

REPLY TO DE DREU:

Shared partner nationality promotes ingroup favoritism in cooperation

Angelo Romano^{a,b,c,1}, Daniel Balliet^c, Toshio Yamagishi^d, and James H. Liu^e

In Romano et al. (1), we report an experimental study conducted across 17 societies that found that individuals gave more in the trust game to ingroup members (partner from own nationality), compared with outgroup members (partner from one of the other 16 nationalities) and strangers (partner with unknown nationality). This contrast can be used to infer ingroup favoritism and to test theories about this phenomenon. We also found that people extended greater cooperation to outgroup members than to strangers. De Dreu (2) interprets these analyses to mean that people extended equally greater cooperation with ingroup and outgroup members, compared with strangers, and then offers an alternative explanation of our findings that predicts “similar levels of trust towards ingroup and outgroup.” Romano et al. (1) do not report a statistical test comparing ingroup and outgroup members. Thus, we newly conducted a meta-analysis of our data across the 17 countries to estimate the overall mean difference in cooperation in the trust game with ingroup vs. outgroup members. Results were clear: people gave more in the trust game to ingroup compared with outgroup members [$d = 0.14$, 95% CI (0.11, 0.17)]. This finding fits within the confidence interval and prediction interval of a recent meta-analysis on ingroup favoritism in cooperation (3). Moreover, we found similar results to previous research on ingroup favoritism that has used partner nationality as a manipulation of group membership (4–8). Thus, our data replicate previous findings on ingroup favoritism in cooperation

using the trust game. Furthermore, these analyses clearly show that the pattern of means does not support the alternative perspective offered by De Dreu (2): individuation and social judgeability (9).

De Dreu’s (2) letter draws our attention to the finding that people extended greater trust to outgroup members than strangers [$d = 0.10$, 95% CI (0.07, 0.13)]. Comparing this effect size to the results of a previous meta-analysis (3), our study falls within the prediction interval of the outgroup vs. stranger comparison. The prediction interval estimates the range of values that can be true effect sizes for the observed phenomenon, and can be used to predict the true value of effect sizes in future studies (10). Thus, the outgroup vs. stranger comparison in our study falls within the range of values that would be expected based on past research.

In the outgroup condition in our study, participants’ partners were selected from one of 16 outgroups (nationalities) to control for national stereotypes (4). Perhaps, De Dreu’s (2) individuation and social judgeability perspective (9) may partially explain how people responded to a partner with multiple nationalities, but cannot account for responses to partner ingroup nationality. Future research can test theories about the conditions that result in outgroup favoritism (i.e., ingroup > outgroup > stranger). That said, we clearly observe that cues of ingroup membership (e.g., the flag of one’s nationality) increase cooperation, relative to outgroup members.

- 1 Romano A, Balliet D, Yamagishi T, Liu JH (2017) Parochial trust and cooperation across 17 societies. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 114:12702–12707.
- 2 De Dreu CKW (2017) Giving decision-makers nondiagnostic person information promotes trust within and across nations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 10.1073/pnas.1720040115.
- 3 Balliet D, Wu J, De Dreu CK (2014) Ingroup favoritism in cooperation: A meta-analysis. *Psychol Bull* 140:1556–1581.
- 4 Dorrough AR, Glöckner A (2016) Multinational investigation of cross-societal cooperation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 113:10836–10841.
- 5 Stoddard O, Leibbrandt A (2014) An experimental study on the relevance and scope of nationality as a coordination device. *Econ Inq* 52:1392–1407.

^aMax Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods, D-53113 Bonn, Germany; ^bDepartment of Psychology, University of Turin, Turin 10124, Italy; ^cDepartment of Experimental and Applied Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam 1081BT, The Netherlands; ^dGraduate School of International Corporate Strategy, Hitotsubashi University, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-8439, Japan; and ^eSchool of Psychology, Massey University, Auckland 0745, New Zealand

Author contributions: A.R., D.B., T.Y., and J.H.L. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Published under the [PNAS license](#).

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: romano@coll.mpg.de.

- 6 Goerg SJ, Meise J, Walkowitz G, Winter E (2013) Experimental study of bilateral cooperation under a political conflict: The case of Israelis and Palestinians. Available at www.koeln.de/fileadmin/wiso_fak/cgs/pdf/working_paper/cgswp_04-01-rev.pdf. Accessed December 5, 2017.
- 7 Takahashi C, et al. (2008) The intercultural trust paradigm: Studying joint cultural interaction and social exchange in real time over the Internet. *Int J Intercult Relat* 32:215–228.
- 8 Winterich KP, Mittal V, Ross WT, Jr (2009) Donation behavior toward in-groups and out-groups: The role of gender and moral identity. *J Consum Res* 36:199–214.
- 9 Yzerbyt V, Schadron G, Leyens JP, Rocher S (1994) Social judgeability—The impact of meta-informational cues on the use of stereotypes. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 66:48–55.
- 10 IntHout J, Ioannidis JP, Rovers MM, Goeman JJ (2016) Plea for routinely presenting prediction intervals in meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 6:e010247.