# Updated coding for Wisdom Summit + Lay sample

## General rules

- none of the categories are exclusive: just because a person got a score on one dimension does *not* mean they cannot also receive a score on another dimension

- most codes are 0 (not present) vs. 1 (present) unless specified otherwise; empty cells indicate there was no response to code. If there is a response to code, it should have a value!

- though codes are for specific categories (e.g., morality, common wisdom model, culture), open-ended responses for other categories can include some information (e.g., a person may talk about culture in the morality section and vice versa), which may be instrumental to consult when forming a judgment.

- please ensure *not to look at participants’ credentials, background,* other info from a given person, to avoid bias.

## Morality & wisdom

* Always start with the open-ended response, NOT with analogies! Analogies are just helpful notes to get extra inspiration/clarification. Analogies can only be used for scoring on their own if they provide an *explanation* in response to the analogies within the column.
* Consider forced-choice responses and analogies in conjunction with open-ended responses to get a richer understanding.
* Focus on analogies AND the relationship of wisdom to morality questions – both categories to be considered for coding
* In the case where the participants’ responses to *analogies* do not provide enough detail to clearly understand the exact meaning of analogies, and they do not provide further response in open-ended columns, leave blank (not zero). In particular, analogies without extra information in other columns representing open-ended and forced-choice responses may not provide sufficient insight about probabilistic, deterministic, process, universal, and construct dimensions.
* DIMENSIONS
  + (IMW) Independent: Morality and wisdom are not related to each other. One could be wise but immoral, AND moral but unwise. This exclusivity is bi-directional.
  + (FRMW) Functional relationship: morals=> wisdom. Morals is in service of wisdom. Morals is the driver that leads to outcome (Wisdom).
  + (FRWM) Functional relationship: wisdom=> morality. Wisdom is in service of morality. Wisdom is the driver that leads to outcome (Morality).
  + (FRJF) Functional relationship where both morality and wisdom serve a *joint function*: they can be independent from each other, but they both contribute towards a specific life goal (e.g., common good).
  + (TRMW) Taxonomic relationship: morality is part of wisdom.
  + (TRWM) Taxonomic relationship: wisdom is part of morality.
  + (TRHOC) Taxonomic relationship: wisdom and morality are branches of a higher order category (e.g., breaststroke and butterfly are both swimming styles). This code applies even if the person initially says that there is no (functional) relationship between wisdom and morality.
  + (PR) Probabilistic relationship: X can guide / often guides Y (with X and Y being either morality or wisdom). In other words: if you have X, you will have higher chance of having Y because X can guide/often guides Y. But it’s not a given. For example, if the person states that X *fosters* or *motivates* Y, there may be a higher chance that Y will occur, even though it is not an absolute certainty.
  + (DR) Deterministic relationship: X requires/ought to promote Y (with X and Y being either morality or wisdom) or X is sufficient for Y and when X is present, Y will (always) follow.
  + (FM) (1) Fixed/ Universal versus (2) malleable/ context-dependent relationship/association (0 = not applicable). This also applies to individual features. If *both* morality and wisdom are viewed as universal/fixed, their relationship by default will also be fixed (i.e., coded as 1). If one of the two features is context-dependent, it will be by definition a malleable/context-dependent relationship as well (i.e., coded as 2). If participants refer to malleability/evolution of relationship of morality and wisdom, it would be a 2. If participants state that morality and wisdom are unrelated, it will be coded as 0. Check forced-choice responses to see if participants mention them not to be related (in which case participants will not select any forced choice response son the prior question).
  + PROCESS-MECH Theme: Wisdom as a *process* allowing moral action/outcome (even if not always). In other words, wisdom is *a tool or a mechanism* that allows us to achieve moral outcome/action. It is not about lifelong journey of life experiences leading to later-life development of moral character.
  + PROCESS-LIFE Theme: Wisdom as a *life-long/experiential* *process* (of accumulating life experiences), which consequently contribute to cultivation of moral character (e.g., compassion, humility). It is not about situation-specific decisions concerning moral action.
  + CONSTRUCT Theme: Constructivism – morals as a set of culturally-bounded rules/norms and wisdom as discerning how/when to apply them and/or to implement these rules/norms.
  + (IMW) Independent: Morality and wisdom are not related to each other. One could be wise but immoral, AND moral but unwise. This exclusivity is bi-directional.

## Moral intention vs. action and wisdom

The question is: To what extent do psychological characteristics of wisdom depend on either moral intentions or actions? By intentions we mean desires and beliefs that behavior will lead to moral outcomes. By actions we mean behaviors undertaken to effect/achieve/obtain outcomes.

We will code responses on three dimensions:

* Intention: wisdom depends on moral intentions
* Action: wisdom depends on moral action
* MDW: morality depends on wisdom (reverse path)

## Culture & wisdom

* Culture include mentioning of religion.
* If participants mention morality in the culture question, consider examining the open-ended response for the morality & wisdom section to get a better picture whether they mean culture when they talk about morality.
* DIMENSIONS
  + (AR) Absolute relativism – definition of what is wisdom as culture-dependent, can only be understood through the eyes/experiences of the insider (emic).
  + (U) Universalism - Same set of mental processes, just the expression/manifestation varies (e.g., due to different emphasis in socialization), outsider viewpoint on the relationship of culture and wisdom. Culture is a moderator of expression (etic).
  + (MBR) Morally-bounded relativism: Wisdom has both universal and culture-specific components. In particular, moral features of wisdom are culture-bound. Only give it a 1 *if* there are instances of relativism with respect to morality **BUT ALSO** the person is mentioning other (non-moral) features of wisdom being universal.
  + (CCOMPETENCE) Wisdom as a cultural competence.

Clarifications

For this survey, **Absolute Relativism** and **Universalism** are positions concerning the influence of culture in the descriptions of Wisdom.

* **Absolute Relativism** involves the view that wisdom is entirely dependent and constructed by the cultural context/ can only be fully understood through the eyes of an insider from this culture.
* **Universalism** is concerned with the idea that culture influences the expression of wisdom, and mental processes are the same across cultures (even if the expression of these mental processes can vary across cultures).
* **Morally bounded Relativism** involves both universal and culture-specific components in descriptions of Wisdom. Notably, this position is characterized by the view that moral features of Wisdom are bound by culture (whereas non-moral features are universal).
* **Cultural Competence**: Evident when survey responses identify skills related to better understanding one’s own or other cultures (and possibly fostering harmony, though harmony orientation is not necessary). This is evident in the interest to understand other cultures, and their perspectives in terms of values, customs and social norms.

## Common wisdom model commonalities and differences so far

**Points of Agreement:**

* PMC/deliberative components (incl. Metacognition, Insight, Integration, Perspective-taking, Intellectual Humility)
* Morals/prosocial features of the model (incl. prosocial behavior)
* Integration of morals and PMC

**Points of Disagreement:**

* Morality is irrelevant/comes only at the end (after engaging in PMC)
* Not enough “morality” (e.g., moral aspirations are not enough, need action)
* Variability in engagement in the processes
* Ignores the role of emotion
* Needs behavioural skills
* Minimal inclusion of contemplative wisdom tradition

Coding instructions: tally of instances (yes/no) each of these categories was mentioned.

Possible Discussion Points for the roundtable beyond tally of key points

* Role of emotions and self-regulation
* What are other representative aspects of wisdom-related meta-cognition? Example: Acceptance of paradox/ambivalence