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**‎Research question(s) and/or theory.**

We aim to replicate and extend Rozin et al. (1997) and will test their theory and hypotheses. Rozin et al. (1997) sought to examine the differences between moral-origin vegetarians (vegetarians who reported moral and/or ecological reasons as one of the first reasons for avoiding meat) and health-origin vegetarians (vegetarians who reported health reasons as one of the first reasons for avoiding meat) on a number of attitudes and emotional reactions towards meat. We chose to replicate Rozin et al. (1997) because it is a seminal study that sparked a long line of theoretical and empirical research on moralization in the domain of vegetarianism and beyond.

Research questions: (1) Is there a greater accretion of motives with time, and a greater range of animal foods rejected, for moral as opposed to health vegetarians? (2) Is there a tendency for disgust toward meat to be associated with moral as opposed to health motivations to vegetarianism? (3) Is the increased dislike of meat (negative reactions to the taste, smell, texture, or appearance) more likely to occur in moral than in health vegetarians?

**Hypotheses.**

Our replication focused on testing the five hypotheses of Rozin et al. (1997): 1) Moral-origin vegetarians have more current reasons for being a vegetarian than health-origin vegetarians, 2) Moral-origin vegetarians have more current reasons for being a vegetarian that are neither moral nor health reasons than health-origin vegetarians, 3) Disgust toward meat is more associated with moral vegetarianism than health vegetarianism, 4) Moral vegetarians have more emotional reactions to the eating of meat than health vegetarians, 5) Personality-related reasons for vegetarianism is more associated with moral vegetarianism than health vegetarianism. In addition to these five replication hypotheses, we also plan to test the hypothesis that moral- and health- origin vegetarians differ in hedonic responses to meat and that these differences are too small to have been detected by the original study – to empirically assess the veracity of the original authors ‘claim that there are no differences.

Our extension hypotheses: 1) moral-origin vegetarians reject the consumption of a wider range of animal meats and animal products/by-products than health-origin vegetarians, 2) moral-origin vegetarians are more strongly opposed to the use of animals for scientific testing, like a wider range of animals, and reject a wider range of products that directly or indirect involve the use of animals than health-origin vegetarians.

**Study design and methods.**

We conducted a safeguard power analysis (lower bound of 60% confidence intervals) and aim to target to recruit 830 American participants from Prolific. Correlational design with scales and measures and no manipulation, contrasting types of vegetarians. We followed the target article’s design and reconstructed the questions used in the original study using information provided in the target article - animal meat/product consumption and liking of animals. We added extension measures - opposition to the use of animals for scientific testing and rejection of products that directly/indirectly involve the use of animals.

**Key analyses that will test the hypotheses and/or answer the research question(s).**

We mirror the target article’s data analysis by conducting t-tests supplemented with equivalence tests (TOST) for null hypotheses.

**‎****Conclusions that will be drawn given different results.**

We will evaluate the replicability of our findings against the target article’s findings using the Lebel et al. (2019) paradigm (examining signal and consistency with the target article’s effect size). The replication of the article as a whole will be considered a successful replication if atleast 4 or 5 out of the 5 predictions were supported, a mixed replication if 2 or 3 out of the 5 predictions were supported, and a failed replication if none or 1 out of the five predictions were supported.
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