Total length of the introduction/literature review is currently ~10 pages. I would expect any added material referring to ELM or any additional references to add bulk/length/depth to the topics already covered in the introduction should be approximately 1-3 additional pages.

The overall main goal is to re-frame and ‘rewrite’ (as necessary) material in the introduction/literature review to clearly communicate one thing:

**How can we change polarized beliefs? (Main Goal)**

* **How does manipulating social consensus affect polarized beliefs? (Study 1)**
* **How does manipulating moral conviction affect polarized beliefs? (Study 2)**
* **Can manipulating moral conviction interact with social consensus? (Study 3)**

Ch1

* Consider reframing some of opening material away from healthcare
* Emphasize how each element relates specifically to polarized beliefs
* Add an early reference to ELM when talking about belief change being multifaceted process.

Ch2

* Could cut material on attitude/belief formation that doesn’t talk directly to formation of *polarized* belief specifically.
* Integrate paragraph on attitude measurement better
* Emphasize how attitude strength relates to polarized beliefs specifically.
  + As well as how moral conviction can relate, and is not clearly a ‘sub item’ of attitude strength.
* Unimodel is brought up to note that it exists, and to note that it is likely inferior compared to the dual process model (and likely ELM). Could consider cutting for length.
* Talking about Social Consensus broadly seems like good usage of space
  + The case we make here is – social consensus strongly affects belief change and formation. However – social consensus can be used to propagate misinformation. One of the most effective motivators of misinformation is social consensus.
  + THUS we must acknowledge the direct effect of manipulation of social consensus on forming/changing polarized beliefs (make this case and make it strong – it DIRECTLY addresses our research question).
  + We get close to addressing it – but we should make it blisteringly clear how it relates to our main research question.
* Utilitarian and deontological orientation can be segmented into an individual differences section later. We can specifically tie these to how they relate to polarized beliefs as well.
* Segment out Moral Conviction NOT as an ‘individual difference’ but as an important element of my research – have it flow directly from the effects of social consensus, then also talk about how social consensus is blocked by the effects of ‘moral conviction’
  + Focus on how moral conviction relates to polarized beliefs. Keep emphasizing on how polarized beliefs are the core tenet.
* Segment on moral conviction is a bit clunky here and there – could definitely rewrite it in order to coherently show that moral conviction affects belief change.
  + Emphasize how moral conviction inoculation happens earlier – perhaps give it a whole paragraph and note it as a research point of interest?

Additionally – Look into resources/literature on ELM that would be appropriate to include, as Ken as mentioned above (roughly 2-3 papers providing a strong backbone, and 2-3 others that relate specifically to polarized belief?).

Individual Differences Section

* What individual differences exist that we measured across our 3 studies?
  + Utilitarian
  + Deontological
  + Subjective Numeracy
    - ‘Objective’ Numeracy through number line task
  + Demographic information
    - Political leaning
    - Age
    - Gender Identity
    - Race/Ethnicity
    - School Year