**Background**

Outgroup: A social group with which an individual does not identify as being a member.

Ingroup: A social group with which a person does identify as being a member.

- Morality is highly valued (Haslam, 2015) and acts of immorality as an ingroup member are met with ingroup shame (Piff, Martinez & Keltner, 2012).
- Punishment for past transgressions is favoured over punishing for future prevention (Wenzel & Thielmann, 2006; Carlsmit et al, 2002; Darley & Pittman, 2003). However, previous research shows the relationship between the individual and the group.
- In the event of immoral behaviour and to maintain a positive group image, people judge likeable ingroup members more favourably and deviant ingroup members more harshly than comparable outgroup members (black sheep effect; Marques & Yzerbyt, 1988; Marques, Yzerbyt, & Leyens, 1988).
- Limitations of previous research and therefore rationale for this study: very little to none research examining what observers’ motives for punishing the ingroup vs. outgroup harm-doers are.

**Methods**

### Participants

- 189 Dutch participants living in the Netherlands; 93 female and 96 males.
- 2 excluded due to failure of manipulation checks (to increase validity & decrease falsification of results).
- Recruited in crowded locations (i.e., metro and train stations) from several cities in the Netherlands using a paper questionnaire.

### Experimental Design and Procedure

- Manipulated offenders' group membership in vignettes.
- Vignette: participants were asked to read a scene where a Dutch (ingroup) or a Moroccan (outgroup) employee working in a company stole a wallet left behind on a table after a meeting.

**Example of vignette used in study:**

---

**Results**

- Motive by group membership interaction was significant ($F(2,187) = 4.56, p < .05, \eta^2 = .05$).
- Stronger utilitarian motives for punishing an ingroup than an outgroup offender ($t_{188} = 2.70, p = .008$).
- However, stronger restorative motives for punishing the ingroup versus outgroup member ($t_{188} = -2.26, p = .025$).
- No effect of group membership on retributive motives ($3.2 < 1, ns$).

---

**Discussion**

- Findings confirm the hypothesis that observers assign more utilitarian and less restorative punishments to the ingroup than the outgroup offender.
- This research is useful for correcting bias in professional and legal environments.
- This study whilst supported by identity theory, simplified the identity context to nationality, which isn’t representative in a general context given the complexity of ones identities.
- We have focused on Study 1 from a collection of 3 studies. Study 1: demonstrated the main findings & effect. Others were mainly replicatory studies that looked at member typicality. All three studies supported a sub-hypothesis.
- Focused on intentions and attitudes, not behaviour.↑↑ the social desirability bias and ↓ the practical application for predicting punishment behaviour in groups.
- The motivations for punishment results may be effected by hidden influences i.e. cultural motives
- Suggestion or future research: explore and account for the sub-dimensions of utilitarian motives (private deterrence, public deterrence, and incapacitation).

**Critical Evaluation**

- Very new study (2019) and only cited by one other article.
- Upon first reading of the paper, the rationale seems rather weak meaning it’s hard to draw wider implications for the study.
- Methodology limited the potential to generalise findings to the wider population; a small sample comprised of one nationality might not be representative of group behaviours across different cultures and social contexts.
- The use of self-report instruments (motives for punishment scale) means that the nature of actual punishment behaviour may differ to participants’ reports, which may reduce validity.
- The study did not use Green’s self-geiser or Huynh-Feldt corrections regarding ANOVAs for sphericity
- We attempted to reproduce their results, but the data they provided was insufficient to do so (data but no code); producing same pattern involved reversing the effect.
- Results could have been communicated more effectively. We account for this by creating a graph to visually present the data.