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ABSTRACT

This study aims to use Moral Foundations Theory to reduce prejudiced attitudes towards Latino immigrants. Research has shown that liberals and conservatives tend to differ in their support of moral foundations. Liberals are more likely to endorse individualizing moral foundations (fairness and caring for others) while conservatives are more likely to endorse binding moral foundations (sanctity, loyalty, and authority). Participants read one of two brief messages in support of Latino immigrants framed in either the binding or individualizing morals. The hypothesis was that conservatives who read the binding message will have more pro-immigrant attitudes, be more supportive of pro-immigrant policies, and have a more prosocial behavior intention toward immigrants compared to conservatives who read the individualizing message. Likewise, liberals who read the individualizing message will have more positive outcomes compared to liberals who read the binding message. I also hypothesized that this effect will be mediated by feelings of disgust for conservatives, but it will be mediated by feelings of anger for liberals. The results indicated that there was no significant main effect or interaction effect for the type of message on attitudes toward immigrants and policies, or intentions to donate. However, liberal Democrats were significantly more likely to donate to a pro-immigrant charity and to have positive attitudes toward immigrants and pro-immigrant policies.
USING MORAL FOUNDATIONS FRAMING TO INFLUENCE PARTISAN ATTITUDES TOWARD LATINO IMMIGRANTS

Attitudes toward immigrants are highly partisan in the United States. Conservatives tend to have more negative views than liberals (Cox, 2018). This difference could be a consequence of conservatives and liberals adopting different moral frameworks. According to research on Moral Foundations Theory liberals tend to place a higher value on fairness, caring for others, and reducing harm. Conservatives, on the other hand, place more value on loyalty, respect for authority and sanctity (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009). Thus, if immigration issues are typically framed in arguments about care, such arguments would appeal to liberals more than they would appeal to conservatives. Studies have shown that congruent moral framing can influence people’s attitudes toward several policies and behaviors (Feinberg & Willer, 2015; Wolsko, Ariceaga, & Seiden, 2016). The current study would add to this area of research by attempting to influence prejudicial attitudes toward a marginalized group, specifically Latino immigrants, by morally framing a message in a manner that is congruent with the readers’ moral foundations. It would also attempt to explain the path through which moral framing can influence prejudicial attitudes using the socio-functional threat-based approach to prejudice.

Moral Foundations Theory

Moral Foundations Theory argues that people have immediate and intuitive moral reactions and are socially motivated to use reasoning to justify their moral intuition after the fact (Graham et al., 2012). Researchers have identified five preliminary moral foundations: care/harm,
The theory argues that these foundations emerged because they serve adaptive functions. The care/harm foundation is concerned with caring for the vulnerable and alleviating the suffering of others. It developed because it was useful for motivating humans to care for their young. The fairness/cheating foundation is based on the importance of fair and equitable exchange and the condemnation of cheating. This foundation emerged as it encouraged the equitable distribution of resources and punished those who attempted to monopolize resources. The loyalty/betrayal foundation is concerned with loyalty to the in-group and was useful for achieving victory during conflicts with other groups. Authority/subversion is about respect for authorities and hierarchy and was useful for creating and maintaining social systems. Finally, the sanctity/degradation foundation relates to matters of contamination and purity (both moral and physical) and helped humans avoid disease and contagion (Graham et al., 2012).

The five moral foundations can be divided into binding (sanctity, loyalty, and authority) and individualizing (care and fairness) foundations (Haidt & Graham, 2007). Binding foundations tend to be more valued by conservatives, while individualizing foundations are typically more important for liberals (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009). Studies have also linked endorsement of certain foundations to several specific attitudes and behaviors. For example, endorsement of individualizing foundations has been linked with willingness to take action to reduce one’s carbon footprint (Dickinson, McLeod, Bloomfield, & Allred, 2016), eco-friendly consumption habits (Vainio & Ma’kiniemi, 2016), donations to causes benefiting an outgroup (Nilsson, Erlandsson, & Västfjäll, 2016), and collective action intention (Milesi & Alberici, 2018).
Sociofunctional Threat-based Approach to Prejudice

Like Moral Foundations Theory, the socio-functional approach to prejudice is based on the premise that emotional responses to outgroups evolved because they served a specific purpose. According to Cottrell and Neuberg (2005), different groups in society are perceived to pose various distinct threats to the ingroup, and the ingroup’s emotional responses to each group serve specific adaptive functions. Thus, the emotional response triggered by any particular group will depend on the threat associated with that group. For example, groups that are seen to present an obstacle to a desired outcome will elicit anger which, in turn, will motivate an aggressive response towards the group, serving the function of removing it and eliminating the obstacle to the desired outcome. Groups that pose a threat to physical safety will elicit fear which motivates an escape response in order to reach safety. If a group is perceived to be morally or physically contaminated, it will elicit feelings of disgust and the associated response will be to avoid that group and minimize the risk of contamination. Envy is evoked when an outgroup possesses a desired resource and the function of that emotional response is to reclaim the desired possession. Pity and guilt are elicited when the outgroup is distressed through no fault of their own, and both emotions lead to prosocial behavior. Guilt is specifically prompted when the ingroup is complicit in causing the distress and results in compensatory prosocial behavior.

Immigrants, as a broad, overarching category, are associated with various stereotypes and emotional profiles depending on their nationality, economic status, occupation, etc. (Lee & Fiske, 2006). Therefore, it is important to specify the immigrant group that this experiment will focus on. This study focuses on attitudes toward Latino immigrants in particular, primarily because of how the current presidency has negatively affected their position within American society. For example, the president has made some incendiary comments about Latino immigrants (Washington-
ton Post Staff, 2015) and there have been a few notable incidents where Latinos were specifically targeted, including a shooting in El Paso (Zurcher, 2019). Such events are reflected in perceptions among Latinos about their place in American society. For example, a recent Pew survey (2018) found that 67% of Latinos surveyed agree that the current administration’s policies have been harmful for Latinos in the US, compared to 15% in 2010 and 41% in 2007. Moreover, the survey found that attitudes among Latinos differed by immigration status, such that immigrants are more concerned about their place in US society compared to US Latino citizens (Pew Research Center, 2018).

Research has yielded unclear results regarding the emotional responses evoked by Latino immigrants. For example, Lee and Fiske (2002) found that “Latino”, “Mexican”, “South American”, and “undocumented” immigrants were low on both dimensions of competence and warmth, indicating that Latino immigrants elicit mostly dislike and disrespect and are associated with feelings of contempt (Fiske et al., 2002).

Cottrell and Neuberg (2005) argue that contempt is an emotion that combines both anger and disgust. Therefore, it is possible that Latino immigrants evoke both emotions. This is somewhat supported by other research demonstrating that unfamiliar foreign immigrants were associated with contamination concerns (Faulkner, Schaller, Park, & Duncan, 2004), which, according to the sociofunctional threat-based approach, would pair this contamination concern with feelings of disgust. Indeed, Feinberg and Willer (2013) found that disgust partially mediated the relationship between sanctity concerns and ideology when it came to environmental attitudes.

However, the assumption that attitudes toward Latino immigrants are based on disgust is complicated by the finding that anger, but not disgust, predicted policy attitudes toward immigration (Cottrell, Richards, & Nichols, 2010). Cottrell et al. hypothesized that stereotypes of Latino
immigrants as freeloaders could be interpreted to mean that they present a threat to resources and reciprocity, and therefore, would evoke feelings of anger (Cottrell et al., 2010).

This discrepancy in the emotional responses toward Latino immigrants may be explained using Moral Foundations Theory. There are different stereotypes associated with Latino immigrants, and those stereotypes might affect people differently depending on their moral foundations. Liberals may be more sensitive to the stereotype of immigrants as “freeloaders” because they tend to value fairness more than conservatives. On the other hand, conservatives might be more affected by the perceived threat posed by immigrants to American values and purity, and thus respond with disgust. Consequently, participants’ affective responses to Latino immigrants may mediate the relationship between the moral framing of the message and their attitudes toward immigrants.

The study will conceptually replicate work by Wolsko et al. (2016) who framed pro-environmental messages in binding and individualizing terms to differentially influence liberals’ and conservatives’ attitudes and behavioral intentions toward environmentalism. Participants were presented with either a binding or individualizing message and then asked to complete measures regarding their intentions to engage in conservation efforts (e.g. recycling), their attitude toward climate change (e.g. “the seriousness of climate change is exaggerated”), their willingness to donate a percentage of their compensation to an environmental protection organization, and their perception of whether the source of the message was an ingroup or outgroup member. They found that the binding message moderated conservatives’ conservation intentions, attitudes toward climate change, and donations and that this effect was mediated by the source’s perceived group membership (liberals tended to have similar attitudes and donations across the different conditions). In addition to following the same design, this study will adapt the messages used in
the Wolsko et al. (2016) study and use a similar intention to donate measure to approximate prosocial behavior toward Latino immigrants.

The Current Research

Past research has shown that the moral framing of a message can influence people’s attitudes on a variety of issues (Feinberg & Willer, 2013; Feinberg & Willer, 2015; Wolsko et al., 2016; Voelkel & Feinberg, 2018). The purpose of the present study is to demonstrate that moral framing can not only influence people’s attitudes towards issues, policies, and behaviors, but also toward marginalized groups in society. The second purpose of this study is to elucidate a path through which moral framing can influence attitudes by examining people’s emotional responses.

In addition to following the general design of the Wolsko et al. (2016) experiments, this study used many of the measures used by Cottrell et al. (2010). Cottrell and colleagues used a threat-based approach to prejudice to show that different emotions predicted attitudes towards policy positions that affect different groups (specifically, Mexican immigrants, gays and lesbians, Arab Muslims, and African Americans). For example, participants’ feelings of disgust (as opposed to other emotions or general prejudice) predicted their attitudes toward gay rights. This study adapted many of the measures used by Cottrell et al. (2010), namely the policy attitude measure, the affective response measure, and the attitude toward immigrants measure.

Hypotheses

Based on past research and theory, the following results are hypothesized:

Hypothesis 1: There will be a main effect of political orientation on attitudes toward Latino immigrants, attitudes toward pro-immigrant policies, and prosocial behavior. Liberals will have more positive attitudes and will donate money compared to conservatives.
Hypothesis 2: The binding message will lead to more positive attitudes toward Latino immigrants, more support for pro-immigrant policies, and higher donations to a pro-immigrant charity for conservative Republicans (compared to the individualizing message), but the individualizing message will be more effective for liberal Democrats (compared to the binding message).

Hypothesis 3: The effect of the moral framing of the message on the dependent variables will be mediated by disgust for conservative Republicans and by anger for liberal Democrats. Receiving a message framed in binding morals should lower feeling of disgust (but not anger) among conservatives which would in turn lead to more positive attitudes toward immigrants and pro-immigrant policies, and higher levels of prosocial behavior. Similarly, the individualizing message should lower feelings of anger (but not disgust) among liberals, leading to more positive attitudes and behavior (see Appendix A for the relevant models).

**Methods**

**Study Design**

This study followed roughly the same procedures outlined in Wolsko et al. (2016). The experiment used a 2 (political orientation: liberal Democrat v. conservative Republican) x 2 (moral framing: individualizing v. binding) between-subjects design. Participants were told that the purpose of the study is to evaluate various persuasive messages and then were directed to choose one of six messages to read. In reality, they were randomly assigned to read either an individualizing or binding message advocating for Latino immigrants. Participants were then asked to complete several items regarding their attitudes and emotions towards Latino immigrants. Participants also answered a few other questions as part of the cover story for the study (e.g. to what extent did they find the message persuasive).
Messages

Participants were randomly assigned to receive a pro-immigrant message framed according to either binding or individualizing morals. The messages were based on those used by Wolsko et al. (2016) and were accompanied by a relevant picture (see Appendix B). These messages went through two rounds of pilot testing to ensure that they conveyed the relevant moral foundations. (see Appendix C for pilot study questionnaire)

The messages were edited after the first round of piloting to be more effective. In the second round of pilot testing, a sample of 95 MTurk users rated the extent to which the message they read conveyed each of the five moral foundations on a 7-point scale (1 = Not at all, 7 = To an extremely large extent). Composite scores were created by averaging the ratings for the individualizing items (care and fairness) and the binding items (loyalty, sanctity, and authority). An independent samples t-test revealed that there was a significant group difference on the composite binding score between the two groups ($t(93) = -2.47, p = .02$), participants who received the binding message ($M = 4.50, SE = 0.23$) had a higher average rating than participants who read the individualizing message ($M = 3.64, SE = 0.26$). Results for the composite individualizing score, however, indicated that there was no significant difference between the two groups ($t(93) = 1.88, p = .06$), but the means were in the expected direction, with participants in the individualizing condition ($M = 5.83, SE = 0.15$) having a higher average on the individualizing composite rating than participants in the binding condition ($M = 5.39, SE = 0.18$).

These results suggested that the individualizing morals were being detected in both messages (albeit to a lesser extent in the binding condition), but that the opposite was not happening (i.e. people were not detecting binding morals in the individualizing message). Since past research suggests that conservatives incorporate more of the moral foundations in their judgements
(Graham et al., 2009) and since the manipulation of the main study was more concerned with influencing conservative Republicans’ attitudes using the binding framing, these pilot results were deemed satisfactory and the messages were used for the main study.

**Participants**

Following the sampling procedures used by Voelkel and Feinberg (2018), the goal was to recruit approximately 400 participants in order to have sufficient power assuming a small effect size. The final sample consisted of 576 non-Latino/Hispanic US citizens from the MTurk participant pool after cleaning the data and excluding responses that failed the data quality checks. Participants completed a 10-minute survey in exchange for $0.75.

Participants’ ages ranged from 20-82 ($M = 40.63$, $SD = 12.62$), 42.4% identified as male and 57.5% identified as female. In terms of ethnicity, 83% identified as White/Caucasian, 6.8% identified as Black/African American, and 7.5% identified as Asian. After dichotomizing political orientation using the method discussed below, 49.1% of the sample consisted of liberal Democrats and 23.3% were conservative Republicans.

**Measures**

**Attitude measure.** An adapted version of the general prejudice measure used by Cottrell et al. (2010) was used to assess attitudes toward Latino immigrants. The measure included two items, scored on a 7-point scale, instructing participants to indicate the degree to which they “dislike” and “feel negative towards” Latino immigrants ($\alpha = .91$). The items were averaged to create the respondents’ composite attitude scores.

**Affective response.** Affect toward Latino immigrants was measured following the method used by Cottrell et al. (2010). Participants indicated on a scale of 1 = Not at all to 9 = Extremely to what extent they feel anger, disgust, fear, and pity when thinking about their impres-
sions of Latino immigrants. The measure includes two items per emotion which were averaged to create five composite scores. The inter-item correlations for this measure are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Table Inter-Item Correlations for the Affective Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anger</th>
<th>Resentment</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Sympathy</th>
<th>Pity</th>
<th>Sickness</th>
<th>Disgust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resentment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
*p < .001

**Policy attitudes.** Following Cottrell et al. (2010), participants were asked to what extent (1 = Strongly oppose, 7 = Strongly favor) they believe the government should provide Latino immigrants with essential social services (e.g., health care, welfare, education, job training), deport Latino immigrants, and grant citizenship to Latino immigrants who have resided in the United States for a minimum number of years. These items were then be averaged to create a composite score of policy support (α = .86).

**Behavioral intention measure.** Participants were also asked what percentage of their compensation they were willing to donate to a charity benefitting Latino immigrants in the United States to assess prosocial behavior toward Latino immigrants (Wolsko et al., 2016).

**Political orientation.** Following Ottati, Wilson, and Price (2019), participants indicated the degree to which they identified as liberal or conservative, and the degree to which they identified as Republican or Democrat on 9-point scales. Only liberal Democrats (those who selected 1, 2, 3, or 4 on both items) and conservative Republicans (those who selected 6, 7, 8, or 9 on both items) were included in analyses. This is consistent with past research on Moral Founda-
tions Theory which has used multiple items to assess political orientation (e.g. Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013; Silver & Silver, 2017).

**Demographics.** Participants also completed several demographic questions about their age, gender, ethnicity, etc. Participants who did not meet the criteria required for participation in the study (i.e. being a non-Latino/Hispanic US citizen) were excluded from data analysis.

**Data quality.** Attention, manipulation, fluency, and bot checks were also included. Participants were asked what group was mentioned in the message they read, if their answers indicated that they did not pay attention to the message, they were dropped from the sample. To exclude any potential bots that may have participated in the experiment, participants were asked to type in their age and select their year of birth from a dropdown menu. If the responses to both items did not match the participant was excluded from analyses (Kennedy, Clifford, Burleigh, Jewell, & Waggoner, 2018). Additionally, participants were asked multiple choice questions in which they identified the synonym for a given word as a language fluency check (“After the Bot Scare,” 2018). Participants who failed any of these checks were dropped from analyses (see Appendix D for the complete questionnaire).

**Results**

As a manipulation check, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which the five moral foundations were present in the message they received in a similar manner to the pilot test. Independent samples t-tests revealed that the manipulation was effective at evoking the appropriate moral concerns. Participants who received the binding message had a significantly higher average on the binding composite rating ($M = 3.65, SE = 0.07$) than participants who read the individualizing message ($M = 2.39, SE = 0.08$) ($t(570.25) = -11.26, p < .001$). Likewise, results for the composite individualizing score indicated that there was a significant difference between the
two conditions \((t(492.37) = 12.93, \ p < .001)\), with participants in the individualizing condition \((M = 5.97, \ SE = 0.07)\) having a higher average rating than participants in the binding condition \((M = 4.46, \ SE = 0.10)\).

To test the effects of the manipulation, three 2\(\times\)2 ANOVAs were conducted for each of the dependent variables (attitudes toward Latino immigrants, attitudes toward pro-immigrant policies, and intended donations to a hypothetical pro-immigrant charity). Results indicated that there was no significant main effect for experimental condition. The type of message did not significantly impact attitude toward Latino immigrants \(F(1, 413) = 2.10, \ p = .15, \ \eta^2 = 0.01\), donations \(F(1, 411) = 0.01, \ p = .94, \ \eta^2 = 0.00\), or policy support \(F(1, 412) = .64, \ p = .42, \ \eta^2 = 0.00\).

However, there was a significant main effect for political orientation. Political orientation had a significant impact on attitude toward Latino immigrants \(F(1, 413) = 128.27, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .24\), donations \(F(1, 411) = 26.92, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .06\), and policy support \(F(1, 412) = 393.14, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .49\).

The interaction of political orientation and experimental condition did not have a significant impact on attitudes \(F(1, 413) = .97, \ p = .32, \ \eta^2 = .00\), donations \(F(1, 411) = .27, \ p = .60, \ \eta^2 = .00\), or policy support \(F(1, 412) = .10, \ p = .75, \ \eta^2 = .00\).
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Political Orientation and Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th></th>
<th>Policy Support</th>
<th></th>
<th>Donations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualizing</td>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Individualizing</td>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Individualizing</td>
<td>Binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democrats</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Republicans</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Affect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anger</th>
<th></th>
<th>Disgust</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualizing</td>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Individualizing</td>
<td>Binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democrats</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Republicans</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To test whether the effect of the moral framing of the message on the dependent variables was mediated by disgust for conservative Republicans and by anger for liberal Democrats, I ran a separate moderated mediation using Hayes’ PROCESS Model 8 for each of the dependent variables (attitudes toward Latino immigrants, support for pro-immigrant policies, and pledged donations). Type of message (binding or individualizing) was entered as the independent variable, anger and disgust were simultaneously entered as the mediating variables, and political orientation was the moderator (see Appendix A for the moderated mediation models).

The results of this analysis revealed a few simple effects. Political orientation had a direct effect on anger in the three models, when attitude was the outcome, $b = 1.50$, $95\%$ CI $[-0.65, 0.47]$, $t = 3.25$, $p = .00$, when policy support was the outcome, $b = 1.49$, $95\%$ CI $[0.59, 2.40]$, $t = 3.24$, $p = .00$, and when donations were entered as the outcome, $b = 1.49$, $95\%$ CI $[0.59, 2.40]$, $t = 3.24$, $p = .00$. Likewise, political orientation had a direct effect on disgust in the attitude model, $b = 1.23$, $95\%$ CI $[-0.73, 0.26]$, $t = 2.97$, $p = .00$, in the policy support model, $b = 1.22$, $95\%$ CI $[0.41, 2.04]$, $t = 2.96$, $p = .00$, and in the donations model, $b = 1.22$, $95\%$ CI $[0.41, 2.04]$, $t = 2.96$, $p = .00$. There was also a marginally significant moderating effect of political orientation on the direct relationship between message and attitude toward Latino immigrants, $b = -0.55$, $95\%$ CI $[-0.01, 1.11]$, $t = 1.94$, $p = .05$

Affect also had a significant direct effect on some of the outcomes. Anger had a significant direct effect on attitude toward Latino immigrants, $b = 0.59$, $95\%$ CI $[0.45, 0.74]$, $t = 8.26$, $p < .001$, support for pro-immigrant policies, $b = -0.62$, $95\%$ CI $[-0.08, -0.44]$, $t = -6.66$, $p < .001$, and donations, $b = -5.68$, $95\%$ CI $[-8.14, -3.21]$, $t = -4.53$, $p < .001$. Disgust also had a significant direct effect on donations, $b = 4.631$, $95\%$ CI $[0.52, 8.74]$, $t = 2.22$, $p = .03$. 
However, there was no moderated mediation effect for any of the three dependent variables. That is, the indirect effect of moral framing on the outcome variables, operating through disgust and anger, did not depend on political affiliation. The conditional indirect effect of message on attitude through anger was not significant for liberal Democrats, $b = -0.03, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.13, 0.05]$, or conservative Republicans, $b = -0.09, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.42, 0.23]$. Likewise, the conditional indirect effect on attitude through disgust was not significant for conservative Republicans, $b = -0.01, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.09, 0.64]$, or liberal Democrats, $b = -0.00, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.02, 0.012]$. The results also indicated that there was no moderation effect of political orientation on attitude toward Latino immigrants through either anger, $b = -0.09, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.65, 0.47]$, $t = -0.33, p = .74$, or disgust, $b = -0.24, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.73, 0.26]$, $t = -0.93, p = .35$.

Similar results emerged for policy support. The conditional indirect effect of message on policy support as mediated by anger was not significant for liberal Democrats, $b = 0.04, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.06, 0.13]$, or conservative Republicans, $b = 0.09, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.25, 0.45]$. Nor was the conditional indirect effect mediated by disgust for conservative Republicans, $b = -0.03, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.15, 0.04]$, or liberal Democrats, $b = -0.00, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.03, 0.02]$. The interaction effect in this model was also not significant for anger, $b = -0.09, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.65, 0.47]$, $t = -0.32, p = .75$; nor was it significant for disgust, $b = -0.24, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.73, 0.26]$, $t = -0.92, p = .36$, indicating no moderation effect.

The same pattern emerged for intended donations as well. The conditional indirect effect of message on donations was not significantly mediated by anger for liberal Democrats, $b = 0.33, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.49, 1.30]$, or conservative Republicans, $b = 0.85, 95\% \text{ CI } [-2.10, 4.41]$. And it was also not significantly mediated by disgust for conservative Republicans, $b = -1.10, 95\% \text{ CI } [-4.65,
0.93], or liberal Democrats, $b = -0.01$, 95% CI [-0.73, 0.65]. There was also no significant interaction effect for anger, $b = -0.09$, 95% CI [-0.65, 0.47], $t = -0.32$, $p = .75$; and there was no significant interaction effect for disgust, $b = -0.24$, 95% CI [-0.73, 0.26], $t = -0.93$, $p = .35$.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to attempt to reduce prejudice toward Latino immigrants using moral framing. Since conservatives tend to have more negative attitudes toward Latino immigrants, framing the issue in moral language that they endorse (specifically the binding moral foundations) was hypothesized to lead to less negative attitudes toward Latino immigrants, more support for pro-immigrant policies, and more hypothetical donations to a pro-immigrant charity. A similar effect was hypothesized for liberals. It was assumed that liberal Democrats would start off with more positive attitudes toward Latino immigrants, but it was further hypothesized that liberal Democrats who read a pro-immigrant message framed in the individualizing moral foundations would have more pro-immigrant outcomes compared to their counterparts who received a message framed in the binding moral foundations.

Furthermore, the effect of the type of message on attitudes and donations was hypothesized to be differentially mediated for liberals and conservatives. This effect was supposed to be mediated by disgust for conservatives since that is the emotion that’s most closely tied to violations of the binding morals of sanctity, loyalty, and respect for authority. However, it was hypothesized that this effect would be mediated by anger for liberals since that is the emotion most likely to be elicited by violations of the fairness moral foundation.

The results of the experiment did not support these hypotheses. In general, liberal Democrats did indeed have more positive attitudes toward Latino immigrants, were more supportive of
pro-immigrant policies, and pledged higher donations to a pro-immigrant charity compared to conservative Republicans. However, the framing of the message did not influence any of those outcomes for either liberal Democrats or conservative Republicans. Moreover, the hypothesized mediation effects were not supported by the results. Disgust did not seem to mediate the relationship for conservative Republicans and anger did not have an indirect effect for liberal Democrats.

Political orientation did appear to have a direct effect on both anger and disgust in all three models (one for each dependent variable). Furthermore, affect appeared to have a direct effect on outcomes in some situations. For example, anger had an effect on attitudes toward Latino immigrants, support for pro-immigrant policies, and donations pledged; and disgust had a direct effect on donations as well (although this relationship indicated that disgust was associated with increases donations). These effects were in the predicted direction, such that having a conservative political orientation predicted more negative affect, and negative affect predicted more prejudiced outcomes – with the exception of the relationship between disgust and donations. This is in line with previous research that has demonstrated a relationship between affect and prejudiced attitudes (e.g. Cottrell et al., 2010), as well as research on the relationship between political ideology and prejudice toward immigrants (Bassett, 2010). However, the overall moderated mediation effect was not supported by the results.

These results suggest that while morally reframed messaging can influence attitudes toward certain attitudes and behaviors, such as environmental issues (e.g. Wolsko et al., 2016), this effect may not transfer to attitudes and behaviors toward groups of people. Moreover, the findings do not support the notion that prejudice toward Latino immigrants is based on different emotions for liberals and conservatives since the indirect effects were not significant. This could
indicate that prejudice toward Latino immigrants is rooted in the same emotions for both liberals and conservatives. On the other hand, prejudice toward Latino immigrants may in fact be related to different emotional profiles for liberals and conservatives, however the exact configuration of those profiles is yet to be determined. It is also worth noting that there was a slight floor effect, especially among liberal Democrats, in the ratings of attitudes toward Latino immigrants, therefore, it may be difficult to identify negative affect associated with Latino immigrants for liberals.

**Limitations and Future Research**

This study has several limitations that future research could address. Firstly, while the manipulation did seem to evoke the appropriate moral concerns, it may have been too vague and generic to be persuasive. Participants simply read a very brief message that broadly encouraged readers to support Latino immigrants without providing any specific steps they could take or policies they could support. This may have hindered the effectiveness of the message. Future research should examine the effect of more precise and targeted messaging aimed at taking specific actions.

In a similar vein, the measures used in this study could have also been more precise. For example, the items assessing support for pro-immigrant policies did not mention actual policies being proposed in government, instead all the items were hypothetical proposals. Additionally, the sole behavior intention measure used was also a hypothetical donation. Future studies should utilize existing policy proposals and examine a variety of different behaviors when assessing the impact of moral foundations on prejudicial attitudes and behaviors. Moreover, the attitude measure used in this experiment was very brief and undifferentiated. It may have been beneficial to include an implicit measure of attitudes as well as a more detailed explicit measure.
Another limitation with this study is that it did not adequately specify the target group. Two participants wrote that they were unsure if “Latino immigrants” referred to documented or undocumented immigrants and that this additional information would have affected their answers. Thus, the legal status of immigrants was likely an important variable to include in the experiment.

Additionally, the sample consisted of approximately twice as many liberals as conservatives. Thus, the cell sizes were quite uneven, hindering the statistical power to detect an effect. Ideally, each cell would have had at least 100 participants, however due to the low percentage of conservatives in the sample, the smallest cell size – which consisted of conservatives in the binding condition – had only 59 participants and the second smallest cell size – conservatives in the individualizing condition – had about 75 participants (in comparison, the largest cell size had about 147 participants). Thus, neither cell size reached the minimum number required as suggested by the power analysis.

Conclusion

The findings of this experiment suggest that using moral reframing does not lead to less prejudice toward Latino immigrants. There are several conceivable explanations for this result. It is possible the manipulation simply was not strong enough to elicit the effect or that the measures for the dependent variables were not sensitive enough to capture the effect if it existed. It is also likely that ideology precedes morality, and thus reframing the moral terms of an issue would not change one’s ideological position. However, since past research has found moral reframing to be somewhat effective, it may be that prejudice towards marginalized groups is unlike other attitudes (e.g. environmentally friendly attitude) and thus is not susceptible to the same kind of moral appeals. Further research is needed to better understand this issue.
APPENDIX A

MODERATED MEDIATION MODELS
APPENDIX B

MORAL FRAMING MANIPULATION
Instructions (adapted from Wolsko et al., 2016):

Many people around the country are concerned about the increasing number of Latino immigrants. We are interested in what you think and feel about this issue. First, please choose one of the following 6 messages to read before answering a few additional questions.

Individualizing Message (adapted from Wolsko et al., 2016):

Show your love for all of humanity and the world in which we live by helping to care for the vulnerable among us. Help to reduce the harm done to Latino immigrants by taking action. By caring for immigrants, you are helping to ensure that everyone gets to enjoy living in a safe environment. Do the right thing by preventing the suffering of all humans and making sure that no one is denied their right to living safely and comfortably. SHOW YOUR COMPASSION!
Binding Message (adapted from Wolsko et al., 2016)

Show your respect for your country and its forefathers by defending the sanctity of American values. This nation was founded by immigrants. By fighting to protect Latino immigrants you will be upholding the legacy of the founding fathers and guarding the principles they fought for. Honor their legacy and follow the examples of your religious and political leaders by defending Latino immigrants and protecting America's core values. Together, we will build a safe, strong, and proud America. SHOW YOUR FAITH AND PATRIOTISM!
APPENDIX C

PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
[After reading one of the messages in Appendix B] At this point we would like you to answer the following questions. Please answer honestly, there are no “correct” answers, we are simply interested in your opinion.

1. What moral values do you think were communicated in the message you read? [open-ended textbox]

2. To what extent did the message you read emphasize the following concerns [1 = not at all, 7 = to a very large extent]: caring for others/reducing the harm done to others; respecting authority; loyalty to people or institutions; fairness/equality concerns; sanctity/purity concerns.

3. To what extent was the message that you read [1 = not at all, 7 = to a very large extent]: easy to understand; well-written; clear; difficult to understand.

4. What is your age? _____

5. What is your gender? [Male; Female; Non-binary; Something else (please specify)]

6. What is your ethnicity? [Caucasian/White; African American/Black; Asian; Latinx; Middle Eastern; Other (please specify)]

7. Where would you place yourself on this political spectrum? [1=Strongly liberal, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7=Strongly conservative]

8. If you had to choose, where would you place yourself on this political spectrum? [1=Strong Democrat, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7=Strong Republican]
APPENDIX D

COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE MAIN STUDY
1. To what extent do you feel the following emotions when thinking about your impressions of Latino immigrants (1 = Not at all to 9 = Extremely)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resentful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgusted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickenen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How much would you support a government action that (1 = Strongly oppose, 7 = Strongly favor):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides Latino immigrants with essential social services (e.g., health care, welfare, education, job training).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deports Latino immigrants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants citizenship to Latino immigrants who have resided in the United States for a minimum number of years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. To what extent do you (1 = Not at all, 7 = to a very large extent):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dislike Latino immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel negative towards Latino immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What percentage of the compensation you received for participating in this study would you be willing to donate to a charity benefitting Latino immigrants in the United States:

[type in a number from 0-100%]
5. To what extent was the message that you read at the beginning of this study [1 = not at all, 7 = to a very large extent]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easy to understand</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well-written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What is your year of birth? [dropdown menu]

7. What group was mentioned in the message you read at the beginning of this study?
   [Latino Immigrants/Asian Immigrants/African Immigrants/European Immigrants]

8. Please select your gender [man/woman/non-binary/prefer not to say]

9. What is your ethnicity? [Caucasian/White; African American/Black; Asian; Latinx/Hispanic; Middle Eastern; Other (please specify)]

10. What is the highest level of education you have completed? [some high school; high school or GED; some college; 2-year degree; 4-year degree; Master's degree; Doctoral degree; Professional degree (MD or JD); Other]

11. Where would you place yourself on this political spectrum? [1=Strongly liberal, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7=Strongly conservative]

12. If you had to choose, where would you place yourself on this political spectrum?
   [1=Strong Democrat, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7=Strong Republican]

13. What is your age? ___
14. Please select the closest synonym for the words listed below using the drop-down menus:

   a. Justification [Needle/Constant/Definite/Excuse]
   b. Provoke [Irritate/Innocuous/Balance/Grant]
   c. Partisan [Biased/Stubborn/Gullible/Complicated]
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