(#129737)

Author(s)
This pre-registration is currently anonymous to enable blind peer-review.
It has one author.

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?
It's complicated. We have already collected some data but explain in Question 8 why readers may consider this a valid pre-registration nevertheless.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?
The new hypothesis for this study is whether the magnitude of the self-other dissimilarity pessimism gap predicts people's choice of conversation partner. Based on some other related work, we do not necessarily have a confident directional prediction, and we are simply curious about the result no matter the direction or significance.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
The key dependent variable is people's desire to choose a dissimilar conversation partner. Specifically, we told participants, "[n]ext, you will see a series of several different potential conversation partners [...]. Please indicate whether or not you want to talk to each one. This will determine which conversation partner you chat with next." We presented participants with the similar and the dissimilar conversation partner, in counterbalanced order. We then asked participants, "How much would you want to talk to [insert partner]?" (1: not very much, 7: very much).

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
4 within-subjects conditions: 2 (similarity: same/different personality type) x 2 (who: self/other)

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
In contrast to the prior study where participants made a binary choice about whether they wanted to talk to a dissimilar other, here we asked participants to make choices using Likert scales. This change is better suited to the methods required to test our final hypothesis regarding the relationship between dissimilarity pessimism and choice, namely whether the magnitude of the self-other dissimilarity pessimism gap (i.e., the difference between peoples own interest in talking to dissimilar others and their estimates of dissimilar others' interest in talking to them) also predicts homophilous choice.

Traditionally, this hypothesis would have been tested using a difference score approach. First, a self-other gap would be calculated for each participant, and then this difference score would be used to predict participants' choices. Despite its popularity, many researchers have suggested drawbacks to this approach (e.g., Edwards & Parry, 1993), the fatal flaw being that differences scores do not allow researchers to statistically separate the effect of a difference score from the main effects of the underlying variables that went into forming the difference score in the first place. For example, in the case of dissimilarity pessimism, a difference score approach would not disentangle the actual effect of the self-other dissimilarity pessimism gap from the main effects of people's own interest in talking to a dissimilar other and their estimates of dissimilar others' interest.

To overcome these limitations, one method that has been suggested is condition-based regression analysis (CRA) (Humberg et al., 2018 for more details). CRA is, in essence, just a multiple regression, but it is set up in a clever way to extract a set of parameters that allows a clear test of the effect of a difference score. In the literature, CRA has mainly been applied to questions of self-enhancement or self-effacement predicting an important outcome variable (e.g., is overestimating how intelligent you are good for your well-being?). In our case, the "self-enhancement" or "self-effacement" is the gap between participants' own interest in talking to a dissimilar other and participants' beliefs about how interested a dissimilar other is, while the outcome variable is participants' choice of whether to talk to a dissimilar conversation partner.

Additional analyses are the same as a previously pre-registered study (AsPredicted #79821).

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
All data will be included.

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.
750

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
This is a follow up study to another pre-registered study (AsPredicted #79821). The current study was requested during peer review. The data was collected during the semester, but I'm just now done with teaching and pre-registering the hypotheses. Most of the hypotheses are exactly the same hypotheses that have been replicated and pre-registered multiple times for this paper. The only new hypothesis for this study is whether the magnitude of dissimilarity pessimism predicts people's choice of conversation partner.