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**Justice in the Eye of the Beholder: How Comparison Framing Affects the Perception of Global Inequality Through Social Emotions and Justice Sensitivity**

I enjoyed reading this Stage 1 RR! The topic of global inequality is absolutely important and timely, and I am glad researchers are investigating ways of addressing inequality between countries. I do believe the research questions make sense considering the literature, but the hypotheses were surprising given the literature on inequality framing. I was surprised to not read theory and research on when and why people focus on advantaged versus disadvantaged in framing (inequality framing) as opposed to comparison framing overall. For example, there is work on the “half-blindness of privilege” (Pratto & Stewart, 2012), suggesting that people mask the privilege of advantaged groups by focusing on the disadvantaged. In other words, advantaged groups are seen as the default and people like to discuss how groups are disadvantaged instead of how groups are advantaged. Indeed, for some groups, framing inequality as privilege versus disadvantage can lead to heightened threat (Lowery et al., 2007) and they are motivated to deny, distance, but also dismantle when that threat happens (Knowles et al., 2014). From that perspective, we might expect the opposite result suggested here, that people would be more inclined to address inequality when it is focused on how much advantage certain groups have. Some research has even shown that (Chow & Galak, 2012; Iyer et al., 2003; Lowery et al., 2012)!

The authors even cite these papers to support the importance of comparison framing but don’t grapple with the fact that these papers find the exact opposite pattern they are proposing here. Given the two preliminary studies, this paper is poised to help elucidate why sometimes disadvantage framing works and sometimes it doesn’t work. I would like to see some theorizing about it and perhaps include a variable that can capture this dimension. The fact that hypothesis 1 wasn’t supported in either preliminary studies could be because for some participants the framing leads to more support and for other participants the disadvantage framing leads to less support.

I am not well versed in literature that is not United-States centered, so apologies that my reference examples are US-centric. I would be surprised if there wasn’t similar research in other contexts though!

Another thing I would love to see the authors grapple with is the level of the dynamic. Should we expect comparison framing to work in the same way for individuals (the research that is currently being used to support the framing hypothesis) as it does for groups? Is there a difference when the comparative framing is on the level of countries compared to groups within a country? The authors note that “global inequality is a rather abstract form of inequality”, suggesting that global inequality shouldn’t be perceived similarly as forms of inequality like racism and sexism. If that is true, how would we expect the comparison framing to impact abstract forms of inequality? That could also be the moderating variable that distinguishes when disadvantaged framing leads to more or less interest in redistribution.

I think the point of level also matters because of the use of justice motives as the relevant moderator. I expected SDO to be the moderator and not just simply controlled for because it is related to recognition of inequality (Kteily et al., 2017; Kteily & Richeson, 2016). The same logic the authors used for including Justice sensitivity as a moderator is very similar to why I would use SDO as a moderator, and they can test SDO as a moderator already because they have measured it multiple times. Justice sensitivity, however, is on the level of the individual and not about groups and group dynamics (like SDO is).

Finally, I was surprised that the social emotions (as a mediator) didn’t include the action-oriented emotions like collective outrage and anger as outlined in the introduction. Especially in the case of collective action on behalf of a marginalized group, anger in conjunction with sympathy/empathy are particularly important. For example anger can be a more potent motivator of political action than guilt (Leach et al., 2006). The authors cite this paper, but don’t use it to motivate which emotions they selected as mediators. Instead of measuring what is effectively group gloating/superiority/schadenfreude (superiority and pride), I encourage the authors to include action-oriented emotions in their main study.

One small point: SDO should be measured as either an 8 or a 16 item scale, as it was designed to have equal numbers of con-trait and pro-trait, as well as anti-egalitarian and dominance subscale components.
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