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Introduction:
- Uncontrolled law variable (Turiel, 2007).
- Personal/ Impersonal transgressions (Greene & Haidt, 2002).

Hypothesis:
- Wording effects in moral judgments.
- Interaction between Law and Wording.
- Generalization of results across all 5 Moral Foundations.
- Generalization of results in two samples: Colombia and USA.

Methods:
- 528 participants (n USA = 405; n Colombia = 123; males = 260; Mean age = 32.9±12.1).
- Sacrificial dilemmas using 5 Moral Foundations (Graham & Haidt, 2007).

Analysis:
- Repeated-measures MANCOVA (Within variables: Wording and Foundations; Between variables: Law and Personal transgressions).
- Controls: Demographics Political and Religious Preferences and previous knowledge.
- Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons.

Results:
- Main effect of Moral Foundations and Wording.
- No effect of Law except for Permissibility ratings.
- Personal/ Impersonal distinction replicated only in Harm, Ingroup and Purity Foundations.
- No main effect of Country.
- Controlling for: demographics, Political and Religious preferences and previous knowledge.

Conclusions:
- Wording effects: Wrong and Blameworthy vs Appropriate and Acceptable vs Permissible.
- Clear distinction between Law and Morality in all Moral Foundations.
- Personal/ Impersonal distinction exists only in 3 out of 5 Foundations: Harm, Respect and Purity.
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