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 aim to test the extent to which the advantage of having an honest (vs. proficient or friendly) negotiator reputation – namely, being less likely to be deceived - is moderated when actual behavior is dishonest. In other words, we hypothesize a 2-way interaction effect between counterpart’s reputation (honest vs. friendly vs. proficient) and counterpart’s actual behavior (dishonest vs. control) on negotiator’s deceptive behavior towards such counterparts. We specifically aim to test whether counterparts with honest reputations will be deceived less than counterparts with other (i.e., proficient and friendly) reputations, only when their behavior does not reflect dishonesty – that is, does not disconfirm honesty expectations. We will also examine whether individual differences in participants’ a-priori tendencies to deceive in negotiations play a role and perhaps moderate the above predicted effects.

Lastly, with respect to anticipated feelings following deception, we expect an interaction effect between counterparts’ reputation (honest vs. proficient and friendly) and counterparts’ behavior condition (dishonest vs. control). Specifically, we predict that participants will anticipate stronger guilt and related negative emotions when assuming deceiving counterparts in the control behavior condition (when counterparts did not behave dishonestly) than in the counterpart dishonest behavior condition, and this difference is predicted to be larger towards counterparts with honest (vs. friendly and proficient) reputations. We also expect stronger positive feelings when deceiving counterparts who behaved dishonestly compared to when deceiving counterparts who behaved honestly. Again, we will also examine whether the above interactions are moderated by individual differences in participants’ a-priori tendencies to deceive in negotiations.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
Actual deception during negotiation – concealing vs. disclosing important information. This will be coded by two RAs blind to the experimental conditions. Based on a previous study we conducted in Hebrew, we will instruct coders to assign responses among 6 categories, ranging from complete truth telling (that is disclosing all relevant information) to complete lying. The exact final number of categories will be determined by initially assessing a subset of 60 responses (10% of the sample). Depending on coders’ ability to discriminate among these five categories, and inter-rater reliability, we may reduce the number of categories and might decide to use a dichotomous measure, coding responses as 0=revealing a problem and 1=concealing the problem. After deciding on the final coding scheme, the full sample will be coded accordingly.
We will also measure anticipated emotions following engaging in deception– specifically, after the negotiation task, participants will indicate the extent to which they thought that hiding things from their counterpart would make them feel negative emotions related to guilt (guilty, bothered, uncomfortable) and positive emotions related to pride (good, proud, satisfied).

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
We will use a 3 (reputation: friendly, honest, proficient) by 2 (actual behavior: dishonest, control) between-subjects design (thus we have 6 conditions)

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
We will conduct a series of 2-way analyses on deceptive behavior (coded) and emotions (positive and negative) followed by contrast analyses comparing between honest reputation vs. (friendly and proficient) reputations (and test for further possible moderation by participants’ a-priori tendencies to deceive in negotiations)

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
We include instructional manipulation checks (IMC, Oppenheimer, Meyvis, & Davidenko, 2009) to ensure that participants read our instructions and are thus exposed to our manipulations. We will exclude participants who fail these tests.
We will also exclude participants with studentized residuals greater than three.

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 recruit a total of at least 600 valid participants (100 participants per cell), and ideally target a total of 700 (on Mturk/Prolific platform)

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
No