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Abstract

This study investigates how actor status, moral foundations, and individual values influence the moral judgments of guilt and punishment. I argue that the consequences of individual values for actions can be understood only if considered alongside organizational values and larger frameworks of institutional logics. Building on Zerubavel’s (1999) conception of a three-level cognition, I argue for a tri-level conception of values and morality in order to more fully understand how moral judgments work within the social context that shapes them.

Zerubavel (1999) argued that cognition operated at the individual, social, and macro levels. Based on original research, I offer evidence of three levels of morality. I evaluate individual level morality two ways. First, I evaluate individual moral culture using Schwartz values (Schwartz 2012; Vaisey and Miles 2014). I then account for the social level through the impact of the organization on moral culture measure through the use of status hierarchies (Sauder, Lynn, and Podolny 2012). Finally, I account for the macro level and evaluate broader cultural morality using moral foundations theory (Graham et al. 2016; Kesebir and Haidt 2010). Taken together, these three levels of morality provide a more ecologically valid understanding of how moral culture operates from the individual level to the meso-social level, and to the macro level culture.
I demonstrate the complex ways in which moral judgments are influenced by universal moral concerns contained in individual characteristics, organizational influences, and culturally anchored institutional logics. I find that actor status most strongly predicts the outcomes of guilt and punishment, demonstrating that social context has a powerful influence on individual moral judgments. Moral foundations theory conceptions of harm do not predict judgments of guilt and punishment, but Schwartz values do influence these moral judgments. The research provides a foundation for future research on the influence of actor status on moral judgments of guilt and punishment beyond the limited moral community of the current study.
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1. The Problem of Moral Universals

The question of why high-status individuals go unpunished for immoral behavior remains a pressing question for academics and nonacademics alike. I argue that to understand individual influence on moral judgments, they must be considered alongside organizational values and within a larger framework of institutional logics. Building on Zerubavel’s (1999) conception of a three-level cognition, I argue for a tri-level conception of values and morality in order to more fully understand how moral judgments work and the social context in which they are shaped. I combine insights from moral psychology and theories of status and deviance to examine the role of an actor’s status in others’ perceptions of im(morality), guilt, and deservingness of punishment.

Zerubavel (1999) argued that cognition operated at the individual, social, and macro levels. Based on original research, I offer evidence of three levels of morality. I evaluate individual level morality two ways. First, I evaluate individual moral culture using Schwartz values (Schwartz 2012; Vaisey and Miles 2014). I then account for the social level through the impact of the organization on moral culture measure through the use of status hierarchies (Sauder, Lynn, and Podolny 2012). Finally, I account for the macro level and evaluate broader cultural morality using moral foundations theory (Graham et al. 2016; Kesebir and Haidt 2010). Taken together, these three levels of morality provide a more ecologically valid understanding of how moral culture operates.
from the individual level to the meso-social level, and to the macro level culture. The following chapters demonstrate the complex ways in which moral judgments are influenced by individual characteristics, organizational influences, and institutional logics.

Sociology was once deeply concerned with values and morality (Hitlin and Vaisey 2012; Hitlin and Piliavin 2004). The retreat from Parsons combined with the culture of poverty arguments lead the field of sociology to question the role that values played in individual outcomes (Lewis 1969). Further research demonstrated inconsistency between stated values and behavioral outcomes (Swidler 1986; Swidler 2003). Moral Psychology has not suffered from this reticence regarding values and morality in accounting for human behavior. In his argument that morality is more than harm and fairness, Jonathan Haidt attempted to bring sociology into the psychological study of morality and moral judgments (Haidt 2007). Although sociology may be late in returning to a field it originally plowed (Coser 2003; Durkheim 1992a; M. Weber 1993; Hitlin and Vaisey 2013), sociology has much to offer in the study of morality and values. This dissertation will outline three studies drawing new links between the sociological study of morality and the psychological study of moral judgments.

I argue that to advance our understanding of how values and morality influence actions in everyday life, we must study actors embedded in situated context. Organizations offer an ideal setting to test general theories of values. Like individuals,
organizations do not exist in a valueless vacuum; they are situated in broader moral cultures that are at least partly defined by institutional logics. The first analysis combines moral psychology’s notion the act rather than the actor motivates moral judgments with sociological understandings of status and deviance. Using original survey experiment data collected from the U.S. Army, I find evidence that an actor’s status within a specific moral community influences the moral judgments others make about his or her actions. I discuss the implications for future research on status and morality.

The second analysis investigates whether individual values, as measured by the Schwartz values scales, predict judgments of guilt and punishment. Importantly, however, this analysis focuses on the individual level of Zerubavel’s tri-level cognition. This second analysis evaluates the influence of individual values on moral judgments.

The third analysis tests whether the moral foundation of harm, based on a prominent moral psychological theory of morality, predicts judgments of guilt and punishment for acts that vary on levels of harm. The idea that harm is immoral is well accepted in moral psychology. Moral foundations theory (MFT) within the field of moral psychology, argues that morality is more than merely harm and fairness and claims to offer a broader view of morality that more accurately depicts daily life. This theory has been used to predict a wide variety of decisions, but little research has explored just what MFT predicts for actual moral decision making when individuals are embedded in
communities. Sociological questions of morality, however, are not centered on harm but rather focus on two main areas: (1) the study of altruism, and (2) understanding individual’s definitions of good and bad, right and wrong. Importantly, sociological questions of morality incorporate social context as opposed to unsituated individuals.

I combine insights from MFT and sociological theories of multilevel morality to examine whether MFT offers insights into moral judgments. I find that it is again the actor and not the action that is the strongest predictor of guilt and punishment. Using original survey experiment data collected from the U.S. Army, I find that MFT does not predict moral judgments involving guilt or punishment in a specific moral community. Specifically, I demonstrate that although MFT orientations may be predictive of moral evaluations at the macro level, these are insufficient explanations for moral decisions made in particular settings, which are anchored in individuals’ more personal and social meaning.

Combined, these studies offer new insights into how individuals make moral judgments beyond the methodologically limited field of moral psychology. By accounting for individual values, social level organizational membership and broader moral culture, I demonstrate that moral judgments are not abstract notions destined for study in a lab but rather are influenced in embedded social context everyday life rather than universal understandings of morality (Kesebir and Haidt 2010; Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2012).
2. The Halo Effect: How Status Influences Moral Judgments in the Moral Community of the U.S. Army

2.1 Introduction

Why do some people get away with immoral acts whereas others appear to be punished more harshly for the very same act? Is it the act, the actor, or the observer that influences outcomes of moral judgments of guilt and punishment? Much of moral psychology has focused on the moralization of acts, with a primary emphasis on harm and fairness rather than actors.¹

However, focusing on the act itself offers only limited insight because, for example, it ignores factors surrounding actors’ social positions. A challenge with these studies is they may not offer a phenomenological approach to how moral judgments work beyond the laboratory (Abend 2012; Abend 2008; Vaisey and Miles 2014). People may agree that an act is wrong, but their moral judgments beyond the lab may be influenced by the particular situation, group dynamics, or individual differences. Combining research from both moral psychology and sociology can offer insights into what factors influence moral judgment outcomes. Questions of guilt and punishment are often evaluated through questions about moral responsibility. Just what moral

¹ In recent decades, moral psychology has expanded to include realms of morality beyond acts involving harm or fairness (Kesebir and Haidt 2010; Haidt 2008; Haidt 2003; Haidt and Graham 2006) and questions about characteristics of the actor (Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2012; Goodwin 2015).
responsibility measures, however, is also subject to debate (Malle, Guglielmo, and Monroe 2014). Recent research in moral psychology has focused on distinguishing between blame (focus on individuals) and wrongness (focus on acts) (Malle, Guglielmo, and Monroe 2014; Thapar-Bjorkert and Morgan 2009; Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2012) or moral responsibility (Haidt and Baron 1996; Karelaia and Keck 2013; Abrams, Randsley de Moura, and Travaglino 2013; Effron and Monin 2010; Stewart 2005). To this author’s knowledge, none of the referenced research has examined differences in pathways to blame and judgment when actors are embedded within a particular social context that has subjective meaning for the respondents.

In contrast to the vast field of moral psychology, sociology has more robustly explored the roles of actor status and the social context in decision-making. First, much work has examined how status influences outcomes associated with, for example, jobs and hiring (S. J. Correll, Benard, and Paik 2007; Berger 1977), promotions at work (Hollander 1958; Lucas 2003; Cecilia L. Ridgeway et al. 2009), and status influences on evaluations of workplace misbehavior (Fragale et al. 2009; Polman, Pettit, and Wiesenfeld 2013; Wahrman 1970b). Organizational studies have found that status is based on past demonstrations of competence and performance (Sorenson 2013), is inherently a marker of distinction, and often denotes previous contributions to the group (Willer 2009). Status is almost always derived as a function of group position (Sorenson 2013). High status cannot be claimed; rather, it must be bestowed by the
group (Willer 2009). This is not to say that status cannot stem from very large, diffuse groups. Celebrities, athletes, and politicians are examples of widely recognized, high-status individuals.

Research on status and moral judgments has recently begun to broaden our understanding of how status affects moral actions (P. K. Piff 2013; P. K. Piff et al. 2012; P. K. Piff, Martinez, and Keltner 2012; R. Willer et al. 2012; R. Willer 2009). Applying knowledge about social patterns from various status research traditions to the study of moral judgments can potentially inform how an actor’s multiple roles and membership in diverse groups influence moral judgments. Moreover, extending the study of moral judgments to include perceptions of guilt and punishment—which are foci of the deviance literature in sociology—would enhance our understanding of why some individuals are punished for immoral acts but others are not.

Finally, it is exactly this membership in multiple roles and groups that creates challenges for the study of status and morality (Wahrman 1970b). A moral community (Durkheim 1992a; Haidt 2007) enables measurement of both moral judgments (assessments of which acts are viewed as right and wrong) and status (whether group members are evaluated differently because of their positions within the group) (Wahrman 1970b).

Studying a moral community allows us to address the problems raised in each of the research traditions because a moral community, by definition, involves relatively
homogenous observer beliefs. A moral community offers agreed-upon assessments of what acts are (im)moral within the community, and clearly defined formal status that goes beyond a collective task group to a group bound by a shared common sentiment (Durkheim 1996). The U.S. Army provides an ideal moral community for study because it exemplifies these two characteristics.

I argue that understanding how individuals make moral judgments requires moving beyond the nature of specific acts or even the intentionality of unsituated actors (Malle, Guglielmo, and Monroe 2014). Research must account for social context by specifically asking, who is the actor? I investigate whether status influences moral judgments within the moral community of the U.S. Army in order to control for measurement issues inherent in measuring both morality and status. In so doing, I aim to further our understanding of how individuals arrive at moral judgments of wrongness, perceived guilt, and recommended punishment. I offer evidence from an online survey experiment conducted using members of the U.S. Army to demonstrate that judgments of morality, guilt, and punishment are influenced by membership within a moral community and by status internal to that particular moral community. I show that despite widespread consensus on moral judgments within the moral community, an actor’s status within that community has a strong influence over judgments of wrongness, guilt, and punishment. I conclude with implications for further study of status and morality within sociology.
2.2 Durkheim’s Morality and Moral Communities

Durkheim understood morality as obligations to the group and as a force within individuals prompting them to act rather than as a rational evaluation of right and wrong. According to his view, morality works through individuals—component parts of their community—creating an obligatory sense of commitment and duty (Durkheim 1992a). Durkheim’s work was a response to the rise of individual autonomy that frees the individual from any group or community restraints (Durkheim 1992a; Miller 1996; Joas 2013).

Critically, Durkheim understood that morality was distinctly limited: he recognized that individuals were incapable of being morally bound beyond a specific, local group. Although he argued for moral education as a means to expand individual moral boundaries beyond primary groups, such as family or tribe (Joas 2013), he provided no mechanism that served as this bridging function. The moral pressure that these primary groups exerted then should have greater influence over moral judgments (Durkheim 1992a) than the more diffuse morality of more distant groups, such as the state. Classical Durkheimian sociology, then, provides an account of the group’s influence on individual moral judgments (Durkheim 1992a).

Haidt (2007) built on Durkheim’s ideas by arguing that groups are more than a knot of people working together. Instead, he argued that certain groups are, in essence, moral communities with the ability to reward and sanction those who adhere to or
deviate from the group’s norms. By defining moral boundaries of permissible and impermissible actions, groups then regulate each member’s behavior by rewarding what the group defines as good and punishing what the group defines as bad (Haidt 2007; Durkheim 1992a). Basing moral judgments in moral communities—those communities bound by “shared norms…combined with means for imposing costs on violators” (Haidt 2007)—provides clear measurements of morality and group expectations. The very definitions of deviance, status, and morality are contingent on the shared understanding and agreement of a group of individuals (Wahrman 1970a).

I now turn to three potentially fruitful contemporary sociological approaches to studying judgments: the act approach, the status approach, and the deviance approach. Each of these approaches offers a distinct perspective about the potential influence of status on moral judgments.

### 2.3 The Act Approach

Much of moral psychology’s definition of morality extends from Kant’s perspective that “the moral status of an act is evaluated in relation to rules, duties or obligations viewed as a set of constraints on the action” (Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2012). Moral psychology seeks to answer questions about how people judge what is right and wrong based on evaluations of the act itself (see Figure 1) (J. Greene and Haidt 2002) and is anchored in the ideas that actions, not actors, are to be judged (Joas 2013; Joas 2001).
Although some research in taking this approach has evaluated differences in moral judgments based on perceived social distance (Sachdeva, Singh, and Medin 2011) and the role expectations of who is engaging in the act (Hamilton and Sanders 1981), little work has attempted to account for status effects on moral judgments.

![Figure 1. Moral Psychology Model of Judgment](image)

Moral psychology argues that harm is scientifically and cross-culturally understood as the basis of evil. As a result, it is a more clearly identifiable deviant act (Sousa, Holbrook, and Piazza 2009; Carnes and Janoff-Bulman 2012; Chakroff, Dungan, and Young 2013; Haidt 2008). Acts that are more deviant are more likely to be recognized as such and thus, those acts that cause more harm should be evaluated as more guilty. (White 1975).

Harm, therefore, serves as the basis for evaluating the act, rather than the actor. Moral judgments of blame and responsibility are the foundation for the application of social sanctions. Holding someone morally responsible for an action is closely connected to the “moral sentiments of indignation, resentment and guilt” (Wallace 1994). Although debate exists about how distinct moral blame is from moral responsibility, moral
philosophy generally suggests that one cannot be found responsible (guilty) without first having been blamed (Wallace 1994; Russell and Deery 2013). Assessments of “guilt determine responsibility and responsibility [then determines] punishment” (Ross 1975, v). Therefore, asking the respondents about actor guilt is another way to assess blameworthiness of the actor rather than wrongness of the act itself is. When asked to ascribe guilt, respondents are essentially being asked to evaluate whether the actor engaged in the act (Ross 1975). Therefore, an act-based model of moral judgment looks as follows:

Model 1. Act based model of judgment

$$\text{judgment} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{act}) + \epsilon$$

These traditions, it should be noted, “place little (if any) emphasis on evaluations of a person—they are fundamentally act based rather than person based” (Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2012, 95 emphasis added). Recent work on moral character has opened the door to the possibility that individual characteristics influence moral judgments (Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2012; Goodwin 2015; Feather and Atthuson 1998), but serious consideration of the actor’s status currently remains largely outside the moral judgment research tradition.

2.4 The Status Approach

Status beliefs are critical evaluations for determining individuals’ positions within a group and thus are important considerations with regard to moral judgments.
(Hitlin and Vaisey 2013). There are many ways that status is measured. The research tradition used to measure status is often dependent on what the researcher is studying. The status characteristics approach argues that an actor’s position within a social hierarchy creates expectations about performance, behavior, and capability (Berger 1977; Berger, and Webster 2006; Berger, Ridgeway, and Zelditch 2002). Ridgeway (2013: 1) argued that status beliefs “bias evaluations for competence and suitability for authority.”

Research traditions with more strident scope conditions have posited that status is obtained through team efforts focused on tasks or that expectations shape perceptions of status (Berger 1977; Berger, and Webster 2006; Berger, Ridgeway, and Zelditch 2002; S. J. Correll and Ridgeway 2006). Much research has examined the influence of status on outcomes, some associated with jobs and hiring (S. J. Correll, Benard, and Paik 2007; Berger 1977), promotions at work (Hollander 1958; Lucas 2003; Cecilia L. Ridgeway et al. 2009), and evaluations of workplace misbehavior (Fragale et al. 2009; Polman, Pettit, and Wiesenfeld 2013; Wahrman 1970b).

In organizational research, high-status actors are frequently held to different standards of behavior than those of lower status (Willer 2009). Lower conformity to group expectations is generally accepted for high-status individuals. In fact, in some cases, nonconformity can signal greater status than conformity (Hollander 1960). Hollander (1958) argued that high-status group members are granted “transgression
credit” for conforming to group behaviors and that the high-status group member exchanges these credits upon engaging in idiosyncratic behavior. In one of the few studies to measure the effects of status on moral judgments, deviant acts by high-status actors were judged as less deviant based solely on their high status (Hollander 1961). Additionally, studies in the group processes literature often report that in-group members tend to judge other members of their group more favorably (Hewstone, Rubin, and Willis 2002). In-group members also tend to be evaluated as higher status than out-group members (Bailey and Ferguson 2013) and this has potentially significant implications for evaluations of wrongdoing and other moral judgments. High-status individuals are usually seen as deserving of their status (S. T. Fiske and Cuddy 2006) and tend to be evaluated less critically than lower-status individuals (Foschi 2000). In addition, status is nearly unshakeable once bestowed (S. Correll and Ridgeway 2003).

In the status research tradition, who an actor is must first be considered before the expectations surrounding the act can be determined. The expectations surrounding the act then are shaped by expectations surrounding the actor (see Figure 2). These expectations then help shape evaluations of guilt and punishment.
A status characteristics approach to studying moral judgment would be modeled as follows:

Model 2: Status Characteristics Model of Judgment

\[ \text{judgment} = \alpha + \beta_i(\text{actor}) + \varepsilon \]

In sum, moral psychology argues that the \textit{act} is the basis of individuals’ moral judgments, whereas status characteristics research focuses on the \textit{actor}. The deviance tradition, however, has a long tradition of addressing both status and a specific type of moral judgment—namely, guilt and punishment.

2.5 \textit{The Deviance Approach}

Deviance research has long recognized that differences exist in how acts are perceived depending on the status of the actor (Chambliss 1973). For instance, social status and punitive reactions to rule violations are strongly linked (White 1975). Kaplan (2006:471) noted that research surrounding status and deviance has found that “social responses to deviant acts depends upon characteristics of the offense, the offender, and the victim.” The very definition of deviance involves labeling the actor and then the act
As Becker (1997:9) noted, the deviance literature recognizes that deviance “is not the quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application of rules and sanctions to the ‘offender’.”

![Deviance Model of Judgment](image)

**Figure 3. Deviance Model of Judgment (Grattet 2011)**

According to the deviance tradition, the *actor* must be recognized as deviant before the act can be viewed as such and before sanctions can be imposed. Thus, actor status will have a stronger influence on the perceived deviance of an act. Furthermore, the deviance tradition suggests that groups will impose stronger sanctions on behaviors that the group considers more important. Put another way, a good soldier may be less sanctioned for domestic violence than for cowardice. Being a coward may be perceived as much worse than beating one’s spouse, given that cowardice would negatively impact the members of the group whereas domestic violence harms a non-group member (Kaplan 2006). Therefore, a deviance model of moral judgments would be represented as follows:

\[
\text{Model 3. Deviance model of judgment} \\
\text{judgment} = \alpha + \beta_1\text{(act)} + \beta_2\text{(actor status)} + \epsilon
\]
As noted earlier, within organizations, high-status actors are frequently held to different standards of behavior (Willer 2009). Furthermore, these actors are often more strongly sanctioned than lower status actors only if their actions are detrimental to the group (White 1975). Because actions that are more severe violations of norms are more readily labeled as deviant, “the severity of sanctions and the status of the offender depends on the seriousness of the violation” (White 1975, 412). Notice that in this tradition, the status of the actor influences the level of severity of the sanctions but the actor status remains unchanged. Status thus appears to create a halo effect, blurring and shaping the way the act is viewed. A model that takes into account the characteristics of the act, the actor’s status, and the interaction between the two captures this perspective. The interaction term permits nonlinearities such as transgression credit for high-status actors.

Model 4. Deviance model of judgment with transgression credit

\[
\text{judgment} = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{situation}) + \beta_2(\text{actor status}) + \beta_1(\text{situation}) \times \beta_2(\text{actor status}) + \epsilon
\]

Although the deviance research tradition has studied the perception of actors based on their status, it has measured status primarily in socioeconomic terms finding, for instance, that socioeconomic status confers unequal treatment before the law (Kaplan 2006; White 1975; Chambliss 1973). This understanding of status does not engage with the more formalized definition of status from the status characteristics research tradition.
In the current study, by accounting for moral judgments within a specific moral community, I am able to isolate the effects of status on moral judgments. Examining these dynamics within a single moral community allows me to clearly identify the more valued members of the group based on sanctions rather than rewards (Wahrman 1970b; Sorenson 2013) and to measure meaningful status characteristics, including those of middle-status actors (S. J. Correll and Ridgeway 2006). Status research has largely neglected middle-status actors. Indeed, it is difficult to quantify what constitutes a middle-status actor (Phillips and Zuckerman 2001). Research from organizational sociology suggests that middle-status actors should be more invested in the structure and survival of the group, thus judging violations of group norms more harshly and being bound themselves more strongly by the rules and expectations of the group (Phillips and Zuckerman 2001).

Anchoring the investigation within a specific moral community also enables me to test whether status changes the perception of moral judgment outside of formal legal environments (White 1975; Wahrman 1970b; Chambliss 1973). Furthermore, I am able to pinpoint which acts are greater violations of the more narrow community norms and expectations. Finally, a moral community also allows for moral judgments of right and wrong to be clearly measured through formal rules and sanctions (Grattet 2011). As I will show, the U.S. Army offers such a moral community.
The current research explicitly links status as understood by sociologists with moral judgments as understood by moral psychologists and deviance scholars. Investigating how status influences moral judgments will insights into whether status truly confers a halo effect around certain individuals’ actions.

**2.6 The Present Study**

I recruited respondents from social media centered around the U.S. Army to participate in a survey about morality in the military. In the survey, I embedded two experiments to evaluate whether actor status had an impact on moral judgments. Many of the survey measures of morality were adapted from the Measuring Morality survey hosted by the Kenan Institute of Ethics at Duke University.²

This study builds on previous research in the moral psychology, status characteristics, and deviance traditions by using respondents who were asked evaluate a member of their own community. The current research offers insight into the challenges inherent in measuring status and moral judgments.

Offering insight into how observer and actor status influences moral judgments is a key contribution of the current research. Observer judgments are critical to the labeling theory of deviance, which argues that behaviors must be viewed as deviant before they can be sanctioned (Kaplan 2006). Indeed, Durkheim foreshadowed Becker’s

---

² [http://kenan.ethics.duke.edu/attitudes/resources/measuring-morality/]
argument regarding the definition of deviance when he argued, contrary to Kant, that actions are not inherently criminal: they are crimes only because they are sanctioned and punished by society as such (Durkheim 1997). Thus, in order to accurately measure status, morality, or deviance, the researcher must first know something about the observers and how they define these acts and actors (Wahrman 1970a).

U.S. Army members’ evaluations of actors and actions within their specific moral community provides a baseline understanding of how observers should already view the acts and actors in question. Because the military has clearly proscribed definitions of right and wrong as well as clearly defined definitions of status, all study participants can reasonably be expected to judge the acts they view according to the *standards of expected behavior by members of the military*. This removes at least some ambiguity about whether the respondents view an act such as marijuana use as acceptable within their community and also addresses Warhman’s concerns over the difficulty in measuring status (1972). Additionally, the U.S. Army provides a clear legal and moral framework of right and wrong through the Uniform Code of Military Justice that applies to all soldiers, regardless of rank or position (Regulation 2011).

Because status inherently involves social prestige and honor, use of the U.S. Army as an experimental population provides a unique opportunity to measure the effects of status for both the actor in the vignette and the observers participating in the experiment. I operationalize status as rank, which is formally assigned by the
in institutional rewards system (Department of the Army 2010). Achievement of greater rank means that an individual has been vetted by the organization and has been previously found to be both competent and worthy of advancement (Robb Willer et al. 2012). Although this is far from a perfect measure, using rank as a measurement of status provides the ability to clearly operationalize a status effect in a moral community in which prestige and honor are embedded in everyday interactions (Department of the Army 2004). Furthermore, the clear demarcation of rank in the U.S. Army allows me to identify middle-status actors, thus expanding our understanding of how status characteristics might work at varying status levels as opposed to simply at the extremes (Phillips and Zuckerman 2001).

2.6.1 Data

Respondents were all members of the U.S. Army and were recruited through military-focused online communities and social media. Respondents thought they were participating in a survey; they did not know that some of their questions were experimental manipulations. They were excluded from the final sample if they failed the attention check or if they did not answer basic demographic information. Respondents were not paid to participate, and participation was purely voluntary. Finally, respondents who participated in the survey were from almost every rank of the U.S. Army. The final sample size was 406.
2.6.2 Method

I conducted two experiments using U.S. Army respondents. Experiment 1 tests perceptions of wrongness (morality and immorality) and determines whether there is consensus surrounding the moralization of everyday actions (Lovett, Jordan, and Wiltermuth 2012). Experiment 2 focuses on judgments of guilt and recommended punishment; this experiment moves beyond everyday moralizations to more serious criminal infractions and tests whether the status of the actor influences moral judgments.

2.6.1.1 Experiment 1

In the first experiment, respondents were randomly assigned one of six variants, reflecting six ranks, and each read 32 simple statements describing an actor committing an everyday act. Thus, experiment 1 contained six status conditions: three conditions with high-status actors and three conditions with low-status actors. Respondents saw each action only once, and they saw a different randomly assigned status condition for each action (see Appendix A). For example, a respondent would see one of the following six versions of the action “lies to the commander to keep a buddy out of trouble”:

A private lies to the commander to keep a buddy out of trouble.

A private first class lies to the commander to keep a buddy out of trouble.

A specialist lies to the commander to keep a buddy out of trouble.

A captain lies to the commander to keep a buddy out of trouble.
A major lies to the commander to keep a buddy out of trouble.

A lieutenant colonel lies to the commander to keep a buddy out of trouble.

Experiment 1 tests whether respondents in this moral community are in consensus about which mundane acts are morally wrong (Lovett, Jordan, and Wiltermuth 2012), thus providing a common understanding of rules and expectations to which community members were expected to adhere (Haidt 2007; Durkheim 1992a). If the U.S. Army is indeed a moral community, then survey participants should be agreement about how wrong each act is. The complete survey instrument is available in Appendix A.

2.6.1.2 Experiment 2

Experiment 2 tests whether actor status influences moral judgments of acts that were relatively harmless (theft) or caused physical harm (domestic abuse). Experiment 2 measures the effects of actor status and seriousness of the act on moral judgments of guilt and subsequent punishment.

Experiment 2 thus moves beyond an assessment of whether the act is wrong (Malle, Guglielmo, and Monroe 2014) and asks how guilty an actor is for engaging in an act.

Respondents were randomly assigned to read one of three vignettes and determine how guilty the actor is. The experiment has a $3 \times 3$ factorial design: three
status variations for each of three vignettes. Each respondent read one vignette and evaluated one actor. Respondents were not aware of the other vignettes. Each vignette presented one rank condition and one act condition. The rank conditions were either Private First Class, Staff Sergeant, or Captain.

Vignette 1

A Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested with his girlfriend by civilian law enforcement after stealing software from a local store.

Vignette 2

A Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested by civilian law enforcement after a physical altercation with his girlfriend.

Vignette 3

A Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed
yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested by civilian law enforcement after a physical altercation with his girlfriend. The girlfriend was hospitalized with severe injuries.

The key dependent variable for Experiment 2 is how guilty each respondent judges the actor based on the act that respondents witnessed. I used ordered logistic regression to model the effect of actor rank on degree of guilt. I conducted model fit tests to determine which model best fits the data. To determine whether the actor or the act influences moral judgments, I tested models based on the above-stated hypotheses (see Table 2).

### 2.6.3 Measures

#### 2.6.3.1 Key Independent Variable

Status is the key independent variable for this analysis. I operationalized status using U.S. Army rank. Experiment 1 distinguishes high- and low-status actors. Low-status actors are those with the ranks of private, private first class, and specialist. Low-status actors have typically been in the army less than four years and are significantly junior to everyone around them. High-status individuals in this study are Captains, majors, and lieutenant colonels. Captains typically have at least five years in service before they are considered for this rank; majors have closer to 10 years, and lieutenant colonels usually have about 15 years in service.
Although the high-status actors in this study are not of the highest status organizationally, they are typically high for most units in the Army that have more junior soldiers in them. I selected these ranks because they should be familiar to all soldiers. I did not use the highest level of officer rank for in order to ensure that lower-status participants in the experiment would have encountered the individuals of the ranks represented in the vignettes. The chances of a private encountering a general officer would be relatively rare on a day-to-day basis, whereas every private has a company commander and a battalion commander.

Experiment 2 involves actors of low, middle, and high status. To operationalize low status, I use the rank of Private First Class, a rank typically achieved after 18 months in service. To operationalize middle status, I use the rank of Staff Sergeant. The Staff Sergeant rank is typically achieved between 5 and 12 years of service, and service members are required to attend specific schools in order to be considered for promotion to this rank. To operationalize high status, I use the rank of Captain.

2.6.3.2 Key Dependent Variables

Moral judgments are the key dependent variables for this analysis. Experiment 1, in which the key moral judgment is wrongness, assesses how wrong each respondent evaluates each act. Respondents received the following instruction: “Please use the following scale, from 1 to 6, to indicate the degree to which you judge the behavior to be wrong (if at all).” Respondents rated wrongness as follows: (1) not wrong at all, has
nothing to do with morality; (2) not very wrong; (3) slightly wrong; (4) somewhat wrong; (5) very wrong; or (6) extremely wrong/an extremely immoral action. For each act, they were randomly assigned into a high or low status condition.

For Experiment 2, respondents were asked to rate how guilty they thought the respondent was on the following scale: (1) definitely not guilty; (2) probably not guilty; (3) unclear/can’t decide; (4) probably guilty; and (5) definitely guilty. To measure the moral judgment of responsibility, respondents were asked, “What do you think the appropriate punishment should be based on the scenario you just read?” Options were listed in order from least severe to most severe: (1) no action; (2) informal counseling; (3) formal counseling; (4) Article 15; (5) letter of reprimand; (6) administrative separation; and (7) court martial. Military punishment differs from civilian punishment and thus requires a brief explanation.
Figure 4. Military Punishments and the Possible Outcomes for Officers and Enlisted

Commanders have a wide selection of tools to shape and form member's behavior. Counseling—both informal and formal—is the least harsh form of punishment. Informal counseling involves the supervisor discussing the behavior and desired reforms with the actor. Formal counseling involves a written copy of the discussion regarding the behavior and a formal plan for improvement. Punishment under Article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (commonly referred to as Article 15) is a nonjudicial punishment and the first means of punishment available to commanders that involves legal oversight. Although all soldiers regardless of rank are
subject to punishment under Article 15, it is mostly reserved for Staff Sergeants and lower ranks. Officers and senior enlisted receiving nonjudicial punishment have essentially stopped their career advancement, thus ending the potential for future service. The formal letter of reprimand also requires a legal review before proceeding. Administrative separation is a process to remove a soldier from the military through administrative rather than criminal means. The most serious punishment is the court martial, which is usually reserved for the most serious misconduct because, like civilian legal cases, it implies significant overhead in time and effort.

2.6.4 Analytic Approach

For Experiment 1, I present descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) of perceived wrongness of the 30 individual acts (see Appendix A). I then used ordered logistic regression\(^3\) for each of the 30 acts to control for observer demographic characteristics directly related to membership within the moral community (officer versus enlisted, time in service, and education) as well as standard demographics (race and gender).

For Experiment 2, I used ordered logistic regression with robust standard errors to evaluate whether perceptions of guilt and recommended punishment differ by status

\(^3\) Ordered logistic regression is preferable to ordinary least squares regression because the categories are ordered and have no set distance between them (Long and Freese 2005). I tested robust standard errors to determine whether there were any large deviations resulting from model misspecification. I found no large variations, suggesting that the models were correctly specified. I thus report robust standard errors.
of the actor. I tested four models that hypothesize differing relationships among the actor, the act, and perceptions of guilt and punishment. Model 1 tested the effect of the characteristics of the situation on the judgments of guilt and punishment. Model 2 tested the characteristics of the actor status. Model 3 tested the characteristics of both the situation and the actor status, and Model 4 incorporated an interaction term between the situation and actor status. I controlled for observer demographics in all models.

2.7 Results and Discussion

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for Experiment 1. Most acts were seen as morally wrong, with 20 of the 32 acts having a mean wrongness rating of 4 (somewhat wrong) or higher. The relatively small standard deviations indicate general consensus regarding the wrongness of these daily acts in the moral community of the U.S. Army. Acts that were less moralized received lower ratings of mean wrongness (3 or lower) and had larger standard deviations in responses.
### Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Experiments 1 and 2

**Experiment 1**

*How Wrong is a Soldier if...*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forges a PT card</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.571</td>
<td>0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fakes unsecured military equipment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buys alcohol with a government travel card</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.464</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fakes an injury to avoid a PT test</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.464</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pets a DUI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.429</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forges a signature on a form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.393</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives a soldier a good eval they didn’t earn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.214</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lies to the commander to keep a buddy out of trouble</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.214</td>
<td>1.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets a buddy go home with someone obviously intoxicated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.143</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watches porn on duty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.107</td>
<td>1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobeys a lawful order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.107</td>
<td>1.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flirts with someone not their spouse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.071</td>
<td>1.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests positive for marijuana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.964</td>
<td>0.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a prescription that isn’t theirs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.679</td>
<td>1.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets an award for their rank instead of their performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.679</td>
<td>1.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves a buddy at the bar who is obviously intoxicated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>1.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts while driving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>1.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevents a soldier from going on sick call</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>1.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stays quiet when a senior NCO belittles another soldier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.321</td>
<td>1.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teases someone who goes on sickcall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.179</td>
<td>1.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks 10 beers really fast and vomits at a party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>1.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeds on post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>1.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls out of a run</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>1.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails a PT test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.393</td>
<td>1.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wears headphones in uniform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.393</td>
<td>1.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is late to formation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.071</td>
<td>1.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walks during PT formation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.071</td>
<td>1.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets a payday loan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>1.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates a soldier in their platoon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>1.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports a soldier who hits a detainee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>1.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carries a baby in uniform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experiment 2**

*How Guilty...*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altercation w/Girlfriend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalizes Girlfriend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appropriate Punishment...*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altercation w/Girlfriend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalizes Girlfriend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PT stands for physical training
*Experiment 1 was minimum 1, maximum 6
Experiment 2 was minimum 1, maximum 7 and used different scales discussed in the text
Overall, these descriptive results suggest that this sample of members of the U.S. Army represent a moral community that has a shared understanding of expectations for its members. Having met this condition, I now turn to the test of features of acts and actors’ status on moral judgments.
Table 2. Odds Ratio Results from Experiment 1 Measuring Agreement of Wrongness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How wrong is it if a soldier:</th>
<th>Forges a pt card</th>
<th>Takes uncured military equipment</th>
<th>Buys alcohol with a government travel card</th>
<th>Takes a prescription that isn’t obviously intoxicated</th>
<th>Leaves a buddy at the bar who is obviously intoxicated</th>
<th>Prevents a soldier from going on sick call</th>
<th>Teases someone going on sick call</th>
<th>Drinks to beeps really fast and vomits at a party</th>
<th>Speeds on post</th>
<th>Falls out of a run</th>
<th>Fails a PT test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Status</td>
<td>1.906**</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>2.179***</td>
<td>4.499***</td>
<td>4.045**</td>
<td>1.700**</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>2.855**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.375)</td>
<td>(0.376)</td>
<td>(0.375)</td>
<td>(0.376)</td>
<td>(0.375)</td>
<td>(0.375)</td>
<td>(0.375)</td>
<td>(0.374)</td>
<td>(0.374)</td>
<td>(0.374)</td>
<td>(0.374)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>0.456**</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.742**</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.361)</td>
<td>(0.361)</td>
<td>(0.361)</td>
<td>(0.361)</td>
<td>(0.361)</td>
<td>(0.361)</td>
<td>(0.361)</td>
<td>(0.361)</td>
<td>(0.361)</td>
<td>(0.361)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>2.101***</td>
<td>1.861***</td>
<td>2.358***</td>
<td>1.971***</td>
<td>3.257**</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>1.901</td>
<td>1.018**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Service</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>1.114***</td>
<td>1.081***</td>
<td>1.040**</td>
<td>1.015**</td>
<td>1.084***</td>
<td>1.193**</td>
<td>1.070**</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.272)</td>
<td>(0.192)</td>
<td>(0.202)</td>
<td>(0.202)</td>
<td>(0.202)</td>
<td>(0.202)</td>
<td>(0.202)</td>
<td>(0.202)</td>
<td>(0.202)</td>
<td>(0.202)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001; standard error in parentheses

Low status is the reference category for the sets

Endnote is the reference category for Observer Status (Officer)

** Additional models were tested to evaluate whether any observer traits influenced moral judgments. Other models tested length of time in the military, number of combat deployments and overseas tours, whether respondent was married as well as the respondent’s rank. None of these factors were significant other than length of time in the military and thus are omitted from the main discussion for brevity’s sake. Full tables available upon request.
Table 2 presents the results of ordered logistic regression in log-odds of observer demographics on moral wrongness. As shown in the table, 18 acts were deemed significant in wrongness based on the actor being high status. Despite agreement on which acts were viewed as more highly moralized (Table 1), the acts themselves do not present a clear pattern in significance. The acts for which actor status was not a significant predictor were forging a physical training card, forging a signature, giving a soldier a good evaluation that was not earned, leaving a buddy at the bar who was obviously intoxicated, texting while driving, speeding on post, failing to keep up with a run, getting a payday loan, wearing headphones while in uniform, carrying a baby while in uniform, flirting with someone not their spouse, and disobeying a lawful order.

Turning to observer characteristics, time in service, status, gender, and level of education are related to judgments of wrongness for some acts. Observer status (rank) is a significant predictor of judgment in eight cases; gender, in nine cases; and education, for 10 acts. Most importantly, length of time in the military significantly predicts perceived wrongness for 15 acts: the longer the respondent was a member of the moral community of the military, the more wrong the act was judged.

Experiment 1 explored whether a moral consensus exists within the proposed moral community. I did indeed find that participants rated most of these acts as wrong. Despite this moral agreement, a status effect still was in play for 15 of the 32 acts. This suggests that within a moral community—even one with a very strong conviction that
the standards apply equally to all soldiers—status has an influence over moral judgments in everyday life. The deviance model, which suggests that evaluations of an actor influence subsequent moral judgments, appears to be supported for at least some everyday interactions.

Experiment 1 suggests that in some cases, high-status actors are perceived as more wrong for violating the moral community norms than low-status actors. However, be a strong pattern is not evident across the *actions*; rather, the pattern persists across the *actors* themselves. High-status officers are expected to embody the Army’s values, and thus their violations may be viewed as more wrong. Nonetheless, this finding does not explain why *all* high-status actions aren’t viewed as more wrong.

I turn now to Experiment 2, which moves beyond the moralization of everyday acts to explore more concrete legal violations in order to evaluate status effects on moral judgments of guilt and punishment. In Experiment 2, I tested four model specifications to account for the effects of the characteristics of the situation and the actor: (1) moral psychology model; (2) status characteristics model; (3) deviance model; and (4) deviance interaction model. I also controlled for observer demographics in each model.
Table 3. Odds Ratio Results from Experiment 2: Recommended Guilt and Punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Guilt</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altercation w/ Girlfriend</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.8625</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.129)</td>
<td>(0.214)</td>
<td>(0.279)</td>
<td>(0.283)</td>
<td>(0.240)</td>
<td>(0.218)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts Girlfriend in Hospital</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>1.631*</td>
<td>2.681**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.168)</td>
<td>(0.179)</td>
<td>(0.409)</td>
<td>(0.333)</td>
<td>(0.377)</td>
<td>(1.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Sergeant</td>
<td>0.287***</td>
<td>0.288***</td>
<td>0.295***</td>
<td>0.394***</td>
<td>0.378***</td>
<td>0.334***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.096)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td>(0.126)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>1.518**</td>
<td>1.760***</td>
<td>3.407**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.246)</td>
<td>(0.265)</td>
<td>(0.595)</td>
<td>(0.602)</td>
<td>(0.612)</td>
<td>(1.373)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altercation*Staff Sergeant</td>
<td>2.135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altercation*Captain</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.673)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.209)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital*Staff Sergeant</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.370)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.357)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital*Captain</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.899**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.227)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.156)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.399)</td>
<td>(0.316)</td>
<td>(0.332)</td>
<td>(0.324)</td>
<td>(0.377)</td>
<td>(0.277)</td>
<td>(0.277)</td>
<td>(0.281)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>1.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.126)</td>
<td>(0.134)</td>
<td>(0.132)</td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td>(0.139)</td>
<td>(0.132)</td>
<td>(0.149)</td>
<td>(0.156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.931*</td>
<td>1.861*</td>
<td>1.837*</td>
<td>1.943*</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.587)</td>
<td>(0.560)</td>
<td>(0.558)</td>
<td>(0.598)</td>
<td>(0.274)</td>
<td>(0.259)</td>
<td>(0.247)</td>
<td>(0.262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Service</td>
<td>0.943**</td>
<td>0.933**</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.942**</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.243)</td>
<td>(0.277)</td>
<td>(0.275)</td>
<td>(0.282)</td>
<td>(0.282)</td>
<td>(0.282)</td>
<td>(0.282)</td>
<td>(0.282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood</td>
<td>-438.411</td>
<td>-413.685</td>
<td>-422.932</td>
<td>-410.943</td>
<td>-603.744</td>
<td>-602.147</td>
<td>-598.643</td>
<td>-598.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>888.823</td>
<td>837.377</td>
<td>839.846</td>
<td>843.886</td>
<td>1277.499</td>
<td>1218.296</td>
<td>1217.387</td>
<td>1211.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>872.185</td>
<td>856.937</td>
<td>867.324</td>
<td>886.876</td>
<td>1308.77</td>
<td>1248.16</td>
<td>1246.16</td>
<td>1236.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001

For the act based moral psychology model, Model 1, none of the acts themselves were rated significantly different from one another in terms of guilt or punishment. The act’s level of harm does not appear to significantly predict moral judgments of guilt or punishment, implying a lack of support for the moral psychology model. For the status characteristics model (Model 2) and the deviance model (Model 3), actor status is a
significant predictor of differences in moral judgments of guilt and punishment. For the deviance model, Model 3, however, the act is also a significant predictor in one case (a physical altercation that led to his girlfriend being hospitalized), suggesting some merit for the moral psychology argument that actions involving harm are more readily recognized as deviant. Yet, it is only when the act involving the most harm is interacted with the higher-status actors that the act itself appears to have a significant effect. For the deviance interaction model (Model 4), I find a significant interaction between actor status and his physical altercation resulting in hospitalizing his girlfriend. The only observer characteristics that are a significant predictor of guilt across all models are, again, length of time in service and gender.

I now turn to examining the model fit statistics, located at the bottom of Table 2, to adjudicate between the three perspectives’ different models of status and moral judgments. I use the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) statistic because it is the most parsimonious measure of model fit (Burnham 2004). This measure identifies Model 2, which accounts only for actor status, as the best-fitting and most parsimonious model. It is striking that predicting judgments of guilt and punishment using only the status of the actor in the vignette (as well as observer demographic controls) is a better-fitting model than models that account for features of the act (the moral psychology model, Model 1), features of the actor and act (the deviance model, Model 3), and the interaction
between the actor and act (the deviance model with transgression credit, Model 4). Actor status is thus a key determinant in moral judgment.

Figure 5 displays predicted probabilities to examine the effect of status on guilt. The surprising finding here is that it is not the effect of all actor statuses but only of the middle-status actor—the Staff Sergeant—that has marked influence over moral judgments of guilt. Indeed, the middle status is the only significant variable across all the guilt models that accounts for actor status. The middle-status Staff Sergeant has a higher predicted probability of being evaluated as “unclear/can’t decide” than either the low-status private or the high-status Captain.

![Figure 5. Predicted Probability of Recommended Guilt](image)

Figure 5. Predicted Probability of Recommended Guilt
Whereas Table 2 shows that actor status is the strongest predictor of changes in the odds ratios for recommended punishment, Figure 5 shows that the middle-status actor is more likely to receive lower guilty evaluations than either the high-status Captain or the low-status private.

![Graph showing predicted probability of punishment]

**Figure 6. Predicted Probability of Recommended Punishment**

As shown in Figure 6, predicted probabilities for punishment show a similar pattern. The Staff Sergeant has a higher predicted probably of receiving either no action, informal counseling, or formal counseling *regardless of the situation*—mild sanctions. Even when the situation involves clearly identifiable harm, the middle-status actor has a higher predicted probability of receiving essentially no sanction for actions that moral
psychology suggests should be labeled as most wrong and should be most strongly sanctioned.

The lower-status private and the higher-status Captain appear to have essentially the same predicted probability of receiving the formal sanction of an Article 15 administrative hearing. This finding contradicts the deviance model, which suggests that high-status actors should be viewed as less guilty and thus should be sanctioned less, presenting a paradox: the higher-status actor’s actions are not viewed as more guilty, yet they are more likely to receive harsher punishment.

This pattern of findings also contradicts prevailing wisdom in organizational research (Sauder, Lynn, and Podolny 2012a) as well as status characteristics theory, but it could be a specific function of how the moral community of the military sees itself. Given that officers are expected to embody the Army’s values, the higher predicted probability of sanctions with stronger ramifications protects the moral community and its standard-bearers. Thus, it would seem that the high status of Captains is preserved through the removal of those who violate what it means to be a Captain and an officer (Gould 2002).

The punishment findings demonstrate the importance of evaluating moral judgments and sanctions within a moral community. Doing so allows researchers to differentiate within-group differences of guilt and punishment as well as informal outcomes that greatly influence the moral evaluations. Note that, with the exception of
gender and time in service in Model 2, observer characteristics have nonsignificant effects in Experiment 2. This finding provides interesting insight into the mechanism through which the moral community may influence moral judgments. Time in service suggests that the longer observers remain in the moral community, the more members are evaluated based on their position within that moral community. In the particular moral community of the U.S. Army, this position stems from both status and character. Insight from the institutions literature suggests that as individuals internalize the moral expectations of the community, their education, race, and class background become less salient parts of their identities (Zucker 1977). Therefore, the findings that Captains have a greater predicted probability of receiving a punishment that permanently removes them from service suggests that the moral community demonstrates a similar process of internalization: members who remain longer are influenced more by the moral community than by external demographic factors.

At first glance, the differences in status effects on perceived wrongness and assignment of guilt and punishment do not appear to hold to a particular pattern; however, they do indicate that an actor being more embedded within a moral community (higher status) results in harsher evaluations of wrongness, guilt, and punishment. Experiment 1 reveals that higher-status actors are perceived as more wrong when they violate everyday actions that are moralized by the community. Experiment 2, however, appears to demonstrate that the higher-status Captain and the low-status
private are held to the same standards for guilt and punishment. The middle-status effect observed here is not explained by the current literature and represents a surprising result. Future research should further investigate the effects of middle status on moral judgments.

2.8 Conclusion

This study uses an original data set to examine how status influences moral judgments. I have argued that status influences moral judgments, using research methods from moral psychology, status, and deviance theories to generate four models that explain this relationship. The results suggest that status plays a significant role in moral judgments in both everyday actions and more serious moral dilemmas. The deviance research tradition has focused on status and criminal actions, arguing that the actor must be seen as deviant for the act to be sanctioned. However, my findings suggest that the actor’s sanctions are based more on the actor’s status than on the characteristics of the acts themselves.

This study contributes to knowledge about status and moral judgments in four key ways. First, the current research demonstrates that there is much more to moral judgments than acts in isolation, and supports calls for the incorporation of status and character into research on moral judgments. Previous research in moral psychology has focused on the moralization of the acts. The current research suggests that higher-status actors are viewed as more wrong in everyday moral violations but may not be viewed as
more wrong when the acts are more clearly defined as deviant. Evidence suggests that high-status actors may be sanctioned more harshly even if their actions are not evaluated as more wrong or deserving of more punishment.

Second, my findings suggest that differing moral judgments do not occur because individuals within the community cannot see the actions for what they are (Kaplan 2006), but rather because of other features of the moral community. By using a moral community to control for observer characteristics, the current study offers methodological insight into how status and morality interact. Additionally, by providing a methodological argument for conducting future studies in a moral community, this study addresses Warhman’s (1972) concerns about the difficulties in measuring status and moral judgments. Indeed, existing research suggests that it is often outsiders who expose wrongdoing within a specific group or organization (Bailey and Ferguson 2013). The current research provides insight into why some individuals appear to be protected whereas others are punished more harshly for the same actions.

Third, by providing an operationalization of middle-status actors, the current study expands research on status processes beyond those for high- and low-status actors. Further research should investigate this phenomenon more fully to understand how middle-status actors are accounted for in status and moral judgment processes.

Fourth, the current research adds to our knowledge about how specific moral communities moralize everyday acts, going beyond more abstract and extreme or
unrealistic situations that have typically been studied. In addition, this study also explores how status influences moral evaluations of everyday acts that occur in everyday life but that are less easily identifiable with regard to harm.

The current research demonstrates a complex effect of status on morality. There may indeed be agreement about moral universals as Durkheim argued (Miller 1996), but the differential application of sanctions suggests that it is the group that defines what is wrong for its members (Durkheim 1997). Moral judgments and status are central mechanisms that contribute to current inequality structures and thus are central concerns of sociological inquiry. Further research investigating how moral judgments and status influence outcomes is needed to fully address how and why certain individuals go unpunished for their actions whereas others are severely sanctioned for the same act. Future research should focus on understanding how status influences moral judgments and whether and under what conditions moral judgments are made without considering the status of the actor.
3. Individuals, Organizations, and Culture: Evidence for a Tri-Level Conception of Morality

3.1 Introduction

Much of the research on values and morality has been focused on unsituated actors—that is, actors who are removed from specific context—thus limiting our understanding of how values and morals interact to influence individual decision-making. For decades, researchers deemed values insignificant in understanding individual actions, leading to the development of toolkit theories that suggest actors select responses to stimulus in their environments (Swidler 1986; Vaisey 2010a).

Problems such as the culture of poverty argument that lead to values being jettisoned from the field in the first place haven’t been fully addressed, either, (Vaisey 2010b). Despite a recent resurgence, individual values remain understudied in sociology, leaving gaps in knowledge about how and what values influence in everyday life (Hitlin and Piliavin 2004).

Much research on morality in moral psychology suffers from a similar lack of context. Attempts to measure the moral domain have focused on developing insights into human universal processes surrounding morality (Graham et al. 2016), but these insights are limited in their ecological validity: understanding the processes underlying morality has not lead to greater understanding of how morality functions beyond a
laboratory. Little work has evaluated how a measure of morality, such as a measure based on MFT, predicts moral judgments (Graham et al. 2016).

Both areas of research are limited in explaining how values and morality influence actual behavior (Baumeister, Vohs, and Funder 2007; Abend 2012; Meglino and Ravlin 1998). I argue that to advance our understanding of how values and morality influence actions in everyday life, we must study actors embedded in context. Individual’s moral judgments and values cannot be understood without first understanding the cultural, institutional, and organizational settings in which they are shaped. However, this endeavor is fraught with logistical challenges and measurement issues. Daily life is far too complex to be able to study individuals from interaction to interaction.

One area that may provide insights into both individual values and moral judgment is the organizational management literature. Organizations are an ideal setting to test general theories of values. This area of research has demonstrated links between organizational values and both individual and organizational level outcomes. Like individuals, organizations do not exist in a valueless vacuum; rather, they are situated in broader moral cultures that are at least partly defined by institutional logics (Friedland and Alford 1991; Zucker 1977). Thus, individual and organizational values cannot be understood without first being situated in the “supraorganizational patterns of activity through which humans conduct their material life in time and space, and
symbolic systems through which they categorize that activity and infuse it with meaning” (Friedland and Alford 1991, 239).

I argue that to understand individual values consequences for actions, researchers must consider them using the frameworks of organizational values and larger institutional logics. The current study evaluates the influence of individual values on moral judgments in an organization that is situated within a broader moral framework. Using original research, I offer evidence of three levels of morality in the organization of the U.S. Army. I evaluate individual moral culture using Schwartz values (Schwartz 2012; Vaisey and Miles 2014) as well as the impact of the organization on moral culture as measured through status hierarchies (Sauder, Lynn, and Podolny 2012). Finally, I evaluate broader cultural morality using MFT (Graham et al. 2016; Kesebir and Haidt 2010). Taken together, this study offers preliminary evidence for a new way of understanding how moral culture works at the individual, meso-social, and broader cultural levels. I shift now to a brief discussion of values research in sociology.

3.2 The Abandonment and Slow Return of Values

The study of values, along with the study of action, came under considerable questioning when empirical research demonstrated that people’s values do not actually explain their actions (Lamont 2004; Swidler 1986; Swidler 2003). In essence, a value “implies a code or a standard which has some persistence through time, or more broadly put, which organizes a system of action. Value...places things, acts, ways of behaving.
goals of action on the approval-disapproval continuum… This definition takes culture, group, and the individuals’ relation to culture and his group as primary points of departure” (Kluckholn 1965, 395). However subsequent research demonstrated a lack of connection between values and behaviors was a key factor that lead to the situationalist approach developed by toolkit theorists (Wuthnow 2008). Toolkit theories offer strategies of action that are motivated, not by individual values orientations or internal motivation, but instead by reactions to the situation (Vaisey 2010a). These theories suggest that people piece together strategies of action based on their reactions to situational influences as opposed to any internally consistent values (Swidler 1986; Vaisey 2010a).

The idea that individuals lack internal motivation to guide their actions and decisions however, remains unsatisfying. If individuals merely react to situations, what was sociology really studying beyond behavior? The loss of subjective meaning in actions also removed the idea of individual agency (Campbell 1998). Vaisey (2010a) argued that toolkit theories are insufficient explanations for action because even in intense situations such as the Stanford Prison Experiment, individuals still have tremendous influence. The situational influence may be overstated in accounts of behavior (Vaisey 2010a) but more research is needed to provide links between values and behavior.
Values have returned, albeit slowly, to the field thanks in part to the importing of efforts from other fields where values are still recovering after being abandoned with the retreat from Parsons and the subsequent culture of poverty arguments. If individuals value different things, then they are responsible for their choices and thus poor people are poor because of their choices and not because of structural constraints on their actions and desires (Vaisey 2009; Vaisey and Miles 2014). Despite being essentially disowned for a large part of the twentieth century, values research persisted under different names in sociology and grew in other fields adjacent to sociology (Durkheim 1992a; Lamont 1992; Lamont 2004; Bellah et al. 2007).

Another major problem with the study of values was the lack of agreed upon meaning. The Schwartz conception of values offers a cross culturally tested measure of values, along with a theoretical framing that provides methodological consistency across research traditions (Schwartz 2012).

### 3.3 Schwartz Values

Values are “an essential part of social life” (Vaisey and Miles 2014, 6) and have been researched extensively (often outside of sociology) but often mislabeled due to a lack of agreed upon meaning of values. Before proceeding, it is beneficial to define the nature of values. According to Schwartz (2012, 4-5), values are “(1) beliefs linked inextricably to affect; (2) refer to desirable goals that motivate action; (3) transcend specific actions and situations; (4) serve as standards or criteria; (5) ordered by
importance relative to one another; and (6) the relative importance of multiple values
guides action”. The Schwartz values framework has been empirically verified in nearly
100 nationally representative samples from 32 countries and has been used to “compare
individuals within countries and to compare patterns across countries (Vaisey and
Miles 2013, 5). The framework is usually represented as a wheel (Figure 7) comprising
10 key values.

![Figure 7. The Schwartz Model of Values (Schwartz 2012)](image_url)

The values are conceptualized in a wheel to demonstrate how certain values are
at odds with each other. For example, the value of conformity is linked to supporting the
status quo and the avoidance of “conflict and violations of group norms” (Schwartz

50
Conformity and tradition link with security in the conservativism quadrant. Conservatism is generally more the socially focused quadrant, that is these values emphasize security of the group and preservation of a group’s tradition. The conservative values “regulate how one relates to socially to others and affect their interests” (Schwartz 2012, 13). Opposite conformity and tradition lies the group of values representing openness to change; hedonism, stimulation, and self-direction, which are related to individual “growth and self-expansion” (Schwartz 2012, 13). Because values are ranked in relative importance, the conflict between subordination of the self to the group and independence in thought and action provide an apt illustration of the challenges between tradition and self enhancement. With regard to the present study, the competition between subordination of the self to the group and openness to change provide important insight into the social group’s influence regarding guilt and punishment.

Just as important to the individual values are the factors that influence values formation. While Schwartz values have been studied extensively, less information is known regarding what specific cultural factors influence the formation of values in general. Research has demonstrated that values are shaped by variables such as socioeconomic status (Sayer 2005; Lamont 1992), age and gender (Vaisey 2010b), social location (Wuthnow 2008), and organizational membership (Miscenko and Day 2016; Leavitt et al. 2012). These demographic variables are only a piece of the explanation.
Understanding the broader culture in which they are shaped may also shed critical insight into how values are shaped.

Values cannot be understood without considering the social patterns that shape and influence them (Hitlin and Piliavin 2004; Vaisey and Miles 2014). Individual conceptions of morality such as those conceived by Kant as being focused on harm, fairness, and rights are “contingent modern products” (Friedland and Alford 1991, 239). One cannot argue that people value human life, for example, without considering the institutional logic of human rights that extends from both the Enlightenment and Christianity (Joas 2013). As such, broader institutional logics influence values formation. Consequently, individual American’s values and moral judgments must be understood in the context of the major institutional logics shaping American culture and values. “Family, religion, state, market, professions, and corporations” are all examples of institutional orders that provide “unique organizing principles, practices, and symbols that influence individual and organizational behavior” (Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury 2012, 2).

3.4 Moral Foundations as Measures of Institutional Logics

Moral foundations theory (MFT) posits that morality consists of the five domains of care/harm, fairness, purity, in-group and authority (Graham et al. 2016). Moral foundations can be either an innate tendency or a measure of moral culture (Graham et al. 2016; Gray and Keeney 2015). The theory has been tested cross culturally but despite
this, it has been criticized for mapping on to distinctly American (or Western) moral and political culture (Gray and Keeney 2015). However, for the purposes of this study, this provides an advantage, not a drawback. The institutional logics framework of family, religion, state (in terms of justice and fairness in both law and economics), profession, and corporation map onto the 15 “major value orientations in America … achievement and success, activity and work, moral orientation, humanitarianism, efficiency, progress, material comfort, equality, freedom, external conformity, science and secular rationality, nationalism and patriotism, democracy, individual personality, and racism” (Wuthnow 2008, 335). The five moral foundations of care/harm, fairness, purity, loyalty, and authority offers a means of measuring these institutional logics in American culture (Graham et al. 2016).

MFT has been used to predict everything from whether someone supports abortion rights to how someone will feel about domestic violence (Graham and Haidt 2011; Frimer et al. 2013). However, little research has explored MFT’s predictions about moral judgments (Graham et al. 2016). Previous research has demonstrated that MFT may provide limited insight into moral judgments once they are embedded in situational context (see the next chapter in this project). One reason for this may be that MFT predicts where an individual fits within broader political culture rather than within more localized contexts. These broader political designations are clearly part of the macro-level description of American society, but they also hold personal significance to
individuals. If they are personally significant, however, why then do they fail to predict people’s behaviors (Davis et al. 2016)?

MFT has been studied at the macro level – meaning respondents were often asked questions about a person rather than anchoring the questions within specific group membership. Values, too, have been studied broadly, in some cases focusing on how they predict individual outcomes longitudinally (Vaisey 2010b). To this author’s knowledge, there are limited studies offering insights into how values and morality influence everyday moral judgments (Abend 2008; Abend 2012; Baumeister, Vohs, and Funder 2007). In many ways, the lack of research on individual values in everyday context is understandable, given the logistical difficulties in measuring people in their daily lives. Organizations may offer an opportunity to situate individuals in embedded contexts without having to follow them around. Just as individuals are shaped by the moral culture in which they are raised, so too are organizations influenced by the broader moral culture. As a result, the organizational context offers a potential missing layer between the institution and the individual. I turn now to a discussion of values in the field of organizational management, where the study of values and their consequences have been vigorously pursued.

3.5 Values in Organizations

The organizational management literature has built on values research in both sociology and psychology to develop a rich understanding of how values operate and
how they are internalized. This research suggests that individuals’ values are influenced by their individual concepts of what is good and desirable and by their group’s. Values provide “order [through] a set of shared, motivating values” (Hitlin and Piliavin 2004, 362), an behaviors to which the individual ought to strive (Meglino and Ravlin 1998; Hitlin 2008).

Values therefore provide a means of influencing individual behavior with regard to conformity to a group’s expectations. Violating a value or failing to uphold it often leads to guilty feelings. Because they are learned as absolutes, values are not mutable across situations. Despite being relatively stable (Schwartz 2012), however, values have demonstrated susceptibility to change under conditions that bring about significant negative changes in self-concept. If values are changed because of discomfort, they are also acquired through discomfort. For example, learning not to steal is uncomfortable because it often involves the shame of being caught stealing (Meglino and Ravlin 1998).

Additionally, the organizational literature offers insight into how values are formed through studying the socialization process. Values—perceived or actual—are important aspects of the attraction, selection, and attrition of employees (Van Maanen 1978). Values congruence explains how organizations end up occupied by people who are more similar than others (De Cooman et al. 2009). That is, values may be a key mechanism that influences homophily in groups/organizations. Forces at the periphery of an organization tend to expel those who are not a good fit and may be a centrifugal
force at the center to retain those who more closely match the organization’s values or who are integral to accomplishing the organizational goals (McPherson and Ranger-Moore 1991).

If values predict whether an individual remains with an organization or is removed, then they may provide insight into the mechanism that enforces group boundaries. As such, values embedded in organizational context may provide key insight into how values may influence moral judgments.

3.6 The Present Study

The current study evaluates whether individual values predict moral judgments in an organization that is situated within a broader moral framework. Rather than focusing on between-group variations in values, the current study focuses on within-group variation (Hitlin and Piliavin 2004). Despite values being viewed as somewhat stable (Schwartz 2012), different values are often activated by organizational context (Leavitt et al. 2012).

Values play a role in establishing both acceptable and unacceptable actions for both self and other. Values are believed to influence outcomes by directing behavior and choices of the individual or by invoking congruence with the other (Meglino and Ravlin 1998). By eliciting a judgment of another’s behavior, the values judgment begins the process of rewarding or sanctioning individuals. This process subsequently affects their socialization into the group and strongly predicts whether they will remain in the group.
or attrite (De Cooman et al. 2009; Van Maanen 1978). Time in service also represents a measure of organizational commitment. “Organizational commitment consists of a belief in the organization’s goals and values and the willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization” (Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg 2003).

The present study evaluates the influence of respondents’ individual values on moral judgments in their own community of the U.S. Army. This focus offers three key benefits. First, it allows us to measure individual values in relation to organizational norms. Second, it allows an evaluation of variations in individual values judgments within a single group and of the ways in which this variance impacts judgments of guilt and punishment. Lastly, it clearly defines the organizational context within which both the actor and the respondent are embedded, meaning that individuals are evaluating in-group members rather than unsituated individuals.

Use of the U.S. Army as a sample population offers additional benefits. First, the U.S. Army is one of the few organizations with clearly defined organizational values. The seven values of Loyalty, Duty, Respect, Selfless Service, Honor, Integrity, Personal Courage (“Army Values” 2015) are inculcated from the first moment a recruit or officer candidate encounters the organization. Individuals who don’t share these values are often attrited within the first four years of service (Watkins and Sherk 2008). A second clear benefit of this sample population is its clearly defined formal status hierarchies. I argue that the status hierarchies represent a moral order in the organization (Sorenson
2013). Status is clearly linked to considerations of who is deemed morally worthy (Lamont 1992) as well as who is perceived as worthy of emulation, honor, and respect (Sauder, Lynn, and Podolny 2012b; Thye 2000; C. L. Ridgeway 2013). This operationalization of status helps control for the moral order of actors in the organization.

3.7 Data and Methods

3.7.1 Data

I conducted an online experiment to evaluate whether Schwartz values predict moral judgments of respondents embedded within a specific community that has clearly defined boundaries and standards of behavior. The experiment was part of an online survey on morality and the military. Many of the survey measures of morality were adapted from the Measuring Morality project hosted by the Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke University. Respondents were members of the U.S. Army and were recruited through military-focused online communities and social media. Respondents did not know that they were participating in an experiment. They were excluded from the final sample if they failed the attention check or if they did not provide basic demographic information. Respondents were not paid to participate, and participation was purely

---

4 (http://kenan.ethics.duke.edu/attitudes/resources/measuring-morality/)
voluntary. Finally, respondents who participated in the survey ranged from almost every rank of the U.S. Army. The final sample size was 406.

Respondents were asked to answer a variety of questions on moral values, including the Schwartz Portrait Values Questionnaire and the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (see Appendix A for the full instrument).

3.7.1.1 Schwartz Values Demographic Description

I first used ordinary least squares (OLS) regression to determine whether sociodemographic variables predict Schwartz values (Table 4). Although direct comparisons between the patterns found for the current sample with those from other samples cannot be made, some patterns consistent with other data sets are worth noting. One of the benefits of using scales such as Schwartz values or the Moral Foundations Questionnaire is that they allow comparisons across samples (Schwartz 2012; Vaisey and Miles 2014). In this sample, age appears to influence power and achievement. This pattern is consistent with a larger, more representative sample set in the Measuring Morality data set (Vaisey and Miles 2014). Age does not appear to influence conformity directly in the current sample, although it does in the Measuring Morality sample. However, higher rank, which is often achieved only through time served thus is indirectly associated with older ages and is associated with a stronger preference for conformity and greater rank.
Education does not appear to influence openness to change in the current data set but does appear to have a negative relationship with conformity. This pattern is consistent with other research showing that education has a negative effect on values such as security and conformity (Longest, Hitlin, and Vaisey 2013; Vaisey and Miles 2014). The general lack of demographic predictors suggests that other mechanisms are at play in the social patterning of the Schwartz values in the current sample. Additionally, because this is a volunteer sample selected on the basis of participating in a study about morals in the military, the conformity results should not be surprising; those who volunteer for specific events tend to care more about the issue at hand.

### Table 4. Demographic Predictors of Schwartz Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Tranceadence</th>
<th>Openness To Change</th>
<th>Social Focus</th>
<th>Self-Enhancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>benevolence</td>
<td>universalism</td>
<td>selfdirection</td>
<td>hedonism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rank</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tis</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combat</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.226</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marital status</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001 standard error in parentheses

### 3.7.1.2 Moral Foundations and Demographic Predictors of Schwartz Values
I then added moral foundations variables to test whether they had any additional influence on Schwartz values (Table 5). In this study, I use MFT as a measure of moral culture and test whether the moral foundations influence values. MFT provides a bridge between individual innateness and moral culture. Individuals are born with certain moral modules and the development of these moral foundations are influenced by broader culture (Graham et al. 2016). Sociodemographic considerations such as age, gender, and income influence values development, the broader cultural context also influences values formation (Friedland and Alford 1991; Zucker 1977). Table 5 presents the MFT predictors of Schwartz Values in the current data set. Note that certain moral foundations more strongly predict values than demographics such as age, marital status or gender.
For example, the moral foundation of harm predicts a higher valuation of benevolence and universalism. Fairness positively predicts universalism and negatively predicts an influence on tradition. Purity concerns have often been criticized as importing religion (Gray and Keeney 2015) as opposed to measuring only concerns for purity. Here, they negatively predict openness to change, hedonism, and stimulation, whereas they positively predict tradition and conformity. The moral foundation of
authority significantly predicts security, tradition, and conformity. The specific relationships between particular moral foundations and particular values, however, are not the important story here. The important concern is that the use of MFT as a measure of moral culture results in expected alignment the Schwartz Values. If, for example, authority somehow predicted openness to change, it would call into question the measurement validity of the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (Haidt 2013; Gray and Keeney 2015) and the Schwartz Values framework.

It is possible that the model could work the opposite direction—that is, that values could predict MFT orientations. I argue against this possibility for two reasons. First, MFT is an attempt to discover the innateness of morality arguing that we are born primed to accept or reject certain moral concerns (Graham et al. 2016; Suhler and Churchland 2011). Second, these innate tendencies are then shaped by the culture into which people are born. Thus, using moral foundations theory as a measure of culture that influences values formation remains true to the original formulations of the theory.

3.7.2 Method

Finally, respondents were asked to read a vignette that contained an experiment. The vignette was part of a three by three experimental design: one of three actor statuses and one of three behaviors was randomly assigned. Each respondent read only one vignette, and respondents were not aware of the experimental manipulation. The actor statuses were Private First Class, Staff Sergeant and Captain and were always presented
as male. Each status represents a different set of behavioral expectations (Berger, and Webster 2006) and a different position of honor within the organization (Department of the Army 2004).

Vignette 1

A Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested with his girlfriend by civilian law enforcement after stealing software from a local store.

Vignette 2

A Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested by civilian law enforcement after a physical altercation with his girlfriend.

Vignette 3

A Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested by civilian law enforcement.
enforcement after a physical altercation with his girlfriend. The girlfriend was hospitalized with severe injuries.

3.7.3 Measures

3.7.3.1 Key Independent Variables

The key independent variables are the Schwartz values. Values serve as “standards for judging others’ (and own) behavior” (Hitlin and Piliavin 2004, 362). As one of the most widely tested frameworks for measuring values, Schwartz values, then, should predict levels of guilt and punishment (Vaisey and Miles 2013).

3.7.3.2 Key Dependent Variable

Because organizations require order and because sanctions are a primary mechanism for maintaining that order (Durkheim 1996; Malle, Guglielmo, and Monroe 2014), moral judgments of guilt and punishment are key dependent variables. Respondents were asked to rate how guilty they thought the respondent was on the following scale: (1) definitely not guilty; (2) probably not guilty; (3) unclear/can't decide; (4) probably guilty; and (5) definitely guilty. To measure the moral judgment of responsibility, respondents were asked, “What do you think the appropriate punishment should be based on the scenario you just read?” Response options were listed in order from least severe to most severe: (1) no action; (2) informal counseling; (3) formal counseling; (4) Article 15; (5) letter of reprimand; (6) administrative separation;
and (7) court martial. Military punishment differs from civilian punishment but offers a broader set of tools to control individual behaviors and transgressions.\textsuperscript{5}

3.7.3.3 Control Variables

Control variables included gender (0 = female, and 1 = male), race (0 = nonwhite, 1 = white), and education (GED, diploma, some college, four-year college degree, master’s degree, professional degree or doctorate). Additional military-specific control variables were also used: combat deployment (0 = no, and 1 = yes), leadership positions held (1 = team chief, 2 = quad leader, 3 = platoon sergeant, 4 = first sergeant, 5 = sergeant major, 6 = platoon leader, 7 = company commander, 8 = battalion commander, and 9 = brigade command or higher). Age, income, and marital status were also included. I did not collect information on religious affiliation because I wanted to avoid priming a conflation of religion with morality. Future studies will include this control variable.

3.7.4 Analytic Approach

I used ordered logistic regression with robust standard errors to control for multiple testing to test whether Schwartz values predict moral judgments of guilt and punishment. I tested guilt and punishment separately. I tested the following five models for guilt and for punishment:

Model 1: Guilt and Individual Values
Model 2: Guilt, Values, and Status

Model 3: Guilt, Values, and Situation

Model 4: Guilt, Values, Status, and Situation

Model 5: Guilt, Values, Status, Situation, and Moral Foundations

I used the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) to select the best-fitting, most parsimonious model (Table 6). A frequent challenge with statistics is that the more variables added to the model, the more variance can be explained. The BIC is more conservative and imposes higher restrictions on adding in additional variables to the model (Burnham 2004), resulting in the best fitting model that has the fewest possible number of variables. Model fit statistics, of course, do not substitute for an argument based in theory. The BIC recommends that Model 2 best fits the current data, suggesting that individual values and organizational culture influence the moral judgments of guilt and punishment. This provides support for the argument that measuring individual values without accounting for social context may provide an explanation for why earlier values research did not provide a link between values and behavior (Swidler 1986; Vaisey 2010a).
Table 6. Results of Model Fit Test for Recommended Guilt and Punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>ll(model)</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guilt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 - Individual Values</td>
<td>-413.8395</td>
<td>865.6791</td>
<td>939.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2 - Values &amp; Status</td>
<td>-391.2195</td>
<td>824.4391</td>
<td>906.2793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3 - Values &amp; Situation</td>
<td>-412.8028</td>
<td>867.6056</td>
<td>949.4458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4 - Values, Status, &amp; Situation</td>
<td>-390.3274</td>
<td>826.6548</td>
<td>916.2893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5 - Values, Status, Situation &amp; Moral Foundations</td>
<td>-388.2774</td>
<td>832.5547</td>
<td>941.5998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Punishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 - Individual Values</td>
<td>-611.2359</td>
<td>1266.512</td>
<td>1352.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2 - Values &amp; Status</td>
<td>-582.3249</td>
<td>1212.656</td>
<td>1306.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3 - Values &amp; Situation</td>
<td>-610.0462</td>
<td>1268.092</td>
<td>1361.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4 - Values, Status, &amp; Situation</td>
<td>-579.9984</td>
<td>1211.997</td>
<td>1313.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5 - Values, Status, Situation, &amp; Moral Foundations</td>
<td>-575.0274</td>
<td>1212.055</td>
<td>1332.781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 Results and Discussion

3.8.1 Guilt

I tested whether Schwartz values predict moral judgments of guilt and punishment. Table 7 presents the odds ratio results for recommended guilt. Individual values have significant impact on judgments of guilt and punishment but, interestingly, vary according to the status of the actor. As in the previous study, the actor status of the Staff Sergeant results in significantly lower evaluations of guilt than the Captain. Conformity, along with time in service and being female, are the only significant respondent predictors of guilt in the preferred model, Model 2. I argue that the value of conformity offers an explanation with regard to organizational commitment. Although it
seems counterintuitive that protecting someone from judgments of guilt or punishment may serve the organization’s interests, the last 16 years at may war have shaped a generation of soldiers who are more focused on winning at war than on the consequences of negative behavior once they have returned safely home (Department of the Army 2011).
Table 7. Odds Ratio Results of Schwartz Values Influence on Recommended Guilt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altercation w/Girlfriend</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>-0.217</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.254)</td>
<td>(0.267)</td>
<td>(0.271)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts Girlfriend in Hospital</td>
<td>-0.345</td>
<td>-0.323</td>
<td>-0.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.248)</td>
<td>(0.249)</td>
<td>(0.254)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Sergeant</td>
<td>-1.511</td>
<td>-1.516</td>
<td>-1.475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.290)**</td>
<td>(0.290)**</td>
<td>(0.292)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.261)</td>
<td>(0.263)</td>
<td>(0.265)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schwartz Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.119)</td>
<td>(0.130)*</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
<td>(0.131)*</td>
<td>(0.145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>-0.206</td>
<td>-0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>(0.121)</td>
<td>(0.116)</td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.133)</td>
<td>(0.156)</td>
<td>(0.152)</td>
<td>(0.155)</td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.104)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td>(0.104)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td>(0.112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.088)</td>
<td>(0.091)</td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>(0.091)</td>
<td>(0.095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>-0.292</td>
<td>-0.226</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
<td>-0.219</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.147)*</td>
<td>(0.148)</td>
<td>(0.146)</td>
<td>(0.148)</td>
<td>(0.159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.136)*</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>(0.139)*</td>
<td>(0.149)</td>
<td>(0.171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.132)</td>
<td>(0.136)</td>
<td>(0.135)</td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
<td>(0.142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.134)</td>
<td>(0.129)</td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
<td>(0.144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
<td>(0.113)</td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
<td>(0.112)</td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>-0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.327)</td>
<td>(0.349)</td>
<td>(0.328)</td>
<td>(0.352)</td>
<td>(0.363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.139)</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>(0.152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.333)</td>
<td>(0.320)*</td>
<td>(0.337)</td>
<td>(0.321)*</td>
<td>(0.323)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Service</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.031)*</td>
<td>(0.031)**</td>
<td>(0.031)**</td>
<td>(0.031)**</td>
<td>(0.032)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.331)</td>
<td>(0.366)</td>
<td>(0.335)</td>
<td>(0.368)</td>
<td>(0.460)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIC: 865.7191  834.4391  837.6458  820.6548  825.5074
BIC: 930.7255  906.2725  920.4659  896.2814  914.0285

* = p < 0.10, ** = p < 0.01, *** = p < 0.001; standard error in parentheses.

Stealing is the reference category for Act.
Private Goal stated in the reference category for the Actor.
The current study demonstrates that values do not appear to influence the moral judgment of guilt through the action but rather through the status of the actor. Thus, the values appear to influence perceptions of a group member rather than the perceptions of the actions of the group member. This raises questions about research on moral judgments that focuses entirely on the acts without considering the actor (Abend 2012; Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2012; Baumeister, Vohs, and Funder 2007) and further offers support for studying values and moral judgments embedded in social context.

A focus on values offers additional insights into the mechanism behind the lower assignment of guilt to the Staff Sergeant. Respondents who are higher on conformity are less likely to see the Staff Sergeant as guilty. Tetlock (2003) argued that when people are asked to violate an object with special significance, they take extreme measures to avoid the action. In keeping with McGraw and Tetlock’s “principled rigidity as a demonstrated ‘refusal to answer certain questions’ when asked to assign a dollar amount to sacred items” (Leavitt et al, pg 2012; Tetlock 2005, pg 2), respondents in the current study selected “can’t decide, uncertain” rather than assign a moral judgment of guilt. This finding mirrors Durkheim’s conception of the sacred, which must remain untouched and unspoiled by the profane (Durkheim 1996; Miller 1996). I am not arguing that the Staff Sergeant holds a sacred position, but it is possible that the Staff Sergeant position holds a special status in the organization’s moral framework that protects the Staff Sergeant from judgments of guilt (Tetlock 2003). Failing to judge an actor as guilty...
also means that the act is subsequently not viewed as worthy of punishment, thus preserving the group membership status quo. The action itself appears to be irrelevant. It is the actor who is most important.

This variable demonstrates a higher marginal effect of “unsure/can’t decide” for all actors regardless of their behavior. This finding suggests that there are yet to be identified forces at play within the group that influence how respondents interpret the actor’s guilt. The current research in this section may shed light on the mechanism leading organizations to be composed of people who share similar values commitments (Miscenko and Day 2016). A key linkage in understanding how these values shape behavior may be found in identity—specifically, organizational identity. Organizational identity serves as a link between the individual and the broader values orientations of the culture writ large. Organizational identity is important for the study of values because it involves temporal commitment along with “cognitive-affective structures” that define how individuals perceive themselves in relation to their organization (Leavitt et al. 2012, 1318). This identity both constrains and motivates, and it is an important source of status and belonging (Sauder, Lynn, and Podolny 2012b). Organizational identity may affect moral judgments by making judging a perceived peer more difficult than judging someone perceived as other (Leavitt et al. 2012). How individuals ought to act at work may vary from how they believe they ought to behave at home or in other social contexts—meaning that respondents may view the actor’s actions outside of the
workplace through a different lens than actions which occur at work. These “oughts” influence ideal conceptions of the self. Activating these different conceptions of self have resulted in variance of moral judgments (Leavitt et al. 2012) and may explain why early values research was unable to identify values as a source of action (Swidler 1986). Future research should investigate how specific organizational identities influence moral judgments.

3.8.2 Punishment

As they did for judgments of guilt, values have a significant influence on punishment (Table 8). Once again, Model 2 is the best-fitting model for the data, suggesting that people decide which actors are worthy of punishment not necessarily based on what the actors have done but rather on status of the actors (Wahrman 1970b; Feshback 1967; Fragale et al. 2009). Punishment sanctions individuals for failure to conform to the group and thus is the first step in removing them from the group. The value of conformity should predict punishment in the same way it predicts guilt. Surprisingly, though, conformity does not predict punishment. I argue that while conformity is key to maintaining group norms, willingness to punish requires a willingness to upset the group norms and boundaries, by potentially removing a group member. While low status actors are relatively easy to remove, higher status actors such as the Staff Sergeant result in much greater impact to the group.
### Table 8. Odds Ratio Results Schwartz Values Influence on Recommended Punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altercation w/Girlfriend</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.231)</td>
<td>(0.234)</td>
<td>(0.245)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts Girlfriend in Hospital</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.249)</td>
<td>(0.254)</td>
<td>(0.259)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Sergeant</td>
<td>-1.031</td>
<td>-1.074</td>
<td>-1.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.220)**</td>
<td>(0.222)**</td>
<td>(0.225)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>0.811**</td>
<td>0.891**</td>
<td>0.899**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.277)**</td>
<td>(0.279)**</td>
<td>(0.280)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schwartz Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.110)</td>
<td>(0.114)</td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
<td>(0.113)</td>
<td>(0.120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.111)</td>
<td>(0.112)</td>
<td>(0.112)</td>
<td>(0.114)</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.151)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.151)</td>
<td>(0.159)</td>
<td>(0.158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td>(0.095)</td>
<td>(0.092)</td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td>(0.095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.085)</td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>(0.085)</td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>(0.091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>-0.327</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
<td>-0.343</td>
<td>-0.269</td>
<td>-0.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.151)*</td>
<td>(0.151)</td>
<td>(0.152)*</td>
<td>(0.153)</td>
<td>(0.158)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.143)</td>
<td>(0.150)</td>
<td>(0.143)</td>
<td>(0.149)</td>
<td>(0.158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
<td>-0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
<td>(0.134)</td>
<td>(0.124)</td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(0.132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulativ</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.377**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.122)*</td>
<td>(0.123)**</td>
<td>(0.120)*</td>
<td>(0.123)**</td>
<td>(0.133)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>-0.214</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>-0.263</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.103)*</td>
<td>(0.105)*</td>
<td>(0.104)*</td>
<td>(0.105)*</td>
<td>(0.105)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.152)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purity</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.139)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Group</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>-0.376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.170)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.239</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
<td>-0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.305)</td>
<td>(0.323)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.316)</td>
<td>(0.318)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.132)</td>
<td>(0.137)*</td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(0.133)*</td>
<td>(0.137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.272)</td>
<td>(0.283)</td>
<td>(0.275)</td>
<td>(0.284)</td>
<td>(0.296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Service</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.378)</td>
<td>(0.395)</td>
<td>(0.381)</td>
<td>(0.390)</td>
<td>(0.383)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood</td>
<td>-611.2559</td>
<td>-582.3249</td>
<td>-610.0462</td>
<td>-579.9984</td>
<td>-569.8242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>1466.512</td>
<td>1422.65</td>
<td>1468.092</td>
<td>1411.997</td>
<td>1381.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>1472.249</td>
<td>1506.382</td>
<td>1476.634</td>
<td>1412.513</td>
<td>1382.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.05, ***p < 0.001 standard error in parentheses**

Stealing is the reference category for Act
New parent is the reference category for the Actor
Respondents who rate higher on openness to change are significantly more likely to recommend that the Staff Sergeant face an Article 15 but are also much more likely to recommend that the Captain be court martialed. Punishing actors who hold either of these ranks has a much greater impact on the organization. Hedonism and stimulation, values that make up openness to change, have significant effects on willingness to punish. Openness to change is the only variable that predicts the Staff Sergeant receiving a greater predicted probability of being recommended for punishment than the Captain or the private.

This set of findings helps explain why a respondent who might have judged the Staff Sergeant to be more guilty would still reticent to punish. Respondents who rate score on conformity and conservativism might argue that the higher-ranking Staff Sergeant should know better than to engage in the actions depicted in the vignettes and thus would evaluate the Staff Sergeant as more guilty. However, the same logic that argues that the Staff Sergeant should know better also makes it difficult if not impossible for the respondent to suggest punishment for the higher-ranking individual. Because of belief that individuals who attain higher status are worthy of being there (Berger, Ridgeway, and Zelditch 2002; Hollander 1958; Sauder, Lynn, and Podolny 2012b) the special status of the actors in the organization as well as the overarching cultural may make it more difficult to identify their actions as guilty and thus warranting punishment (Friedland and Alford 1991). Punishment involves disrupting the group, and losing the
higher-status actor implies greater disruption. Therefore, it is not surprising that conservation and conformity do not predict punishment: individuals who rate these values as more important are more likely to protect the group rather than seek to disrupt it.

3.9 Limitations

Use of a normative measurement, such as the Schwartz values, is appropriate in this study because respondents being asked to classify an actor’s guilt (Meglino and Ravlin 1998). This method raises issues, though, with making claims about organizational values above and beyond what can reasonably be stated with regard to the aggregation of individual values. Problems include making assumptions about what individuals know about their organizational values, whether those values are relevant to the current situation, whether the values have been activated during the experiment, and what people assume about the values of others around them.

The U.S. Army sample used here helps mitigate some of these concerns. First, cadets and new officers are inculcated with the organization’s values from day one. Values are rated on every performance evaluation for leaders at all levels. Because of the shared moral framework provided by the Army community, the aforementioned assumptions are less problematic than in organizations that may be less explicit in their values orientation.
Work withdrawal presents another challenge to the findings. Work withdrawal involves the withdrawal of individuals from the workplace because of misconduct, failure to perform, or other behaviors that negatively affect the member’s usefulness to the organization. All three vignettes presented to the respondents represent an example of work withdrawal. Yet, respondents remained reticent both to assign blame for the actions and to punish them (Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg 2003). Work withdrawal is a critical challenge for all organizations, but especially in this context: work withdrawal suggests that dynamics are at play upon soldiers’ returning home that leaders are failing to address (Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg 2003). Again, it appears that the actor’s status outweighs the negative contribution to the organization.

Finally, values don’t appear to offer an explanation about why the actor’s behaviors in the vignettes are not stronger predictors of moral judgments. If values are a means of passing judgment, then surely individual actions would inform this judgment as well. Future research should investigate whether there is a continuum where actions do influence moral judgments more than actor status or whether actor status always influences perceptions of guilt and punishment.

3.10 Conclusion

Based on Parsons and Shils (1951) conclusion that most people prioritize relationships over universals moral concerns, Leavitt et al. (2012) argued for moral universalism and moral particularism. The argument for moral particularism is further
supported by Durkheim’s conception of morality that extends from identity, which is shaped and influenced by relationships (Miller 1996). Furthermore, allowing for moral particularism more fully accounts for patterns observed time and again across different domains. The current work expands on the work of Leavitt et al (2012), which argues that situated moral identities operate differently than universal moral particulars. Individuals’ values are the result of and subject to these meso-level contexts. Importantly, the current chapter adds to the body of literature that supports evidence for a proximal moral realm that operates between particular moral judgments and unsituated moral universals. Put another way, if harm is a universal moral judgment, then why didn’t benevolence not predict evaluations of guilt and punishment in the current study? Accounting for proximal influence on the moral judgments such as can be found and measured within organizations offers an explanation.

However, the universal/particularism dyad doesn’t go far enough. Individuals have moral frameworks that exist beyond organizational boundaries and often conflict. A man can be a good soldier and a good father, and many aspects of those identities could result in conflict between competing moral frameworks. As such, it is important to evaluate moral decision-making as embedded in communities/organizations, especially if researchers are concerned with behavioral outcomes associated with moral judgments (Bardi and Schwartz 2003; Baumeister, Vohs, and Funder 2007).
Although it is essentially a laboratory experiment, the current chapter benefits ecological validity because it is situated within a specific organization’s moral framework (Abend 2008; Abend 2012). By demonstrating that actor characteristics cause respondents to avoid addressing the actors’ transgressions or to look away from transgressions by evaluating them as less worthy of guilt or punishment, this chapter advances our understanding of why some individuals end up in the disciplinary system and others do not. It also demonstrates a possible mechanism for in-group bias (Singh, Choo, and Poh 1998; Bailey and Ferguson 2013).

An additional benefit to this research, however, is that it demonstrates that there is significantly more to moral judgments than MFT offers on its own. Moral psychology and MFT have both contributed to the current findings by offering a mechanism to measure broader moral culture and that is still situated in Western ideas about morality (Gray, Waytz, and Young 2012). Future research in moral psychology should move beyond unsituated acts and moral universals and instead look more closely at the specific communities and at how morality works when situated within specific communities. This would provide greater insight into how morality works in everyday life.

Finally, this chapter offers evidence that both individual values and organizational moral order influence moral decision-making. Organizational identity argues that values stem from relationships (Sluss and Ashforth 2007). Perceptions of fit
between an individual’s values and those of his or her organization tend to result in lower levels of employee turnover (De Cooman et al. 2009). Organizational identity also shapes values and has demonstrated influence over individual decision-making that either benefits or harms the organization (Miscenko and Day 2016; Dutton, Roberts, and Bednar 2010). In short, organizations provide a meso-level link between individual values and the broader moral culture.

If our relationships influence our values, then examining values without considering relational context would provide limited utility in understanding how values work in everyday life. This chapter offers an opening argument for better understanding the link between values and behavior and will provide future researchers with a starting point for new research that accounts for a tri-level morality.
4. Beyond Moral Foundations

4.1 Introduction

If morality is about harm/care, then why, in the legal system do we see offenders receiving lighter punishment despite their actions involving harm? If individual harm is so critical to morality, why then would the Catholic Church not punish child abusers instead of shuffling them around for decades only to have them find new victims?

Since the retreat from Parsons in the 1950s, morality has returned to the sociological stage, albeit rather slowly. Sociology’s abandonment of the core questions asked upon the founding of the discipline led moral psychology to stake dominant claim on the study of morality, or at least of moral judgments. Despite the two fields common origins tracing back to Kant through Durkheim and Kohlberg, a stark divergence exists between how psychologists have studied morality and how sociologists have engaged and operationalized the concept. In moral psychology, harm is widely understood to be immoral and is the field’s primary focal point (Gray, Waytz, and Young 2012; Carnes and Janoff-Bulman 2012; Cushman, Young, and Hauser 2006; Sousa, Holbrook, and Piazza 2009; Haidt 2008). In sociology, however, morality has a very different and arguably more diverse theoretical tradition that focuses on conceptions of the good (Miller 1996; Lamont 1992; Bellah et al. 2007; Vaisey and Miles 2013; Hitlin and Vaisey 2013).
Both fields have contributed greatly to the scientific study of morality and moral judgments but suffer from challenges with ecological validity. More work is needed to understand how moral judgments made in abstract situations unmoored from everyday life can inform moral decision-making for individuals embedded within communities. Moral psychology and sociological studies of morality could both benefit if each applied methodological and theoretical frameworks from the other.

Moral psychology’s limited ability to account for cultural variations in morality has limited the generalizability of its claims somewhat (Graham et al. 2011). However, some moral psychology researchers have specifically accounted for a sociological understanding of morality within their frameworks (Haidt and Graham 2006). By accounting for moral frameworks that bind individuals into “tightly integrated…strong groups that cooperatively pursue common goals,” Haidt and Graham brought a distinctly Durkheimian (i.e., sociological) understanding of morality to moral psychology (2006, 2). It is from this research tradition that MFT arises, offering a more sociological understanding of morality in a field that has limited morality to a focus on harm and fairness for much of its theoretical history (Haidt and Graham 2006). MFT still accounts for harm and fairness but now also accounts for the influences of authority, in groups, and purity.

MFT evolved as a means of attempting to understand the moral domains—to decipher what it is that people moralize and what similarities exist across cultures. That
is, MFT is designed to understand the *types* of things people moralize, rather than the objects themselves. MFT has been rigorously tested in the realm of political ideology (Frimer et al. 2013) and has been used to predict character (Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2012; Goodwin 2015), explain possible moralizations in justifying domestic violence (Vecina, Marzana, and Paruzel-Czachura 2015; Vecina 2014), and provide insight into why some individuals tend to support war (Graham and Haidt 2011). This research has encouraged further development of how moral concerns in one domain can translate into moral judgments in another.

MFT has been challenged, however, by the argument that rather than representing varying innate foundations, morality is actually just differing variations of harm. For example, Gray argued for a moral dyad of harm (Gray, Waytz, and Young 2012). Furthermore, the idea that harm concerns could be directed at an entity other than the individual suggests that harm may indeed be a primary focus of morality (Gray, Waytz, and Young 2012; Gray, Schein, and Ward 2014; Schein and Gray 2015). If perceptions of harm can be directed toward something other than individuals, then a group-based understanding of morality may offer a needed extension to MFT.

This chapter extends previous research on MFT and applies it to moral judgments of guilt and punishment of respondents embedded in a community. I examine whether MFT predicts moral judgments of guilt and punishment within a
single organization, and I suggest that an embedded sense of identity and organizational commitment offers an alternative explanation for the variance in moral judgments.

In this chapter, I argue that to further expand our understanding of moral judgments, we must evaluate whether universal claims of moral judgments such as MFT predict behavior within social groups. I investigate whether MFT predicts moral judgments of guilt and punishment within the U.S. Army. My findings show that MFT does not predict judgments of guilt or punishment when acts vary along the harm continuum, nor do any other of the moral foundations predict judgments of guilt or punishment. Instead, I find that the actor’s position within the group is a stronger predictor of judgments of guilt and punishment, suggesting that although MFT may predict moral judgments outside of group contexts, once an individual is embedded in a group, the group mediates overarching moral concerns.

I aim to further our understanding of how current normative understandings of morality (i.e., that harm is bad) presents a limited view of how morality actually works at the group level. I use MFT because it offers an explicit, well-tested measure of harm that has been validated across many domains as well as tested cross-culturally. I offer evidence from an online survey experiment conducted using members of the U.S. Army to demonstrate that despite widespread agreement that harm and fairness are important moral foundations, MFT does not predict judgments of guilt or punishment. I show that actor status, length of time a respondent has been a member of a community and gender
have stronger influence on judgments of guilt and punishment than MFT. I conclude with implications for further study of morality as both a universal and locally influenced judgment.

**4.2 Individual or Group Moral Concerns**

Both moral psychology and the sociology of morality offer critical insights into moral decision-making, but each on its own presents an incomplete picture. Moral psychology’s continued focus on harm as a universal moral domain, however, has resulted in a limited understanding of how moral judgments work in everyday situations absent social context (Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2012; Abend 2012). Moral realism remains somewhat absent from moral psychology.

The sociology of morality remains splintered between two main understandings of morality: that which is viewed as good/bad or right/wrong and that which adheres to or violates “standards of morality” (Hitlin and Vaisey 2013). These two views on morality are not mutually exclusive, but they do inform different subfields within sociology (see e.g. Hitlin and Vaisey 2013) and are more descriptive discussions of morality. Standards of morality are often associated with Kantian themes of rights, justice, and harm (Turiel 2002); as such, standards of morality involve an inherently normative discussion of morality based on how individuals ought to behave. Descriptive forms of morality should encompass not only people’s stated beliefs about
what is moral but also how these statements affect moral judgments beyond experimental conditions (Abend 2012).

Haidt argued for exploring not just the “content but also the function,” thus circling back to thick morality as Durkheim understood it (Haidt & Kesebir 800). MFT brings in distinctly communal views of morality and anchors moral concerns in five domains of purity, harm, fairness (justice), in-group, and authority (Haidt 2007). The foundations of harm and fairness are generally considered the individual foundations, whereas authority, purity, and in-group are considered to be moral concerns that bind individuals to their group (Napier and Luguri 2013; Graham et al. 2011). With MFT, these domains are fundamentally Durkheimian at their core (Haidt 2007).

Despite accounting for group-based morality, MFT may not adequately explain how individuals make decisions when embedded in their day-to-day context. Although Haidt et al. used MFT to attempt to account for the function of moral communities, I argue the current construction of moral domains offers limited insight into moral judgments beyond Western and possibly American sociopolitical insights. Instead, I argue that the moral foundations pertain to distant, second-order morality as “bright lights” (Hitlin 2008) rather than tightly bound, local morality embedded in moral communities (Durkheim 1992b; Miller 1996; Haidt 2007) and offer support for Gray’s conception that harm to something other than individuals can be a moral concern (Gray, Waytz, and Young 2012; Gray, Schein, and Ward 2014).
Sociological studies of group boundaries, for example, allow for groups to define moral boundaries separating the in-group from the out-group. These boundaries are grounded in lived experience and tell us more about moral realism and how it may actually operate than how we think it ought to operate. Thus, MFT is undermined by the same problem it sought to solve: it tries to predict how the moral domain ought to be perceived rather than how it is perceived.

4.3 Moral Psychology and Morality

Space constraints prevent a full discussion of the history of moral psychology and the development of moral foundations theory (for a more thorough discussion, see Kesebir and Haidt 2010). A brief summary is necessary, however, for those who are not familiar with the development of MFT developed and its relevance to the current argument.

Haidt sought to develop a theory of morality both to account for normative conceptions of morality anchored in concern for fairness, harm, and justice (Turiel 2002; Gilligan 1977; Kohlberg and Hersh 1977) and to account for variations across cultures that focus more on relational aspects of morality (A. P. Fiske 1992). Critically, Haidt departed from a more Kantian conception of morality as what individuals ought to do and instead offered a descriptive map of the moral domain. By considering the various domains of morality, rather than the specific items people moralized, he sought to develop a unifying theory of morality.
MFT identifies five moral domains that can be found in every culture: care/harm, fairness, purity, authority, and in-group. These domains are found in all cultures and the degree to which they vary is dependent on the culture within which an individual is born. Just as someone raised outside Japan would have a hard time pronouncing some of the sounds in that language, individuals born outside a certain culture would have difficulty picking up on the moral nuances. MFT asks a battery of questions attempting to establish why some people care more about certain virtues (Haidt and Graham 2006; Graham and Haidt 2011).

Despite this map of the moral domain, questions about morality linger. In particular, harm presents a challenge for MFT, as well as for moral psychology writ large. Moral psychology assumes that harm and fairness are inherently individual focused. Put another way, moral psychology focuses on harm to individual people, ignoring that harm to groups, objects, even imaginary conceptions such as a soul (Gray, Schein, and Ward 2014). Individually focused harm also denies that harm to groups is nothing beyond accounting for the number of individuals within a group (Schein and Gray 2015; Gray, Schein, and Ward 2014). The group itself is not an object that can be harmed.

Gray’s theory of dyadic morality seeks to answer this challenge by taking seriously what people say. Dyadic morality suggests that harm is actually at the root of immorality, and importantly, “it also acknowledges harm pluralism—legitimate
variations in perceived harm. Dyadic morality acknowledges that Brahmans legitimately see harm when burial sites are violated (Shweder, 2012), and U.S. conservatives legitimately see harm in homosexuality (Gray et al., 2014)—whereas harm-monist MFT rejects these perceptions as mere rationalizations (Haidt, 2001)” (Gray and Keeney 2015, 3).

Gray’s conception of morality is a more sociological understanding of people and beliefs. Durkheim argued that people’s beliefs should be taken seriously (Durkheim 1996). Weber argued for verstehen, the subjective first person point of view (J. Weber 1993) and Merton subsequently argued that beliefs have powerful consequences for action (Merton 1948). Dismissing people’s beliefs about harm to something other than individuals imposes an artificial construction of morality that obscures how morality may actually operate once embedded in situational context.

At the center of the debate between MFT and dyadic morality is the hunt for “universality without uniformity” (Gray and Keeney 2015, 3). For example, purity concerns may be legitimate concerns about harming one’s soul (Rottman, Kelemen, and Young 2014). This raises legitimate questions about what is being measured when we account for harm in questions of morality. Is morality that which is defined by the Enlightenment thinkers and primarily concerned with justice and harm, with everything else being defined as social convention (Turiel 2002)? Or does morality vary in its content so much that mapping the moral domain is impossible without resorting to
moral relativism? I turn now to a sociological discussion of sacredness to provide a link between moral dyads and MFT.

4.4 Sociology and Sacredness

A key tenant of Durkheimian sociology surrounds conceptions of the sacred (Durkheim 1996), which is believed to be real both in its need to be protected from the profane but also in its ability to bind individuals to the group. According to this perspective, traditional religion and community, rather than appeals to sanctity, bound individuals to society (Miller 1996; Durkheim 1996; Haidt and Graham 2006). One of Durkheim’s primary concerns was the decaying of traditional society and the loosing of the factors that bound people to society (Durkheim 1992b). He saw the fundamental shift in the sacred away from the traditional forms in the church and community and toward individuals, and he wrestled with this transformation. How could society function if every individual is considered sacred?

The consequences of sacralizing every individual mean that group boundaries can no longer be enforced because the group is no longer the primary concern – the individual is not the focal point. This is exactly the premise in moral psychology—that is, that harm is immoral only if it is harm to the individual. The decline in punishments that inflict harm across societies seem to provide evidence to support this process of individual sacralization. For example, the death penalty can be perceived a violation of human rights only if the human life itself is sacred and thus must be protected and
preserved from the profane (in this case, harm) (Joas 2013). This means that the individual is worthy of protection and preservation regardless of what actions they engage in.

Haidt and Graham noted that those who are concerned with individual rights “are trying to act in accordance with moral concepts such as fairness, rights and justice, which the rest of the hive-like, group-oriented society does not include as a part of the moral domain” and that moral psychology does not acknowledge concepts such as “loyalty, tradition, order, respect for one’s superiors, and sacredness…as part of the moral domain” (Haidt and Graham 2006, 3). Concerns for sacred objects, however, are dismissed as mere superstitions and thus are beyond the scope of MFT and moral dyadic conceptions of harm. I argue that this conception of sacredness cannot be dismissed when considering morality.

Elsewhere, I have argued that moral psychology assumes that morality equates to individual harm and that this assumption is based on an assumed worth (or sacredness) of every human being. If individuals are sacred, then concerns of harm that go beyond the individual would automatically be discounted as not part of the moral domain. Religious objections to the defiling of sacred texts are dismissed as illusion rather than real manifestations of anger to the defiling of a truly sacred object (Harris 2010; Joas 2013). Yet, moral violations are accompanied by “hostility and often violence” (Graham et al. 2016, 5). Joas argues that something is sacred if it can be defined as such
according to “subjective self-evidence and affective intensity” (Joas 2013, 16). However, I argue that if we want to understand morality in the framing of “universality without uniformity,” (Gray and Keeney 2015) then we must develop a conception of the sacred to account for the universal human rights relating to harm that will allow us to understand why competing conceptions of sacredness may overrule conceptions of individual harm.

If we expand our limited conception of morality beyond Kant’s rational defense of rights and justice, we can then begin to conceptualize the moral domain as both universal and varying. We can understand that people will be moved to violence by their real perceptions of harm if we consider that the object of their harm does not need to be an individual human being to provoke the intense affective response that accompanies a moral violation (Gray, Schein, and Ward 2014; Joas 2013; Cerulo 2002).

4.5 *Universal or Group-Based Morality*

Abend (2012) argued that moral judgments tested in moral psychology are limited to a specific type of moral judgment that largely fails to account for context. Contrary to Haidt and Kesebir (798), who argued that moral psychology has become the “study of how individuals solve moral quandaries,” Abend argues that moral psychology cannot actually tell us much beyond the way individuals answer these
specific sets of moral questions (Abend 2012). For example, what do trolley problems actually tell us about moral judgments? Trolley problems and their variants ask respondents to evaluate whether emotion or cognition is invoked (J. D. Greene 2007), or whether these decisions are rational or subconscious (Haidt 2003). These types of problems tell us nothing about whether an individual would actually push a person off the bridge to stop a runaway trolley.

A critical challenge to MFT is its failure to account for relations and their influence on human interactions. Despite the shift in moral psychology to account for the influence of communities on moral judgments, questions remain about the generalizability of MFT. If moral psychology is concerned with harm and rights and MFT specifically accounts for social group effects, then these theoretical traditions should offer an account of how individuals arrive at moral judgments (Abend 2012). Despite accounting for moral communities, MFT has not evolved beyond abstract moral arguments to extensive empirical testing (Graham et al. 2016).

**4.6 The Present Study**

This study evaluates whether MFT provides insight into how individuals make moral judgments when embedded in a group. If morality is to be explained in terms of

---

*Trolley problems are a common moral dilemma used in moral psychology where a respondent is asked whether they would harm an individual by either pushing them off a bridge or pulling a lever in order to stop an oncoming trolley from killing another person or group of people.*
individual-level harm/care or fairness (Haidt 2007; Haidt and Graham 2006), then people who score higher on the moral foundation of harm should be more sensitive to violations involving harm. Thus, respondents should rate acts involving higher levels of individual harm as more guilty and subsequently deserving of greater punishment. The current research not only asks all respondents to complete the Moral Foundations Questionnaire but also asks respondents to evaluate guilt and punishment of actors embedded in the respondents’ own community.

Gray et al. (2012) argued that morality is more than individual harm. If harm can be considered a moral violation even if it is not applied to individuals, then morality can be broadened to consider harm to the group or even to objects considered sacred, such as holy texts. Atheists question whether the harm to a holy text can be viewed as harm, arguing that there is rationally nothing special about those particular words on those particular pages (Harris 2010; Graham et al. 2016). Entire fields of sociology have validated that individual beliefs have predictive value (Berger, and Webster 2006; Berger 1977). Beliefs that are real in their content are real in their consequences (Merton 1948). Dismissing the idea of harm to an object believed to be sacred results in a thin description of morality—one lacking in any real depth beyond trolley problems in lab experiments (Hitlin and Vaisey 2013).

Using members of the U.S. Army as respondents provides a unique ability to test moral judgments embedded in a moral community. Because of the U.S. Army’s clearly
proscribed expectations of behavior and its formal rules, this organization as an experimental population provides a unique ability to measure whether moral universals predict behavior in an embedded cultural context. Although this study arguably suffers from the same constraints as other abstract experiments with regard to moral judgments, the current research moves beyond unsituated scenarios and instead anchors respondents in a community where shared conceptions of the good influence moral judgments.

In this study, I tested whether MFT predicts judgments of guilt and punishment. I offer findings suggesting that harm is a moral judgment that considers harm beyond the individual level. If harm is considered to be that to the group rather than simply harm to the individual, then moral judgments implicitly consider a higher cost to the group rather than individual harm. As such, individuals who are higher on the in-group/authority foundation may not evaluate a harm violation the same as someone who is higher on the harm foundation.

4.7 Data & Methods

4.7.1 Data

Using respondents from the active duty Army community, I conducted an online experiment that was embedded in an original online survey on morality and the military. Many of the survey measures of morality were adapted from the Measuring
Respondents were recruited through military-focused online communities and social media. Respondents did not know they were participating in an experiment. They were excluded from the final sample if they failed the attention check or if they did not provide basic demographic information. Respondents were not paid to participate, and participation was purely voluntary. Finally, respondents who participated in the survey were from almost every rank of the U.S. Army. The final sample size was 406.

4.7.2 Method

Respondents were randomly assigned to read one of three vignettes and were asked to assign a level of guilt to the actor they read about. All three vignettes depicted intentional acts that varied based on the level of harm (Haidt and Baron 1996). Additionally, the actor in each vignette had one of three possible ranks. Each respondent read only one vignette with an actor of only one rank, and they were aware of neither the other vignettes nor the experimental manipulation.

Vignette 1

A Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed
yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested with his girlfriend by civilian law enforcement after stealing software from a local store.

**Vignette 2**

A Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested by civilian law enforcement after a physical altercation with his girlfriend.

**Vignette 3**

A Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the Private First Class/Staff Sergeant/Captain had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested by civilian law enforcement after a physical altercation with his girlfriend. The girlfriend was hospitalized with severe injuries.

### 4.7.3 Measures

Respondents were asked to rate how guilty they thought the respondent was on the following scale: (1) definitely not guilty; (2) probably not guilty; (3) unclear/can’t decide; (4) probably guilty; and (5) definitely guilty. To measure the moral judgment of guilt, respondents were asked, “What do you think the appropriate punishment should
be based on the scenario you just read?” Response options were listed in order from least severe to most severe: (1) no action; (2) informal counseling; (3) formal counseling; (4) Article 15; (5) letter of reprimand; (6) administrative separation; and (7) court martial.

4.7.3.1 Key Independent Variable

The key independent variable is the level of harm of the act in the vignettes. I varied the level harm in three vignettes, with one being relatively harmless (stealing) and two varying in level of severity of individual harm (a domestic altercation compared with a domestic altercation resulting in hospitalization).

4.7.3.2 Key Dependent Variable

The key dependent variable is how guilty each respondent judges the actor based on the level of harm in each vignette. I use ordered logistic regression with robust standard errors to control for multiple testing to model the effect of actor rank on degree of guilt.

4.7.4 Analytic Approach

All three studies used ordered logistic regression with robust standard errors to control for multiple testing. I test guilt and punishment separately. I control for observer demographics in all models (race, education, gender, and combat deployment).

I tested nine models hypothesizing differing relationships between the moral foundation of harm, actor, and the act, as well as their influence on perceptions of guilt and punishment. Further, because previous research has indicated that actor status
influences moral judgments, I included a model accounting for actor status (1 = Private, 2 = Staff Sergeant, 3 = Captain) as well as observer status (0/1 = enlisted/officer).

Model 0: Guilt Harm

Model 1: Guilt and Situation

Model 2: Guilt and Actor

Model 3: Guilt, Harm, and Situation

Model 4: Guilt and Harm##Situation

Model 5: Guilt, Harm, and Actor

Model 6: Guilt and Harm##Actor

Model 7: Guilt, Harm, Situation, and Actor

Model 8: Guilt, Harm, and Situation##Actor

Model 9: Guilt, Harm##Situation##Actor

### 4.8 Results and Discussion

As can be seen in Table 9, the standard deviation between respondents for the evaluation of guilt is relatively low. The somewhat larger standard deviations for punishment suggest more disagreement exists between respondents on the appropriate level of punishment. Overall, these descriptive statistics suggest that respondents have a shared understanding of these acts and that the acts should, in fact, be punished.
The key finding of this study is that the moral foundation of harm does not predict outcomes of guilt in any model. Additionally, none of the moral foundations predict outcomes of guilt in any model. The only observer characteristics that significantly predict guilt across all models are length of time in service and being female.
Table 10. Logit Results of MFT Influence on Recommended Guilt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Model 0</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>altercation w/ girlfriend</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts girlfriend in hospital</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
<td>(1.42)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Sergeant</td>
<td>-1.294</td>
<td>-1.271</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>-1.205</td>
<td>-1.347</td>
<td>-1.485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.31)**</td>
<td>(5.22)**</td>
<td>(5.11)**</td>
<td>(5.17)**</td>
<td>(5.11)**</td>
<td>(5.17)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.61)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>altercation*staff sergeant</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alteration*captain</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospital*staff sergeant</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospital*captain</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm*altercation</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm*hospital</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm*staff sergeant</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm*captain</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm<em>altercation</em>staff sergeant</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm<em>altercation</em>captain</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm<em>hospital</em>staff sergeant</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm<em>hospital</em>captain</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time in service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonwhite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log likelihood</td>
<td>-472.584</td>
<td>-473.468</td>
<td>-452.547</td>
<td>-471.067</td>
<td>-469.581</td>
<td>-450.801</td>
<td>-450.327</td>
<td>-449.958</td>
<td>-446.989</td>
<td>-443.9571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>951.105</td>
<td>958.537</td>
<td>927.2554</td>
<td>956.1356</td>
<td>967.162</td>
<td>925.702</td>
<td>928.363</td>
<td>927.597</td>
<td>923.3975</td>
<td>339.5142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>1005.232</td>
<td>1013.051</td>
<td>971.2193</td>
<td>1014.212</td>
<td>1023.251</td>
<td>973.836</td>
<td>984.352</td>
<td>984.065</td>
<td>1001.512</td>
<td>1094.070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model fit statistics can help adjudicate between the models and select the most parsimonious model. Here, I use the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) statistic because it is the most parsimonious measure of model fit (Burnham 2004). Model 2, the model that accounts only for actor status, is the best-fitting and most parsimonious model for both guilt and punishment.

It is striking that the model predicting judgments of guilt using only the status of the actor in the vignette (as well as observer demographic controls) fits the data better than models that account for moral violation alone. In the field of moral psychology, morality is understood in terms of acts (Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2012). Sociologists, however, tend to view morality as either “the distinction between right and wrong” or “good, virtuous; conforming to the standards of morality” (Hitlin and Vaisey 2012). This distinction between right and wrong versus the good and virtuous overlooks a third sociological conception of morality: one that looks at individuals’ assessments of what kind of person they should be (Hitlin and Vaisey 2013; Lamont 1992; Bellah et al. 2007). The findings here suggest that much more work must be done to investigate not how we wish individuals would make moral judgments but how they actually do.

The act’s level of harm does not appear to significantly predict moral judgments of guilt or punishment, raising questions about the role of individual harm in moral judgments. Likewise, the moral foundation of harm does not predict judgments of guilt or punishment. This finding is surprising, especially regarding the vignette involving a
behavior that puts someone in the hospital. As with previous findings, it is not the act but rather a characteristic of the actor that significantly predicts guilt.

This finding offers support for the idea that harm may extend beyond individuals (Gray, Schein, and Ward 2014). The actors depicted in the vignettes represent different levels of organizational commitment (Van Maanen 1978; Schneider, Goldstein, and Smith 1995). A private hasn’t been in the Army for more than a few years and can join the service with relative ease. Compare that to a Captain, who must have a four-year degree and must have attended one of three commissioning sources: the Captain requires more time to enter into the organization and represents greater organizational commitment. A Staff Sergeant, by comparison, needs at least four to ten years to develop. Although officers require more formal schooling to produce, Staff Sergeants are largely produced by experience. Also important here is that Staff Sergeants gain most of their experience with soldiers; they are embedded in the everyday life of soldiers, whereas Captains tend to be in staff positions if they are not in command. This suggests that the loss of a Staff Sergeant would have a great influence on organizational effectiveness, much to the chagrin of Captains, who would argue the Army couldn’t run without them.

Moral psychology has only limited engagement with the character of individuals, and MFT has even less (Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2012; Goodwin 2015). Anyone who has studied crime and deviance knows that characteristics of the actor
significantly affect guilt and punishment in the justice system. To my knowledge, this is
the first study in the moral foundations literature to demonstrate that the moral
violation centers on the individual rather than the act itself. Additional analyses of the
other moral foundations result in significant predictors of either guilt or punishment.
This suggests that information about the actor may be a key determinant in moral
judgments—a striking finding in a field that has sought to remove the actor from
judgment in favor of a primary focus on the act.

Moving now to testing these models in terms of punishment, I find the same
pattern. MFT, to include models in which the harm foundation is present, does not
predict higher rates of punishment. That harm is not a significant predictor of a moral
violation, even among those who rate harm as very important, suggests that our
understanding of how and where harm operates needs further expansion.
Table 11. Logit Results of MFT Influence on Punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Model 0</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altercation w/Girlfriend</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.356</td>
<td>-0.509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts Girlfriend in Hospital</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>2.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.62)</td>
<td>(1.67)</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
<td>(2.06)*</td>
<td>(3.20)**</td>
<td>(1.61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Sergeant</td>
<td>-0.880</td>
<td>-0.896</td>
<td>-1.247</td>
<td>-0.939</td>
<td>-0.976</td>
<td>-1.318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.23)**</td>
<td>(4.28)**</td>
<td>(1.49)</td>
<td>(4.47)**</td>
<td>(3.30)**</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>-0.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.26)**</td>
<td>(3.25)**</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(3.31)**</td>
<td>(2.32)*</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altercation*Staff Sergeant</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>2.642</td>
<td>(1.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altercation*Captain</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>1.819</td>
<td>(1.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.83)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital*Staff Sergeant</td>
<td>-0.621</td>
<td>-2.695</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital*Captain</td>
<td>-1.905</td>
<td>-0.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.27)**</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm*Altercation</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm*Hospital</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm*Staff Sergeant</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm*Captain</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm<em>Altercation</em>Staff Sergeant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm<em>Altercation</em>Captain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm<em>Hospital</em>Staff Sergeant</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm<em>Hospital</em>Captain</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observer Characteristics**

| Time in Service                  | -0.045  | -0.044  | -0.045  | -0.043  | -0.043  | -0.042  |
|                                  | (1.81)  | (1.77)  | (1.83)  | (1.74)  | (1.75)  | (1.71)  |
| Education                        | 0.135   | 0.122   | 0.170   | 0.125   | 0.123   | 0.182   |
|                                  | (0.93)  | (0.93)  | (1.36)  | (1.05)  | (1.02)  | (1.44)  |
| Female                           | 0.050   | 0.042   | -0.019  | 0.049   | 0.046   | 0.002   |
|                                  | (0.23)  | (0.19)  | (0.08)  | (0.22)  | (0.21)  | (0.01)  |
| Nonwhite                         | -0.007  | -0.016  | -0.029  | -0.014  | -0.013  | -0.026  |
|                                  | (0.15)  | (0.33)  | (0.55)  | (0.29)  | (0.27)  | (0.49)  |
| Combat                           | 0.315   | 0.316   | 0.288   | 0.317   | 0.313   | 0.275   |
|                                  | (0.98)  | (0.98)  | (0.89)  | (0.98)  | (0.97)  | (0.84)  |
| Officer                          | 0.126   | 0.256   | 0.512   | 0.216   | 0.221   | 0.077   |
|                                  | (0.89)  | (1.04)  | (0.43)  | (0.87)  | (0.89)  | (0.29)  |

AIC: 1415.156 1420.402 1371.104 1416.127 1419.908 1366.404 1369.38 1364.795 1358.198 1368.365
BIC: 1467.239 1476.559 1427.261 1476.223 1488.016 1426.499 1437.488 1432.903 1442.331 1484.55

*p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001 standard error in parentheses

# Modeling categories are: Staff Sergeant, Captain, Hospital, Harm, Altercation, Moral Foundation, Observer Characteristics

Private or public status is the reference category for the Actor.
These findings suggest an interesting pattern. Acts that trigger a stronger moral violation is felt to be wrong (Schein and Gray 2015), the more likely punishment is to follow. However, these findings suggest that it is not the act but rather the actor’s status within the group that most strongly affects the predicted probability of punishment.

These findings raise interesting questions about the epistemological validity of MFT. Although significant research has supported the theory of moral domains, the current research presents a striking limitation. This study aimed to discover whether the content of the broader moral domain influenced perceptions of guilt and punishment once embedded in a specific community. Interestingly, the moral domain as measured by MFT does not seem to predict guilt and punishment in a laboratory experiment that does not dramatically differ methodologically from previous mortality research except the key difference that the respondents in this study were asked to judge an actor who represented someone they were likely to encounter rather than representing some distant, vague scenario with little pragmatic application beyond the lab.

The current research suggests that morality and moral decision-making may be more based on identity and group membership than on an obligation to follow the rules or on the act itself. Future research should investigate further the influence of groups as well as identity on outcomes relating to moral judgments that have implications for the study of everyday life.
4.9 Conclusion

A key understanding in moral psychology is that morality centers on harm/fairness. MFT has attempted broaden moral psychology’s understanding of morality beyond harm. This study evaluates MFT’s ability to predict moral judgments in a specific community. Specifically, I find that the level of harm induced by an act does not predict a judgment of guilt, nor does it significantly influence decisions to punish.

MFT specifically makes claims to the internal and external validity of the theory to “fill the need for a theoretically-grounded scale covering the full range of human moral concerns” (Graham et al. 2011, 15). Yet, I find that MFT does not predict moral judgments of guilt or punishment.

This study relied on an original data set to examine whether MFT predicts moral judgments within a specific moral community. I combined insights from both moral psychology and sociology to demonstrate that MFT does not predict moral judgments when an observer is embedded in a group. MFT has focused on understanding domains that individuals use to make moral judgments, but these domains lack predictive power in situations not restricted to the standard MFT scenarios (Davis et al. 2016; Schein and Gray 2015). This study indicates that a more limited view of morality tracing back to sociology’s roots might provide greater insight into how individuals actually make decisions about moral judgments.
This is not the first study to demonstrate limitations to MFT. Previous research has demonstrated that the theory doesn’t predict beliefs for black Americans as easily as it does for white Americans (Davis et al. 2016). Given that the sample in the Your Morals database is overly white and educated, perhaps further research is needed to distinguish between true moral domains and variations along the boundaries of group dynamics.

Oddly enough, this is the same argument Turiel made in suggesting the existence of a true moral domain and with all others notions of morality being social convention. However, the current research suggests that even Turiel’s definition is lacking: it is not the act that is the primary driver of moral judgments but rather the actor, suggesting that relationships and identity may be more influential in determining what is moral than previously thought.
5. Discussion

This set of studies used an original data set to examine whether morality exists at multiple levels consistent with Zerubavel’s tri-level conception of cognition. Using research methods from moral psychology and sociology, I explain the relationships among status, values, and morality as conforming to three levels of cognition: the individual level, represented by values; the social level represented by organizational status; and the cultural level, represented by moral foundations theory. The results suggest that individual values and actor status interact to influence perceptions of guilt and punishment when embedded in a specific community, group, or organization.

This research contributes to knowledge about status, values, and moral judgments in three key ways. First, it demonstrates that there is much more to moral judgments than acts in isolation, and it supports calls for the further development of how morality and values operate in more ecologically valid scenarios.

Second, the current research suggests that differing moral judgments do not occur because individuals within the community cannot see the actions for what they are (Kaplan 2006). The current research addresses Warhman’s (1972) concerns about the difficulties in measuring status and moral judgments. Indeed, research suggests that it is often outsiders who expose wrongdoing within a specific group or organization (Bailey and Ferguson 2013). The current research provides insights into why some individuals are protected whereas others are punished more harshly for the same actions. The scope
condition of the moral community allows researchers to control for what the
respondents actually believe within a specific organizational framework that is actually
meaningful to the respondents. This, therefore, demonstrates that the vast array of
studies concerning harm are not wrong but that they are measuring morality at a
specific level of culture.

Finally, the current research demonstrates a complex effect of status on morality.
Individuals may indeed agree about the moral universals, but the differential
application of sanctions suggests that it is the group that defines what is wrong for its
members (Durkheim 1997). Moral judgments are central mechanisms that contribute to
current inequality structures and thus are central concerns of sociological inquiry.

Values are conceptions and orientations of the good and desirable and
subsequently are conceptions of the undesirable (Kluckholn 1965; Hitlin and Piliavin
2004; Hitlin 2008). Yet, findings presented here appear to suggest that values influence
perceptions of individuals as morally worthy members of the group regardless their
actions. Future research should seek to understand the mechanisms through which these
decisions are made. Perhaps an open-ended question asking, for example, why
respondents selected the level of guilt would provide insight into the underlying
mechanism.

Future research investigating how moral judgments and status impact outcomes
embedded in other organizations is needed to fully address how and why certain
individuals are allowed to go unpunished for their actions whereas others are severely sanctioned for the same act. Future research should focus on understanding how status, values, and morality are influenced and shaped not only by broader culture but also by meso-level structures like organizations. Additionally, future research should incorporate measures of duty orientation, which may offer insights into how strongly individuals are aligned with their organizations beyond those offered by using organizational commitment.

Finally, researchers should be careful about generalizing beyond the current sample. While the Schwartz values framework does offer the ability to generalize somewhat, the organizational context may prove relevant only for organizations with hierarchal structures and clear status mechanisms, such as the military. Despite that potential limitation, the current research offers interesting findings that bear further consideration.

More research is needed to more clearly decipher the mechanisms underlying moral decision-making. Sociology should expand its repertoire to include measures used in other fields in order to apply group-level dynamics to methodologically individual fields of study, such as moral psychology. Furthermore, reincorporating Durkheim’s account of sacredness and group belonging into studies of morality may provide a clearer map of the moral domain that is both individual- and group-based and maps onto larger, cross-cultural universals.
6. Appendix A: Codebook for Measuring Morality Survey

Variable names precede each item.

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this study. Please read all instructions, and answer as honestly as you can. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers, and your responses will remain confidential.

Please answer the following questions.

Cosmopolitanism

PLEASE INDICATE TO WHAT EXTENT YOU AGREE/DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

C1. More needs to be done to restrict foreign influences on American culture
C2. The USA should welcome ideas from foreign cultures
C3. The USA should cooperate with other countries only when in its own interests

Refused
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither/Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

Identity Measures
How important to your sense of identity is …

I1. being a citizen of the United States?

I2. your job?

I3. your home town?

I4. your home state?

I5. your religion?

I6. your social class?

I7. your preferred political party?

I8. your favorite sports team?

Refused

Extremely important

Very important

Somewhat important

Not very important

Not at all important

I9. Religiously, I consider myself

Refused

Very religious

Religious

Somewhat religious

Religious in name only
Not religious

Anti-religious

I10. Spiritually, I consider myself

Refused

Very spiritual

Spiritual

Somewhat spiritual

Not spiritual

Anti-spiritual

Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire, Short-Form

**PLEASE INDICATE TO WHAT EXTENT YOU AGREE/DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.**

RFQ1. My faith is extremely important to me.

Refused

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree/disagree

RFQ2. My religious faith impacts many of my decisions.

RFQ3. I look to faith for meaning and purpose in my life.
The Rational/Experiential Inventory

PLEASE INDICATE TO WHAT EXTENT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS
REPRESENTS YOU.

REI1. I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles that I must solve.

REI2. I believe in trusting my hunches.

REI3. I do better when I try to figure out people and situations logically than when I rely on my feelings.

REI4. I think it is worse to be too sentimental than to be too analytic.

Refused

Definitely not true of myself

Somewhat not true of myself

Neither true/untrue of myself

Somewhat true of myself

Definitely true of myself

Moral Relativism

PLEASE INDICATE TO WHAT EXTENT YOU AGREE/DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

MR1. What is right and wrong is up to each person to decide.
MR2. Right and wrong should be based on God’s law.

MR3. American children should be raised to believe in God.

-1. Refused

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree/disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Moralization of Everyday Life Scale (MELS)

[rotate respondents to see one of the SIX versions, recorded in MELS_game]

showed version 1 (E_HR)

showed version 2 (E_MR)

showed version 3 (E_LR)

showed version 4 (O_HR)

showed version 5 (O_MR)

showed version 6 (O_LR)

[Variables: Private, Private First Class, Lieutenant, Captain, Major]
Many people are used to thinking about morality as it relates to a few controversial public-policy issues: abortion, gay marriage, gun control, the death penalty, etc. This survey is instead about the things that people do in their own daily lives. Below you’ll be presented with a variety of situations and be asked to say whether certain behaviors in those situations would be morally wrong. Please use the following scale from 1 to 6, to indicate the degree to which you judge the behavior to be wrong (if at all).

1 = Not at all wrong; has nothing to do with morality. 6 = Very wrong; an extremely immoral action

MELS1. A soldier tests positive for marijuana.

MELS2. A soldier gets a DUI.

MELS3. A soldier leaves a bar. His battle buddy who is drunk stays behind.

MELS4. A SFC dates a PFC who is in his platoon.

MELS5. A soldier gets a payday loan.

MELS6. A soldier fails a PT test.

MELS7. A soldier lets a battle buddy go home with someone clearly intoxicated.


MELS9. A soldier is late to formation.

MELS10. A soldier drinks 10 beers at a party and vomits several times.

MELS11. A soldier uses a government travel card to buy alcohol.
MELS12. A soldier fakes an injury to get a profile to avoid a PT test.

MELS13. An overweight soldier walking during PT


MELS15. A soldier speeds on post.

MELS16. A soldier’s hair is out of regulation.

MELS17. A soldier texts while driving.

MELS18. A soldier leaves a soldier falling out of a unit run.

MELS19. A soldier prevents a soldier from going on sick call.

MELS20. A soldier gives a soldier a good evaluation they did not earn to help them get promoted.


MELS22. A married soldier flirts with someone who isn’t his or her spouse.

MELS23. A soldier lies to the commander to keep a buddy from getting in trouble.


MELS25. A soldier watches porn on his or her own computer while on staff duty.

MELS26. A soldier reports a buddy who hits a detainee.

MELS27 A soldier takes prescription painkillers that isn’t theirs.

MELS28. A soldier doesn’t say anything when a senior NCO belittles a soldier in his platoon.
MELS29 A soldier teases a soldier who says he needs to go on sick call.

MELS30. A soldier disobeys a lawful order from his platoon leader.

MELS31. A soldier forges a PT card.

Refused

Not at all wrong; has nothing to do with morality

not very wrong

slightly wrong

somewhat wrong

very wrong

extremely wrong; an extremely immoral action

Based on your knowledge of the military and whether you thought the actions were wrong, how likely are you to report the behavior to someone.

Did not think the action was wrong

Refused

Not at all likely

not very likely

slightly likely

somewhat likely

very likely
extremely likely

If you were to report the action, who would you report it to?

Team Chief

Squad Leader

Platoon Sergeant

First Sergeant

Command Sergeant Major

Platoon Leader

Company Commander

Battalion Commander

Brigade Commander

Chaplain

Military Police

Inspector General

Other

If you thought the actions were wrong, which punishment do you believe is appropriate?

Did not think the action was wrong

No Action (not the military’s problem)

Informal Counseling

Counseling statement
Article Fifteen
General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand
Administrative Separation
Court Martial

Based on your knowledge of the military, how likely do you think the punishment you selected would actually occur.

-2. Did not think the action was wrong
-1. Refused
Not at all likely
not very likely
slightly likely
somewhat likely
very likely
extremely likely

Evaluating Fairness (EF)

[rotate respondents to see one of the \^ versions, recorded in EF_game]

EF_game.

showed version 1 (HR)
showed version 2 (MR)
showed version 3 (LR)

[Variables: PFC, Staff Sergeant, Captain]
showed victimless crime
showed crime with victim
showed a violent crime

Below you’ll be presented with a situation and be asked to say whether you think the individual is guilty of misconduct or not. Please use the following scale from 1 to 6, to indicate the degree to which you judge the individual to be guilty.

1 = Definitely Guilty
2 = Guilty
3 = unclear/can’t decide
4 = Probably not guilty
5 = Definitely not guilty

(Version 1)
A SOLDIER returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the SOLDIER had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested with his girlfriend by civilian law enforcement after stealing a software from a local store.

(Version 2)
A SOLDIER returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the SOLDIER had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested by civilian law enforcement after a physical altercation with his GIRLFRIEND.

(Version 3)

A SOLDIER returned in March 2010 from his combat deployment. In the weeks that followed, the SOLDIER had difficulty with stress at work. Five days later, he was observed yelling at soldiers in his section. Ten days later, he was arrested by civilian law enforcement after a physical altercation with his GIRLFRIEND. The GIRLFRIEND was hospitalized with severe injuries.

Based on the above vignette, which punishment do you believe is appropriate?

No Action (not the military’s problem)
Informal Counseling
Counseling statement
Article Fifteen
GOMOR
Administrative Separation
Court Martial

The SOLDIER received NO ACTION for his misconduct. Do you think this is fair?
Definitely Not fair

Not Fair

Neither Fair nor Not Fair

Fair

Definitely Fair

**Moral Foundations Questionnaire**

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

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

1 = not very relevant

2 = slightly relevant

3 = somewhat relevant

4 = very relevant

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

MF1. Whether or not someone suffered emotionally

MF2. Whether or not some people were treated differently than others

MF3. Whether or not someone’s action showed love for his or her country
MF4. Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority

MF5. Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency

MF6. Whether or not someone was good at math

MF7. Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable

MF8. Whether or not someone acted unfairly

MF9. Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group

MF10. Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society

MF11. Whether or not someone did something disgusting

MF12. Whether or not someone was cruel

MF13. Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights

MF14. Whether or not someone showed a lack of loyalty

MF15. Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder

MF16. Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of

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

0 = Strongly disagree

1= Moderately disagree

2 = Slightly disagree

3 = Slightly agree

4 = Moderately agree
5 = Strongly agree

MF17. Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue.

MF18. When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly.

MF19. I am proud of my country’s history.

MF20. Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.

MF21. People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed.

MF22. It is better to do good than to do bad.

MF23. One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal.

MF24. Justice is the most important requirement for a society.

MF25. People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong.

MF26. Men and women each have different roles to play in society.

MF27. I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural.

MF28. It can never be right to kill a human being.

MF29. I think it’s morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing.

MF30. It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself.

MF31. If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer’s orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty.
MF32. Chastity is an important and valuable virtue.

Schwartz Values

How much does each of the following statements sound like you?

SV1. Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to me. I like to do things in my own original way.

SV2. It is important to me to be rich. I want to have a lot of money and expensive things.

SV3. I think it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. I believe everyone should have equal opportunities in life.

SV4. It's very important to me to show my abilities. I want people to admire what I do.

SV5. It is important to me to live in secure surroundings. I avoid anything that might endanger my safety.

SV6. I think it is important to do lots of different things in life. I always look for new things to try.

SV7. I believe that people should do what they're told. I think people should follow rules at all times, even when no-one is watching.

SV8. It is important to me to listen to people who are different from me. Even when I disagree with them, I still want to understand them.
SV9. It’s important to me to be humble and modest and not to draw attention to myself.

SV10. Having a good time is important to me. I like to “spoil” myself.

SV11. It is important to me to make my own decisions about what I do. I like to be free and not depend on others.

SV12. It’s very important to me to help the people around me. I want to care for their well-being.

SV13. Being very successful is important to me. I hope people will recognize my achievements.

SV14. It is very important to me that the government ensures my safety against all threats. I want the state to be strong so it can defend its citizens.

SV15. I look for adventure and like to take risks. I want to have an exciting life.

SV16. It is important to me to always behave properly. I avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.

SV17. It is important to me to get respect from others. I want people to do what I say.

SV18. It is important to me to be loyal to my friends. I want to devote myself to people close to me.

SV19. I strongly believe that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to me.
SV20. Tradition is important to me. I try to follow the customs handed down by my religion and family.

SV21. I seek every chance I can to have fun. It is important to me to do things that give me pleasure.

Refused

Very much like me

Like me

Somewhat like me

A little like me

Not like me

Not like me at all

Moral Dilemma - Trolley

[rotate respondents to see one of the two versions; record version seen in dov_version]

Dov_version.

Version 1

Version 2

In this task you will be presented a moral dilemma.

When the dilemma appears on the screen read through it silently and carefully.

After you have finished reading it, your job is to judge whether the course of action in the dilemma is appropriate or inappropriate.
There are no “right” or “wrong” answers to this problem. You will not, in any case, be asked to justify your response. Do not worry about whether the action is legal or illegal. Simply respond in whatever manner you believe to be morally correct.

**Version 1**

A runaway trolley is heading down the tracks toward five workmen who will be killed if the trolley proceeds on its present course. You are standing next to the track on which the trolley is traveling, but you are too far away from the workmen to warn them of the impending danger.

Next to you there is a very large stranger who is minding his own business.

It occurs to you that if you pushed this person onto the tracks in front of the trolley, it would stop the trolley and save the five workmen from certain death.

However, this would most certainly kill the stranger.

Is it appropriate for you to push this stranger onto the tracks to save the five workmen?

**Version 2**

A runaway trolley is heading down the tracks toward five workmen who will be killed if the trolley proceeds on its present course. You are standing next to the track on
which the trolley is traveling, but you are too far away from the workmen to warn them of the impending danger.

Next to you there is a control switch for the tracks that can reroute the trolley.

You could divert the trolley onto another track and spare the five workmen from certain death.

However, there is another workman on the new track that will certainly die if you divert the trolley.

Block15. Is it appropriate for you to divert the trolley and kill the lone workman in order to save the five workmen?

-1. Refused

Is appropriate

Is inappropriate

Ethical Values Assessment

What moral values do you think are important to how you should live at this time in your life?

EVA1. I should take responsibility for myself.

EVA2. I should take care of my family.

EVA3. I should aim for spiritual salvation.

EVA4. I should be fair to other individuals.

EVA5. I should aim to live a holy life.
EVA6. I should respect other individuals’ rights.

EVA7. I should follow God’s law.

EVA8. I should be cooperative.

EVA9. I should strive for social harmony.

EVA10. I should try to achieve my personal goals.

EVA11. I should know my place or role in a group.

EVA12. I should strive for spiritual purity.

-1. Refused

Not at all Important

Slightly Important

Moderately Important

Very Important

Completely Important

Questions taken from the KN profile data (i.e., collected prior to the time of the survey)

PPRANK

1. PVT

2. PV2

3. PFC

4. SPC

5. SGT
6. SSG
7. SFC
8. MSG
9. 1SG
10. SGM
11. CSM
12. 2LT
13. 1LT
14. CPT
15. MAJ
16. LTC
17. COL
18. BG
19. MG
20. LTG
21. GEN
22. WO1
23. CW2
24. CW3
25. CW4
26. CW5

PPGRADE

1. E1
2. E2
3. E3
4. E4
5. E5
6. E6
7. E7
8. E8
9. E9
10. O1E
11. O2E
12. O3E
13. O1
14. O2
15. O3
16. O4
17. O5
18. O6
19. O7
20. O8
21. O9
22. O10
23. WO1
24. WO2
25. WO3
26. WO4
27. WO5
PPTIS
1. <2 YRS
2. 4 YRS
3. 6 YRS
4. 8 YRS
5. 10 YRS
6. 12 YRS
7. 14 YRS
8. 16 YRS
9. 18 YRS
10. 20 YRS
11. 22 YRS
12. 24 YRS
13. 26 YRS
14. 28 YRS
15. 30 YRS
16. 32 YRS
17. 34 YRS
18. 36 YRS
20. 38 YRS
22. 40 YRS

PPMOS
02B
02C
02D
02E
02F
02G
02H
02J
02K
Military Intelligence
Ordnance Corps
Quartermaster Corps
Transportation Corps
Adjutant General's Corps
Medical Service Corps

Chemical Corps

Combat Medic

Veterinary Corps

Functional Area

Military Intelligence

Finance Corps

Psychological Operations

Civil Affairs

Military Police Corps

Corps of Engineers

Signal Corps

Special Forces

Armor

Air Defense Artillery

Aviation

Infantry

Field Artillery

PPLEAD (leadership positions ever held)

Team Chief
Squad Leader
Platoon Sergeant
First Sergeant
Command Sergeant Major
Platoon Leader
Company Commander
Battalion Commander
Brigade Commander
Other (please list)
PPCOMBAT (number of tours to combat zone)
Never deployed
1 tour
2 tours
3 tours
4 tours
5 tours
6 tours
7 tours
8 or more tours
PPLOC_DEP
1. Iraq
2. Afghanistan
3. Kuwait
4. Other

**PPOVERSEAS** (number of overseas tours NOT to a combat zone)

Never been stations overseas

1 tour
2 tours
3 tours
4 tours
5 tours
6 tours
7 tours
8 or more tours

**PPOS_Loc**

1. Germany
2. Korea
3. Japan
4. Italy
5. Turkey
6. Other

PPAGE 'Age'.

-2 'Not asked'

-1 'REFUSED'.

ppagecat 'Age - 7 Categories'.

1 '17-24'

2 '25-34'

3 '35-44'

4 '45-54'

5 '55-64'

6 '65-74'

7 '75+'

ppagect4 'Age - 4 Categories'.

1 '17-29'

2 '30-44'

3 '45-59'

4 '60+'

PPEDUC 'Education (Highest Degree Received)'.

-2 'Not asked'

-1 'REFUSED'
1. '12th grade NO DIPLOMA'

2. 'HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE - high school DIPLOMA or the equivalent (GED)'

3. “High School Equivalent (GED)

4. 'Some college, no degree'

5. 'Associate degree'

6. 'Bachelors degree'

7. 'Masters degree'

8. 'Professional or Doctorate degree'.

PPEDUCAT 'Education (Categorical)'.

-2 'Not asked'

-1 'REFUSED'

1 'Less than high school'

2 'High school'

3 'Some college'

4 'Bachelor’s degree or higher'.

PPETHM 'Race / Ethnicity'.

-2 'Not asked'

-1 'REFUSED'

1 'White, Non-Hispanic'
2 'Black, Non-Hispanic'
3 ‘Asian Pacific Islander’
4 'Hispanic'
5 '2+ Races, Non-Hispanic'
6 ‘Native American’
7. Other

PPGENDER 'Gender'.
-2 'Not asked'
-1 'REFUSED'
1 'Male'
2 'Female'.

PPHHHEAD 'Household Head'.
-2 'Not asked'
-1 'REFUSED'
0 'No'
1 'Yes'.

PPHHSIZE 'Household Size'.
-2 'Not asked'
-1 'REFUSED'.
1. 1 (just you)
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8 or more

PPHOUSE 'Housing Type'.

-2 'Not asked'

-1 'REFUSED'

1 'A one-family house detached from any other house'
2 'A one-family house attached to one or more houses'
3 'A building with 2 or more apartments'
4 'A mobile home'
5 'Boat, RV, van, etc.'.
6 'Barracks'

PPINCIMP 'Household Income'.

-2 'Not asked'

-1 'REFUSED'

1 'Less than $5,000'
2 '5,000 to 7,499'
3 '7,500 to 9,999'
4 '10,000 to 12,499'
5 '12,500 to 14,999'
6 '15,000 to 19,999'
7 '20,000 to 24,999'
8 '25,000 to 29,999'
9 '30,000 to 34,999'
10 '35,000 to 39,999'
11 '40,000 to 49,999'
12 '50,000 to 59,999'
13 '60,000 to 74,999'
14 '75,000 to 84,999'
15 '85,000 to 99,999'
16 '100,000 to 124,999'
17 '125,000 to 149,999'
18 '150,000 to 174,999'
19 '175,000 or more'.

PPMARIT 'Marital Status'.

-2 'Not asked'
-1 'REFUSED'
1 'Married'
2 'Widowed'
3 'Divorced'
4 'Separated'
5 'Never married'
6 'Living with partner'.

PPREG4 'Region 4 - Based on State of Residence'.

-2 'Not asked'
-1 'REFUSED'
1 'Northeast'
2 'Midwest'
3 'South'
4 'West'.

ppreg9 'Region 9 - Based on State of Residence'.

1 'New England'
2 'Mid-Atlantic'
3 'East-North Central'
4 'West-North Central'
5 'South Atlantic'
6 'East-South Central'
7 'West-South Central'
8 'Mountain'
9 'Pacific'.
PPSTATEN 'State'.
-2 'Not asked'
-1 'REFUSED'
11 'ME'
12 'NH'
13 'VT'
14 'MA'
15 'RI'
16 'CT'
21 'NY'
22 'NJ'
23 'PA'
31 'OH'
32 'IN'
33 'IL'
34 'MI'
98 'PR'

99 'VI'.
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