社会イノベーション研究　第 14 巻第 1 号（093-105）2019 年 3 月　　2019 年 2 月 2 日掲載承認

Issue Positions and Moral Concerns among Japanese College Students:

How Five Moral Concerns Help Explain Attitudes toward Capital Punishment

Issue Positions and Moral Concerns among Japanese College Students: How Five Moral Concerns Help Explain Attitudes toward Capital Punishment

Seijo University
TSUZUKI, Yukie
Seijo University
SHINGAKI, Noriko

Abstract

The aim of this paper was to explore how the Five Moral Foundations are related to issue positions among Japanese college students. Taking the death penalty as an example of a specific issue, this study examined how individual issue positions may be predicted by gender, age, political orientation, and moral foundations. Seventy Japanese students were asked to respond to a questionnaire consisting of questions about their moral concerns, political orientation, and attitudes toward the death penalty. Factor analysis revealed five moral concerns that were analogous to those of Graham et al.'s Moral Foundations Questionnaire (Graham, et al., 2009). Attitudes toward the death penalty were most strongly and significantly associated with the *Purity* and *Harm* foundations. These results were consistent with Koleva et al. (2012)'s study inasmuch as respondents' endorsement of various moral foundations predicted specific issue positions over and above their demographic characteristics and political orientation. It was thus suggested that moral intuition constituted psychological predispositions underlying specific attitudes toward controversial political issues and demonstrated the usefulness of Moral Foundations Theory as a lens for examining individual differences in political attitudes. It was also discovered that the critical moral intuitions that underlay favorable (or unfavorable) attitudes toward the death penalty were different between Japanese and Americans. Specifically, concerns about *Harm* predicted *opposition* to the death penalty in the US, whereas concerns about *Purity* and *Harm* predicted *support* in Japan.

Keywords: Morality; Moral Foundations Theory; death penalty; Japan

Moral judgment as more a product of the "gut" than the "head"

The modern discipline of moral psychology was established by Kohlberg (1969). He developed a stage theory of moral development by asking people to respond to hypothetical situations in which a main character faced a moral dilemma and had to make difficult choices.

(For example, “Should Heinz steal a drug in order to save his wife from cancer if he can obtain the drug no other way?"). Kohlberg was interested in the reasons people offered to justify their answers. He developed a stage theory focusing on the progressive development of a child’s understanding of justice. Thus, Kohlberg’s theory was based on the “cognitive” aspects of morality.

Studies on moral judgment were heavily influenced by a substantial amount of work on automatic and intuitive processes in areas such as social psychology and neuroscience during the 1990s. It is currently accepted by cognitive scientists that there are two basic and fundamentally different kinds of mental processes that are operating in people’s minds at all times. These are automatic processing (System 1) and controlled processing (System 2) (Kahneman & Egan, 2011).

The Social Intuitionist Model (SIM) of moral judgment proposed by Haidt was fully compatible with this type of dual-process theory. The SIM model proposes that moral judgments appear in consciousness automatically and rapidly as the result of moral intuitions. In other words, moral judgments are products of effortless, associative, heuristic processing, which is generally referred to as System 1 thinking. According to Graham et al. (2013), “moral evaluation is more a product of the gut than the head, bearing a closer resemblance to aesthetic judgment than principle-based reasoning.”

Under the SIM model, moral reasoning is an effort-laden process, generally referred to as System 2 thinking. In other words, when a person engages in moral reasoning, he or she searches for arguments that support a judgment that has already been made (Haidt, 2001). Haidt (2013) also notes that this kind of deliberate moral reasoning is often initiated by social requirements to explain and justify one’s intuitive “gut” reactions to other people. Simply put, moral reasoning is done mainly for socially strategic purposes and more closely resembles arguing than it does rational deliberation (Mercier & Sperber, 2011).

Five moral concerns as foundations for moral judgment

Haidt developed Moral Foundations Theory (MFT; Graham et al., 2013; Haidt & Joseph, 2004) to explain the variety and universality of moral judgments. Moral Foundations Theory makes four central claims. First, it proposes that there is a first draft of the moral mind that developed in response to evolutionary pressures and is organized prior to experience. Second, the first draft of the moral mind gets edited during development within a culture. Third, as MFT builds on the Social Intuitionist Model (SIM), it proposes that moral judgments happen quickly, often in less than one second of seeing an action or learning the facts of a case (Haidt, 2001). Fourth and last, MFT claims that there are many psychological foundations of morality and that these foundations emerged in response to numerous adaptive social challenges throughout evolutionary history.

Graham et al. (2013) identified five categories of moral intuitions. By relying, to varying degrees, on the five innate psychological systems, people construct moral virtues, meanings and institutions. Each system produces fast, automatic, gut-reactions of like and dislike when certain patterns are perceived in the social world, which in turn guide judgments of right and wrong (Koleva, et al., 2012, p.185).

The Five Moral Foundations are: Harm/Care, Fairness/Reciprocity, Ingroup/Loyalty, Authority/Respect, and Purity/Sanctity. The Harm/Care foundation (hereinafter shortened to *Harm*) leads people to disapprove of individuals who inflict pain and suffering on others and to approve of those who prevent or alleviate harm. When people learn of suffering of those who are weak and vulnerable, their urge to care and protect may become activated and lead to anger toward the perpetrator. The Fairness/Reciprocity foundation (*Fairness*) makes people sensitive to issues of equality and justice and leads them to disapprove of individuals who violate these principles. The Ingroup/Loyalty foundation (*Ingroup*) is based on people's attachment to the groups they belong to, such as family and country. This foundation leads people to approve of individuals contributing to their own group's welfare and cohesion. The Authority/Respect foundation (*Authority*) leads people to approve of individuals who fulfill the duties assigned to their position on the social ladder, be that position one of leadership or one of subordination, and it leads them to disapprove of individuals who do not respect authority or tradition. The Purity/Sanctity foundation (*Purity*) is based on the emotion of disgust in response to biological contaminants like pathogens and parasites, and to various social contaminants like spiritual corruption or inability to control base impulses (Koleva et al., 2012). Schaller and Park (2011) showed that this concern can be generalized to avoidance and stigmatization of those who are different (e.g., xenophobia) and to rejection of those whose lifestyles are inconsistent with the group's sacred practices (e.g., homophobia).

These moral foundations were shaped by evolutionary processes and are universally present. They are psychological frameworks for detecting and reacting emotionally to issues relating to *Harm, Fairness, Ingroup, Authority*, and *Purity* (Haidt & Graham, 2007). Although the moral foundations are universal and innate, different societies, subcultures, and individuals emphasize and elaborate upon different foundations to different degrees. Research (Haidt, Koller, & Dias, 1993) suggests that gender, socioeconomic status, and ethnic background all are associated with differential emphasis on each moral foundation.

The Five Moral Foundations and the political spectrum

Graham, Haidt, and Nosek (2009) applied MFT to examine differences in moral judgment across the political spectrum within the United States. Liberalism was hypothesized to be associated with a morality in which the individual is the locus of moral value. Protecting individuals from harm and unfair treatment by other individuals or by the social system would be of foremost moral concern among liberals. Conservatives, in contrast, were hypothesized to prefer creating more tightly ordered communities, in which individuals are bound to well-defined roles, duties, and mutual obligations.

Results from the Graham et al. (2009) study were consistent with these hypotheses. It was suggested that liberals and conservatives differed in the weight they put on different moral foundations. Specifically, liberals showed greater endorsement and use of *Harm* and *Fairness* and considered these "individualizing foundations" (Graham et al., 2011) to be significantly more important than *Ingroup, Authority*, and *Purity*. In other words, in the liberal view, acts are considered as immoral to the extent that they do harm to others or treat people in an unfair manner. Conservatives, on the other hand, endorsed and applied the five foundations more equally. Thus, the most striking difference between liberals and conservatives seems to involve the "binding foundations" (*Ingroup*, *Authority*, and *Purity*) — the ones that are about binding people together into larger groups or institutions (Graham et al., 2011). Graham et al. (2009) noted that these findings help explain why liberals and conservatives fail to agree on so many moral issues and often find it difficult to comprehend how an “ethical” person could come to hold the beliefs of the other side.

The Five Moral Foundations and issue positions

Hunter (1991), in his book *Culture Wars*: *The Struggle to Define America*, described a dramatic realignment and polarization that had transformed US politics and culture. Hunter proposed that these divisions are driven by fundamentally different and opposed notions of moral authority. The first of the two polarized groups was described as *orthodox*, characterized by the belief that moral truths exist independently of human preferences. The other was *progressive*, characterized by the belief that moral truths must be reinterpreted by each generation.

Koleva et al. (2012) examined psychological underpinnings of culture-war attitudes through the lens of Moral Foundations Theory. Individual differences in moral intuition were explored as possible psychological predispositions underlying specific attitudes toward controversial political issues.

Koleva et al. (2012) scored individuals’ moral disapproval for thirteen controversial issues and examined the extent to which these scores were predicted by demographic factors, interest in politics, political ideology, and scores on the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ; Graham et al., 2011). The thirteen issues were abortion, the death penalty, medical testing on animals, euthanasia, same-sex marriage, homosexual relations, burning the US flag, having a baby outside of wedlock, stem-cell research, pornography, gambling, casual sex, and animal cloning.

Disapproval ratings for each issue were regressed on age, gender, religious attendance, interest in politics, political orientation (liberal vs. conservative), and all five moral foundation scores. The study showed the usefulness of Moral Foundations Theory in understanding the organization of political attitudes. For nine out of thirteen issues the strongest predictor was a subscale of the MFQ rather than political orientation. It was found that *Purity* was the best predictor for disapproval on eight out of thirteen issues. *Harm* was the strongest predictor for disapproval on medical testing on animals. Political orientation was the best predictor for only three issues: abortion, flag burning, and the death penalty. Where moral disapproval of the death penalty was concerned, *Harm* was the second strongest predictor, after political orientation.

Koleva et al. (2012) went on to examine individual judgments about specific policy positions on eleven issues. Participants were asked to select the position that came closest to their own from a supplied list of specific positions. The eleven issues were abortion, defense spending, teaching creationism, same-sex marriage, the use of torture in interrogation, global warming, burning the US flag, stem-cell research, combating terrorism, illegal immigration, and gun control. Although political ideology was the strongest predictor for nine issues, all eleven issues were significantly and uniquely associated with two or more moral foundations. Specifically, *Purity* was the best foundation predictor for endorsing anti-abortion laws, favoring a ban on same-sex marriage, opposing federal funding for embryonic stem cell research, supporting the teaching of creationism in public schools, and supporting stricter laws against illegal immigration. *Ingroup* was the strongest predictor for favoring a ban on flag-burning, supporting increased defense spending, and approving of aggressive measures against terrorism. *Harm* was the strongest foundation predictor for supporting gun control and banning torture.

Koleva et al. (2012) noted that examining individual issue positions through the lens of moral intuitions is especially useful in understanding multiple and potentially conflicting motives at work. For example, opposition to the use of torture was most strongly predicted by *Harm*, followed by *Ingroup* and *Authority* (which operated in the opposite direction, i.e., approval). Looking at an individual's moral intuitions instead of relying solely on an individual's self-placement on the political spectrum would help us understand the rich tapestry of an individual's political attitudes (Koleva et al.).

Political ideology in Japan

Political parties in Japan have been identified in terms of their positions along the conservative-progressive ideological spectrum. Scholars and journalists alike have continued to use these terms to describe party positions. For example, the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) and the Japanese Communist Party (JCP) have respectively been treated as anchoring the conservative and progressive ends of the party space for more than 60 years (Endo & Jou, 2014).

However, data indicated that the conventional view of parties' ideological positions along the conservative-progressive spectrum is no longer shared by Japan's younger generation. For example, while older respondents continue to recognize the JCP as the most progressive party, younger voters view the JCP as occupying the middle of the ideological scale (Endo & Jou, 2014).

Inamasu and Miura (2015) studied how Japanese university students understand the conservative-progressive dichotomy. The study indicated that university students tended to be more "conservative" than older cohorts inasmuch as they showed more conservative attitudes on some of Japan's controversial issues, such as the Yasukuni Shrine dispute and nuclear-energy policy. Their issue positions on collective self-defense and amending Japan's Constitution were not necessarily conservative, however. Further, students had limited knowledge as to which specific issue positions were associated with which end of the political spectrum. Thus, the study implied that ideological self-placement would not necessarily predict specific issue positions among Japanese university students.

The death penalty and the Five Moral Foundations

The present study aims to examine how the Five Moral Foundations may predict individual issue positions, using the example of the death penalty. The United States and Japan are the only G7 countries that still have the death penalty. In the US, the proportion of those who support the death penalty has ranged from 60% and up throughout most of the past 80 years. Support for the death penalty generally increased from the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s, peaking at 80% in 1994 which was a time when Americans viewed homicide and violent crime as the most serious problem facing the nation. In recent years, however, there has been a trend of declining support for capital punishment, especially among Democrats. Currently, 55% of US adults are reported to favor the death penalty (Jones, 2017).

Most Americans who favor the death penalty justify their support for retributive reasons (Ellsworth & Gross, 1994). In a 1991 Gallup survey, the most popular justification by far was "a life for a life," and fully 50% of pro-death-penalty respondents cited retribution as the basis for their support. Ranked second and cited by 19% was incapacitation, i.e., preventing murderers from killing again. Deterrence was cited by only 13% of the respondents (Gross, 1997). In the anti-death-penalty camp, the leading justification was that "it's wrong to take a life," which was cited by 41%, followed by "punishment should be left to God (17%)." Only 11% cited the possibility of miscarriages of justice ("defendants may be wrongly convicted and sentenced") as the prime reason for their opposition.

According to the 2014 Japan Cabinet Office's survey of public opinion on the death penalty, 80.3% of Japanese people supported the death penalty and 9.7% were opposed. When asked to justify their support, 53.4% mentioned "consideration for the feelings of victims and their families," and 52.9% claimed that murderers should atone by giving up their *own* lives. Thus, catering to the feelings of victims and their families was the top justification for supporting the death penalty. Among those who opposed capital punishment, the leading justification was that "innocent people may be wrongly convicted and executed" (46.6 %), followed by: "it is better to keep the criminal alive to atone for his or her wrongdoing" (41.6%); "even a nation does not have the right to kill someone" (38.8%); and "it is always wrong and cruel to take a life" (31.5 %). Thus, although Japan and the US are similar in the sense that the death penalty enjoys majority support in both countries, the leading justifications offered for support and opposition are quite different.

Kawai et al. (2015) examined death penalty supporters' reasons for their position. The authors supplied a list of potential reasons and asked participants to choose the ones they endorsed. The number-one choice was "because one who killed should pay for the crime with his or her own life," (68.7%) followed by "consideration for the feelings of victims and their families." Those who mentioned the death penalty's alleged "deterrence effect" was 43.9%.

Watamura, Saeki, Kiyomitsu, and Wakebe (2016) surveyed Japanese university students regarding their positions on the death penalty and found that those who favored the death penalty considerably outnumbered those opposed to it. However, their survey did not indicate as large a spread (66% to 17%) between supporters and opponents as the Japan Cabinet Office's poll had (80% to 10%). Thus, it was suggested that there might be a generational difference in issue positions on the death penalty.

The purpose of the present study

This study aims to explore how the Five Moral Foundations are related to issue positions among Japanese college students. Taking the death penalty as an example of a specific issue, this study examines how individual issue positions may be predicted by gender, age, political orientation, and moral foundations. In the present study, it was hypothesized that positions on the death penalty would be more closely related to moral foundations than to self-identified political orientation.

Method

Participants

Participants were 70 Japanese undergraduate students (19 male and 51 female) enrolled in an introductory psychology class at a private university in Tokyo. Their ages ranged from 20 to 23 with a mean of 21.2 years (*SD*=.65).

Measures

Moral foundations

A Japanese translation of the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ) was used for measuring five moral foundations. Graham et al. (2011) developed the MFQ in order to gauge individual differences in the range of concerns that people consider morally relevant. Specifically, it measures the degree to which individuals endorse each of five intuitive systems, *Harm*, *Fairness*, *Ingroup*, *Authority*, and *Purity*. The Japanese translation was hosted on the website MoralFoundations.org, run by Jonathan Haidt and his associates.

The MFQ is a 30-item measure which consists of two parts. The first part concerns moral relevance. Participants are asked to rate how relevant each of 15 concerns are to them when making moral judgments. Examples are: "Whether or not someone suffered emotionally" (*Harm*); "Whether or not some people were treated differently from others" (*Fairness*); "Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country" (*Ingroup*); "Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority" (*Authority*); and "Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency" (*Purity*). Participants rate each item on a 6-point Likert scale (1=not at all relevant, 6=extremely relevant). These "relevance" subscales aim to access explicit theories about what is morally relevant.

The second part concerns moral judgments. Participants are asked to rate to what degree they agree with each of 15 statements that embody or negate each foundation. Examples are: "Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue" (*Harm*); "When the government makes laws, the number-one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly" (*Fairness*); "I am proud of my country's history" (*Ingroup*); "Respect for authority is something all children need to learn" (*Authority*); and "People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed" (*Purity*). Participants rate each item on the same 6-point Likert scale. These "judgment" subscales take the form of normative declarations and assess actual use of moral foundations in judgment.

Political orientation

Past studies have shown that Japanese university students have limited knowledge about political ideology or the terms "conservatism" and "liberalism." Instead of asking respondent to place themselves on the political spectrum, participants were instead asked how they generally felt toward the LDP and JCP respectively on a 4-point Likert scale (1=not favorable, 4=favorable).

Issue positions on the death penalty

Participants were asked how strongly they supported or opposed the death penalty on a 4-point Likert scale (1=oppose, 4=support).

Procedure

Classrooms of students were asked to participate in a research study of college students' beliefs on morality. It was explained that participation was entirely voluntary; that all responses would remain anonymous; that the questionnaire would take the last 15 minutes of class time; that students who chose not to participate would leave class early without penalty, and that students who *did* choose to participate would not receive extra credit for it. The refusal rate was around 30%.

Results

Scale for Moral Foundations

Using the data from 70 respondents, exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine the factor structure of the MFQ's Japanese translation. The Questionnaire's 30 items were submitted to a principal factor analysis using a promax rotation. The scree plot indicated a five-factor solution. The factor solution explained 60.5% of the total variance. To be retained, an item had to present a factor loading of greater than .33 in only one factor; any items presenting factor loadings of above .33 in more than one factor or in no factors were discarded. The results indicated 16 items corresponding to five factors, each with 2 to 4 items.

The first factor was composed of 4 items: "It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself"; "If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty"; "Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society"; and "Whether or not someone's actions showed love for his or her country." These four items are a mixture of the *Ingroup* and *Authority* factors of the original MFQ's structure. These items reflect individuals' tendency to humbly self-efface and their unwillingness to stick out in their community, prioritizing the role assigned to them by the collective rather than their individual wishes for self-actualization. This factor was considered analogous to the original MFQ's *Ingroup* factor and will therefore also be referred to as *Ingroup*, for simplicity's sake.

The second factor was composed of 2 items: "Respect for authority is something all children need to learn"; and "Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority." This factor represents an individual's tendency to respect authority in hierarchical relationships. Both items are extracted directly from the original MFQ's *Authority* factor, and this factor will therefore also be referred to as *Authority*.

The third factor was composed of 3 items: "Whether or not someone acted unfairly"; "Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights"; and "Whether or not some people were treated differently from others." They all come from the original *Fairness* factor of the English-language MFQ, which will be referred to as the *Fairness* factor here, as well.

The fourth factor was composed of 4 items: "Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of"; "Men and women each have different roles to play in society"; "I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural"; and "Chastity is an important and valuable virtue." Of the four items, three came from the *Purity* factor of the original Questionnaire, and one from the *Authority* factor. These items represent an individual's belief in and acceptance of an inviolable, foreordained way of living. This factor is most analogous to the *Purity* factor of the original MFQ and will therefore be referred to hereafter as the *Purity* factor, again, for simplicity's sake.

The fifth factor was composed of 3 items: "Whether or not someone suffered emotionally"; "Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue"; and "Whether or not someone was cruel." All of these items came from the *Harm* factor of the original MFQ and so will be referred to as *Harm* here as well.

These factors accounted for 21.4%, 12.6%, 10.0%, 9.1%, and 7.4% of the total variance, respectively. The internal consistency alpha values of the 5 factors were: .69 for *Ingroup*; .64 for *Authority*; .56 for *Fairness*; .57 for *Purity*; and .59 for *Harm*. Reliability coefficients were acceptable considering the limited number of items

Table 1. Summary of Factor Loadings for the Japanese Translation of the Moral Foundations Questionnaire

Item	Factor Loading				
	1	2	3	4	5
Factor 1: *Ingroup* (α= . 69)					
It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself.	**.89**	−.12	−.24	−.16	.08
If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty.	**.64**	−.07	.20	.17	−.19
Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society.	**.47**	.27	.15	.08	.15
Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country.	**.40**	.19	−.09	−.01	.08
Factor 2: *Authority* (α= .64)					
Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.	−.09	**1.03**	−.02	−.18	.04
Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority.	.28	**.51**	.23	.14	−.18
Factor 3: *Fairness* (α= .56)					
Whether or not someone acted unfairly.	−.17	.20	**.71**	−.08	.08
Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights.	.01	−.06	**.52**	.03	.25
Whether or not some people were treated differently from others.	.30	−.28	**.38**	−.04	.11
Factor 4: *Purity* (α= .57)					
Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of.	−.08	.04	−.17	**.72**	.22
Men and women each have different roles to play in society.	−.04	−.10	.03	**.53**	−.16
I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural.	.05	−.15	.04	**.47**	.05
Chastity is an important and valuable virtue.	.12	.23	−.16	**.34**	−.05
Factor 5: *Harm* (α= .59)					
Whether or not someone suffered emotionally.	.02	−.04	.27	−.09	**.60**
Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue.	.27	.13	−.09	−.07	**.51**
Whether or not someone was cruel.	−.17	−.08	.33	.12	**.49**
Factor correlations					
Factor 1	--				
Factor 2	.28	--			
Factor 3	−.01	.04	--		
Factor 4	.42	.49	−.08	--	
Factor 5	.16	.17	−.12	.37	--

(2-4).

Table 2 presents means, standard deviations, and correlations between research variables. *Ingroup* was significantly and positively related to *Authority* (r=.35, p<.01) and *Purity* (r=.33, p<.01). *Purity* was also significantly and positively related to *Authority* (r=.32, p<.01). *Harm* and *Fairness* were significantly and positively related (r=.37, p<.01).

The mean of issue positions on death penalty was 2.91 (SD=.81). Specifically, 31.4% indicated "oppose" (3.0%) or "oppose if forced to choose"

Table 2.　Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations of Research Variables

	M	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Death Penalty	2.91	.81							
2. LDP	2.59	.58	－.04						
3. JCP	2.14	.67	－.09	－.11					
4. *Ingroup*	3.12	.76	－.03	.33**	.09				
5. *Authority*	3.22	1.05	－.01	.37**	.01	.35**			
6. *Fairness*	4.71	.66	.09	.05	－.25*	.05	.01		
7. *Purity*	3.51	.75	.20	.30*	－.01	.33**	.32**	－.11	
8. *Harm*	4.43	.82	.11	.08	.08	.16	.06	.37**	.20

Note：*N*=70. * *p*<.05. ***p*<.01

(28.4%) on retaining the death penalty, and 68.7% indicated “support” (25.4%) or “support if forced to choose” (43.3%). Issue positions on the death penalty did not have any significant relationship with gender, with any of the moral foundations, or with political orientation.

Favorable attitudes toward LDP (Japan’s Liberal Democratic Party) were related to *Ingroup* (*r*=.33, *p*<.01), *Authority* (*r*=.37, *p*<.01), and *Purity* (*r*=.30, *p*<.01). On the other hand, favorable attitudes toward JCP (the Japanese Communist Party) were negatively and significantly related to *Fairness* (*r*=-.25, *p*<.05).

Issue positions on the death penalty and the Five Moral Foundations.

Issue positions on the death penalty were regressed on age, gender (dummy-coded as 1=male and 2=female), political orientation, and all five moral foundation scores. As presented in Table 3, issue positions on the death penalty were positively and significantly related to concerns about *Purity* and *Harm*. Specifically, endorsement of *Purity* and *Harm* predicted support for the death penalty. *Purity* emerged as the foundation that best predicted favorable issue positions on the death penalty. Neither political orientation nor gender predicted issue positions on the death penalty.

Table 3. Regression Analysis Summary for Demographic and Moral Foundation Variables Predicting Issue positions on Death Penalty

Variable	*B*	*SEB*	*β*
Gender	－.10	.23	－.06
Age	.37	.17	.31*
LDP	－.27	.20	－.20
JCP	－.10	.15	－.09
Ingroup	－.06	.14	－.06
Authority	.00	.11	.00
Fairness	.34	.18	.26
Purity	.33	.14	.32*
Harm	.31	.15	.29*

Note：R^2 =.27 (*N*=70, *p*<.05)　* *p*<.05.

Discussion

The Japanese translation of the MFQ was factor-analyzed, and five moral foundations emerged from the Japanese sample. Although some factors in the Japanese scale did not necessarily retain the original factor structure, the extracted five factors were considered highly analogous to the Five Moral Foundations of the original MFQ.

Ingroup, *Authority*, and *Purity* were significantly and positively correlated with one another. *Harm* and *Fairness* were significantly and positively related. This pattern of intercorrelations among the Five Moral Foundations was consistent with Graham et al. (2011). In the present sample, 31.4% of this study's participants opposed the death penalty, 68.7% supported retaining the death penalty. The support rate was lower than the 2014 Cabinet Office survey. However, it was consistent with a study by Watamura et al. (2016), in which 66% of Japan's youth supported the death penalty.

More favorable attitudes toward LDP were related to stronger endorsement of *Ingroup*, *Authority*, and *Purity*. This was consistent with the Graham et al. (2009) study in which conservatives' stronger endorsement of these "binding foundations" constituted the most striking difference between conservatives and liberals.

On the other hand, more favorable attitudes toward JCP were negatively related to *Fairness*. This was *inconsistent* with Graham et al. (2009)'s study, in which liberals showed greater endorsement and use of *Harm* and *Fairness*. Haidt (2013) noted that there are two subtypes of distributive fairness, i.e., equality and proportionality. Liberals tend to prefer equality (everyone gets the same), whereas conservatives prefer proportionality or equity (everyone receives rewards in proportion to his or her individual inputs). It is possible that those participants who favored JCP interpreted *Fairness* as proportional fairness. This question should be investigated and clarified in future studies.

Issue positions on the death penalty and the Five Moral Foundations

Issue positions on the death penalty were positively and significantly related to *Purity* and *Harm*. Neither political orientation nor gender were useful predictors. This is generally consistent with Koleva et al. (2012), which demonstrated that endorsement of five moral foundations predicted political attitudes above and beyond demographic characteristics and political orientation. However, in Koleva et al.'s study, political ideology tended to explain the most variance for specific stands on the politically divisive issues. In this study, political orientation was not related to issue positions on the death penalty. This may be due to Japanese college students' limited knowledge of which issue positions are embraced by which parties, and more generally, where on the political spectrum they are considered to lie (Inamasu & Miura, 2015).

In this study, *Purity* and *Harm* were among the strongest predictors for issue positions on the death penalty. Stronger endorsements of *Purity* and *Harm* were related to pro-death-penalty views. This, too, was inconsistent with the results in Koleva et al. (2012), where *Harm* was the second strongest moral foundation factor for *disapproval* of the death penalty. In Koleva et al. (2012), the view that the death penalty was morally reprehensible appeared to be driven by *Harm*, suggesting that death-penalty opponents were focusing on the harm committed at the moment of execution (or the potential harm attendant to wrongful conviction) rather than the harm inflicted by the original crime. This is plausible, given that as 41% of those Americans who opposed capital punishment cited "it's wrong to take a life" and 11% cited "innocent persons may be wrongly convicted" as justifications.

In the present sample, in contrast, *Harm* was positively related to positions *favoring* the death penalty. This may be accounted for by the fact that the leading justification for the death penalty was "consideration for the feelings of victims and their families," which 53.4% of the supporters cited as one of their lead justifications. Thus, Japanese people who support the death penalty may be focusing on the original harm inflicted by the convict.

Furthermore, *Purity* was positively related to pro-death-penalty positions. Koleva et al. (2012) noted that *Purity* scores were most strongly associated with such issues as same-sex marriage, abortion, cloning, euthanasia, and stem-cell research. The present result is consistent with Koleva et al.'s study attesting to the role of *Purity* in many social controversies. This may be accounted for by the fact that the second leading justification for the death penalty was that murderers should atone by giving up their *own* lives. One can infer that, in the eyes of those respondents, "atonement by death" qualifies as purification of the original, unclean act.

In sum, the present study's finding that endorsements of the Five Moral Foundations predict specific issue positions was generally consistent with the findings of Koleva et al. (2012). It was thus suggested that moral intuition constituted psychological predispositions underlying specific attitudes toward controversial political issues and demonstrated the usefulness of Moral Foundations Theory as a lens for examining individual differences in political attitudes. That said, the present study's finding concerning the association of pro-death-penalty attitudes with *Harm* and *Purity* concerns was inconsistent with Koleva et al.'s finding. Thus, the critical moral intuitions that underlay favorable (or unfavorable) attitudes toward the death penalty were different between Japanese and Americans. Specifically, concerns about *Harm* predicted *opposition* to the death penalty in the US, whereas concerns about *Purity* and *Harm* predicted *support* in Japan.

There are clearly limitations to this study. The sample was small and restricted to university students, so the validity of its findings, especially in different age groups, is unknown. Subscales on the Japanese version of the MFQ were composed of only two to four items and therefore may have captured only a small amount of the foundations' scope. The equivalence of the Japanese scale to the original MFQ in terms of reliability, validity, and measurement should be explored in forthcoming studies. Finally, the present study was concerned with issue positions on the death penalty alone. Future studies should explore the relationship of the five moral concerns to other issue positions, such as global warming and same-sex marriage, which would shed more light on the psychological underpinnings of specific stands on controversial political issues among Japanese people.

References

Ellsworth, P. C., & Gross, S. R. (1994). Hardening of the attitudes: Americans' views on the death penalty. *Journal of Social Issues, 50 (2)*, 19-52.

Endo, M., & Jou, W. (2014). How Does Age Affect Perceptions of Parties' Ideological Locations? Japanese *Journal of Electoral Studies, 30 (1)*, 96-112.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., Koleva, S., Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Wojcik, S. P., & Ditto, P. H. (2013). Moral foundations theory: The pragmatic validity of moral pluralism. *Advances in experimental social psychology, 47*, 55-130.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 96 (5)*, 1029-1046. doi:10.1037/a0015141

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 101 (2)*, 366-385. doi:10.1037/a0021847

Gross, S. R. (1997). Update: American public opinion on the death penalty-It's getting personal. *Cornell L. Rev., 83*, 1448.

Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review, 108 (4)*, 814-834. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.108.4.814

Haidt, J. (2013). Of freedom and fairness. *Democracy: A Journal of Ideas, 28,* 38-50.

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

Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2004). Intuitive ethics: How innately prepared intuitions generate culturally variable virtues. *Daedalus, 133 (4),* 55-66.

Haidt, J., Koller, S. H., & Dias, M. G. (1993). Affect, culture, and morality, or is it wrong to eat your dog? *Journal of personality and social psychology, 65 (4),* 613.

Hunter, D., J. . (1991). *Culture wars: The struggle to define America*. New York: Basic Books.

Inamasu, K., & Miura, A. (2015). Verificaiton of "conservative swing of Japanesee university students" using online survey: What do the maintain? (「オンライン調査を用いた「大学生の保守化」の検証: 彼らは何を保守しているのか」『関西学院大学社会学部紀要』120, 53-63).

Jones, J. M. (2017, October 26). U.S. Death Penalty Support Lowest Since 1972. Retrieved from https://news.gallup.com/poll/221030/death-penalty-support-lowest-1972.aspx

Kahneman, D., & Egan, P. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow* (Vol. 1): Farrar, Straus & Giroux, New York.

河合幹雄・葛野尋之・木下麻奈子・平山真理・久保秀夫・木村正人, (2015),「刑罰とりわけ死刑に関する全国意識調査基本報告書: 2014 年 3 月調査」『桐蔭法学』22 (1), 1-65.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive–developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research (pp. 347–480). Chicago: Rand McNally. Kohlberg, day.

Koleva, S. P., Graham, J., Iyer, R., Ditto, P. H., & Haidt, J. (2012). Tracing the threads: How five moral concerns (especially Purity) help explain culture war attitudes. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46 (2),* 184-194.

Mercier, H., & Sperber, D. (2011). Why do humans reason? Arguments for an argumentative theory. *Behavioral and brain sciences, 34 (2),* 57-74.

Schaller, M., & Park, J. H. (2011). The behavioral immune system (and why it matters). *Current directions in psychological science, 20 (2),* 99-103.

Watamura, E., Saeki, M., Kiyomitsu, N., & Wakebe, T. (2016). How Is the Death Penalty System Seen by Young People in Japan?—An Analysis of a Survey of University Students. *Advances in Applied Sociology, 6 (02),* 29.

This work was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP15K0069, JP18K11966, JP18H00796, and by Seijo University TOKUBETSU KENKYU JOSEI.