business Ethics, 78*, 527 – 545.

- Curran, P. J., Stice, E., & Chassin, L. (1997). The relation between adolescent alcohol use and peer alcohol use: A longitudinal random coefficients model. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65*, 130 – 140.
- Dal Cin, S., Worth, K. A., Dalton, M. A., & Sargent, J. D. (2008). Youth exposure to alcohol use and brand appearances in popular contemporary movies. *Addiction, 103*, 1925 – 1932.
- Davies, J. J. (2007). Uses and dependency of entertainment television among Mormon young adults. *Journal of Media and Religion, 6*, 133 – 148.
- Dennis, D. L., Cox, W., Black, A., & Muller, S. (2009). The influence of religiosity and spirituality on drinking behaviors: Differences between students attending two southern universities. *Journal of Drug Education, 39*, 95 – 112.
- De Pelsmacker, P., & Janssens, W. (2007). The effect of norms, attitudes and habits on speeding behavior: Scale development and model building and estimation. *Accident Analysis and Prevention, 39*, 6 – 15.
- Dittus, P. J., & Jaccard, J. (2000). Adolescents' perceptions of maternal disapproval of sex: Relationship to sexual outcomes. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 26*, 268 – 278.

- Dittus, P. J., Jaccard, J., & Gordon, V. V. (1996). Maternal correlates of adolescent sexual and contraceptive behavior. *Family Planning Perspectives, 28*, 159 – 185.
- Dittus, P. J., Jaccard, J., & Gordon, V. V. (1997). The impact of African American fathers on adolescent sexual behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 26*, 445 – 465.
- Dotson, K. B., Dunn, M. E., & Bowers, C. A. (2015). Stand-alone personalized normative feedback for college student drinkers: A meta-analytic review, 2004 to 2014. *PLoS ONE, 10*(10). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139518
- Donnelly, J., Goldfarb, E., Duncan, D. F., Young, M., Eadie, C., & Castiglisa, D. (1999). Self-esteem and sex attitudes as predictors of sexual abstinence by inner-city early adolescents. *North American Journal of Psychology, 1*, 205 – 212.
- Eberhardt, D., Rice, N. D., & Smith, L. D. (2003). Effects of Greek membership on academic integrity, alcohol abuse, and risky sexual behavior at a small college. *NASPA Journal, 41*, 135 – 146.
- Eyal, B. G., & Liberman, N. (2012). Morality and Psychological Distance: A construal level theory perspective. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *The social psychology of morality: Exploring the causes of good and evil* (pp. 185 – 202). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Farrar, K., Kunkel, D., Biely, E., Eyal, K., Fandrich, R., & Donnerstein, E. (2003). Sexual messages during prime-time programming. *Sexuality and Culture*, 7, 7 – 37.
- Feather, N. T. (1995). Values, valences, and choice: The influence of values on the perceived attractiveness and choice of alternatives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 1135 – 1151.
- Ferguson, S. A., Williams, A. F., Chapline, J. F., Reinfurt, D. W., & DeLeonardis, D. M. (2001). Relationship of parent driving records to the driving records of their children. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 33, 229 – 234.
- Fernquist, R. M. (1995). A research note on the association between religion and delinquency. *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 16, 167 – 175.
- Fischer, J., Aydin, N., Kastenmüller, A., Frey, D., & Fischer, P. (2012). The delinquent media effect: Delinquency-reinforcing video games increase players attitudinal and behavioral inclination toward delinquent behavior. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 1, 1 – 5.
- Foxcroft, D. R., & Lowe, G. (1997). Adolescents' alcohol use and misuse: The socializing influence of perceived family life. *Drugs: Education, Prevention, and Policy*, 4, 215 – 229.

- Fugère, M. A., Leszczynski, J. P., & Cousins, A. J. (2014). *The social psychology of attraction and romantic relationships*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Geisner, I., Mittmann, A., Sheng, E., Herring, T., Lewis, M., & Lee, C. (2015). Understanding college student spring break drinking: Demographic considerations, perceived norms, and travel characteristics. *Addiction Research & Theory, 23*, 238 – 245.
- Gino, F., Ayal, S., & Ariely, D. (2009). Contagion and differentiation in unethical behavior. *Psychological Science, 20*, 393 – 398.
- Goles, T., Jayatilaka, B., George, B., Parsons, L., Chambers, V., Taylor, D., & Brune, R. (2008). Softlifting: Exploring determinants of attitude. *Journal of Business Ethics, 77*, 481 – 499.
- Gollwitzer, P. M., Heckhausen, H., & Steller, B. (1990). Deliberative and implemental mind-sets: Cognitive tuning toward congruous thoughts and information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 1119 – 1127.
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 1029 – 1046.

- Gruber, E. L., Thau, H. M., Hill, D. L., Fisher, D. A., & Grube, J. W. (2005). Alcohol, tobacco and illicit substances in music videos: A content analysis of prevalence and genre. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 37*, 81 – 83.
- Gunasekera, H., Chapman, S., & Campbell, S. (2005). Sex and drugs in popular movies: An analysis of the top 200 films. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 98*, 464 – 470.
- Haglund, M., & Åberg, L. (2000). Speed choice in relation to speed limit and influences from other drivers. *Transportation Research Part F, 3*, 39 – 51.
- Hahnel, U. J. J., Gölz, S., & Spada, H. (2014). How does green suit me? Consumers mentally match perceived product attributes with their domain-specific motives when making green purchase decisions. *Journal of Consumer Behavior, 13*, 317 – 327.
- Hanway, S., & Lyons, L. (2003). *Gallup: Teens OK with letting music downloads play*. Retrieved November 8, 2016, from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/9373/teens-letting-music-downloads-play.aspx>
- Harding, T. S., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., & Carpenter, D. D. (2007). The theory of planned behavior as a model of academic dishonesty in engineering and humanities undergraduates. *Ethics and Behavior, 17*, 255 – 279.

- Hayes, B. C. (1995). The impact of religious identification on political attitudes: An international comparison. *Sociology of Religion*, *56*, 177 – 194.
- Herd, D. (2014). Changes in the prevalence of alcohol in rap music lyrics 1979 – 2009. *Substance Use & Misuse*, *49*, 333 – 342.
- Homer, P. M., & Kahle, L. R. (1988). A structural equation test of the value-attitude-behavior hierarchy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 638 – 646.
- Hull, J. G., Draghici, A. M., & Sargent, J. D. (2012). A longitudinal study of risk-glorifying video games and reckless driving. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, *1*, 244 – 253.
- Internal Revenue Service. (2012). *IRS releases new tax gap estimates; Compliance rates remain statistically unchanged from previous study*. Retrieved October 26, 2015, from <https://www.irs.gov/uac/IRS-Releases-New-Tax-Gap-Estimates;-Compliance-Rates-Remain-Statistically-Unchanged-From-Previous-Study>
- Jakovcevic, A., & Steg, L. (2013). Sustainable transportation in Argentina: Values, beliefs, norms and car use reduction. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behavior*, *20*, 70 – 79.
- Joshi, S. P., Peter, J., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2014). A cross-cultural content-analytic comparison of the hookup culture in U.S. and Dutch teen girl magazines. *Journal of Sex Research*, *51*, 291 – 302.

Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification. In T. Parsons & E. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action* (pp. 388 – 433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Koljatic, M., Silva, M., & Ardiles, J. (2003). Are students perceptions of parental acceptance of academic dishonesty associated with its occurrence? *Psychological Reports, 93*, 93 – 97.

Kopanidis, F. A., & Shaw, M. J. (2014). Courses and careers: Measuring how students' personal values matter. *Education & Training, 56*, 397 – 413.

Lefkowitz, E. S., Gillen, M. H., Shearer, C. L., & Boone, T. L. (2004). Religiosity, sexual behaviors, and sexual attitudes during emerging adulthood. *The Journal of Sex Research, 41*, 150 – 159.

Lewis, M. A., Litt, D. M., Cronce, J. M., Blayney, J. A., & Gilmore, A. K. (2014). Underestimating protection and overestimating risk: Examining descriptive normative perceptions and their association with drinking and sexual behaviors. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*, 86 – 96.

- Lewis, M. A., Patrick, M. E., Litt, D. M., Atkins, D. C., Kim, T., Blayney, J. A., Norris, J., George, W. H., & Larimer, M. E. (2014). Randomized controlled trial of a web-based personalized normative feedback intervention to reduce alcohol-related risky sexual behavior among college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 82*, 429 – 440.
- Lewis, M. A., Patrick, M. E., Mittmann, A., & Kaysen, D. L. (2014). Sex on the beach: The influence of social norms and trip companion on spring break sexual behavior. *Prevention Science, 15*, 408 – 418.
- Lynch, J. F., Mowrey, R. J., Nesbitt, G. M., & O’Neil, D. F. (2004). Risky business: Misperceived norms of sexual behavior among college students. *NASPA Journal, 42*, 21 – 35.
- Lyons, A., McNeill, A., Gilmore, I., & Britton, J. (2011). Alcohol imagery and branding, and age classification of films popular in the UK. *International Journal of Epidemiology, 40*, 1411 – 1419.
- Manago, A. M., Ward, L. M., & Aldana, A. (2015). The sexual experiences of Latino young adults in college and their perceptions of values about sex communicated by their parents and friends. *Emerging Adulthood, 3*, 14 – 23.
- Manstead, A. S. R., Parker, D., Stradling, S. G., Reason, J. T., & Baxter, J. S. (1992). Perceived consensus in estimates of the prevalence of driving errors and violations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22*, 509 – 530.

- Mattern, J. L., & Neighbors, C. (2004). Social norms campaigns: Examining the relationship between changes in perceived norms and changes in drinking levels. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 65*, 489 – 494.
- McCabe, D. L., & Bowers, W. J. (1996). The relationship between cheating and college fraternity or sorority membership. *NASPA Journal, 33*, 280 – 291.
- McNeely, C., Shew, M. L., Beuhring, T., Sieving, R., Miller, B. C., & Blum, R. W. (2002). Mothers' influence on the timing of first sex among 14- and 15-year-olds. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 31*, 256 – 265.
- Middleton, R., & Putney, S. (1962). Religion, normative standards, and behavior. *Sociometry, 25*, 141 – 152.
- Miranda, D., & Claes, M. (2004). Rap music genres and deviant behaviors in French-Canadian adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 33*, 113 – 122.
- Mitchell, C. E., Tanner, J. F., & Raymond, M. A. (2004). Adolescents' perceptions of factors influencing values and sexual initiation: Implications for social marketing initiatives. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 12*, 29 – 49.
- Moncher, F. J., & Miller, G. E. (1999). Nondelinquent youths stealing behavior and their perceptions of parents, school, and peers. *Adolescents, 34*, 577 – 591.

Morgan, E. M., & Zurbriggen, E. L. (2012). Changes in sexual values and their sources over the first year of college. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 27*, 471 – 497.

Motion Picture Association of America. (2015). *Theatrical market statistics 2014*.

Retrieved June 4, 2015, from <http://www.mpa.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/MPAA-Theatrical-Market-Statistics-2014.pdf>

Nalkur, P. G., Jamieson, P. E., & Romer, D. (2010). The effectiveness of Motion Picture Association of America's rating system in screening explicit violence and sex in top-ranked movies from 1950 to 2006. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 47*, 440 – 447.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2013). *2011 national survey of speeding attitudes and behavior*. Retrieved November 3, 2016, from [http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/communications/pdf/2011\\_N\\_Survey\\_of\\_Speeding\\_Attitudes\\_and\\_Behaviors\\_811865.pdf](http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/communications/pdf/2011_N_Survey_of_Speeding_Attitudes_and_Behaviors_811865.pdf)

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2014). *Traffic safety facts 2012 data*.

Retrieved October 26, 2015, from <http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/812021.pdf>

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2015a). *The economic and societal impact of motor vehicle crashes, 2010*. Retrieved October 31, 2015, from

<http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/812013.pdf>

- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2015b). *Traffic safety facts 2013 data*. Retrieved October 26, 2015, from <http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/812162.pdf>
- National Retail Federation. (2015). *National retail security survey 2015*. Retrieved October 28, 2015, from <https://nrf.com/resources/retail-library/national-retail-security-survey-2015>
- Neighbors, C., Dillard, A. J., Lewis, M. A., Bergstrom, R. L., & Neil, T. A. (2006). Normative misperceptions and temporal precedence of perceived norms and drinking. *Journal of Studies in Alcohol, 67*, 290 – 299.
- Neighbors, C., Larimer, M. E., & Lewis, M. A. (2004). Targeting misperceptions of descriptive drinking norms: Efficacy of a computer-delivered personalized normative feedback intervention. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72*, 434 – 447.
- Neighbors, C., Lewis, M. A., LaBrie, J., DiBello, A. M., Young, C. M., Rinker, D. V., Litt, D., Rodriguez, L. M., Knee, C. R., Hamor, E., Jerabeck, J. M., & Larimer, M. E. (2016). A multisite randomized trial of normative feedback for heavy drinking: Social comparison versus social comparison plus correction of normative misperceptions. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 84*, 238 – 247.

- Neighbors, C., Oster-Aaland, L., Bergstrom, R. L., & Lewis, M. A. (2006). Event- and context-specific normative misperceptions and high-risk drinking: 21<sup>st</sup> birthday celebrations and football tailgating. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *67*, 282 – 289.
- Nejati, M., & Moghaddam, P. P. (2013). The effect of hedonic and utilitarian values on satisfaction and behavioral intentions for dining in fast-casual restaurants in Iran. *British Food Journal*, *115*, 1583 – 1596.
- Nielsen. (2014). *Multi-platform gaming: For the win!* Retrieved June 4, 2015, from <http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/news/2014/multi-platform-gaming-for-the-win.html>
- Nielsen. (2015). *The total audience report: Q4 2014*. Retrieved June 4, 2015, from <http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/reports/2015/the-total-audience-report-q4-2014.html>
- Padilla-Walker, L. M. (2006). “Peers I can monitor, it’s media that really worries me!” Parental cognitions as predictors of proactive parental strategy choice. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *21*, 56 – 82.
- Paradise, J. N., Cote, J., Minsky, S., Lourenco, A., & Howland, J. (2001). Personal values and sexual decision-making among virginal and sexually experienced urban adolescent girls. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *28*, 404 – 409.

- Parker, D., Manstead, A. S. R., & Stradling, S. G. (1995). Extending the theory of planned behaviour: The role of personal norm. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 34*, 127 – 137.
- Passow, H. J., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., Harding, T. S., & Carpenter, D. D. (2006). Factors influencing engineering students' decisions to cheat by type of assessment. *Research in Higher Education, 47*, 643 – 684.
- Patrick, M. E., & Lee, C. M. (2010). Sexual motivations and engagement in sexual behavior during the transition to college. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 39*, 674 – 681.
- Patrick, M. E., Lee, C. M., & Neighbors, C. (2014). Web-based intervention to change perceived norms of college student alcohol use and sexual behavior on spring break. *Addictive Behaviors, 39*, 600 – 606.
- Pedersen, E. R., Neighbors, C., & LaBrie, J. W. (2010). College students' perceptions of class year-specific drinking norms. *Addictive Behavior, 35*, 290 – 293.
- Perkins, H. W., & Berkowitz, A. D. (1986). Perceiving the community norms of alcohol use among students: Some research implications for campus alcohol education programming. *International Journal of the Addictions, 21*, 961 – 976.

- Perkins, H. W., Linkenbach, J. W., Lewis, M. A., & Neighbors, C. (2010). Effectiveness of social norms media marketing in reducing drinking and driving: A statewide campaign. *Addictive Behaviors, 35*, 866 – 874.
- Peters, S. J. (2012). *Let's talk about sex: The influence of a sexy media diet on college freshmen's endorsement of the hookup culture, peer influence, and behaviors regarding casual sex and sexual risk taking* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Accession Order No. 3534013)
- Phua, J. J. (2013). The reference group perspective for smoking cessation: An examination of the influence of social norms and social identification with reference groups on smoking cessation self-efficacy. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 27*, 102 – 112.
- Pollio, H. R., Humphreys, W. L., & Eison, J. A. (1991). Patterns of parental reactions to student grades. *Higher Education, 22*, 31 – 42.
- Primack, B. A., Gold, M. A., Schwarz, E. B., & Dalton, M. A. (2008). Degrading and non-degrading sex in popular music: A content analysis. *Public Health Reports, 123*, 593 – 600.
- Reifman, A., Barnes, G. M., Dintcheff, B. A., Farrell, M. P., & Uhteg, L. (1998). Parental and peer influences on the onset of heavier drinking among adolescents. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 59*, 311 – 317.

- Remple, S. R., & Burris, C. T. (2015). Personal values as predictors of donor- versus recipient-focused organizational helping philosophies. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 44*, 181 – 191.
- Ren, W. (2013). *The portrayal of risk-taking behaviors in traffic on the prime-time television series* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Accession Order No. 1545650)
- Rettinger, D. A., & Jordan, A. E. (2005). The relations among religion, motivation, and college cheating: A natural experiment. *Ethics and Behavior, 15*, 107 – 129.
- Ridout, B., & Campbell, A. (2014). Using Facebook to deliver a social norm intervention to reduce problem drinking at university. *Drug and Alcohol Review, 33*, 667 – 673.
- Robinson, E., Amburgey, R., Swank, E., & Faulkner, C. (2004). Test cheating in a rural college: Studying the importance of individual and situational factors. *College Student Journal, 38*, 380 – 395.
- Rodriguez, L. M., Neighbors, C., & Foster, D. W. (2014). Priming effects of self-reported drinking and religiosity. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 28*, 1 – 9.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.

- Russell, C. A., & Russell, D. W. (2009). Alcohol messages in prime-time television series. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, *43*, 108 – 128.
- Sargent, J. D., Wills, T. A., Stoolmiller, M., Gibson, J., & Gibbons, F. X. (2006). Alcohol use in motion pictures and its relation with early-onset teen drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *67*, 54 – 65.
- Schwartz, S. (1996). Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario symposium* (pp. 1 – 24). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Schwartz, S. (2012). *An overview of the Schwartz Value Theory of basic values*. Retrieved November 24, 2015, from <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1116&content=orpc>
- Schwartz, S. H., & Butenko, T. (2014). Values and behavior: Validating the refined value theory in Russia. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *44*, 799 – 813.
- Selfhout, M. H. W., Delsing, M. J. M. H., ter Bogt, T. F. M., & Meeus, W. H. J. (2008). Heavy metal and hip-hop style preferences and externalizing problem behavior: A two-wave longitudinal study. *Youth & Society*, *39*, 435 – 452.

- Sevgili, F., & Cesur, S. (2014). The mediating role of materialism on the relationship between values and consumption. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 14, 2083 – 2096.
- Siegel, M., Johnson, R. M., Tyagi, K., Power, K., Lohsen, M. C., Ayers, A. J., & Jernigan, D. H. (2013). Alcohol brand references in U.S. popular music, 2009 – 2011. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 48, 1475 – 1484.
- Sieving, R. E., Perry, C. L., & Williams, C. L. (2000). Do friendships change behaviors, or do behaviors change friendships? Examining paths of influence in young adolescents' alcohol use. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 26, 27 – 35.
- Siwek, S. E. (2007). *The true cost of copyright industry piracy to the U.S. economy*. Retrieved October 29, 2015, from [http://www.ipi.org/docLib/20120515\\_CopyrightPiracy.pdf](http://www.ipi.org/docLib/20120515_CopyrightPiracy.pdf)
- Statista. (2015a). *Netflix: Monthly number of viewed videos 2013*. Retrieved June 6, 2015, from <http://www.statista.com/statistics/325045/netflix-number-viewed-videos/>
- Statista. (2015b). *Redbox: Number of kiosk rentals 2010 – 2014*. Retrieved June 4, 2015, from <http://www.statista.com/statistics/296377/redbox-number-kiosk-rentals/>

- Stroch, E. A., & Stroch, J. B. (2002). Fraternities, sororities, and academic dishonesty. *College Student Journal*, 36, 247 – 252.
- Stroch, J. B., Stroch, E. A., & Clark, P. (2002). Academic dishonesty and neutralization theory: A comparison of intercollegiate athletes and nonathletes. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43, 921 – 930.
- Talbott, L. L., Martin, R. J., Usdan, S. L., Leeper, J. D., Umstattd, M., Cremeens, J. L., & Geiger, B. F. (2008). Drinking likelihood, alcohol problems, and peer influence among first-year college students. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 34, 433 – 440.
- Tao, L., & Au, W. (2014). Values, self and other-regarding behavior in the dictator game. *Rationality and Society*, 26, 46 – 72.
- The Pew Internet & American Life Project. (2003). *Music downloading, file-sharing, and copyright*. Retrieved November 8, 2016, from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2003/07/31/music-downloading-file-sharing-and-copyright/>
- The Princeton Review. (2017). *Most conservative students*. Retrieved December 20, 2016, from <https://www.princetonreview.com/college-rankings?rankings=most-conservative-students>

The Princeton Review. (2017). *Most religious students*. Retrieved December 20, 2016, from <https://www.princetonreview.com/college-rankings?rankings=most-religious-students>

Tonglet, M. (2001). Consumer misbehavior: An exploratory study of shoplifting. *Journal of Consumer Behavior, 1*, 336 – 354.

Torelli, C. J., & Kaikati, A. M. (2009). Values as predictors of judgments and behaviors: The role of abstract and concrete mindsets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 231 – 247.

Trinh, S. L., Ward, L. M., Day, K., Thomas, K., & Levin, D. (2014). Contributions of divergent peer and parental sexual messages to Asian American college students' sexual behaviors. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*, 208 – 220.

Turner, J. S. (2011). Sex and the spectacle of music videos: An examination of the portrayal of race and sexuality in music videos. *Sex Roles, 64*, 173 – 191.

Uecker, J. E. (2008). Religion, pledging, and premarital sexual behavior in married young adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 70*, 728 – 744.

Van den Bulck, J., & Beullens, K. (2005). Television and music video exposure and adolescent alcohol use while going out. *Alcohol & Alcoholism, 40*, 249 – 253.

- Van Houten, R., & Nau, P. A. (1983). Feedback interventions and driving speed: A parametric and comparative analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 16*, 253 – 281.
- Van Houten, R., Nau, P., & Marini, Z. (1980). An analysis of public posting in reducing speeding behavior on an urban highway. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 13*, 383 – 395.
- Vecchione, M., Schwartz, S. H., Caprara, G. V., Schoen, H., Ciecuch, J., Silvester, J., et al. (2015). Personal values and political activism: A cross-national study. *British Journal of Psychology, 106*, 84 – 106.
- Verplanken, B., & Holland, R. (2002). Motivated decision making: Effects of activation and self-centrality of values on choices and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 434 – 447.
- Ward, L. M., & Friedman, K. (2006). Using TV as a guide: Associations between television viewing and adolescents' sexual attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Research on Adolescents, 16*, 133 – 156.
- Welch, M. R., Xu, Y., Bjarnason, T., Petee, T., O'Donnell, P., & Magro, P. (2005). “But everybody does it ...”: The effects of perception, moral pressures, and informal sanctions on tax cheating. *Sociological Spectrum, 25*, 21 – 52.

- Wells, G. M. (2010). The effect of religiosity and campus alcohol culture on collegiate alcohol consumption. *Journal of American College Health, 58*, 295 – 304.
- Wenzel, M. (2005a). Misperceptions of social norms about tax compliance: From theory to intervention. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 26*, 862 – 883.
- Wenzel, M. (2005b). Motivation or rationalization? Causal relations between ethics, norms, and tax compliance. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 26*, 491 – 508.
- Williams, A. E., & Janosik, S. M. (2007). An examination of academic dishonesty among sorority and nonsorority women. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*, 706 – 714.
- Wills, T. A., & Clearly, S. D. (1999). Peer and adolescent substance use among 6<sup>th</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup> graders: Latent growth analyses of influence versus selection mechanisms. *Health Psychology, 18*, 453 – 463.
- Wood, M. D., Read, J. P., Mitchell, R. E., & Brand, N. H. (2004). Do parents still matter? Parent and peer influences on alcohol involvement among recent high school graduates. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 18*, 19 – 30.
- Woodroof, J. T. (1985). Premarital sexual behavior and religious adolescents. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24*, 343 – 366.

Wrapson, W., Harre, N., & Murrell, P. (2006). Reduction in drive speed using posted feedback of speeding information: Social comparison or implied surveillance? *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, *38*, 1119 – 1126.

Wright, P. J. (2009). Sexual socialization messages in mainstream entertainment mass media: A review and synthesis. *Sexuality & Culture*, *13*, 181 – 200.

Zaidel, D. M. (1992). A modeling perspective on the culture of driving. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, *24*, 585 – 597.

## Appendix A - Value Source Scale

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine how *you personally, your parents, your peers, the media or your religion* think(s) you should act if you were given the opportunity to engage in a variety of moral violations. Using the scale below, please write in the blank to the left of each item the one number that best reflects *your personal, your parents', your peers', the media's or your religion's* opinion of how you should act if you were given the opportunity to engage in that moral violation.

	NEVER ACCEPTABLE TO DO		SOMEWHAT ACCEPTABLE TO DO		ALWAYS ACCEPTABLE TO DO
	0	1	2	3	4
1					
	keep <u>\$10</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account				
2					
	keep <u>\$20</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account				
3					
	keep <u>\$50</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account				
4					
	keep <u>\$100 or more</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account				
5					
	give yourself a <u>slightly better</u> score on some game (e.g., miniature golf) than you actually earned				
6					
	give yourself a <u>much better</u> score on some game (e.g., miniature golf) than you actually earned				
7					
	take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>less than \$1</u>				
8					
	take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u>				
9					
	take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u>				
10					
	take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>more than \$50</u>				
11					
	copy a CD for personal use that is copyrighted				
12					
	drive away without notifying the owner after <u>scratching</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot				
13					
	drive away without notifying the owner after <u>denting</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot				
14					
	drive away without notifying the owner after <u>severely damaging</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot				
15					
	pay someone else to do an assignment for a course that you would turn in as your own				

- 16  violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) a little so as to increase your chances of winning
- 17  violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) a lot so as to increase your chances of winning
- 18  not stop for a person waiting to cross the street in a pedestrian crosswalk
- 19  turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about a quarter of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 20  turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about half of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 21  turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about three quarters of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 22  turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although all of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 23  fail to report that you were undercharged less than \$1 on some purchase
- 24  fail to report that you were undercharged \$1 - \$10 on some purchase
- 25  fail to report that you were undercharged \$11 - \$50 on some purchase
- 26  fail to report that you were undercharged more than \$50 on some purchase
- 27  list an accomplishment or award on your resume that you did not earn
- 28  buy a term paper from a website that you would turn in as your own
- 29  take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth less than \$1
- 30  take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth \$1 - \$10
- 31  take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth \$11 - \$50
- 32  take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth more than \$50
- 33  use one or two of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 34  use several of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 35  use all of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 36  download a copyrighted song from the Internet
- 37  download a copyrighted album from the Internet
- 38  download a copyrighted software from the Internet
- 39  put in less than your equal portion of the money when pitching in to pay for a meal shared by several individuals
- 40  keep something that you intended to purchase worth less than \$1 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 41  keep something that you intended to purchase worth \$1 - \$10 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 42  keep something that you intended to purchase worth \$11 - \$50 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 43  keep something that you intended to purchase worth more than \$50 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 44  turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was partially taken from another student's work
- 45  turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was completely taken from another student's work
- 46  hide a library book in the library so that only you will be able to find it later

- 47 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car knowing that your registration or driver's license had expired  
48 \_\_\_\_\_ speed up a little to drive through a yellow light before you get to an  
intersection
- 49 \_\_\_\_\_ speed up a lot to drive through a yellow light before you get to an  
intersection
- 50 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost  
less than \$1 to buy
- 51 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost \$1  
- \$10 to buy
- 52 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost  
\$11 - \$50 to buy
- 53 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost  
more than \$50 to buy
- 54 \_\_\_\_\_ turn right on a red light without coming to a complete stop
- 55 \_\_\_\_\_ keep less than \$1 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 56 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 57 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 58 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$10 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 59 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 1 - 5 minutes
- 60 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 6 - 10 minutes
- 61 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 11 - 30 minutes
- 62 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for more than 30 minutes
- 63 \_\_\_\_\_ copy a DVD for personal use that is copyrighted
- 64 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains  
the owner's identification
- 65 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains  
the owner's identification
- 66 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$11 - \$20 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains  
the owner's identification
- 67 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$20 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that  
contains the owner's identification
- 68 \_\_\_\_\_ engage in premarital sex
- 69 \_\_\_\_\_ have premarital sex with someone you know very well but aren't in a  
committed relationship with
- 70 \_\_\_\_\_ have premarital sex with someone you know very well and are in a  
committed relationship with
- 71 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other  
rarely or never
- 72 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other  
occasionally
- 73 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other  
often
- 74 \_\_\_\_\_ have a sexual relationship with someone other than your spouse while  
you're married to another person

- 75 \_\_\_\_\_ use a fake ID
- 76 \_\_\_\_\_ get ahead of someone else waiting in line without that person's permission
- 77 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 1 - 4 miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 78 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 5 - 9 miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 79 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 10 or more miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 80 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of less than \$1
- 81 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of \$1 - \$10
- 82 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of \$11 - 50
- 83 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of more than \$50
- 84 \_\_\_\_\_ tear out a page from a publication (e.g., magazine, telephone book) that doesn't belong to you
- 85 \_\_\_\_\_ use pennies provided by a store to pay for something you purchased even though you had change that could have been used
- 86 \_\_\_\_\_ provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty
- 87 \_\_\_\_\_ keep less than \$1 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 88 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 89 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 90 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$10 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 91 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 1 - 2 alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 92 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 3 - 4 alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 93 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 5 or more alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 94 \_\_\_\_\_ provide incorrect or incomplete information to another student in your class who asks for assistance with class work
- 95 \_\_\_\_\_ not pay for food from a grocery store that is eaten while shopping in the store
- 96 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 1 - 5 minutes
- 97 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 6 - 10 minutes
- 98 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 11 - 30 minutes
- 99 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for more than 30 minutes
- 100 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$10 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 101 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$20 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 102 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$50 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 103 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$100 or more extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank

## Appendix B - “Personally Would Act” Minor Moral and Legal

### Violation Scale

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine how you would act if you were given the opportunity to engage in a variety of moral violations. Using the scale below, please write in the blank to the left of each item the one number that best reflects how you would act if you were given the opportunity to engage in that moral violation.

	NOT AT ALL LIKELY			SOMEWHAT LIKELY			EXTREMELY LIKELY
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	_____						
							keep <u>\$10</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account
2	_____						
							keep <u>\$20</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account
3	_____						
							keep <u>\$50</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account
4	_____						
							keep <u>\$100 or more</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account
5	_____						
							give yourself a <u>slightly better</u> score on some game (e.g., miniature golf) than you actually earned
6	_____						
							give yourself a <u>much better</u> score on some game (e.g., miniature golf) than you actually earned
7	_____						
							take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>less than \$1</u>
8	_____						
							take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u>
9	_____						
							take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u>
10	_____						
							take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>more than \$50</u>
11	_____						
							copy a CD for personal use that is copyrighted
12	_____						
							drive away without notifying the owner after <u>scratching</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot
13	_____						
							drive away without notifying the owner after <u>denting</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot
14	_____						
							drive away without notifying the owner after <u>severely damaging</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot
15	_____						
							pay someone else to do an assignment for a course that you would turn in as your own
16	_____						
							violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a little</u> so as to increase your chances of winning

- 17 \_\_\_\_\_ violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) a lot so as to increase your chances of winning
- 18 \_\_\_\_\_ not stop for a person waiting to cross the street in a pedestrian crosswalk
- 19 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about a quarter of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 20 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about half of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 21 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about three quarters of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 22 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although all of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 23 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged less than \$1 on some purchase
- 24 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged \$1 - \$10 on some purchase
- 25 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged \$11 - \$50 on some purchase
- 26 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged more than \$50 on some purchase
- 27 \_\_\_\_\_ list an accomplishment or award on your resume that you did not earn
- 28 \_\_\_\_\_ buy a term paper from a website that you would turn in as your own
- 29 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth less than \$1
- 30 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth \$1 - \$10
- 31 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth \$11 - \$50
- 32 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth more than \$50
- 33 \_\_\_\_\_ use one or two of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 34 \_\_\_\_\_ use several of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 35 \_\_\_\_\_ use all of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 36 \_\_\_\_\_ download a copyrighted song from the Internet
- 37 \_\_\_\_\_ download a copyrighted album from the Internet
- 38 \_\_\_\_\_ download a copyrighted software from the Internet
- 39 \_\_\_\_\_ put in less than your equal portion of the money when pitching in to pay for a meal shared by several individuals
- 40 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth less than \$1 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 41 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth \$1 - \$10 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 42 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth \$11 - \$50 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 43 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth more than \$50 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 44 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was partially taken from another student's work
- 45 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was completely taken from another student's work
- 46 \_\_\_\_\_ hide a library book in the library so that only you will be able to find it later
- 47 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car knowing that your registration or driver's license had expired

- 48 \_\_\_\_\_ speed up a little to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection
- 49 \_\_\_\_\_ speed up a lot to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection
- 50 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost less than \$1 to buy
- 51 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost \$1 - \$10 to buy
- 52 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost \$11 - \$50 to buy
- 53 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost more than \$50 to buy
- 54 \_\_\_\_\_ turn right on a red light without coming to a complete stop
- 55 \_\_\_\_\_ keep less than \$1 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 56 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 57 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 58 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$10 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 59 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 1 - 5 minutes
- 60 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 6 - 10 minutes
- 61 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 11 - 30 minutes
- 62 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for more than 30 minutes
- 63 \_\_\_\_\_ copy a DVD for personal use that is copyrighted
- 64 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 65 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 66 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$11 - \$20 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 67 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$20 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 68 \_\_\_\_\_ engage in premarital sex
- 69 \_\_\_\_\_ have premarital sex with someone you know very well but aren't in a committed relationship with
- 70 \_\_\_\_\_ have premarital sex with someone you know very well and are in a committed relationship with
- 71 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other rarely or never
- 72 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other occasionally
- 73 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other often
- 74 \_\_\_\_\_ have a sexual relationship with someone other than your spouse while you're married to another person
- 75 \_\_\_\_\_ use a fake ID

- 76 \_\_\_\_\_ get ahead of someone else waiting in line without that person's permission
- 77 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 1 - 4 miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 78 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 5 - 9 miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 79 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 10 or more miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 80 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of less than \$1
- 81 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of \$1 - \$10
- 82 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of \$11 - 50
- 83 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of more than \$50
- 84 \_\_\_\_\_ tear out a page from a publication (e.g., magazine, telephone book) that doesn't belong to you
- 85 \_\_\_\_\_ use pennies provided by a store to pay for something you purchased even though you had change that could have been used
- 86 \_\_\_\_\_ provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty
- 87 \_\_\_\_\_ keep less than \$1 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 88 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 89 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 90 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$10 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 91 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 1 - 2 alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 92 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 3 - 4 alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 93 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 5 or more alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 94 \_\_\_\_\_ provide incorrect or incomplete information to another student in your class who asks for assistance with class work
- 95 \_\_\_\_\_ not pay for food from a grocery store that is eaten while shopping in the store
- 96 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 1 - 5 minutes
- 97 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 6 - 10 minutes
- 98 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 11 - 30 minutes
- 99 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for more than 30 minutes
- 100 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$10 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 101 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$20 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 102 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$50 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 103 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$100 or more extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank

## Appendix C - Demographic Form

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Please answer the following questions.

- 1 \_\_\_\_\_ Age
- 2 \_\_\_\_\_ Sex  
\_\_\_\_\_ Male  
\_\_\_\_\_ Female
- 3 \_\_\_\_\_ Class level  
\_\_\_\_\_ Freshman  
\_\_\_\_\_ Sophomore  
\_\_\_\_\_ Junior  
\_\_\_\_\_ Senior  
\_\_\_\_\_ Graduate
- 4 \_\_\_\_\_ Marital Status  
\_\_\_\_\_ Married  
\_\_\_\_\_ Unmarried
- 5 \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity  
\_\_\_\_\_ African-American  
\_\_\_\_\_ Asian-American  
\_\_\_\_\_ Hispanic-American  
\_\_\_\_\_ Native-American  
\_\_\_\_\_ White/European-American  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other
- 6 \_\_\_\_\_ Religion  
\_\_\_\_\_ Not Religious  
\_\_\_\_\_ Catholic  
\_\_\_\_\_ Baptist  
\_\_\_\_\_ Pentecostal  
\_\_\_\_\_ Mormon  
\_\_\_\_\_ Presbyterian  
\_\_\_\_\_ Methodist  
\_\_\_\_\_ Lutheran  
\_\_\_\_\_ Episcopal  
\_\_\_\_\_ Jewish  
\_\_\_\_\_ Buddhist  
\_\_\_\_\_ Hindu  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ Religious/no denomination  
\_\_\_\_\_ Spiritual

## Appendix D - Experiment 1 Informed Consent

This research is examining K-State students' and different social organizations' (e.g., parents, peers, media, religion) thoughts about minor moral violations. You will be asked to complete questionnaires about how you and various social organizations evaluate several of the *same* minor moral violations. Thus, do not be concerned that the surveys are very redundant.

There are no right or wrong answers to the questions, just your opinions. You can skip any questions you feel uncomfortable answering. If at any time during this experiment you decide you no longer want to participate, you can quit participating without penalty. All responses remain anonymous and confidential.

This study takes approximately 1 hour to complete (research credit: 1 ½ hours).

Should you have questions or concerns about this study, you can contact Laura Brannon at (785) 532-0604 or [lbrannon@ksu.edu](mailto:lbrannon@ksu.edu). You may also contact Rick Scheidt [Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, 203 Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 532-3224] with the Kansas State University IRB.

TERMS OF PARTICIPATION: I understand this project is research, and that my participation is completely voluntary. I also understand that if I decide to participate in this study, I may withdraw my consent at any time, and stop participating at any time without explanation, penalty, or loss of benefits, or academic standing to which I may otherwise be entitled.

Continuing to the next page indicates that I have read and understood this consent form, and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described (Kansas State University IRB Informed Consent; <http://www.k-state.edu/comply/irb/forms/>).

## Appendix E - Experiment 1 Debriefing

We're studying how values influence behavior. All participants described different value sources' (personal, parental, peer/friend, media, religion) thoughts about committing moral violations. Some participants first reported how value sources thought they *should* act in moral situations, after which they indicated how they *would* act. Other participants indicated how they *would* act in moral situations, then reported how value sources thought they *should* act.

Should you have questions or concerns (either now or later) about this study, you can contact Laura Brannon at (785) 532-0604 or [lbrannon@ksu.edu](mailto:lbrannon@ksu.edu). You may also contact Rick Scheidt [Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, 203 Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 532-3224] with the Kansas State University IRB.

Thanks for participating.

## Appendix F - Likelihood Scales

### Actual Rating Scale

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In a previous semester, KSU students rated how likely they would be to engage in the following moral violations if given the opportunity to commit those violations. The ratings of the students from past semesters are listed after each item. The higher the number, the more likely the students were to engage in the moral violation. The lower the number, the less likely students were to engage in the moral violation. Read the following moral violations and the ratings of past students concerning how likely they are to occur and think about how likely you would be to engage in the violation. You will be asked some questions about this later.

NOT AT ALL LIKELY	1	2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	3	4	5	EXTREMELY LIKELY	6	
	0								PREVIOUS STUDENT LIKELIHOOD RATINGS
1									4.73
2									4.52
3									3.74
4									3.14
5									3.17
6									1.79
7									4.32
8									3.80
9									2.36
10									1.53
11									5.18
12									3.83

13	drive away without notifying the owner after <u>denting</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot	2.84
14	drive away without notifying the owner after <u>severely damaging</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot	1.73
15	pay someone else to do an assignment for a course that you would turn in as your own	2.30
16	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a little</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	3.20
17	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a lot</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	2.09
18	not stop for a person waiting to cross the street in a pedestrian crosswalk	2.24
19	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about a quarter</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	2.60
20	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about half</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	1.62
21	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about three quarters</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	1.04
22	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>all</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	1.19
23	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>less than \$1</u> on some purchase	4.35
24	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$1 - \$10</u> on some purchase	3.80
25	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$11 - \$50</u> on some purchase	2.87
26	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>more than \$50</u> on some purchase	2.31
27	list an accomplishment or award on your resume that you did not earn	2.09
28	buy a term paper from a website that you would turn in as your own	1.85
29	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>less than \$1</u>	4.02
30	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	3.23
31	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u>	1.92
32	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>more than \$50</u>	1.25
33	use <u>one or two</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	4.28
34	use <u>several</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	3.32

35	use <u>all</u> of someone else’s answers to complete a homework assignment	2.06
36	download a copyrighted <u>song</u> from the Internet	5.25
37	download a copyrighted <u>album</u> from the Internet	4.91
38	download a copyrighted <u>software</u> from the Internet	4.35
39	put in less than your equal portion of the money when pitching in to pay for a meal shared by several individuals	2.49
40	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>less than \$1</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	4.23
41	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	3.47
42	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	2.73
43	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>more than \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	2.18
44	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>partially</u> taken from another student’s work	2.46
45	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>completely</u> taken from another student’s work	1.31
46	hide a library book in the library so that only you will be able to find it later	3.45
47	drive a car knowing that your registration or driver’s license had expired	3.57
48	speed up <u>a little</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	4.95
49	speed up <u>a lot</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	3.81
50	take something from a store that you didn’t pay for that would have cost <u>less than \$1</u> to buy	2.72
51	take something from a store that you didn’t pay for that would have cost <u>\$1 - \$10</u> to buy	2.03
52	take something from a store that you didn’t pay for that would have cost <u>\$11 - \$50</u> to buy	1.26
53	take something from a store that you didn’t pay for that would have cost <u>more than \$50</u> to buy	1.08
54	turn right on a red light without coming to a complete stop	4.40
55	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	4.73
56	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	4.07
57	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	3.12
58	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	2.54
59	park in a “No Parking” zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	4.31
60	park in a “No Parking” zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	3.59
61	park in a “No Parking” zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	2.39
62	park in a “No Parking” zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	1.68
63	copy a DVD for personal use that is copyrighted	4.32

64	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	2.64
65	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	2.19
66	keep <u>\$11 - \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	1.73
67	keep <u>more than \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	1.55
68	engage in premarital sex	5.04
69	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>but aren't in a committed relationship with</u>	4.19
70	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>and are in a committed relationship with</u>	5.13
71	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>rarely or never</u>	3.03
72	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>occasionally</u>	3.42
73	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>often</u>	2.97
74	have a sexual relationship with someone other than your spouse while you're married to another person	1.65
75	use a fake ID	4.41
76	get ahead of someone else waiting in line without that person's permission	3.03
77	drive <u>1 - 4</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	5.49
78	drive <u>5 - 9</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	4.83
79	drive <u>10 or more</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	3.30
80	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>less than \$1</u>	3.84
81	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	3.14
82	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$11 - 50</u>	2.13
83	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>more than \$50</u>	1.41
84	tear out a page from a publication (e.g., magazine, telephone book) that doesn't belong to you	3.15
85	use pennies provided by a store to pay for something you purchased even though you had change that could have been used	3.03
86	provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty	2.06
87	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	4.49
88	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	3.80

89	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	2.75
90	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	2.10
91	drive a car after you had <u>1 - 2</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	4.05
92	drive a car after you had <u>3 - 4</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	3.00
93	drive a car after you had <u>5 or more</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	2.07
94	provide incorrect or incomplete information to another student in your class who asks for assistance with class work	1.83
95	not pay for food from a grocery store that is eaten while shopping in the store	2.10
96	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	2.76
97	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	1.98
98	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	1.22
99	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	.89
100	keep <u>\$10</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	3.63
101	keep <u>\$20</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	2.97
102	keep <u>\$50</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	2.45
103	keep <u>\$100 or more</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	2.19

## Low Rating Scale

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In a previous semester, KSU students rated how likely they would be to engage in the following moral violations if given the opportunity to commit those violations. The ratings of the students from past semesters are listed after each item. The higher the number, the more likely the students were to engage in the moral violation. The lower the number, the less likely students were to engage in the moral violation. Read the following moral violations and the ratings of past students concerning how likely they are to occur and think about how likely you would be to engage in the violation. You will be asked some questions about this later.

NOT AT ALL LIKELY	1	2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	3	4	5	6	EXTREMELY LIKELY	PREVIOUS STUDENT LIKELIHOOD RATINGS
0									
1									3.23
2									3.02
3									2.24
4									1.64
5									1.67
6									.29
7									2.82
8									2.30
9									.86
10									.03
11									3.68
12									2.33
13									1.34
14									.23

15	pay someone else to do an assignment for a course that you would turn in as your own	.80
16	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a little</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	1.70
17	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a lot</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	.59
18	not stop for a person waiting to cross the street in a pedestrian crosswalk	.74
19	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about a quarter</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	1.10
20	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about half</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	.12
21	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about three quarters</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	.00
22	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>all</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	.00
23	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>less than \$1</u> on some purchase	2.85
24	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$1 - \$10</u> on some purchase	2.30
25	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$11 - \$50</u> on some purchase	1.37
26	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>more than \$50</u> on some purchase	.81
27	list an accomplishment or award on your resume that you did not earn	.59
28	buy a term paper from a website that you would turn in as your own	.35
29	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>less than \$1</u>	2.52
30	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	1.73
31	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u>	.42
32	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>more than \$50</u>	.00
33	use <u>one or two</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	2.78
34	use <u>several</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	1.82
35	use <u>all</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	.56
36	download a copyrighted <u>song</u> from the Internet	3.75
37	download a copyrighted <u>album</u> from the Internet	3.41
38	download a copyrighted <u>software</u> from the Internet	2.85

39	put in less than your equal portion of the money when pitching in to pay for a meal shared by several individuals	.99
40	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>less than \$1</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	2.73
41	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	1.97
42	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	1.23
43	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>more than \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	.68
44	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>partially</u> taken from another student's work	.96
45	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>completely</u> taken from another student's work	.00
46	hide a library book in the library so that only you will be able to find it later	1.95
47	drive a car knowing that your registration or driver's license had expired	2.07
48	speed up <u>a little</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	3.45
49	speed up <u>a lot</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	2.31
50	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>less than \$1</u> to buy	1.22
51	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>\$1 - \$10</u> to buy	.53
52	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>\$11 - \$50</u> to buy	.00
53	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>more than \$50</u> to buy	.00
54	turn right on a red light without coming to a complete stop	2.90
55	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	3.23
56	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	2.57
57	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	1.62
58	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	1.04
59	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	2.81
60	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	2.09
61	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	.89
62	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	.18
63	copy a DVD for personal use that is copyrighted	2.82
64	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	1.14
65	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	.69
66	keep <u>\$11 - \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	.23

67	keep <u>more than \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	.05
68	engage in premarital sex	3.54
69	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>but aren't in a committed relationship with</u>	2.69
70	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>and are in a committed relationship with</u>	3.63
71	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>rarely or never</u>	1.53
72	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>occasionally</u>	1.92
73	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>often</u>	1.47
74	have a sexual relationship with someone other than your spouse while you're married to another person	.15
75	use a fake ID	2.91
76	get ahead of someone else waiting in line without that person's permission	1.53
77	drive <u>1 - 4</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	3.99
78	drive <u>5 - 9</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	3.33
79	drive <u>10 or more</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	1.80
80	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>less than \$1</u>	2.34
81	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	1.64
82	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$11 - 50</u>	.63
83	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>more than \$50</u>	.00
84	tear out a page from a publication (e.g., magazine, telephone book) that doesn't belong to you	1.65
85	use pennies provided by a store to pay for something you purchased even though you had change that could have been used	1.53
86	provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty	.56
87	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	2.99
88	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	2.30
89	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	1.25
90	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	.60
91	drive a car after you had <u>1 - 2</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	2.55

92	drive a car after you had <u>3 - 4</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	1.50
93	drive a car after you had <u>5 or more</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	.57
94	provide incorrect or incomplete information to another student in your class who asks for assistance with class work	.33
95	not pay for food from a grocery store that is eaten while shopping in the store	.60
96	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	1.26
97	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	.48
98	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	.00
99	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	.00
100	keep <u>\$10</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	2.13
101	keep <u>\$20</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	1.47
102	keep <u>\$50</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	.95
103	keep <u>\$100 or more</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	.69

## High Rating Scale

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In a previous semester, KSU students rated how likely they would be to engage in the following moral violations if given the opportunity to commit those violations. The ratings of the students from past semesters are listed after each item. The higher the number, the more likely the students were to engage in the moral violation. The lower the number, the less likely students were to engage in the moral violation. Read the following moral violations and the ratings of past students concerning how likely they are to occur and think about how likely you would be to engage in the violation. You will be asked some questions about this later.

NOT AT ALL LIKELY	0	1	2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	3	4	5	6	EXTREMELY LIKELY	PREVIOUS STUDENT LIKELIHOOD RATINGS
1										6.00
2										6.00
3										5.24
4										4.64
5										4.67
6										3.29
7										5.82
8										5.30
9										3.86
10										3.03
11										6.00
12										5.33
13										4.34
14										3.23

15	pay someone else to do an assignment for a course that you would turn in as your own	3.80
16	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a little</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	4.70
17	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a lot</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	3.59
18	not stop for a person waiting to cross the street in a pedestrian crosswalk	3.74
19	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about a quarter</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	4.10
20	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about half</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	3.12
21	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about three quarters</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	2.54
22	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>all</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	2.69
23	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>less than \$1</u> on some purchase	5.85
24	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$1 - \$10</u> on some purchase	5.30
25	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$11 - \$50</u> on some purchase	4.37
26	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>more than \$50</u> on some purchase	3.81
27	list an accomplishment or award on your resume that you did not earn	3.59
28	buy a term paper from a website that you would turn in as your own	3.35
29	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>less than \$1</u>	5.52
30	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	4.73
31	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u>	3.42
32	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>more than \$50</u>	2.75
33	use <u>one or two</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	5.78
34	use <u>several</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	4.82
35	use <u>all</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	3.56
36	download a copyrighted <u>song</u> from the Internet	6.00
37	download a copyrighted <u>album</u> from the Internet	6.00
38	download a copyrighted <u>software</u> from the Internet	5.85

39	put in less than your equal portion of the money when pitching in to pay for a meal shared by several individuals	3.99
40	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>less than \$1</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	5.73
41	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	4.97
42	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	4.23
43	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>more than \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	3.68
44	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>partially</u> taken from another student's work	3.96
45	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>completely</u> taken from another student's work	2.81
46	hide a library book in the library so that only you will be able to find it later	4.95
47	drive a car knowing that your registration or driver's license had expired	5.07
48	speed up <u>a little</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	6.00
49	speed up <u>a lot</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	5.31
50	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>less than \$1</u> to buy	4.22
51	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>\$1 - \$10</u> to buy	3.53
52	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>\$11 - \$50</u> to buy	2.76
53	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>more than \$50</u> to buy	2.58
54	turn right on a red light without coming to a complete stop	5.90
55	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	6.00
56	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	5.57
57	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	4.62
58	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	4.04
59	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	5.81
60	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	5.09
61	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	3.89
62	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	3.18
63	copy a DVD for personal use that is copyrighted	5.82
64	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	4.14
65	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	3.69
66	keep <u>\$11 - \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	3.23

67	keep <u>more than \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	3.05
68	engage in premarital sex	6.00
69	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>but aren't in a committed relationship with</u>	5.69
70	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>and are in a committed relationship with</u>	6.00
71	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>rarely or never</u>	4.53
72	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>occasionally</u>	4.92
73	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>often</u>	4.47
74	have a sexual relationship with someone other than your spouse while you're married to another person	3.15
75	use a fake ID	5.91
76	get ahead of someone else waiting in line without that person's permission	4.53
77	drive <u>1 - 4</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	6.00
78	drive <u>5 - 9</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	6.00
79	drive <u>10 or more</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	4.80
80	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>less than \$1</u>	5.34
81	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	4.64
82	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$11 - 50</u>	3.63
83	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>more than \$50</u>	2.91
84	tear out a page from a publication (e.g., magazine, telephone book) that doesn't belong to you	4.65
85	use pennies provided by a store to pay for something you purchased even though you had change that could have been used	4.53
86	provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty	3.56
87	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	5.99
88	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	5.30
89	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	4.25
90	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	3.60
91	drive a car after you had <u>1 - 2</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	5.55

92	drive a car after you had <u>3 - 4</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	4.50
93	drive a car after you had <u>5 or more</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	3.57
94	provide incorrect or incomplete information to another student in your class who asks for assistance with class work	3.33
95	not pay for food from a grocery store that is eaten while shopping in the store	3.60
96	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	4.26
97	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	3.48
98	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	2.72
99	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	2.39
100	keep <u>\$10</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	5.13
101	keep <u>\$20</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	4.47
102	keep <u>\$50</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	3.95
103	keep <u>\$100 or more</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	3.69

## Appendix G - Excusable Scales

### Actual Rating Scale

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In a previous semester, KSU students rated how serious they thought the following moral violations were. The ratings of students from past semesters are listed after each item. The higher the number, the more serious the students thought the moral violation was. The lower the number, the less serious the students thought the moral violation was. Read the following moral violations and the ratings of past students concerning their severity and think about how serious you think the violation is. You will be asked some questions about this later.

NOT AT ALL SERIOUS	1	2	SOMEWHAT SERIOUS	3	4	5	EXTREMELY SERIOUS	6	PREVIOUS STUDENT SEVERITY RATINGS
1									1.94
									2.55
									3.74
									4.47
									1.31
									2.36
									.98
									1.79
									3.50
									4.65
									1.38
									3.77
									4.67

14	drive away without notifying the owner after <u>severely damaging</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot	5.64
15	pay someone else to do an assignment for a course that you would turn in as your own	4.50
16	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a little</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	1.65
17	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a lot</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	2.63
18	not stop for a person waiting to cross the street in a pedestrian crosswalk	3.33
19	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about a quarter</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	4.28
20	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about half</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	5.06
21	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about three quarters</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	5.45
22	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>all</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	5.57
23	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>less than \$1</u> on some purchase	.96
24	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$1 - \$10</u> on some purchase	2.06
25	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$11 - \$50</u> on some purchase	3.65
26	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>more than \$50</u> on some purchase	4.68
27	list an accomplishment or award on your resume that you did not earn	4.53
28	buy a term paper from a website that you would turn in as your own	5.00
29	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>less than \$1</u>	2.01
30	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	3.17
31	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u>	4.53
32	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>more than \$50</u>	5.27
33	use <u>one or two</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	2.27
34	use <u>several</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	3.54
35	use <u>all</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	4.89
36	download a copyrighted <u>song</u> from the Internet	1.25

37	download a copyrighted <u>album</u> from the Internet	1.85
38	download a copyrighted <u>software</u> from the Internet	2.73
39	put in less than your equal portion of the money when pitching in to pay for a meal shared by several individuals	2.73
40	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>less than \$1</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	1.88
41	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	3.17
42	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	4.32
43	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>more than \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	4.94
44	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>partially</u> taken from another student's work	4.25
45	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>completely</u> taken from another student's work	5.40
46	hide a library book in the library so that only you will be able to find it later	1.91
47	drive a car knowing that your registration or driver's license had expired	3.05
48	speed up <u>a little</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	1.25
49	speed up <u>a lot</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	2.58
50	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>less than \$1</u> to buy	3.21
51	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>\$1 - \$10</u> to buy	4.19
52	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>\$11 - \$50</u> to buy	4.95
53	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>more than \$50</u> to buy	5.52
54	turn right on a red light without coming to a complete stop	1.79
55	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	1.02
56	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	2.13
57	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	3.27
58	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	4.16
59	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	1.76
60	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	2.61
61	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	3.60
62	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	4.31
63	copy a DVD for personal use that is copyrighted	2.34
64	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	4.07
65	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	4.55

66	keep <u>\$11 - \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	4.97
67	keep <u>more than \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	5.27
68	engage in premarital sex	2.09
69	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>but aren't in a committed relationship with</u>	2.76
70	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>and are in a committed relationship with</u>	1.80
71	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>rarely or never</u>	1.19
72	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>occasionally</u>	2.34
73	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>often</u>	3.66
74	have a sexual relationship with someone other than your spouse while you're married to another person	5.43
75	use a fake ID	3.08
76	get ahead of someone else waiting in line without that person's permission	3.03
77	drive <u>1 - 4</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	.59
78	drive <u>5 - 9</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	1.61
79	drive <u>10 or more</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	3.54
80	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>less than \$1</u>	2.46
81	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	3.57
82	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$11 - 50</u>	4.59
83	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>more than \$50</u>	5.33
84	tear out a page from a publication (e.g., magazine, telephone book) that doesn't belong to you	2.33
85	use pennies provided by a store to pay for something you purchased even though you had change that could have been used	1.74
86	provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty	4.52
87	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	1.04
88	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	2.19
89	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	3.51
90	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	4.44

91	drive a car after you had <u>1 - 2</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	3.32
92	drive a car after you had <u>3 - 4</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	4.68
93	drive a car after you had <u>5 or more</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	5.46
94	provide incorrect or incomplete information to another student in your class who asks for assistance with class work	3.98
95	not pay for food from a grocery store that is eaten while shopping in the store	4.10
96	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	3.06
97	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	3.87
98	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	4.55
99	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	4.89
100	keep <u>\$10</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	3.08
101	keep <u>\$20</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	3.86
102	keep <u>\$50</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	4.46
103	keep <u>\$100 or more</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	4.88

## Low Rating Scale

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In a previous semester, KSU students rated how serious they thought the following moral violations were. The ratings of students from past semesters are listed after each item. The higher the number, the more serious the students thought the moral violation was. The lower the number, the less serious the students thought the moral violation was. Read the following moral violations and the ratings of past students concerning their severity and think about how serious you think the violation is. You will be asked some questions about this later.

NOT AT ALL SERIOUS	1	2	SOMEWHAT SERIOUS	3	4	5	EXTREMELY SERIOUS	6	PREVIOUS STUDENT SEVERITY RATINGS
1									.44
									1.05
									2.24
									2.97
									.00
									.86
									.00
									.29
									2.00
									3.15
									.00
									2.27
									3.17
									4.14

15	pay someone else to do an assignment for a course that you would turn in as your own	3.00
16	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a little</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	.15
17	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a lot</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	1.13
18	not stop for a person waiting to cross the street in a pedestrian crosswalk	1.83
19	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about a quarter</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	2.78
20	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about half</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	3.56
21	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about three quarters</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	3.95
22	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>all</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	4.07
23	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>less than \$1</u> on some purchase	.00
24	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$1 - \$10</u> on some purchase	.56
25	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$11 - \$50</u> on some purchase	2.15
26	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>more than \$50</u> on some purchase	3.18
27	list an accomplishment or award on your resume that you did not earn	3.03
28	buy a term paper from a website that you would turn in as your own	3.50
29	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>less than \$1</u>	.51
30	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	1.67
31	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u>	3.03
32	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>more than \$50</u>	3.77
33	use <u>one or two</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	.77
34	use <u>several</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	2.04
35	use <u>all</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	3.39
36	download a copyrighted <u>song</u> from the Internet	.00
37	download a copyrighted <u>album</u> from the Internet	.35
38	download a copyrighted <u>software</u> from the Internet	1.23

39	put in less than your equal portion of the money when pitching in to pay for a meal shared by several individuals	1.23
40	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>less than \$1</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	.38
41	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	1.67
42	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	2.82
43	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>more than \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	3.44
44	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>partially</u> taken from another student's work	2.75
45	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>completely</u> taken from another student's work	3.90
46	hide a library book in the library so that only you will be able to find it later	.41
47	drive a car knowing that your registration or driver's license had expired	1.55
48	speed up <u>a little</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	.00
49	speed up <u>a lot</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	1.08
50	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>less than \$1</u> to buy	1.71
51	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>\$1 - \$10</u> to buy	2.69
52	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>\$11 - \$50</u> to buy	3.45
53	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>more than \$50</u> to buy	4.02
54	turn right on a red light without coming to a complete stop	.29
55	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	.00
56	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	.63
57	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	1.77
58	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	2.66
59	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	.26
60	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	1.11
61	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	2.10
62	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	2.81
63	copy a DVD for personal use that is copyrighted	.84
64	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	2.57
65	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	3.05
66	keep <u>\$11 - \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	3.47

67	keep <u>more than \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	3.77
68	engage in premarital sex	.59
69	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>but aren't in a committed relationship with</u>	1.26
70	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>and are in a committed relationship with</u>	.30
71	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>rarely or never</u>	.00
72	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>occasionally</u>	.84
73	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>often</u>	2.16
74	have a sexual relationship with someone other than your spouse while you're married to another person	3.93
75	use a fake ID	1.58
76	get ahead of someone else waiting in line without that person's permission	1.53
77	drive <u>1 - 4</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	.00
78	drive <u>5 - 9</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	.11
79	drive <u>10 or more</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	2.04
80	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>less than \$1</u>	.96
81	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	2.07
82	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$11 - 50</u>	3.09
83	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>more than \$50</u>	3.83
84	tear out a page from a publication (e.g., magazine, telephone book) that doesn't belong to you	.83
85	use pennies provided by a store to pay for something you purchased even though you had change that could have been used	.24
86	provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty	3.02
87	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	.00
88	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	.69
89	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	2.01
90	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	2.94
91	drive a car after you had <u>1 - 2</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	1.82

92	drive a car after you had <u>3 - 4</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	3.18
93	drive a car after you had <u>5 or more</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	3.96
94	provide incorrect or incomplete information to another student in your class who asks for assistance with class work	2.48
95	not pay for food from a grocery store that is eaten while shopping in the store	2.60
96	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	1.56
97	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	2.37
98	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	3.05
99	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	3.39
100	keep <u>\$10</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	1.58
101	keep <u>\$20</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	2.36
102	keep <u>\$50</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	2.96
103	keep <u>\$100 or more</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	3.38

## High Rating Scale

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In a previous semester, KSU students rated how serious they thought the following moral violations were. The ratings of students from past semesters are listed after each item. The higher the number, the more serious the students thought the moral violation was. The lower the number, the less serious the students thought the moral violation was. Read the following moral violations and the ratings of past students concerning their severity and think about how serious you think the violation is. You will be asked some questions about this later.

NOT AT ALL SERIOUS	1	2	SOMEWHAT SERIOUS	3	4	5	EXTREMELY SERIOUS	6	PREVIOUS STUDENT SEVERITY RATINGS
1									3.44
2									4.05
3									5.24
4									5.97
5									2.81
6									3.86
7									2.48
8									3.29
9									5.00
10									6.00
11									2.88
12									5.27
13									6.00
14									6.00

15	pay someone else to do an assignment for a course that you would turn in as your own	6.00
16	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a little</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	3.15
17	violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a lot</u> so as to increase your chances of winning	4.13
18	not stop for a person waiting to cross the street in a pedestrian crosswalk	4.83
19	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about a quarter</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	5.78
20	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about half</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	6.00
21	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>about three quarters</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	6.00
22	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although <u>all</u> of it was taken directly from the Internet	6.00
23	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>less than \$1</u> on some purchase	2.46
24	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$1 - \$10</u> on some purchase	3.56
25	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>\$11 - \$50</u> on some purchase	5.15
26	fail to report that you were undercharged <u>more than \$50</u> on some purchase	6.00
27	list an accomplishment or award on your resume that you did not earn	6.00
28	buy a term paper from a website that you would turn in as your own	6.00
29	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>less than \$1</u>	3.51
30	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	4.67
31	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u>	6.00
32	take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth <u>more than \$50</u>	6.00
33	use <u>one or two</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	3.77
34	use <u>several</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	5.04
35	use <u>all</u> of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment	6.00
36	download a copyrighted <u>song</u> from the Internet	2.75
37	download a copyrighted <u>album</u> from the Internet	3.35
38	download a copyrighted <u>software</u> from the Internet	4.23

39	put in less than your equal portion of the money when pitching in to pay for a meal shared by several individuals	4.23
40	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>less than \$1</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	3.38
41	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	4.67
42	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	5.82
43	keep something that you intended to purchase worth <u>more than \$50</u> that was accidentally excluded from your bill	6.00
44	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>partially</u> taken from another student's work	5.75
45	turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was <u>completely</u> taken from another student's work	6.00
46	hide a library book in the library so that only you will be able to find it later	3.41
47	drive a car knowing that your registration or driver's license had expired	4.55
48	speed up <u>a little</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	2.75
49	speed up <u>a lot</u> to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection	4.08
50	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>less than \$1</u> to buy	4.71
51	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>\$1 - \$10</u> to buy	5.69
52	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>\$11 - \$50</u> to buy	6.00
53	take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost <u>more than \$50</u> to buy	6.00
54	turn right on a red light without coming to a complete stop	3.29
55	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	2.52
56	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	3.63
57	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	4.77
58	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a store clerk	5.66
59	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	3.26
60	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	4.11
61	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	5.10
62	park in a "No Parking" zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	5.81
63	copy a DVD for personal use that is copyrighted	3.84
64	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	5.57
65	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	6.00
66	keep <u>\$11 - \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	6.00

67	keep <u>more than \$20</u> that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification	6.00
68	engage in premarital sex	3.59
69	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>but aren't in a committed relationship with</u>	4.26
70	have premarital sex with someone you know very well <u>and are in a committed relationship with</u>	3.30
71	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>rarely or never</u>	2.69
72	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>occasionally</u>	3.84
73	have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other <u>often</u>	5.16
74	have a sexual relationship with someone other than your spouse while you're married to another person	6.00
75	use a fake ID	4.58
76	get ahead of someone else waiting in line without that person's permission	4.53
77	drive <u>1 - 4</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	2.09
78	drive <u>5 - 9</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	3.11
79	drive <u>10 or more</u> miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway	5.04
80	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>less than \$1</u>	3.96
81	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$1 - \$10</u>	5.07
82	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>\$11 - 50</u>	6.00
83	fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of <u>more than \$50</u>	6.00
84	tear out a page from a publication (e.g., magazine, telephone book) that doesn't belong to you	3.83
85	use pennies provided by a store to pay for something you purchased even though you had change that could have been used	3.24
86	provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty	6.00
87	keep <u>less than \$1</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	2.54
88	keep <u>\$1 - \$5</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	3.69
89	keep <u>\$6 - \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	5.01
90	keep <u>more than \$10</u> extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant	5.94
91	drive a car after you had <u>1 - 2</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	4.82

92	drive a car after you had <u>3 - 4</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	6.00
93	drive a car after you had <u>5 or more</u> alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)	6.00
94	provide incorrect or incomplete information to another student in your class who asks for assistance with class work	5.48
95	not pay for food from a grocery store that is eaten while shopping in the store	5.60
96	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>1 - 5</u> minutes	4.56
97	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>6 - 10</u> minutes	5.37
98	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>11 - 30</u> minutes	6.00
99	park in a "Handicapped" zone for <u>more than 30</u> minutes	6.00
100	keep <u>\$10</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	4.58
101	keep <u>\$20</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	5.36
102	keep <u>\$50</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	5.96
103	keep <u>\$100 or more</u> extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank	6.00

## Appendix H - Likelihood of Committing Minor Moral and Legal Violations Following Students' Likelihood Ratings Scale

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The previous page showed KSU students' likelihood to engage in a variety of moral violations if given the opportunity to commit those violations. Using the scale below, please write in the blank to the left of each item the one number that best reflects how likely you would be to engage in that moral violation.

NOT AT ALL LIKELY	1	2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	3	4	5	EXTREMELY LIKELY	6
1								
_____								
2								
_____								
3								
_____								
4								
_____								
5								
_____								
6								
_____								
7								
_____								
8								
_____								
9								
_____								
10								
_____								
11								
_____								
12								
_____								
13								
_____								
14								
_____								
15								
_____								
16								
_____								

- 17 \_\_\_\_\_ violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) a lot so as to increase your chances of winning
- 18 \_\_\_\_\_ not stop for a person waiting to cross the street in a pedestrian crosswalk
- 19 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about a quarter of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 20 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about half of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 21 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about three quarters of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 22 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although all of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 23 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged less than \$1 on some purchase
- 24 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged \$1 - \$10 on some purchase
- 25 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged \$11 - \$50 on some purchase
- 26 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged more than \$50 on some purchase
- 27 \_\_\_\_\_ list an accomplishment or award on your resume that you did not earn
- 28 \_\_\_\_\_ buy a term paper from a website that you would turn in as your own
- 29 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth less than \$1
- 30 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth \$1 - \$10
- 31 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth \$11 - \$50
- 32 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth more than \$50
- 33 \_\_\_\_\_ use one or two of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 34 \_\_\_\_\_ use several of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 35 \_\_\_\_\_ use all of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 36 \_\_\_\_\_ download a copyrighted song from the Internet
- 37 \_\_\_\_\_ download a copyrighted album from the Internet
- 38 \_\_\_\_\_ download a copyrighted software from the Internet
- 39 \_\_\_\_\_ put in less than your equal portion of the money when pitching in to pay for a meal shared by several individuals
- 40 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth less than \$1 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 41 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth \$1 - \$10 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 42 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth \$11 - \$50 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 43 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth more than \$50 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 44 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was partially taken from another student's work
- 45 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was completely taken from another student's work
- 46 \_\_\_\_\_ hide a library book in the library so that only you will be able to find it later
- 47 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car knowing that your registration or driver's license had expired

- 48 \_\_\_\_\_ speed up a little to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection
- 49 \_\_\_\_\_ speed up a lot to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection
- 50 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost less than \$1 to buy
- 51 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost \$1 - \$10 to buy
- 52 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost \$11 - \$50 to buy
- 53 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost more than \$50 to buy
- 54 \_\_\_\_\_ turn right on a red light without coming to a complete stop
- 55 \_\_\_\_\_ keep less than \$1 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 56 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 57 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 58 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$10 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 59 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 1 - 5 minutes
- 60 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 6 - 10 minutes
- 61 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 11 - 30 minutes
- 62 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for more than 30 minutes
- 63 \_\_\_\_\_ copy a DVD for personal use that is copyrighted
- 64 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 65 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 66 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$11 - \$20 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 67 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$20 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 68 \_\_\_\_\_ engage in premarital sex
- 69 \_\_\_\_\_ have premarital sex with someone you know very well but aren't in a committed relationship with
- 70 \_\_\_\_\_ have premarital sex with someone you know very well and are in a committed relationship with
- 71 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other rarely or never
- 72 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other occasionally
- 73 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other often
- 74 \_\_\_\_\_ have a sexual relationship with someone other than your spouse while you're married to another person
- 75 \_\_\_\_\_ use a fake ID
- 76 \_\_\_\_\_ get ahead of someone else waiting in line without that person's permission

- 77 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 1 - 4 miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 78 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 5 - 9 miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 79 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 10 or more miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 80 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of less than \$1
- 81 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of \$1 - \$10
- 82 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of \$11 - 50
- 83 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of more than \$50
- 84 \_\_\_\_\_ tear out a page from a publication (e.g., magazine, telephone book) that doesn't belong to you
- 85 \_\_\_\_\_ use pennies provided by a store to pay for something you purchased even though you had change that could have been used
- 86 \_\_\_\_\_ provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty
- 87 \_\_\_\_\_ keep less than \$1 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 88 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 89 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 90 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$10 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 91 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 1 - 2 alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 92 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 3 - 4 alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 93 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 5 or more alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 94 \_\_\_\_\_ provide incorrect or incomplete information to another student in your class who asks for assistance with class work
- 95 \_\_\_\_\_ not pay for food from a grocery store that is eaten while shopping in the store
- 96 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 1 - 5 minutes
- 97 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 6 - 10 minutes
- 98 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 11 - 30 minutes
- 99 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for more than 30 minutes
- 100 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$10 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 101 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$20 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 102 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$50 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 103 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$100 or more extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank

## Appendix I - Likelihood of Committing Minor Moral and Legal Violations Following Students' Excusable Ratings Scale

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The previous page showed how serious KSU students thought a variety of moral violations were. Using the scale below, please write in the blank to the left of each item the one number that best reflects how likely you would be to engage in that moral violation.

NOT AT ALL LIKELY	1	2	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	3	4	5	EXTREMELY LIKELY	6
1	_____							
								keep <u>\$10</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account
2	_____							
								keep <u>\$20</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account
3	_____							
								keep <u>\$50</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account
4	_____							
								keep <u>\$100 or more</u> extra cash dispensed by an ATM that was not deducted from your bank account
5	_____							
								give yourself a <u>slightly better</u> score on some game (e.g., miniature golf) than you actually earned
6	_____							
								give yourself a <u>much better</u> score on some game (e.g., miniature golf) than you actually earned
7	_____							
								take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>less than \$1</u>
8	_____							
								take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>\$1 - \$10</u>
9	_____							
								take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>\$11 - \$50</u>
10	_____							
								take items from a motel or hotel for your personal use that are worth <u>more than \$50</u>
11	_____							
								copy a CD for personal use that is copyrighted
12	_____							
								drive away without notifying the owner after <u>scratching</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot
13	_____							
								drive away without notifying the owner after <u>denting</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot
14	_____							
								drive away without notifying the owner after <u>severely damaging</u> a car parked on the street or in a parking lot
15	_____							
								pay someone else to do an assignment for a course that you would turn in as your own
16	_____							
								violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) <u>a little</u> so as to increase your chances of winning

- 17 \_\_\_\_\_ violate the rules of a game (e.g., board or card game) a lot so as to increase your chances of winning
- 18 \_\_\_\_\_ not stop for a person waiting to cross the street in a pedestrian crosswalk
- 19 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about a quarter of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 20 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about half of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 21 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although about three quarters of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 22 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own although all of it was taken directly from the Internet
- 23 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged less than \$1 on some purchase
- 24 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged \$1 - \$10 on some purchase
- 25 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged \$11 - \$50 on some purchase
- 26 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to report that you were undercharged more than \$50 on some purchase
- 27 \_\_\_\_\_ list an accomplishment or award on your resume that you did not earn
- 28 \_\_\_\_\_ buy a term paper from a website that you would turn in as your own
- 29 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth less than \$1
- 30 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth \$1 - \$10
- 31 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth \$11 - \$50
- 32 \_\_\_\_\_ take supplies from work for your personal use that are worth more than \$50
- 33 \_\_\_\_\_ use one or two of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 34 \_\_\_\_\_ use several of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 35 \_\_\_\_\_ use all of someone else's answers to complete a homework assignment
- 36 \_\_\_\_\_ download a copyrighted song from the Internet
- 37 \_\_\_\_\_ download a copyrighted album from the Internet
- 38 \_\_\_\_\_ download a copyrighted software from the Internet
- 39 \_\_\_\_\_ put in less than your equal portion of the money when pitching in to pay for a meal shared by several individuals
- 40 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth less than \$1 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 41 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth \$1 - \$10 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 42 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth \$11 - \$50 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 43 \_\_\_\_\_ keep something that you intended to purchase worth more than \$50 that was accidentally excluded from your bill
- 44 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was partially taken from another student's work
- 45 \_\_\_\_\_ turn in a writing assignment (e.g., a term paper) as your own that was completely taken from another student's work
- 46 \_\_\_\_\_ hide a library book in the library so that only you will be able to find it later
- 47 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car knowing that your registration or driver's license had expired

- 48 \_\_\_\_\_ speed up a little to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection
- 49 \_\_\_\_\_ speed up a lot to drive through a yellow light before you get to an intersection
- 50 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost less than \$1 to buy
- 51 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost \$1 - \$10 to buy
- 52 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost \$11 - \$50 to buy
- 53 \_\_\_\_\_ take something from a store that you didn't pay for that would have cost more than \$50 to buy
- 54 \_\_\_\_\_ turn right on a red light without coming to a complete stop
- 55 \_\_\_\_\_ keep less than \$1 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 56 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 57 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 58 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$10 extra change returned by a store clerk
- 59 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 1 - 5 minutes
- 60 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 6 - 10 minutes
- 61 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for 11 - 30 minutes
- 62 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "No Parking" zone for more than 30 minutes
- 63 \_\_\_\_\_ copy a DVD for personal use that is copyrighted
- 64 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 65 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 66 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$11 - \$20 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 67 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$20 that you found in a wallet or purse on the street that contains the owner's identification
- 68 \_\_\_\_\_ engage in premarital sex
- 69 \_\_\_\_\_ have premarital sex with someone you know very well but aren't in a committed relationship with
- 70 \_\_\_\_\_ have premarital sex with someone you know very well and are in a committed relationship with
- 71 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other rarely or never
- 72 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other occasionally
- 73 \_\_\_\_\_ have sexual thoughts toward a person other than your significant other often
- 74 \_\_\_\_\_ have a sexual relationship with someone other than your spouse while you're married to another person
- 75 \_\_\_\_\_ use a fake ID
- 76 \_\_\_\_\_ get ahead of someone else waiting in line without that person's permission

- 77 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 1 - 4 miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 78 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 5 - 9 miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 79 \_\_\_\_\_ drive 10 or more miles per hour over the speed limit on the highway
- 80 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of less than \$1
- 81 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of \$1 - \$10
- 82 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of \$11 - 50
- 83 \_\_\_\_\_ fail to return money or possessions loaned to you by another person with a value of more than \$50
- 84 \_\_\_\_\_ tear out a page from a publication (e.g., magazine, telephone book) that doesn't belong to you
- 85 \_\_\_\_\_ use pennies provided by a store to pay for something you purchased even though you had change that could have been used
- 86 \_\_\_\_\_ provide false information on a court document to avoid serving jury duty
- 87 \_\_\_\_\_ keep less than \$1 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 88 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$1 - \$5 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 89 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$6 - \$10 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 90 \_\_\_\_\_ keep more than \$10 extra change returned by a waiter or waitress in a restaurant
- 91 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 1 - 2 alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 92 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 3 - 4 alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 93 \_\_\_\_\_ drive a car after you had 5 or more alcoholic drinks (e.g., beers, glasses of wine, shots, mixed drinks)
- 94 \_\_\_\_\_ provide incorrect or incomplete information to another student in your class who asks for assistance with class work
- 95 \_\_\_\_\_ not pay for food from a grocery store that is eaten while shopping in the store
- 96 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 1 - 5 minutes
- 97 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 6 - 10 minutes
- 98 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for 11 - 30 minutes
- 99 \_\_\_\_\_ park in a "Handicapped" zone for more than 30 minutes
- 100 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$10 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 101 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$20 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 102 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$50 extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank
- 103 \_\_\_\_\_ keep \$100 or more extra cash handed to you by a teller at a bank

## **Appendix J - Experiment 2 Informed Consent**

This research is examining K-State student attitudes toward various minor moral violations. For this study, you will be asked to complete questionnaires about your attitudes on minor moral violations.

There are no right or wrong answers to the questions, just your opinions. You can skip any questions you feel uncomfortable answering. If at any time during this experiment you decide you no longer want to participate, you can quit participating without penalty. All responses remain anonymous and confidential.

This study takes approximately 1 hour to complete (research credit: 1 hour).

Should you have questions or concerns about this study, you can contact Laura Brannon at (785) 532-0604 or [lbrannon@ksu.edu](mailto:lbrannon@ksu.edu). You may also contact Rick Scheidt [Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, 203 Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 532-3224] with the Kansas State University IRB.

**TERMS OF PARTICIPATION:** I understand this project is research, and that my participation is completely voluntary. I also understand that if I decide to participate in this study, I may withdraw my consent at any time, and stop participating at any time without explanation, penalty, or loss of benefits, or academic standing to which I may otherwise be entitled.

Continuing to the next page indicates that I have read and understood this consent form, and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described (Kansas State University IRB Informed Consent; <http://www.k-state.edu/comply/irb/forms/>).

## Appendix K - Experiment 2 Debriefing

You were told you were reading how K-State students' rate minor moral violations. These ratings were not accurate. Some participants read K-State students were *more* or *less* likely to engage in a behavior than they actually are. Other participants read K-State students considered a behavior to be *more* or *less* serious than they actually do. K-State students' actual likelihood and severity ratings are presented at the end of this debriefing. We apologize for this deception.

Should you have questions or concerns (either now or later) about this study, you can contact Laura Brannon at (785) 532-0604 or [lbrannon@ksu.edu](mailto:lbrannon@ksu.edu). You may also contact Rick Scheidt [Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, 203 Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 532-3224] with the Kansas State University IRB.

Thanks for participating.