Research in the social sciences has shown that people are influenced by, and often adjust their behavior to mesh with, social norms (Schultz et al., 2007, Miller & Prentice, 2016, Schultz et al., 2007). This research investigates how framing descriptive ethical scenarios as being common (majority frame) or uncommon (minority frame) can influence individual’s moral judgement of a particular behaviour (e.g. 80% of Canadians use desks made from sustainable wood vs. 20% of Canadians use desks made from sustainable wood). Building on research from the “common is moral” (CiM) heuristic which suggests that the relative frequency of social behaviours serve as a basis for moral judgement (Lindström et al. 2018), we propose that majority frames are especially effective when they involve members of an in-group rather than an out-group. More specifically, participants presented with unsustainable (vs. sustainable) actions presented in the majority frame (e.g. 80% of students do not recycle) will perceive them as more moral than the same action presented in the minority frame (e.g. 20% of students do not recycle), particularly when members of an in-group are involved (e.g. UBC vs SFU students). These perceptions of morality are predicted to drive ethical behaviour, offering an explanation of how social norms influence action. This study also illustrates potential framing methods firms may be able to utilize to nudge the moral perceptions and subsequent actions of consumers.
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Comments:

The title seems to be a little indirect. Isn’t it majority or minority activity that is judged to influence moral judgements. I don’t get the “majority minority norms”. If lots of people do it, it is more likely to be judged as morally good. This then is further conditioned by whether the majority or minority action is undertaken by someone in an in-group (likely to be even more persuasive) versus someone in an out-group (likely to be less persuasive). Might also want to suggest how UBC/SFU triggers in-group versus out-group allegiances.