

Citation:

Day, M. V., Fiske, S. T., Downing, E. L., & Trail, T. E. (2014). Shifting liberal and conservative attitudes using moral foundations theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. DOI: 10.1177/0146167214551152

Additional Analyses of Participants' Written Responses

Note: These are supplementary analyses mentioned in Day, Fiske, Downing and Trail (2014). Please see the article (above) for the main findings, or contact the first author (Martin Day: mday@fas.harvard.edu).

Study 1: Conservative Stances on Issues

We cleaned and analyzed 2710 written responses from participants (i.e., 10 per participant) using the Linguistic Inquiry Word Count (LIWC) program (Pennebaker, Booth, & Francis, 2007). (n = 271)

Harm

Did participants write more harm-foundation related words following exposure to a harm frame, compared to when this foundation was not salient?

Analysis: Harm frequencies in Harm cells vs. Harm frequencies in Non-Harm cells.

Moral Foundation	Mean Frequency	SD
Harm	1.69%	2.13
Fairness	1.21%	1.63
Ingroup	1.18%	1.89
Authority	0.64%	1.23
Purity	0.82%	1.37

Within ANOVA: $F(4, 267) = 19.70, p < .001$

Harm vs. Fairness: $t(270) = 3.50, p = .001$

Harm vs. Ingroup: $t(270) = 3.45, p = .001$

Harm vs. Authority: $t(270) = 7.69, p < .001$

Harm vs. Purity: $t(270) = 5.90, p < .001$

We conducted the same analyses for the other four moral foundations.

Fairness

Analysis: Fairness frequencies in Fairness cells vs. Fairness frequencies in Non-Fairness cells.

Moral Foundation	Mean Frequency	SD
Fairness	0.87%	1.51
Harm	0.20%	0.65
Ingroup	0.20%	0.73
Authority	0.23%	0.71
Purity	0.28%	0.86

Within ANOVA: $F(4, 267) = 27.41, p < .001$

Fairness vs. Harm: $t(270) = 7.04, p < .001$

Fairness vs. Ingroup: $t(270) = 6.51, p < .001$

Fairness vs. Authority: $t(270) = 6.45, p < .001$

Fairness vs. Purity: $t(270) = 6.44, p < .001$

Ingroup

Analysis: Ingroup frequencies in Ingroup cells vs. Ingroup frequencies in Non- Ingroup cells

Moral Foundation	Mean Frequency	SD
Ingroup	1.13%	1.65
Harm	0.41%	1.06
Fairness	0.39%	0.96
Authority	0.35%	0.81
Purity	0.55%	1.18

Within ANOVA: $F(4, 267) = 22.91, p < .001$

Ingroup vs. Harm: $t(270) = 6.34, p < .001$

Ingroup vs. Fairness: $t(270) = 6.77, p < .001$

Ingroup vs. Authority: $t(270) = 6.97, p < .001$

Ingroup vs. Purity: $t(270) = 5.14, p < .001$

Authority

Analysis: Authority frequencies in Authority cells vs. Authority frequencies in Non-Authority cells

Moral Foundation	Mean Frequency	SD
Authority	2.51%	3.29
Harm	0.39%	1.03
Fairness	0.40%	0.95
Ingroup	0.48%	1.07
Purity	0.58%	1.29

Within ANOVA: $F(4, 267) = 71.15, p < .001$

Authority vs. Harm: $t(270) = 9.94, p < .001$
 Authority vs. Fairness: $t(270) = 10.01, p < .001$
 Authority vs. Ingroup: $t(270) = 9.66, p < .001$
 Authority vs. Purity: $t(270) = 8.69, p < .001$

Purity

Analysis: Purity frequencies in Purity cells vs. Purity frequencies in Non- Purity cells

Moral Foundation	Mean Frequency	SD
Purity	0.48%	1.11
Harm	0.06%	0.31
Fairness	0.03%	0.17
Ingroup	0.08%	0.42
Authority	0.05%	0.33

Within ANOVA: $F(4, 267) = 30.15, p < .001$
 Purity vs. Harm: $t(270) = 5.91, p < .001$
 Purity vs. Fairness: $t(270) = 6.61, p < .001$
 Purity vs. Ingroup: $t(270) = 5.61, p < .001$
 Purity vs. Authority: $t(270) = 6.08, p < .001$

Study 2: Liberal Stances on Issues

As in Study 1, we cleaned and analyzed 2560 written responses from participants (i.e., 10 per participant) using the LIWC program. (n = 256)

Harm

Did participants write more harm-foundation related words following exposure to a harm frame, compared to when this foundation was not salient?

Analysis: Harm frequencies in Harm cells vs. Harm frequencies in Non-Harm cells.

Moral Foundation	Mean Frequency	SD
Harm	3.29%	2.61
Fairness	0.88%	1.36
Ingroup	0.68%	1.34
Authority	0.92%	1.72

Purity	0.88%	1.56
--------	-------	------

Within ANOVA: $F(4, 251) = 100.42, p < .001$

Harm vs. Fairness: $t(255) = 13.72, p < .001$

Harm vs. Ingroup: $t(255) = 15.16, p < .001$

Harm vs. Authority: $t(255) = 12.16, p < .001$

Harm vs. Purity: $t(255) = 12.62, p < .001$

Fairness

Analysis: Fairness frequencies in Fairness cells vs. Fairness frequencies in Non-Fairness cells.

Moral Foundation	Mean Frequency	SD
Fairness	1.55%	2.20
Harm	0.52%	1.23
Ingroup	0.27%	0.88
Authority	0.37%	0.80
Purity	0.57%	1.32

Within ANOVA: $F(4, 251) = 35.70, p < .001$

Fairness vs. Harm: $t(255) = 6.54, p < .001$

Fairness vs. Ingroup: $t(255) = 8.94, p < .001$

Fairness vs. Authority: $t(255) = 7.79, p < .001$

Fairness vs. Purity: $t(255) = 6.12, p < .001$

Ingroup

Analysis: Ingroup frequencies in Ingroup cells vs. Ingroup frequencies in Non- Ingroup cells

Moral Foundation	Mean Frequency	SD
Ingroup	1.53%	1.88
Harm	0.46%	1.05
Fairness	0.41%	0.86
Authority	0.29%	0.87
Purity	0.41%	0.90

Within ANOVA: $F(4, 251) = 50.97, p < .001$

Ingroup vs. Harm: $t(255) = 8.47, p < .001$

Ingroup vs. Fairness: $t(255) = 8.68, p < .001$

Ingroup vs. Authority: $t(255) = 9.58, p < .001$

Ingroup vs. Purity: $t(255) = 8.37, p < .001$

Authority

Analysis: Authority frequencies in Authority cells vs. Authority frequencies in Non-Authority cells

Moral Foundation	Mean Frequency	SD
Authority	3.60%	3.30
Harm	0.52%	1.13
Fairness	0.54%	1.00
Ingroup	0.66%	1.27
Purity	0.72%	1.53

Within ANOVA: $F(4, 251) = 134.58, p < .001$

Authority vs. Harm: $t(255) = 13.94, p < .001$

Authority vs. Fairness: $t(255) = 14.28, p < .001$

Authority vs. Ingroup: $t(255) = 13.45, p < .001$

Authority vs. Purity: $t(255) = 12.17, p < .001$

Purity

Analysis: Purity frequencies in Purity cells vs. Purity frequencies in Non- Purity cells

Moral Foundation	Mean Frequency	SD
Purity	1.09%	1.67
Harm	0.13%	0.43
Fairness	0.13%	0.45
Ingroup	0.05%	0.27
Authority	0.11%	0.44

Within ANOVA: $F(4, 251) = 72.19, p < .001$

Purity vs. Harm: $t(255) = 8.93, p < .001$

Purity vs. Fairness: $t(255) = 8.82, p < .001$

Purity vs. Ingroup: $t(255) = 9.82, p < .001$

Purity vs. Authority: $t(255) = 8.96, p < .001$