**Social Identity // Social Exclusion Experiment**

|  | No Social Id | Social Id |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Random exc | T1 | T2 |
| Personal exc | T3 | T4 // T5-T8 (Information) |

T1<T2<T3<T4

* T5-T8 is created by the variation of the information in the 2nd stage.
  + Within variation with: group identity and exclusion. Everyone answers 4 different questions.
  + Classic DG or 3?

1) Group composition

a. T1 and T2 – 2 members

b. T3 and T4 - 3 members – m1 spectator (i/o) + m2 Ingroup + m3 outgroup

2) Choosing hard or easy task

Stage 1 – choosing the painting – chat about painting

1) Tajfel – chat on who is the author

2) Chat about why people choose the painting – 2 sentences together.

Stage 2 – task exclusion

Stage 3 – Game – Public good; dictator game (pilot); trust game – strategy method. (Spectator does not play).

Dictator game – 2 people – Ingroup / Outgroup

MEASURING THE BEH OF THOSE EXCLUDED

Information – Knowing if the person is ingroup or outgroup.

10 rounds, stranger matching (one-shot). Or strategy method? How many rounds?

Dictator game - decide between any value to split between 0-20 (or 0-10) or given then values - 10/10 vs 12/8; 11/9; 8/12 (altruism); 16/4;

Or other values:

10/10 vs 12/4; 10/6; 10/18; 11/19; 16/4….

We have 3 options for DG:

1. Decide how much to allocate for one self, one from in group and one from out group
2. Decide how much to allocate like a spectator(Chen and Li, 2009)
3. Decide to allocate for himself and another person(design as we have now classic DG with stranger matching)

| **DG Options** | **DG with 3 players** | **Chen and Li(Spectator)** | **Classic DG** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** |  | * Spectator like design does not measure altruism * Spectator is not an impartial participant, can be excluded or included * Measures preferences for others based on group identity * Can we add a dimension that being excluded and included is given in the information as well?(empathy) | * Altruism * Altruism after exclusion |
| **Use** | * Chen and Li does not use it | * Chen and Li uses it(makes a reference and comparison) * How to use it in our treatment variations * Cannot move both social identity and exclusion at the same time | * Classic * Can the empathy be used here better? * Can have both social identity and exclusion * One with social identity and one with exclusion(treatment variation with the information) |

***Question****: Are those who are excluded more generous(towards others/their own groups/others excluded)? Are there any papers looking at it already?*

**Real Effort Task(s)**

Based on the design, we want to use one easy and one more complicated task that are going to be performed by excluded and non excluded participants.

While choosing the task and how it is going to be implemented we consider several points to make sure that our design has enough capacity to measure our research questions. For that reason:

1. Everyone—except for the spectators—performs in a real effort task. We do not want those who are not excluded to be idle while the others are performing a task. Therefore we introduce a variation in the difficulty of the task that can preserve the feelings of exclusion with the increased difficulty.
2. To avoid participants attribute task assignment to their abilities, skills or any other mechanism than exclusion we try to find a real effort task that does not require any skills and can be more/less difficult.
3. We try to hold the task simple that does not take a long time to complete.

Task candidates

***Slider Task*** Slider task (Gill and Prowse 2019) does not require any high.order skills but rather requires concentration and dexterity. It is widely used and shown to be successful in measuring real effort even though the outcome of the task does not have an intrinsic value and men usually perform better in the task. The difficulty of the task can be induced by number of repetitions. One potential drawback can also be that there is some learning by repetition which can reduce the feelings of exclusion.

It can take time and can get boring with many repetitions, takes long time to finish f.eks. As in Helia’s paper. We want them to feel punished and excluded so having a boring task can be what we want? As the repetition increases the effort increases as well.

HM- Easy vs difficult - number of slider tasks→5 rounds instead of 30 at the end

Easy can be 5 and difficult can be several more

* Will they wait for the others if they finish earlier?
* Can we increase difficulty by giving narrower intervals for click points?

Time limit? Can they have a deadline(so they can take a break)?

How do we deal with the drop-outs—if they do so?

***Counting Numbers Task*** Counting numbers or characters in a matrix is a task that is widely used and easy to communicate (Abeler et al. 2011). The task itself is very easy to design but also tedious and gives more work effort impression, and does not require any prior experience or high ordered skills which are advantages in the online experiments. Vranceanu et al., 2013 show some learning in repeated settings but the difficulty for this task can be introduced not only by repetition but also the size of the matrix. So for example easy version can be a small matrix whereas the difficult one presents a bigger matrix.

**Analysis**