We recruited 1123 American participants from Prolific, 50% Democrats and 50% Republicans. Due to the way the randomizer is structured, many participants did not end up being successfully matched into a group. After excluding those who were unable to complete the survey, we were left with 606 American participants from Prolific.

outgroup animosity emerged in a non-political context, where participanrs were judging the fairness of a political outgroup member based on a non-political decision.

that ingroup favoritism can arise from minimal group inductions, but only among those who become strongly identified with their minimal group

For natural groups, it looks like we aren’t seeing a hypocrisy effect, but rather we’re seeing an outgroup derogation effect. People are rating themselves, unaffiliated others, and ingroup members as equally moral, but outgroup members as significantly less moral.

* Why were people behaving more morally than in the original paper?

Supplement:

1. The 13 participants who accidently took the survey twice, there was nothing in their text chats that let the other participants in their group know what the purpose of the experiment was. However, we re-ran the analyses with those entire chat groups removed, and the results….
2. Due to an unforeseen issue where some people reported that they were more highly identified with their “outgroup” from what they had said on prolific, we also reanalyzed the data with these people excluded from the analyses. We were especially interested in the collective identification measures, which showed…
   1. We also ran an exploratory analysis looking at differences between political groups, but we didn’t see any differences except when those highly atypical exemplars were included in the analyses, and even then the results weren’t significant. We do see an approaching significant result that would suggest a black sheep effect.