**Results Section for Berkeley Replicating Minimal Groups (UVA)**

We worked with Luth Research to receive 1,500 survey respondents that passed the three attention checks. To maximize opportunity to find decline in our effects, per the Operations Manual, we collected these respondents in two rounds of 750. We assessed the number of attention check passes approximately every two days (without viewing the dependent variables of interest). Beyond this check, no data analyses took place before data collection was completed.

The key dependent variable was the degree of favoritism participants showed for their assigned group: an average of agreement with the six uneven point distributions, reverse coding the three distributions favoring the other group. Lower numbers indicate greater agreement. Per the assignment detailed in the Operations Manual, we first analyzed and report the first set 750 respondents, then the second. We conclude here with an analysis of the full set.

*First 750*

In the first round of data collection, we received 1,314 participants, 768 (58.4%) of which passed the attention checks. With these participants, we ran a 2 (final group: green vs. blue) x 2 (change: yes vs. no) ANOVA on the averaged favoritism measure. We found no effect of final group, *F*(1, 764) = 1.56, *p* = .212, and no interaction with group change, *F*(1, 764) = 0.02, *p*  = .890. Contrary to predictions, however, we also found no effect of changing groups, *F*(1, 764) = 0.46, *p* = .498. Participants who retained their original group assignment (M = 3.25, SD = .88) reported only directionally more agreement with point distributions favoring their own group than participants who changed groups (M = 3.29, SD = .90), *t*(766) = 0.63, *p* = .531, *d* = .04. There was not differential dropout across the four conditions, *X2* (3, N = 1441) = 7.31, *p* = .063.

*Second 750*

In the second round of data collection, we received 1,331 participants, 864 (64.9%) of which passed the attention checks. With these participants, we ran another 2 (final group: green vs. blue) x 2 (change: yes vs. no) ANOVA on the averaged favoritism measure. We found no effect of final group, *F*(1, 860) = 2.54, *p* = .111, and no interaction with group change, *F*(1, 860) = 0.14, *p*  = .711. Also in line with predictions, we found a significant effect of changing groups, *F*(1, 860) = 3.87, *p* = .050. Participants who retained their original group assignment (M = 3.23, SD = .88) reported significantly more agreement with point distributions favoring their own group than participants who changed groups (M = 3.35, SD = .87), *t*(862) = 1.98, *p* = .048, *d* = .14. There was not differential dropout across the four conditions, *X2* (3, N = 1437) = 2.59, *p* = .459.

*Full Set*

Overall, then, we received 2,645 participants, 1,632 (61.7%) of which passed the attention check. With these participants, we ran another 2 (final group: green vs. blue) x 2 (change: yes vs. no) ANOVA on the averaged favoritism measure. Here, we did find an effect of final group, *F*(1, 1628) = 4.18, *p* = .041, but no interaction with group change, *F*(1, 1628) = 0.15, *p*  = .695. More importantly, in line with predictions, we found a marginally significant effect of changing groups, *F*(1, 1628) = 3.59, *p* = .058. Participants who retained their original group assignment (M = 3.24, SD = .88) reported marginally more agreement with point distributions favoring their own group than participants who changed groups (M = 3.32, SD = .88), *t*(1630) = 1.86, *p* = .063, *d* = .10. There was not differential dropout across the four conditions, *X2* (3, N = 2848) = 3.58, *p* = .311.