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Why study citizenship?

Many world problems arise from poor government: non-functioning government (including world government), populism, corruption, poor policies, isolationism.

This occurs in democracies and quasi-democracies.

Thus thee bad decisions of citizens hurt other people; hence this is a moral issue, like donating to charity. Not just voting, but that is an example.

Voting, unlike donating to charity, is (usually) cheap.
Three related utilitarian virtues and vices of good citizens

Cosmopolitanism is a continuum, from pure self-interest voting to concern for present and future humanity. In the middle is parochialism, which is voting for an in-group, even when out-group harm exceeds in-group benefit.

Opposition to Moralism, the willingness to impose on others beliefs that cannot be defended in terms of their goals, which often come from attachment to pre-Enlightenment traditions.

Actively open-minded thinking (AOT) includes active search for reasons why a pet idea might be wrong, and fair inference from what is found. It is required for individual thinking, for group discussion, and for evaluation of authorities.
Positive manifold?

Everything correlates with everything:

- Parochialism in the form of nationalism, e.g., opposition to immigration.
- Social conservatism (pre- vs. post-Enlightenment).
- Religion, especially Divine Command Theory, the belief that we must accept the commands of God, because we are incapable of reasoning ourselves.
- Deontology, as opposed to utilitarianism.
- Acceptance of actively open-minded thinking as a standard.
Likely sources of these correlations

**Cultural diversity (a.k.a. heterogeneity).** Pre-Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment cultures in the same population. Older, traditional beliefs and values associated with (but not limited to) religion vs. modern liberalism (tolerance, respect for science, etc.).

**Different standards for thinking.** People differ (for many reasons, including their cultural background) in the way they reach conclusions, in part because of their norms and beliefs about how they *should* reach conclusions, and these differences affect their beliefs.

Thus, culture can affect each measure directly, or indirectly through norms for thinking, which have other determinants.

And these variables can affect each other, e.g., utilitarian standards can increase cosmopolitanism.
3.2. Results

The sample yielded 36 Creationists, 60 Theistic Evolutionists, 112 Evolutionists, and 4 Others, who were left out of all analyses. The average participant checked 5.9 of 16 candidate criteria as acceptable (SD = 3.1, range 1–16).

As suggested by the interviews in Study 1, Creationists, Evolutionists, and Theistic Evolutionists did differ considerably in which candidate criteria they took as legitimate (see Fig. 2). Indeed, the number of non-scientific criteria taken as acceptable and/or excellent strongly correlated with rejection of evolution (r(211) = .65, p < .00001), while the number of scientific criteria taken as acceptable and/or excellent strongly correlated with acceptance of evolution (r(211) = .53, p < .00001).

3.2.1. Non-scientific criteria

Unsurprisingly, the three groups differed most in their acceptance of the Bible criterion, which strongly correlated with rejection of evolution (r(211) = .64, p < .001). This was significantly different across all three groups, with more Creationists (74%) than Theistic Evolutionists (27%; v²(1, N = 96) = 18.97, p < .001), and more Theistic Evolutionists than Evolutionists (<1%) accepting this as a legitimate reason for belief (v²(1, N = 172) = 29.14, p < .001).

Clergy was also a significant predictor of acceptance (r(211) = .29, p < .0001), with Creationists accepting their epistemic authority (20%) significantly more often than did Evolutionists (1%) (v²(3, N = 212) = 18.34, p < .001), though no more than Theistic Evolutionists.
Actively open-minded thinking (AOT) as a norm

- People tend to follow their own standards for what good thinking is.
- And use these standards to evaluate others.
- AOT based on theory of optimal thinking.
- Takes into account the cost of thinking. Allows reliance on others. (Hence is different from reflection/impulsivity.)
- Main departures from AOT: myside bias and overconfidence.
AOT scale: acceptance of norms for thinking

- Willingness to be convinced by opposing arguments is a sign of good character.
- People should take into consideration evidence that goes against conclusions they favor.
- Being undecided or unsure is the result of muddled thinking. (-)
- People should revise their conclusions in response to relevant new information.
- Changing your mind is a sign of weakness. (-)
- People should search actively for reasons why they might be wrong.
- It is OK to ignore evidence against your established beliefs. (-)
- It is important to be loyal to your beliefs even when evidence is brought to bear against them. (-)
- There is nothing wrong with being undecided about many issues.
- When faced with a puzzling question, we should try to consider more than one possible answer before reaching a conclusion.
I. EU of voting: Why cosmopolitanism is utilitarian?

Utility of voting is given by the formula:

$$\text{Utility} = \frac{(B \times N + S)}{V}$$

- For $B = 0.5$, $S = 50$:
  - $V = 1000$, Utility = 2
  - $N = 2000$, Utility = 3
  - $N = 4000$, Utility = 4

- For $B = 0.1$, $S = 50$:
  - $V = 1000$, Utility = 0.75
  - $N = 2000$, Utility = 1.25
  - $N = 4000$, Utility = 1.75

- For $B = 1.1$, $S = 50$:
  - $V = 1000$, Utility = 2.25
  - $N = 2000$, Utility = 3.75
  - $N = 4000$, Utility = 5.25

The graph shows the utility and cost of voting for different values of $B$ and $S$, with $V$ fixed at 1000 voters.
British Election Survey (wave 8, 2016) items

Selected items for parochialism measure:
The UK should help other EU members in times of crisis
Should EU citizens be able to claim child-benefit for children not in the UK
Good or bad for Britain: Allowing the free movement of workers within Europe
Allow more asylum seekers to come to UK
Britain should allow more workers from other EU countries
Britain should allow more workers from outside the EU
Allow more student to come to UK
Allow more families of people who already live here to come to UK
Self: Allow more or fewer immigrants
EU Referendum vote intention (unqueezed)
Correlations from British Election Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AOT</th>
<th>Brexit</th>
<th>Rightwng</th>
<th>GwHum</th>
<th>Educ</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>NoRelig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOT</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brexit</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rightwng</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GwHum</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoRelig</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Anti-moralism

In June, 2006, then Senator Barak Obama said something like the following (from USA Today, July 10): “To say that men and women should not inject their ‘personal morality’ into public policy debates is a practical absurdity; our law is by definition a codification of morality. ... [But d]emocracy demands that the religiously motivated translate their concerns into universal, rather than religion-specific, values. It requires that their proposals be subject to argument, and amenable to reason. If I am opposed to abortion for religious reasons but seek to pass a law banning the practice, I cannot simply point to the teachings of my church. I have to explain why abortion violates some principle that is accessible to people of all faiths, including those with no faith at all.”
### Categorization of goals (values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent on others’ goals</th>
<th>Altruistic</th>
<th>Moral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent of others’ goals</td>
<td>Self-Interested</td>
<td>Moralistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moralistic values need not be based on religion. They involve things like opposition to various forms of biotechnology.
III. Actively open-minded thinking

“In the case of any person whose judgment is really deserving of confidence, how has it become so? Because he has kept his mind open to criticism of his opinions and conduct. Because it has been his practice to listen to all that could be said against him; to profit by as much of it as was just, and expound to himself . . . the fallacy of what was fallacious.” J. S. Mill, On liberty
Properties of AOT: A theory of good thinking

- Applies to search and inference.
- Objects can be **possibilities** (options, candidate conclusions), **evidence** (arguments), or **goals** (values, criteria).
- About fairness, not just amount. Not the same as reflection/impulsivity. Does not always demand lots of thinking.
- Applied to others (authorities), as well as self. We trust others to tell us what to believe.
- Applies to confidence, not just conclusions. Confidence can be justifiably low.
- Leads to better decisions.
- Main departures for individual differences: *Myside bias* (Perkins, 2019) and *Overconfidence*. 
Some correlations of AOT scale (including similar scales)

- predicts judgments of others’ thinking
- $-0.61$ ($-0.82$ corrected for attenuation) with belief in divine-command theory (Piazza & Landy, 2013).
- $0.3$ (corrected) with utilitarian responding in moral dilemmas (Baron et al., 2015).
- $-0.27$ ($-0.41$) with political conservatism in a study where CRT correlated 0 (Kahan & Corbin, 2016).
- $-0.49$ with supernatural religious beliefs (Pennycook et al., 2014).
- $-0.44$ with superstitious beliefs (Svedholm-Häkkinen & Lindeman (2017).
- lower negative correlations with belief in conspiracy theories and paranormal beliefs.

Note: Correlations with the CRT were always lower.
Correlations from Baron et al. 2015, Study 4

AOT   Divine   CRT   CRT.rt   Uscale   Uaction
AOT   0.67     −0.82   0.53   0.38     0.59     0.4
Divine −0.61   0.83    −0.39  −0.27   −0.81    −0.37
CRT    0.38    −0.32   0.78   0.47     0.58     0.31
CRT.rt 0.3      −0.24   0.4    0.91     0.25     0.28
Uscale 0.37     −0.57   0.39   0.18     0.6      0.57
Uaction 0.29    −0.29   0.24   0.23     0.38     0.76
Correlations from Bronstein et al., JDM 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FakeNewsBelief</th>
<th>RealNewsBelief</th>
<th>AOT</th>
<th>CRT</th>
<th>DelusionalIdeas</th>
<th>Dogmatism</th>
<th>Fundamentalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FakeNewsBelief</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RealNewsBelief</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOT</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelusionalIdeas</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentalism</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation of AOT scale with myside bias in political statements, Study 1 (with Derrick High II)

8 pairs of items differing in recognition of otherside arguments, 100 Ss:

- **Type1** It would be flat out irresponsible to oppose tuition-free access to community or technical college programs — it will create a wave of new workers prepared for the 21st century economy.

- **Type2** Tuition-free access to community or technical college programs will create a wave of new workers prepared for the 21st century economy. Yes, it is expensive, but it is worth the price.

*How much can you trust the judgment of the person who said this?* (4-point scale)
- \( r = .35 \) between AOT and the Type2-Type2 difference

*How fairly has the speaker thought about the topic?* (4-point scale)
- \( r = .37 \) between AOT and the Type2-Type1 difference
Correlation of AOT scale with overconfidence of statements, Study 2

14 pairs of items differing in unjustified high confidence, 100 Ss:

- "Those tremors don’t mean anything. An earthquake won’t happen. (scientist)"
- "Those tremors probably don’t mean anything. An earthquake is unlikely. (scientist)"

Trust: “Consider someone who made this statement. How would this affect your willingness to rely on what this person says? (The type of person is in parentheses.)”

Difference between ratings of two types correlated .36 with AOT.

Credibility: “How credible is each statement by itself, when made by the source in parentheses?”

Difference correlated .47 with AOT.
Time travel experiment, items (some shortened)

- **Divine.** The truth about morality is revealed only by God.
- Acts that are immoral are immoral because God forbids them.
- We don’t need to try to figure out what is right and wrong, the answers have already been given to us by God.
- **Relig.** There is a god that truly exists.
- God, and gods, do not exist, despite what people believe.
- I consider myself a religious person.”
- **Conserv.** I would be reluctant to make any large-scale changes to the social order.
- I have a preference for maintaining stability in society,…
- Society should be quicker to throw out old ideas…
- Traditional values, customs, and morality have a lot wrong…
- On SOCIAL matters, my political orientation is on the right (conservative)…
- On ECONOMIC matters, my political orientation is on the right…

Followed by 10 item AOT scale.
How have your views changed on this question over your lifetime?
I have moved toward the agree/completely-agree side of this scale.
My views haven’t changed.
I have moved toward the disagree/completely-disagree side of this scale.

How do your views differ from your upbringing?
My upbringing was closer to the disagree side of the scale.
My views are similar to the way I was brought up.
My upbringing was closer to the agree side of this scale.
Additional questions about influences

Please indicate which of the following influences on your views are relevant, even if they did not lead to any changes.

▶ I thought about things like this myself. [ Not at all Somewhat Quite a bit]
▶ People involved in my upbringing influenced me, or tried to influence me.
▶ Other people I met later influenced me, or tried to influence me.
▶ My formal education (e.g., school, college) was relevant to this question.
▶ I had certain specific life experiences that changed, or could have changed, my views on this.

Critical measure, “Relative influence”, is Thought (“I thought about things ...”) minus the mean of the other four influences.
Effect of thought on liberalism, vs. upbringing (product)
Effect of thought on liberalism, over lifetime

Thought effect on liberalism, over lifetime (5 point scale)

DCT  Relig  Liberal  AOT
Lifetime effect of thought, no AOT difference from upbringing
Regressions for selected subjects: causal pathways?

Subjects (N=93) who do not differ from upbringing in AOT:
   AOT predicts effect of thought on liberalism (b=.47, p=.006)

Subjects (N=56) who do not differ from (or are more extreme than)
upbringing in Divine Command Theory:
   Divine predicts Aot (B=.10, p=.036)
Conclusions

There is a positive manifold among measures of deontology, social conservatism, parochialism, religious “fundamentalism”, and non-acceptance of AOT.

Some of these dimensions may affect others. Active reflection can lead to cosmopolitanism, rejection of moralistic values, and utilitarianism. Utilitarianism can lead to cosmopolitanism. Belief in divine command theory can make people resist AOT.

Some beliefs/norms/standards seem likely to arise from direct cultural transmission (Divine Command Theory). We need more investigation of why some norms are more culturally compatible than others.

Other norms seem to arise as a result of people’s own thinking, according to their own retrospection. Even when AOT does not differ from upbringing, it correlates with the effect of thought on movement toward liberalism.