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### Study Information

1. Title (required)

When is Outgroup Inclusion a Deviant Act? The Role of Agent and Participant Group Status

1. Authors (required)

Bethany Corbett, Jocelyn Dautel, Laura K. Taylor

1. Description (optional)

We examine the conditions in which children aged 6-10 judge an objectively positive act – inclusion - negatively (i.e., when violating group norms, and when performed by individuals of differing group status).

1. Hypotheses (required)

H1 (DV: own evaluations of permissibility). Children will evaluate the agent’s inclusive actions as ‘less okay’ in exclusive norm conditions than in inclusive norm conditions.

H2 (DV: own reasoning of permissibility). Children in exclusive norm conditions will explain relatively negative evaluations of the agent by making reference to group reasoning, and will do so more often than in inclusive norm conditions. In inclusive norm conditions, children will explain relatively positive evaluations of the agent by referencing moral/social conventional reasoning, and will do so significantly more often than in the exclusive norm conditions.

H3 (DV: group evaluation of permissibility). Children will perceive ingroup evaluation of the inclusive actions as ‘less okay’ in exclusive norm conditions than in inclusive norm conditions.

H4 (DV: group reasoning of permissibility). Children in exclusive norm conditions will explain relatively negative evaluations of the agent by the ingroup by making reference to group reasoning, and will do so more often than in inclusive norm conditions. In inclusive norm conditions, children will explain relatively positive evaluations of the agent by the ingroup by referencing moral/social conventional reasoning, and will do so significantly more often than in the exclusive norm conditions.

H5 (DV: spontaneous expectations). Children in exclusive norm conditions will more often expect a negative ingroup reaction to the agent than children in the inclusive norm conditions. Children in inclusive norm conditions will more often expect a positive group reaction to the agent than those in exclusive norm conditions.

H6 (DV: behavioral consequences). Children in exclusive norm conditions will judge it less likely that ingroup children will play with the agent in future, than children in inclusive norm conditions.

H7: Age will be positively associated with more negative evaluations of the agent in exclusive norm conditions, and more reference to group reasoning.

### Design Plan

In this section, you will be asked to describe the overall design of your study. Remember that this research plan is designed to register a single study, so if you have multiple experimental designs, please complete a separate preregistration.

1. Study type (required)
   1. Experiment - A researcher randomly assigns treatments to study subjects, this includes field or lab experiments. This is also known as an intervention
2. Blinding (required)
   1. Blinding describes who is aware of the experimental manipulations within a study. Mark all that apply.
      1. For studies that involve human subjects, they will not know the treatment group to which they have been assigned.
3. Is there any additional blinding in this study?

No

1. Study design (required)

This is a full factorial, between-subjects design: 2 (norm: inclusive/exclusive) x 2 (agent group status: higher/lower) x 2 (participant group status: lower/higher) x 4 (age: 6-7, 7-8, 8-9, 9-10).

1. Randomization (optional)

Participants will be randomly assigned to one of four conditions: inclusive-norm/lower status agent, exclusive-norm/lower status agent, inclusive-norm/higher status agent, exclusive-norm/higher status agent by Qualtrics software. The color (purple/yellow) representing groups will also be randomly assigned by Qualtrics.

### Sampling Plan

1. Existing data (required)
   * 1. Registration prior to creation of data: As of the date of submission of this research plan for preregistration, the data have not yet been collected, created, or realized.
2. Data collection procedures (required)

We will recruit children aged 6-10 from primary schools within Northern Ireland. We will target historic majority/higher status and minority/lower status groups, with respect to both ethno-religious (Catholic/Protestant) and ethnicity/racial boundaries (White as majority/advantaged group in the local context). Participants will receive small, age-appropriate toys/stickers as thanks. Schools will be offered an incentive valued at £2 per person to a maximum value of £100. Participants who fail understanding checks (>2 times per any item) will be excluded.

1. Sample size (required)

We plan to recruit approximately 200 participants. The recommended minimum sample size (GPower 3.1) to achieve 80% power to detect a medium effect size, at alpha = .05 is N = 193, for the following ANOVA model: 2 (norm: inclusive/exclusive) x 2 (agent group status: higher/lower) x 2 (participant group status: higher/lower) x 4 (age: 6-7, 7-8, 8-9, 9-10). The model parameters were: partial eta squared = .06, numerator df = 4, number of groups = 32.

1. Stopping rule (optional)

Data collection will be stopped after the target sample size is reached, and a minimum of N = 6 participants are recruited to each cell of the design (200/32).

### Variables

Manipulated variables (optional)

(1) Norm Manipulation

*Inclusive:* “I’m going to tell you a story about a town, and the children who live there. In the town there are two groups of people – the purple group, and the yellow group.”

Children from the purple group and children from the yellow group live very similar lives. They see each other often. For example, children from the purple group and yellow group go to the same schools, live in the same parts of the town, they listen to the same types of music, they play the same sports, and they celebrate the same holidays.

Almost all of the children from the purple group are very happy things are this way, and do not want them to change.

*Exclusive:* ““I’m going to tell you a story about a town, and the children who live there. In the town there are two groups of people – the purple group, and the yellow group.”

Children from the purple group and children from the yellow group live very different lives. They see each other rarely. For example, children from the purple group and yellow group go to different schools, live in different parts of the town, they listen to different types of music, they play different sports, and they celebrate different holidays.

Almost all of the children from the purple group are very happy things are this way, and do not want them to change.”

(2) Group Status Manipulation

*Higher Status Agent*

“In the town, the purple group have the most money, best jobs, and get to make the decisions about how the town is run.”

*Lower Status Agent*

“In the town, the purple group have the least money, worst jobs, and do not get to make the decisions about how the town is run.”

1. Measured variables (required)

(1) Gender (male/female/other/prefer not to say)

(2) Date of Birth

(3) Year Group

(4) Ethnicity

- White British

- White Irish

- White Other

- Bangladeshi

- Black African

- Black Caribbean

- Black Other

- Chinese

- Indian

- Pakistani

- Asian Other

- Irish Traveller

- Another Ethnicity (please state)

- Prefer Not to Say

(5) Community Background

- Catholic

- Protestant

- Both

- Neither

- Other

- Prefer Not to Say

(6) Permissibility Scale Training Errors (0-3 x 5 items)

(7) Likelihood Scale Training Errors (0-3 x 5 items)

(8) Own Evaluation of Permissibility

"Do you think it was okay that the child from the [purple] school was friendly to the [yellow] school children? Can you show me how 'okay' or 'not okay' you think it was, using the scale from earlier?” (5 point scale; not at all okay, mostly not okay, sort of okay and sort of not oaky, mostly okay, totally okay; Weller, Hansen, & Lagattuta, 2013)

(9) Own Reasoning of Permissibility

“"Why do you think it is [CHILD’S ANSWER] that the child from the [purple] school was friendly to the [yellow] school children?"

(10) Perceived Group Evaluation of Permissibility

"Do you think the rest of the [purple] group would think it was okay that the child from the [purple] school was friendly to the [yellow] school children? Can you show me how 'okay' or 'not okay' the purple group would think it was, using the scale from earlier?” (5 point scale; Weller, Hansen, & Lagattuta, 2013).

(11) Perceived Group Reasoning of Permissibility

“Why do you think it is [CHILD’S ANSWER] that the child from the [purple] school was friendly to the [yellow] school children?"

(12) Spontaneous Expectations

"If you had to guess, what do you think could happen next in the story? Why?"

(13) Behavioral Consequences

"Do you think the other children from the [purple] school will play with the child from their group next week if they have the chance? Can you use the thumb scale from earlier to show me?" (5-point scale, definitely no, probably no, unsure, probably yes, definitely yes).

(14) Understanding of Risk

(i) "Do you know what it means if something is risky?, (ii) What does it mean if something is risky?, and (iii) Can you please give an example of something that is risky?”

### Analysis Plan

(H1, H3, H6, H7) Three four-way ANOVAs will be performed with evaluation of permissibility, perceived group evaluation of permissibility, and behavioral consequences as dependent variables. The ANOVA models will be 2 (condition: inclusion/exclusion) x 2 (agent group status: lower/higher) x 2 (participant group status: lower/higher) x 4 (age: 6-7, 7-8, 8-9, 9-10), with all factors between-subjects.

(H2, H4) Own and perceived group reasoning responses will be coded according to existing guidelines (e.g., Elenbaas et al.; Killen et al.; McGuire et al.; Rizzo et al.; Rutland et al.) derived from social domain theory (Smetana, 2013) (e.g., group reasoning, moral reasoning, social conventional reasoning, autonomy).

(H5) Spontaneous expectations will be coded according to valance: positive, negative, neutral. Subcodes may be generated through observation of the data (e.g., physical, emotional, psychological consequences). In this case, a coding scheme will be developed, and two independent raters will code the data according to these criteria; interrater reliability will be calculated.

1. Exploratory analysis (optional)

We will examine how confirmatory analyses H1-H7 are influenced by the group status of (i) the agent, and (ii) the participant. We anticipate interactions with these factors, though the direction of effects remains exploratory.

Children recognize social hierarchies and who stands to benefit from maintaining the status quo; thus, children from majority groups (as benefiters) may be more invested in maintaining division than children from minority groups. Therefore, majority group participants may evaluate the outgroup inclusive agent (in exclusion conditions) more negatively than minority group participants as such actions have potential to disrupt the status quo.