

Supplementary Materials for

**When are similar individuals a group?**

**Early reasoning about similarity and ingroup support**

This file includes:

Adult online data

Familiarization and Pretest Data in Experiments 1-2

## Adult Online Data

Experiments 1 and 2 built on the commonplace intuition that outfits can serve various functions, including ritualistic or instrumental functions. To add empirical weight to this intuition, in an online Qualtrics survey we presented adult participants with photos (culled from the Internet) of 24 individuals wearing distinct outfits. In half of the photos, the outfit identified its wearer as a member of a particular group (e.g., a military uniform, religious habit, or ethnic costume; *ritualistic* outfits); in the other photos, the outfit allowed its wearer to achieve a situation-related goal (e.g., a raincoat, robe, or swimsuit; *instrumental* outfits). Each outfit was shown one at a time, in randomized order, and participants indicated whether the outfit served a group-membership function (100), a situation-related function (0), or both (50). Participants also completed a demographic questionnaire.

Participants were 110 adults (55 male) recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk and paid \$0.15 for their participation. In the sample, 68.2% of participants were European American, 11.8% Asian American, 9.1% African American, 8.2% Latino or Hispanic, and 2.7% Multiracial American. Two additional participants were excluded because they indicated that they did not pay attention (1) or gave identical answers throughout the survey (1). Each participant provided informed consent, and the protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board at [BLINDED FOR REVIEW].

Participants were significantly more likely to attribute a group-membership function to the ritualistic outfits ( $M = 78.00$ ,  $SE = 1.09$ ) than to the instrumental outfits ( $M = 51.94$ ,  $SE = 2.74$ ),  $F(1, 109) = 62.452$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.364$ , 90% CI [0.246, 0.461]. A Wilcoxon signed-rank test confirmed this result,  $Z = 5.963$ ,  $p < .001$ . Inspection of individual responses indicated that 66% of the participants (73/110) rated the ritualistic outfits, on average, as more likely to serve a group-

membership function than the instrumental outfits (cumulative binomial probability,  $p < 0.001$ ).

These results thus bolstered the intuition underlying Experiments 1 and 2 that outfits can be perceived as serving more ritualistic or more instrumental functions.

## **Familiarization and Pretest Data in Experiments 1-2**

### ***Experiment 1***

Looking times during the final phase of the familiarization trial were analyzed using an ANOVA with condition (two-group, no-group) as a between-subject factor. This factor was not significant,  $F(1, 30) = 2.003, p = .167, \eta_p^2 = 0.063, 90\% \text{ CI } [0.000, 0.228]$  (two-group:  $M = 32.01, SE = 3.98$ ; no-group:  $M = 24.60, SE = 3.41$ ). Infants thus tended to look equally whether TargetE put the toys away in the box next to her (two-group condition) or in the pocket on her shirtfront (no-group condition), suggesting that they did not perceive this last action as more novel or unusual. Looking times during the final phase of the pretest trial were analyzed in the same manner, and the main effect of condition was again not significant,  $F(1, 30) = 1.645, p = .210, \eta_p^2 = 0.052, 90\% \text{ CI } [0.000, 0.213]$  (two-group:  $M = 29.54, SE = 4.87$ ; no-group:  $M = 21.38, SE = 4.10$ ). Infants in the two conditions thus tended to look equally as SimilarE and DifferentE read their picture books in the pretest trial.

### ***Experiment 2***

Looking times during the final phases of the familiarization trials were analyzed using an ANOVA with condition (two-group, no-group) as a between-subject factor and event (SimilarE, DifferentE) as a within-subject factor. The interaction between condition and event was not significant,  $F(1, 30) = 0.845, p = .365, \eta_p^2 = 0.027, 90\% \text{ CI } [0.000, 0.171]$ . We next examined how infants in the two conditions responded to each event separately. For the DifferentE event, which was identical in the two conditions (DifferentE drank from her cup), the main effect of condition was not significant,  $F(1, 30) = 0.033, p = .858, \eta_p^2 = 0.001, 90\% \text{ CI } [0.000, 0.062]$  (two-group:  $M = 22.88, SE = 3.63$ ; no-group:  $M = 21.94, SE = 3.66$ ), suggesting that infants in both conditions tended to look equally when DifferentE drank from her cup. For the SimilarE event, which did

differ between conditions (SimilarE drank from her cup in the two-group condition, but cleaned messy lines on her cup in the no-group condition), the main effect of condition was again not significant,  $F(1, 30) = 1.037, p = .317, \eta_p^2 = 0.033, 90\% \text{ CI}[0.000, 0.182]$  (two-group:  $M = 15.80, SE = 2.24$ ; no-group:  $M = 20.21, SE = 3.71$ ), suggesting that infants responded similarly whether SimilarE drank from her cup or cleaned it. These results provide evidence that infants in the no-group condition did not perceive the familiarization events as more novel or unusual than did infants in the two-group condition.