THERE OUGHT TO BE A LAW, BUT NOT FOR ME: HYPOCRITICAL DISJUNCTURES BETWEEN LEGAL AND MORAL BELIEFS AND LOW-CONSENSUS IMMORAL BEHAVIORS.*

Brenda Vogel and Henry F. Fradella
California State University, Long Branch

Although the scholarly literature on the relationship between law and morality has been largely theoretical, research has empirically linked conceptualizations of morality with both personal views on formal social control and personal conduct in deviant behaviors. In this study, survey respondents were asked about their moral and legal views on nine low-consensus deviant behaviors, including three drug offenses, three victimless sex offenses, and three criminal traffic offenses, as well as their own history of engaging in the behaviors. Analyses focus on the characteristics of respondents displaying "Belief-Behavior Incongruence"—individuals who believed an act to be immoral and/or felt that the act should be illegal, but nonetheless engaged in the behavior. Significant relationships were found between respondents' belief-behavior incongruent conduct in several low-consensus deviant behaviors and their gender, religiosity, religion and political party. The socio-legal and theoretical implications of these findings are explored.

Keywords: deviant behavior, hypocrisy, morality, social control, cognitive dissonance

Scholars have long engaged in an intellectual struggle to define the relationship between law and morality (Aristotle, c. 350 B.C.E., trans. 2003; Devlin, 1965; Hart, 1963; Hume, 1739/1978; Kant, 1785/1996; Plato, c. 360 B.C.E./trans. 2008; Rawls, 1972; Rousseau, 1762/1979). Morality also has been an integral part of the study of psychology since its early roots (Freud, 1930/2005; Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1964, 1981, 1984;; Piaget, 1932/1965). In spite of the pervasiveness of morality as a topic of research in the humanities and social sciences, criminal justice has been slow to include morality as a variable even though it plays a role in both Social Control Theory and Social Learning Theory (Akers, 1985; Hirschi, 1969). Empirical tests of these theories have demonstrated that moral belief systems are related to one's propensity to engage in criminal behaviors (e.g., Akers & Cochran, 1985; Antonaccio & Tittle, 2008; Bachman, Paternoster, & Ward, 1992; Evans, Cullen, Burton, Dunaway, & Benson, 1997; Krohn & Massey, 1980; Matsueda, 1989). In addition to its role in criminological theory, the connection between

Author Note: Brenda Vogel, Ph.D. Professor of Criminal Justice, California State University, Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Boulevard, Long Beach, CA 90840, (562) 985-1894 (office phone), (562) 985-8086 (fax), Brenda.Vogel@csulb.edu

Henry F. Fradella, J.D., Ph.D., Chair and Professor of Law and Criminal Justice, California State University, Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Boulevard, Long Beach, CA 90840, (562) 985-2669 (office phone), (562) 985-8086 (fax), Hank.Fradella@csulb.edu

law, morality, and specific aspects of the criminal justice system have only recently begun to be explored (Carrier, 2007; Lambert, Pasupuleti, & Jiang, 2008; Lee & Rasinski, 2006; Rogers, Smoak, & Liu, 2006; Simpson, 2005).

The extant research suggests that many behaviors deemed as immoral are often defined as illegal (Wikström & Treiber, 2007) and, consequently, the combined designations commonly dissuade individuals from engaging in those behaviors (Antonaccio & Tittle, 2008; Fradella & Vogel, 2009). There are, however, conspicuous exceptions to this relationship. More specifically, although it is reviled, hypocrisy abounds. One need not look much further than newspaper headlines to find examples of individuals who zealously preach against a particular behavior (i.e. adultery, homosexual relationships, etc.), support their legal proscription, yet, on the sly, engage in these very behaviors (Norman, 2009). Similarly, empirical research suggests that hypocrisy is widespread with respect to many behaviors including cheating (Vinski & Tryon, 2009), condom use (Aronson, Fried, & Stone, 1991), water conversation (Dickerson, Thibodeau, Aronson, & Miller, 1992), and recycling (Aronson, 1999). The present study explores the nature of hypocrisy and the factors that are related to hypocrisy in various types of low-consensus deviant behaviors concerning sexual conduct, drug and alcohol use, and risky driving.[1]

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Hypocrisy as an Explanation for the Disconnect between Morality and Behavior

Moral people sometimes engage in immoral behavior. Otherwise moral individuals might transgress because: a particular moral precept was not adequately learned or internalized (e.g., Bandura, 1977); the necessary controls to prevent transgressions were not in place (e.g., Bandura, 2004; Hirschi, 1969); or situational pressures from sources like authority figures negatively influenced behavior (e.g., Milgram, 1974). Nonetheless, even people who have firmly internalized moral principles and who are in low pressure situations can fail to behave in a moral manner (Batson & Thompson, 2001; Naso, 2006).

A growing body of research on people who fall into this latter group has emerged since the mid-1990s. Most of this research falls into one of four camps: psychodynamic examinations of hypocritical behaviors (see Naso, 2006, 2007); personality research which links hypocrisy to narcissistic traits that undermine moral values (see Rangell, 1976, 1980) or traits which might mediate hypocrisy, such as the actor's level of self esteem (e.g., Peterson, Haynes, & Olson, 2008); experimental research on moral hypocrisy (Batson, Kobrynowicz, Dinnerstein, Kampf, & Wilson, 1997); and social psychological research examining cognitive dissonance as an explanatory and/or mediating factor in those who fail to "practice what they preach" (see Aronson, 1999; Aronson et al., 1991; Dickerson, Thibodeau, Aronson, & Miller, 1992; Fried, 1998; Fried & Aronson, 1995; Stone, Aronson, Crain, Winslow, & Fried, 1994). The latter two approaches dominate the literature and, therefore, warrant explication.

Moral hypocrisy. Moral hypocrisy refers to an individual's ability to hold a belief while behaving in a manner inconsistent with that belief (Batson, Kobrynowicz,

Dinnerstein, Kampf, & Wilson, 1997). While moral hypocrites avoid at all costs the shame associated with their behavior (Naso, 2007), the benefits of moral hypocrisy are obvious. "One can reap the material rewards of acting selfishly and also garner the social and self-rewards of being seen and seeing oneself as upstanding and moral" (Batson, Thompson, Seuferling, Whitney, & Strongman, 1999, p. 526).

Batson and his colleagues (1997, 1999) emphasized that ordinary people, as differentiated from narcissistic individuals studied in some personality trait research (e.g., Rangell, 1976, 1980), routinely exhibit morally hypocritical behaviors. Indeed, it appears that moral hypocrisy is "powerful and pervasive" (Batson, Thompson & Chen, 2002, p. 338) such that individuals high on traits related to moral responsibility are no less likely to demonstrate morally hypocritical responses than those low on these traits (Batson et al. , 1997). Research on moral hypocrisy also demonstrates that individuals perceive their own transgressions to be less objectionable than the same transgression enacted by another (Batson et al., 1997). And, perhaps most insightfully from an explanatory point of view, hypocrisy "at both the individual and group levels" appears to be inextricably linked to the "context-dependent nature of moral reasoning" such that "preservation of a positive self-image appears to trump the use of more objective moral principles" (Valdesolo & DeSteno, 2007, p. 690).

Research on cheating illustrates the context-dependent nature of moral hypocrisy. Vinski and Tryon (2009) found that overwhelmingly students believe cheating to be wrong, yet nearly 90% of their sample engaged in cheating.[2] Students justified their cheating by attributing it to external factors, like teacher characteristics or job-related responsibilities (see Diekhoff et al., 1996; Evans & Craig, 1990; Stephens & Nicholson, 2008). Some theories of crime and delinquency incorporate the premise that the link between moral reasoning and moral action might be mediated by situational factors along the lines espoused by Kohlberg in his own updated theory (see Kohlberg & Candee, 1984). For instance, Sykes and Matza's (1957) theory of delinquency postulates that different techniques of neutralization devices can obscure or even negate one's sense of personal responsibility to act in accordance with one's moral code by attributing responsibility for conduct to others or situational contingencies. As Blasi (1980, p. 201) explained, "Since a judgment of responsibility concerns the necessary relation between agent and action, not to act according to one's judgment should be perceived as a substantial inconsistency, as a fracture within the very core of the self, unless neutralizing devices are put into operation."

The complex nature of hypocritical behavior in the realm of academic dishonesty involves more than students' desire to be perceived positively (via-a-vis good grades) by instructors and potential employers; aspects of deterrence theory are also evident in Vinski and Tryon's findings (2009). Specifically, they reported that students were not afraid of getting caught cheating, largely because nearly two-thirds of the cheaters reported never having been caught due to the ease of cheating and/or because instructors did not aggressively deter cheating in their classes. Hence, the low certainty of punishment combined with the desire to be perceived positively (as a function of high academic achievement, even though accomplished by cheating) combine to present a context in which cheating, although viewed

as immoral, is commonplace due to its self-serving utility (see Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 2002).

Cheating by students is an excellent example of a perverse irony in the study of moral hypocrisy. On one hand, cheating is immoral; on the other, our culture normatively sanctions acting in one's own best self-interest (see Ratner & Miller, 2001). Indeed, the pursuit of self-interest lies at the foundation of American jurisprudence and economics (e.g., Bentham, 1988/1843; Mill, 1859/1956; Smith, 1869). Yet, research has demonstrated that many variables moderate the relentless pursuit of self-interest, including a host of moral values "such as empathy, compassion, justice, and fairness" (Watson & Sheikh, 2008, p. 260,). Cognitive dissonance may help to explain why these moral moderators work sometimes and fail others.

Cognitive dissonance. Cognitive dissonance is an uncomfortable feeling caused by holding inconsistent or contradictory cognitions simultaneously (Festinger, 1957). A person can have cognitions about many things including behaviors, attitudes, beliefs, and feelings. Furthermore, they can be about oneself, someone else, a group, or about things in the environment (Harmon-Jones & Mills, 1999). Because cognitive dissonance is "psychologically uncomfortable," it serves as a powerful motivator for people to bring their dissonant ideas and or behaviors into consonance (Festinger, 1957, p. 3). In other words, when inconsistencies in beliefs and behavior are exposed, then people are motivated to reduce those inconsistencies. Dissonance can be reduced *directly* by altering elements of the discrepant thought or behavior or through justifying the behavior, or blaming the behavior on others (Festinger, 1957). Dissonance also can be reduced *indirectly* by focusing on misattributing the discomfort to something else or focusing on other, positive and valued aspects of the self (Stone, Wiegand, Cooper & Aronson, 1997). Regardless of the manner in which it is reduced, dissonance can be a powerful motivator (see Aronson, 1999; Fointait, 2004).

Cognitive dissonance provides us with a framework in which to explain the prevalence of hypocrisy in our sample and the demographic factors to which it is related. Given that the degree to which individuals feel cognitive dissonance varies, it stands to reason that we will uncover differences in the degree to which people report a hypocritical disconnect between their beliefs concerning law and morality and their own personal conduct which violates those beliefs.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Although morality, legality, and human behavior are distinct concepts, each has a significant impact on the other (Fradella & Vogel, 2009). Stated otherwise, law affects morality; morality affects law; and both law and morality affect behavior. It stands to reason that if people perceive a behavior as deserving to be criminalized, then the legitimacy of their belief in the threat of criminal punishment for the given behavior *ought* to deter them from engaging in that conduct (Fradella & Vogel, 2009). Yet there are exceptions to this logical order; hypocrisy abounds (Fradella & Vogel, 2009). This study examines those

individuals who engage in behaviors that they have defined as immoral and/or deserving of legal control. In consideration of those individuals, the following questions will be addressed:

1. What type of low-consensus behavior (drug/alcohol use, risky driving, or sexual behavior) is most likely to yield belief-behavior incongruence (BBI)?
2. What demographic factors are most closely associated with belief-behavior incongruence (BBI)?
3. Are those demographic factors consistent across all types of behavior or do they vary across type of low consensus behavior (drug/alcohol use, risky driving, and sexual behaviors)?

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Data for this study were drawn from a larger study of 950 undergraduate students designed to examine the relationship between law, morality, and behavior (Fradella & Vogel, 2009). For the current study, only those participants who defined one or more of nine behaviors under investigation as immoral were included. The average age of respondents was 20.5 years. Additional demographic information is provided in Table 1.

Research Design

Data were gathered via an anonymous survey completed by undergraduate students from a variety of majors at five U.S. colleges or universities. These institutions included one large, public research university in Arizona; one small, private liberal arts college in Massachusetts; one mid-sized, public, comprehensive college in New Jersey; one mid-sized, public, comprehensive university in Texas; and one mid-sized, public, comprehensive university in Michigan. Participants were asked to volunteer their participation in exchange for extra credit in course work.

The anonymous survey presented respondents with 11 behaviors that either once were or currently are criminal offenses in the United States. The behaviors included were selected because they had previously been identified as low-consensus deviant behaviors (Meier & Geis, 1997; Packer, 1968; Winslow & Gay, 1993). For the current study, only 9 of the 11 behaviors were included and they fall into one of three broad types of crimes: drug and alcohol offenses (smoking marijuana, underage drinking, and using a fake ID to secure alcohol); "victimless" sex offenses (fornication, heterosexual sodomy, and buying pornography); and traffic offenses (driving under the influence, speeding in excess of 25 miles per hour over the speed limit, and intentionally running a red light).

For each of the behaviors, respondents were asked to provide their personal judgments about the morality of the conduct (Perfectly Moral, Somewhat Immoral, Moderately Immoral, Highly Immoral); their perceptions about whether the behavior should be criminally punished (Not Criminally Regulated, Fineable Violation, Misdemeanor

Carrying Probation, Misdemeanor Carrying Jail Time, Felony Carrying Prison Time); and to self-report their own involvement in each behavior (Never, 1-5 times, 6-10 times, more than 10 times). As stated above, for the current study, only those respondents who believed one or more of the listed behaviors was immoral (at any degree) were included. Also, for the current study, the response categories for the items measuring legality and the response categories for the behavior items were collapsed into dichotomies (i.e., should be illegal/ should not be illegal, I do engage in the behavior/I do not engage in the behavior). These items were dichotomized because of limited variation in the original responses.

Table 1

Demographic Variables

Variable	**Percent**	**Number**
Gender		909
Female	56.1	
Male	43.9	
Religiosity		902
Unreligious	34.3	
Moderate	16.5	
Religious	49.2	
Religion		893
Catholic	57.9	
Protestant	15.0	
Agnostic/Atheist	10.2	
Other	16.9	
Political Party		760
Republican	27.0	
Independent	34.2	
Democrat	38.8	
Race/Ethnicity		909
White	86.5	
Black	4.6	
Hispanic	4.6	
Asian/Pac. Islander	1.3	
Native American	.3	
Other	2.6	
Year in College		908
Freshman	23.6	
Sophomore	19.9	
Junior	21.4	
Senior	35.1	

Table 2 provides the counts and percentages of those defined as belief-behavior incongruent (BBI) and their non-BBI counterparts. For the drug use items, BBIs were defined as individuals who believed the act to be immoral and felt it should be illegal, but reported that they engaged in the behavior nonetheless. These individuals are compared to those who reported that they believed the act to be immoral and felt it should be illegal, but who reported that they did not engage in the behavior.

Table 2

The Hypocrites: Among those who believe the behavior to be immoral, those who do engage (Belief-Behavior Incongruent or BBI) and those who do not engage in the behavior.

Behavior	**Number (Percent) who Engage in the Behavior**		**Number who believe behavior is immoral**
	Yes (BBI)	**No (Not BBI)**	
Drug & Alcohol Behavior			
Smoking Marijuana	108 (33.0)	219 (67.0)	327
Drinking Alcohol Underage	162 (72.3)	62 (27.7)	244
Using a Fake ID to Purchase Alcohol	114 (18.4)	506 (81.6)	620
Victimless Sexual Behaviors			
Having Premarital Sexual Intercourse	156 (54.5)	130 (45.5)	286
Having Oral or Anal Sex	120 (56.1)	94 (43.9)	214
Purchasing Pornography	52 (17.4)	246 (82.6)	298
Traffic Offenses			
DUI (Drugs or Alcohol)	315 (37.1)	534 (62.9)	849
Speeding over 25 mph over Limit	312 (67.0)	154 (33.0)	466
Running a Red Light	264 (43.4)	344 (56.6)	608

Very few respondents felt the items depicting sexual behavior should be criminalized. Consequently, our BBIs were defined as those who believed the act to be immoral, but reported that they engaged in the behavior anyway. They were compared to those who felt the behavior was immoral but reported that they did not engage in the behavior.

Finally, for the items depicting reckless driving behavior, BBIs were defined as those who believed the behavior to be immoral and felt it should be illegal, but who reported that they engaged in it nonetheless. The BBIs were compared to those who believed the behavior to be immoral but who reported that they did not engage in the behavior. Interestingly, of those who felt the reckless driving behaviors were immoral, 100% felt they should also be illegal.

RESULTS

The purpose of this research is to address three questions: (1) what type of low-consensus behavior (drug/alcohol use, risky driving or sexual) is most likely to yield belief-behavior incongruent BBI behavior; (2) what demographic characteristics are most closely associated with BBI; and (3) are the factors associated with BBI consistent across all types of behavior or do they vary across type of low consensus behavior (drug/alcohol use, sexual behaviors, and risky driving).

With respect to the first question, of the three types of behaviors presented to respondents, the behaviors for which the largest disconnect between moral judgment and personal conduct were the traffic ones. As presented in Table 2, of the 849 respondents who judged DUI to be immoral, 37.1% (*N*=315) reported that they had driven under the influence. Similarly, 312 (67%) of the 466 people who thought that criminal speeding was immoral nonetheless engaged in that behavior. And 264 (43.4%) of the 608 study participants had intentionally run red lights even though they thought doing so was immoral.

A fairly large number of people judged drinking under age and having sex as immoral as well, yet nonetheless engaged in these behaviors. For example, 162 respondents who thought underage drinking was immoral drank before they turned 21 years of age and 156 respondents who thought premarital sex was immoral had nonetheless engaged in that behavior.

In order to address the second research question, we used Chi-Square and Cramer's V to determine the extent to which the demographic variables (gender, religiosity, religion, and political party) influence the nine measures of belief-behavior incongruence. While Lambda is a common measure of association appropriate for use with two categorical variables, it is unstable when the marginals for the dependent variable are not similar in size which is the case in this research (Babbie, Halley, Wagner, & Zaino, 2011; Norušis, 2010). Consequently, we use Cramer's V to assess relationship strength or effect size.

Table 3 provides the Chi-Square and Cramer's V results for the influence of gender on BBI. Only those results that reached statistical significance are provided. Specifically, gender was significantly related to BBI for four behaviors: buying pornography, χ^2 (1, N = 298) =39.87, p = .000; driving under the influence, χ^2 (1, N = 849) =12.03, p = .001; speeding, χ^2 (1, N = 466) =10.67, p = .001; and running a red light, χ^2 (1, N = 608) =10.85, p = .001. In all cases, males are more likely than females to report BBI. The effect size for the buying pornography analysis is .366, which suggests a moderate relationship (Cohen, 1988). The effect sizes for the other analyses are under .2 suggesting weak relationships.

Table 3

The Influence of Gender on Belief-Behavior Incongruence

	Gender			Statistics
	Female (%)	**Male (%)**	**Total**	
Buying Pornography				$\chi 2(1) = 39.87$, $p = .000$, V = .366
BBI	12 (6.5)	40 (35.1)	52 (17.4)	
Non BBI	172 (93.5)	74 (64.9)	246 (82.6)	
Total	184 (100)	114 (100)	298 (100)	
DUI				$\chi 2(1) = 12.03$, $p = .001$, V = .119
BBI	152 (32)	163 (43.6)	315 (37.1)	
Non BBI	323 (68)	211 (56.4)	534 (62.9)	
Total	475 (100)	374 (100)	849 (100)	
Speeding				$\chi 2(1) = 10.67$, $p = .001$, V = .151
BBI	161(60.8)	151 (75.1)	312	
Non BBI	104 (39.2)	50 (24.9)	154	
Total	265 (100)	201 (100)	466 (100)	
Running Red Light				$\chi 2(1) = 10.85$, $p = .001$, V = .134
BBI	125 (37.4)	139 (50.7)	264 (43.4)	
Non BBI	209 (62.6)	135 (49.3)	344 (56.6)	
Total	334 (100)	274 (100)	608 (100)	

Table 4 provides the results for the influence of religiosity (defined as unreligious, moderately religious, and religious) on BBI. Religiosity is significantly related to five of the nine variables: smoking marijuana, χ^2 (2, N = 322) =5.98, p = .05; using a fake ID, χ^2 (2, N = 618) =7.75, p = .021; buying pornography, χ^2 (2, N = 296) =14.41, p = .001; driving under the influence, χ^2 (2, N = 842) =9.26, p = .01; and running a red light, χ^2 (2, N = 601) =9.82, p = .007. In all cases, those who identify as moderately religious are more likely to report BBI. The effect size for buying pornography is .221, which indicates a weak to moderate relationship. The others range from .105 to .136 suggesting fairly weak relationships.

Table 4

The Influence of Religiosity on Belief-Behavior Incongruence

	Religiosity				Statistics
	Unreligious (%)	**Moderate (%)**	**Religious (%)**	**Total (%)**	
Smoking Marijuana					$\chi 2(2) = 5.98$, $p = .050$, V = .136
Hypocrite	27 (32.5)	21 (50)	60 (30.5)	108 (33.5)	
Nonhypocrite	56 (67.5)	21 (50)	137 (69.5)	214 (66.5)	
Total	83 (100)	42 (100)	197 (100)	322 (100)	
Using Fake ID					$\chi 2(2) = 7.75$, $p = .021$ V = .112
BBI	30 (13.8)	27 (26.7)	57 (19)	114 (18.4)	
Non BBI	187 (86.2)	74 (73.3)	243 (81)	504 (81.6)	
Total	217 (100)	101 (100)	300 (100)	618 (100)	
Buying Pornography					$\chi 2(2) = 14.41$, $p = .001$, V = .221
BBI	2 (2.9)	9 (27.3)	41 (21.2)	52 (17.6)	
Non BBI	68 (97.1)	24 (72.7)	152 (78.8)	244 (82.4)	
Total	70 (100)	33 (100)	193 (100)	296 (100)	
DUI					$\chi 2(2) = 9.26$, $p = .010$, V = .105
BBI	108 (37.2)	65 (47.4)	137 (33)	310 (36.8)	
Non BBI	182 (62.8)	72 (52.6)	287 (67)	532 (63.2)	
Total	290 (100)	137 (100)	415 (100)	842 (100)	
Running Red Light					$\chi 2(2) = 9.82$, $p = .007$, V = .128
BBI	90 (45.2)	59 (55.1)	112 (38)	261 (43.4)	
Non BBI	109 (54.8)	48 (44.9)	183 (62)	340 (56.6)	
Total	199 (100)	107 (100)	295 (100)	601 (100)	

Table 5 presents the results for the effect of religion (defined as Catholic, Protestant, Agnostic/Atheist, and Other) on BBI. Religion was significantly related to five of the nine behaviors examined: smoking marijuana, χ^2 (3, N = 310) =27.15, p = .000; using a fake ID, χ^2 (3, N = 94) = 31.24, p = .000; heterosexual sex, χ^2 (3, N = 278) =32.39, p = .000; heterosexual sodomy, χ^2 (3, N = 205) =10.9, p = .005; and driving under the influence, χ^2 (3, N = 794) =20.87, p = .000. With the exception of smoking marijuana, Catholics demonstrated more BBI than the other religious groups. For smoking marijuana, Agnostic/Atheists reported the highest level of BBI. The effect size for the heterosexual premarital sex analysis is .341 indicating a moderate relationship. The other effect sizes, smoking marijuana, V = 2.96; using a fake ID, V = .233; heterosexual sodomy, V = .231; and DUI, V = 1.62, are fairly weak.

Table 5

The Influence of Religion on Belief-Behavior Incongruence

	Religion					Statistics
	Catholic (%)	**Protestant (%)**	**Agnostic or Atheist (%)**	**Other Religion (%)**	**Total (%)**	
Smoking Marijuana						$\chi 2(3) = 27.15$, $p = .000$, V = .296
BBI	57 (35.2)	9 (15.3)	18 (75)	24 (36.9)	108 (34.8)	
Non BBI	105 (64.8)	50 (84.7)	6 (25)	41 (63.1)	202 (65.2)	
Total	162 (100)	59 (100)	24 (100)	65 (100)	310 (100)	
Using Fake ID						$\chi 2(3) = 31.24$, $p = .000$, V = .233
BBI	80 (25.1)	10 (10.2)	0 (0)	12 (12.8)	102 (17.7)	
Non BBI	239 (74.9)	88 (89.8)	65 (100)	82 (87.2)	474 (82.3)	
Total	319 (100)	98 (100)	65 (100)	94 (100)	94(100)	
Heterosexual Premarital Sex						$\chi 2(3) = 32.39$, $p = .000$, V = .341
BBI	117 (66.1)	12 (23.5)	X	21 (42)	150 (54)	
Non BBI	60 (33.9)	39 (76.5)	X	29 (58)	128 (46)	
Total	177 (100)	51 (100)	X	50 (100)	278 (100)	
Heterosexual Oral/Anal Sex						$\chi 2(3) = 10.9$, $p = .005$, V = .231
BBI	81 (64.3)	18 (47.4)	X	15 (36.6)	114 (55.6)	
Non BBI	45 (35.7)	20 (52.6)	X	91 (44.4)	91 (44.4)	
Total	126 (100)	38 (100)	X	205 (100)	205 (100)	
DUI						$\chi 2(3) = 20.87$, $p = .000$, V = .162
BBI	209 (43.6)	32 (25.6)	21 (25)	38 (35.8)	300 (37.8)	
Non BBI	270 (56.4)	93 (74.4)	63 (75)	68 (64.2)	494 (62.2)	
Total	479 (100)	125 (100)	84 (100)	106 (100)	794 (100)	

Table 6 presents the results for the influence of political affiliation (measured as Republican, Independent, and Democrat) on BBI. Political affiliation was significantly related to four of nine behaviors: heterosexual sodomy, χ^2 (2, N = 176) = 8.67, p = .013; driving under the influence, χ^2 (2, N = 715) = 7.33, p = .026; speeding, χ^2 (2, N = 382) = 38.47, p = .000; and running a red light χ^2 (2, N = 182) =14.08, p = .001. In all cases, Republicans were more likely than either Independents or Democrats to report BBI. The effect size for political affiliation and speeding (Cramer's V = .317) is moderate (Cohen, 1988). The effect sizes for the remaining analyses are weak.

Table 6

The Influence of Political Affiliation on Belief-Behavior Incongruence

	Political Affiliation				**Chi²**
	Republican (%)	**Independent (%)**	**Democrat (%)**	**Total (%)**	
Heterosexual Oral/Anal Sex					$\chi 2(2) = 8.67$, $p = .013$, V = .222
BBI	48 (69.6)	15 (42.9)	36 (50)	99 (56.3)	
Non BBI	21 (30.4)	20 (57.1)	36 (50)	77 (43.8)	
Total	69 (100)	35 (100)	72 (100)	176 (100)	
DUI					$\chi 2(2) = 7.33$, $p = .026$, V = .101
BBI	86 (45.3)	81 (33.1)	100(35.7)	267 (37.3)	
Non BBI	104 (54.7)	164 (66.9)	180 (64.3)	448 (62.7)	
Total	190 (100)	245 (100)	280 (100)	715 (100)	
Criminal Speeding					$\chi 2(2) = 38.47$, $p = .000$, V = .317
BBI	80 (80.8)	107 (76.4)	68 (47.6)	255 (66.8)	
Non BBI	19 (19.2)	33 (23.6)	75 (52.4)	127 (33.2)	
Total	99 (100)	140 (100)	143 (100)	382 (100)	
Running Red Light					$\chi 2(2) = 14.08$, $p = .001$, V = .167
BBI	68 (50)	86 (45.7)	56 (30.8)	210 (41.5)	
Non BBI	68 (50)	103 (54.3)	126 (69.2)	296(69.2)	
Total	136 (100)	188 (100)	182 (100)	182(100)	

Finally, Table 7 presents the results addressing our last research question which is *are the factors associated with BBI consistent across all types of behavior or do they vary across type of low consensus behavior (drug/alcohol use, sexual behaviors, and risky driving)?* With only one exception, those factors associated with BBI are consistent across all three types of behavior. Specifically, belief-behavior incongruence is more common among those who report being male, religiously moderate, Catholic, and Republican.

Table 7

Summary of Belief-Behavior Incongruence by Behavior and Demographic Variable (Cramer's V)

	Gender	**Religiosity**	**Religion**	**Political Affiliation**
Smoking Marijuana		Moderate (.136)	Agnostic/ Atheist	
Drinking Alcohol Underage				
Using Fake ID		Moderate (.112)	Catholic (.233)	
Having Premarital Sexual Intercourse			Catholic (.341)	
Having Oral or Anal Sex			Catholic (.231)	Republican (.222)
Purchasing Pornography	Men (.366)	Moderate (.221)		
DUI	Men (.119)	Moderate (.105)	Catholic (.162)	Republican (.101)
Criminal Speeding	Men (.151)			Republican (.317)
Running Red Light	Men (.134)	Moderate (.128)		Republican (.167)

DISCUSSION

Question 1: In which behavior group is belief-behavior incongruence (BBI) most prevalent?

Researchers have reported that believing a behavior to be morally wrong is an inhibiting factor to engaging in that behavior (Bachman et al., 1992; Paternoster, 1987; Pogarsky, 2002); yet, our results suggest that belief-behavior incongruence (BBI) is alive and well. Of the three types of behaviors presented to respondents, BBI was most prevalent in risky driving behaviors. One-third of respondents reported speeding in excess of 25 mph over the speed limit, one-third admitted to driving while under the influence, and over one-fourth admitted to intentionally running a red light.

One possible explanation for this finding is the ubiquity of driving compared to the other behaviors examined: drug use and sexual activity. Simply put, most people drive and drive frequently, therefore providing more opportunity to engage in risky, and illegal, driving. These results also call into question the deterrent effect of the laws that regulate driving. Although an argument could be made that the severity of criminal punishment for all three behaviors is low, it is also plausible that respondents do not feel there is a high enough certainty of punishment (see Andenaes, 1974) since the relative likelihood of being

caught while engaging in any of these behaviors is quite low (Fradella, 2000; Misner & Ward, 1975).

Additionally, our sample consists of college students, and it is well established that risky driving is common among young people, especially young males (Deery, 1999; Harré, Feld, & Kirwood, 1996; Rhodes & Pivik, 2011). Younger drivers tend to underestimate the risk of an accident, detect hazards less efficiently, and have fewer skills necessary to handle road hazards (Deery, 1999). Adolescent and young adult drivers are more likely than adults to make emotional rather than rational driving decisions, (Rhodes & Pivik, 2011) and young drivers are more willing to accept risk while driving than experienced drivers (Deery, 1999).

Additionally, young drivers tend to overestimate their own driving skill (Deery, 1999). They are more likely to believe that driving risks do not pertain to them personally and that they are less likely to be involved in an accident than the "average" driver (DeJoy, 1989). This overoptimistic assessment of skill relative to the average driver can take two forms, either an overestimation of individual skill or an underestimation of the skill of others (DeJoy, 1989). Either way, combined with a lack of skill and a misperception of risk, such overconfidence, can lead to risky and dangerous driving behavior and the inclination to believe that, while immoral and illegal, risky driving is "OK for me," but not others.

The tendency for young people to engage in risky driving and rationalize their behavior can lead to tragic consequences (Deery, 1999). Automobile accidents are the leading cause of death for those 15-20 years of age and,while teen drivers make up only 7% of licensed drivers, they accounted for nearly 12% of all fatal crashes in 2008 (National Highway Transportation and Safety Administration [NHTSA], 2009). Additionally, while the number of young people involved in alcohol-related driving fatalities has declined over recent years, more than three people under the age of 21 die each day in alcohol-related automobile accidents (NHTSA, 2009).

Finally, given the social pressures that college students face, their peer associations likely moderate both the deterrent effect of law and their own moral beliefs regarding these behaviors (see Akers, 1998; Pogarsky, 2002; Higgins & Makin, 2004). Similar peer pressure effects might also explain the significant proportion of respondents who thought that smoking marijuana (N=108) and premarital sex (N=156), were immoral behaviors, yet they self-reported having engaged in these behaviors. Peer pressure also may explain the number of respondents who judged excessive speeding, DUI, and intentionally running a red light to be immoral, but nonetheless engaged in such conduct.

Research Question #2: What demographic factors are most closely associated with BBI?

As indicated in the results, BBI is significantly related to age, gender, political orientation, and religiosity. Specifically, those identifying themselves as male, religiously moderate, Catholic, and Republican are more likely than their counterparts to report BBI.

Gender. Those identifying themselves as male are more likely to report BBI in the three driving behaviors (DUI, excessive speeding, and running red lights) and in purchasing

pornography. Young men are often more interested in driving and enjoy driving more than young women (Harré et al., 1996). They are also much more likely to use pornography (Petersen & Hyde, 2010, 2011).

Unconscious psychological processes, especially emotions, play a strong role in moral judgments and corresponding behaviors (e.g., Haidt, 2003). We know that emotions greatly affect driving behaviors, particularly the feelings of exhilaration and power that males—especially young males—tend to feel while speeding or otherwise driving recklessly (Lawton, Parker, Manstead, & Stradling 1997b; Rhodes & Pivik, 2011). Further, in U.S. culture, driving carries with it a certain amount of prestige and driving fast and recklessly is glorified in the popular media (Rhodes & Pivik, 2011). Males also tend to rationalize their own dangerous driving by adopting the belief that driving while impaired, excessive speeding, and running red lights are dangerous for others, but not themselves (Yagil, 2005). Their moral beliefs and knowledge of the risks of such recklessness are mitigated by the use of two common mechanisms of cognitive dissonance reduction. First, they create the illusion of control by perceiving themselves to be better drivers than others and, therefore, in control of what happens to them while driving. Second, by adopting the bias of a just world, they believe that something bad, like a serious accident, would not happen to them (Yagil, 2005). These rationalizations are likely to be sufficient in overcoming the normal mediating effects of the combination of moral beliefs and legal proscriptions (Fradella & Vogel, 2009). Not surprisingly then, the fatality rate for male drivers is more than triple that for female drivers (NHTSA, 2009), and males are twice as likely to drive under the influence of alcohol or drugs than are females (Elliott, 1987).

In addition to expressing BBI about risky driving, we also found that those identifying themselves as male were more likely than women to purchase pornography despite their belief that it is immoral. This finding comes as little surprise given that men are more likely than women to use pornography (Petersen & Hyde, 2011). In fact, in a meta-analysis of gender differences across several sexual attitudes, Petersen and Hyde (2010) found that differences in pornography use were more pronounced than differences in other areas like attitudes toward premarital sex, gay marriage, and condom use.

Religiosity. Our results suggest that those identifying themselves as religious moderates are more likely than those identifying themselves as nonreligious or the extremely religious to report BBI. Specifically, those identifying themselves as religious moderates report BBI in five of the nine behaviors examined: smoking marijuana, using a fake ID, buying pornography, DUI, and running a red light.

Researchers have failed to uncover a clear and consistent relationship between religiosity and moral reasoning (Cottone, Ducker, & Javier, 2007; Guttmann, 1984). Some studies report an inverse relationship between moral reasoning and religious conservatism or orthodoxy (Glover, 1997), while others reveal a positive relationship between moral reasoning and conservative religious ideology (Guttmann, 1984). Glover (1997) found that religious conservatives appeared to use significantly less principled moral reasoning than did religious moderates or religious liberals. This suggests that "conservatively religious

people rely more on divine law for moral decision making than on justice as measured within the Kohlbergian framework" (p. 253). On the other hand, Guttmann (1984) found that religious subjects scored higher on measures of morality than did nonreligious subjects. The religious subjects, however, reported significantly higher levels of immoral *behavior* (cheating) than did their secular counterparts. This appears to be consistent with the findings of Batson and his colleagues (1997) who found that those who scored higher on a moral responsibility scale did not show signs of greater moral integrity, but showed signs of greater hypocrisy. In other words, they were more likely to *appear* moral, but not more likely than those who scored low on the moral responsibility scale to *behave* morally.

Given the ambiguity apparent in the literature, we are left to speculate on why those identifying themselves as religious moderates report more BBI than either those identifying themselves as very religious or nonreligious. Quite possibly, individuals reporting no or low levels of religious beliefs would be less likely to judge a low-consensus behavior to be "immoral" than those with moderate or high levels of religiosity. Thus, even if they engaged in the conduct, it would not be hypocritical since their belief in the behavior's immorality was not a strongly held belief, or they did not think there was anything immoral about it in the first place. Conversely, those with high levels of religiosity are likely to judge the conduct at issue to be immoral as a function of their religious beliefs. Yet, since factors like peer pressure and a healthy sex drive are likely to be strong counter-veiling forces in college students, it is not surprising that they feel one way, but act another. Cognitive dissonance would be a significant mediator of this intra-psychic conflict and, therefore, may be a plausible explanation for the disconnect between beliefs and conduct.

Religion. Our results suggest that, with one exception, those who identify themselves as Catholic are more likely than those who identify themselves as members of other denominations or nonreligious to report BBI. Specifically, those who identify themselves as Catholic report BBI in four of the nine behaviors: using a fake ID, heterosexual sex, heterosexual sodomy, and DUI. The prevalence of BBI among those who identify themselves as Catholics might be explained by the religion's relationship to other variables which influence behavior, especially with regard to sexual conduct.

While most religions set boundaries around sexual behavior, Catholic doctrine limits sex to procreation only (Catholic Church, 1997). Nonetheless, there is evidence to suggest that Catholics are, more so than members of other religions or the nonaffiliated, significantly more likely to engage in casual sexual relationships (Brewster, Cooksey, Guilkey, & Rindfuss, 1998; Burdette, Ellison, Hill, & Glenn, 2009). Brewster et al. (1998) found that religious affiliation interacted with religiosity. Specifically, Catholics with lower levels of religious commitment are actually more likely to be sexually experienced as compared to nonfundamentalist Protestant, non-Christian, and nonreligious teens. Conversely, Catholic women with high levels of religious commitment were more likely to delay sexual activity while those with lower levels of commitment display increased odds of sexual behavior compared to their unaffiliated counterparts.

Smith and Lundquist-Denton (2005), in a national study of religiosity and youth, found that Catholic teenagers, who make up nearly one-quarter of U.S. teens, score much lower than their counterparts (Protestant and Jewish youth) on most measures of religiosity and are more likely to behave in ways that are contrary to official Church doctrines, including those related to premarital sex. This may, in part, be the result of a national decline in the number of Catholic schools and the waning popularity of religious socialization programs such as catechism taught in Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (CCD) classes. Regardless of the cause, Smith and Denton note, "For very many U.S. teens, religion is important but not a priority, valued but not much invested in, praised by not very describable" (p. 262).

Considering our findings from a completely different perspective, it is possible that our respondents who identify themselves as Catholic are simply more willing than their nonreligious peers or counterparts in other faiths to *admit* to engaging in behaviors they deem as immoral. In the Catholic tradition, confession of misdeeds is not only a morally favorable behavior, but required through the Sacrament of Reconciliation (Catholic Church, 1997). This sacrament, however, also might be a contributing factor to Catholic hypocrisy. Specifically, since Catholic doctrine stresses the forgiveness of moral transgressions through the Sacrament of Reconciliation, Catholics might feel license to engage in low-consensus deviant behaviors believing that, as "venial sins," such acts will be forgiven (see Etzioni & Carney, 1997; Wilkes, 1997).

Political affiliation. The results of our research suggest that those identifying themselves as Republican, more so than Independents or Democrats, are more likely to report BBI. Specifically, they are more likely to engage in acts of sodomy, DUI, excessive speeding, and running red lights even though they classify these behaviors as immoral and, further, believe that the criminal law ought to regulate such conduct.

Moral philosophy and social psychology recognize that morality has both intrapersonal and interpersonal domains (seeFlanagan, 1991; Janoff-Bulman, Sheikh & Baldacci, 2008). The former focuses on people's own behavior, while the latter is directed at the behaviors of others. Janoff-Bulman et al. (2008) found that higher levels of social conservatism were significantly associated with concern for the moral actions of others, rather than one's self—especially with regard to maintaining social order by applying "avoidance-based inhibition motives to other people in order to protect the larger community" (p. 1092). Janoff-Bulman (2009, p. 20) later explained that that:

Conservatism is avoidance based; it is focused on preventing negative outcomes (e.g., societal losses) and seeks to regulate society via inhibition (restraints) in the interests of social order. Liberalism is approach based; it is focused on advancing positive outcomes (e.g., societal gains) and seeks to regulate society via activation (interventions) in the interests of social justice.

These findings may help to explain those in the present study, as conservatives might focus more on external/interpersonal morality (i.e., linking law and morality for "society") than they do on conforming personal behavior in accordance with those beliefs.

Research Question # 3: Are the factors associated with belief-behavior incongruence (BBI) consistent, or do they vary, across all types of behavior?

The results of this study suggest that, with one exception, those factors most closely associated with BBI—being male, religiously moderate, Republican, and Catholic—are consistent across all types of low-consensus deviant behaviors. This might be explained, in part, by the fact that members of these groups tend to have social power. Lammers, Stapel, and Galisky (2010) found that power increases hypocrisy in terms of moralizing in reasoning, but behaving immorally. Other reasons for this consistency should be explored in future research.

CONCLUSION

The results of this research suggest a disconnect between moral reasoning and personal conduct concerning several of the low-consensus deviant behaviors studied. Significant numbers of respondents engaged in behaviors in spite of both their beliefs about the immorality of the conduct and their beliefs in the legitimacy of criminal punishment to deter the behavior. This was particularly evident for driving behaviors like driving under the influence, excessive speeding, and running red lights, as well as drinking underage and having premarital sex.

Our conclusions should be viewed in congruence with the limitations of our research. First, the external validity of the study may be constrained by the population from which the research sample was drawn—college students (Davis & Buskist, 2008; Peterson, 2001). We attempted to minimize the threats to the external validity of the present research by using a large sample drawn from five sites across the United States. Moreover, understanding deviance among college student populations is important since 17- to 25-year-olds engage in a disproportionate amount of deviant behaviors. Nonetheless, before the findings are generalized, the research should be replicated using participants of more diverse ages drawn from non-student populations.

Second, as with any survey research, there are concerns about the ecological validity of the present study since responses to survey questions regarding compliance with the criminal law may differ from people's actual compliance in real-world settings (Davis & Buskist, 2008). Observational or experimental research would be best suited to address this shortcoming.

Third, a number of the low-consensus deviant behaviors used in this study are currently illegal while others have been decriminalized. These variables were intentionally selected since they were likely to elicit disparities in people's moral judgments on whether the criminal law ought to be used as a tool to control the behaviors (see Winslow & Gay, 1993). However, the current legal status of these behaviors may have played a part in the judgments made by the respondents in the study, thereby complicating comparisons between the variables.

Fourth, our findings are limited by the lack of a direct measure of dissonance. While most studies in this area support a connection between hypocrisy and dissonance (see Aronson, 1999; Aronson et al., 1991; Dickerson et al., 1992; Fried, 1998; Fried & Aronson, 1995; Stone et al., 1994), an important premise of dissonance theory is that not all inconsistencies between attitudes and behavior are the result of cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957). Consequently, without providing a direct measure of dissonance, it is not possible to be certain that our findings are the result of cognitive dissonance.

Finally, there are always risks of both intentional and unintentional inaccuracies when respondents are asked to self-report their own behaviors (Stone, Bachrach, Jobe, & Kurtzman, 1999). This risk is likely heightened when asking about people to self-report their own violations of the criminal law. However, self-report data are essential to criminological research since they allow us to collect information on conduct not detected by authorities and, therefore, not contained in official records (Farrington, Loeber, Stouthamer-Loeber, VanKammen, & Schmidt, 1996). To reduce the risk of inaccuracies in self-report data, respondents were asked relatively straightforward questions with simple response options. This relatively crude method of data gathering and coding yielded categorical data, and limited our data analysis options. A more sophisticated survey instrument that gathered interval-level data might yield results with better predictive validity than the results reported herein.

REFERENCES

Akers, R. L. (1998). *Social learning and social structure: A general theory of crime and deviance*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Akers, R. L. (1985). *Deviant behavior: A social learning approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Akers, R. L., & Cochran, J. K. (1985). Adolescent marijuana use: A test of three theories of deviant behavior. *Deviant Behavior*, *6*, 323-346.

Andenaes, J. (1974). *Punishment and deterrence*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

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

Aristotle. (2003). *The Nicomachean ethics*. (H. Tredennick, Ed., & J.A.K. Thomson, Trans.). New York, NY: Penguin Classics. (Original work published c. 350 B.C.E.).

Aronson, E. (1999). Dissonance, hypocrisy, and the self-concept. In E. Harmon-Jones & J. Mills (Eds.) *Cognitive Dissonance: Progress on a pivotal theory in social psychology* (pp. 103-126). Washington, DC: American Psychological Society.

Aronson, E., Fried, C. B., & Stone, J. (1991). Overcoming denial and increasing the intention to use condoms. *American Journal of Public Health*, *81*, 1636-1638.

Athanasou, J. A., & Olabisi, O. (2002). Male and female differences in self-report cheating. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, *8*, 37-51.

Babbie, E., Halley, F. S., Wagner, W. E. III, & Zaino, J. (2011). *Adventures in social research: Data analysis using IBM SPSS statistics*. (7th ed.) Los Angeles, CA: Sage/Pine Forge.

Bachman, R., Paternoster, R., & Ward, S. (1992). The rationality of sexual offending: Testing a deterrence/rational choice conception of sexual assault. *Law and Society Review*, *26*, 43-372.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (2004). Selective exercise of moral agency. In T. A. Thorkildsen & H. J. Walberg (Eds.) *Nurturing morality* (pp. 37-57). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic.

Batson, C. D. (1994). Why act for the public good? Four answers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin: The Self and the Collective*, *20*(5), 603-610.

Batson, C. D., Kobrynowicz, D., Dinnerstein, J. L., Kampf, H. C., & Wilson, A.D. (1997). In a very different voice: Unmasking moral hypocrisy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 1335-1348.

Batson, C. D. & Thompson, E. R. (2001). Why don't moral people act morally? Motivational considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 10*(10), 54-57.

Batson, C. D., Thompson, E. R., & Chen, H. (2002). Moral hypocrisy: Addressing some alternatives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*(2), 330-339.

Batson, C. D., Thompson, E. R., Seuferling, G., Whitney, H., & Strongman, J. A., (1999). Moral hypocrisy: Appearing moral to oneself without being so. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(3), 525-537.

Bentham, J. (1988). *The principles of morals and legislation*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books (Original work published 1843).

Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, *88*(1), 1-45.

Brewster, K. L., Cooksey, E. C., Guilkey, D. K., & Rindfuss R. R. (1998). The changing impact of religion on the sexual and contraceptive behavior of adolescent women in the United States. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *60*(2), 493-504.

Burdette, A. M., Ellison, C. G., Hill, T. D., & Glenn, N. D. (2009). "Hooking up" at college: Does religion make a difference? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *48*(3), 535-551.

Carrier, N. (2007). The autonomy and permeability of law: The case of the Canadian prohibition of cannabis. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, *22*(1), 123-138.

Catholic Church. (1997). *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. (2nd Ed.) Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cottone, J., Ducker, P., & Javier, R. A. (2007). Predictors of moral reasoning: Components of executive functioning and aspects of religiosity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *46*(1), 37-53.

Davis, S. F., & Buskist, W. (2008). *21st century psychology: A reference handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davis, S. F., Grover, C. A., Becker, A. H., & McGregor, L. N. (2002). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishments. In R. A. Griggs (Ed.), *Handbook for teaching introductory psychology: Vol. 3: With an emphasis on assessment* (pp. 153-157). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Deery H. A. (1999). Hazard and risk perception among young novice drivers. *Journal of Safety Research*, *30*, 225-236.

DeJoy, D. M. (1989). The optimism bias and traffic accident risk perception. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, *21*, 333-341.

Devlin, P. (1965). *The enforcement of morals*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.

Dickerson, C., Thibodeau, R., Aronson, E., & Miller, D. (1992). Using cognitive dissonance to encourage water conservation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *22*, 841-854.

Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., Clark, R. E., Williams, L. E., Francis, B., & Haines, V. J. (1996). College cheating: Ten years later. *Research in Higher Education*, *37*(4), 487-502.

Elliot, D. (1987). Self-reported driving while under the influence of alcohol/drugs and the risk of alcohol/drug related accidents. *Alcohol, Drugs and Driving, 3*(3-4), 31-43.

Etzioni, A., & Carney, D. (1997). *Repentance: A comparative perspective*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Evans, E. D., & Craig, D. (1990). Adolescent cognitions for academic cheating as a function of grade level and achievement status. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *5*(3), 325-45.

Evans, T. D., Cullen F. T., Burton V. S., Dunaway, R. G., & Benson, M. L. (1997). The social consequences of self-control: Testing the general theory of crime. *Criminology*, *35*, 475-504.

Farrington, D. P., Loeber, R., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., VanKammen, W. B., & Schmidt, L. (1996). Self-reported delinquency and a combined delinquency seriousness scale based on boys, mothers, and teachers: Concurrent and predictive validity for African-Americans and Caucasians. *Criminology*, *34*(4), 493-514.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Flanagan, O. (1991). Varieties of personality: Ethics and psychological realism. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Fointait, V. (2004). "I know what I have to do, but…": When hypocrisy leads to behavioral change. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *32*(8), 741-746.
Fradella, H .F. (2000). Minimum mandatory sentences: Arizona's ineffective tool for the social control of DUI. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *11*, 113-135.
Fradella, H. F., & Vogel, B. L. (2009). An empirical analysis of the relationship between law, morality, and personal conduct: Implications for theory and policy. *Journal of Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, *5*(2), 203-236.
Freud, S. (2005). Civilization and its discontents. (J. Strachey, Trans.). New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1930).
Fried, C. (1998). Hypocrisy and identification with transgressions: A case of undetected dissonance. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *20*, 145-154.
Fried, C., & Aronson, E. (1995). Hypocrisy, misattribution, and dissonance reduction: A demonstration of dissonance in the absence of aversive consequences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*, 925-933.
Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Glover, R. J. (1997). Relationships in moral reasoning and religion among members of conservative, moderate, and liberal religious groups. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *137*, 247-55.
Guttmann, J. 1984. Cognitive morality and cheating behavior in religious and secular school children. *Journal of Educational Research*, *77*, 249-254.
Haidt, J. (2003). The moral emotions. In R.J. Davidson, K.R. Scherer, & H.H. Goldsmith (Eds.) *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 852-870). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Harmon-Jones, E., & J. Mills. (Eds.) (1999). *Cognitive dissonance: Progress on a pivotal theory in social psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
Harré, N., Field, J., & Kirkwood, B. (1996). Gender differences and areas of common concern in the driving behaviors and attitudes of adolescents. *Journal of Safety Research*, *27*(3), 163-173.
Hart, H. L. A. (1963). *Law, liberty and morality*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
Higgins, G. E., & Makin, D. A. (2004). Self-control, deviant peers, and software piracy. *Psychological Reports*, *95*, 921-931.
Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Hume, D. (1978). *A treatise of human nature* (2nd. ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1739).
Janoff-Bulman, R., Sheikh, S., & Baldacci, K. (2008). Mapping moral motives: Approach, avoidance, and political orientation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*(4), 1091-1099.
Kant, I. (1996). *The metaphysics of morals* (2nd ed.). M. J. Gregor (Ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published in 1785).
Kohlberg, L. (1964). Development of moral character and ideology. In L. Hoffman & M. Hoffman (Eds.), *Review of childhood development research: Vol. 1* (pp. 383-431). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice.* New York, NY: Harper and Row.
Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
Kohlberg, L., & Candee, D. (1984). The relationship of moral judgment to moral action. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development* (pp. 52-73). New York: Wiley.
Krohn, M. D., & Massey, J .L. (1980). Social control and delinquent behavior: An examination of the elements of the social bond. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *21*, 419-437.

Lambert, E. G., Pasupuleti, S., & Jiang, S. (2008). Views on the death penalty among college students in India. *Punishment & Society*, *10*(2), 207-218.

Lammers, J., Stapel, D. A., & Galinsky, A. D. (2010). Power increases hypocrisy: Moralizing in reasoning, immorality in behavior. *Psychological Science*, *21*(5), 737-744.

Lawton, R., Parker, D., Stradling, S. G., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1997a). Self-reported attitude towards speeding and its possible consequences in five different road contexts. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *7*, 153-165.

Lawton, R., Parker, D., Manstead, S. G., & Stradling, A. S. R. (1997b). The role of affect in predicting social behaviors: The case of road traffic violations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *27*, 1258-1276.

Lee, R. D., & Rasinski, K. A. (2006). Five grams of coke: Racism, moralism and white public opinion on sanctions for first time possession. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, *17*(3), 183-191.

Lim, V. K. G., & See, S. K. B. (2001). Attitudes toward and intentions to report, academic cheating among students in Singapore. *Ethics and Behavior*, *11*, 261-274.

Matsueda, R. L. (1989). The dynamics of moral beliefs and minor deviance. *Social Forces*, *68*(2), 428-457.

McCabe, D., & Trevino, L. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multi-campus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, *38*, 379-396.

Meier, R. F., & Geis, G. (1997). *Victimless crime? Prostitution, drugs, homosexuality, and abortion*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.

Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Mill, J. S. (1956). *On liberty* (Library of Liberal Arts ed.). C.V. Shields, Ed. New York, NY: MacMillan. (Original work published 1859).

Misner, R. L., & Ward, P. G. (1975). Severe penalties for driving offenses: Deterrence analysis. *Arizona State Law Journal*, *1975*, 677-713.

Naso, R. C. (2007). Beneath the mask: Hypocrisy and the pathology of shame. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, *24*(1), 113-125.

Naso, R. C. (2006). Immoral actions in otherwise moral individuals: Interrogating the structure and meaning of moral hypocrisy. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, *23*(3), 475-489.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2009). *Traffic safety facts, 2008*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Center for Statistical Analysis.

Norman, T. (2009, June 26) Sanford and sin: Hypocrisy is all too human. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*. Retrieved from http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/09177/980032-153.stm

Norušis, M. J. (2010). *PASW statistics 18 guide to data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Packer, H. L. (1968). *The limits of the criminal sanction*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Paternoster, R. (1987). The deterrent effect of the perceived certainty and severity of punishment: A review of the evidence and issues. *Justice Quarterly*, *4*, 173-217.

Peterson, A. A., Haynes, G. A., & Olson, J. M. (2008). Self-esteem differences in the effects of hypocrisy induction on behavioral intentions in the health domain. *Journal of Personality, 76*(2), 305-322.

Petersen, J. L., & Hyde, J. S. (2011). Gender differences in sexual attitudes and behaviors: A review of meta-analytic results and large datasets. *Journal of Sex Research*, *48*(2-3), 149-165.

Petersen, J. L., & Hyde, J. S. (2010). A meta-analytic review of research on gender differences in sexuality: 1993 to 2007. *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*, 21-38.

Peterson, R. A. (2001). On the use of college students in social science research: Insights from a second-order meta-analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *28*(3), 450-461.

Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral judgment of the child*. (M. Gabain, Trans.). New York, NY: The Free Press. (Original work published 1932).

Plato (2008). *The republic*. (R. Waterfield, Trans.). New York, NY: Oxford University (Original work published 360 B.C.E.).

Pogarsky, G. (2002). Identifying deterrable offenders: Implications for deterrence research. *Justice Quarterly*, *19*, 431-452.

Rangell, L. (1976). Lessons from Watergate: A derivative for psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, *45*, 37-61.

Rangell, L. (1980). *The mind of Watergate: An exploration of the compromise of integrity*. New York, NY: Norton.
Ratner, R., & Miller, D. (2001). The norm of self-interest and its effects on social action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*(1), 5-16.
Rawls, J. (1972). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
Rhodes, N., & Pivik, K. (2011). Age and gender differences in risky driving: The roles of positive affect and risk perception. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, *43*, 923-931.
Rogers, M., Smoak, N. D., & Liu, J. (2006). Self-report deviant computer behavior: A big-5, moral choice, and manipulative explotative behavior analysis. *Deviant Behavior*, *27*, 45-68.
Rousseau, J. J. (1979). *Emile, or on education*. (A. Bloom, Ed. & Trans.) New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1762).
Simpson, A. W. (2005). Shooting felons: Law, practice, official culture, and perceptions of morality. *Journal of Law and Society*, *32*(2), 241-266.
Smith, A. (1869). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund.
Smith, C., & Lundquist-Denton, M. (2005). *Soul searching: The religious and spiritual lives of American teenagers*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
Stephens, J. M., & Nicholson, H. (2008). Cases of incongruity: Exploring the divide between adolescents' beliefs and behavior related to academic dishonesty. *Educational Studies*, *34*(4), 361-376.
Stone, A. A., Bachrach, C. A., Jobe, J. B., & Kurtzman, H. S. (1999). *The science of self-report: Implications for research and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Stone, J., Aronson, E., Crain, A. L., Winslow, M. P., & Fried, C. B. (1994). Inducing hypocrisy as a means of encouraging young adults to use condoms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *20*, 116-128.
Stone, J., Wiegand, A. W., Cooper, J., & Aronson, E. (1997). When exemplification fails: Hypocrisy and the motive for self-integrity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*(1), 54-65.
Sykes, G., & Matza , D. (1957). Techniques of neutralisation: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, *22*, 664-670.
Valdesolo, P., & DeSteno, D. (2007). Moral hypocrisy: Social groups and the flexibility of virtue. *Psychological Science*, *18*, 689-690.
Vinski, E. J., & Tryon, G. S. (2009). Study of cognitive dissonance intervention to address high school students' cheating attitudes and behaviors. *Ethics & Behavior, 19*(3), 218-226.
Watson, G. W., & Sheikh, F. (2008). Normative self-interest or moral hypocrisy?: The importance of context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *77*, 259-269.
Wilkes, P. (1997). *The good enough Catholic: A guide to for the perplexed*. New York, NY: Ballentine/ Random House.
Winslow, R. W., & Gay, P. T. (1993). The moral minorities: A self-report study of low-consensus deviance. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *37*(1), 17-27.
Wikström, P. H., & Treiber, K. (2007). The role of self-control in crime causation: Beyond Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime. *European Journal of Criminology*, *4*(2), 237-264.
Yagil, D. (2005). Drivers and traffic laws: A review of psychological theories and empirical research. In G. Underwood (Ed.). *Traffic and transport psychology: Theory and application* (pp. 487-503). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier.
Yardley, J., Rodriguez, M. D., Bates, S. C., & Nelson, J. (2009). True confessions?: Alumni's retrospective reports on undergraduate cheating behaviors. *Ethics and Behavior*, *19*(1), 1-14.

Received: 8/2011
Accepted: 2/2012

Vogel, B., & Fradella, H.F. (2012). There ought to be a law, but not for me: Hypocritical disjunctures between legal and moral beliefs and low-consensus immoral behaviors. [Electronic Version]. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, *8*(2), 87-110.

ENDNOTES

1. In an attempt to preserve a person-first use of language, rather than using the fairly strong label of "hypocrite" to describe those in our sample who report hypocritical beliefs, we will use the phrase "those with belief-behavior incongruence" (BBI).

2. For other studies finding high prevalence rates of academic dishonesty, see, e.g., Athanasou & Olabisi, 2002; Lim & See, 2001; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Yardley, Rodriguez, Bates, & Nelson, 2009).