

PERSONAL AND **SOCIAL** **RESPONSIBILITY INVENTORY**

An Institutional Climate Measure

St. Philip's College

Moral and Ethical Development Assessment Report

July 2016

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Sample and Respondent Characteristics	4
Case Study	5
Figure 1: Case Study Decision.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Figure 2: Commitment to Case Study Decision.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Table 1: Frequency of Case Study Response Reasons.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Table 2: Case Study Composite Score.....	6
Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory	7
Table 3: PSRI Items	8
Table 4: PSRI Items (cont.)	8
Table 5: PSRI Pre-Test Frequencies	9
Table 6: PSRI Pre-Test Frequencies (cont.).....	9
Table 7: PSRI Post-Test Frequencies.....	10
Table 8: PSRI Post-Test Frequencies (cont.).....	10
Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ20)	11
Table 9: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Factor Comparisons	12
Table 10: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Care/Harm.....	12
Table 11: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Fairness/Cheating.....	13
Table 12: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Loyalty/Betrayal	13
Table 13: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Authority/Subversion.....	14
Table 14: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Sanctity/Degradation.....	14

Introduction

This survey provides data to support the St. Philip's College Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment. We ask students to examine their values as part of understanding their ethical and moral development.

The assessment consists of three parts, which were assembled to align with the three student learning outcomes outlined in the St. Philip's College QEP:

- A. Students gain the skills to assess their own values and the origins of those values (e.g., fairness, respect)
- B. Students identify and know about ethical issues (e.g., academic integrity, broad issues)
- C. Students analyze ethical perspectives (e.g., how perspectives might differ by character)

The following components comprise the St. Philip's assessment:

1. *An original case study* was developed using Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of moral development, as well as the AAC&U Characteristic Traits of the Dimensions document. The case study asked students consider an incident of academic dishonesty, make a decision, and provide their reasoning for the decision.
2. *Ten items from the Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory (PSRI)* were selected by a team of assessment professionals at St. Philip's College to evaluate students' perceptions of the campus climate. The PSRI is a nationally-administered climate instrument designed to assess students' perceptions of institutional support and opportunities for education in personal and social responsibility.
3. *The Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ)* was selected as a way through which to assess the student values from a different conceptual lens than Kohlberg. Jonathan Haidt, the social psychologist who created the instrument, suggests that societies develop their moral systems from five foundations: harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and sanctity/degradation.

Table A outlines how each step and task intentionally correspond to the three outcomes, as well as the rationale for each decision.

Survey Methodology

The assessment was delivered online to a panel of 12,271 students for both the pre- and post-tests – all data were collected electronically through the Qualtrics platform. The students were contacted through e-mail with a personalized message inviting them to complete an electronic survey. Each student was assigned an individual link, which allowed students to leave and return to the survey without losing progress.

The pre- and post-tests were administered approximately two months apart, with initial invitations sent in early-February and early-April respectively. For the pre-test, five reminders were sent to students who had not yet completed the survey throughout the month of February and into early March 2016. Similarly, for the post-test, five reminders were sent throughout the month of April and into early May 2016. There were 869 respondents to the pre-test and 700 respondents to the post-test.

A reduced sample (392 for pre-test; 308 for the post-test) was used in the Moral Foundations analysis based on selection criteria in the item key (<http://moralfoundations.org/questionnaires>). The 20-item Moral Foundations Questionnaire included two unscored, "catch" items, which force a response at a

specified end of the scale. If the wrong end of the scale is used, the response is not considered valid and is removed from the analysis.

The first catch item asked about the relevance of “whether or not someone was good at math.” This item is not scored; it is included both to force people to use the bottom end of the scale, and to catch and cut participants who respond with 3 or above. The second catch item had respondents indicate their level of agreement with “it is better to do good than to do bad.” This item is not scored; it is included to force use of top end of the scale, and to catch and cut people who respond with first 3 response options.

Of the students who provided a response for both “whether or not someone was good at math” and “it is better to do good than bad” on the pre-test, 392 were included in the analysis. The students were included because they selected that it was not at all relevant, not very relevant, or slightly relevant “whether or not someone was good at math,” and they selected that they slightly agreed, moderately agreed, or strongly agreed “it is better to do good than bad.”

The same method was employed for the post-test. Of the students who provided a response for both “whether or not someone was good at math” and “it is better to do good than bad” on the pre-test, 308 were included in the analysis. The students were included because they selected that it was not at all relevant, not very relevant, or slightly relevant “whether or not someone was good at math,” and they selected that they slightly agreed, moderately agreed, or strongly agreed “it is better to do good than bad.”

Note on Assessing Change over Time

While change can be assessed over time using a pre-post design around specified experiences, it is difficult to say what or if change has occurred over the course of such a short period of time. This pilot administration has provided an opportunity to further refine the instrument, and the case study element in particular. Refinement of the instrument in tandem with future administrations and data collection will provide more stable longitudinal data for the purposes of the St. Philip's College QEP.

Table A: Assessment Alignment with Student Learning Outcomes

	Step and task	Rationale	Outcome
1.	Students read a scenario and make a decision	Step 1 allows students to consider and react to an ethical issue	B – issues C – perspectives
2.	Students identify and rank up to five items that influenced their decision	Step 2 allows us to see what values are influencing students decisions	A – values C – perspectives
3.	Students rate their commitment to the decision they made in Step 1	Step 3 allows us to understand their commitment to the decision	A - values
4.	Students complete the MFQ Short Form, a psychometrically sound instrument that identifies which of five values inform decision-making processes.	Step 4 allows us to understand broader foundations in students values	A – values B – issues C – perspectives
5.	Students rank five statements, which align with the previously assessed moral foundations. The survey does not indicate to the student that the previous 20 questions form five foundations.	Steps 4 allows us to understand broader foundations in students' values, as well as the congruence between what they believe influences their decisions (ranking in Step 5) and what we have found influences their decisions (Step 4)	A - values

Sample and Respondent Characteristics

	Sample		Respondents			
	N	%	Pre-Test		Post-Test	
			n	%	n	%
Gender						
Male	5273	43%	314	37%	258	38%
Female	6906	57%	529	63%	414	61%
Not Reported	28	*	1	*	6	1%
Total	12207	100%	844	100%	678	100%
Class Year						
First Year	6199	51%	365	43%	340	50%
Second Year	6007	49%	478	57%	337	50%
Not Reported	1	*	1	*	1	*
Total	12207	100%	844	100%	678	100%
Race						
American Indian/Alaska Native	31	*	2	*	3	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	119	1%	13	2%	8	1%
Black or African American	489	4%	49	6%	26	4%
Hispanic	2313	19%	174	21%	158	23%
International	11	*	1	*	2	0%
White Non-Hispanic	1240	10%	91	11%	60	9%
Two or More Races	10	*	-	-	-	-
Other	147	1%	24	3%	14	2%
Unknown or Not Reported	7842	64%	488	58%	407	60%
Not Disclosed	5	*	2	*	-	-
Total	12207	100%	844	100%	678	100%
Status						
Full-Time	2058	17%	300	36%	230	34%
Part-Time	10148	83%	543	64%	447	66%
Not Reported	1	*	1	*	1	*
Total	12207	100%	844	100%	678	100%

Note: Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

This table presents response frequencies in relation to the overall panel provided by St. Philip's, with the pre- and post-test administrations garnering response rates of 6.9% and 5.6% respectively. These are very low response rates, and inferences from these findings should be avoided.

Case Study

This case study and the subsequent value ranking items were designed with Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of moral development as a foundation (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010), as well as the AAC&U Characteristic Traits of the Dimensions document. Research (Rohan, 2000) suggests that value identification, value prioritization, and the consistency of prioritization over time are good measures of personal value development.

The case study was administered online, and students were asked to make a decision based upon a scenario involving academic integrity. This process provides an opportunity for respondents to consider and react to an ethical issue. The selection of reasons for their initial decision provides potential opportunities to see what values are shaping student decisions and where students generally stand within the stages of moral development.

Text of the Case Study

(Public content removed from this section of the report by QEP Director to protect integrity of future administrations)

References

- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rohan, M. J. (2000). A rose by any name? The values construct. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(3), 255-277.

Prior to administering the survey, potential reasons for a decision in the case study were generated. These reasons were informed by Kohlberg’s understanding of moral development. Level 1 reasons are rooted in concrete perspectives, which are individually-focused and responsive to authority. Level 2 reasons align with social roles and expectations, as well as the rule of law. Level 3 reasons reflect the social system as a contact, which protects fundamental human rights and welfare.

There were 709 respondents on the pre-test and 585 on the post-test. Table 1 presents the frequency of selection of each reason as part of the case study. Students could select 2-5 reasons—the total number of reasons selected across the three levels do not correspond to the total number of respondents. Percentages were calculated for each item based on the number of responses to an item divided by the total number of respondents. More students selected yes on both the pre- and post-test, which means that yes-leaning reasons were selected more frequently.

(Public content removed from this section of the report by QEP Director to protect integrity of future administrations)

Each case study reason was coded as 1-3 to denote the corresponding level of moral reasoning as selected by the student, and a composite mean score was calculated for each respondent. The score provides an estimate of a student’s moral reasoning in response to this case study. Table 2 presents the institutional mean scores from both the pre- and post-test administrations of the case study.

Table 2: Case Study Composite Score

Item	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Case Study Composite Score	709	2.08	0.39	585	2.11	0.41

Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory

A team of assessment professionals at St. Philip's College selected 10 items from the Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory (PSRI) as an institutional climate measure for their QEP. The items closely aligned with the student learning outcomes being assessed. The PSRI is a nationally-administered climate instrument designed to assess students' perceptions of institutional support and opportunities for education in personal and social responsibility.

The PSRI not only provides data for institutional improvement, but also continues exploration into interventions and strategies that will inform a national conversation on ways to strengthen learning for personal and social responsibility. The research emerging from this project informs good practice for the development of personal and social responsibility for all students.

Table 3: PSRI Items**Please rate your level of agreement with the following items:***

Item	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
My experiences at this campus have increased my ability to learn from diverse perspectives.	562	4.13	1.02	494	4.15	1.03
My experiences at this campus have helped me develop a better understanding of academic integrity	560	4.22	1.02	493	4.23	1.05
Faculty at this institution understand the campus academic policies	551	4.41	0.95	475	4.34	0.98
Helping students recognize the importance of taking seriously the perspectives of others is a major focus of this campus	545	4.13	1.03	478	4.20	1.04
Faculty at this institution help students think through new and challenging ideas or perspectives	553	4.31	0.97	478	4.28	1.01
This campus has high expectations for students in terms of their ability to take seriously the perspectives of others, especially those with whom they disagree	534	4.10	1.03	484	4.21	1.02
Helping students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning is a major focus of this campus	544	4.15	1.06	471	4.23	1.04
This campus helps students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning, including the ability to express and act upon personal values responsibly	553	4.15	1.04	480	4.20	1.05
This campus provides opportunities for students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning in their academic work	547	4.20	1.03	475	4.25	1.06

*Response ranged from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree

Table 4: PSRI Items (cont.)**How often do the following occur on this campus?***

Item	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Faculty reinforce the campus academic policies	503	4.39	0.85	465	4.37	0.87

*Response ranged from 1 = Almost never to 5 = Almost always

Table 5: PSRI Pre-Test Frequencies

Please rate your level of agreement with the following items:*

	Student Respondents					
	Valid Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree
My experiences at this campus have increased my ability to learn from diverse perspectives.	562 100%	17 3%	14 3%	115 21%	151 27%	265 47%
My experiences at this campus have helped me develop a better understanding of academic integrity	560 100%	18 3%	11 2%	101 18%	132 24%	298 53%
Faculty at this institution understand the campus academic policies	551 100%	13 2%	13 2%	66 12%	102 19%	357 65%
Helping students recognize the importance of taking seriously the perspectives of others is a major focus of this campus	545 100%	16 3%	18 3%	105 19%	147 27%	259 48%
Faculty at this institution help students think through new and challenging ideas or perspectives	553 100%	13 2%	14 3%	81 15%	123 22%	322 58%
This campus has high expectations for students in terms of their ability to take seriously the perspectives of others, especially those with whom they disagree	534 100%	18 3%	9 2%	123 23%	134 25%	250 47%
Helping students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning is a major focus of this campus	544 100%	20 4%	15 3%	108 20%	122 22%	279 51%
This campus helps students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning, including the ability to express and act upon personal values responsibly	553 100%	20 4%	12 2%	107 19%	141 26%	273 49%
This campus provides opportunities for students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning in their academic work	547 100%	18 3%	15 3%	95 17%	131 24%	288 53%

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Scale: (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree.

Table 6: PSRI Pre-Test Frequencies (cont.)

How often do the following occur on this campus?*

	Student Respondents					
	Valid Responses	Almost Never	Not Very Often	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always
Faculty reinforce the campus academic policies.	503 100%	7 1%	9 2%	53 11%	145 29%	289 58%

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Scale: (1) Almost never to (5) Almost always.

Table 7: PSRI Post-Test Frequencies

Please rate your level of agreement with the following items:*

	Student Respondents					
	Valid Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neutral	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree
My experiences at this campus have increased my ability to learn from diverse perspectives.	494 100%	18 4%	10 2%	90 18%	137 28%	239 48%
My experiences at this campus have helped me develop a better understanding of academic integrity	493 100%	20 4%	9 2%	80 16%	115 23%	269 55%
Faculty at this institution understand the campus academic policies	475 100%	11 2%	12 3%	71 15%	90 19%	291 61%
Helping students recognize the importance of taking seriously the perspectives of others is a major focus of this campus	478 100%	19 4%	12 3%	71 15%	130 27%	246 52%
Faculty at this institution help students think through new and challenging ideas or perspectives	478 100%	14 3%	15 3%	64 13%	115 24%	270 57%
This campus has high expectations for students in terms of their ability to take seriously the perspectives of others, especially those with whom they disagree	484 100%	15 3%	14 3%	81 17%	118 24%	256 53%
Helping students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning is a major focus of this campus	471 100%	16 3%	11 2%	81 17%	103 22%	260 55%
This campus helps students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning, including the ability to express and act upon personal values responsibly	480 100%	17 4%	17 4%	71 15%	122 25%	253 53%
This campus provides opportunities for students to develop their ethical and moral reasoning in their academic work	475 100%	17 4%	18 4%	65 14%	104 22%	271 57%

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Scale: (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree.

Table 8: PSRI Post-Test Frequencies (cont.)

How often do the following occur on this campus?*

	Student Respondents					
	Valid Responses	Almost Never	Not Very Often	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always
Faculty reinforce the campus academic policies.	465 100%	5 1%	12 3%	55 12%	127 27%	266 57%

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding. Items with * instead of a percentage rounded to 0%.

Scale: (1) Almost never to (5) Almost always.

Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ20)

Haidt and Graham (2007) present a conceptualization of morals different from the work of Lawrence Kohlberg, Carol Gilligan, and James Rest. Their thesis, based on anthropological work, suggests societies develop their moral systems from five foundations. The foundations are harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and sanctity/degradation.

The first foundation exists because humans have developed a natural aversion to suffering, and the harm/care foundation is based on normally developed humans dislike of and empathy towards others' pain. The foundation of fairness/reciprocity is related to justice from human interaction and reciprocal altruism. Loyalty/betrayal examines the tribal nature of groups and ones self-sacrifice for the group. Authority/subversion is concerned with leadership, followership, and individuals' deference to legitimate authority. The final foundation, sanctity/degradation, is tied to emotion of disgust; in this foundation disgust is conceived as socially-related to a particular set of virtues and the purity of individual souls rather than body.

Individual's place different weight on each of the foundations, which shapes their values and moral judgment. Moral Foundations theory suggests these five foundations encompass a wide variety of social and ideological differences and are helpful in explaining tensions related to moral issues in society.

Five Foundations

1. **Care/harm:** This foundation is related to our long evolution as mammals with attachment systems and an ability to feel (and dislike) the pain of others. It underlies virtues of kindness, gentleness, and nurturance.
2. **Fairness/cheating:** This foundation is related to the evolutionary process of reciprocal altruism. It generates ideas of justice, rights, and autonomy.
3. **Loyalty/betrayal:** This foundation is related to our long history as tribal creatures able to form shifting coalitions. It underlies virtues of patriotism and self-sacrifice for the group. It is active anytime people feel that it's "one for all, and all for one."
4. **Authority/subversion:** This foundation was shaped by our long primate history of hierarchical social interactions. It underlies virtues of leadership and followership, including deference to legitimate authority and respect for traditions.
5. **Sanctity/degradation:** This foundation was shaped by the psychology of disgust and contamination. It underlies religious notions of striving to live in an elevated, less carnal, nobler way. It underlies the widespread idea that the body is a temple which can be desecrated by immoral activities and contaminants (an idea not unique to religious traditions).

References

Haidt, J. & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize. *Social Justice Research*, 20(1), 98-116.

A reduced sample (392 for pre-test; 308 for the post-test) was used in the Moral Foundations analysis based on selection criteria in the item key (<http://moralfoundations.org/questionnaires>). The 20-item Moral Foundations Questionnaire included two unscored, “catch” items, which force a response at a specified end of the scale. If the wrong end of the scale is used, the response is not considered valid and is removed from the analysis.

The first catch item asked about the relevance of “whether or not someone was good at math.” This item is not scored; it is included both to force people to use the bottom end of the scale, and to catch and cut participants who respond with 3 or above. The second catch item had respondents indicate their level of agreement with “it is better to do good than to do bad.” This item is not scored; it is included to force use of top end of the scale, and to catch and cut people who respond with first 3 response options.

Of the students who provided a response for **both** “whether or not someone was good at math” and “it is better to do good than bad” on the pre-test, 392 were included in the analysis. The students were included because they selected that it was not at all relevant, not very relevant, or slightly relevant “whether or not someone was good at math,” and they selected that they slightly agreed, moderately agreed, or strongly agreed “it is better to do good than bad.”

The same method was employed for the post-test. Of the students who provided a response for **both** “whether or not someone was good at math” and “it is better to do good than bad” on the pre-test, 308 were included in the analysis. The students were included because they selected that it was not at all relevant, not very relevant, or slightly relevant “whether or not someone was good at math,” and they selected that they slightly agreed, moderately agreed, or strongly agreed “it is better to do good than bad.”

Table 9: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Factor Comparisons

Foundation	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Care/Harm Foundation Scale	392	3.71	0.92	308	3.77	0.93
Fairness/Cheating Foundation Scale	392	3.86	0.81	308	3.89	0.75
Loyalty/Betrayal Foundation Scale	392	2.98	0.95	308	3.13	0.93
Authority/Subversion Foundation Scale	392	3.28	0.81	308	3.23	0.85
Sanctity/Degradation Foundation Scale	392	3.10	0.99	308	3.04	0.97

Table 10: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Care/Harm

	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Care/Harm Foundation Scale	392	3.71	0.92	308	3.77	0.93
When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking?*						
Whether or not someone suffered emotionally	391	3.36	1.41	307	3.52	1.25
Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable	388	3.45	1.36	307	3.40	1.37
Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement.**						
Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue.	389	3.72	1.22	308	3.95	0.97
One of the worst things a person can do is hurt a defenseless animal.	390	4.30	1.17	307	4.23	1.16

*Responses ranged from, 0 = Not at all relevant to 5 = Extremely relevant

**Responses ranged from, 0 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

Table 11: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Fairness/Cheating

	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Fairness/Cheating Foundation Scale	392	3.86	0.81	308	3.89	0.75
When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking?*						
Whether or not some people were treated differently than others	389	3.61	1.37	306	3.71	1.24
Whether or not someone acted unfairly	387	3.55	1.23	307	3.60	1.13
Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement.**						
When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly.	392	4.33	1.05	308	4.21	1.10
Justice is the most important requirement for a society.	390	3.97	1.11	306	4.04	0.99

*Responses ranged from, 0 = Not at all relevant to 5 = Extremely relevant

**Responses ranged from, 0 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

Table 12: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Loyalty/Betrayal

	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Loyalty/Betrayal Foundation Scale	392	2.98	0.95	308	3.13	0.93
When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking?*						
Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country	391	2.47	1.65	305	2.63	1.49
Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group	392	3.34	1.41	307	3.49	1.25
Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement.**						
I am proud of my country's history.	392	3.26	1.47	307	3.26	1.46
People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong.	392	2.86	1.57	307	3.12	1.61

*Responses ranged from, 0 = Not at all relevant to 5 = Extremely relevant

**Responses ranged from, 0 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

Table 13: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Authority/Subversion

	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Authority/Subversion Foundation Scale	392	3.28	0.81	308	3.23	0.85
When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking?*						
Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority	391	3.60	1.30	307	3.50	1.31
Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society	391	2.20	1.34	307	2.23	1.39
Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement.**						
Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.	389	4.47	0.95	307	4.39	0.98
Men and women each have different roles to play in society.	391	2.86	1.66	308	2.78	1.74

*Responses ranged from, 0 = Not at all relevant to 5 = Extremely relevant

**Responses ranged from, 0 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree

Table 14: Moral Foundations Questionnaire – Sanctity/Degradation

	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Sanctity/Degradation Foundation Scale	392	3.10	0.99	308	3.04	0.97
When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking?*						
Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency	389	3.53	1.37	307	3.43	1.29
Whether or not someone did something disgusting	390	2.65	1.48	307	2.53	1.47
Please read the following sentences and indicate your agreement or disagreement.**						
People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed.	389	3.39	1.42	307	3.41	1.42
I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural.	391	2.85	1.52	306	2.81	1.54

*Responses ranged from, 0 = Not at all relevant to 5 = Extremely relevant

**Responses ranged from, 0 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree