Notes from Sean’s Dissertation

Get rid of section on benefits of UHC

Reframe the text to get rid of the focus on UHC

Psych undergrads listed as limitation; another idea would be to consider this a strength because this is a sample of adults from a conservative state that are now interacting with a liberal environment. Students in their formative years who are; where are the students from (give zip code or say where they are from) Developmental literature on moral reasoning (look at work by Arnett).

What is the research question?

How are these four concepts operationalized?

Do people’s moral convictions that their current ethical stance that their issue is correct prevent them from being influenced by the consensus around them?

Table with list of measurements

Appendix with survey items

How do the moral constructs of social consensus, moral conviction, deontological/utilitarianism?

Between subjects with repeated measures (easiest way to describe study 3)

Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM)

* Gender in sports?
* Usage of AI in … grading?

Overall Drafting Notes – Coherent Narrative and Focus on Rebuilding the “Introduction/Literature Review”

WHAT IS THE RESEARCH QUESTION AND HOW DOES EACH ELEMENT OPERATIONALIZE MOVING IT FURTHER?

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

* **How does manipulating social consensus affect polarized beliefs? (S1)**
* **How does manipulating moral conviction affect polarized beliefs? (S2)**
  + **Can manipulating moral conviction interact with social consensus? (S3)**

Chapter 1: Introduction

* Consider seeing if we can reframe some of the opening material. The writing is good – but there is a heavy emphasis on healthcare/UHC (perhaps find other sources for the other things we’re looking at?).
* Perhaps throw a bone to ELM at the end of chapter 1 when we talk about belief change being a multifaceted process.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

* Do we need all this material on attitude/belief formation that doesn’t directly talk about formation on POLARIZED beliefs? (here’s somewhere we can trim and focus).
* Do we need the paragraph of material on ‘attitude measurement’?
  + We bring it up because there’s some adjacent conversation about how ‘true attitude’ measurement is affected by social desirability (which is tangentially related to social consensus).
  + Consider emphasizing this part in order to make it seem more necessary if we keep it?
* We briefly bring up ‘attitude strength’ when talking about measurement – or different subsections of attitude strength, of which conviction is not necessarily clearly a sub-item of. Can we emphasize this here, and if we don’t, is it confusing to leave it in?
* Last chunk of the attitude-change paragraph doesn’t seem strictly necessary? Either elaborate as to why it’s important, or consider cutting it?
* We bring up the unimodel to note that it exists, sort of as a ‘pre-defense’ but then we clearly show recent research indicating that the dual process model is superior.
  + Thus, we can consider cutting the information on the unimodel?
* Right here near these various models of belief formation-change, we can insert writing and material on ELM just to make space?
* 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.
* Do we even need to bring up utilitarian and deontological orientation? It’s individual differences (can be segmented into it’s own area later?)
  + One paragraph or two that can be cut or moved? Emphasize it as an ‘individual differences’ section – not a utilitarian/deontological orientation section, we can also merge in some other material from bits/bobs around the paper into here.
* 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?

Doing some basic rewrites on the study 3 proposal – and inserting a little graphic action