

The MEVIR Framework: A Virtue-Informed Moral-Epistemic Model of Human Trust Decisions

Daniel Schwabe

dschwabe@gmail.com

Abstract

The 21st-century information landscape presents an unprecedented challenge: how do individuals make sound trust decisions in an environment characterized by complexity, polarization, and deliberate misinformation? Traditional rational-agent models fail to capture the reality of human trust formation, which involves not merely logical calculation but a complex synthesis of reason, character, and pre-rational intuition.

This report introduces the Moral-Epistemic VIRTue informed (MEVIR) framework, a comprehensive descriptive model that integrates three distinct theoretical perspectives to explain how humans actually form trust judgments. The framework synthesizes: (1) a procedural model describing the mechanical structure of evidence-gathering and reasoning chains; (2) Linda Zagzebski's virtue epistemology, which characterizes the intellectual disposition and character-driven processes of the epistemic agent; and (3) Extended Moral Foundations Theory (EMFT), which explains the rapid, automatic moral intuitions that anchor and fuel the reasoning process.

Central to the framework is the integration of ontological concepts—Truth Bearers, Truth Makers, and Ontological Unpacking—which reveal that disagreements often stem not from disputes over facts but from fundamental differences in what counts as admissible reality. The MEVIR framework reframes common cognitive biases as systematic failures in the application of epistemic virtues and demonstrates how different moral foundations lead agents to construct entirely separate, internally coherent "trust lattices" that are mutually incomprehensible.

Through detailed case studies of polarized discourse on topics including vaccination mandates and climate policy, the framework demonstrates that political polarization represents not merely factual disagreement but a deeper divergence in moral priors, epistemic authorities, and evaluative heuristics. The report further analyzes how information disorders—including propaganda, psychological operations, and echo chambers—systematically exploit the layers of the MEVIR process.

While primarily descriptive, the framework provides the foundation for a novel Decision Support System designed to augment human metacognition, helping individuals identify biases and practice epistemic virtues. The report concludes by acknowledging the framework's limitations, addressing inherited critiques from its constituent theories, and proposing longitudinal studies as the most promising direction for future research into the dynamic evolution of trust and belief systems.

1 Introduction: The Challenge of Trust in the Modern Information Ecosystem

The 21st-century information landscape presents a formidable challenge to both individuals and societies: how to make sound trust decisions in an environment characterized by unprecedented complexity, emotional polarization, and the deliberate propagation of misinformation. The contemporary "infodemic" has laid bare the inadequacies of traditional models of human decision-making, particularly those rooted in the assumption of a purely rational agent.

Such models, while elegant in their parsimony, fail to capture the messy, multifaceted reality of how humans come to trust a person, an institution, or a piece of information. Trust, it is now abundantly clear, is not simply the output of a logical calculation. It is a deeply human process, a complex synthesis of reason, intellectual character, and powerful, pre-rational intuition.

For decades, the dominant paradigm for understanding judgment and decision-making has been the rational-agent model, which posits that individuals weigh evidence, calculate probabilities, and select the option that maximizes their expected utility. While this framework has proven useful in certain economic and strategic contexts, its limitations become glaring when applied to the emotionally charged and morally laden trust decisions that define modern public discourse. It cannot adequately explain why well-intentioned, intelligent people, when presented with the same body of evidence on topics like climate change, public health, or economic policy, arrive at diametrically opposed conclusions.

The persistence of cognitive biases, the power of group identity, and the overwhelming influence of pre-existing moral commitments demonstrate that human reasoning deviates from the purely logical ideal in ways that are not random, but systematic and predictable. The primary challenge, therefore, is not merely to acknowledge human irrationality, but to understand its underlying structure. These deviations from pure logic are not mere noise; they are signals systematically shaped by deeper cognitive and moral frameworks.

The central contribution of a more sophisticated model is to provide the structure for this apparent "irrationality," reframing cognitive biases and emotional reasoning not as bugs in the system, but as predictable outputs of a complex, multi-layered cognitive architecture. This analytical shift, from simply identifying irrationality to deconstructing its underlying mechanics, has profound implications for understanding and potentially navigating polarized environments.

In the contemporary digital ecosystem, where claims are produced and disseminated with little to no curation, the process by which an agent decides to trust information is of paramount importance. Existing computational and procedural models of trust provide a valuable mechanical framework, describing how an agent might build a chain of evidence to support or reject a claim. These models posit that an agent, intending to act, recursively seeks evidence for a given claim until the process terminates at a set of foundational "trust anchors," such as pre-existing beliefs or deference to an accepted authority. The resulting "trust chain" is then evaluated according to the agent's "trust policies" to yield a set of accepted facts.

While structurally coherent, these procedural models are descriptively incomplete. They treat the most critical components of the trust process—the unexamined "Beliefs" that anchor the entire logical edifice and the "Trust Policies" that govern its evaluation—as axiomatic primitives. They describe the syntax of trust formation but leave its semantics largely unexplored. A truly robust model must explain the origin and nature of these foundational elements. Why does an agent hold a particular belief unconditionally? How are an agent's evaluative policies formulated? Answering these questions requires moving beyond procedural logic and into the domains of epistemology and psychology.

A pre-condition to adequately analyse statements or claims being proposed is to make them as precise as possible in terms of their formulation. In common everyday discourse, statements can be made which are still ambiguous. For example, "Mary is John's parent", while apparently straightforward, can in fact be further clarified as "Mary is John's biological parent" or as "Mary is John's legal parent". The particular precise meaning intended is determined by the context in which the claim will be used in a decision. To truly understand how agents trust information, we must look beyond the surface of language and examine the relationship between the symbols we trade and the reality they describe. This requires the introduction of concepts from applied ontology: Truth Bearers, Truth Makers, and the methodological process of Ontological Unpacking.

This report proposes the Moral-Epistemic VIRtue informed (MEVIR) framework as a more robust and psychologically realistic model for understanding these dynamics. MEVIR is a descriptive and explanatory framework, not a normative one. Its purpose is not to prescribe how people *should* trust, but to clarify in exhaustive detail how they *actually* form

trust judgments, including their common failure modes. It posits that any comprehensive model of trust must account for three distinct but interacting components: the procedural structure of reasoning, the epistemic character of the reasoner, and the intuitive moral foundations that anchor the entire process.

The MEVIR framework is built upon a tripartite architecture. The first component is a **Procedural Model**, which describes the syntactic structure of trust formation—the sequence of steps through which logical chains of reasoning are constructed, challenged, and ultimately terminated. The second is a **Virtue Model**, which provides the rational and qualitative engine of the process. Drawing from virtue epistemology, it characterizes the intellectual disposition of the ideal decision agent, focusing on traits like conscientiousness, intellectual courage, and humility. It is this component that allows for a nuanced diagnosis of flawed epistemic processes. The third component is a **Moral Model**, which supplies the semantic content and intuitive heuristics that fuel the reasoning process. Instantiated here through an extended version of Moral Foundations Theory (EMFT), this model explains why specific starting points (anchors) are chosen, why certain authorities seem inherently plausible, and how evidence is intuitively weighed before formal reasoning even begins.

By synthesizing these three components, the MEVIR framework aims to offer a richer, more detailed explanation for the dynamics of trust, providing a powerful analytical tool for navigating the complexities of our modern world.

2 Ontological Foundations: Truth Bearers, Truth Makers, and Unpacking

To truly understand how agents trust information, we must look beyond the surface of language and examine the relationship between the symbols we trade and the reality they describe. This requires the introduction of concepts from applied ontology: Truth Bearers, Truth Makers, and the methodological process of Ontological Unpacking.

2.1 The Architecture of Truth

At the heart of this perspective lies the Correspondence Theory of truth (David 2025), which posits a relation between a representation and reality. This relation is mediated by two distinct categories of entities: Truth Bearers and Truth Makers.

In an exchange of information, we deal primarily with Truth Bearers. These are the entities that carry the property of being true or false. They are the symbolic representations—the propositions, sentences, data entries, or conceptual models—that agents encounter in

reports, news feeds, and databases. For example, the sentence "The virus is airborne" is a truth bearer.

However, a truth bearer is only true if it corresponds to something in reality. The entities in the world that validate the truth bearer are known as Truth Makers. These are the specific slices of reality—the objects, events, qualities, and relationships—that exist independently of our description of them. If the truth bearer is "Mary is John's biological mother," the truth maker is the actual birth event that has to have occurred for this statement to be true.

The core insight for trust modeling is this: A claim is only trustworthy if the agent believes there is a corresponding Truth Maker in reality. Trust is not just accepting the sentence; it is accepting the existence of the entity that validates the sentence. Trust fails when agents agree on the Truth Bearer (the sentence) but disagree on the Admissible Truth Maker (the reality that validates it). This disconnect necessitates Ontological Unpacking, which is the analytical process of revealing the "real-world semantics" of a Truth Bearer. It unfolds "simplified" or ambiguous claims or statements to expose the ontological commitments lying beneath—asking, "What must exist in the world for this claim to be true?" (Guizzardi and Guarino 2024).

2.2 Domain Examples of Unpacking

To illustrate the necessity of this unpacking, we can look to the complex domains of public health and climate change, where semantic ambiguity often fuels distrust.

In the domain of Public Health, specifically regarding viral surveillance, data is often exchanged using "Information Structuring Models" that compress reality for efficiency. A standard database might represent a viral mutation simply as a string of characters. However, applying Ontological Unpacking to a Viral Conceptual Model (VCM) (Bernasconi et al. 2022; Guizzardi et al. 2021) reveals the deep reality: a virus is an object with a disposition (infectivity); an infection is an event where this disposition is manifested; and a mutation is not just a text edit, but an evolutionary change event in the virus's lineage. When the public is asked to trust a claim about "variant transmissibility," they are being asked to trust this complex chain of biological events. If an agent's ontology of health relies on a different Truth Maker—for instance, defining "health" as "purity" rather than "absence of viral load"—communication breaks down despite the data being accurate.

Similarly, in the domain of Climate Change, the concept of "Risk" is frequently debated. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) produces reports (Truth Bearers) that warn of "High Risk." Skepticism often arises not from reading different words, but from unpacking "Risk" differently. Using the Common Ontology of Value and Risk (COVER), researchers have shown that "Risk" unpacks into a Threat Event (e.g., a heatwave), a

Vulnerability (a disposition to be harmed), and, crucially, an Impact—which is a loss event relative to a specific Goal (Adamo et al. 2024). This reveals that "Risk" is goal-dependent. A scientist might identify the Truth Maker of "Climate Risk" as the probability of Ecological Collapse (where the Goal is ecosystem stability). An economic stakeholder might identify the Truth Maker of "Climate Risk" as the probability of GDP Loss caused by regulation (where the Goal is economic growth). Both read the word "Risk," but they are anchoring their trust in fundamentally different realities.

3 The Constituent Architectures of the MEVIR Framework

To construct an integrated model, it is first necessary to precisely define the core mechanics and terminology of its constituent parts. This section deconstructs the three foundational theories—the procedural framework for trust elaboration, Linda Zagzebski's virtue epistemology, and Extended Moral Foundations Theory—to establish a common ground for their subsequent synthesis.

These three frameworks, while originating in different disciplines, exhibit a remarkable complementarity. The procedural model identifies functional but unexplained primitives. Virtue epistemology and EMFT, in turn, offer the substantive content to fill these conceptual "black boxes." The former provides a model of the rational, character-driven agent, while the latter describes the intuitive, psychological landscape in which that agent operates. This suggests a three-layered architecture for trust: a base layer of pre-rational moral intuitions (EMFT), a mediating layer of conscious, character-driven epistemic management (Virtue Epistemology), and an operational layer of formal, procedural evidence-gathering (The Procedural Model).

3.1 The Procedural Model: The Mechanics of Trust Elaboration

The procedural model conceptualizes "trust in information" as a functional state: an agent trusts the veracity of a claim if it uses the statements within that claim to decide upon or carry out an action. This model provides a step-by-step mechanical description of how an agent moves from a state of uncertainty or conflict regarding a claim to a state of acceptance or rejection for a specific purpose.

3.1.1 The Elaboration Process

When an agent encounters a claim whose veracity is unknown or contradicts a previously held belief, it must initiate an "elaboration process." This process is defined as a recursive search for evidence, where evidence consists of additional statements whose veracity implies or contributes to the veracity of the original claim. For each piece of evidence found, the agent must recursively apply the same trust process, creating a dependency structure. This recursive logic forms the core of the procedural model, representing a systematic attempt to ground a questionable claim in a set of more fundamental, accepted statements.

3.1.2 Trust Chains and Lattices

The result of this recursive elaboration is an interdependent set of statements, termed a "trust chain." This chain represents the full line of reasoning, from the initial claim back to its ultimate sources of justification. In practice, because different claims may rely on the same pieces of evidence, these individual chains often intersect. The resulting structure is more accurately described as a "trust lattice," a complex web of interconnected claims and evidence that constitutes the agent's belief system regarding a particular topic. This lattice concept is crucial, as its structure and insularity can later be used to explain phenomena like ideological echo chambers.

3.1.3 Trust Anchors: The Termination of Recursion

The recursive search for evidence cannot continue indefinitely. The procedural model specifies that the process must terminate when it reaches a "trust anchor." An anchor is a statement that requires no further justification for the agent. The model identifies five conditions under which the recursion stops:

1. **Pre-trusted Statements:** The evidence is a statement whose veracity has already been established through a prior elaboration process.
2. **Beliefs:** The evidence is a statement that the agent accepts unconditionally, without the need for external proof.
3. **Accepted Authorities:** The source of the evidence is an authority that the agent accepts under a prevailing social norm (i.e., it has "Public Faith").
4. **Evidence Exhaustion:** No further statements can be found to serve as evidence.
5. **Resource Exhaustion:** The agent runs out of resources (e.g., time, computational power, money) to continue the search.

Of these five, the "Belief" and "Accepted Authority" anchors are the most analytically significant. They represent the internal, psychological, and external, social endpoints of

justification. They are the foundational pillars upon which the entire trust lattice is built, yet the procedural model itself does not explain their origin or the basis for their privileged status.

In practice, however, we recognize that these Trust Anchors are actually **Information Proxies**. Agents rarely have direct access to the ontological Truth Makers (e.g., we cannot directly witness the birth event). Instead, we rely on Proxies—information artifacts or institutions (Sources) that stand in for the reality. Thus, a birth certificate is a Proxy for the Truth Maker of "Mary is John's biological mother" (a declarative speech act). Trusting an anchor is essentially an agreement that the Proxy reliably represents the admissible Truth Maker. Notice that disagreement often arises precisely on what are admissible Information Proxies for Truth Makers. For example "a copy of a birth declaration" vs "an official birth certificate issued by a recognized authority".

3.1.4 Trust Policies

Once the trust lattice is constructed and grounded in its anchors, the agent must evaluate it to decide which statements will be accepted as facts. This evaluation is governed by a set of "trust policies." These are agent-specific (or group-specific) rules and criteria for accepting statements, including the valid entailment rules that connect elements in the chain. For example, a trust policy might state, "Data from a peer-reviewed scientific journal is to be weighted more heavily than an anonymous blog post." Like the anchors, trust policies are presented as primitives within the procedural model; the model specifies their function but not the principles that guide their formulation.

3.1.5 Belief Revision and the Dynamics of Trust

A crucial extension to the procedural model is the mechanism of **belief revision**, which addresses how an agent's trust lattice can evolve over time. Belief revision is the process of changing beliefs to adapt an agent's epistemic state to a new piece of information. This is particularly relevant when new information, often presented as an argument from another agent, contradicts an existing belief. (Hunter and Booth 2015)

The process can be conceptualized as follows:

- **Trust as a Pre-processor:** When new information arrives from an external source, the agent does not automatically incorporate it. Instead, trust acts as a pre-processing step. The agent first evaluates the trustworthiness of the source, often within a specific domain of expertise. Information from an untrusted source may be discounted or ignored entirely, while information from a trusted source is passed to the revision stage.

- **Incorporating New Information:** If the new information is deemed trustworthy, it is incorporated into the existing trust lattice. This may create a logical contradiction with a previously held belief.
- **Consistency Restoration:** To restore consistency, the agent must retract one or more existing beliefs. The core principle governing this step is that of **minimal change**: the agent seeks to alter its belief system as little as possible to accommodate the new information. This means preserving as much of the original trust lattice as possible.
- **Non-destructive Revision:** Importantly, this revision process does not have to be destructive. Instead of permanently erasing the old, contradicted belief and its supporting lattice, the agent can "remember" it (Pereira, Tettamanzi, and Villata 2011). The framework can be designed to allow for the recovery of previous information if the change turns out to be wrong or if subsequent information reinstates the old belief. By retaining the original lattice associated with the now-rejected belief and the context of the action it was intended for, the agent maintains a history of its epistemic evolution.

This allows for a more dynamic and realistic model of persuasion, where minds can be changed and then changed back as new arguments and evidence emerge.

3.2 The Virtue Model: The Epistemic Agent and Belief Formation

Virtue epistemology, particularly the neo-Aristotelian framework developed by Linda Zagzebski (Zagzebski 1996), shifts the focus of epistemological inquiry from the properties of beliefs (e.g., "Is this belief justified?") to the properties of the epistemic agent (e.g., "Is this person an intellectually virtuous knower?"). This agent-centered approach provides a rich conceptual toolkit for understanding the rational and characterological dimensions of belief formation.

3.2.1 The Conscientious Agent and Epistemic Self-Trust

At the heart of Zagzebski's model is the "conscientious agent," an individual motivated by a genuine desire for truth. This motivation is not merely a passive wish but an active disposition that guides cognitive conduct. The fundamental starting point for this agent is **epistemic self-trust**: a foundational, non-derivative trust in the proper functioning of one's own cognitive faculties, such as perception, memory, and reason. This self-trust is the ultimate anchor from which all rational belief formation proceeds; without it, an agent would be paralyzed by radical skepticism.

3.2.2 Zagzebski's Two-Path Model

Governed by the virtue of epistemic conscientiousness, the agent constantly makes a judgment call: "Am I, in this specific situation, a reliable instrument for determining the truth of this claim?". The answer to this question directs the agent down one of two paths for belief formation:

- **Path 1: Direct Reliance:** This is the default mode of cognitive life. The agent directly employs their own epistemic faculties to evaluate a claim. When one accepts that it is raining because one sees and feels the rain, one is directly relying on the trustworthiness of one's perceptual apparatus. This path represents the primary and most common application of epistemic self-trust.
- **Path 2: Deferral to an Epistemic Authority:** This path is taken when a conscientious agent recognizes their own limitations. Faced with a complex claim in a specialized field like quantum mechanics or epidemiology, the agent exercises epistemic humility. This humility leads them to defer their belief to a recognized epistemic authority. Crucially, the **selection** of this authority is itself an act of epistemic self-trust. The agent must trust their own judgment to discern a genuine expert from a charlatan. This makes the act of deference a rational process, not a blind leap of faith.

3.2.3 Bounded Rationality as the Rationale

This two-path model is necessitated by the reality of **bounded rationality**, a concept introduced by Herbert Simon (Simon 1990). Humans are not hyper-rational optimizers with unlimited cognitive capacity and information. Our rationality is "bounded" by finite memory, attention, and processing power. This cognitive reality makes Path 1 impossible for a vast range of complex issues, forcing the conscientious agent to adopt the "satisficing" strategy of Path 2—finding a "good enough" authority as a heuristic shortcut to a likely true belief.

3.2.4 The Role of Intellectual Virtues

Intellectual virtues are the stable, acquired excellences of character that enable an agent to reliably achieve epistemic goods like truth, understanding, and wisdom. Examples include open-mindedness, intellectual courage, humility, attentiveness, and intellectual rigor. Zagzebski proposes a unified theory of virtue, arguing that intellectual virtues are a subset of moral virtues, distinguished by their characteristic motivation: the virtuous epistemic agent is motivated by a desire to acquire knowledge.

This framework suggests that the process of forming true beliefs is not just a mechanical or logical exercise, but a moral and characterological one. The integration of ontological unpacking provides a robust explanation for the "incommensurability" of trust lattices. Polarization is often framed as a disagreement over facts (Truth Bearers). MEVIR suggests it is a disagreement over Truth Makers. When two agents argue, they are often negotiating the Admissibility of the Truth Maker. For instance, in the case of inheritance law, the biological truth maker (DNA) is inadmissible; only the legal truth maker (the speech act of recognition) counts. In public discourse, these rules of admissibility are rarely explicit. Agents talk past one another because Agent A is proving the existence of Truth Maker X, while Agent B demands proof of Truth Maker Y.

This aligns with the "Situationist" critique of virtue epistemology. While the Virtue Model idealizes a consistent character, the Ontological model acknowledges that the **context** determines which Truth Makers are relevant. A virtuous agent is one who can correctly identify the admissible Truth Maker for the specific context (e.g., using legal truth makers for court cases and biological truth makers for medical treatment).

3.3 The Moral Model: The Intuitive Foundations of Judgment

While virtue epistemology describes the conscious, character-driven aspects of cognition, Extended Moral Foundations Theory (EMFT) provides a model for the rapid, automatic, and intuitive layer of judgment that precedes and shapes conscious reasoning. Developed by Jonathan Haidt, Jesse Graham, and others (Haidt 2012), EMFT is a theory of "intuitive ethics" which posits that human morality is organized around a small number of innate psychological systems that were shaped by evolutionary pressures.

3.3.1 The Six Foundations

EMFT proposes that our "intuitive ethics" are built upon several foundations, which act like moral taste buds, providing immediate feelings of approval or disapproval. The version of the theory instantiated in the MEVIR framework includes six such foundations:

1. **Care/Harm:** Evolved from the need to protect vulnerable offspring, this foundation underlies virtues of kindness and compassion and triggers sensitivity to suffering and cruelty.
2. **Fairness/Cheating:** Evolved to facilitate reciprocal altruism and cooperation, this foundation is concerned with justice, rights, and proportionality.

3. **Liberty/Oppression:** Evolved from the resentment felt towards bullies and dominators, this foundation underlies the desire for individual autonomy and resistance to coercion and oppression.
4. **Loyalty/Betrayal:** Evolved from our history as tribal creatures forming coalitions, this foundation underlies virtues of patriotism and group solidarity and is sensitive to signs of betrayal.
5. **Authority/Subversion:** Evolved from our primate history of hierarchical social interactions, this foundation underlies virtues of leadership, followership, and respect for legitimate traditions and institutions.
6. **Purity/Sanctity (or Sanctity/Degradation):** Evolved from the psychology of disgust and contamination avoidance, this foundation underlies notions of sacredness, nobility, and the idea that the body is a temple that can be desecrated.

3.3.2 The Decoupling of the Fairness Foundation

The Fairness foundation itself contains a crucial ideological distinction. In its original formulation, it was found to conflate two different conceptions of fairness. Subsequent research and theoretical refinement led to its split into two distinct foundations, a distinction adopted by the MEVIR framework for its explanatory power:

- **Fairness-as-Equity (or Equality):** This intuition centers on equal treatment and equal outcomes for individuals. It is more strongly endorsed by those on the political left and is often associated with concepts of social justice and the correction of systemic inequalities. The term "equity" is often used in broader discourse to refer to fairness in both opportunity and outcomes, seeking to level the playing field between different groups, which aligns closely with this concept.
- **Fairness-as-Proportionality:** This intuition is about individuals getting rewarded in proportion to their merit or contribution. It is more strongly endorsed by those on the political right and is associated with concepts of personal responsibility, meritocracy, and "just deserts".

3.3.3 Ideological Asymmetry

A central finding of MFT research is that these foundations are not weighted equally across the political spectrum. Self-identified liberals and progressives tend to build their moral worldviews primarily on the "individualizing" foundations of Care, Fairness, and Liberty. In contrast, conservatives tend to rely on all six foundations more equally, giving significant weight to the "binding" foundations of Loyalty, Authority, and Purity.

This ideological asymmetry provides a powerful explanatory framework for understanding why good people can arrive at starkly different conclusions on political and social issues: they are often responding to different sets of moral intuitions. As an example, an agent high in Purity might reject a "safe vaccine" claim because their admissible Truth Maker for "safety" involves "naturalness," whereas the medical Truth Maker involves "statistical non-harm." The moral intuition determines which reality is admissible before the procedural logic even begins.

4 Discussion and Theoretical Grounding of the Sub-Models

4.1 Supporting the Procedural Model

The procedural model's core structure, which formalizes reasoning as the construction and evaluation of evidence chains, finds strong theoretical support in the field of computational argumentation. This field offers a robust basis for the model's mechanics, while the broader study of "trust in information" validates its focus on source reliability and uncertainty management.

4.1.1 Argumentation-Based Decision Support

Argumentation-based decision support systems are a well-established area of research in artificial intelligence and decision science. These systems conceptualize decision-making as a process of constructing, comparing, and evaluating arguments for and against different options. They provide a formal, logical structure for human reasoning, especially in contexts with conflicting, incomplete, or uncertain information—the very conditions that necessitate trust decisions. The procedural model's "trust lattice" is a direct analogue to the argument graphs used in these systems, where claims are nodes and evidential relationships are edges representing support or attack. By framing the trust process as a form of argumentation, the procedural model inherits a rich formal apparatus for representing and analyzing the structure of an agent's reasoning. This approach allows for the documentation and analysis of the decision process itself, moving beyond simple numerical evaluations to provide a transparent justification for why a particular conclusion was reached.

4.1.2 Conceptualizing "Trust in Information"

The procedural model's focus on evidence and authority is also well-grounded in theories of information and social trust. Trust is often conceptualized as a mechanism for managing uncertainty and reducing complexity, allowing an agent to make a decision without possessing complete information. When an agent decides to trust a piece of information, they are essentially making a judgment about the reliability of its source, whether that source is direct perception, memory, or another agent. Information theory and computational trust models formalize this by treating trust as a subjective probability or belief strength that an agent assigns to a source regarding a specific piece of information (Wu, Arenas, and Gómez 2017). The procedural model operationalizes this concept: the recursive search for evidence is a process of propagating trust (or distrust) from foundational anchors (trusted sources) through a network of claims. The model's distinction between direct evaluation and deference to authority mirrors the core problem in information trust: deciding whether to trust the information itself or to trust the source providing it (Hancock et al. 2023).

4.2 Supporting the Virtue Model

The primary strength of the virtue model lies in its profound explanatory power for diagnosing flawed human epistemic processes. It moves beyond simply labeling an outcome as "biased" and instead identifies the specific failure of intellectual character—the corruption of epistemic conscientiousness—that leads to the error. This provides a richer, more nuanced understanding of cognitive failure.

The well-known dual-process model of cognition, popularized by Daniel Kahneman's concepts of System 1 (fast, intuitive) and System 2 (slow, deliberative), can be mapped onto the MEVIR framework in a more granular way. The Moral Model, with its rapid, automatic intuitions, can be seen as the engine of System 1. The Procedural Model, with its formal construction of logical chains, represents the operation of System 2. The Virtue Model, and specifically the virtue of epistemic conscientiousness, serves as the crucial bridge between them.

It is the conscientious agent's self-monitoring function that determines *whether* to override a powerful System 1 intuition and engage the costly, effortful process of System 2 reasoning. Cognitive biases, therefore, represent a failure of this bridge—instances where the agent improperly defaults to a System 1 output (as with the availability heuristic) or, more insidiously, uses the machinery of System 2 merely to find justifications for a conclusion already reached by System 1 (as with confirmation bias). This integration connects MEVIR to a major paradigm in cognitive psychology and provides a detailed

mechanism for how these two systems interact and, critically, how and why that interaction so often fails.

4.2.1 Systematic Analysis of Cognitive Biases

The virtue model reframes common cognitive biases as systematic failures in the application of Zagzebski's two-path model. An agent operating under the influence of bias is no longer primarily motivated by a desire for truth; their cognitive processes are unconsciously directed toward goals of ease, comfort, or social belonging. This corrupts the crucial judgment of whether to rely on oneself (Path 1) or defer to an authority (Path 2), and it contaminates how each path is executed.

The following table provides a systematic diagnosis of several common biases within this framework.

Cognitive Bias	Definition	Underlying Epistemic Failure (MEVIR Diagnosis)	Concrete Example
Overconfidence Bias & Dunning-Kruger Effect	The tendency to have an excessive belief in one's own skills, intellect, or judgment.	Misapplication of Path 1. A failure of epistemic humility. The agent has an inflated sense of their own competence and wrongly believes they are equipped for direct evaluation, stubbornly remaining in Path 1 when they should switch to Path 2 (deferral).	An amateur investor, after a few successful trades, believes they can outperform the market and makes large, un-researched bets, ignoring advice from professional financial analysts.
Confirmation Bias	The tendency to search for, interpret, favor,	Corruption of Path 2. The agent's goal is no longer to	A person who believes a particular political

	and recall information in a way that confirms or supports one's pre-existing beliefs.	find the most reliable authority, but the most validating one. They select pseudo-experts or pundits who echo their intuitions, turning deference into a feedback loop for self-validation.	candidate is corrupt will primarily consume news from sources that highlight that candidate's scandals, while dismissing reports of their successes as "media bias".
Availability Heuristic	Overestimating the likelihood of events that are more easily recalled in memory, which are often recent, frequent, or emotionally charged.	Corruption of the evidence base for Path 1. The agent mistakes "ease of recall" for "high probability." Their direct judgment is based on a skewed and unrepresentative sample of evidence, leading to a faulty direct evaluation.	After seeing several news reports about shark attacks, a person judges the risk of being attacked by a shark to be much higher than it is, and cancels their beach vacation, despite the statistical rarity of such events.
Anchoring Bias	The tendency to rely too heavily on the first piece of information offered (the "anchor") when making decisions.	Improper framing of Path 1. The agent's direct evaluation does not start from a neutral position but is tethered to an initial, often arbitrary, piece of	During a salary negotiation, the first number put on the table, whether by the employer or the candidate, becomes the anchor that heavily influences the

		information. Their self-trust operates within a contaminated and artificially narrowed environment.	range of all subsequent counter-offers.
Bandwagon Effect	The tendency to do or believe things because many other people do or believe the same.	Corruption of Path 2. The agent mistakes the crowd for a reliable authority. Belief formation is outsourced not to the most competent source, but to the most socially comfortable one, prioritizing social cohesion over truth.	An individual adopts a fashion trend or a political opinion not because they have evaluated it, but because it has become popular within their social circle, and they wish to fit in.
Fundamental Attribution Error	The tendency to over-emphasize personality-based explanations for others' behaviors while under-emphasizing situational explanations.	Misapplication of Path 1. An overconfidence in one's ability to directly intuit another's character from minimal evidence. The agent fails to recognize the limits of their knowledge and rushes to a	Seeing a coworker arrive late for a meeting, one might immediately conclude they are lazy or disorganized (a character judgment), rather than considering possible situational factors like a traffic

		simplistic judgment, lacking epistemic humility.	accident or a family emergency.
Reactance	The urge to do the opposite of what someone wants you to do out of a need to resist a perceived attempt to constrain freedom of choice.	Pathological inversion of Path 2. The agent rejects a belief <i>precisely because</i> it comes from an authority. The emotional desire for autonomy overrides the epistemic goal of finding truth, leading the agent to actively choose the opposite of expert advice.	A teenager told by their parents not to associate with a certain group of friends may deliberately seek out that group's company specifically to assert their independence and resist parental control.
Halo Effect	The tendency for a positive impression of a person in one area to positively influence one's opinion or feelings in other areas.	Corruption of the selection criteria in Path 2. The agent wrongly extends an individual's authority from their specific domain of expertise to unrelated domains, creating an illusion of general epistemic reliability.	A voter may trust a successful and charismatic business leader's opinions on foreign policy or public health, despite the leader having no expertise in those fields, simply because of their "halo" of business acumen.

False Consensus Effect	The tendency for people to overestimate the degree to which others share their beliefs, opinions, and behaviors.	Failure of epistemic humility in Path 1. The agent wrongly treats their own limited perspective as a reliable model for the population. This flawed direct evaluation makes them feel certain, blinding them to the need to seek genuine authority (Path 2).	Someone who regularly uses a particular social media platform might be shocked to learn that the majority of the population does not use it, because their own experience and that of their immediate friends creates an illusion of a broad consensus.
------------------------	--	--	---

Supporting the Moral Model

The MEVIR framework's architecture is designed to be modular. While it instantiates the Moral Model with Extended Moral Foundations Theory (EMFT), this choice is based on EMFT's empirical strength and explanatory power for contemporary political polarization, not on a rigid dependency. The framework's validity is not contingent on the ultimate correctness of EMFT; its structure could readily accommodate or be augmented by other theories of moral values.

4.2.2 Alternative and Complementary Moral Value Theories

To illustrate this modularity, it is useful to consider how alternative theories could be integrated into the MEVIR framework, potentially offering different lenses or a more refined understanding of the intuitive substrate of trust.

- **Schwartz Value Theory (SVT):** This theory proposes a universal structure of human values (McNeace and Sinn 2018), identifying ten basic values (e.g., Universalism, Benevolence, Tradition, Security, Power) organized along two major axes: Conservation vs. Openness to Change, and Self-enhancement vs. Self-transcendence. SVT could complement or replace EMFT within MEVIR by providing a

different set of primitives for the "Belief" anchors and "Trust Policies." For example, a trust policy favoring stability and tradition could be seen as stemming from Schwartz's "Conservation" values, while a policy favoring social justice and equality would stem from "Self-transcendence" values. SVT's explicit modeling of value conflicts (e.g., the tension between Power and Universalism) could offer a more nuanced way to understand the trade-offs an agent makes when evaluating claims.

- **Morality-as-Cooperation (MAC) Theory:** This theory offers a more fundamental, first-principles approach (Curry 2025), arguing that morality is a collection of solutions to the problems of cooperation that have arisen during evolution. Grounded in game theory, MAC proposes seven distinct moral domains: Family, Group, Reciprocity, Heroism, Deference, Fairness, and Property. MAC critiques MFT for being an ad-hoc collection of intuitions rather than a systematic derivation from a theory of cooperation. Integrating MAC into MEVIR could provide a more rigorous evolutionary basis for the Moral Model. For instance, the "Loyalty/Betrayal" foundation could be reframed as the more specific cooperative problem of "Group" cohesion, and "Authority/Subversion" could be mapped to "Deference." MAC's inclusion of domains like "Property" and "Reciprocity" could also explain trust decisions in economic and contractual contexts that are not as clearly captured by EMFT's foundations.

4.2.3 Addressing MFT's Flaws

The use of MFT as the primary instantiation of the Moral Model must also acknowledge its known critiques. Scholars have challenged MFT on several grounds, including that its list of foundations is an ad-hoc collection rather than being derived from a first-principles theory, that empirical studies often show the foundations collapsing into a simpler two-factor structure (Individualizing vs. Binding), and that the direction of causality is unclear (i.e., whether moral intuitions shape political ideology or ideology shapes the endorsement of certain foundations). However, for the descriptive and explanatory purposes of the MEVIR framework, these flaws do not necessarily invalidate its utility. MFT provides a powerful and empirically useful heuristic map of the intuitive landscape that drives political and social judgment. Even if the map is imperfect, or if the underlying territory is ultimately shaped by a different "geology" (such as the cooperative problems identified by MAC), MFT remains highly effective at predicting and explaining the patterns of trust and distrust observed in polarized environments. It functions as an effective descriptive layer, regardless of its ultimate foundational status.

5 Pathologies and Shortcomings of the MEVIR Framework

A robust theoretical model must be subjected to rigorous critique. The MEVIR framework, as a synthesis of three distinct theories, is vulnerable not only to its own internal inconsistencies but also to the established criticisms of its constituent parts. This section explores these inherited vulnerabilities, addresses the model's limitations in capturing dynamic processes, and analyzes specific failure conditions where the model, even when functioning as designed, fails to produce true beliefs.

5.1.1 Inherited Vulnerabilities from Sub-Models

The MEVIR framework's explanatory power is directly dependent on the validity of the theories it integrates. Therefore, any significant critique leveled against its components is, by extension, a potential weakness of the framework itself.

5.1.2 The Situationist Challenge to Virtue Epistemology

Perhaps the most significant empirical challenge to the Virtue Model comes from situationist psychology. This line of research argues that stable, global character traits—such as the intellectual virtues of courage, humility, and open-mindedness—do not actually exist in the way virtue theories presuppose (Alfano 2012). Instead, behavior is overwhelmingly determined by minor, often unnoticed situational factors.

However, this critique does not undermine the MEVIR framework's descriptive goal. The framework uses Zagzebski's "conscientious agent" as an **ideal reference**, not as a prescription that all agents must or do embody. The very premise of MEVIR is that humans are *not* perfectly conscientious agents, and their failures to live up to this ideal are systematic and predictable. The situationist critique, therefore, does not invalidate the model but rather reinforces its utility. It highlights the importance of context and situational pressures in causing agents to deviate from the virtuous ideal. MEVIR provides the vocabulary to precisely characterize these observed deviations—for example, a specific situation might predictably trigger the Bandwagon Effect, which the framework diagnoses as a corruption of the Path 2 deference process. The ideal model serves as the necessary baseline against which these real-world behaviors can be measured and understood.

5.1.3 Architectural Limitations

Beyond the critiques of its components, the MEVIR framework has architectural limitations that constrain its descriptive power, particularly concerning the dynamic nature of belief and persuasion.

5.1.4 The Problem of Dynamic Change

The model, in its basic form, risks portraying the agent as a static entity with a fixed MFT profile and a stable set of epistemic virtues. This is a simplification that does not adequately account for the dynamic nature of human development and belief change. However, the inclusion of a **belief revision** mechanism directly addresses part of this criticism. By allowing for the retraction and reinstatement of beliefs based on new arguments and evidence, the framework introduces a pathway for epistemic evolution. This mechanism provides a formal structure for understanding how an agent's trust lattice can change over time, making the model less static and more responsive to the processes of learning and persuasion. A complete model would still need to account for deeper longitudinal changes in an agent's moral profile or the cultivation of virtues, but belief revision is a critical first step.

5.1.5 Explaining Persuasion

If agents are locked into their MFT-driven trust lattices, it becomes difficult to explain how genuine persuasion across ideological divides is possible. The model, in its simplest form, predicts intractable disagreement. However, research in applied MFT suggests that persuasion can occur through **moral reframing**—the act of framing an argument to appeal to the *other person's* moral foundations. For example, an environmental argument can be framed for a conservative audience not in terms of Care (polar bear suffering) but in terms of Purity (stewardship of God's creation, keeping it clean and sacred). The success of moral reframing implies that the application of moral heuristics is not deterministic. A skillful communicator can trigger different foundations, suggesting a more dynamic and context-dependent application of the MEVIR framework's processes than a static description might imply.

5.2 Failure Conditions

A critical test of any epistemic model is to identify conditions under which it fails to achieve its primary goal: the acquisition of true beliefs. The MEVIR framework can fail in several distinct ways, even when its internal processes are executed correctly.

5.2.1 The Virtuous Agent in a Corrupted Ecosystem

Consider a scenario where an agent possesses exemplary epistemic virtues: they are conscientious, intellectually humble, courageous, and open-minded. However, this agent operates within a totally controlled information environment, such as a state with pervasive censorship and propaganda, where all available sources and authorities are systematically compromised. In this case, the MEVIR process, despite being executed perfectly by a virtuous agent, will inevitably lead to false beliefs. The agent's conscientious search for evidence (Path 1) will only yield curated misinformation. Their humble and rigorous attempt to find a reliable authority (Path 2) will lead them to a carefully vetted, state-sanctioned "expert."

While it is outside the scope of the MEVIR framework to directly alter such an ecosystem, its true value in this scenario is diagnostic. The framework provides a direct and precise way to characterize ecosystems in which this failure occurs. By mapping the available information sources, identifying the sanctioned "authorities," and analyzing the propagandistic narratives, MEVIR can explain *why* a virtuous agent would be led astray. It demonstrates that epistemic virtue is a necessary but not sufficient condition for truth and highlights the critical importance of a healthy, diverse information environment.

5.2.2 The Incommensurable Foundations Dilemma

Imagine two agents, Agent A (with a strong Care/Fairness-as-Equity profile) and Agent B (with a strong Loyalty/Authority/Purity profile), who are presented with the same comprehensive and unbiased body of evidence regarding a complex social issue like immigration policy (American Immigration Council 2025). Both are equally intelligent and conscientious. Both agents execute the MEVIR process flawlessly. Agent A's "Care" heuristic causes them to prioritize and assign greater weight to evidence of human suffering among immigrants. Agent B's "Loyalty" and "Authority" heuristics cause them to prioritize evidence related to national security, social cohesion, and the rule of law. They select different types of authorities (human rights organizations vs. border patrol unions) and apply different trust policies to the same data set.

They will arrive at diametrically opposed, deeply entrenched, and rationally justified conclusions. It is not the goal of the MEVIR framework to propose a mechanism for resolving this disagreement, but rather to provide a precise model of *what* the disagreement actually is. It moves the analysis beyond a superficial "dispute over facts" to reveal a fundamental divergence in moral priors and evaluative heuristics. By making the underlying structures of each agent's trust lattice explicit, the framework clarifies the true nature of the divide that needs to be bridged. Furthermore, the belief revision mechanism

provides a potential, albeit challenging, step in this direction. Persuasion could theoretically occur if one agent can present an argument that is not only factually compelling but is also framed in a way that resonates with the other's moral foundations, thereby triggering a revision of a core belief or a re-evaluation of a trusted authority.

6 Practical Application of the MEVIR Framework: Case Studies in Polarized Discourse

The true test of the MEVIR framework is its ability to deconstruct and explain real-world instances of polarized trust decisions. By applying its tripartite lens to contemporary controversial topics, it is possible to move beyond surface-level disagreements over facts and expose the deeper, structural divergence in how different groups construct their realities. These case studies demonstrate that political polarization is not simply a "disagreement over the facts," but a more fundamental phenomenon. The MEVIR framework reveals that opposing groups, operating from different moral foundations, build entirely different **architectures of belief** (trust lattices). They use different anchors, defer to different authorities, and employ different evaluative policies. The result is two separate, internally consistent, but mutually incomprehensible factual worlds. The disagreement is not *within* a shared reality; it is a disagreement *about the nature of reality itself*. This explains why simply "fact-checking" polarized claims is often ineffective; the fact-checker is typically perceived as an authority from the *other* trust lattice and is immediately dismissed by those on the opposing side.

6.1 Case Study 1: Deconstructing the "Forced Penetration is Rape" Narrative

An Instagram post from Brazil equating mandatory vaccination with rape serves as a powerful example of how a complex public health issue can be reframed into a simple, morally charged narrative that bypasses scientific debate entirely. The post, with the caption "Meu corpo minhas regras" ("My body my rules"), constructs a claim designed to trigger an immediate and powerful intuitive judgment. The Truth Bearer in this example is the claim "Mandatory vaccination constitutes a violation equivalent to rape."

6.1.1 Moral Foundation Analysis

For an adherent (anti-mandate), the truth maker *is a* Phenomenological Event, the *subjective experience* of unwanted penetration and the loss of bodily sovereignty. The biological outcome is irrelevant to this truth maker. The valid proxies for this truth maker

(the feeling of violation) are then personal testimonials of coercion; political philosophy texts on self-ownership; the visual imagery of the needle (symbolizing penetration).

The post's effectiveness lies in its ability to simultaneously activate several potent moral foundations for an adherent (anti-mandate).

- **Liberty/Oppression:** This is the most explicit and central foundation. The caption is a direct assertion of individual autonomy. The message frames a vaccine mandate not as a public health policy but as an act of extreme oppression by a dominant power (the state) against the individual, triggering feelings of reactance.
- **Sanctity/Degradation:** This is the most visceral foundation activated. By using the metaphor of rape ("estupro"), the post reframes the act of injection from a medical procedure into a violent violation that desecrates the body. This taps into the deep-seated intuition that the body is a temple that can be contaminated by impure or unnatural substances.
- **Care/Harm (Inverted):** While the pro-vaccine narrative is typically built on the Care foundation (preventing the harm of disease), this post cleverly inverts it. It reframes the *vaccine itself* as the source of profound, violent harm—the harm of non-consensual physical violation.

For a non-adherent (Pro Health), the truth maker is a Teleological/Biological Event, the *medical purpose* (prevention of infection) and the *collective outcome* (herd immunity). The subjective feeling is secondary to the biological reality. The valid proxies for this truth maker are then clinical trial data; epidemiological curves; WHO statements, that indicate medical efficacy.

For the non-adherent, the post triggers a profound moral dissonance by violating a different set of foundations:

- **Care/Harm:** The non-adherent's concern is focused on preventing the harm caused by the *disease* to the community. Furthermore, the use of the word "rape" is seen as a grotesque trivialization of the extreme trauma experienced by victims of sexual assault, causing a secondary moral offense.
- **Authority/Subversion:** The non-adherent's moral matrix includes respect for the legitimate *Authority* of scientific and medical institutions. The post is seen as a direct and aggressive *subversion* of this trusted authority.
- **Justice (as Equity/Proportionality):** The non-adherent likely views public health measures through the lens of *Justice* as a collective social contract. Vaccination is seen as a fair and proportional civic duty, and the post's slogan is interpreted as an unjust rejection of this contract.

6.1.2 Comparative Trust Process

The core of the analysis is a detailed comparison of how an "adherent" and a "non-adherent" process the claim, illustrating the MEVIR framework in action. The following table, derived from the analysis in the source material, visualizes how two rational individuals can look at the same stimulus and construct completely different, internally coherent realities.

Aspect of Framework	Adherent's Position & Justification	Non-Adherent's Position & Justification
Central Claim	Accepted: "Forced vaccination is rape."	Rejected: "Forced vaccination is rape."
Primary Moral Foundations Activated	Liberty/Oppression: The state is an oppressor violating individual freedom. Sanctity/Degradation: The pure body is being defiled by an unnatural substance. Care/Harm (Inverted): The vaccine is the source of violent harm.	Care/Harm: The disease is the source of harm; the post trivializes the harm of rape. Authority/Subversion: The post subverts the legitimate authority of science and medicine. Justice: Vaccination is a civic duty; the post promotes an unjust disregard for others.
Key "Belief" Anchors	"My body is sovereign and my choice is absolute." "Forced medical procedures are a violation of my rights." "The government cannot be trusted to protect my interests."	"We have a collective duty to prevent the spread of disease." "Scientific consensus is the best guide for public health." "Using the trauma of rape as a political metaphor is morally wrong."
Trusted Epistemic Authorities	Public figures, political leaders, and media	Scientific bodies (WHO), public health agencies,

	sources that validate the narrative of individual liberty and skepticism toward mainstream institutions.	medical professionals, and established news organizations that report the scientific consensus.
Resulting Trust Policies	"Distrust claims from government and medical establishments." "Prioritize claims that defend individual autonomy against coercion." "Favor sources that confirm my intuition of being oppressed."	"Distrust emotionally charged metaphors that lack evidence." "Prioritize claims from credentialed scientific and medical experts." "Reject false equivalences that minimize real-world suffering."
Final Interpretation of Post	A courageous and true statement defending fundamental human rights against a tyrannical and violent state overreach.	A dangerous, irresponsible, and morally offensive piece of misinformation that undermines public health and trivializes the horrific crime of rape.

The Adherent trusts the claim because their proxies confirm their specific Truth Maker. They reject the Non-Adherent's proxies (e.g., "The vaccine is safe") as Ontologically Irrelevant. To someone focused on the ontology of sovereignty, data about safety is a non-sequitur. It answers the wrong ontological question.

6.2 Case Study 2: Analyzing the Climate Change Debate

The debate over climate change is another quintessential example of a polarized information environment where opposing sides operate from incommensurable factual and moral realities (Schertzer 2025; Varin 2025). The MEVIR framework can be used to deconstruct the competing narratives.

A representative pair of opposing claims might be formulated as follows:

- **Claim (Truth Bearer) A (Skeptic/Minimalist Position):** "Aggressive climate policies, such as carbon taxes and emissions regulations, are an unacceptable infringement on individual liberty and a threat to national economic prosperity and sovereignty." Truth makers are economic studies about the costs of regulation, the uncertainties in climate models, and arguments about national sovereignty.
- **Claim (Truth Bearer) B (Activist/Interventionist Position):** "Failing to enact aggressive climate policies is a catastrophic moral failure to care for the world's most vulnerable people and to act with fairness towards future generations." Truth makers are studies showing evidence of rising global temperatures, the frequency of extreme weather events, and data on the disproportionate impact on vulnerable populations.

6.2.1 MEVIR Analysis

The framework can be applied to deconstruct the deep structure of these opposing claims:

- **Moral Foundations:** The two claims are anchored in almost entirely different sets of moral intuitions.
 - **Claim A** is anchored primarily in **Liberty/Oppression**, framing government regulations as a form of coercion that restricts personal and economic freedom. It also activates **Loyalty/Betrayal** by prioritizing national economic interests over international agreements, which can be framed as betraying the in-group's prosperity. Finally, it may draw on **Fairness-as-Proportionality**, arguing that the industries and nations that create wealth should not be disproportionately "punished" with taxes and regulations.
 - **Claim B** is anchored overwhelmingly in **Care/Harm**, focusing on the suffering of current and future victims of climate-related disasters like floods, droughts, and famines. It also strongly activates **Fairness-as-Equity**, highlighting the profound injustice of the present generation (and wealthy nations) imposing severe costs on future generations (and poorer nations) who have contributed least to the problem.
- **Authority Selection (Path 2):** The initial moral filtering process leads adherents of each claim to select entirely different sets of epistemic authorities.
 - An adherent of **Claim A**, guided by intuitions about liberty and economic proportionality, will find economists from free-market think tanks, industry leaders, and politicians who emphasize economic growth and deregulation to be the most plausible and trustworthy sources. Their Path 2 search for an authority is a search for someone who validates their concern that the proposed solutions are worse than the disease.

- An adherent of **Claim B**, guided by intuitions about care and equity, will defer to the overwhelming consensus of climate scientists (e.g., the IPCC), international humanitarian organizations, and environmental advocacy groups. Their Path 2 search is for the most reliable experts on the *harm* being caused, validating their concern that inaction is morally catastrophic.
- **Trust Lattices:** The result is the construction of two distinct, non-overlapping trust lattices. The lattice for Claim A is built upon evidence of the economic and sovereignty aspects. The lattice for Claim B is built upon evidence of the disproportionate impact on vulnerable populations. The MEVIR framework explains why neither side can easily accept the evidence from the other's lattice; it is systematically filtered out by their morally-grounded trust policies, which deem the other side's sources to be biased or their concerns to be irrelevant.

6.2.2 Comparative Trust Process Summary

Aspect of Framework	Skeptic/Minimalist Position & Justification	Activist/Interventionist Position & Justification
Central Claim	Accepted: "Aggressive climate policies are an unacceptable infringement on liberty and economic prosperity."	Accepted: "Failing to enact aggressive climate policies is a catastrophic moral failure."
Primary Moral Foundations Activated	<p>Liberty/Oppression: Government regulations are coercive and restrict freedom.</p> <p>Loyalty/Betrayal: International agreements betray national economic interests. Fairness-as-Proportionality: Successful industries should not be</p>	<p>Care/Harm: Inaction causes immense suffering to vulnerable populations and future generations.</p> <p>Fairness-as-Equity: It is unjust for the present/wealthy to impose costs on the future/poor.</p>

	disproportionately punished.	
Key "Belief" Anchors	"Individual and economic freedom are paramount." "National interests must be protected." "The free market is the best engine for prosperity."	"We have a moral duty to prevent suffering." "We must ensure justice for future generations." "Scientific consensus should guide policy on existential threats."
Trusted Epistemic Authorities	Economists from free-market think tanks, industry leaders, and politicians emphasizing deregulation and economic growth.	The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the majority of climate scientists, international humanitarian organizations, and environmental advocacy groups.
Resulting Trust Policies	"Distrust claims that advocate for greater government regulation." "Prioritize claims that highlight the economic costs of climate policy." "Favor sources that emphasize national sovereignty and economic competitiveness."	"Distrust claims that downplay the scientific consensus on climate change." "Prioritize claims that highlight the human and environmental costs of inaction." "Favor sources from the established scientific and international communities."
Final Interpretation of Policy Debate	A struggle to protect individual liberty and economic vitality from a dangerous, ideologically-	A moral imperative to act decisively to prevent catastrophic harm and profound injustice, guided

	driven overreach of government power.	by overwhelming scientific evidence.
--	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

7 Information Disorders as Disputes of Narratives

Contemporary information disorders, such as the spread of misinformation and disinformation, are best understood not as isolated factual errors but as disputes between competing narratives. A narrative, in this context, is a coherent system of related claims, often emotionally and morally charged, designed to lead agents toward certain desired beliefs and behaviors. These narratives function as powerful influence mechanisms. The MEVIR framework provides a detailed analytical tool to deconstruct how these mechanisms operate by targeting the different layers of an agent's trust-formation process.

Several strategies used in information disorders can be characterized using MEVIR. For instance, effective disinformation does not just lie about the Truth Bearer; it attempts to switch the Admissible Truth Maker. Thus, when a leader is accused of corruption (Legal Truth Maker: Evidence of crimes), defenders often shift the narrative to "He is fighting the Deep State" (Narrative Truth Maker: Role as a hero). They provide Proxies (conspiracy theories, emotional rallies) that support the Narrative Truth Maker, rendering the Legal Truth Maker (court documents) irrelevant in the eyes of supporters.

A distinct class of disorder arises when an entity actively prevents Ontological Unpacking. They appeal to messages like "Trust us, the algorithm is fair." The entity provides the Truth Bearer but hides the Truth Makers (the weights, the training data, the objective function) behind "proprietary" walls. As a consequence, the agent cannot use Path 1 (direct verification). They are forced into Path 2 (deference). If the agent lacks a pre-existing "Blind Faith" anchor in the corporation, trust collapses. If they *do* have that anchor, they become vulnerable to exploitation.

Echo chambers are a widely occurring phenomenon in the current information ecosystem. They are essentially a Trust Lattice that has become closed and self-referential. Every node in the lattice is supported by another node within the same system. The "Trust Policies" are tuned to reject any Truth Bearer that originates from an "Outgroup Authority." Because the lattice is anchored in Moral Foundations (e.g., Loyalty), factual correction (attacking a single truth bearer) fails. The agent simply reroutes the support to a different strand of the lattice. "Adversarial Unpacking"—interpreting opposing claims through the most uncharitable ontology possible—becomes the default defense mechanism.

7.1 Analyzing Influence Mechanisms with MEVIR

7.1.1 Propaganda

Propaganda is the deliberate, systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions, and direct behavior to achieve a response that furthers the desired intent of the propagandist (Britannica 2025). It is distinguished by its deliberateness and its heavy emphasis on manipulation (Sotirovic 2025). The MEVIR framework explains its mechanism as a multi-layered attack on the trust process. Propaganda works by first crafting messages that activate powerful, pre-rational moral foundations—such as Loyalty ("us vs. them"), Purity ("they are unclean/unnatural"), or Liberty ("they want to control you")—to create a compelling and unshakeable intuitive anchor. Once this moral anchor is set, the propaganda provides a curated set of seemingly credible "authorities" and "evidence" that validates the initial intuition. This systematically corrupts the agent's Path 2 deference process, leading them to build a trust lattice that is internally coherent but entirely supports the propagandist's desired conclusion.

Example: The CDC's "Tips from Former Smokers" campaign is a form of public health propaganda that uses graphic, fear-based appeals to direct behavior (Johnson 2012). One ad features Terrie, a former smoker who developed throat cancer, showing the devastating physical consequences of smoking, including the use of a stoma. The ad is a deliberate attempt to manipulate emotions by activating the **Care/Harm** foundation (evoking fear of suffering) and the **Purity/Sanctity** foundation (showing the degradation of the body) to achieve a desired public health outcome: smoking cessation.

7.1.2 PSY-OPS (Psychological Operations)

PSY-OPS are military operations designed to convey selected information and indicators to foreign audiences to influence their emotions, motives, reasoning, and ultimately, their behavior in a way that is favorable to the operator's objectives. MEVIR clarifies this as a highly targeted and strategic application of the same principles underlying propaganda. A PSY-OP begins with a detailed analysis of the target audience's psychological profile, which maps directly to the MEVIR components. Analysts identify the target's dominant moral foundations (their "moral matrix"), their cultural values, and their epistemic vulnerabilities (e.g., common biases, sources they are inclined to trust or distrust). With this profile, messages are designed to be maximally effective at creating new, desired trust anchors and disrupting or discrediting existing ones that support the adversary.

Example: During the Vietnam War, the U.S. Army's 6th PSYOP Battalion executed "Operation Wandering Soul." (Eff 2025) This operation exploited the traditional Vietnamese

belief that the souls of the dead must be buried in their homeland to find peace. U.S. forces broadcast eerie, ghostly wailing sounds and fabricated messages from "wandering spirits" of dead Viet Cong soldiers over loudspeakers in the jungle at night. The messages were designed to activate the **Loyalty/Betrayal** foundation (appealing to soldiers' duty to their families and ancestors) and the **Care/Harm** foundation (evoking fear and psychological distress) to lower morale and encourage desertion.

7.1.3 Moral Persuasion and Moral Reframing

Moral suasion is a broader category of influence that relies on an appeal to morality to change behavior, rather than coercion. The MEVIR framework provides the mechanism for a particularly sophisticated and potentially constructive form of this: **moral reframing**. Unlike propaganda, which often seeks to amplify a single set of moral intuitions, moral reframing attempts to build a bridge between two different trust lattices by finding a shared or alternative moral anchor. It involves taking a policy position and framing it using the moral language and foundations of the target audience, rather than the speaker's own. This is a conscious effort to make a claim resonate with the target's pre-existing Moral Model, thereby making it seem more plausible and worthy of consideration.

Example: Research on climate change communication has demonstrated the effectiveness of moral reframing. While arguments based on the **Care/Harm** foundation (e.g., protecting vulnerable populations from harm) are less persuasive to conservatives, arguments reframed to appeal to conservative moral foundations are more effective. For instance, an argument for environmental protection can be framed in terms of **Purity/Sanctity** (the need to not desecrate and pollute our pure and sacred habitats) or **Loyalty/Betrayal** (appealing to patriotism and the need to protect the country and its natural traditions). This approach doesn't change the underlying facts but reframes their moral significance, potentially opening a pathway for trust where one did not previously exist.

8 A MEVIR-Based Decision Support System (DSS)

The MEVIR framework, while primarily descriptive, forms the basis for a novel type of Decision Support System (DSS). Computationally, MEVIR should not be regarded as a blueprint for a fully automated decision-making agent, but rather as the foundation for a system that aids humans in making more informed decisions. The functional vision is to augment, not replace, the human agent. The system's purpose would be to make the user's own trust-formation process more transparent to them, serving as a tool for metacognition that helps them identify and overcome biases, thereby aligning their

reasoning more closely with the ideal of the conscientious agent (Eom 2020). This represents a shift from a descriptive model to a prescriptive aid—one that does not prescribe *what* to believe, but *how* to believe more virtuously (Zeng et al. 2018).

8.1 Representational Requirements

Translating the MEVIR framework into a functional DSS requires specific representational choices for its data and algorithms, drawing on established principles from computational trust and DSS architecture.

8.1.1 Data Representation

The system would need to model the core components of the MEVIR framework using appropriate data structures:

- **Claims and Arguments:** Each piece of information (a claim, an argument, a piece of evidence) would be represented as a node in a graph. Each node would have properties such as its textual content, source, publication date, and other relevant metadata.
- **Evidential Links:** The relationships between claims would be represented as directed edges in the graph, forming the "trust lattice." Edge types would include "supports," "attacks," "is evidence for," and "is sourced from," allowing the system to map the argumentative structure of a user's belief system.
- **Agent Profile:** A dynamic data structure would represent the user. This profile would include:
 - An inferred or self-reported **Moral Profile**, such as a vector of weights corresponding to the six EMFT foundations.
 - A record of **Epistemic Dispositions**, such as a checklist of cognitive biases the user has been identified as being prone to.
 - A history of trusted and distrusted sources.
- **Source/Authority Database:** A comprehensive knowledge base would be required to store information about sources of claims. This database would contain metadata for each source, including its domain of expertise, known ideological leanings, funding sources, publication record, and a reputation score derived from past reliability.

8.1.2 Algorithmic Functions

The DSS would employ several key algorithms to provide feedback to the user:

- **Moral Content Analysis:** The system would use Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques, potentially leveraging tools like the extended Moral Foundations

Dictionary (eMFD) (Hopp et al. 2021), to scan a claim, article, or social media post and identify the primary moral foundations being activated. The output could be a "Moral Foundation Footprint" that visually shows the user which intuitions the content is appealing to.

- **Trust Lattice Visualization:** A core feature would be a graphical interface that allows the user to visualize their constructed trust lattice for any given belief. This would make the chain of reasoning explicit, showing the user the evidential links from their current belief all the way back to their ultimate trust anchors (e.g., an unconditional "Belief" or a deferred-to "Authority").
- **Bias Detection Heuristics:** The system would monitor the user's information-seeking behavior in real-time and use heuristic rules to flag potential epistemic failures. For example:
 - If a user exclusively consumes information from a narrow band of ideologically aligned sources, the system could generate a notification: "Warning: You have only consulted sources that confirm your initial position. This pattern is consistent with Confirmation Bias. Would you like to view a well-reasoned critique of this view from a credible authority?"
 - If a user makes a rapid judgment based on a single, emotionally vivid story, the system might ask: "This is a powerful example. However, it may not be representative. This could be an instance of the Availability Heuristic. Would you like to see the broader statistical data on this topic?"
- **Authority Recommendation Engine:** When a user recognizes their own limitations and decides to engage Path 2 (Deferral to Authority), the system could act as an epistemic guide. Based on the topic, it could query its authority database and recommend a diverse set of credible experts, explicitly highlighting their different perspectives, areas of consensus, and points of disagreement.

8.1.3 Use Case Scenario

To illustrate its function, consider a user encountering a controversial article about immigration policy on social media. As they engage with it, the MEVIR-based DSS would operate in the background:

- **Initial Analysis:** Upon opening the article, the DSS scans the text and displays a small, non-intrusive overlay: "Moral Foundation Footprint: This article heavily utilizes language related to the **Loyalty/Betrayal** (e.g., 'protecting our borders') and **Purity/Sanctity** (e.g., 'threat to our culture') foundations." This immediately provides the user with metacognitive awareness of the intuitive levers being pulled.

- **Lattice Construction:** As the user follows links within the article or performs their own searches, the DSS maps their path, building a visual representation of their trust lattice. They can see that their belief is anchored in the initial article and two opinion pieces from commentators with similar ideological leanings.
- **Epistemic Nudge:** After the user has explored several sources that all reinforce the same narrative, the DSS detects a pattern consistent with confirmation bias and the creation of an echo chamber. It generates a notification: "You have explored three sources that argue for more restrictive immigration policies. To ensure a comprehensive understanding, consider this analysis on the economic contributions of immigrants from, a reputable economic research institute, or this report on the humanitarian situation from, a respected international aid organization."

In this scenario, the DSS does not tell the user what to believe about immigration. Instead, it makes the structure of their own belief-formation process visible and offers them concrete tools to practice the intellectual virtues of open-mindedness and intellectual humility, thereby facilitating a more conscientious and well-rounded trust decision.

9 Conclusion and Future Work

This report has introduced the Moral-Epistemic VIRTue informed (MEVIR) framework, a synthetic model that integrates a procedural account of trust elaboration with the philosophical insights of Linda Zagzebski's virtue epistemology and the psychological findings of Extended Moral Foundations Theory. The MEVIR framework moves beyond simplistic, mechanical accounts of trust by providing a multi-layered, psychologically grounded explanation for *why* and *how* agents come to accept claims as facts. It posits that the trust process is driven by a conscientious agent's character-driven pursuit of truth, a pursuit that is profoundly shaped and often preempted by a substrate of rapid, pre-rational moral intuitions.

By re-envisioning the procedural model's "Belief" and "Accepted Authority" anchors as manifestations of moral foundations and epistemic deference, and by recasting "Trust Policies" as MFT-driven moral heuristics, the MEVIR framework offers a more complete and nuanced picture of trust formation. The primary strength of the framework is its descriptive and explanatory power. It provides a detailed, mechanistic framework for understanding some of the most pressing issues in our contemporary information landscape, most notably the phenomenon of ideological polarization. The model explains how agents with different underlying moral profiles can, through the rational application of their own trust-forming procedures, construct entirely different and mutually

incomprehensible factual realities. It formalizes the architecture of the echo chamber, showing how a combination of shared moral intuitions and cognitive biases can lead to the convergence of individual trust lattices into isolated and self-validating systems.

However, the framework's strengths are counterbalanced by significant limitations and unresolved challenges. As a synthetic construct, it inherits the theoretical and empirical vulnerabilities of its constituent parts, including ongoing debates about the completeness and causal direction of MFT and the philosophical challenge of situationism to virtue theory. Its current formulation tends toward a static view of the agent, though the inclusion of a belief revision mechanism begins to address this by modeling how beliefs can evolve. Furthermore, the analysis of its failure cases reveals that the model is not a panacea; a virtuously executed trust process can still lead to false beliefs in a corrupted information environment, and the model itself offers no clear path to resolving disagreements rooted in incommensurable moral foundations. Its complexity, while a source of descriptive richness, also renders it computationally intractable for direct implementation in artificial systems.

A key caveat must be reiterated: MEVIR describes the trust process for a given claim, but the decision to trust is always contextual and tied to a contemplated action. The level of epistemic rigor and evidence required to trust a restaurant review is, and should be, vastly different from that required to trust a medical diagnosis for a life-threatening illness. The framework is independent of the action being contemplated, but its application in the real world is not.

9.1 Future Work: Longitudinal Studies

The most promising avenue for future work lies in addressing the static nature of the current model. The MEVIR framework provides an ideal theoretical basis for conducting longitudinal studies of trust and belief evolution. Such research would move beyond cross-sectional snapshots and track individuals or groups over extended periods, measuring the dynamic interplay of the framework's components.

A longitudinal study could track:

- **Changes in the Moral Model:** How do individuals' MFT profiles (the weights of their moral foundations) shift in response to major life events, such as parenthood, trauma, or significant changes in social or economic status?
- **Development of the Virtue Model:** Can epistemic virtues be cultivated? Research could measure the intellectual virtues and vices of individuals before and after educational interventions designed to promote critical thinking, metacognition, and intellectual humility.

- **Evolution of the Procedural Model's Outputs:** How do the structures of individuals' trust lattices change over time as they are exposed to new information, competing narratives, and different social groups? Can we observe the formation and dissolution of echo chambers at the individual level?

By undertaking such research, the MEVIR framework can evolve from a powerful descriptive model of how trust works at a given moment into a dynamic model of how belief systems are formed, maintained, and transformed over a lifetime. Ultimately, the framework serves as a powerful reminder that to understand what an agent believes, one must first understand how they think and who they are. It argues that any successful theory of trust in the 21st century must be one that fully embraces the inseparable link between logic, virtue, and intuition.

10 References

Adamo, Greta, Anna Sperotto, Mattia Fumagalli, Alessandro Mosca, Tiago Prince Sales, and Giancarlo Guizzardi. 2024. "Unpacking the Semantics of Risk in Climate Change Discourses." In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Formal Ontology in Information Systems (FOIS 2024)*. <https://www.utwente.nl/en/eemcs/fois2024/resources/papers/adamo-et-al-unpacking-the-semantics-of-risk-in-climate-change-discourses.pdf>

Alfano, Mark. 2012. "Expanding the Situationist Challenge to Responsibilist Virtue Epistemology." *The Philosophical Quarterly* 62 (247): 223–249. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14802/2888>.

Amaral, G., V.d. Santos, E.H. Haeusler, G. Guizzardi, D. Schwabe, and S. Lifschitz. 2026. "Unpacking Trust: An Ontological Framework for Information Trustworthiness in Decision-Making." In *Advances in Conceptual Modeling: ER 2025*, edited by C. M. Fonseca, A. Bernasconi, S. de Cesare, L. Bellatreche, and O. Pastor. LNCS, vol 16190. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-08620-4_11.

American Immigration Council. 2025. "Overcoming Polarization: How to Talk with Immigration Opponents." Accessed October 13, 2025. <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/uncategorized/content-overcoming-polarization-how-talk-immigration-opponents/>.

Bernasconi, Anna, Giancarlo Guizzardi, Oscar Pastor, and Veda C. Storey. 2022. "Semantic Interoperability: Ontological Unpacking of a Viral Conceptual Model." *BMC Bioinformatics* 23 (Suppl 11): 491.

Britannica. 2025. "Propaganda | Definition, History, Techniques, Examples, & Facts." Accessed October 13, 2025. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/propaganda>.

Curry, Oliver S. 2025. "What's Wrong with Moral Foundations Theory, and How to Get Moral Psychology Right." *Behavioral Scientist*. Accessed October 13, 2025. <https://behavioralscientist.org/whats-wrong-with-moral-foundations-theory-and-how-to-get-moral-psychology-right/>.

David, Marian. 2025. "The Correspondence Theory of Truth." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2025 Edition), edited by Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2025/entries/truth-correspondence/>.

Eom, Sean B. 2020. "Decision Support Systems." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford University Press.

Guizzardi, Giancarlo, and Nicola Guarino. 2023. "Semantics, Ontology and Explanation." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11124*.

Guizzardi, Giancarlo, and Nicola Guarino. 2024. "Explanation, Semantics, and Ontology." *Data & Knowledge Engineering* 153: 102325.

Guizzardi, Giancarlo, Anna Bernasconi, Oscar Pastor, and Veda C. Storey. 2021. "Ontological Unpacking as Explanation: The Case of the Viral Conceptual Model." In *Conceptual Modeling (ER 2021)*.

Haidt, Jonathan. 2012. *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Hancock, Peter A., Theresa T. Kessler, Alexandra D. Kaplan, Kimberly Stowers, J. Christopher Brill, Deborah R. Billings, Kristin E. Schaefer, and James L. Szalma. 2023. "How and Why Humans Trust: A Meta-Analysis and Elaborated Model." *Frontiers in Psychology* 14: 1081086. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10083508/>.

Hopp, F.R., J.T. Fisher, D. Cornell, et al. 2021. "The Extended Moral Foundations Dictionary (eMFD): Development and Applications of a Crowd-Sourced Approach to Extracting Moral Intuitions from Text." *Behavior Research Methods* 53: 232–246. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-020-01433-0>.

Hunter, Aaron, and Richard Booth. 2015. "Trust-Sensitive Belief Revision." In *Proceedings of the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 3069–3075. *E*.

Johnson, Teddi Dineley. 2012. "Hard-Hitting Public Health Ad Campaigns Sparking Awareness: New Tactics Gaining Results, Controversy." *The Nation's Health* 42 (5): 1–10. <https://www.thenationshealth.org/content/42/5/1.3>.

McNeace, Marissa, and Jeffrey Sinn. 2018. "Moral Foundations Theory vs. Schwartz Value Theory: Which Theory Best Explains Ideological Differences?" *The Winthrop McNair Research Bulletin* 4, no. 6. <https://digitalcommons.winthrop.edu/wmrb/vol4/iss1/6/>.

Eff, Myk. "The 24 Most Audacious Psyops of All Time." Medium. 2025. Accessed October 13, 2025. <https://medium.com/spy-novel-research/the-24-most-audacious-psyops-of-all-time-0553dd72e9bf>.

MoralFoundations.org. 2025. "Critiques | Moral Foundations Theory." Accessed October 13, 2025. <https://moralfoundations.org/critiques/>.

Moraitis, Pavlos, and Simon Parsons. 2003. "Argumentation Based Decision Making for Autonomous Agents." In *Proceedings of the Second International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*. <https://helios2.mi.parisdescartes.fr/~moraitis/webpapers/Moraitis-AAMAS03.pdf>.

ORCA. 2016. "Trust-Sensitive Belief Revision." Accessed October 13, 2025. https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/89681/1/agm_trust.pdf.

Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics. 2025. "Decision Support Systems." Accessed October 13, 2025. <https://oxfordre.com/politics/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-1008>.

Pereira, Célia da Costa, Andrea G. B. Tettamanzi, and Serena Villata. 2011. "Changing One's Mind: Erase or Rewind? Possibilistic Belief Revision with Fuzzy Argumentation Based on Trust." In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 2642–2647. <https://www.ijcai.org/Proceedings/11/Papers/039.pdf>.

Pew Research Center. 2016. "The Politics of Climate Change in the United States." Accessed October 13, 2025. <https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2016/10/04/the-politics-of-climate/>.

Schertzer, Robert. 2025. "How Nationalist Rhetoric Drives Polarization over Climate Change in the US." *Environmental Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2025.2525638>.

Simon, Herbert A. 1990. "Invariants of Human Behavior." *Annual Review of Psychology* 41: 1–19.

Kerlin, Kat. 2017. "Polarized Debate." UC Davis News, November 29.
<https://www.ucdavis.edu/news/polarized-debate>.

Sotirovic, Mira. 2025. "What is Propaganda?" University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Accessed October 13, 2025. <https://publish.illinois.edu/mirasotirovic/whatispropaganda>.

Varin, F. 2025. "Environmental Skepticism and Political Polarization in the United States." Illinois State University Student Conference. Accessed October 13, 2025.
[https://pol.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/student-life/conferences/Varin Climate Change Debate.doc](https://pol.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/student-life/conferences/Varin%20Climate%20Change%20Debate.doc).

Wu, Hongrun, Alex Arenas, and Sergio Gómez. 2017. "Influence of Trust in the Spreading of Information." *Physical Review E* 95 (1): 012301. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.95.012301>.

Zagzebski, Linda Trinkaus. 1996. *Virtues of the Mind: An Inquiry into the Nature of Virtue and the Ethical Foundations of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zeng, Zhiwei, Xiuyi Fan, Chunyan Miao, Cyril Leung, Chin Jing Jih, and Ong Yew Soon. 2018. "Context-based and Explainable Decision Making with Argumentation." In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2018)*, 1114–1122. Stockholm: IFAAMAS. <https://ifaamas.org/Proceedings/aamas2018/pdfs/p1114.pdf>.