

**Detecting and reducing intergroup bias:  
Using vignettes in experimental research**

*A textbook/ Vysokoškolská učebnica*

Andrej Findor

*Published by:*

Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave

*Year of publication:*

2017

*Edition:*

1st edition

*ISBN:*

978-80-223-4435-7

*Reviewers:*

Mgr. Pavol Hardoš, PhD.

Mgr. Otakar Horák, PhD.

*Acknowledgments:*

This work was supported by VEGA, the Scientific Grant Agency of the Ministry of Education, Science, Research, and Sport of the Slovak Republic and the Slovak Academy of Sciences, under the project no. 2/0079/15 “Imagined contact as a tool for prejudice reduction? Testing the method in Slovak context”.

*About the author:*

Andrej Findor is an assistant professor at the Institute of European Studies and International Relations, Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University in Bratislava.

# Contents

<b>List of vignettes</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>List of tables</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 1. Vignettes in experimental research: Key concepts</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Chapter 2. Making treatments work: Detecting ethnic/racial bias in moral judgment</b>	<b>19</b>
Research project 1: Ethnic/racial bias in moral judgment	20
<b>Chapter 3. Transferring theories across countries: Reducing ethnic and sexual prejudice</b>	<b>35</b>
Research project 2: Changing attitudes to Roma with MFT	36
Research Project 3: Increasing public acceptance of LGBTI people	46
<b>Chapter 4. Confounds in treatments: What drives the attitude change in persuasive communication?</b>	<b>57</b>
Research project 4: Changing attitudes to same-sex marriage with MFT	59
Research project 5: Changing environmental attitudes with MFT	63
<b>Chapter 5. By way of conclusion: Deception, research ethics, and scientific conduct</b>	<b>71</b>
Research project 6: Threat and anti-immigrant attitudes	71
How to handle vignettes: Openness, authority, and constant vigilance	76
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>82</b>

# List of vignettes

Vignette 1	21
Vignette 2	22
Vignette 3	23
Vignette 4	24
Vignette 5	28
Vignette 6	32
Vignette 7	40
Vignette 8	41
Vignette 9	47
Vignette 10	48
Vignette 11	50
Vignette 12	51
Vignette 13	60
Vignette 14	61
Vignette 15	64
Vignette 16	65
Vignette 17	72
Vignette 18	73

# List of tables

Table 1. Experimental design: Ethnic/racial bias in moral judgment	27
Table 2. The five moral foundations	37
Table 3. Experimental design: Changing attitudes to Roma with MFT	43
Table 4. Comparison of the treatments: Changing attitudes to Roma with MFT	44
Table 5. Factorial research design: Increasing public acceptance of LGBTI people	52
Table 6. Experimental design: Changing attitudes to same-sex marriage with MFT	62
Table 7. Experimental design: Changing environmental attitudes with MFT	68
Table 8. Experimental design: Threat, emotions and prejudice in anti-immigrant attitudes	74

# Introduction

Detecting ethnic or racial bias in social judgment and reducing various forms of intergroup prejudice and discrimination by changing attitudes of social actors has long been on the research agenda of various social science disciplines. This textbook presents vignettes – short, carefully constructed scenarios about a person, object, or situation – as effective research instruments that can help to detect the intergroup bias or discover how (not) to change someone’s opinion. The textbook introduces students to basic principles of designing and evaluating vignettes. Each chapter is centred around practical, hands-on exercises with vignettes used in published and unpublished research. Throughout the textbook, students can learn how to make effective experimental treatments with vignettes; how (not) to transfer theories used for vignette development from one country-context to another; how to detect and prevent the occurrence of confounding variables in vignettes; and how to use deception in vignettes design in a responsible, participant-sensitive manner. The assessment of strong and weak characteristic of presented vignettes-based research projects encourages students to adopt the criteria of openness, transparency, and reproducibility as the guiding principles of scientific ethics and conduct.

The 187 words in the paragraph above are succinct and informative enough to be considered as a fine example of an academic abstract. Yet, I believe they leave some essential questions about this textbook unanswered.

## **Why vignettes?**

Vignettes count among the most widely used instruments to conduct experiments in social and behavioural sciences. Experimental research (not only the one using vignettes) is a member of quantitative methods family. Several years ago when I

began doing experiments, vignettes were among the first novel things I had to learn from scratch. Since I had no proper training in quantitative methods, I had to rely on the qualitative, interpretative skill-set that I learned by analysing texts or interviewing people. Vignettes and to some degree design of questionnaires that are used to collect values of dependent/ outcome variables were the only parts of experimental method that I felt comfortably with. In contrast to statistical analysis, I could pick them up more easily. The reason for my writing on such a personal note is simple: I want to show that even someone who is untrained in quantitative methodology can grasp the design and application of vignettes in experimental research. It only requires solid reading comprehension and elementary imagination when it comes to realizing the (sometimes ambiguous) potential of vignettes in conveying the desired meaning. This alone makes the vignettes an ideal starting point for anyone who wishes to pursue the experimental research but has still too much respect for crunching numbers.

### **Why intergroup bias and its reduction?**

The vignettes presented in this textbook are, with one exception, all about detecting and reducing intergroup bias - stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination. They concern various stigmatised out-groups – Roma, gays and lesbians, immigrants – and in one case a policy (environmental protection) that deeply divides the citizens of the United States. I have two strong reasons for presenting vignettes about intergroup bias and its reduction in this text.

First, I believe in what might be called a noble purpose in studying social phenomena. For me, social science research should be about uncovering often hidden biases in judgment and behaviour of the people – “them”, the out-groups – who are for various reasons excluded from belonging to “us”, our in-groups. I think it is equally important to study what can we do about it: how to reduce intergroup prejudice or change attitudes in the direction that makes “us” and “them” more equal.

Second, vignettes employed within an experimental design, are perfectly suited to deal with issues that might be too sensitive, socially undesirable to share by answering questions in survey research. Instead of asking respondents what they think about various groups of people at once and thus triggering their socially desirable responding to hide “double standards” they might have for different groups of people, we might ask them these questions in separate, randomly assigned experimental groups, and then compare their answers across these groups.

### **Why this format?**

The underlying principle of this textbook is that practising something is a better way to learn than just reading what other people have written about it. In this respect, this text is more an exercise book than a textbook with carefully distilled authoritative knowledge based on extensive literature review.

Except for the first chapter, which introduces the basic conceptual apparatus to deal with vignettes in experimental research, each chapter is structured in the same fashion. First, I provide the context (its story and significance) about the research project(s) covered in the respective chapter. Second, I list the concepts covered in the chapter, so you can easily check back and forth between the respective chapter and the first, conceptual chapter. Each chapter will present at least one research project with accompanying vignettes. In each chapter you will be asked to participate in exercises – answer questions related to design of vignettes presented within respective research projects. The exercises will be concluded with a take-home message – what to do and especially what not to do when designing vignettes. I call this message a “learning from failure”. At the end of each chapter you will find my recommendation for further reading that could extend the issues you dealt with in the respective chapter.

In the textbook, I will often use “we” instead of “I” not because I prefer the author’s voice in plural form. “We” simply refers to the fact that I authored some of the research projects with my collaborators - Matej Hruška, Miroslav Sirota, Marie Juanchich, and John Gould. Together, we developed the vignettes and research designs that are presented in chapters 2 and 3.

### **Who is this textbook for?**

I use vignettes in my research and I expect most students who write their BA and MA thesis projects with me to use vignettes as well. So, naturally, this textbook is for them. Also, students attending my courses on political psychology and political communication are often asked to read papers or read about papers that are based on utilising vignettes in experimental research. They could also find this textbook useful.

### **What will you learn?**

Besides learning how to design and use vignettes in experimental research, what I would like you to learn while reading this textbook is to maintain “constant vigilance” whenever reading vignettes or other experimental materials. In the last chapter you will learn where this advice comes from. I hope it will become clear that I am asking you to be alert when reading experimental materials (including vignettes) – to take nothing for granted.

# Chapter 1. Vignettes in experimental research: Key concepts

## **Context of Chapter 1:**

In this chapter, you will be introduced to key concepts needed to design and apply vignettes in experimental research. This is a reference chapter, so you are invited to consult these concepts whenever reading about and critically scrutinizing the vignettes in the chapters that follow.

## **Concepts to be learned in Chapter 1:**

- observational/correlational research
- experimental research
- between-subjects/between-groups design
- within-subject design
- simple experimental design
- factorial design
- experimental treatment
- treatment/independent/predictor variable
- outcome/dependent variable
- confounding variable
- manipulated variable
- internal validity
- construct validity
- causal validity
- statistical validity
- manipulation checks

- *ceteris paribus* rule
- lab experiment
- field experiment
- population-based survey experiment
- external validity
- vignette
- third-person judgment
- internal experimental realism
- comprehensibility
- unobtrusiveness
- deception
- experimental demand effect
- social-desirability bias
- ecological validity

## **The design of experimental research**

Vignettes are frequently used in both, qualitative (various types of interviews) and quantitative (lab experiments and population-based experiments) research. In quantitative research, we need to distinguish between observational and experimental research.

**Observational or correlational research** is based on observations of variables of interest in their natural environment without directly interfering with them. In **experimental research**, researchers manipulate one or several variables to find out whether they have effect on other variable(s). (Field, 2013, p. 13) Experimental research (not only the one employing the vignettes) starts with formulation of a **testable hypothesis** that is grounded in a relevant theory pertaining to the studied object of interest. Hypothesis is usually a causal statement about the impact of treatment on the outcome variables.

Experiments have to fulfill two fundamental conditions. First, “no causation without manipulation” (Imai, 2017. p. 48) - researchers have to have a control over the **manipulation of variables**. They must be able to “isolate causal variables that constitute basis for experimental manipulation” (Iyengar, 2011, p. 78). Second, researchers need to rule out the fundamental problem of causal inference - our inability to observe the **counterfactual outcomes** (the effect of present and absent treatment variable on outcome) (Imai, 2017. p. 47). The way to accomplish this is to use **random assignment of participants to conditions**, to make sure that each participant has equal chance to be in each treatment condition.

**Randomization** requires the “use of an impersonal device with known probabilistic properties” (Jackson & Cox, 2013, p. 33). Throughout the following chapters, you will be repeatedly asked to randomly assign yourself and your coursemates to different groups (experimental conditions). Lottery draws (<https://www.wikihow.com/Randomize>) and online randomization generators (e.g. <https://www.randomizer.org/>) are the most convenient ways to randomize.

In **between-subjects** or **between-groups design**, the participants are randomly assigned to distinct treatment conditions and thus receive a single vignette in one treatment condition - “they make choices in only one state of the world”, while in **within-subject design**, all participant are exposed to all available treatment conditions thus receiving multiple vignettes - “they make choices in multiple states of the world” (Mutz, 2011, p. 55; Field & Hole, 2003, p. 70; Morton & Williams, 2010, p. 86, 87).

**Simple experimental designs** manipulate one characteristic of a study object while **factorial design** manipulate more than one characteristic, factors of treatment. Vignettes are particularly well suited to be applied in factorial design (Mutz, 2011).

## **Treatments, variables and internal validity**

**Experimental treatments** are “potentially causal interventions” (Druckman, Green, Kuklinski, & Lupia, 2011, p. 16) that are controlled by a researcher. **Treatment/ independent/ predictor variable** is “the principal variable that we expect to have a causal impact” (Morton & Williams, 2010, p. 76). Its value is independent from other variables in the experiment and instead is manipulated by the researcher. The value of treatment variable depends on the **manipulated variable** - “a variable that has an impact on the treatment variable [and] can be manipulated either naturally or by an experimenter” (Morton & Williams, 2010, p. 77). **Manipulation** is “the construction of events or information in a controlled environment” (Kuipers & Hysom, 2014, p. 148). It is controlled by an experimenter who “creates the independent variables operationally within the experimental setting” (Walker, 2014, p. 130). The treatment and manipulated variable are not identical. As you will see in Chapter 2, certain treatments based on seemingly immutable characteristics (such as race, gender or ethnicity) cannot be directly applied in experimentation but some of their signalling characteristics (ethnic-specific names, skin tone) can become the subject of experimental manipulation.

**Internal validity** is about the “causal impact of the concerned stimulus” or “the extent to which causal assumptions are satisfied in the study”. Internal validity concerns the question whether in fact the experimental manipulation (stimulus) is solely responsible for the differences in outcome variables between various treatment conditions (Druckman, Green, Kuklinski, & Lupia, 2011, p. 18, 20; Imai, 2017, p. 50). In general, we can understand the **internal validity** as “the approximate truth of the inference or knowledge claim within a target population studied” (Morton & Williams, 2010, p. 255). More specifically, internal validity can be broken down into three separate components: **construct validity** - “whether the inferences from the data are valid for the theory (or constructs) the researcher is evaluating in a theory testing experiment”; **causal validity** - “whether the relationships the researcher finds within the target population analyzed are causal”; and **statistical validity** -

“whether there is a statistically significant covariance between the variables the researcher is interested in and whether the relationship is sizable” (ibid., p. 256).

**Manipulation checks** indicate the degree of control the researcher has over his or her treatment (independent) variables (Walker, 2014, p. 132). They check (provide evidence) that “manipulations actually got through the respondents” (Mutz, 2011, p. 65). In the case of effective manipulation, participants experience or interpret the treatment variable in the same way as it was intended by the researcher (Kuipers & Hysom, 2014, p. 151; Druckman, Green, Kuklinski, & Lupia, 2011, p. 18).

When applying treatments, researchers observe ***ceteris paribus* rule** - they do what they can to keep other things (variables) equal, they manipulate the treatment variables only.

Keeping other factors intact is the best way to prevent the potential effects of **confounding variables** which are “variables other than experimental manipulation that affects the outcome variable” (Field, 2013, p. 480). Confounds introduce factor or factors that were not accounted for in the experimental manipulation and thus challenge the causal relationship between treatment and outcome variables as spurious relationship.

The value of **outcome/dependent variable** is the outcome of intervention and depends on other variables (Field & Hole, 2003, p. 21), it “represents the effects that we wish to explain” (Morton & Williams, 2010, p. 78). Outcome/dependent variables follow after the treatment (vignette) and usually have a questionnaire format - a set of questions with scalable answers. The issues related to the design of questionnaire are not the subject of this textbook.

## **Types of experiments and external validity**

In **lab experiments**, participants are subjected to interventions (treatments) in an environment that was created and is controlled by the researcher. Lab experiments usually rely on a special category of participants - undergraduate students from universities, or on friends, relatives and acquaintances in convenience samples recruited through personal social networks.

In contrast, **field experiments** take place in natural environments that were not created by the researcher and over which he or she has a lesser degree of control than in the lab. Although the researcher controls the random assignment to different treatments, it is very difficult to have the same degree of control over the sample (characteristics of the participants) and the exact manner and context in which the treatment happens (Jackson & Cox, 2013).

**Population-based survey experiments** combine the advantages of large-scale surveys and experimental research. They are usually conducted on representative or random samples of the target population (exactly like in a survey research) and offer a higher degree of control over the environment than field experiments. Participants in survey experiments are usually recruited online from national online panels run by market research firms (such as 2muse or GfK in Slovakia) or through crowdsourcing platforms (such as Mechanical Turk or Prolific Academic) and less often offline (face-to-face) via interviewer networks operated by market research firms. The offline survey experiments rely on electronic devices (tablets) to make the random assignment to conditions possible. Findings from survey experiments are usually more generalizable for the target population than outcomes from the lab experiments.

The generalizability of findings is represented by **external validity**, which is “the extent to which the conclusions can be generalized beyond a particular study” (Imai, 2017, p. 50), although there are alternative definitions that refer to a broader scope of generalization: “External validity is the approximate truth of the inference or knowledge claim for observations beyond the target population studied” (Morton & Williams, 2010, p. 255). Morton and Williams argue that political scientists “often

apply the term external validity incorrectly even if they are aware of the definition” - having a random or stratified representative sample from the target population does not make the findings valid for other populations which were not considered in the sampling (Morton & Williams, 2010, p. 264). The mounting evidence suggest that external validity is a challenge that is endemic to how research in behavioural sciences is conducted and interpreted (Fessler et al., 2015; Barrett et al., 2016). Findings from research samples consisting of undergraduate (mostly North American) university students in W.E.I.R.D. (western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic) societies are generalized for the whole human population as inferences about the “human nature” despite them being outliers in many characteristic that make up the human condition (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010).

## **Vignettes**

**Experimental vignette methodology (EVM)** consists of “presenting participants with carefully constructed and realistic scenarios to assess dependent variables including intentions, attitudes, and behaviors” (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014, p. 352). Since its inception in anthropology in 1950s, vignettes became the method of alternative choice to survey research (and laboratory experiments) in political science, organizational studies, social work, sociology, communication, psychology, nursing and other social science disciplines (Finch, 1987; Hughes & Huby, 2002; Hughes & Huby, 2004; Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010; Aguinis & Bradley, 2014; Hainmueller, Hangartner, & Yamamoto, 2015).

**Vignette** is “a short, carefully constructed description of a person, object, or situation, representing a systematic combination of characteristics” (Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010, p. 128). Although mostly presented in a text format, vignettes can solely consist of or include images and videos (Hughes & Huby, 2002). “The goal of vignette treatments is to evaluate what difference it makes when the actual object of study or judgment, or the context in which that object appears, is systematically

changed in some way” (Mutz, 2011, p. 54). Participants are frequently asked to imagine themselves in hypothetical situations and they report how they would act on those situations. More often, participants are expected to make **third-person judgments** about other people described in vignettes.

In comparison to experimental research in the lab, vignettes provide participants with less tangible experience that might not increase the intensity of participants’ emotions and might not impact affective meanings related to the presented stimuli (Collett & Childs, 2011). On the other hand, vignettes as “multivalent representations of subjects or situations” have several advantages over survey methodology: 1. vignettes are embedded in more concrete, realistic context - they enhance experimental realism (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014, p. 352); 2. they can study multiple factors simultaneously; 3. they are better at avoiding the socially desirable responses of the participants (Steiner, Atzmüller, & Su, 2016, p. 53).

### **Internal experimental realism**

Internal experimental realism is “the extent to which respondents are fully aware of and responsive to the characteristics in treatments” (Mutz, 2011, p. 65) It depends on the strength of manipulations: how strong is the presence of treatment variables in experimental materials.

First, **treatments must be blunt and realistic enough to be understandable to participants** (Walker, 2014, p. 128). Experimental manipulations must be created in an extremely comprehensible manner, so they can be interpreted in a similar fashion by as many participants as possible - “SUBTLETY IS OUT OF PLACE IN EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN” (Walker, 2014, p. 131)

Second, participants must be provided with enough opportunities to receive the treatment - manipulated pieces of information. According to Walker “it is better to err on the side of saying things too often, even with a risk of irritating the

participants than to err on the side of not saying things often enough and failing to properly create the conditions needed to create useful data” (2014, p. 131) Walker advises that **participants should be introduced to relevant pieces of information in the experimental materials at least three times** although participants “who are not used to the laboratory setting may need more friendly and repetitious instructions” and conveying of manipulated information (ibid.). This draws our attention to the type of participants that receive the vignette treatments. Vignettes should be comprehensible even for the least educated, the least receptive participant. This applies especially to population-based samples in survey experiments that consist of a far greater variety of participants than student samples or convenience samples used in lab experiments.

Internal experimental realism is closely connected to one of the components of external validity: **ecological validity** - “whether the methods, materials, and settings of the research are similar to a given target environment” (Morton & Williams, 2010, p. 265).

Treatments in vignettes should strike the right balance between being obvious enough to be **comprehensible** even to the least receptive participant and being **non-obtrusive** enough not to reveal the purpose behind the treatment to the most perceptive participant. According to Diana C. Mutz, in vignette studies, researchers “must walk a fine line” between making sure that respondents process the relevant treatment and attracting their undue attention to the study’s purpose behind the treatments (2011, p. 58). In order to distract participants’ undue attention to study’s purpose, manipulations in experimental design may involve the use of **deception** - “deceiving the subject about the true nature [of the study] or its hypothesis” (Kuipers & Hysom, 2014, p. 148)

Vignette design should account for two potential biases in participants’ style of responding. First, the treatments in vignettes should not contain cues that “convey to participants what is expected of them” (Iyengar, 2011, p. 77). Researchers should be aware of creating a potential **experimental demand effect** in their vignette design

- participants generating “knowledge or guesses about the expectations that researchers have for their behaviour” (Kuipers & Hysom, 2014, p. 149). Second, the vignette design should reduce as much as possible the potential **social desirability bias** - “the tendency on behalf of the subjects to deny socially undesirable traits and to claim socially desirable ones, and the tendency to say things which place the speaker in a favourable light” (Nederhof, 1985, p. 264)

Heeding the advice of Mutz (2011, p. 55) - “the best way to understand the potential of vignette treatments is by example” not by abstract terms - the chapters that follow will provide examples to substantiate the abstract concepts presented in the introductory chapter.

## Chapter 2. Making treatments work: Detecting ethnic/racial bias in moral judgment

### Context of Chapter 2:

The vignettes presented in this chapter were used in our research about ethnic/racial bias in moral judgment. Our aim was to find out whether in Slovakia there is a “double moral standard” in judgments of Roma as compared to judgments of Slovaks, Hungarians, or targets with undisclosed ethnicity. Unfortunately, all three studies we conducted within this research project confirmed the existence of ethnic/racial bias in moral judgment: Slovak participants judged the character and actions of targets more harshly when targets were Roma, compared to Slovak, Hungarian or undisclosed ethnicity.

We used “ethnic/racial” as a composite construct because group-based categorization practices in Slovakia contain both elements at once: distinguishing Slovaks and Hungarians by their **ethnic** characteristics (language, history, institutions); and distinguishing Roma and Slovaks (and Hungarians) by ethnic (language, customs) AND by **racial** characteristics (colour and tone of skin). The identifier most of the Slovaks use for Roma is “Gypsy” and “whites” for non-Roma. The impossibility to separate ethnicity and race for analytical purposes is not a unique property of the category of Roma, but is an inherent feature of many social categories across diverse contexts and countries (Sen & Wasow, 2016).

The results (not presented in this textbook) showed that Slovak participants made stricter judgments about Roma protagonist’s (stigmatized out-group) and his family’s moral character, morality of actions, punishment for morally ambiguous behaviour, deservingness of social assistance, and attributions for their socio/economic

situation than about protagonist (and his family) of Slovak (in-group), Hungarian (non-stigmatized out-group), or undisclosed ethnicity.

### **Concepts to be exercised in Chapter 2:**

- vignette
- simple experimental design
- between-subject/ between-group design
- experimental treatment
- treatment variable
- confounding variable
- manipulated variable
- *ceteris paribus* rule
- third-person judgment
- internal experimental realism
- comprehensibility
- unobtrusiveness
- experimental demand effect
- social-desirability bias
- ecological validity

## Research project 1: Ethnic/racial bias in moral judgment

### **Instructions:**

Please, by using lottery or randomization generator mentioned in the Chapter 1, randomly assign the students of your class into four groups. Group 1 will read Vignette 1, group 2 will read Vignette 2, group 3 will read Vignette 3, and group 4 will

read Vignette 4. After carefully reading the assigned vignette, answer the questions that follow after Vignette 4. First, answer each question individually. Second, share your answers with other members of your group. Third, compare the answers across all groups.

Please, read carefully Vignette 1:

### **Vignette 1**

The XY family lives in very modest conditions, like many other families in poor Slovak counties that are plagued with a high unemployment rate. Father of four children, Mr. XY works illegally (off the books) at a construction site in the capital. Even though he is not receiving unemployment benefits, the state still pays for his health insurance. From the money he earns at the construction site, Mr. XY should pay for his own health insurance. It is unlawful to let the state pay for his health insurance. The company which employs Mr. XY illegally (off the books) is also breaking the law.

Mrs. XY is a mother of four children who are 2, 4, 7 and 9 years old. A fifth child is expected to be born in three months. Until now, Mrs. XY has never had a job because she was continually on maternity leave. The family XY lives in the same household as the parents of Mrs. XY who are long-term unemployed/job seekers. In a county with a 27% unemployment rate this is not unusual.

Thanks to the income of Mr. XY and the social benefits that the Slovak Republic provides to all families who fulfil the required criteria by the social assistance legislation, the XY family can survive from month to month.

The XY family receives **203,20 EUR** of parental allowance and **94,08 EUR** of children allowances.

The XY family is eligible for assistance in material need (160,40 EUR); housing allowance (89,20 EUR); school attendance allowance for two children (34,40 EUR); and Mr. XY can apply for an activation allowance (63,07 EUR), which he must work off by working at public cleaning in the village. Because the total entitlement of family XY for assistance in material need is counted in with parental

allowance, family XY will receive through assistance in material need plus the related allowances **143,87 EUR**.

Thanks to the social benefits provided by the state, the XY family receives a total monthly allowance of **441,15 EUR**.

Please, read carefully Vignette 2:

### **Vignette 2**

The Kováč family lives in very modest conditions, like many other Slovak families in poor Slovak counties that are plagued with a high unemployment rate. Father of four children, Mr. Kováč works illegally (off the books) at a construction site in the capital. Even though he is not receiving unemployment benefits, the state still pays for his health insurance. From the money he earns at the construction site, Mr. Kováč should pay for his own health insurance. It is unlawful to let the state pay for his health insurance. The company which employs Mr. Kováč illegally (off the books) is also breaking the law.

Mrs. Kováč is a mother of four children who are 2, 4, 7 and 9 years old. A fifth child is expected to be born in three months. Until now, Mrs. Kováč has never had a job because she was continually on maternity leave. The family Kováč lives in the same household as the parents of Mrs. Kováč who are long-term unemployed/job seekers. In a county with a 27% unemployment rate this is not unusual.

Thanks to the income of Mr. Kováč and the social benefits that the Slovak Republic provides to all families who fulfil the required criteria by the social assistance legislation, the Kováč family can survive from month to month.

The Kováč family receives **203,20 EUR** of parental allowance and **94,08 EUR** of children allowances.

The Kováč family is eligible for assistance in material need (160,40 EUR); housing allowance (89,20 EUR); school attendance allowance for two children (34,40

EUR); and Mr. Kováč can apply for an activation allowance (63,07 EUR), which he must work off by working at public cleaning in the village. Because the total entitlement of family Kováč for assistance in material need is counted in with parental allowance, family Kováč will receive through assistance in material need plus the related allowances **143,87 EUR**.

Thanks to the social benefits provided by the state, the Kováč family receives a total monthly allowance of **441,15 EUR**.

Please, read carefully Vignette 3:

### **Vignette 3**

The Nagy family lives in very modest conditions, like many other Hungarian families in poor Slovak counties that are plagued with a high unemployment rate. Father of four children, Mr. Nagy works illegally (off the books) at a construction site in the capital. Even though he is not receiving unemployment benefits, the state still pays for his health insurance. From the money he earns at the construction site, Mr. Nagy should pay for his own health insurance. It is unlawful to let the state pay for his health insurance. The company which employs Mr. Nagy illegally (off the books) is also breaking the law.

Mrs. Nagy is a mother of four children who are 2, 4, 7 and 9 years old. A fifth child is expected to be born in three months. Until now, Mrs. Nagy has never had a job because she was continually on maternity leave. The family Nagy lives in the same household as the parents of Mrs. Nagy who are long-term unemployed/job seekers. In a county with a 27% unemployment rate this is not unusual.

Thanks to the income of Mr. Nagy and the social benefits that the Slovak Republic provides to all families who fulfil the required criteria by the social assistance legislation, the Nagy family can survive from month to month.

The Nagy family receives **203,20 EUR** of parental allowance and **94,08 EUR** of children allowances.

The Nagy family is eligible for assistance in material need (160,40 EUR); housing allowance (89,20 EUR); school attendance allowance for two children (34,40 EUR); and Mr. Nagy can apply for an activation allowance (63,07 EUR), which he must work off by working at public cleaning in the village. Because the total entitlement of family Nagy for assistance in material need is counted in with parental allowance, family Nagy will receive through assistance in material need plus the related allowances **143,87 EUR**.

Thanks to the social benefits provided by the state, the Nagy family receives a total monthly allowance of **441,15 EUR**.

Please, read carefully Vignette 4:

#### **Vignette 4**

The Lakatoš family lives in very modest conditions, like many other Roma families in poor Slovak counties that are plagued with a high unemployment rate. Father of four children, Mr. Lakatoš works illegally (off the books) at a construction site in the capital. Even though he is not receiving unemployment benefits, the state still pays for his health insurance. From the money he earns at the construction site, Mr. Lakatoš should pay for his own health insurance. It is unlawful to let the state pay for his health insurance. The company which employs Mr. Lakatoš illegally (off the books) is also breaking the law.

Mrs. Lakatoš is a mother of four children who are 2, 4, 7 and 9 years old. A fifth child is expected to be born in three months. Until now, Mrs. Lakatoš has never had a job because she was continually on maternity leave. The family Lakatoš lives in the same household as the parents of Mrs. Lakatoš who are long-term

unemployed/job seekers. In a county with a 27% unemployment rate this is not unusual.

Thanks to the income of Mr. Lakatoš and the social benefits that the Slovak Republic provides to all families who fulfil the required criteria by the social assistance legislation, the Lakatoš family can survive from month to month.

The Lakatoš family receives **203,20 EUR** of parental allowance and **94,08 EUR** of children allowances.

The Lakatoš family is eligible for assistance in material need (160,40 EUR); housing allowance (89,20 EUR); school attendance allowance for two children (34,40 EUR); and Mr. Lakatoš can apply for an activation allowance (63,07 EUR), which he must work off by working at public cleaning in the village. Because the total entitlement of family Lakatoš for assistance in material need is counted in with parental allowance, family Lakatoš will receive through assistance in material need plus the related allowances **143,87 EUR**.

Thanks to the social benefits provided by the state, the Lakatoš family receives a total monthly allowance of **441,15 EUR**.

Please, answer the following questions:

1. What is the ethnicity of the protagonist and his family that you read about in the vignette?
2. How did you learn about the ethnicity of the protagonist and his family in the vignette?

3. Think of this ladder, to the right, as representing where people stand in Slovakia.

At the top of the ladder (10) are the people who are the best off – those who have the most money, the most education, and the most respected jobs. At the bottom (1) are the people who are the worst off - who have the least money, least education, and the least respected jobs or no job. The higher someone is on this ladder, the closer he or she is to the people at the very top; the lower someone is, the closer he or she is to the people at the very bottom.

**Where would you place the protagonist and his family your read about on this ladder?**

Please choose the cell (1 to 10) corresponding to the position on the ladder where you think the protagonist and his family stand compared to people in Slovakia.

-> 10
-> 9
-> 8
-> 7
-> 6
-> 5
-> 4
-> 3
-> 2
-> 1

4. After you answered individually these three questions, share your responses with other members of your group. Describe the variance in responses for your group. Prepare a short summary description of the responses given in your group.

5. Calculate your group's mean value for responses to socio-economic standing (sum up the values of all responses in your group and divide them by the number of members in your group).

6. Compare the short summary descriptions of the responses given in all groups.

7. Compare mean values for responses to socio-economic standing for all four groups.

As Table 1 indicates, the four vignettes presented above were presented as stimuli (experimental materials) in a **between-subject/ between-groups design** to study the impact of ethnicity of the protagonist and his family on a variety moral

judgments made by the participants. The protagonist and his family were either Slovak (members of an in-group), Hungarian (members of an unstigmatized out-group), Roma (members of a stigmatised out-group) or their ethnic identity was not disclosed (control group).

In the research project we used **simple experimental design**: we manipulated only one treatment factor - the ethnicity of the protagonist and his family.

**Table 1.**

**Experimental design - ethnic bias in moral judgment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Vignette</b>	<b>Treatment</b>
1	1	no ethnicity (last name “XY”)
2	2	Slovak (last name “Kováč”)
3	3	Hungarian (last name “Nagy”)
4	4	Roma (last name “Lakatoš”)

First important feature of the vignettes that we should discuss is how instrumental they have been in delivering the **experimental treatment**. Table 1 shows that members of each of the four groups read a vignette that signalled ethnicity of the protagonist and his family by his/their last name. The experimental treatment in vignettes strictly followed the ***ceteris paribus* rule** - except the manipulations, all other things were kept equal. In vignettes you have read, the **treatment variable** was the perceived ethnicity of the protagonist and his family. Since, it is impossible to manipulate the immutable characteristic such as race or ethnicity, the treatment relied on ethnic “soundingness” of the names used in the vignette (Sen & Wasow, 2016). The **manipulated variable** was ethnically distinct last name. Racially or ethnically distinctive names as signals of putative race or ethnicity fulfill the **excludability assumption of experimental research** - they are presumably

not easily confounded with socioeconomic status or political characteristics (Butler & Homola, 2017). They are often used in experimental research on bias and discrimination across several disciplines (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; DeSante, 2013; Ford, 2015; Harell, Soroka, & Iyengar, 2016).

Please, read carefully Vignette 5:

### **Vignette 5**

The XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš family lives in very modest conditions, like many other [XY = ethnicity not mentioned]/ Slovak/ Hungarian/ Roma families in poor Slovak counties that are plagued with a high unemployment rate. Father of four children, Mr. XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš works illegally (off the books) at a construction site in the capital. Even though he is not receiving unemployment benefits, the state still pays for his health insurance. From the money he earns at the construction site, Mr. XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš should pay for his own health insurance. It is unlawful to let the state pay for his health insurance. The company which employs Mr. XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš illegally (off the books) is also breaking the law.

Mrs. XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš is a mother of four children who are 2, 4, 7 and 9 years old. A fifth child is expected to be born in three months. Until now, Mrs. XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš has never had a job because she was continually on maternity leave. The family XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš lives in the same household as the parents of Mrs. XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš who are long-term unemployed/job seekers. In a county with a 27% unemployment rate this is not unusual.

Thanks to the income of Mr. XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš and the social benefits that the Slovak Republic provides to all families who fulfil the required criteria by the social assistance legislation, the XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš family can survive from month to month.

The XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš family receives **203,20 EUR** of parental allowance and **94,08 EUR** of children allowances.

The XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš family is eligible for assistance in material need (160,40 EUR); housing allowance (89,20 EUR); school attendance allowance for two children (34,40 EUR); and Mr. XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš can apply for an activation allowance (63,07 EUR), which he must work off by working at public cleaning in the village. Because the total entitlement of family XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš for assistance in material need is counted in with parental allowance, family XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš will receive through assistance in material need plus the related allowances **143,87 EUR**.

Thanks to the social benefits provided by the state, the XY/ Kováč/ Nagy/ Lakatoš family receives a total monthly allowance of **441,15 EUR**.

In order to signal the ethnicity of the protagonist and his family we used surnames typical for each ethnic group (Kováč for Slovak protagonist and his family, Nagy for Hungarian, Lakatoš for Roma, and XY for the protagonist and his family with undisclosed ethnicity). As you can see in Vignette 5, the last name signaling ethnicity is mentioned 16 times and the ethnicity of the family is explicitly mentioned once in the first sentence of the vignette.

Some authors warn that names are not enough to send unambiguous signals about target's race or ethnicity and they argue for using pictures to make sure ethnicity and race becomes obvious (Mutz, 2011; Mutz 2011). Although the "race as conveyed by a picture seems unavoidable" Mutz (2011. pp. 61), there are reasons against using faces in research on race and ethnicity without experimental control of the potential **confounding factors**. When manipulating faces as ethnic or racial stimuli, the experimental treatment should control for the influence of **facial appearance** on perceptions and judgments of target's character such as warmth, trustworthiness or intelligence (Penton-Voak, Pound, Little, & Perrett, 2006; Todorov, Said, Engell, & Oosterhof, 2008; Todorov, Olivola, Dotsch, & Mende-Siedlecki, 2015). In addition, when using pictures of faces to signal race or ethnicity, researcher should be beware

of the “bad is black” heuristic in social judgment - shortcut assumption that “immoral acts [are] committed by people with darker skin tones, regardless of the racial background of those immoral actors”(Alter, Stern, Granot, & Balcetis, 2016, p. 1653). The experimental control should thus account for the different effects of lighter and darker skin tones - **skin-tone bias** or **phenotypicality bias** - in ethnically and racially stereotypical facial depictions on social judgments<sup>1</sup> (Maddox, 2004; Maddox, & Perry, 2017).

If the comparison of group’s mean value for responses to socio-economic standing showed differences (e.g. the value for Roma group was the lowest), the **perceived socio-economic status** might have confounded the results of the research. Participants might not had been considering only the ethnicity of the protagonist and his family but also their standing in the society. This might lead to their scorning down and devaluing, stricter judgment of the protagonist and his family with lowest perceived social standing as lower status people (Fiske, 2010).

### **Learning from failure**

Unfortunately, when we conducted this research we have not thought about socio-economic status of the protagonist and his family as a potential confounding variable. If we did, we would have asked the participants the question about their perception of the protagonist and his family’s social standing and accounted for it in our interpretation of the data. When we submit this research for publication, we will report the **socio-economic status as a potential confounding factor** in the discussion and propose its inclusion in the future upgraded experimental design.

---

<sup>1</sup> The darker skin, not the self- and other-identification according to available ethno-racial category, is a better predictor of educational inequality and expectations in Latin and North American countries (Telles, Flores, & Urrea-Giraldo, 2015; Thompson & McDonald, 2016; Meeus, Paredes Mayor, González, Brown, & Manzi, 2017).

Second important feature of the vignettes you just read is their **internal experimental realism**. They conveyed a complex and realistic information about an unemployed man who was working illegally while receiving social benefits (his health insurance was paid by the state). The vignettes also included background information about family of the protagonist (four children; pregnant wife who has never worked due to being continuously on a maternal leave; all living together with his parents-in-law who had been long term unemployed), and the contextual information about protagonist's and his parents in law's unemployment situation (the county in which they resided had 27% unemployment rate). The vignette enumerated in a detailed manner various types and specific amounts of social assistance benefits for which the protagonist and his family were eligible, including the total sum of these monthly benefits - 441,15 EUR for the family of six. All amounts of social assistance benefits were **realistic calculations based on the then existing legislation** (as of March 2015) and were **highlighted in bold**.

Internal experimental realism is closely connected to one of the components of external validity - **ecological validity**: "whether the methods, materials, and settings of the research are similar to a given target environment" (Morton & Williams, 2010, p. 265). We purported to design our vignette to have a strong ecological validity: its key characteristics mimic the situation in the target environment. Working illegally - off the books, has been for years a frequent practice in construction industry in Slovakia (Folentová, 2013). Also, there are regions with high unemployment rates that are populated with many children families. These families often include a father who works off the books for a construction company (Sivý, 2013). Ecological validity of the vignette allowed us to consider the potential role the content of stereotypes plays in social judgment (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). The vignette contained information that were congruent (unemployment of protagonist and his parents in law, drawing of social assistance benefits, cheating - working off the books) and incongruent (willing to work) with stereotypes about Roma as "sinful losers": people who are too lazy to work and cheat on others - abuse social welfare system (Phalet & Poppe, 1997; Drál', 2009). Placing the information

congruent with stereotypes in vignettes was expected to answer research question about the relationship between group-specific stereotypes and moral judgment.

The third important feature of vignettes that deserves our attention is the fine line vignettes have to walk in conveying the treatment information between being **comprehensible** and at the same time **unobtrusive**. The vignette treatment is considered to be a good choice when devising treatments containing socially sensitive information - it “has the advantage of being less obtrusive way of studying the impact of race and other sensitive issues on human judgment” (Mutz, 2011, p. 64.).

On one hand, the treatment must not be too subtle, otherwise some of the participants might not comprehend it. As mentioned in Chapter 1, treatments must be blunt enough and repeated at least three times to get noticed. As you could see in Vignette 5, we tried our best not to underestimate the bluntness and repetitiveness of the treatment - the last name signaling ethnicity was mentioned 16 times and in addition the ethnicity of the family was explicitly mentioned once in the first sentence of the vignette.

On the hand, unobtrusiveness is in direct conflict with comprehensibility of the vignette. When done wrong, the real purpose of the treatment becomes too noticeable even to the least perceptive participant.

Please, read carefully Vignette 6:

### **Vignette 6**

The Lakatoš family lives in very modest conditions, like many other Roma families in poor Slovak counties that are plagued with a high unemployment rate. Father of four children, Mr. Lakatoš works illegally (off the books) at a construction site in the capital. Even though he is not receiving unemployment benefits, the state still

pays for his health insurance. From the money he earns at the construction site, Mr. Lakatoš should pay for his own health insurance. It is unlawful to let the state pay for his health insurance. The company which employs Mr. Lakatoš illegally (off the books) is also breaking the law.

Mrs. Lakatoš is a mother of four children who are 2, 4, 7 and 9 years old. A fifth child is expected to be born in three months. Until now, Mrs. Lakatoš has never had a job because she was continually on maternity leave. The family Lakatoš lives in the same household as the parents of Mrs. Lakatoš who are long-term unemployed/job seekers. In a county with a 27% unemployment rate this is not unusual.

Thanks to the income of Mr. Lakatoš and the social benefits that the Slovak Republic provides to all families who fulfil the required criteria by the social assistance legislation, the Lakatoš family can survive from month to month.

The Lakatoš family receives **203,20 EUR** of parental allowance and **94,08 EUR** of children allowances.

The Lakatoš family is eligible for assistance in material need (160,40 EUR); housing allowance (89,20 EUR); school attendance allowance for two children (34,40 EUR); and Mr. Lakatoš can apply for an activation allowance (63,07 EUR), which he must work off by working at public cleaning in the village. Because the total entitlement of family Lakatoš for assistance in material need is counted in with parental allowance, family Lakatoš will receive through assistance in material need plus the related allowances **143,87 EUR**.

Thanks to the social benefits provided by the state, the Lakatoš family receives a total monthly allowance of **441,15 EUR**.

Vignettes are useful tools to answer questions about the impact of categorical information (e.g. age, gender, race, ethnicity) on evaluative judgment, especially when “the direct approach has limited credibility” (Mutz, 2011, p. 64). We could ask the participants how they judge people of different ages, genders, races or ethnicities, but such direct approach would be too exposed to participants’ guessing of the reasons behind asking this type of question. It could trigger **social desirability** and

**demand effects** on their responses. They could answer in a socially desirable way by demonstrating their unprejudiced attitudes toward members of age, gender, racial or ethnic category. They could also respond in a way they think is demanded of them by the researchers - express opinions that researchers are expecting them to have. Equally problematic is to draw the undue attention to the real purpose behind the treatment. As you can see in Vignette 6, underlining the 16-times repeated last name-based information about the ethnicity of the protagonist and his family and one direct reference to the ethnicity of the family may reveal the study's real purpose by attracting the unwanted kind of attention of participants.

### **Recommended reading for Chapter 2:**

Mutz, D. C. (2011). *Population-based survey experiments*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

Mutz's book is my first choice when it comes to reading an introductory text on conducting population-based survey experiments. Mutz's approach is less formal and text-book like. Hers is a rich (often personal) account of what can go right and wrong when doing survey experiments and what one can learn from these failures and achievements.

# Chapter 3. Transferring theories across countries: Reducing ethnic and sexual prejudice

## **Context of Chapter 3:**

In this chapter you will read about two research projects in which we tested interventions aimed at persuasion and attitude change. As I wrote in the introduction, experiments are not only employed to uncover and describe inter-group biases. They are also well-suited to test the interventions aimed at the reduction of these biases.

In research project 2 we wanted to find out whether we can change the attitudes of Slovak participants to inter-school and intra-school segregation of Roma pupils. In research project 3 we were interested in learning what kind of message and messenger could increase the public acceptance of LGBTI (lesbians, gays, bisexual, transgender and inter-sex) people. Both these projects drew inspiration from, and were in a way Slovak adaptations of, theories and approaches that have been developed and tested in other countries. None of these theories and bias-reduction approaches has yet been validated in Slovakia. We found out that transferring these theories and approaches to Slovak context was far more challenging than we initially expected.

## **Concepts to be exercised in Chapter 3:**

- moral foundations
- persuasion and attitude change
- factorial research design

- direct replication
- conceptual replication
- message and messenger
- manipulation checks
- internal experimental realism
- comprehensibility
- ecological validity
- pretesting

## Research project 2: Changing attitudes to Roma with MFT

The Roma living in marginalized communities in Slovakia are subjected to a variety of discriminatory practices in employment, healthcare, and education that have far-reaching negative consequences for the wellbeing and socio-economic mobility (European Roma Rights Centre, 2007; Europarat, 2012). Roma children are often the victims of inter-school (separate schools for Roma and non-roma children) and intra-school (separate classes for Roma and non-Roma pupils within one school) segregation (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2014). We designed vignettes in research project 2 to learn how to persuade people in Slovakia to support the principle of inclusiveness - not segregating the Roma children - in Slovak schools and classes.

**Moral foundations theory** (MFT) was exactly what we were looking for in our search for the theory that would provide conceptual basis for our persuasive efforts. We had two solid reasons to have such high expectations from MFT's persuasive powers.

First, MFT offers an elaborate toolkit for understanding and analysing the plurality of people's judgmental values. MFT provides conceptual apparatus to capture and

explain the variance in values that people uphold and which give basis to their evaluative judgments. MFT was developed by Jonathan Haidt and Craig Joseph (Haidt & Joseph, 2004). Haidt and his colleagues later devised and validated a **moral foundations questionnaire** (MFQ) that measures the variance (differences) in moral judgments along five distinct moral foundations and can predict political attitudes and ideological positions (Haidt, Graham, & Joseph, 2009; Iyer, Koleva, Graham, Ditto, & Haidt, 2012; Koleva, Graham, Iyer, Ditto, & Haidt, 2012). To explain, at least partially, the plurality of moral judgments, we can borrow a useful metaphor from Haidt (2012) who likens distinct moral foundations to distinct taste buds. Human gustatory sensations are derived from five basic tastes (with corresponding set of five distinct taste buds in our mouths) – sweet, salty, sour, bitter, and savoury. Yet there is no universal gustatory standard that would dictate how the food we consume will actually taste to each of us. A meal that one finds too salty might not be salty enough for another. We might refer to the same concept (e.g. salty) but our perceptions of its quality (e.g. saltiness) can be subject to individual differences and collective, group-based criteria for its perception and judgment. Moral foundations questionnaire captures (see Table 2) the individual variance in moral judgment along five distinct moral foundations: care/harm, fairness/cheating, loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and sanctity/degradation (Graham et al., 2011; Graham, Haidt, et al., 2013). According to MFT every moral foundation has its distinct evolutionary roots with corresponding set of current cultural triggers and corresponding set of foundation-specific emotions.

**Table 2.**  
**The five moral foundations**

Care	Fairness	Loyalty	Authority	Sanctity
Harm	Cheating	Betrayal	Subversion	Degradation

<b>Adaptive challenge</b>	Protect and care for children	Reap benefits of two-way partnership	Form cohesive coalitions	Forge beneficial relationships within hierarchies	Avoid contaminants
<b>Original triggers</b>	Suffering, distress, or neediness expressed by one's child	Cheating, cooperation, deception	Threat or challenge to group	Signs of dominance and submission	Waste products, diseased people
<b>Current triggers</b>	Baby seals, cute cartoon characters	Marital fidelity, broken vending machines	Sport teams, nations	Bosses, respected professionals	Taboo ideas (communism, racism)
<b>Characteristic emotions</b>	Compassion	Anger, gratitude, guilt	Group pride, rage at traitors	Respect, fear	Disgust
<b>Relevant virtues</b>	Caring, kindness	Fairness, justice, trustworthiness	Loyalty, patriotism, self-sacrifice	Obedience, deference	Temperance, chastity, piety, cleanliness
<b>Moral Foundations Questionnaire (examples of questions)</b>	It can never be right to kill a human being.	Justice is the most important requirement for a society.	I am proud of my country's history.	Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.	People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed.

Source: (Haidt, 2012, p. 125). Bottom row was added by the author.

There is a robust cross-cultural evidence that moral foundations are strongly associated with political attitudes, ideological preferences, and religious beliefs (Iyer, Koleva, Graham, Ditto, & Haidt, 2012; Koleva, Graham, Iyer, Ditto, & Haidt, 2012; Graham, Nosek, & Haidt, 2012). There seems to be a “moral gap” between American conservative and liberals (Ditto & Koleva, 2011). The above mentioned studies provide evidence that American liberals are more sensitive than American conservatives to issues related to “individualising” (individual-centred) moral foundations of care/harm and fairness/cheating. On the other hand, American conservatives are more sensitive to three “binding” (group-centred) moral foundations of loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and sanctity/degradation.

Some researchers took the curious relationship between moral foundations, ideological preferences, and political opinions as an opportunity to test MFT's capacity to shift political attitudes.

Our second reason for using MFT in designing our research on changing attitudes was MFT's track record of successful **persuasive interventions**. Numerous studies have found that appealing to specific moral foundations that are relevant for the target audience can make the political appeals more persuasive (Feinberg & Willer, 2013; Day, Fiske, Downing, & Trail, 2014; Feinberg & Willer, 2015; Wolsko, Ariceaga, & Seiden, 2016; Miles, 2016; Voelkel & Feinberg, 2017).<sup>2</sup> These studies were built on a simple premise: changing the opinions of target audiences about divisive issues (environmental protection, immigration, same-sex marriages) in counter-attitudinal (persuasive) direction requires framing the argument in moral terms that the target audience can understand and can identify with. Trying to win the people over to your side in a moral language that appeals to their, not your, sacred, innermost values, had undisputable alluring attraction. Although all these studies were conducted on student or convenience samples in the United States, they covered diverse policy domains, so their results seemed promising and worth "replicating" in Slovak context. I used quotation marks for "replication" because we did not attempt to do **direct replication** - repeat the methods used in some of these studies in exactly the same manner as possible, but on different target population. What we tried to do, even though we were not aware of the concept that time, was a **conceptual replication** - showing that the principle can be "extended and applied in [...] different contexts" by using methods that can diverge from the ones used in original study (Chambers, 2017, pp. 14-15). We were equally ignorant of methodological problems associated with conceptual replication (ibid.).

### Instructions:

---

<sup>2</sup> You will learn more about some of these studies in Chapter 4.

Please, by using lottery or randomization generator mentioned in the Chapter 1, randomly assign the students of your class into two groups. Group 1 will read Vignette 7, group 2 will read Vignette 8. After carefully reading the assigned vignette, answer the questions that follow after Vignette 8. First, answer each question individually. Second, share your answers with other members of your group. Third, compare the answers across all groups.

Please, read carefully Vignette 7:

### **Vignette 7**

#### **Every child deserves a chance for quality education**

Children from Roma settlements belong to the same schools as other children. Every pupil should have an opportunity to get quality education. We have to make sure that this internationally acknowledged principle, which is already recognised by Slovak courts, becomes reality in Slovakia. The best way to take care of children is to ensure their having equal access to quality elementary education.

Findings from several towns and municipalities indicate that fulfilling the ideal of quality education for all will not be an easy task. Recent research in elementary schools in Eastern Slovakia pointed out the cases of purpose-built creation of school districts that included only Roma children. Other schools enrolled Roma children to „special classes“ on separate floors in order to prevent any contact with non-Roma schoolmates.

More than two and half years after rulings which prohibited segregation of Roma children to Roma-only classes, not that much has changed. On contrary, there is a new approach to educating Roma children directly in their place of residence, in schools made of containers. It will mean an additional blow for a just system of elementary education that should create for every child an equal opportunity to receive the best education possible.

Despite of difficulties with building quality and fair system of elementary education, there is still one fact standing. We will take the best care of children, if we make sure that we will give them all, no matter what their ethnicity is, a chance to receive a quality elementary education. Thanks to it they will all have an opportunity to make their lives successful. This applies even more to Roma children living in socially disadvantaged environment, who were being ignored in Slovakia for a long time. It is fair that children from the settlements received equally solid foundations to build their lives on in the same classes, in the same schools as other children.

Please, read carefully Vignette 8:

### **Vignette 8**

#### **Our country will thrive thanks to quality education for all children**

Children from Roma settlements belong to the same schools as other children. Our country will be successful when we jointly create for all people (including our children) favourable conditions to reclaim it together. These conditions include quality elementary education, which is the backbone of self-confident and flourishing nation.

Findings from several towns and municipalities indicate that fulfilling the ideal of quality education for all will not be an easy task. Recent research in elementary schools in Eastern Slovakia pointed out the cases of purpose-built creation of school districts that included only Roma children. Other schools enrolled Roma children to „special classes“ on separate floors in order to prevent any contact with non-Roma schoolmates.

More than two and half years after rulings which prohibited segregation of Roma children to Roma-only classes, not that much has changed. On contrary, there is a

new approach to educating Roma children directly in their place of residence, in schools made of containers. It will mean an additional blow for an effective system of elementary education that should be the basis for industrial development and enhancement of our country.

Despite of difficulties with building quality and fair system of elementary education, there is still one fact standing. Countries that successfully managed to make it through, strictly oversaw that all children, no matter what their ethnicity was, adopted in schools the basic societal values such as work discipline and positive attitude to education. Our homeland can do best when also Roma children living in socially disadvantaged environment receive equally solid foundations to build their lives on as other children. Only common schools and common classes for all children can impress enough common respect for education and work to become a solid foundation for nation-wide welfare and development.

Please, answer the following questions:

1. Please, identify the main arguments for inclusive schools that were used in the articles you have read.
2. Please, identify the moral foundations of persuasive appeals which were used in the article.
3. Please, specify, give characteristics of the people with whom the persuasive appeals based on moral foundations could resonate.

I assume that most of you were able to identify correctly the main arguments for inclusive education of Roma children that were used in both vignettes. I also assume that identifying moral foundations has proven to be more difficult. After careful reading, one could identify several moral foundations that were used in both vignettes. As you can see in the Table 3, in research project 2, we used simple experimental design. In Vignette 7 we intended to use “individualising” moral foundations - care, fairness - typical for American liberals, while in Vignette 8 we

wanted to support our appeal for inclusive education of Roma children with “binding” moral foundations - authority and loyalty - that are popular among American conservatives.

**Table 3.**

**Experimental design: Changing attitudes to Roma with MFT**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Vignette</b>	<b>Treatment</b>
1	7	Liberal (care, fairness)
2	8	Conservative (authority, loyalty)

To our disappointment, there was no significant difference between the groups who read vignettes framed in different moral foundations. There could be several factors responsible for this result.

First, we might have got wrong the experimental design. If we included the control group (participants would not read any vignette), we could learn if vignettes, written as short persuasive newspaper articles, were able to persuade the participants at all. Without control groups we could only compare the effects of two persuasion articles framed in different moral foundations.

Second, unwittingly we might have included the confounding variables in the treatment. As you can see in Table 4, we tried to leave as little room as possible for potential confounds. There are large parts of the vignettes that we kept constant across both groups. I dare to say, we applied the *ceteris paribus* rule as best as we could.

**Table 4.**

## Comparison of the treatments: Changing attitudes to Roma with MFT

Liberal op-ed	Conservative op-ed
<b>Every child deserves a chance for quality education</b>	<b>Our country will thrive thanks to quality education for all children</b>
Children from Roma settlements belong to the same schools as other children.	
Every pupil should have an opportunity to get quality education. We have to make sure that this internationally acknowledged principle, which is already recognised by Slovak courts, becomes reality in Slovakia. The best way to take care of children is to ensure their having equal access to quality elementary education.	Our country will be successful when we jointly create for all people (including our children) favourable conditions to reclaim it together. These conditions include quality elementary education, which is the backbone of self-confident and flourishing nation.
<p>Findings from several towns and municipalities indicate that fulfilling the ideal of quality education for all will not be an easy task. Recent research in elementary schools in Eastern Slovakia pointed out the cases of purpose-built creation of school districts that included only Roma children. Other schools enrolled Roma children to „special classes“ on separate floors in order to prevent any contact with non-Roma schoolmates.</p> <p>More than two and half years after rulings which prohibited segregation of Roma children to Roma-only classes, not that much has changed. On contrary, there is a new approach to educating Roma children directly in their place of residence, in schools made of containers. It will mean an additional blow for</p>	
a just system of elementary education that should create for every child an	an effective system of elementary education that should be the basis for

<p>equal opportunity to receive the best education possible.</p>	<p>industrial development and enhancement of our country.</p>
<p>Despite of difficulties with building quality and fair system of elementary education, there is still one fact standing.</p>	
<p>We will take the best care of children, if we make sure that we will give them all, no matter what their ethnicity is, a chance to receive a quality elementary education. Thanks to it they will all have an opportunity to make their lives successful. This applies even more to Roma children living in socially disadvantaged environment, who were being ignored in Slovakia for a long time. It is fair that children from the settlements received equally solid foundations to build their lives on in the same classes, in the same schools as other children.</p>	<p>Countries that successfully managed to make it through, strictly oversaw that all children, no matter what their ethnicity was, adopted in schools the basic societal values such as work discipline and positive attitude to education. Our homeland can do best when also Roma children living in socially disadvantaged environment receive equally solid foundations to build their lives on as other children. Only common schools and common classes for all children can impress enough common respect for education and work to become a solid foundation for nation-wide welfare and development.</p>

Third, the manipulation (moral foundations used in different vignettes) might not have been executed properly enough. One sure way to find out whether manipulation worked as planned by the researcher, is to ask participants about it. We could have asked participants whether the text (about inclusive schools and classrooms) they read was based on argument for “the best way to take care of children is to ensure their having equal access to quality elementary education” (care, fairness), or on argument for “common respect for education and work” (authority) and “development and enhancement of our country” (loyalty). Or whether they did not

notice either of these arguments in the text. We could have asked the participants a **manipulation check** question.

### **Learning from failure**

One of the fundamental conditions of experimental design is the manipulation of a treatment that is controlled by the researcher. The only way how to learn about the degree of control, researcher had over manipulation, is to conduct **manipulation check** - ask participants whether they understood the manipulated parts of information or stimuli they received, as they were intended by the researcher. By not including manipulation checks, one can never be sure whether it is the intended treatment or some other factor that is responsible for the obtained outcomes.

## Research Project 3: Increasing public acceptance of LGBTI people

According to the European Social Survey data, the public acceptance of gay men and lesbian women in Slovakia gradually decreased since 2004 (Takács & Szalma, 2014). Not surprisingly, attempts at increasing the widespread public support for same-sex unions in Slovakia did not bring the desired results (Rábara, 2016). The aim of research project 3 was to find out how to communicate persuasively in order to increase the public acceptance of same-sex unions (same-sex marriages, registered partnerships).

The research design was based on existing social science literature and on successful campaigns for same-sex marriage in the US and the UK. The research questions and hypotheses were not only theory driven but are at the same time practice oriented - the research findings could be helpful in preparing future campaigns for recognition and equal rights of LGBTI people in Slovakia.

### Instructions:

Please, by using lottery or randomization generator mentioned in the Chapter 1, randomly assign the students of your class into four groups. Group 1 will read Vignette 9, group 2 will read Vignette 10, group 3 will read Vignette 11, and group 4 will read Vignette 12. After carefully reading the assigned vignette, answer the questions that follow after Vignette 12. First, answer each question individually. Second, share your answers with other members of your group. Third, compare the answers across all groups.

Please, read carefully Vignette 9:

### **Vignette 9**

**Lesbian activist: We all have a right to have a family**

*Zuzana is an activist. She works in an organization that advocates for the rights of LGBTI people. She has lived with her partner Katarína for eight years. According to Zuzana, gays and lesbians are the same citizens like everybody else and that is why they should have the same right for an union that is recognised by the state.*

**You work as an activist, fighting for the human rights of LGBTI people (lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transgender, and intersexual people). How do you perceive the definition of marriage as the union between a man and a woman?**

This definition is discriminating. In contrast to couples of the opposite sex, it does not allow the same-sex couples enter into a union recognised by the state and defined by their mutual rights and obligations. Slovak Republic is a democratic country and a member state of the European Union, and as such **it should not adopt laws that discriminate people according to their sexual orientation.** On contrary, it should strive to strengthen the human rights for every citizen, regardless of his or her sexual orientation.

**Is there any solution?**

In our society, we still have deficiencies in all areas related to minorities and human rights. **Everyone should have the right for a happy family life.** Either in marriage or in other form of state recognised union, such as registered partnership. Gays and lesbians are the same citizens as everyone else, they live in the same conditions, they fulfill their obligations to the state, pay the same taxes, and that is why they should have the same rights as the rest of the population. We cannot be in the degrading position of unequal, second class citizens of Slovakia.

Please, read carefully Vignette 10:

**Vignette 10**

**Lesbian activist: Family is the most important value**

***Zuzana is an activist. She works in an organization that advocates for the rights of LGBTI people. She has lived with her partner Katarína for eight years. According to Zuzana, family is of a fundamental value, and she would like to cherish it in a union recognised by the state.***

**You work as an activist, fighting for the human rights of LGBTI people (lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transgender, and intersexual people). How do you perceive the definition of marriage as the union between a man and a woman?**

This definition limits our efforts to live normal lives. Love and mutual commitment are important for happy and full-valued life of every couple, regardless of their sexual orientation. **For me and my partner, family is the most important value.** For us, family is a mutual commitment which helps us, along with many other couples, to get through the challenging parts of our lives. I think that couples like us share similar values with other married couples. We all respect our families and commitments. There are many things like money, jobs or split-ups that can endanger our family. Despite them, we want to cherish our family.

**Is there any solution?**

Current situation punishes all people who hold family values in high esteem, who consider the family as the fundamental value. I think, **we all deserve the opportunity to lead a happy family life.** Either in marriage or in other form of state recognised union, such as registered partnership. We want to live in a wholesome relationship and declare before the law “this is the person I love and I want to take care of”.

Please, read carefully Vignette 11:

## Vignette 11

### **Lesbian woman: We all have a right to have a family**

***Zuzana works as a nanny.** She has lived with her partner Katarína for eight years. According to Zuzana, gays and lesbians are the same citizens like everybody else and that is why they should have the same right for an union that is recognised by the state.*

**You work as a nanny and you do not engage professionally in politics. Despite that how do you perceive the definition of marriage as the union between a man and a woman?**

This definition is discriminating. In contrast to couples of the opposite sex, it does not allow the same-sex couples enter into a union recognised by the state and defined by their mutual rights and obligations. Slovak Republic is a democratic country and a member state of the European Union, and as such **it should not adopt laws that discriminate people according to their sexual orientation.** On contrary, it should strive to strengthen the human rights for every citizen, regardless of his or her sexual orientation.

### **Is there any solution?**

In our society, we still have deficiencies in all areas related to minorities and human rights. **Everyone should have the right for a happy family life.** Either in marriage or in other form of state recognised union, such as registered partnership. Gays and lesbians are the same citizens as everyone else, they live in the same conditions, they fulfill their obligations to the state, pay the same taxes, and that is why they should have the same rights as the rest of the population. We cannot be in the degrading position of unequal, second class citizens of Slovakia.

Please, read carefully Vignette 12:

## **Vignette 12**

### **Lesbian woman: Family is the most important value**

*Zuzana works as a nanny. She has lived with her partner Katarína for eight years. According to Zuzana, family is of a fundamental value, and she would like to cherish it in a union recognised by the state.*

**You work as a nanny and you do not engage professionally in politics. Despite that how do you perceive the definition of marriage as the union between a man and a woman?**

This definition limits our efforts to live normal lives. Love and mutual commitment are important for happy and full-valued life of every couple, regardless of their sexual orientation. **For me and my partner, family is the most important value.** For us, family is a mutual commitment which helps us, along with many other couples, to get through the challenging parts of our lives. I think that couples like us share similar values with other married couples. We all respect our families and commitments. There are many things like money, jobs or split-ups that can endanger our family. Despite them, we want to cherish our family.

**Is there any solution?**

Current situation punishes all people who hold family values in high esteem, who consider the family as the fundamental value. I think, **we all deserve the opportunity to lead a happy family life.** Either in marriage or in other form of state recognised union, such as registered partnership. We want to live in a

wholesome relationship and declare before the law “this is the person I love and I want to take care of”.

Please, answer the following questions:

1. Please, identify the message - the argument for same-sex unions - that was used in the vignette you have read.
2. Please, identify the messenger - the person delivering the argument for same-sex unions - that was used in the vignette you have read.
3. Please, specify, give characteristics of the people with whom the argument could resonate.
4. Please, specify, give characteristics of the people with whom the argument could NOT resonate - they would not understand it or it would going against their values.

In this unpublished research project we were interested **how** (argument / message) and **by whom** (messenger) we would be able to persuade respondents to change their opinion about the same-sex unions in Slovakia. As you can see in Table 5, in the project we used **2x2 factorial research design** that treated both these factors: the **message** (an interview using an argument in favor of same-sex unions highlighting that family as a value or highlighting same-sex unions as a matter of equality and human rights) and **messenger** (an interview with Zuzana, a lesbian, who is either an activist or an "ordinary woman" - a nanny).

**Table 5.**

**Factorial research design: Increasing public acceptance of LGBTI people**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Vignette</b>	<b>Treatment</b>
--------------	-----------------	------------------

1	9	Activist + human rights argument
2	10	Activist + family argument
3	11	Ordinary woman + human rights argument
4	12	Ordinary woman + family argument

Experimental materials used in the study took the form of an interview with Zuzana, a lesbian, who was either an activist or a nanny. In the interview Zuzana advocated in favor of legalization of same-sex unions using either a human rights argument ("The right to a happy family life should be for everyone") or using a family argument ("For me and my partner, the family is the most important value"). While preparing the experimental materials we wanted to achieve a high level of **internal experimental realism** - our aim was to use a vocabulary and forms of expression as close to real-life actors as possible. Therefore, we used several expressions from an existing newspaper interview with a lesbian couple that has been raising three kids; from an interview with a LGBTI activist; as well as from documents and statements of non-governmental organizations.

Research project 3 was based on contemporary psychological literature on negative stereotypes about activists as eccentric and militant people that weaken their impact in fostering of social change - negative stereotypes make activists less persuasive messengers (Bashir, Lockwood, Chasteen, Nadolny, & Noyes, 2013). We wanted to find out if messages about adoption of same-sex unions law will be less persuasive when they will be delivered by a lesbian activist as when delivered by an "ordinary" lesbian woman - a nanny.

We also considered literature about "shifting attitudes" - political persuasion and attitude change that stresses the importance of framing arguments in specific values that are relevant for people who are the targets of persuasion (Stiff & Mongeau, 2016; Feinberg & Willer, 2013; Day, Fiske, Downing, & Trail, 2014; Feinberg & Willer,

2015). If undecided, centrist (moderately conservative) voters uphold marriage as fundamental value that defines romantic relationships, they should be better persuaded by messages (arguments) which emphasize the value of marriage than by human rights arguments emphasizing equal rights and opportunities. Conservatively-laden value appeal to marriage as a mutual commitment of two adult persons was used by an American think-tank Third Way in successful campaigns before same-sex marriage state referenda in Washington, Maine, Maryland and Minnesota (Hatalsky & Trumble, 2012). In a similar vein, David Cameron justified the adoption of same-sex marriage law by the protection of the institution of marriage as the defining value of British conservatives: “Yes, it's [same-sex marriage] about equality, but it's also about something else: commitment. Conservatives believe in the ties that bind us; that society is stronger when we make vows to each other and support each other. So I don't support gay marriage in spite of being a Conservative. I support gay marriage because I am a Conservative” (Park, 2013).

Unfortunately, the results showed that neither message nor messenger played any significant role in persuading participants to change their attitudes about same-sex unions. Fortunately, in this research project we used manipulation checks which showed that respondents had been able to properly understand only one factor - they correctly identified whether the interview had been with an activist or with a nanny. On the other hand, a high proportion (39 %) of respondents could not correctly determine which argument had been used. This clearly pointed to the problematic quality of the argument depicted in the vignette.

One of the problems with the argument could be its **ambiguity**. We did not clearly distinguish between two distinct types of same-sex unions: same-sex marriages and registered partnerships. This failure could jeopardize the **comprehensibility** of the treatments used in vignettes. Respondents could have had different, even contradicting opinions about these two forms of civil unions. A solution to the ambiguity problem would be to choose one type of same-sex union and use it thoroughly in the vignettes.

Another problem with the argument could be its **ecological validity**. Slovak participants could have had problem to recognize the commitment as the argument for same-sex unions, for supporting the marriage as societal institution. This type of argument is probably not a valid one in Slovakia because Slovak conservatives (even the moderate ones) understand the issues related to same-sex unions in different notions and values than commitment.

An effective way to prevent both these problems with argument from happening was to conduct a **pretest** of the vignettes, which could give us an early warning about potential problems with comprehensibility and ecological validity of the treatments used in vignettes. This also applies to previous research project presented in this chapter.

### **Learning from failure**

**Pretesting** - testing the the operational quality of experimental materials and questionnaires before they are used for data collection - is the integral part of research process. Pretesting can be done with individual respondent using **cognitive interviews** (Willis, 2005) and with groups of respondents using group discussions - **focus groups** (Krueger & Casey, 2015). Yet, for various reasons, researchers often leave pretesting out from their research projects. Time or budgetary constraints or strong feelings about the theory and hypothesis are the frequent culprits. As you could see in both research projects presented in this chapter, failing to conduct pretest can have grave consequences on the quality of experimental materials and can imperil the successful undertaking of the research project.

### **Recommended reading for Chapter 3:**

Firestein, S. (2016). *Failure: Why science is so successful*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Firestein's book made me rethink my ideas about failure when doing experiments. It presents failure as an integral part of research process with unexpected ramifications extending beyond scientific method to research ethics and scientific conduct. It reads like a superbly-written long-form article, fitting well with its not too expansive length.

# Chapter 4. Confounds in treatments: What drives the attitude change in persuasive communication?

## **Context of Chapter 4:**

In previous chapters we have read vignettes from unpublished research projects that I co-authored. In this and the next chapter I will present published research projects that were authored by someone else.

Both research projects presented in this chapter used MFT to successfully change participants' attitudes to same-sex marriages and environmental protection. Their success was in sharp contrast to our failure which we presented in the previous chapter. To learn what we could do better when designing experimental project testing persuasion and attitude change techniques, we turned to these successful examples of persuasion. What we learned however was quite different from what we initially expected. Instead of a secret recipe for effective attitude change we found confounding variables. They alone do not question the success of these research projects but they do question the treatment variables that are supposed to causally explain why the attitude change happened.

## **Concepts to be exercised in Chapter 4:**

- moral foundations
- dyadic morality
- persuasion and attitude change
- treatment variable
- manipulated variable

- confounding variable
- construct validity

In Chapter 3, you have read about moral foundations theory (MFT) and its fundamental premise: five distinct moral foundations that explain the variance in individual's moral judgment across diverse contexts. It did not take long for alternative theories of moral judgment to emerge. One of the theories that questioned the MFT's fundamental claim about five moral foundations was the theory of dyadic morality (DM) (Schein & Gray, 2017). DM is based on two assumptions. First, there is only one fundamental moral foundation - care/harm - every moral judgment involves the answer to question whether care or harm has been done. All other foundations (e.g. purity) are just derivatives from care/harm. Second, moral judgment must always involve the dyadic relationship between two perceived minds - moral agent and moral patient. Every moral judgment thus involves the perception of who committed harm or cared for someone (i.e., who was the moral agent) and who suffered harm or has been cared for (i.e., who was the moral patient) (Gray, Young, & Waytz, 2012; Gray & Keeney, 2015; Schein & Gray, 2015; Gray & Schein, 2016; Wegner & Gray, 2016). Authors behind DM argued with parsimony: all else being equal the simpler, frugal explanation should be chosen. If one moral foundation - care/harm - can together with dyadic perception of moral agent and moral patient explain the variance in moral judgment then it should be chosen over the more complicated explanatory framework based on five moral foundations (MFT).

As you would expect the authors who developed MFT responded critically to DM's claims, especially the claim about the only one, truly fundamental, moral foundation (Haidt, 2015; Haidt, Graham, & Ditto, 2015; Graham, 2015; Inbar, Scott, & Rozin, 2016). In one of their blogs, they even called the theory of dyadic morality a **"Volkswagen of moral psychology"** implying that DM was behaving just like than infamous VW concern. It promised things it could not fulfill. In case of VW, they declared to comply with emission standards that their engines did not really fulfill. In case of DM, they presumably postulated theoretical claims that they could not

support with empirical evidence (Haidt, Graham, & Ditto, 2015). Jonathan Haidt argued that empirical evidence supporting the MFT is more solid than the one in favour of DM (Haidt, 2015). To emphasize this claim he referred to an article that has used MFT to better understand and shift attitudes on a divisive political issue (Feinberg & Willer, 2013). This article, together with another one with the same MFT-based approach to persuasion (Feinberg & Willer, 2015), is presented in this chapter. These two articles were part of a broader research programme that used MFT as an effective instrument of attitude change (Day, Fiske, Downing, & Trail, 2014; ; Wolsko, Ariceaga, & Seiden, 2016; Miles, 2016; Voelkel & Feinberg, 2017). As you will see in the rest of this chapter, these two articles did not fail to demonstrate that persuasion with appeals to moral foundations is possible but they failed to convincingly show that it was the moral foundations theory alone, and not some other alternative theory (dyadic morality), that could explain these persuasive effects.

## Research project 4: Changing attitudes to same-sex marriage with MFT

The materials for research project 4 come from Study 5 in this article:

Feinberg, M., & Willer, R. (2015). From gulf to bridge: When do moral arguments facilitate political influence? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(12), 1665–1681. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215607842>

### Instructions:

Please, by using lottery or randomization generator mentioned in the Chapter 1, randomly assign the students of your class into two groups. Group 1 will read

Vignette 13, group 2 will read Vignette 14. After carefully reading the assigned vignette, answer the questions that follow after Vignette 14. First, answer each question individually. Second, share your answers with other members of your group. Third, compare the answers across both groups.

Please, read carefully Vignette 13:

### **Vignette 13**

#### **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.

Please, read carefully Vignette 14:

### **Vignette 14**

#### **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.

Please, answer the following questions:

1. Please, identify the moral foundations underlying the argument for same-sex unions that were used in the vignette you have read.
2. Please, identify the moral agent (who is doing care or harm) and moral patient (who or what is being cared for or harmed) in the vignette you have read.

I assume you made one significant finding when comparing the vignettes across the groups. The **treatment** in these vignettes was not limited to moral foundations. Authors unwittingly **manipulated** with who is identified as moral agent and especially a moral patient. As you can see in Table 6, the Vignette 13 appealed to moral foundation of “loyalty” and identified the United States and all Americans as moral patient benefitting from gay couples’ contribution to the U.S. economy and their service in the American military forces. So, by extension, besides same-sex couples it will be America and all Americans who will actually benefit from the introduction of same-sex marriage. Framing the argument in moral foundation of “loyalty” is more likely appeal to conservative Americans.

**Table 6.**

**Experimental design: Changing attitudes to same-sex marriage with MFT**

Group	Vignette	Treatment	Confound
-------	----------	-----------	----------

1	13	Loyalty	U.S. is a moral patient
2	14	Fairness	Gay couples are moral patients

In contrast, the Vignette 14 appealed to moral foundations of “fairness” and identified gay couples as moral patients. They alone will benefit from having the right to get married. The target of “fairness” moral appeal were American liberals. After comparing these vignettes, we may conclude that moral dyad (moral agent and moral patient) played the role of a **confounding variable** in the research project that studied the influence of moral foundation appeals on attitudes to same-sex marriage. Moral dyad was part of the treatment that was supposed be exclusively about manipulating moral foundations.

## Research project 5: Changing environmental attitudes with MFT

The materials for research project 5 come from Study 3 in this article:

Feinberg, M., & Willer, R. (2013). The moral roots of environmental attitudes. *Psychological Science*, 24(1), 56–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612449177>

### Instructions:

Please, by using lottery or randomization generator mentioned in the Chapter 1, randomly assign the students of your class into two groups. Group 1 will read Vignette 15, group 2 will read Vignette 16. After carefully reading the assigned

vignette, answer the questions that follow after Vignette 16. First, answer each question individually. Second, share your answers with other members of your group. Third, compare the answers across both groups.

Please, read carefully Vignette 15:

### **Vignette 15**

#### **We must stop harming the environment**

Now more than ever it is important that we protect our natural habitats and start caring about the environment. In many important ways, we are causing real harm to the places we live in. It is essential that we take steps now to prevent further destruction from being done to our earth.

Trees all around the world are being cut down. Humans have consistently razed the earth's forests, killing off countless animals and plants. In fact, every single day about 150 different species go extinct. This has indirect, harmful effects for humans as many plant species that we kill off could be used to make medicines to protect human lives.



Dumping of waste and chemicals into our lakes and seas has resulted in the deaths of billions of fish and other sea life. In some parts of the world, 70% of the coral reefs, homes to millions of precious species, have disappeared entirely.



The carbon emissions that industry and vehicles produce are also extremely harmful for human health, causing respiratory problems and higher risks of cancer. The emissions also cause acid rain to fall from the skies, further damaging plant and animal life.

Short-sighted farming practices have led to the erosion of topsoil, making formerly fertile land into useless deserts. The result is barren soil across the world, making it harder to produce food, resulting in famine and starvation.



The good news is that we can stop harming the environments we live in, protecting them from further degradation. Simply recycling, choosing to use energy efficient appliances, and driving less can make a big difference. Each person caring for the environment can stop the harmful effects humans have had. It should be everyone's goal to care for the environment, so our children and our children's children can experience a healthy and thriving natural environment.

Please, read carefully Vignette 16:

## **Vignette 16**

## **We must protect the purity of the environment**

Now more than ever it is important that we protect our natural habitats from desecration and pollution. Keeping our forests, drinking water, and skies pure is of vital importance. There is something entirely pristine about nature. When surrounded by wilderness, there is something especially pure and cleansing about the air you breathe and the sights you see.



Preserving that purity is important. We should regard the pollution of the places we live in to be disgusting. This is not just because our environment is sacred, but also because pollution in our environment inevitably contaminates us and our bodies. When we drink polluted water, live near toxic sites, or inhale dirty, smog-filled air we contaminate our bodies with chemical impurities and pathogens. Air pollution in many cities makes the once crisp, pure blue sky into a foul grayish color.



Chemical particles end up everywhere – in our food, on our skin, and inside our lungs. Dirty, polluted air actually enters our bodies and becomes a part of us. When we do not recycle it leads to mountains of disgusting trash reeking across our natural landscapes. Billions of tons of garbage have to be put into landfills – many of which possess toxic chemicals which seep into our water supply, making even filtered water contaminated. Deforestation turns once pristine wilderness into barren, depleted fields.



The good news is that we can act to protect and decontaminate the environments we live in, making them pure once again. Simply recycling, choosing to use energy efficient appliances, and driving less can make a big difference. Reducing pollution can help us preserve what is pure and beautiful about the places we live. It should be everyone's goal to cleanse the environment, so our children and our children's children can experience the uncontaminated purity and value of nature.

Please, answer the following questions:

1. Please, identify the moral foundations underlying the argument for the environmental protection that were used in the vignette you have read.
2. Please, identify the moral agent (who is doing care or harm) and moral patient (who or what is being cared for or harmed) in the vignette you have read. Please, take into consideration the pictures which were used in vignettes.
3. After you compare your answers across the groups, please, identify the confounding factor in the treatment.

Unlike in Slovakia, environmental protection is one of the most polarising political issues, that deeply divide liberal and conservative Americans. Authors of the study presented in research project 5 tested the influence of appeals to different moral foundations on changing the attitudes of American citizens to environmental protection. I assume that doing the same exercise for the third time made you expert-identificators of moral foundations and moral dyad. As you can see in Table 7, the appeals to environmental protection were made to moral foundation of “care/harm” in Vignette 15 to appeal to liberal Americans and “purity/degradation” in Vignette 16 to appeal to American conservatives. Just as in the previous research project, authors also manipulated the moral dyad. In first group they identified natural environment and in second group the people (human population) as a moral patient. The degradation of environment or human population was accentuated with accompanying pictures that, especially in the case of suffering of human population (moral patient), convincingly represented the underlying emotion of disgust related to contamination - the smog above the city skyline and a person drinking polluted water.

**Table 7.**

**Experimental design: Changing environmental attitudes with MFT**

Group	Vignette	Treatment	Confound
-------	----------	-----------	----------

1	15	Care/ harm	Natural environment is moral patient
2	16	Purity/ degradation	People are moral patient

Similarly to the previous research project, the treatment that was used in experimental design had problematic **construct validity** - the obtained results are not valid for the theory the researchers were testing - the moral foundations theory. The messages used in these papers might not be persuasive only because they are being framed in ideologically-relevant moral foundations - moral foundations manipulation. Instead they might also persuade the respondents by **unknowingly** reframing the messages in terms of dyadic relationship of moral patient and moral agent - dyadic morality manipulation.

Although the main crux of the debate between moral foundations theory and theory of dyadic morality lies in the competing definitions of harm and the number of fundamental moral foundations, it was the dyadic relationship between moral patient and moral agent that confounded the treatments based on MFT in both research projects. Only future research can answer the question whether framing in moral foundations is inevitably accompanied by (re)configuring the moral dyad.

### **Learning from failure**

A golden rule to prevent the intrusion of **confounding variables** into treatments is to stick to ***ceteris paribus*** principle. Keeping other things equal serves as a safeguard against experimenter's blindness to variable(s) he or she would not expect to intervene with his or her experimental treatment. As you might have observed, not complying with the *ceteris paribus* rule can damage even the best theory-driven experiments. Potential confounds, driven by alternative theories, lurk everywhere.

#### **Recommended reading for Chapter 4:**

Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion* (1st ed). New York: Pantheon Books.

When I read Haidt's book a couple of years ago, it was a kind of revelation. It was this book that attracted me to moral psychology and it played a pivotal role in my methodological conversion - it convinced me to take seriously the quantitative research (both observational and experimental). At the top of that, it is written in an engaging style which guarantees that its readers will never get bored with it.

## Chapter 5. By way of conclusion: Deception, research ethics, and scientific conduct

### **Context of Chapter 5:**

The principles research ethics and standards of scientific conduct cannot be omitted from learning about the process of designing, applying, and scrutinizing vignettes in experimental research. The research project and stories of scientific misconduct presented in this chapter will allow us to discuss these issues and formulate the take-home message of this textbook - constant vigilance when handling yours and other people's vignettes.

### **Concepts to be exercised in Chapter 5:**

- deception
- debriefing
- ethical standards
- research ethics committee/ institutional review board
- openness
- transparency
- reproducibility
- constant vigilance

Research project 6: Threat and anti-immigrant attitudes

The materials for research project 6 come from Study 1 in this article:

Shepherd, L., Fasoli, F., Pereira, A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2017). The role of threat, emotions, and prejudice in promoting collective action against immigrant groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2346>

### Instructions:

Please, by using lottery or randomization generator mentioned in the Chapter 1, randomly assign the students of your class into two groups. Group 1 will read Vignette 17, group 2 will read Vignette 18. After carefully reading the assigned vignette, answer the questions that follow after Vignette 18. First, answer each question individually. Second, share your answers with other members of your group. Third, compare the answers across both groups.

Please, read carefully Vignettes 17:

### **Vignette 17**

Immigrants currently account for 10.8% of the UK population. Research by Professor David Coleman of University of Oxford suggests that this is unlikely to change in the future. His report stated that if current trends continue, in 40 years the proportion of immigrants and British people in the UK will remain the same. British people will account for 87.7% of the population and 12.3% will be immigrants. Professor Coleman concluded by stating that British people will remain a majority in the UK in 2051.

Please, read carefully Vignettes 18:

### **Vignette 18**

Immigrants currently account for 10.8% of the UK population. Research by Professor David Coleman of University of Oxford suggests that this is likely to change in the future. His report stated that if current trends continue, in 40 years there may be more immigrants in the UK than British people. British people will account for 48.2% of the population and 51.8% will be immigrants. Professor Coleman concluded by stating that British people may become a minority in the UK by 2051.

Please, answer the following questions:

1. Please, identify the main message that was delivered in the vignette you have read.
2. Please, identify the messenger that was used in the vignette you have read.
3. Please, imagine how could participants react to the message in the vignette you have read.
4. Please, imagine how could participants react to the messenger that was presented in the vignette you have read.
5. Could the information that participants received have long-lasting (extending beyond their participation at the research project) consequences on their attitudes towards migration?

I assume that you identified both message and messenger that were used in Vignettes 17 and 18. As the Table 8 indicate, researchers used a simple experimental design to manipulate the threat posed by immigrants. To make the manipulation stronger, they displayed in each condition two pie charts that represented the current and

future proportion of immigrants in British population.<sup>3</sup> Researchers also used a credible and authoritative messenger - professor David Coleman from the University of Oxford, an expert on demography of immigration.<sup>4</sup>

**Table 8.**

**Experimental design: Threat, emotions and prejudice in anti-immigrant attitudes (Study 1)**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Vignette</b>	<b>Treatment</b>
1	17	Control condition
2	18	Threat condition

The authors of the study used **deception** to manipulate their treatment variable - threat caused by immigrants. As they report in the article: “Participants read information concerning immigrants living in the UK. First, participants were accurately informed that immigrants currently account for 10.8% of the UK population. Next, we manipulated the threat posed by immigrants.” (Shepherd, Fasoli, Pereira, & Branscombe, 2017) They used accurate information (professor Coleman, the current proportion of immigrants in British population) and combined it with inaccurate information (future proportion of immigrants in British population) to create a desired manipulation without letting participants learn the true purpose of the study. Both accurate and inaccurate information that was used in the study can have long-lasting consequences beyond the lab or the online panel. It can influence the way participants perceive the issues even after their participation at the research becomes a distant memory.

---

<sup>3</sup> I did not present the original pie charts in the vignettes used in this chapter because they were not included in the published article.

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.ox.ac.uk/news-and-events/find-an-expert/professor-david-coleman>

In order to prevent this from happening, institutions conducting research with human subjects had created a specialized type of safeguards. **Research Ethics Committees (REC)** or **Institutional Review Boards (IRB)** oversee the quality of ethical scientific conduct with human subjects. Before researchers begin their dealings with research subjects the ERC or IRB must approve that their research fulfills the required **ethical standards**. In case of experimental research, these standards usually include informed consent of the participants; sensitive use of deception; debriefing of participants about the purpose of the research; confidentiality about identity and information provided by the participants; and protection of participants from physical and psychological harm (Field & Hole, 2003).

The authors of the study presented in this chapter have not reported whether they debriefed their participants or not. It might be safe to assume, given their institutional affiliation, that without including debriefing in their research design, their university's ERC would have never approved their research project. Sadly, this assumption is not completely safe at all. There are vast differences in the oversight of research ethics and scientific conduct across countries (Israel & Hay, 2006, Israel, 2015). For example, at my faculty, there is a research ethics committee but it does not approve my and my colleagues' research dealings with human subjects. In case of my faculty, **the research ethics oversight nominally exist but in reality it does not fulfill its function**. Other social science faculties in Slovakia are probably not different. Given the non-existence of international standards for oversight of ethical conduct, I would argue for the introduction of reporting standards which would require researchers to disclose information about the ethical treatment (e.g. debriefing) of their research subjects.

<b>Learning from failure</b>
------------------------------

“Whether or not the deception is used, you should always tell the participants what the experiment was about after they have finished it and leave time to answer any questions they might have” (Field & Hole, 2003, p. 100). This is easier to do in lab experiments than in population-based survey experiments. There, without the direct contact with the participants, the debriefing becomes more complicated. When writing this textbook I realised that I and my colleagues did not give any concern for providing **debriefing** to participants recruited from national online panel. We usually gave them an email address, so they could contact one of us in case they had any questions or comments. This is clearly not a commendable practice. We will have to develop a debriefing protocol which can provide online participants with correct information about the research they took part in

## How to handle vignettes: Openness, authority, and constant vigilance

In my opinion, there are three fundamental principles that should be followed when handling your or other people’s vignettes:

### **Openness**

“Sharing is caring” also applies to handling vignettes. Throughout this text, we have dealt with vignettes that were used in published or unpublished research projects. We could use these vignettes because their authors were willing to share them. Openness, together with transparency and reproducibility, is considered more often than ever the fundamental principle on which a reformed “culture of scientific practice” will be founded (Dowding, 2015; Chambers, 2017). Openly sharing research materials (including, vignettes), research designs, data-sets, code for statistical

analysis in all stages of research process (pre- and post-publication) contributes to more productive critical scrutiny and to detection of fraud, errors or omissions that might come up while doing research.

## **Authority**

Vignettes designed by highly-reputed authors and published in high-impact journals should not get a break from critical scrutiny. You could see in Chapter 4 that even established authors from top universities can unwittingly make mistakes, and review process in high-ranked journals is not able to eliminate articles whose findings are confounded with uncontrolled variables. The following story is a telling example of what could happen when trust vested in scientific authority or reputation backfires:

In an infamous scandal, Michael J. LaCour - a doctoral student at UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) - fabricated the data for his article about intervention that was durably reducing transphobia. The article was published in a prestigious scientific journal *Science* (LaCour & Green, 2014). His co-author, Donald P. Green - a professor of political science at Columbia University, was not aware of this blatant fraud. When analysis, pointing to fraudulent practices in LaCour and Green's article was published (Broockman, Kalla, & Aronow, 2015),<sup>5</sup> the editors of *Science*, on the insistence of professor Green, retracted the article (McNutt, 2015). When fellow scientists could have had doubts about methodological rigour of LaCour and Green's impressive findings, the reputation of professor Green alone was able to repel them. This was the case with Jon Krosnick, a social psychologist from Stanford University: "I see Don Green is an author. I trust him completely, so I'm no longer doubtful." (Singal, 2015) As science journalist Jesse Singal later observed, "Krosnick is no outlier. Over and over again, throughout the scientific community and the media,

---

<sup>5</sup> Interestingly, the same authors who found out about LaCour's making up his own data, later published an article in the same journal in which they demonstrated that the intervention for reducing transphobia actually works and has durable impact on the participants (Broockman & Kalla, 2016).

LaCour’s impossible-seeming results were treated as truth, in part because of the weight Green’s name carried” (ibid.)

### **Constant vigilance**

The principles of openness, transparency and reproducibility that I mentioned above are founded on an egalitarian notion of accountability. No matter what is their reputation, what chair at prestigious university they hold, how many high-impact articles they have published, their research should be held accountable according to the same standards. This, of course, includes vignettes as well. Judgments about making (occasional) mistakes in research design, drawing false inferences from the available data or over-interpreting the results, should not be subjected to your **trusting** someone as scientific authority, trusting his or her “superpowers” of virtuosity or creativity in generating insight. Instead of trust, the truth-seeking or error-eliminating purpose of scientific practice is better served by your constant vigilance.

This is still a heavily contested claim. In the quote below, Colin Hay (2017) critically reviews Keith Dowding’s call for a more open science expressed in his book *The Philosophy and Methods of Political Science* (2016). Hay explicitly argues against the “unimpeachable virtue” of openness, transparency and reproducibility, and against “unsubstantiated fears of duplicity and mistrust”.

Hay, C. (2017). Explanation, prediction, causation: An unholy trinity? *Political Studies Review*, 15(2), 180–186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478929917693640>

“This relates to the question of research transparency and reproducibility (Dowding, 2016: 166–169). Here, Dowding echoes the recent calls in certain parts of the discipline for all of the data and coding frames used in empirical research to be made fully transparent and available (through open access) to the wider

research community and the public more generally. This, I think, we should reject. The argument is simple and is perhaps best put in personal terms. When I read one of Keith Dowding's empirical papers, I want to read his analysis and his interpretation of the data he collects and interrogates. I am not terribly interested in having full access to his data, his coding book and the means he uses to make the inferences he draws from that data. What I want to read is his interpretation and, above all, the argument he makes on the basis of that interpretation. It is that argument which I want to understand and to engage with. I am happy to trust him, as much as I trust anyone, to collect and process the data appropriately and for peer review to take care of that part of things. In short, I want to read him, not what someone trying to behave like him might write and think were they to try to replicate his research using his data and his code book. Transparency and reproducibility sound like unimpeachable virtues, but they are no substitute for insight; their fetishisation downplays the role of interpretation in the generation of that insight, and the manifesto to which they have given rise is based on unsubstantiated fears of duplicity and mistrust. We need to be very careful what we wish for. As I am sure Keith Dowding would agree, political science cannot be conducted by robots; I wish that some of our colleagues would stop trying to pretend that it can or that things would be better if it were."

Colin Hay is definitely not an academic lightweight. As a Professor of Political Science at Sciences Po, Paris, an Affiliate Professor of Political Analysis at the University of Sheffield, and a Fellow of the UK Academy of Social Sciences, he is an established academic authority. Author of many books and articles, he is also the lead editor of *New Political Economy* and founding co-editor of *Comparative European Politics and British Politics*.

Yet, despite his credentials, I think his ideas about scientific conduct are wrong. In this textbook, I repeatedly provided the evidence of fallibility in the designing of experimental vignettes. Many vignettes that I presented in previous chapters did not

perform the experimental treatment as was intended or their capability to perform the experimental treatment was substantially undermined by confounds. I am convinced that we can learn from these failures and mistakes by embracing them, by actively seeking them in our own and other people's research. To do that, we need at systemic level, the culture of scientific practice based on openness, and at an individual level, the constant vigilance to recognise our missteps.

In a Harry Potter universe, you might have come across an auror named Mad-Eye Moody. Aurors were members of an "elite unit of highly-trained, specialist officers tasked with upholding the law and protecting the magical communities in their respective countries from large-scale threats".<sup>6</sup> Their primary task in Great Britain was to catch dark wizards. Mad-Eye Moody became a legendary auror thanks to his extreme vigilance - every witch or wizard could be a secret Death Eater - the follower of You-Know-Who. Hence his personal motto: "Constant vigilance!" I argue that when it comes to delineating the principles of scientific conduct and research practice we might run into less trouble if we heed the advice of Mad-Eye Moody, not professor Hay.

Reading vignettes vigilantly does not require sophisticated methodological competence: you do not have to understand statistics as in the case of analysing the data and interpreting the results or have extensive knowledge about question and answer formats to assess the quality of questionnaires. Assessment of vignettes requires careful reading and checking whether they achieve their purpose as stated in the research design. Although the assessment of vignettes requires the least competence or set of skills, their execution is all but faultless. As I have demonstrated with vignettes developed by myself and my colleagues, or by other scholars, vignettes can be a tricky thing. **Reading vignettes as experimental treatments, requires constant vigilance. Confounds, just like the dark wizards, may lurk everywhere.**

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://harrypotter.wikia.com/wiki/Auror>

### **Recommended reading for Chapter 5:**

Chambers, C. (2017). *The seven deadly sins of psychology: A manifesto for reforming the culture of scientific practice*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Although I am still reading Chambers's book at the time of writing this textbook, I can only recommend it. You will learn all there is about the ills that plague scientific practice. You will also learn what to do about it and how can you take part in the reform. Rest assured to meet "constant vigilance" along the way. In addition, this book reads really easily.

# Bibliography

- Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best practice recommendations for designing and implementing experimental vignette methodology studies. *Organizational Research Methods, 17*(4), 351–371.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114547952>
- Alter, A. L., Stern, C., Granot, Y., & Balcetis, E. (2016). The ‘bad is black’ effect: Why people believe evildoers have darker skin than do-gooders. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 42*(12), 1653–1665.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216669123>
- Atzmüller, C., & Steiner, P. M. (2010). Experimental vignette studies in survey research. *Methodology: European Journal of Research Methods for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 6*(3), 128–138.  
<https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-2241/a000014>
- Barrett, H. C., Bolyanatz, A., Crittenden, A. N., Fessler, D. M. T., Fitzpatrick, S., Gurven, M., Henrich, J., Kanovsky, K., Kushnick, G., Pisor, A., Scelza, B. A., Stich, S., von Rueden, C., Zhao, W., & Laurence, S. (2016). Small-scale societies exhibit fundamental variation in the role of intentions in moral judgment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113*(17), 4688–4693.  
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1522070113>
- Bashir, N. Y., Lockwood, P., Chasteen, A. L., Nadolny, D., & Noyes, I. (2013). The ironic impact of activists: Negative stereotypes reduce social change influence. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(7), 614–626.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1983>
- Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review, 94*(4), 991–1013.  
<https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828042002561>
- Broockman, D. E., Kalla, J., & Aronow, P. (2015, May 19). *Irregularities in LaCour* (2014). Retrieved from

[http://stanford.edu/~dbroock/broockman\\_kalla\\_aronow\\_lg\\_irregularities.pdf](http://stanford.edu/~dbroock/broockman_kalla_aronow_lg_irregularities.pdf)

Broockman, D., & Kalla, J. (2016). Durably reducing transphobia: A field experiment on door-to-door canvassing. *Science*, *352*(6282), 220–224.

<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad9713>

Butler, D. M., & Homola, J. (2017). An empirical justification for the use of racially distinctive names to signal race in experiments. *Political Analysis*, *25*(01), 122–130. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2016.15>

Chambers, C. (2017). *The seven deadly sins of psychology: A manifesto for reforming the culture of scientific practice*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Collett, J. L., & Childs, E. (2011). Minding the gap: Meaning, affect, and the potential shortcomings of vignettes. *Social Science Research*, *40*(2), 513–522.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.08.008>

Correll, S. J., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology*, *112*(5), 1297–1339.

<https://doi.org/10.1086/511799>

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*, *40*(12), 1559–1573.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167214551152>

DeSante, C. D. (2013). Working twice as hard to get half as far: Race, work ethic, and America's deserving poor. *American Journal of Political Science*, *57*(2), 342–356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12006>

<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12006>

Ditto, P. H., & Koleva, S. P. (2011). Moral empathy gaps and the American culture war. *Emotion Review*, *3*(3), 331–332.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073911402393>

Dowding, K. M. (2015). *The philosophy and methods of political science*. London; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Drál', P. (2009). Lenivosť ako 'esencia' rómskej etnickej identity: kritická analýza diskurzu slovenskej sociálnej politiky. In P. Drál' & A. Findor (Eds.), *Ako*

- skúmať národ: deväť štúdií o etnicite a nacionalizme (pp. 189–224). Brno: Tribun EU.
- Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H., & Lupia, A. (Eds.). (2011a). *Cambridge handbook of experimental political science*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Druckman, J. N., Green, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H., & Lupia, A. (2011b). Experiments: An introduction to core concepts. In J. N. Druckman, D. P. Green, J. H. Kuklinski, & A. Lupia (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science* (pp. 15–26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921452.002>
- Europarat (Ed.). (2012). *Human rights of Roma and travellers in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- European Roma Rights Centre. (2007). *The glass box: Exclusion of Roma from employment*. Budapest, Hungary: European Roma Rights Centre.
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2014). *Education: The situation of Roma in 11 EU member states*. Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Union.
- Feinberg, M., & Willer, R. (2013). The moral roots of environmental attitudes. *Psychological Science*, 24(1), 56–62.  
<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*, 41(12), 1665–1681. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215607842>
- Fessler, D. M. T., Barrett, H. C., Kanovsky, M., Stich, S., Holbrook, C., Henrich, J., ... Laurence, S. (2015). Moral parochialism and contextual contingency across seven societies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1813), 20150907. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.0907>
- Field, A. P. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th edition). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Field, A. P., & Hole, G. (2003). *How to design and report experiments*. London ; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Finch, J. (1987). The vignette technique in survey research. *Sociology*, 21(1), 105–114.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038587021001008>
- Firestein, S. (2016). *Failure: Why science is so successful*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fiske, S. T. (2010). Envy up, scorn down: How comparison divides us. *American Psychologist*, 65(8), 698–706. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.65.8.698>
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878–902. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.82.6.878>
- Folentová, V. (2013, October 1). Prácu na čierno už kontroluje kobra. *SME*. Retrieved from  
<https://ekonomika.sme.sk/c/6955044/pracu-na-cierno-uz-kontroluje-kobra.html>
- Ford, R. (2015). Who should we help? An experimental test of discrimination in the british welfare state. *Political Studies*, 64(3), 630–650.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12194>
- Graham, J. (2015). Explaining away differences in moral judgment: Comment on Gray and Keeney (2015). *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 6(8), 869–873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550615592242>
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., Koleva, S., Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Wojcik, S. P., & Ditto, P. H. (2013). Moral foundations theory: The pragmatic validity of moral pluralism. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 47, pp. 55–130). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-407236-7.00002-4>
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., & Haidt, J. (2012). The moral stereotypes of liberals and conservatives: Exaggeration of differences across the political spectrum. *PLoS ONE*, 7(12), e50092. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0050092>
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 366–385. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021847>

- Gray, K., & Keeney, J. E. (2015). Disconfirming moral foundations theory on its own terms: Reply to Graham (2015). *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 6(8), 874–877. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550615592243>
- Gray, K., & Schein, C. (2016). No absolutism here: Harm predicts moral judgment 30× better than disgust. Commentary on Scott, Inbar, & Rozin (2016). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(3), 325–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616635598>
- Gray, K., Young, L., & Waytz, A. (2012). Mind perception is the essence of morality. *Psychological Inquiry*, 23(2), 101–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2012.651387>
- Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion* (1st ed). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Haidt, J. (2013). Moral psychology for the twenty-first century. *Journal of Moral Education*, 42(3), 281–297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2013.817327>
- Haidt, J. (2015, October 27). A straw man can never beat a shapeshifter: Response to Schein and Gray (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.yourmorals.org/blog/2015/10/a-straw-man-can-never-beat-a-shapeshifter/>
- Haidt, J., Graham, J., & Ditto, P. H. (2015, October 28). Volkswagen of moral psychology. Retrieved from <http://www.spsp.org/news-center/blog/volkswagen-of-morality>
- Haidt, J., Graham, J., & Joseph, C. (2009). Above and below left–right: Ideological narratives and moral foundations. *Psychological Inquiry*, 20(2–3), 110–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10478400903028573>
- Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2004). Intuitive ethics: How innately prepared intuitions generate culturally variable virtues. *Daedalus*, 133(4), 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0011526042365555>
- Hainmueller, J., Hangartner, D., & Yamamoto, T. (2015). Validating vignette and conjoint survey experiments against real-world behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(8), 2395–2400. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1416587112>

- Hainmueller, J., Hopkins, D. J., & Yamamoto, T. (2014). Causal inference in conjoint analysis: Understanding multidimensional choices via stated preference experiments. *Political Analysis*, 22(01), 1–30.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpt024>
- Harell, A., Soroka, S., & Iyengar, S. (2016). Race, prejudice and attitudes toward redistribution: A comparative experimental approach. *European Journal of Political Research*, 55(4), 723–744. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12158>
- Hatalsky, L. E., & Trumble, S. (2012, December). *How marriage won in Washington state*. Retrieved November 18, 2017, from  
[http://content.thirdway.org/publications/623/Third\\_Way\\_Report\\_-\\_How\\_Marriage\\_Won\\_in\\_Washington\\_State.pdf](http://content.thirdway.org/publications/623/Third_Way_Report_-_How_Marriage_Won_in_Washington_State.pdf)
- Hay, C. (2017). Explanation, prediction, causation: An unholy trinity? *Political Studies Review*, 15(2), 180–186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478929917693640>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 61–83.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Hughes, R., & Huby, M. (2002). The application of vignettes in social and nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 37(4), 382–386.  
<https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2002.02100.x>
- Hughes, R., & Huby, M. (2004). The construction and interpretation of vignettes in social research. *Social Work and Social Sciences Review*, 11(1), 36–51.  
<https://doi.org/10.1921/17466105.11.1.36>
- Hutchings, V. L., & Piston, S. (2011). The determinants and political consequences of prejudice. In J. N. Druckman, D. P. Green, J. H. Kuklinski, & A. Lupia (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of experimental political science* (pp. 306–319). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921452.022>
- Imai, K. (2017). *Quantitative social science: An introduction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Inbar, Y., Scott, S. E., & Rozin, P. (2016). Gray & Schein’s (2016) objections are theoretically and statistically faulty. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(3), 330–332. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616635615>

- Israel, M. (2015). *Research ethics and integrity for social scientists: Beyond regulatory compliance* (2nd edition). Los Angeles; London; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Israel, M., & Hay, I. (2006). *Research ethics for social scientists: Between ethical conduct and regulatory compliance*. London; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Iyengar, S. (2011). Laboratory experiments in political science. In J. N. Druckman, D. P. Green, J. H. Kuklinski, & A. Lupia (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science* (pp. 73–88). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921452.006>
- Iyer, R., Koleva, S., Graham, J., Ditto, P., & Haidt, J. (2012). Understanding libertarian morality: The psychological dispositions of self-identified libertarians. *PLoS ONE*, 7(8), e42366. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0042366>
- Jackson, M., & Cox, D. R. (2013). The principles of experimental design and their application in sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39(1), 27–49. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071811-145443>
- Koleva, S., & Haidt, J. (2012). Let's use Einstein's safety razor, not Occam's Swiss army knife or Occam's chainsaw. *Psychological Inquiry*, 23(2), 175–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2012.667678>
- Koleva, S. P., Graham, J., Iyer, R., Ditto, P. H., & Haidt, J. (2012). Tracing the threads: How five moral concerns (especially Purity) help explain culture war attitudes. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 46(2), 184–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.01.006>
- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2015). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (5th edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kuipers, K. J., & Hysom, S. J. (2014). Common problems and solutions in experiments. In M. Webster & J. Sell (Eds.), *Laboratory experiments in the social sciences* (pp. 145–177). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-404681-8.00007-8>
- LaCour, M. J., & Green, D. P. (2014). When contact changes minds: An experiment on transmission of support for gay equality. *Science*, 346(6215), 1366–1369. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1256151>

- Maddox, K. B. (2004). Perspectives on racial phenotypicality bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(4), 383–401.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspro804\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspro804_4)
- Maddox, K. B., & Perry, J. M. (2017). Racial appearance bias: Improving evidence-based policies to address racial disparities. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1-9.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732217747086>
- McNutt, M. (2015). Editorial retraction. *Science*, 348(6239), 1100–1100.  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac6638>
- Meeus, J., Paredes Mayor, J., González, R., Brown, R., & Manzi, J. (2017). Racial phenotypicality bias in educational expectations for both male and female teenagers from different socioeconomic backgrounds. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 47(3), 289–303. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2247>
- Miles, M. R. (2016). Presidential appeals to moral foundations: How modern presidents persuade cross-ideologues. *Policy Studies Journal*, 44(4), 471–490.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12151>
- Morton, R. B., & Williams, K. C. (2010). *Experimental political science and the study of causality: From nature to the lab*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mutz, D. C. (2011). *Population-based survey experiments*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400840489>
- Nederhof, A. J. (1985). Methods of coping with social desirability bias: A review. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15(3), 263–280.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420150303>
- Park, J. (2013, July 17). David Cameron: “Gay marriage is something I believe we can be proud of as a country.” Retrieved November 18, 2017, from *PinkNews*, <http://www.pinknews.co.uk/2013/07/17/david-cameron-gay-marriage-is-something-i-believe-we-can-be-proud-of-as-a-country/>
- Penton-Voak, I. S., Pound, N., Little, A. C., & Perrett, D. I. (2006). Personality judgments from natural and composite facial images: More evidence for a ‘kernel of truth’ in social perception. *Social Cognition*, 24(5), 607–640.  
<https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2006.24.5.607>

- Phalet, K., & Poppe, E. (1997). Competence and morality dimensions of national and ethnic stereotypes: A study in six eastern-European countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27(6), 703–723.  
[https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0992\(199711/12\)27:6<703::AID-EJSP841>3.0.CO;2-K](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199711/12)27:6<703::AID-EJSP841>3.0.CO;2-K)
- Rábara, P. (2016, May 25). Slováci sú naďalej jasne proti registrovaným partnerstvám. Retrieved November 18, 2017, from *Konzervatívny denník Postoj*,  
<https://www.postoj.sk/13994/slovaci-sa-do-akceptacie-prav-homosexualov-nahrnu>
- Reeder, G. D., Pryor, J. B., Wohl, M. J. A., & Griswell, M. L. (2005). On attributing negative motives to others who disagree with our opinions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(11), 1498–1510.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205277093>
- Schein, C., & Gray, K. (2015). The unifying moral dyad: Liberals and conservatives share the same harm-based moral template. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(8), 1147–1163.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215591501>
- Schein, C., & Gray, K. (2017). The theory of dyadic morality: Reinventing moral judgment by redefining harm. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 108886831769828. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868317698288>
- Scott, S. E., Inbar, Y., & Rozin, P. (2016). Evidence for absolute moral opposition to genetically modified food in the United States. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(3), 315–324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691615621275>
- Sen, M., & Wasow, O. (2016). Race as a bundle of sticks: Designs that estimate effects of seemingly immutable characteristics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19(1), 499–522. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-032015-010015>
- Shepherd, L., Fasoli, F., Pereira, A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2017). The role of threat, emotions, and prejudice in promoting collective action against immigrant groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2346>

- Singal, J. (2015, May 29). The case of the amazing gay-marriage data: How a graduate student reluctantly uncovered a huge scientific fraud. *Science of Us, NYMag*. Retrieved from <http://nymag.com/scienceofus/2015/05/how-a-grad-student-uncovered-a-huge-fraud.html>
- Sivý, R. (2013, June 4). Mať prácu v Kecerovciach je luxus, robí sa aj načierno. *SME*. Retrieved from <https://romovia.sme.sk/c/6825151/mat-pracu-v-kecerovciach-je-luxus-robi-sa-aj-na-cierno.html>
- Steiner, P. M., Atzmüller, C., & Su, D. (2016). Designing valid and reliable vignette experiments for survey research: A case study on the fair gender income gap. *Journal of Methods and Measurement in the Social Sciences*, 7(2), 52–94. <https://doi.org/10.2458/v7i2.20321>
- Stiff, J. B., & Mongeau, P. A. (2016). *Persuasive communication*. New York; London: The Guilford Press.
- Takács, J., & Szalma, I. (2014, May 8). Gays in the neighborhood? European attitudes about homosexuality a quarter century after the fall of the Soviet Union. Retrieved November 18, 2017, from *CritCom: A Forum for Research & Commentary on Europe*, <http://councilforeuropeanstudies.org/critcom/gays-in-the-neighborhood-european-attitudes-about-homosexuality-a-quarter-century-after-the-fall-of-the-soviet-union/>
- Telles, E., Flores, R. D., & Urrea-Giraldo, F. (2015). Pigmentocracies: Educational inequality, skin color and census ethnoracial identification in eight Latin American countries. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 40, 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2015.02.002>
- Thompson, M. S., & McDonald, S. (2016). Race, skin tone, and educational achievement. *Sociological Perspectives*, 59(1), 91–111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121415580026>
- Todorov, A., Olivola, C. Y., Dotsch, R., & Mende-Siedlecki, P. (2015). Social attributions from faces: Determinants, consequences, accuracy, and functional

- significance. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66(1), 519–545.  
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143831>
- Todorov, A., Said, C. P., Engell, A. D., & Oosterhof, N. N. (2008). Understanding evaluation of faces on social dimensions. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 12(12), 455–460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2008.10.001>
- Voelkel, J. G., & Feinberg, M. (2017). Morally reframed arguments can affect support for political candidates. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 194855061772940. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617729408>
- Walker, L. S. (2014). Developing your experiment. In M. Webster & J. Sell (Eds.), *Laboratory experiments in the social sciences* (pp. 127–144). Elsevier.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-404681-8.00006-6>
- Webster, M., & Sell, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Laboratory experiments in the social sciences* (Second edition). London, UK: Elsevier/Academic Press.
- Wegner, D. M., & Gray, K. J. (2016). *The mind club: Who thinks, what feels, and why it matters*. New York: Viking.
- Willis, G. B. (2005). *Cognitive interviewing: A tool for improving questionnaire design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wolsko, C., Ariceaga, H., & Seiden, J. (2016). Red, white, and blue enough to be green: Effects of moral framing on climate change attitudes and conservation behaviors. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 65, 7–19.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2016.02.005>