Overview

Overview

Design, internal validity

- Politically charged scenarios excluded but:
  - Modelling setup allows evaluation of severity of politically charged items
  - Ideally they would be covered within the interval of least to most severe within a foundation
    - If they then differ stronger between left and right, we would have indication that people have formed much stronger opinions on politically charged violations and this is not due to different sets of moral foundations

Design, internal validity

- (Implicit) assumption that individuals are consistent with respect to their moral evaluations
  - Perhaps each individual violation is reacted to independently or just 1-2 violations are traded off at any one time but these violations happen in the same context, i.e. the underlying situation brings up different moral considerations that are in conflict

Design, internal validity

- Could you use single prompts/scenarios instead?
  - Scenarios would be concrete examples that evoke two moral foundations
    - For example: A disobedient child that is subsequently punished by a parent. The tradeoff is the authority violation of the child vs the care violation of the parent's punishment.

Design, internal validity

- Are respondents perhaps trading off within each of your individual items also?
  - "A man lying about the number of paid days off" concerns the fairness of pay or overall treatment by the employer vs the fairness violation of the employee.
    - Different respondents could imagine different scenarios just like in the more abstract vignettes that you discussed

Design, internal validity

- Since your scenarios could invoke tradeoffs, would it be possible to qualify them?
  - A man turning his back and walking away while his boss justifiably questions her work
  - The UK general unreasonably saying he would never buy any UK product

Design, internal validity

- Are norm violations involving animals perhaps different from those concerning human relationships?
  - The animal examples in your vignettes seemed to be either for shock value or related to abuses of power which could be done in human relations

Design, internal validity

- The worst authority violations did not seem subjectively very severe
  - A soldier disobeying an order out of fear, for example, might invoke harsher/lesser reactions from conservatives/leftists
- The worst sanctity violations are shocking; surprised that there isn't a clearer difference visible in figure 2 between those and the worst loyalty, authority or perhaps even care violations

Analysis

- Table 1 or appendix: Could you add the median and a column with the rank order?

- Interpretation of figure 2: Not clearly visible from the plot (but stated that it is in text) that on average authority and loyalty violations are less severe than fairness, care, and sanctity because of overlapping intervals (and generally quite small differences)

- Figure 3: Right to say that left and right respondents are different with respect to loyalty if it looks like they overlap to a degree where the best guess of the left is inside the credible interval of the right?

Conclusions

- After reading most and least severe violations within a foundation:
  - Not surprised that variation within foundations is larger than variation of an item by ideology. Differences within foundations are subjectively huge. Especially with respect to sanctity, the lightest are amusing and the worst are just shocking
    - Perhaps emphasize that ideology-item variation is tiny without referring back to within foundation variation
    - Culture war issues that you refer to in the introduction are either far removed from these scenarios or closer to the most severe items. For example, I don't see the sanctity violation connected to abortion (as stated in the introduction) reflected in the items.

Overview

Framing

- More precision in the critique of lab experiments on framing effects beyond the generic critique that experiments have low external validity
  - What are the exact problems, what are the contributions
  - What is central in your study for internal validity?
  - Surely one of your reviewers will have done lab experiments on framing

What Else Changed with the Editor

- More information about articles and the shift that occurred
  - Are articles about crime only about crime?
  - Does the amount of crime v other topics within articles change?
  - Does sentiment of migration articles change before and after the treatment?
  - Does the sentiment of migration and crime articles change or just the frequency of both types of information together?
    - Show example crime & mirgration Bild article (perhaps before and after)

Motivated reasoning Hypothesis (H3)

- "Effect of exposure to a specific frame should be stronger for individuals with congruent attitudes"
  - Should this be condition on individual's attitudes? Negative backlash effect against a frame could be stronger than a positive effect

5.2 Tracing the Mechanism

GLESS Panel data item: "The state's capabilities to fight crime should be extended, even if that would entail more surveillance"

- Why should the framing effect should lead those treated to also be more in favor of fighting crime if they could instead opt to "fight" immigration. Especially because the question is specifically framed as a tradeoff between crime and personal freedom
- Expectations here but also in other cases could be more clear

Empirics, Results

- Model: Individuals nested in media outlets?
- Gray vertical lines missing from figure 2
- Plot 4: Label y axis pro-anti

Overview

Framing

- Puzzle seems to be well explained by the literature on collective action
- Slightly different framing: You investigate individual-level rational's for inaction or coping mechanisms and relate to the relevant psychology literature

Additional Denial Item

- Fairness/Equality: I can pollute now because I have done this to a lesser degree than most others
  - Similar to the developing countries argument but on an individual level: I come from a poor background and haven't been on airplanes until I was 20...
  - I never owned a car so I can fly once or twice

Pol Dimension Distinct

- How are those that score high on the Pol dimension but low on the others expected to do in individual emissions?

Cost of Action

- Strategy to relate individual willingness to action to how costly this is for the individual personally
- I don't own a car because of lifestyle choices so being tough in this area costs me nothing but I might be unwilling to restrict myself in other areas
- Young people perhaps have lower costs generally when it comes to climate action

Additive Scale Climate Indicator

- Points/weights seem arbitrary
  - add examples with certain profiles you expect to find

Overview

Explain Intent/Importance Better

- Is it really desirable to maximize bias awareness?
- Surely there is a cost benefit tradeoff
- How about:
  - Start with easy to implement indicators, then add the next easiest indicator and show the magnitude of the difference
    - I want to know how much additional awareness I get for additional aspects

Bias Estimates

- Difficult to assess how sensible the bias estimates are
  - More examples of biases in the texts from your samples
  - Figure 2 shows different bias bars but when reading the article excerpts this alleged bias is not obvious
  - Important to get a feeling of how substantial the biases are
  - Would the model, for example recognize Times style descriptions of people as negative when they write: "politician xy, son of a bus driver..." → How important are such biases and does this doesn't this imply that the most centrist text is the most accurate?

How Substantive are Effects

- No feeling of how substantial these effect sizes are
  - Perhaps speculate how much these effects matter:
  - Are these effects like framing effects?
  - Will the last

Interesting Finding

- Both conservative and liberal readers are more bias aware than centrist readers but:
  - Are conservatives more aware of liberal bias and vice versa?
- Make more out of this finding; doesn't this have positive consequences if bias awareness entails a desire for less bias in the news diet?

Many hypotheses

- Help the reader by not referring to H3 because it is difficult to remember which one that was

Overview

Setting

- Isn't a news article about a policy proposal without information about political actors' positions on it an artificial setting to begin with?
  - How useful/realistic is a counterfactual of no information about party cues
  - A policy proposal in the US is usually related to one of the 2 big parties or bipartisan: Wouldn't a realistic setup be to vary Republican/Democrats/Bipartisan as the origin of the proposal

Setting

- With made up scenarios it is more plausible that respondents do not know the party position. With real news stories it is more likely that respondents are already familiar with the topic
  - Media outlets have political leanings that are known to consumers; shouldn't it be easy to guess for consumers where a proposal is coming from? Give a sense of how good consumers are at doing this
    - Does the outlet function similar to the party cue in the lab

- Perhaps move the time period further back Clinton/Bush to make it harder for people to remember issues
- Will the the journalist who designed the control articles be referenced?
- Cues on national level articles are 3-6 points stronger than local ones; described as unsurprising but shouldn't this be less given that stances on national policies are more known