|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Definition** | **Measures** | **Studies Used** | **Successful Manipulations** | **Unsuccessful**  **Manipulations** |
| A strong and absolute belief that something is right or wrong, moral or immoral. These beliefs are inherently motivation and highly emotionally charged. Morally convicted beliefs are perceived as a universal and objective truth. | Single item measure: “How much are your feelings about \_\_\_\_ connected to your core moral beliefs or convictions?” 5-point likert scale (not at all, slightly, moderately, much, and very much) | Skikta et al., 2005; Luttrell et al.,2016; Luttrell et al., 2019 | Luttrell et al., 2016; Luttrell et al., 2019; | Brannon et al., 2019; Asadullah et al., 2019 |
| Single item measure: “My attitude about \_\_\_\_ reflects something about my core moral values and convictions”. 7-point likert scale (1 = very much agree, 7 = very much disagree) | Skikta et al., 2005; | N/A | N/A |
| Single item measure: “My choice about \_\_\_\_ reflects something about my core moral values and convictions”. 7-point likert scale (1 = strongly agree, 4 = uncertain, 7 = strongly disagree) | Skitka et al., 2008 | N/A | N/A |
| Single item measure: “How much moral importance do you attach to your position on \_\_\_\_?”. 7-point likert scale (1 = morally unimportant, 7 = morally important). | Skitka et al., 2002 | N/A | N/A |
| Single item binary measure: “Is \_\_\_ moral or nonmoral, depending on what you believe, regardless of how the issue may be viewed by others?” | Wright et al., 2008; | N/A | N/A |
| Four item measure: My attitude about \_\_\_\_ is…   * A reflection of my core moral beliefs and convictions. * Connected to fundamental beliefs about right and wrong. * A moral stance. * Based on moral principles.   5-point likert scale (1 = not at all, 5 = very much) scored as an average. | Skitka et al., 2016; Mueller & Skitka, 2017; Feinberg et al., 2019; Wisneski et al., 2020; Aignesberger & Greitemeyer, 2023 | Feinberg et al., 2019; Wisneski et al., 2020 | Aignesberger & Greitemeyer, 2023 |
| Two item measure: How much is your position on \_\_\_...   * Connected to your core moral beliefs and convictions? * Connected to your beliefs about fundamental right or wrong?   7-point likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = very much) scored as an average. | Clifford et al., 2018; Wisneski & Skitka 2017;  Kodapanakkal et al., 2022; Ryan et al., 2014; Ryan et al., 2019;  Garrett 2018; | Wisneski & Skitka 2017; Clifford et al., 2018; Kodapannakkal et al., 2022 | N/A |
| Three item measure:   * “My opinion about \_\_\_ is an important part of my moral norms and values” * “I believe that my opinion about \_\_\_ has a moral character” * “My opinion about \_\_\_ is a universal moral value that should apply everywhere in the world”   7-point likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = very much) scored as an average. | Van Zomeren et al., 2012 | N/A | N/A |
| Strong attitudes regarding specific issues, framed as “oughts” and “shoulds”. Treating specific norms as absolutes and motivating behavior at the expense of all else, including personal gain. | Three item measure:   * “\_\_\_\_ bothers me a lot” * “\_\_\_\_ threatens values that are important to me” * “My attitude towards \_\_\_\_ is a matter of principle”   7-point likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) scored as an average. | Siegrist et al., 2011; Bastian et al., 2015; | N/A | N/A |
| Defined as circumstances that pertain to the welfare of others (harm, justice, rights) as well as affective reactions based on moral emotions (disgust, anger). | Two sub-scales: 6 item subscale measuring ‘reasoned moral conviction’ e.g.,   * “Suppose that \_\_\_ were common in the United States, how alright would it be to engage in this act in this country? 4-point likert scale (1 = definitely alright, 4 = definitely not alright)   5 item subscale measuring ‘sentimental moral conviction’ e.g.,   * “Imagine another country in which the population engages in \_\_\_. How disgusted would this make you fee? 4-point likert scale (1 = definitely disgusted, 4 = definitely not disgusted) | Bloom, 2013 | N/A | N/A |
| Rules or beliefs about what is appropriate surrounding social issues ‘deeply embedded into society (e.g., do not steal)’. | Three item measure: To what extent do you feel your position on \_\_\_ is …   * Based on strong personal principles? * Morally correct? * A moral stance?   9-point likert scale (1 = not at all, 9 = very much) scored as an average. | Hornsey et al., 2003; | N/A | N/A |
| Lay understanding of the participants of a given topic as moral or non-moral, bypassing assumptions from the researchers about the nature of moral vs. nonmoral evaluation. | Single item measure: “How morally wrong/right it would be for you to \_\_\_\_?” 7-point likert scale (1 = very wrong, 7 = very right). | Van Bavel et al., 2012; | N/A | N/A |
| Single item measure: “Think about the person who posted this message, how moral, or good a person do you think they are?”  7-point likert scale (1 = very immoral/bad, 4 = somewhat moral/good, 7 = extremely moral/good) | Everett et al., 2020; | Everett et al., 2020; | N/A |
| Two item measure:   * “I have the idea that there is a clear-cut distinction between moral and immoral when \_\_\_\_ is concerned.” * “When \_\_\_\_ is concerned, rules regarding what is moral and what is immoral apply to everyone.”   7 point likert scale (-3 = not agree at all, 3 = totally agree), scored as an average. | Tauber et al., 2013; | N/A | Tauber et al., 2013; |
| Three item measure:   * “There are very important ethical aspects to this situation.” * “This matter clearly does not involve ethics or moral issues.” * “This situation could be described as a moral issue”   7-point likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree’) scored as an average, second item reverse scored. | Reynolds et al., 2006; | Reynolds et al., 2006; | N/A |

My definition of moral conviction in the pilot was an ‘oversimplification’, there is immense amounts of nuance to consider in the process and we should be explicit regarding this.

* Separately measure universality and objectivity using the individual portions from the literature
* Perhaps use several measures of moral conviction. – Don’t need just one measure of moral conviction.
  + Include all the unique items – if it’s reasonable, don’t need multiple subsets, include.
* Select which item and WHY? – add this because X, and because of adding X I can do Y
  + Think about citing the literature behind objectivity and universality, and why it matters or is related?
* Write a tight 2-3 pager about the methods and what things can be oriented and worth csondiering.
  + What contexts can we manipulate moral conviction? (nuclear energy, death penalty, bloodsports, murdering, pedophila, etc?)
  + Context table (moral y/n, movable y/n, novel y/n?) to brainstorm things in the context there.

Construct validity – wrestling with this not being a perfect measure, but why are we using it? We don’t always have to go to the effort of making a whole new measure. Also, some other constructs end up having issues with face validity???