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1) Have any data been collected for this study already?
No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?
We are interested in understanding whether social status determines people's preferences for human or AI decision makers. We hypothesize that participants who have been primed with high status (vs. low status) will indicate greater preferences for human (vs. AI) decision makers. In other words, we predict that participants' higher social status will be related to greater preferences for human (vs. AI) decision-makers.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
The dependent variable is a dichotomous choice in which participants have to decide whether they prefer a human or AI decider. The question is worded "Please state who you would prefer to interview you..." and the answer allows participants to choose either a human (1) or an AI decider (2).

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
We will ask participants to evaluate a hiring scenario. Participants will be randomly assigned to one of two conditions i.e. high status (condition 1) or low status (condition 2). The status manipulation was adapted from Brown, Anicich and Galinsky (2020).

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
We analyse this between subject study with a chi-square difference test.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
We will exclude participants who fail the attention check question: "This question asks you to select strongly agree".

7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.
Assuming a medium effect size (cohen's d = .5) and a statistical power level of .85, power analysis suggest that we need a minimum of 142 participants to obtain a power of .95 for a two-tailed hypothesis test. To allow for participants failing the attention check, we will aim for 160 participants per condition.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
We will include control variables for gender, age, ethnic background, and work experience.

We will also ask participants to rate the importance of procedural justice variables, including impartiality and process control. If t-tests show differences in the importance of these variables between the condition, we propose to conduct a mediation analysis in which the influence of social status (IV) predicts people's choice of decider (DV), which is (partially) mediated by differences in importance of impartiality (mediator 1) and process control (mediator 2).