The Extent to Which Morally Reframed Arguments Are Effective: The Political Animosity in

the United States

(Word count: 4309)

Abstract

The purpose in this study is to explore the extent to which Morally Reframed Arguments(MRA) is effective. MRA is a form of argument when one bases their argument on the moral foundations of one's audience. In this survey, Democrats and Republicans received a MRA as an attempt to lower their partisan antipathy towards the opposition party. It was hypothesized that MRA will be effective. Through a survey experiment conducted on Amazon Mechanical Turk, the hypothesis was proven false. Therefore, we conclude that MRA has no effect or at least is not more effective than a non-morally reframed argument when used to convince Democrats and Republicans to have less political antipathy towards the opposition party. This new understanding should be looked at and reviewed carefully as that it has been the first time when MRA is found to be ineffective.

The Extent to Which Morally Reframed Arguments Are Effective: The Political Animosity in the

United States

Introduction

Partisan antipathy has been an issue in the United States ever since the creation of the

first political parties. In the 1790s, almost right after the ratification of the constitution, there was

a bitter division in the political landscape between Democratic-Republican Party and the

Federalist party (Brinkley, 2016). The divide is further highlighted by the unpleasantness of the

1800 election and the Alien and Sedition Acts, where opponents of the incumbent party—aka

Democrat-Republicans—are jailed for speaking against the Federalist Party.

Fast forward to the 2016 election, we can see that partisan antipathy never really left. The

election was divisive and filled with animosity towards the opposition party. Joseph Cummings,

a historian with a background in U.S. elections, argued that the 2016 election was "the worst in

about the last 100 years [in terms of mudslinging]" (as cited in Barone, 2016). This election

divided not just America's political landscape, but also the daily lives of Americans. Rasmussen

Reports found that 40% of U.S. voters reported that the 2016 election has damaged their

relationship with a family member or a close friend (2017). A similar poll was conducted days

before the election, and only 26% reported such a problem. Partisan antipathy has become an

ever-growing problem in our daily lives. This research project attempts to find ways to reduce

the partisan antipathy in the United States, with a focus on daily interactions with members of

the opposition party.

One of the ways of bringing people together is through conversation. Recently, a

persuasion method known as Morally Reframed Arguments (MRA) have gained attention of both

scholars and the general public (Feinberg & Willer, 2015 November 13; Friedersdorf, 2017; Rathje, 2017). This study attempts to use MRA as a tool in combating partisan antipathy.

Literature Review

Morally reframed argument is based on the Moral Foundation Theory (MFT) and its political implications (Feinberg & Willer, 2015). MFT is developed by many people, among them Associate Professor and Phycologist Jesse Grahams from USC and Professor and Social Psychologist Johnathan Haidt from NYU. Grahams et al. attempts to explain human morality and how it differs among different people using MFT. It suggests people have six basic morals: Care, Fairness, Loyalty, Authority, Sanctity, and Liberty[1] (Graham, et al., 2012; Iyer, Koleva, Graham, Dito, & Haidt, 2012). These six values are divided based on political orientation: liberals tend to value Care and Fairness more; conservatives value Loyalty, Authority, and Sanctity more, and libertarians value Liberty more (Graham, et al., 2012; Feinberg & Willer, 2015).

Moral Psychologist and Stanford professor Matthew Feinberg and Stanford Sociology professor Robb Willer hypothesized that liberal and conservative viewpoints in political issues are rooted in morality. They believed that by appealing to the moral foundations of your target audience, one will succeed in convincing said audience. They tested this idea in the context of environmentalism and found that by reframing arguments for conservation in the moral foundation of Purity, they were able to significantly increase the conservation attitudes of conservatives (Feinberg & Willer, 2013). At least three additional studies have been done on this subject, and all of them found MRA to be effective: Feinberg and Willer built on their study and proved MRA to be effective regarding other issues other than environmentalism; Völkel and Feinberg used MRA to change people's viewpoint of political candidates (in the context of the

---

[1] MFT has not yet officially accepted Liberty as a moral foundation, but the researcher believes that it is important to not disregard libertarian morality in the context of this study.

2016 election); and Wolsko et al. demonstrated that moral reframing can change one's actual behavior, prompting conservatives to donate to a fund focused on environmental preservation (2015; 2016; Wolsko, Ariceaga, & Seiden, 2016).

However, MRA is still underexplored, and it is unclear if MRA can change people's opinions on other *groups* of people. In the context of the research goal, this leads to the question: "Can MRA convince Democrats and Republicans to have less animosity toward those of the opposition party? Specifically, is MRA more effective than a normal, non-moral argument?" It is hypothesized that MRA will be effective in changing people's views regarding the opposition party, and MRA can reduce the political antipathy in the United States.

Methodology

To test this hypothesis, this study adopted a similar methodology as other MRA studies (specifically that of Wolsko et al. 2016). This study (just like all other MRA studies) is a survey experiment. Participants were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), an online marketplace where individuals (known as "Turkers") can complete tasks sent out by others. MTurk was chosen for this study for its price and accessibility. As MIT Associate Professor Berinsky points out: "MTurk subjects are generally more representative of the general population [compared to convenience samples]" (Berinsky, Huber, & Lenz, 2010, p. 17).

On the first page, Participants are asked to complete a basic demographic survey, indicating age, gender orientation, ethnicity, education level, and whether they have voted in the previous presidential election.

Then, participants were asked a simple one-digit addition math question as a form of bot check, before moving on to the next page. The second page first asks the participants about their political leanings on issues. Participants were asked to identify themselves on a one to seven

scale, (one being completely disagree, seven being completely agree, four being neither agree nor disagree) with a certain statement. Five of those statements regarding black rights (Q1), business taxation (Q3), environmental laws (Q4), foreign policy (Q5), and government regulations (Q6) are statements adopted from Pew Research Center's political typology test (2017). They were chosen because they cover a variety of topics and these questions divide Americans the most (around half agree with the statement and around half disagrees). Three other statements regarding Same-sex marriage (Q8), Abortion (Q9), and gun laws(Q2) were added by the researcher. Question seven is an attention check stating: "America is the greatest country in Africa. (one = completely false, seven = completely true)." Participants are disqualified if they answered anything other than 1 or 2. Statements 1,3,4, and 7 are phrased from a liberal viewpoint where as questions 2, 5, and 8 from a conservative viewpoint. From these eight non-attention check questions, a *Political Orientation Composite* is derived. This score is an average after questions 2,5, and 8 are reversely scored. Therefore, a 1 as a political orientation score would be consistently conservative and a 7 would be consistently liberal. This method of determining political orientation is similar to Wolsko et al.'s method (2016).

On the same page, participants are also asked to identify themselves with either the Republican, Democrat or the Libertarian party. They may also select "Independent or some other party." Those who did not identify as Republican or Democrat were asked "As of today, do you lean more towards the Democratic party or the Republican party?" (Adopted from Pew Research Center (2017)). Participants were then asked how many of their friends are Republican and how many of their friends are democrat. The researcher added the option "Libertarian Party" because libertarian morality (Liberty) is not incorporated in the MRA in this study, and it would be interesting to see if libertarians are less affected by MRA compared to other groups.

After that, participants were randomly assigned either to the control group (n = 73) or the treatment group (n = 134). Page three of this survey is a passage that the participants are told to read. This syntax of this passage is adopted and sometimes quoted from Wolsko et. al.'s (2016) study on MRA[2]. This ensured that the syntax and quality of the passage is consistent with existing studies.

The control group was presented with a non-morally reframed argument, calling them to be more accepting towards the other party. People who are assigned the control condition and identified as Republican or lean Republican will get this message.

Many people in America are concerned about the division in the American electorate. We are interested in what you think and feel about the Democratic Party. First, please read through the following brief announcement before answering a few additional questions.

"A house divided on itself cannot stand" -Abraham Lincoln. We should love everyone in America. America should be a place were[3] different ideas are accepted. We should listen to the ideas of other people. We should come together as a nation to work with each other. It is disadvantageous to ignore the ideas of others. Many Democrats are hardworking Americans who make this nation a better place. By accepting liberal ideas, we will be a stronger country.

---

[2] Professor Wolsko conducted two similar studies on MRA, one in 2016, one in 2017. Both studies used the same paragraph with the same syntax for treatment. This study draws mostly upon the 2016 study. This note is included in case of confusion due to Turnitin.com plagiarism check, which shows the 2017 study as opposed to the 2016 study.

[3] The passage misspelled "where" as "were."

It is required for participants to spend 10 seconds on this page before moving on to the next page. Participants in the control group who identified as a Democrat will get the same message, except the word "Democrat" replaced by "Republican" and the word "liberal" replaced by "conservative."

Those in the treatment group will receive a MRA. This argument is designed to appeal to the moral foundations of the target audience. Words from the MFT dictionary—a dictionary about which words invoke which moral foundations—were used (Graham & Haidt, n.d.).

Democrats in the treatment group will receive the following message, which is designed to appeal to the moral foundations of safety and fairness.

Many people in America and in the world are concerned about the division in the American electorate. We are interested in what you think and feel about the Republican Party. First, please read through the following brief announcement before answering a few additional questions.

"A house divided against itself cannot stand." -Abraham Lincoln. Show your love for all Americans in this country we live in by respecting their voices and views. America should be a country where it is **safe for everyone to speak up** about their views. We should treat everyone's ideas fairly. It is **harmful** to **attack** other people because of their viewpoints. Many republicans are **righteous** people. They are caring and reasonable Americans who strive to make this nation a safer and fairer place. **By accepting conservatives and treating them fairly, you will be honoring the core American values of acceptance and equality.**

The words that are bolded in this paper are bolded on the survey. Participants are required to spend 15 seconds on this page before moving on.

Republicans in the treatment group will receive this morally reframed message, which is designed to appeal to the moral foundations of authority and unity. Words from the MFT Dictionary were used.

Many patriotic citizens of the United States are concerned about the division in the American electorate. We are interested in what you think and feel about the Democratic Party. First, please read through the following brief announcement before answering a few additional questions.

"A house divided against itself cannot stand." -Abraham Lincoln. Show your love for your fellow citizens by respecting their voices and views. America is a big family, and a true patriot is **loyal** to all of his or her family members **regardless of their views.** We should honor the ideas of others. It is **un-American** to **alienate** your brothers and sisters. Many democrats are **righteous** people. They are **patriots** and **dutiful** Americans who strive to make this nation a more beautiful and cleaner place. **By accepting liberals and their lawful right to be heard, you will be honoring the American tradition of democracy and unity.**

The words that are bolded in this paper are bolded on the survey. Participants are required to spend 15 seconds on this page before moving on.

After reading the passages, participants will be directed to page four to measure their dislike of the opposition party (OP), creating a *Political Animosity Composite (PAC)* and a

Political Animosity Thermometer (PAT). They were first asked to rank the viewpoints and members of the opposing party on a 0 to 100 scale, with a 0 being very unfavorable and 100 being very favorable. The average rating from the two scales creates the *PAT*. The higher the *PAT,* the more favorable the participant is towards the OP. The *PAC* is measured by seven questions (further referred to as the *PAC* question set). Participants were given claims and told to rank them on a one to seven scale. Participants were asked if the ideologies of the OP are reasonable (Q1); how would they reacted if a close family member were to marry someone of the OP (Q2); if they're likely to disown a family member due to their political orientation (Q3); if the relationship of between and their friends would change for worse if they find out that they are a member of the OP (Q4); how important it is if at all for them to live next to people of similar ideologies (Q5); if they have something common with the OP (Q7); and if American will be better with less members of the OP (Q8). The average score of these questions (with questions number 1, 2, and 7 reversely scored) composes the *PAC*. The higher the *PAC,* the more the participant dislike the OP. Question six is an attention check, asking the participants if members of the OP "have superpowers and can move things with their mind. (one = completely true, seven= completely false.)" Those who did not answer 1 or 2 were disqualified from the survey. Some of the questions for the *PAC* question set were adopted from Pew Research Center, others were original to this research. These questions were intended to measure the hostility and acceptance that people have of the opposition party. E.g. Q2 and 3 are examples of measuring hostility, and Q8 measures acceptance.

After these questions, participants move on to the next page where they were told the purpose of this experiment and whether they believe that their data is valid. Participants were told that their answer to that question will not affect their pay. Participants who believed that

their data are invalid had their responses nullified. This is to give subjects a chance to invalidate their own data. After that, participants were then given their completion code for Mechanical Turk. The first 30 participants received a $0.50 monetary compensation; the rest received $0.40.

Findings

The survey was sent out in four trials.

Trial One (*n=30*)

The first batch returned unreliable results. It was clear that participants were rushing through the survey to get paid. As an example, nine participants (30%) indicated that they are somewhat to very happy with a family member marrying someone from the opposition party, yet they are also somewhat to very likely to disown a family member based on their political orientation. The researcher believes that this happened because the two buttons are on the same side of the page, as seen in Figure one.

After that, the attention checks and timers were added, along with MTurk qualifications. The added qualification made sure that participants must have at least 5000 MTurk tasked approved, with a 98% approval rating, and be in the United States. Although such qualifications and attention checks may harm the data quality (Vannette, 2017), the data quality is significantly worse without the qualification and attention checks. All data from trial one was invalidated, only the responses from the last three trials were used in this study. Participants were disqualified if they did not pass the attention checks (*n=27*) incomplete (*n=2*), or if participants indicated that they do not believe their responses are valid (*n=3*). In total, 207 surveys were taken into consideration.

Trial Two (*n*=9)

Trial two returned much better data compared to Trial one. The median participants spent three minutes on the survey, compared to two and a half minutes for trial one. It was determined that this new survey is reliable in generating data. A fault in the survey occurred in Trial two— instead of randomly assigning participants to control and treatment, all participants were assigned to control. This was later fixed in trial three and four. No other changes were made in the survey. The survey described in the methodology section is the survey used in trial three through four.

Trial Three (*n* = 149)

Trial three is the main trial where the researcher collected most data. The average age of the trial is 38.5 years, with 91 Democrats/ Lean Democrat and 58 Republicans/ Lean Republican. 55 participants were assigned to the control condition, and 104 to the treatment condition.

Trial Four (*n* = 49)

A four trial was conducted in order to have a bigger sample size and to confirm the findings of trial three, which it did. Trial four and three had quite similar results, the average age for trial four is 38.06, with a *POC* of 5.008 and a PAC of 3.995. This confirms the assumption that the survey is producing consisting results and adds credibility to the study.

Trial Two, Three and Four (N = 207) (All of the data taken into consideration)

Overall, the population has an average age around 38.27 years old, with 85 females, 121 males and one non-binary. A majority of the population are white and educated, with 113 people receiving a college degree or more and 68 receiving some form of college education (no degree). 73 people received the control message; 134 people received the treatment message. The subject pool tends to be more liberal (average *POC* = 4.92).

Results of the study can be seen in table one. A positive number for difference indicates that the group became more tolerant of the other party, a negative number for difference indicates that the group became less tolerant of the other party.

The *Political Animosity Composite* (*PAC*) score for the control group is 3.986 (*SD* = 1.241)*, whereas the *PAC* for the treatment is 3.996 (*SD* = 1.180). The *Political Animosity Thermometer* (*PAT*) score for the control group is 24.948 (*SD* = 23.749), whereas the *PAT* for the treatment is 23.399 (*SD* = 20.079). Two sample T-Tests were conducted on the *PAT* and *PAC* scores. The probability the *PAC* score occurring randomly is equal to $p = 0.9552$ which is greater than the alpha level of 0.05, so the study fails to reject the null hypothesis. The same thing applies to the *PAT* score. The two-sample T-test found that the probability of the *PAT* score occurring randomly is equal to $p = 0.6394$, which, again, is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$. Thus, the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis and the researcher concludes that the original hypothesis is incorrect since neither *PAT* nor *PAC* scores changed significantly because of the MRA treatment paragraph. This result is consistent among Democrats ($p = 0.5566$, $\alpha = 0.05$) and Republicans ($p = 0.3474$, $\alpha = 0.05$) (Only the *PAC* was calculated). Also, as expected, not enough Libertarians ($n = 6$) took the survey to draw any conclusions regarding Libertarian morality and MRA.

There are a few plausible explanations for this data. It is possible that MRA cannot change perceptions on other morals, only the extension of moral viewpoints. Feinberg and Willer (2013) established that people's view on issues is simply an extension of their moral viewpoint. A reason that MRA was found to be so successful in changing people's views is MRA changed how one expresses one's moral foundations (e.g. allowing conservatives to express their moral foundation of purity in the context of environmentalism). However, one's dislike of the

opposition party could be based on one's dislike of the opposition party's morals, which could be a way of expression one's moral foundations that cannot be changed. For example, if one heavily believes in Fairness, it is likely that this person will dislike the moral foundation of Authority. This dislike of moral foundations may be inherently different than that purely concerning morals, which is why MRA was ineffective.

Another explanation is that MRA simply cannot change people's views on groups of people. In past studies, MRA has used to change people's perception on individuals—specifically, Hilary Clinton and Donald Trump—but groups of people may be different (Völkel & Feinberg, 2016). Furthermore, that study only used negative arguments. In other words, they created antipathy toward a candidate. It is possible that creating antipathy and removing antipathy are two completely different things.

Another thing to note is how MRA might not be enough as a stand-along rhetorical device. All other studies on MRA used a combination of logos or even images with MRA, whereas in this study, the researcher used only text. It is possible that MRA is an effective rhetorical device, just not when it is the only rhetorical device used.

General Discussion

Implications

In the end, it is found that MRA is ineffective (or at least not more effective compared to a non-morally reframed argument) when used to try persuade Democrats and Republicans to have less animosity towards each other.

This new understanding builds on top of the existing literature regarding MRA, and it shows the extent to which MRA is effective. Past studies, as iterated in the literature review section, found that MRA can be used to change people's views on issues, political candidates,

and can motivate them to donate to a cause (Feinberg & Willer, 2015; Völkel & Feinberg, 2016; Wolsko, Ariceaga, & Seiden, 2016). It appears that with this study we encounter a situation where MRA is ineffective. This marks an important point in MRA research as we see the limitations of this method of argumentation.

Since MRA was effective in changing people's views on issues, it can be presumed that unless there was a fatal flaw in the study, the dislike of over parties is fundamentally different compared to views on issues. This could have multiple implications outside of the field of persuasion research. This study seems to suggest that the dislike of other party is either not at all connected to morals (which seems unlikely) or possibly rooted deep with our moral foundations. There is much to be asked regarding group animosity and morality. MFT is a rather new idea within the realm of morality research, and its implications on other fields on psychology are still not clear. With study, we seem to see how group animosity is a strong emotion within people can cannot be easily shifted. This, if proven true, can have huge implications in terms of negative stereotyping, since negative stereotyping is a type of group animosity.

Limitations

One of the limitations of this study is the limited demographics of the sample. 83% of the participants claimed to have voted in the election compared to the national average of 55% (Wallace, 2016). The participant pool was overwhelmingly Democrat, with 45% percent identifying as Democrat compared to the national average of 29% (Gallup, 2018). Despite that the results remained the more or less same between Democrats and Republicans, it would still be helpful to survey people outside MTurk in order to get more accurate information.

Another limitation to keep in mind is how this is solely text-based, as previously stated. It is possible that MTurk participants glanced over the paragraph that they were told to read. Past

MRA studies (such as Wolsko et al. 2016) used pictures alongside texts, which could be useful on MTurk since people might be more inclined to pay attention to an image compared to a paragraph.

It is possible that the way in which this study measured political animosity is flawed. Looking back, the utility Q5 and Q7 in measuring political animosity is dubious. However, given the fact that two different methods—the *PAC* and the *PAT*—were used, it is hard to say this had a strong effect on the results. Furthermore, after taking out Q5 and Q7, the change in the *PAC* is still insignificant ($p = 0.7776$, $\alpha = 0.05$), which supports my previous conclusions.

Future Directions

It is important to note (again) how this study is the first time that MRA is found to be ineffective. More studies should be done regarding MRA and animosity towards groups. For example, is MRA an effective tool in combating stereotypes? If so, then it would be interesting to see which attitudes towards which groups can be changed by MRA and which groups can't be changed. Since MRA is so deeply tied with MFT. It would also be important to consider the moral implications of how MRA and group animosity relate to each other. Does, for example, the moral foundation of Fairness increase the inclination to dislike the rich? Does the moral foundation for Authority increase sexism ideas? These are all questions that future studies should explore. Our moral foundations shape us in different ways and it would be interesting to explore how this plays into views outside of politics.

Another thing to consider a possible revision of past MRA studies. Unlike some other studies done in the current field, the neutral condition, or control, in this study is not an irrelevant paragraph (in From Gulf to Bridge, participants read a paragraph regarding the history of skiing). In fact, the control group also read an argumentative piece calling for greater unity and less

partisan antipathy. It can be argued that in other MRA studies, participants supported a certain

issue because they just read an argument written in favor of it, not because that MRA is a more

effect form of argumentation. It is advised that past MRA experiments be repeated, this time with

a non-morally reframed argument as a neutral condition, to confirm the superiority of MRA.

References

Abramowitz, A., & Webster, S. (2015). *All politics is national: The rise of negative partisanship and the nationalization of U.S. House and Senate elections in the 21st century.* Retrieved from http://stevenwwebster.com/research/all_politics_is_national.pdf

Barone, E. (2016, November 3). This writer ranked American history's dirtiest elections. Here's what he says about 2016. *Time.* Retrieved from Times: http://time.com/4554784/dirtiest-elections-american-history-2016/

Berinsky, A. J., Huber, G. A., & Lenz, G. S. (2010). *Using Mechanical Turk as a subject recruitment tool for experimental research.* Retrieved from http://qipsr.as.uky.edu/sites/default/files/Berinsky.Using%20Mechanical%20Turk%20as%20a%20Subject%20Recruitment%20Tool%20for%20Experimental%20Research.pdf

Brinkley, A. (2016). *The unfinished nation: A concise history of the American people.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Feinberg, M., & Willer, R. (2013). The moral roots of environmental attitudes. *Psychological Science*, pp. 56-62. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612449177

Feinberg, M., & Willer, R. (2015). From gulf to bridge: When do moral arguments facilitate political influence? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, pp. 1665-1681. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215607842

Feinberg, M., & Willer, R. (2015, Nov 13). The key to political persuasion: It's a simple strategy. It's just not easy to implement. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/15/opinion/sunday/the-key-to-political-persuasion.html

Friedersdorf, C. (2017, June 27). Working toward the same ends for different reasons: A better

    understanding of moral reasoning could help Americans cooperate on improving the

    country even amid deep disagreements. *The Atlantic.* Retrieved from The Atlantic:

    www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/06/working-towards-the-same-ends-for-

    different-reasons/531666

Gallup. (2018, April). *Party Affiliation*. Retrieved from http://news.gallup.com/poll/15370/party-

    affiliation.aspx

Graham, J., & Haidt, J. (n.d.). *Moral Foundations Dictionary*. Retrieved from

    www.moralfoundations.org/sites/default/files/files/downloads/moral%20foundations%20

    dictionary.dic

Graham, J., Haidt, J., Koleva, S., Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Wojcik, S. P., & Ditto, P. H. (2012). *Moral

    Foundations Theory: The pragmatic validity of moral pluralism.* Retrieved from

    https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2184440

Iyer, R., Koleva, S., Graham, J., Dito, P., & Haidt, J. (2012). *Understandin libertarian morality:

    The psychological dispositions of self-identified libertarians*. Retrieved from

    doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0042366

Pew Research Center. (2014, June 12). *Table 2.1 Partisan Antipathy.* Retrieved from

    http://www.people-press.org/2014/06/12/partisan-antipathy/

Pew Research Center. (2016). *Partisanship and political animosity in 2016.* Retrieved from

    http://www.people-press.org/2016/06/22/partisanship-and-political-animosity-in-2016/

Pew Research Center. (2017). *Political typology quiz*. Retrieved from http://www.people-

    press.org/quiz/political-typology/

Pew Research Center. (2017, October 5). *The partisan divide on political values grows even wider*. Retrieved from http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2017/10/05162647/10-05-2017-Political-landscape-release.pdf

Rasmussen Reports. (2017, February 2). *40% Say Election Has Hurt a Close Relationship.* Retrieved from www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/elections/election_2016/40_say_election_has_hurt_a_close_relationship

Rathje, S. (2017, July 20). The power of framing: It's not what you say, it's how you say it. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from www.theguardian.com/science/head-quarters/2017/jul/20/the-power-of-framing-its-not-what-you-say-its-how-you-say-it

Vannette, D. (2017) *Using attention checks in your surveys may harm data quality.* Retrieved from https://www.qualtrics.com/blog/using-attention-checks-in-your-surveys-may-harm-data-quality/

Völkel, J. G., & Feinberg, M. (2016). *Morally reframed arguments can affect support for political candidates.* Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617729408

Wallace, G. (2016, November 30). Voter turnout at 20-year low in 2016. *CNN*. Retrieved from https://www.cnn.com/2016/11/11/politics/popular-vote-turnout-2016/index.html

Wolsko, C., Ariceaga, H., & Seiden, J. (2016). Red, white, and blue enough to be green: Effects of moral reframing on climate change attitudes and conservation behaviors. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, pp. 7-19. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2016.02.005

Table 1

Combined Results from trial two, three, and four

	PAC (1-7)	*PAT* (0-100)
Control Group	3.986	24.948
Treatment Group	3.996	23.399
Difference	-0.009	-1.539
p-value	0.9552	0.6394

Figure 1

How will you react if a close family member were to marry a Republican? *

Very unhappy	Unhappy	Somewhat unhappy	Doesn't matter if they are Republican	Somewhat happy	Happy	Very Happy
○	○	○	○	○	○	◉

On a one to seven scale (one being completely disagree, seven being completely agree, 4 being neither agree nor disagree), how much do you agree with the following statements?

I am likely to disown a family member or a friend because of their political orientation. (one = completely disagree, seven = completely agree) *

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
○	○	○	○	○	○	◉