Body Art, Deviance, and American College Students

by

Jerome R. Koch and Alden E. Roberts
Tech University

and

Myrna L. Armstrong and Donna C. Owen
Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center

Address all correspondence to:

Jerome R. Koch, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
Box 41012 Holden Hall 158
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX 79409
806 742-2401, ext. 232
jerome.koch@ttu.edu

Body Art, Deviance, and American College Students

This research examines the relationship between body art (tattoos and piercings) and deviance. With the increasing mainstream presence of visible tattoos and piercings among entertainers, athletes, and even in corporate boardrooms, we wonder the extent to which long-time enthusiasts and collectors regard the phenomenon as encroachment. We use sub-cultural identity theory to propose that individuals with increasing evidence of body art procurement will also report higher levels of deviant behavior in order to maintain and/or increase social distance from the mainstream. We tested this proposition by surveying 1753 American college students, asking them to report their level of body art acquisition and their history of deviance. Results indicate that respondents with four or more tattoos, seven or more body piercings, or piercings located in their nipples or genitals, were substantively and significantly more likely to report regular marijuana use, occasional use of other illegal drugs, and a history of being arrested for a crime. Less pronounced, but still significant in many cases, was an increased propensity for those with higher incidence of body art to cheat on college work, binge drink, and report having had multiple sex partners in the course of their lifetime.

Introduction

Individuals who take an interest in, and subsequently obtain, tattoos and body piercings are now seemingly part of mainstream American society. Once regarded as stigmatized members of marginalized or deviant subcultures, individuals with tattoos are now commonly found among professional women, college students, professional athletes, and actors (Armstrong, 1991; Drews, Allison, and Probst, 2000; Koch, Roberts, Armstrong, and Owen, 2005). Tattoos also adorn characters used in marketing to advertise, among other things, credit cards, sports cars, CDs, and cell phones (Atkinson, 2003).

"Old-School" tattoo artists, as well as long-time collectors and enthusiasts, have expressed dismay and disgust at the emergence of such "posers" regarding them as late to the game and playing it casually. A 34 year old male interviewee in Atkinson's (2003, p. 102) monograph put it this way:

> I was walking down the street the other day and I saw this kid get out of a brand new Honda, and he had Harley-Davidson tattoos all over his arms. I mean, c'mon man, I drive a Harley and hang out with guys who take that seriously. This little puke probably lives ... with mom and dad, and he's trying to act like a hardcore rebel. It makes me sick. ... If you're gonna get tattooed, don't take someone else's property.

Similar sentiments were expressed by one of DeMello's tattoo artist respondents (2000, p. 184). He took specific aim at the emerging corporatization of body art exemplified by a new wave of practitioners as well as their mainstream consumers:

> What really gets me though, is that with the influx of capital, the "best and brightest" of the bourgeois art mentality are being attracted to the field. I mean these f***ing kids who presume themselves artists spout service industry maxims straight out of the K-Mart

> management manual as if they were some kind of substitute for a personal philosophy. And it just makes it harder for those of us who don't want to do the kind of bowing and scraping the yuppie clientele expect. They ... want you ... to listen to their pathetic, prudish body-image hangups, but at the end you're supposed to hand them some kind of certificate that certifies them as cool enough to sit at after hours be-bop jam sessions.

It appears the old-school types want to remain distinct; their tattoos are, for them, signs of separation from the mainstream. They militantly differentiate themselves from those who take their body art into the boardrooms, classrooms, and sports arenas of Middle America.

This paper examines the relationship between body art involvement and deviance. Previous research is somewhat paradoxical on this question. On one hand, there seems to be a significant correlation between body art and deviant behavior. Tattooed individuals are, in general, somewhat more likely to abuse alcohol, use illegal drugs, be arrested more often, have more sex partners, and engage in unprotected sexual intercourse with strangers than are those without a tattoo (Greif, Hewitt, and Armstrong, 1999; Drews, Allison, and Probst, 2000; Burger and Finkel, 2002). On the other hand, college students especially seem not to perceive themselves or others as deviant solely because they have tattoos or piercings, nor does being actively religious make one less likely to be interested in or procure body art (Koch, Roberts, Armstrong, and Owen, 2004a; 2004b; 2005; 2007).

All respondents in this study are students at American colleges and universities. We recognize the risk that our respondent pool may be classified as overly homogeneous and reflecting middle-class norms and values (Ehrenreich, 1989). However, DeMello (2000) notes that class systems within the tattoo community oppose the conventional mainstream. She writes

(p. 7):

> I am ... interested in tracing a broad set of ideas held by one class group about another, and in particular, how middle class ideas about the working class and about itself help to define contemporary tattooing for *all* participants.

Even within the seemingly normative boundaries of American college culture, there is perhaps a threshold of body art activity which takes individuals outside the mainstream, creating and maintaining an identity reinforced by social deviance. A single dolphin or rose on one's ankle is seemingly benign, and not especially rebellious compared to multiple tattoos, fully tattooed arm "sleeves," or intimate piercings of the nipples or genitals. While old-school enthusiasts may scoff at the dolphin and rose crowd, they may also seek to maintain an identity as part of a rebellious subculture through concomitant deviant behavior which separates them from the posers.

This research explored the relationship between ever-increasing levels of body art involvement and social deviance. We examined the reported incidence of college cheating, binge drinking, and having multiple sex partners, as well as marijuana use, other illegal drug use, and arrest histories. These were compared across groups of individuals with escalating numbers of body piercings, tattoos, and also those with nipple and genital piercings. We expected escalating body art involvement to be positively related to an overall higher incidence of social deviance.

Sub-cultural Identity Theory, Deviance, and Body Art

Theoretical models and empirical research have demonstrated the influence of social group dynamics to explain the emergence and persistence of deviant as well as normative behavior. Sutherland (1947) advanced earlier structural theories of deviance with his model of

differential association. Merton and Rossi (1968) offered similar insights in their discussion of reference groups.

Peter Berger (1967) applied the same logic to the experience of religious groupings, which he argued are essentially sub-cultures expressing and experiencing their religiosity together under what he termed a "sacred canopy". Smith (1998) refined this conceptualization with his application of sub-cultural identity theory to a discussion of internal solidarity among the highly religious. Smith studied the ties that bind evangelicals together, often in opposition to their larger social world. Moreover, these deeply religious "in-groups" in fact needed "out-groups" to maintain a sense of distinctiveness and moral strength by negotiating a collective identity. Wellman (1999, p. 187) summarizes the impact of sub-cultures on religious behavior this way:

> (S)ub-cultural identity theory predicts that for groups to thrive in a pluralist and open religious market they need to be in tension with, though not separate from, the common cultural milieu. Moreover, there is a need to create out-groups against which group and religious identity is further solidified. This construction of enemies, imaginary or real ... is integral to group solidarity.

The word "religious" in the above quote is, theoretically, interchangeable with any number of characteristic descriptions of virtually any social group whose members are bound together by ideology and behavior.

Subsequent applications of sub-cultural identity theory have sought to understand and explain a wide variety of social behaviors and the conditions that underlie their motivations.

Beezer (1992, p. 114) proposed that sub-cultures form to provide individuals "a sense of community in a society fragmented by divisions of class, race, and gender." An extreme example of such a dynamic occurs among prison inmates. One or more tattoos may reveal part of a life-story or criminal history. The sub-cultural identity signified by inmates' body art may even protect them from being harmed or killed while isolated from mainstream society (DeMello, 1993; Rozycki, 2007).

This theoretical model has also been used to understand and explain several other types of distinctive group behavior that occurs within, but also at the fringe, of normative culture. For example, Wheaton (2000) examined the collective identity of wind-surfers, showing that the practice itself symbolized the parallel adoption of a distinctive lifestyle. Those who fully engaged the sport also exhibited the trappings of that lifestyle through purchasing specialized equipment and conspicuous clothing as well as developing skills necessary to take more risks while wind-surfing. Their goal is to be conferred the status of "hardcore" by the gatekeepers to the sub-culture.

Futrell, Simi, and Gottschalk (2006) demonstrate similar dynamics among members of the White Power Movement. Music germane to their belief system is the mechanism by which group members are defined and conform to in-group norms. Using this musical genre as a social identifier, the "White Power Music Scene" is very much akin to a social movement in opposition to the mainstream. Members also typically showcase extreme body art, utilizing vivid and highly visible symbols of racial and ethnic hate. Circuit riding from concert to concert showcases their membership in the sub-culture.

Clark (2004) presented a case study of a sub-culture that sets itself apart through a radical

interpretation of the meaning of food. "Punk cuisine," and the people who consume food in this way, regard cooking as a subjugation to corporate culture and white male supremacy. Constituents of this sub-culture stand in opposition to the mainstream by consuming raw and/or rotting food. Garish body piercing and tattoos are also common identifiers and symbols of in-group solidarity among this punk sub-subculture.

Paradoxically, an emerging body of research applies the logic of sub-cultural identity to studying a network of body art and music afficionados known as "straight-edge." These are individuals - now largely "grouped" on the internet - who resist deviant sub-cultural norms, subscribing rather to behavior characterized by a mantra of "I don't smoke; I don't drink; I don't f***." Many are also vegetarians and fitness enthusiasts (Copes and Williams, 2007; Williams and Copes, 2005; Williams, 2006; and Wood, 2003)

Underlying the logic of these studies is the common theme that sub-cultures stand within, but are distinctively different from, mainstream society. The question that members of these groups must continually answer is, "How do we maintain our distinctiveness?" This research examines that question in light of a shift in body art behavior toward the mainstream with regard to the meaning of tattoos and body piercings. The behavioral and ideological milieu of old-school tattooists and artists has been invaded by the rose and dolphin crowd. Just having a tattoo is no longer sufficient for admission to the body art sub-cultural and or to make a "legitimate" claim on out-group status. Moreover, the industry itself is becoming a big-business (DeMello, 2000). The logic of Gibson's (2003) analysis of popular music production also suggests that body art is becoming a "cultural industry." Moreover, tattoo and the images themselves are increasingly becoming part of mainstream art (Kosut, 2006).

We propose that tattoo collectors, artists, and piercers must not only increase the number of tattoos and piercings they have in order to maintain a distinctive sub-cultural identity, they are also more likely to solidify their out-group status with higher levels of other anti-social behavior. We seek to explicate that proposition by examining the correlation. between escalating levels of body art and deviance in our college student sample. We hypothesize that individuals with higher numbers of tattoos and piercings, as well as those with nipple and/or genital piercings, will also report higher levels of deviant behavior, thus further setting themselves apart with a more distinctive sub-cultural identity.

Methods

This research differentiates and measures the relationships between escalating levels of body art and social deviance. Deviance was measured here in terms of behavior that is legal, but contrary to social norms, as well as behavior that is overtly illegal. Escalating levels of body art are measured in terms of increasing numbers of general piercings and tattoos as well as with a separate category of respondents who have nipple or genital (intimate) piercings. In this study, earlobe piercings for all respondents were counted only if the openings were gauged, that is, widened beyond the diameter of a typical needle or post. Piercings of the ear cartilage were counted.

Sample

Data for this study were gathered from four convenience samples of undergraduates. Data collection began in the Fall of 2005 and was completed a year later. Respondents for two of the samples were recruited from state-supported public schools. Each school had an undergraduate enrollment of about 30,000. Two came from prominent and highly selective

religious schools with enrollments of 8,500 and 14,000 respectively. Each religious school is also geographically proximal to one of the state schools. While the total respondent pool is not a national probability study, the research design is an effort to create a sample with significant similarities and congruent differences to give a reasonable cross-section of full-time American college students.

Respondents were recruited from groups of undergraduate students enrolled in lower-level sociology classes. After obtaining institutional IRB approval at all study sites and signed consent from all respondents, a total of 1753 individual surveys were returned to us out of a total class enrollment of 2832. Our response rate was sixty-two percent. Seventy-eight percent of all respondents were aged 18-20; sixty percent were female; seventy-nine percent were Euro-American.

Variables

The independent variables in this study were indicators of increasing affinity for body piercings and tattoos. The first of these measures was incidence of general body piercings. Response categories were: (1) No lifetime piercings; (2) 1-3 lifetime piercings; (3) 4-6 piercings; (4) 7 or more lifetime piercings. The second independent variable measured incidence of tattoos. Response categories were: (1) No tattoos; (2) 1 tattoo; (3) 2-3 tattoos; (4) 4 or more tattoos. The final independent variable measures incidence of intimate piercings. Respondents with piercings were asked if one or more of them were located in their nipple(s) or genital area of their bodies. Response categories were: (1) No; (2) Yes.

The dependent variables in this study are escalating indicators of essentially legal, and then illegal social deviance. Indicators of legal deviance included, first, cheating on college

work. The question was: "About how often would you say you cheat on your college work?" Response categories re-coded for the analysis were: (1) Once a year or never; (2) Once a semester or more.

The second indicator of legal deviance was respondents' number of sex partners. The question was: "Approximately how many sex partners have you had in the last year?" Responses were re-coded for analysis in two ways. First (1) 2 or less; (2) 3 or more. Second (1) 8 or less; (2) 9 or more. Respondents who indicated they never had sexual intercourse were excluded here.

The third indicator of legal deviance was binge drinking. While we are aware that many of our respondents who indicated they did this were underage, alcohol consumption is legal in and of itself as well as quite common among college students. Thus, for comparative purposes, we categorize this as essentially legal, but deviant behavior. The question was: "In the past week, have you consumed five or more alcoholic drinks on one occasion?" Response categories were (1) No; (2) Yes.

The first indicator of illegal deviance involved marijuana use. Respondents were asked, "How often do you use cannabis (marijuana) each month?" Responses were re-coded for analysis as (1) Never; (2) Once or More.

The second indicator of illegal deviance involved answers to this question: "How often do you use any illegal drug other than marijuana each month?" Responses were similarly re-coded for analysis as: (1) Never; (2) Once or More.

Finally, respondents were asked about their arrest histories: "How many times have you been arrested for something other than a routine traffic violation?" Responses were re-coded for analysis as: (1) Never; (2) Once or more.

Analyses

Percentages of respondents reporting deviant behavior were compared across categories of those with escalating levels of body art. The first of these comparisons was drawn from those with body piercings but not in intimate areas. This was regarded as the lowest level of body art intensity because jewelry can be removed and the piercing will typically close. In that sense, it is a largely temporary commitment to, or perhaps an experiment with, the body art lifestyle.

The second wave of comparisons involved those with escalating numbers of tattoos. These are permanent body modifications and indicate a more dramatic commitment to a sub-cultural identity. Finally, deviance levels among those with nipple or genital piercings were compared to those with piercings in other areas of the body. We regarded this practice as the most extreme form of body modification in the sample; it was also the group with the smallest number of respondents relative to the comparison categories. These comparative percentages were tested for statistical significance using Pearson's Chi-Square.

Results

Table 1 compares deviant behavior among respondents with escalating numbers of body piercings. There are no statistically significant differences between those who are pierced or not, or among those with any escalating number of piercings, with respect to any measure of legal deviance. However, individuals reporting seven or more piercings were about twice as likely as those with no piercings to use marijuana monthly, report other illegal drug use, or to have been arrested for something other than a traffic violation. The level of statistical significance for these comparisons was strongest for marijuana users ($p < .001$).

(Table 1 about here)

Table 2 compares deviant behavior among respondents with escalating numbers of tattoos. Those with four or more tattoos were roughly two to nearly ten times more likely to report deviant behavior than are those with no tattoos. The only difference in behavior between the heavily tattooed and others that was not statistically significant was cheating on college work. Highest levels of statistical significance ($p < .001$) were seen with respect to multiple sex partners (9 or more), monthly marijuana use, and arrest histories.

(Table 2 about here)

Table 3 compares deviant behavior among pierced respondents with and without intimate piercings. Those with intimate piercings are two to nearly four times more likely to report deviant behavior than are those without intimate piercings. The only difference in behavior that was not statistically significant was binge drinking. Highest levels of statistical significance ($p < .001$) were seen with respect to multiple sex partners (3 or more), monthly marijuana use, other illegal drug use, and arrest histories.

(Table 3 about here)

Discussion

This research adds insight to three bodies of literature. First, it further documents the prevalence of body art in mainstream society. The sample is comprised of young adults who are at the age of decision-making. They are also reasonably successful in that they have acquired the necessary skills and credentials to be attending either a major state university or a highly selective - and expensive - religious college. Even so, 37% of all respondents were pierced, 14% were tattooed, and a noticeable few (4%) had seven or more piercings, four or more tattoos, and/or an intimate piercing. While not terribly common in this sample, even extreme body art

seems to be visibly present in the mainstream college and university scene.

Second, this research further specifies the nature of the relationship between body art and deviance. As noted above, this significant correlation has been documented (Greif, Hewitt, and Armstrong, 1999; Drews, Allison, and Probst, 2000; Burger and Finkel, 2002). However, this study reports stark differences in the levels of deviant behavior among those with just one tattoo versus those with four or more, and among those with just one to three piercing versus those with seven or more. Respondents with intimate piercings reported deviance levels similar to the heavily tattooed. The level of deviance reported by respondents with low levels of body art is much closer to those with none than to those with multiple tattoos and piercings, or intimate piercings.

Third, this work points to an emerging body of research which indicates that acquiring distinctive body art may mark a desire for individual uniqueness (Tiggemann and Golden, 2006; Wohlrab, Stahl, and Kappeler, 2007). While seemingly common in the larger culture, individuals seek to acquire body art to express their need for uniqueness, even if that is simply a tattoo that differs in appearance from those of others. Claiming membership in a sub-culture is a constant struggle to differentiate oneself from the mainstream. When the sub-culture is encroached upon from the outside, insiders may need to modify or extend their behavior to maintain social distance - uniqueness. Escalating levels of body art acquisition and social deviance seem to be concurrent phenomena. Engaging in higher levels of deviance seems to be a strategy for defining the boundaries of sub-cultural identity. This supports DeMello's (2000) assertion that conventions of social class do not define the contemporary tattoo community.

This research is limited in both scope and interpretation. It is a cross-sectional study of

essentially four convenience samples. Thus, we infer no findings to any other setting or context. We also only have a comparatively small number of respondents that are seemingly strong body art afficionados. Even so, we document the presence of these individuals within an otherwise largely normative context of well-socialized college students. Their behavior does seem categorically different, and decidedly more deviant, than their contemporaries who are less heavily adorned with piercings or tattoos. While correlation is not causation, further research may more fully ascertain whether individuals of this type constitute a bone-fide sub-culture distinguished by high levels of body art and concurrent and/or escalating levels of social deviance. Our survey analysis opens the way for further investigation - perhaps through the conducting of interviews and engaging in participant-observation - of the specific attitudes and behavioral correlates of the hard-core collectors of tattoos and piercings. Armstrong, Caliendo, and Roberts (2006) study of a specific respondent pool of those with genital piercings represents research that adds scope and precision to the detailed ethnographies of DeMello (2000) and Atkinson (2003). We offer this work as an addition to, and a basis for, more work of this type.

References

Armstrong, M.L. (1991) Career-oriented women with tattoos. *Image, 23, 215-220.*

Armstrong, M.L., Caliendo, C., & Roberts, A.E. (2006) Genital piercings: What is known and what people with genital piercings tell us. *Urologic Nursing, 26, 173-180.*

Atkinson, M. (2003) *Tattooed: The Sociogenesis of a Body Art*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Beezer, A. (1992) Dick Hebdige, subculture: The meaning of style. Pp. 101-117 in *Readings into cultural studies,* edited by M. Barker and A. Beezer. London and New York: Routledge.

Berger, P. (1967) *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. New York: Doubleday.

Burger, T. D., & Finkel, D. (2002) Relationships between body modifications and very high-risk behaviors in a college population. *College Student Journal, 36, 203-213.*

Clark, D. (2004) The Raw and the Rotten: Punk Cuisine. *Ethnology, 43, 19-31*.

Copes, H. & Williams, J.P. (2007) Techniques Of Affirmation: Deviant Behavior, Moral Commitment, And Resistant Subcultural Identity. *Deviant Behavior, 28, 247-272.*

DeMello, M. (1993) The Convict Body: Tattooing Among Male American Prisoners. *Anthropology Today, 9, 10-13.*

DeMello, M. (2000) *Bodies of Inscription: A cultural history of the modern tattoo community.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Drews, D. R., Allison, C.K., & Probst, J.R.. (2000) Behavioral and self-concept differences in tattooed and nontattooed college students. *Psychological Reports, 86, 475-481*.

Ehrenreich, Barbara. 1989. *Fear of Falling: The Inner Life of the Middle Class*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Futrell, R., Simi, P., & Gottschalk, S. (2006) Understanding Music in Movements: The White Power Music Scene. *The Sociological Quarterly, 47, 275-304*.

Gibson, C. (2003) Cultures ad work: why 'culture' matters to research on the 'cultural' industries. *Social and Cultural Geography, 4, 201-215.*

Greif, J., Hewitt, W., & Armstrong, M. L. (1999) Tattooing and body piercing: Body art practices among college students. *Clinical Nursing Research, 8, 368-385*.

Koch, J.R., Roberts, A.E., Armstrong, M.L., & Owen, D.C. (2004a) Religious Belief and Practice in Attitudes Toward Individuals With Body Piercing. *Psychological Reports, 95, 583-586.*

Koch, J.R., Roberts, A.E., Armstrong, M.L., & Owen, D.C. (2004b) Correlations of religious belief and practice on college students' tattoo-related behavior. *Psychological Reports, 94, 425-430.*

Koch, J.R., Roberts, A.E., Armstrong, M.L., & Owen, D.C. (2005) College Students, Tattoos, and Sexual Activity. *Psychological Reports, 97, 887-890.*

Koch, J.R., Roberts, A.E., Armstrong, M.L., & Owen, D.C. (2007) Frequencies and relations of body piercing and sexual activity in college students. *Psychological Reports, 101, 159-162*.

Kosut, M. (2006). Mad artists and tattooed perverts: deviant discourse and the social construction of cultural categories. *Deviant Behavior, 27, 73-95*.

Merton R.K., & Rossi, A. (1968) Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior. Pp. 279-334 in *Social Theory and Social Structure*, edited by Robert K. Merton. New York: Free Press.

Rozycki, A. (2007) Prison Tattoos as a Reflection of the Criminal Lifestyle and Predictor of Recidivism. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Psychology, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX.

Smith, C. (1998) *American Evangelicalism: Embattled and Thriving*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sutherland, E. (1947) *Principles of Criminology* (4th Edition). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.

Tiggemann, M., & Golden, F. (2006) Tattooing: An expression of uniqueness in the appearance domain. *Body Image, 3, 309-315*.

Wellman, J.K. (1999) The Debate over Homosexual Ordination: Subcultural Identity Theory in American Religious Organizations. *Review of Religious Research, 41, 184-206*.

Wheaton, B. (2000) 'Just Do It': Consumption, Commitment, and Identity in the Windsurfing Subculture. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 17, 254-274*.

Williams, J.P., & Copes, H. (2005) How Edge are You? Constructing Authentic Identities and Subcultural Boundaries in a Straightedge Internet Forum. *Symbolic Interaction, 28, 67-89.*

Williams, J.P. (2006) Authentic Identities: Straightedge Subculture, Music, and the Internet. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 35, 173-200.*

Wohlrab, S., Stahl, J., & Kappeler, P.M. (2007) Modifying the Body: Motivations for getting tattooed and pierced. *Body Image, 4, 87-95*.

Wood, R.T. (2003) The Straightedge Youth Subculture: Observations on the Complexity of Subcultural Identity. *Journal of Youth Studies, 6, 33-52*.

Table 1: Lifetime Piercings and Deviance: Comparative Percentages and Chi-Square Analysis.

Variable	No Piercings	1-3 Piercings	4-6 Piercings	7 + Piercings	Sig.*
Cheat on College Work					
Once/year or less	81.0 (n=871)	82.5 (n=421)	79.8 (n=75)	85.7 (n=42)	
Once/semester or more	19.0 (n=204)	17.5 (n= 89)	20.2 (n=19)	14.3 (n= 7)	n.s.
Sex Partners in Past Year					
2 or less	77.5 (n=402)	77.7 (n=275)	78.1 (n=57)	72.7 (n= 24)	
3 or more	22.5 (n=117)	22.3 (n= 79)	21.9 (n=16)	27.3 (n= 9)	n.s
8 or less	90.2 (n=467)	85.6 (n=302)	86.3 (n=63)	81.8 (n= 27)	
9 or more	9.8 (n= 51)	14.4 (n= 51)	13.7 (n=10)	18.2 (n= 6)	n.s
Binge Drinking in Last Week					
No	63.3 (n=662)	60.6 (n=297)	69.2 (n=63)	54.2 (n=26)	
Yes	36.7 (n=522)	39.4 (n=193)	30.8 (n=28)	45.8 (n=22)	n.s
Monthly Marijuana Use					
Never	87.7 (n=948)	82.1 (n=418)	74.5 (n=70)	73.5 (n=36)	
Once or More	12.3 (n=133)	17.9 (n= 91)	25.5 (n=24)	26.5(n= 13)	$p < .001$
Other Illegal Drug Use					
Never	96.0 (n=1035)	93.3 (n=473)	95.7 (n=89)	89.8 (n=44)	
Once or More	4.0 (n= 43)	6.7 (n= 34)	4.3 (n= 4)	10.2 (n= 5)	$p < .05$
Arrest other than Traffic					
Never	91.3 (n=989)	87.8 (n=448)	85.1 (n=80)	85.7 (n=42)	
Once or More	8.7 (n= 94)	12.2 (n= 62)	14.9 (n=14)	14.3 (n= 7)	$p < .05$

* Chi-square analysis tests the significance of the difference in deviance levels between groups with and without body piercings. For example above, the percentage difference on "Cheat on College Work," "Sex Partners in Past Year," and "Binge Drinking in Last Week" between those pierced vs. those not, are not statistically significant. Those differences in deviance between the pierced and non-pierced with reference to drug use and arrest histories are statistically significant at the levels noted.

Table 2: Tattoos and Deviance: Comparative Percentages and Chi-Square Analysis.

Variable	No Tattoos	1 Tattoo	2-3 Tattoos	4 + Tattoos	Sig.*
Cheat on College Work					
Once/year or less	81.6 (n=1217)	82.0 (n=123)	83.1 (n= 59)	76.5 (n=13)	
Once/semester or more	18.4 (n= 275)	18.0 (n= 27)	16.9 (n= 12)	23.5 (n= 4)	n.s.
Sex Partners in Past Year					
2 or less	79.9 (n=620)	69.4 (n=86)	64.6 (n= 42)	64.3 (n= 9)	
3 or more	20.1 (n=156)	30.6 (n=38)	35.4 (n= 23)	35.7 (n= 5)	$p < .01$
8 or less	91.2 (n=705)	80.8 (n=101)	69.2 (n= 45)	57.1 (n= 8)	
9 or more	8.8 (n= 68)	19.2 (n= 24)	30.8 (n= 20)	42.9 (n= 6)	$p < .001$
Binge Drinking in Last Week					
No	63.9 (n=925)	52.4 (n=76)	55.1 (n= 38)	71.4 (n=10)	
Yes	36.1 (n=522)	47.6 (n=69)	44.9 (n= 31)	28.6 (n= 4)	$p < .01$
Monthly Marijuana Use					
Never	87.3 (n=1308)	70.7 (n=106)	66.2 (n=47)	75.0 (n=12)	
Once or More	12.7 (n= 190)	29.3 (n= 44)	33.8 (n=24)	25.0 (n= 4)	$p < .001$
Other Illegal Drug Use					
Never	95.6 (n=1428)	90.7 (n=136)	91.5 (n=65)	93.3 (n=14)	
Once or More	4.4 (n= 65)	9.3 (n= 14)	8.5 (n= 6)	6.7 (n= 1)	$p < .05$
Arrest other than Traffic					
Never	91.5 (n=1373)	81.3 (n=122)	87.3 (n=62)	29.4 (n= 5)	
Once or More	8.5 (n= 127)	18.7 (n= 28)	12.7 (n= 9)	70.6 (n=12)	$p < .001$

* Chi-square analysis tests the significance of the difference in deviance levels between groups with escalating numbers of tattoos. For example above, the percentage difference on "Cheat on College Work" (Once/year or less vs. Once/semester or more) between those with no tattoos vs. those with 1, 2-3, and 4+ is not statistically significant. Those differences in deviance across the body art groups with reference to other behaviors are statistically significant at the levels noted.

Table 3: Intimate Piercings and Deviance: Comparative Percentages and Chi-Square Analysis.

Variable	Pierced but Not Intimate	1 or More Intimate Piercings	Sig.*
Cheat on College Work			
Once/year or less	82.9 (n=480)	63.6 (n= 21)	
Once/semester or more	17.1 (n= 99)	36.4 (n= 12)	p < .05
Sex Partners in Past Year			
2 or less	79.0 (n=319)	50.0 (n= 15)	
3 or more	21.0 (n= 85)	50.0 (n= 15)	p < .001
8 or less	86.6 (n=349)	70.0 (n= 21)	
9 or more	13.4 (n= 54)	30.0 (n= 9)	p < .05
Binge Drinking in Last Week			
No	60.8 (n=340)	50.0 (n=15)	
Yes	39.2 (n=219)	50.0 (n=15)	n.s
Monthly Marijuana Use			
Never	81.0 (n=469)	53.1 (n= 17)	
Once or More	19.0 (n=110)	46.9 (n= 15)	p < .001
Other Illegal Drug Use			
Never	94.1 (n=543)	75.9 (n= 22)	
Once or More	5.9 (n= 34)	24.1 (n= 7)	p < .001
Arrest other than Traffic			
Never	88.1 (n=510)	60.6 (n= 20)	
Once or More	11.9 (n= 69)	39.4 (n= 13)	p < .001

* Chi-square analysis tests the significance of the difference in deviance levels between groups with and without intimate piercings. For example above, the percentage difference on "Binge Drinking in Last Week" (No vs. Yes) between those who are pierced but not intimate vs. those with intimate piercings is not statistically significant. Those differences in deviance across the body art groups with reference to other behaviors are statistically significant at the levels noted.