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Messages used in Studies 3-6.

Study 3

Purity Message

Health Care for Everyone

The absence of universal healthcare in the United States practically ensures that we will have unclean, infected, and diseased Americans walking among us. The uninsured often develop “diseases of poverty”, such as tuberculosis, hepatitis, toxocariasis, and other viruses or parasites that can easily spread throughout the population. These diseases are disgusting infestations that invade the human body and leech out needed nutrients to survive. Many of these diseases have grotesque symptoms like yellowing of the skin and eyes, coughing up bloody mucus, itchy rashes, and lesions. These diseases are contagious and spread through the population infecting many, including those who are not poor.

The spread of these diseases, however, would be easily preventable if all Americans had healthcare. Individuals infected with these contagious diseases would become much less likely to spread their sickness to others, because doctors could provide them with medicine to cure or control the disease, and doctors could educate these sick patients on how to avoid infecting others.

According to a 2009 Kaiser Commission on Medicaid there are 50 million Americans who lack any type of healthcare insurance. The 50 million uninsured are especially susceptible to contracting infectious diseases because they are often the poorest among us, suffering from malnutrition and stress, both of which lead to weakened immune systems. So, this means that the uninsured tend to serve as repositories that harbor and cultivate contagions which can then, after incubating, more easily spread to others in the population.

Healthcare reform represents a major step towards the extermination of infectious diseases. With universal healthcare, those who are currently uninsured would be able to see doctors and become educated in how to avoid contracting diseases, and those who have contracted disease could get the medicine they need to cure them or at least making them less contagious. Overall, universal healthcare is a way of purifying America from some of its most infectious diseases, making it less and less likely that healthy individuals will ever encounter these diseases. Everyone should have healthcare.

Fairness Message

Health Care for Everyone

In its current state healthcare in the U.S. is inherently unfair and unjust. We need reform to ensure that everyone, not just the rich and the fortunate, has access to the doctors and the medicine they need.

According to a 2009 Kaiser Commission on Medicaid an estimated 50 million American citizens are without adequate insurance coverage – including millions of children who have done nothing wrong. Because most American families obtain healthcare coverage from long term employers, the blue collar sector of the labor force is unfairly hit the hardest. These laborers typically work for hourly wages in temporary jobs which do not offer comprehensive health insurance. These are honest, law-abiding citizens who are being unfairly denied access to resources their wealthier countrymen are entitled to, simply because they make less money.

To make matters worse, the poorest are often the ones who are at the highest risk for health problems. Individuals in the lower economic brackets suffer more diabetes, cancer, asthma, emphysema, hypertension, and heart disease largely due to the financial stress they experience on a day-to-day basis. They are the ones who need healthcare the most, but unjustly are the ones who have the least access to it.
Not having healthcare often amounts to the poor getting poorer because when they or their children get sick, they have to pay the enormous costs for healthcare out-of-pocket. A 2001 study in five States found that medical debt contributed to 46.2% of all personal bankruptcies and in 2007, 62.1% of filers for bankruptcies claimed high medical expenses as the cause. Since then, health costs and the numbers of uninsured and underinsured have increased.

It all comes down to simple questions: Shouldn’t all people equally have the right to see a doctor and get medicine when they are sick? Is it fair to allow people to suffer from illness that are easily curable, simply because they are poor? Is this justice for all? Access to healthcare is a basic human right not a luxury reserved for the rich. Everyone should have healthcare.

**Universal Health Care Support**

I am in favor of universal health care

There is no need for universal health care in America.

Universal health care will help solve many of America's problems

**ObamaCare Support**

The Affordable Care Act (ObamaCare) was a mistake that should never have become a law.

The Affordable Care Act (Obama Care) should continue to go into effect over the next few years.

The Supreme Court should find the Affordable Care Act (Obama Care) unconstitutional.

The passage of the Affordable Care Act (Obama Care) was a great moment in American history.
Study 4

*Fairness Message*

The Military Provides a Fair Chance for Minorities and the Poor

In a society where not everyone is born into equal socioeconomic conditions, the military helps to level the playing field. Disadvantaged Americans who the country has traditionally discriminated against the most – the poor and minorities – can achieve equal standing in the military. Recently, however, people have suggested cutting military funding. Such cuts will limit the military’s ability to offer equal opportunity to minorities and the poor, by cutting away at their chances to find employment and career advancement through the military.

Many of those who join the military do not have access to other opportunities. The military recruits Americans, without concern for their race, religion, or socio-economic background. Indeed, a majority of soldiers come from economically depressed rural or urban areas where they face very limited means for pulling themselves up out of poverty. Enlisting in the military enables the rural and urban poor to break free of the bonds of inequality.

The military is a largely meritocratic institution where people compete for advancement on a level playing field not always found in America; servicemen and women are evaluated by their ability, performance, and demonstrated potential. Promotions and salary increases are awarded based on achievements and time served. Veterans’ benefits such as the GI Bill, College Loan Repayment, VA housing loans, and job placement programs are available to absolutely every soldier.

Being in the military means having a reliable salary and a future apart from the challenges of poverty and inequality. We must not cut funding to an institution that provides equality of opportunity and standing for all Americans.

*Loyalty/Respect Message*

Keep Our Military Strong

The United States is the strongest nation in the world. Our reputation comes from our proven military prowess. For almost a century now, the United States has had the most powerful military that has ever existed, defeating both fascism and communism. Patriotic Americans have banded together in defense of what we hold dear and know is right, and have ensured that The United States of America is a role model for the rest of the world. Recently, however, some people have suggested we cut funding to what makes us the world’s greatest superpower.

Today more than ever, we must oppose such cuts. America must maintain its superpower status in the eyes of rogue states and terrorists around the world. It is our military strength and technology that deters them from attacking us and our loyal friends and allies. Indeed, whenever there are problems in the world, the international community looks to us for our support and guidance.

Not only is the US military the face of the United States abroad, but it is also what unites us together at home in our most trying times. When disasters strike, the National Guard joins with local emergency and law enforcement personnel to maintain order and keep together the fabric of America, ensuring that we come out a stronger and more tight-knit nation.

We must take pride in our military. It makes no sense to cut funding to what makes us the greatest superpower the world has ever seen – what unifies us both at home and abroad– The United States military.
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*Military Promotes Fairness*

The military is an institution that helps reduce inequality in the United States.

The military helps disadvantaged Americans achieve equal status in America.

The poor and minorities can find opportunity through the military.
Military Spending Support

Cutting funding to the military would be a mistake.

The United States needs to increase the military budget, not reduce it.

It is important to fund the U.S. military at high levels.
Study 5

**Loyalty Message**

Gay Americans are Proud and Patriotic Americans

Although gay couples in America have different sexual preferences, they are still proud Americans like you and me. They share the same basic hopes and desires in life. They share in the American dream: to have a family, a home, a safe neighborhood and community to live in, a well-paying job, financial stability, and someone to love and share their lives with. Like other proud Americans, gay couples peacefully build lives together, buy homes, and contribute to the American economy and society. Like all other Americans, they deserve the right to marry the one they love.

Gay couples contribute much to the United States economy. According to U.S. Census data gay couples contribute just as much – if not more – to the economy as heterosexual couples. Gay couples are stable members of the American economy – 65% of them own their own home. Homeownership is foundational to the stability of the American economy, and an excellent predictor of being a law-abiding citizen and community involvement. As upstanding American citizens, they should be able to enjoy the complete American dream – which includes marrying the person they love.

Also of note, gay men and women make up a large portion of our nation’s military. There are approximately 66,000 gay members of the armed forces. Many are bravely serving our country in Iraq and Afghanistan, standing shoulder to shoulder with their fellow soldiers, fighting for freedom and defending what America holds most dear.

Overall, gay couples are just like other American couples. They are proud and patriotic Americans. They contribute greatly to our economy and communities, and they patriotically serve our country. Like other proud, patriotic Americans, they should be allowed to marry.

**Fairness Message**

Gay Americans Deserve Equal Rights

Although gay couples in America have different sexual preferences, they have the same basic hopes and desires in life as others: To have a family, a home, a safe neighborhood and community to live in, a well-paying job, financial stability, and someone to love and share their lives with. Gay couples peacefully build lives together and deserve fair and equal treatment.

Gay couples deserve the right to get married. It is the only fair course of action in a country founded on the principle of equality. In fact, preventing marriage among homosexuals is a direct form of discrimination – a message that we are not all equal. The law requires that all citizens be treated equally and have the same opportunity to pursue happiness. A key to life-long happiness is marriage. Thus, same sex couples should, by law, have this right.

Marriage influences many critical things in society such as tax filing status, joint ownership of property, insurance benefits, and critical medical decisions. As a result, a citizen cannot achieve true legal equality without the right to marry whomever they want. People who have been together for many years may be excluded from visiting their same sex partner in the hospital because of restrictive “family only” rules. In some cases, even if a couple has been together for 20 years and one partner becomes critically ill and hospitalized, visitation may be restricted because the other partner is not considered a “family member”. In these types of situations, gay couples should have the same rights as everyone else. We are a country founded on principles of equality and fairness. There is no reason why we should compromise these principles. Gay marriage should be legal.
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**Same-Sex Marriage attitudes**

The government should allow same-sex couples to marry legally

The government should recognize same-sex marriages as legal marriages
It is wrong to refuse gay couples the right to get married

Gays and lesbians have a constitutional right to get married

I would support a Constitutional Amendment to ban same-sex marriage

I think marriage should be legal for same-sex couples
Study 6

Fairness Message
Leveling the Playing Field with English

When immigrants come to America they have a choice – learn English or not. Many choose to not learn it. Who can blame them? It is not easy learning another language. But the choice to not learn English puts these new immigrants at an extreme disadvantage in society. Immigrants who do not speak English earn substantially less money, are rarely treated as equal members of society, and are often discriminated against. For these reasons, we should make English the official language of the US. Doing so will not force immigrants to stop speaking their native language, it will simply push them to learn English so they have a greater chance of succeeding and being treated more equally by other members of society. No wonder such a large majority of Americans (approximately 90%), including recent immigrants, advocate for making English the official language of the US.

According to the 2000 census, approximately 21.3 million Americans speak English “less than well” with approximately 6.7 million not speaking English at all. Really, these non-English speakers have much less of a fair shot at success and happiness. They are forced to settle for backbreaking work that pays so poorly that many are poverty stricken. Specifically, immigrants who speak English earn $40,741 per year compared to $16,345 that the non-English speaking immigrants earn. Worse, they are often treated unfairly in their day-to-day lives – even discriminated against. They face a phenomenon called “language discrimination”, where they are treated unfairly and as second-class citizens because they do not speak English. People often ignore them or deny them service (for example, they won't be seated at restaurants), they will be treated worse by authorities (for example, police officers will treat them more like criminals when being interviewed), and they even receive harsher sentencing in court.

Making English the official language of the United States will help level the playing field for these immigrants. It will compel them to learn English and will authorize the government to provide learning support for them. Instead of paying millions of tax dollars (an estimated $260 million each year) on translating documents, we should invest in helping them learning English. Making English the official language is key to giving all immigrants an equal opportunity at succeeding in America.

Neutral Message

Why Do Men Wear Ties?

As with most things, the answer can be found in history. Neckties date back hundreds of years, coming into existence as the direct result of a war. In 1660, in celebration of its hard-fought victory over the Ottoman Empire, a crack regiment from Croatia (then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire) visited Paris. The soldiers were presented as heroes to Louis XIV, a monarch well known for his tendency toward personal adornment. The officers of this regiment were wearing brightly colored handkerchiefs fashioned of silk around their necks. These neck cloths - which probably descended from the Roman fascalia worn by orators to warm the vocal chords - struck the fancy of the king, and he soon made them an insignia of royalty as he created a regiment of Royal Cravattes. Vanity reigns supreme! The word “cravat,” is derived from the word “Croat.”

It wasn't long before this new style crossed the channel to England. Soon, no gentleman would have considered himself well-dressed without sporting some sort of cloth around his neck - the more decorative, the better. At times, cravats were worn so high that a man could not move his head without turning his whole body. There were even reports of cravats worn so thick that they stopped sword thrusts. The various styles knew no bounds, as cravats of tasseled strings, plaid scarves, tufts and bows of ribbon, lace and embroidered linen all had their staunch adherents.

How can we account for the continued popularity of neckties? For years, fashion historians and sociologists predicted their demise - the one element of a man's attire with no obvious function. Perhaps they are merely part of an inherited tradition. As long as world leaders continue to wear ties, the youth of the world will follow suit and ties will remain a key component to any man’s professional wardrobe.
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Support for official English
I am in favor of making English the official language of the United States.

The United States should not have an official language.

Making English the official language of US would be mistake.

English should be made into the official language of the United States.
Novelty mediation (Study 4)

We tested whether perceptions that the fairness message was novel might also explain why liberal participants reported greater support for high levels of military spending in the fairness message condition. A multiple regression analysis yielded a significant effect of condition, $b = .90$, $SE = .13$, $p < .001$, a non-significant effect of ideology, $b = .07$, $SE = .07$, $p = .14$, and a significant interaction, $b = -.23$, $SE = .10$, $p = .015$. Simple slopes analyses found that liberals (-1 standard deviation) in the fairness condition scored significantly higher on novelty, $b = 1.21$, $SE = .18$, $p < .001$, than their liberal counterparts in the loyalty/authority condition. Additionally, the conservatives (-1 standard deviation) in the fairness condition also scored significantly higher on novelty, $b = .59$, $SE = .18$, $p < .001$, than their conservative counterparts in the loyalty/authority condition.

Next we conducted a mediated moderation analysis to explore whether novelty perceptions explained the effect of message condition on military spending attitudes among liberal participants. This analysis supported the possibility that perceptions of novelty mediate the relationship (Bootstrap analysis 95% confidence interval [-.12, -.01]). However, an additional mediated moderation analysis, entering both novelty and the military promotes fairness composite simultaneously as mediators, found that the promoting fairness composite remained a significant mediator whereas novelty was no longer significant (Bootstrap analysis 95% confidence intervals: military promotes fairness composite: [-.20, -.01]; novelty: [-.06, .01]).
Sample size determination

For Studies 1-2, we did not have specific prior research to go off of when determining our target sample size. However, based on past theorizing about the moral empathy gap (Ditto & Koleva, 2011), we expected that a majority of participants would fail to tailor their arguments to the moral values of the political opposition. As a result, we expected a large effect, and decided to collect approximately 80 participants for each study.

For Studies 3-6 we used Feinberg & Willer (2013), Study 3, as a guide for our target sample size. They collected approximately 100 participants per condition (N=308), which yielded enough statistical power for them to find significant interactions between their three conditions and their political ideology moderator. As such, our target sample size was at least 100 participants per condition. In Study 5, we had trouble collecting the full 100 per condition because of the small pool of alumni participants willing to take part. Although we aimed for 100 per condition, we decided to stop collecting data from that pool once two weeks had passed and no new participants had taken part.
Invesigation of the Effectiveness of Lay People’s Morally Reframed Arguments

Method

Participants. In total, we recruited 703 participants (427 males, 276 females), including 364 participants who identified as politically liberal in a previous survey, and 339 participants who identified as politically conservative in a previous survey. All participants received modest compensation for participation.

Procedure. After completing a short demographic questionnaire, conservative participants were randomly assigned to read 1 of 16 participant-generated same-sex marriage arguments written by participants from Study 1. The 16 arguments consisted of the 8 arguments coders had judged to be examples of moral reframing, and 8 arguments we randomly selected from the pool of remaining moral, but not reframed, arguments. Similarly, liberal participants were randomly assigned to read 1 of 14 participant-generated official-English arguments participants from Study 2 had written. This included the 7 arguments coders had identified as morally reframed arguments, and 7 other moral, but not reframed, arguments we randomly selected. After reading their assigned argument, participants answered the corresponding set of attitude questions on either same-sex marriage or official English that we used in Studies 5 and 6, respectively, along with a measure of moral-fit asking participants “To what extent do you feel the article's message resonates with your values?”, which participants answered on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely).

Results

A t-test comparing the scores on the support for official English questionnaire yielded a significant difference, $t(362) = -2.30, p = .022$, such that liberals presented with a morally
reframed argument indicated greater support for making English the official language of the United States, $M = 3.07, SD = 1.20$, than liberals presented with a more typical moral argument, $M = 2.77, SD = 1.25$. Next, we found that liberals who read a reframed argument reported that the message resonated significantly more with their values, $M = 2.65, SD = 1.22$, than the liberals who read a more typical argument, $M = 2.14, SD = 1.13, t(358) = -4.09, p < .001$. A mediation analysis (Preacher & Hayes, 2008) revealed that the 95% confidence interval for the indirect effect did not include zero $[.17, .52]$, suggesting that liberals demonstrated greater support for official English because of the moral-fit between the messages they read and their own moral values. However, parallel analyses for conservative participants reading liberal-generated arguments yielded no significant difference in same-sex marriage support due to message type, $t(337) = -.84, p = .399, M_{reframed} = 3.09$ vs. $M_{typical} = 2.96$, or in how much they felt the arguments resonated with their values, $t(329) = .48, p = .635, M_{reframed} = 2.55$ vs. $M_{typical} = 2.62$.

Discussion

It is unclear why we only found effects for conservatives aiming to persuade liberals and not vice-versa. It could be that – when they do use reframed arguments – conservatives are better than liberals at tailoring arguments for a liberal audience, which might stem from conservatives having a greater understanding of liberal morality (Haidt, 2013). Although only a handful of liberals and conservatives wrote morally reframed arguments in Studies 1 and 2, an examination of these arguments may support this possibility. In their arguments, liberals appealed to conservative moral foundations, but they did so in potentially more condescending or offensive ways (e.g., “Same-sex marriage lowers the likelihood of illicit sexual behavior”, “The God of my understanding does not make mistakes, … He created homosexuals.”), than the conservatives
(e.g., “By making English our official language, there will be less racism and discrimination… upon the very groups that are being persecuted.”, “Bullying at schools would decrease.”). This apparent difference, however, might simply reflect an objective difference in how difficult it is to think of persuasive reframed arguments for same-sex marriage than making for English the official language of the U.S.