**[Perspectives on Current and Past Issues]**

This concludes the experiment. Thank you for participating in this study. I would like to take a few additional moments to tell you a little bit more about the research and why it is being conducted.

This research investigates several different theories of how best to change belief on highly polarized issues. One way of doing so is changing the amount level of moral conviction felt regarding these issues. Now, what does this actually mean? In a simple sense, many people can have various reasons for choosing to support one thing or another, but not all reasoning is the same.  
  
For example: some people would support abortion access simply because that's what the law is where they live - they don't think about it beyond that, and if the law changed, their stance would change. Some other people would support abortion access because that's what their friends, family, and neighbors believe - if they moved somewhere else, or their social circle changed their mind, their stance could change as well! However, there are definitely some people who support abortion access because they feel deep in their hearts, that it is the 'right' thing to do and is worth fighting for. Very roughly, beliefs made under this last set of reasoning is considered to have 'moral conviction'.  
  
Generally, beliefs regarding issues that are seen as highly polarized (such as the death penalty, firearms access, abortion, etc.) are generally more 'morally loaded' than others. However, not everyone agrees as to what topics are even up for ethical debate.  
  
We designed this experiment to examine if moral conviction is something that we could change. Furthermore, we chose topics that we believed would be highly polarized, as well as a topic that was believed to be non-polarized. Our most 'non-polarized' topic was exercise, and our two 'highly-polarized' topics were capital punishment (the death penalty) and climate change. We also chose to assess universal health care, as there is little prior research as to whether or not the public has highly polarized beliefs on the issue, but there is plausible reasoning to believe that it has some moral weight.  
  
We believe that understanding more deeply how moral conviction relates to perceptions highly polarized topics will move us forward in our ability to change beliefs and our academic understanding of moral decision making more broadly.  
  
We would like you to know that we really appreciate your time in helping with this research and are always happy to answer any questions that you might have about it. We think that one way to understand medical decisions is by learning more about what was investigated today. If you have any additional questions about the study, you can reach me by email at sxdff5@mail.missouri.edu.  
  
**Thank you, specifically** for your participation. Really, it helps out a ton! - Sean Duan

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or want to report a complaint, please contact the Institutional Review Board at the University of Missouri at 573-882-3181, 310 Jesse Hall, Columbia, MO 65211, or at muresearchirb@missouri.edu