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 predict that emphasizing the socioeconomic disadvantage of the beneficiaries of a charity project increases the likelihood that people will choose to donate to that project despite the relative cost-ineffectiveness of such donation. We also predict that this effect will be explained by the extent that donating to such projects are perceived to reduce the inequality in third world countries.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
Our key dependent variable is the proportion of people who choose the charity project that is less effective (i.e., fewer peoples saved per $), which is Sangala. Importantly, we will also measure our mediator, perceived fairness, by using 3 items (i.e., ‘Donating to which campaign, if any, would most reduce inequality?’, ‘Donating to which campaign, if any, would make the third world a more equal place?’, ‘Donating to which campaign, if any, would make the third world a fairer place?’) that we plan to average.

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
The study will use a two-cell between-subjects design in which we will manipulate the information given about the two projects participants have to select from. Participants will be informed about a charity (Help2) which helps developing countries in Africa. They will then proceed to read the information about Help2's two (hypothetical) donation projects for two countries: Sangala and Naruba. In both conditions, the descriptions will include project’s effectiveness: According to this information, Sangala project saves fewer (i.e., 2-4) people per 10 dollars than Naruba project (i.e., 4-6).

Participants in the control condition will be told that both countries are among the countries with the lowest Human Development Index. Participants in our experimental condition will instead be given information about both countries' socio-economic situation. According to this information, Sangala is more disadvantaged (e.g., lower GDP per capita, lower literacy rate) than Naruba. After reading the description of these two projects, participants will be asked to make a choice about which project to donate to.

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
Our key analysis will consist of a Chi-Square test on participants' binary choices. Additionally, we will also run a mediation analysis by using 10000 bootstrapped samples and test whether the effect of relative disadvantagedness of beneficiaries on people’s choices is mediated by the extent that donating to such projects are perceived to reduce the inequality in third world countries.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
No outlier analysis, and no exclusions.

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.
We will target 300 Prolific users (actual number may differ if more people sign up in this online study).

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
-