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**Elaborated information on in-text analyses**

**RQ1**

***Model results***

The results of the full meta-analytic model for RQ1 can be found below in Table X.

***Plot data***

Table X provides the numerical information plotted in Figure X in the paper.

**Table X.** Data from Figure X in the manuscript.

| measure | estimate | ci\_lower | ci\_upper | pi\_lower | pi\_upper |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IAT | 0.67 | 0.59 | 0.75 | 0.55 | 0.79 |
| Brief IAT | 0.55 | 0.46 | 0.64 | 0.43 | 0.67 |
| SC-IAT | 0.37 | 0.29 | 0.45 | 0.25 | 0.49 |
| AMP | 0.18 | 0.11 | 0.25 | 0.07 | 0.30 |
| GNAT | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.22 |
| EPT | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.16 | -0.01 | 0.20 |

**RQ2**

***Model results***

The results of the full meta-analytic model for RQ1 can be found below in Table X.

***Plot data***

Table X provides the numerical information plotted in Figure X in the paper.

**Table X.** Data from Figure X in the manuscript.

| measure | estimate | ci\_lower | ci\_upper | pi\_lower | pi\_upper |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IAT | 0.52 | 0.42 | 0.61 | 0.39 | 0.64 |
| Brief IAT | 0.38 | 0.28 | 0.48 | 0.25 | 0.51 |
| SC-IAT | 0.33 | 0.23 | 0.43 | 0.20 | 0.46 |
| AMP | 0.21 | 0.11 | 0.31 | 0.08 | 0.34 |
| GNAT | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.17 | -0.04 | 0.20 |
| EPT | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.18 | -0.03 | 0.22 |

**RQ2**

***Model results***

The results of the full meta-analytic model for RQ1 can be found below in Table X.

***Plot data***

Table X provides the numerical information plotted in Figure X in the paper.

**Table X.** Data from Figure X in the manuscript.

| measure | estimate | ci\_lower | ci\_upper | pi\_lower | pi\_upper |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IAT | 0.21 | 0.18 | 0.24 | 0.12 | 0.30 |
| Brief IAT | 0.23 | 0.21 | 0.26 | 0.14 | 0.32 |
| SC-IAT | 0.23 | 0.20 | 0.25 | 0.14 | 0.32 |
| AMP | 0.24 | 0.20 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.33 |
| GNAT | 0.34 | 0.31 | 0.36 | 0.24 | 0.43 |
| EPT | 0.32 | 0.30 | 0.34 | 0.23 | 0.41 |

**Unreported logit-transformed linear mixed-model analyses**

As mentioned in the deviations from preregistration document, we had originally preregistered that we would model our data using logit-transformed linear mixed-effects models before realising that modelling the untransformed proportion data would be both more appropriate (based on simulations from Kubinec, 2023) and more interpretable. For transparency, we report the results from the originally preregistered analyses below.

**RQ1. Proportion of effects detectable from zero effect**

#### **Meta-analytic model**

In order to compare the proportion of detectable effects between measures, the data from individuals was logit transformed and meta-analyzed. For each measure and domain, we calculated the proportion of detectable effects and its variance. We then entered the proportions into a linear mixed-effects model using the R package lme4. The Wilkinson notation for the model was as follows:

proportion\_diff\_zero\_logit ~ 1 + measure + (1 | domain), weights = 1/variance

That is, we entered measure as a fixed effect in order to estimate the proportions for each measure and make inferences about differences between them (i.e., measures are an exhaustive set for our purposes). Domain was entered as a random intercept in order to acknowledge the non-independence of attitudes within each domain, and the fact that there are other domains to be generalized to in principle (i.e., domain is non-exhaustive, and attitude domain is the data generating signal). We weighted by inverse variance, as is common in meta-analytic models. A forest plot of the individual effect sizes for each domain and the meta-analyzed effect size for each measure can be found in Figure XX.
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**Figure X.** Plot of estimates from the logit-transformed linear mixed-effects model for RQ1.

**Table X.** Results from the logit-transformed linear mixed-effects model for RQ1.

| **measure** | **estimate** | **ci\_lower** | **ci\_upper** | **pi\_lower** | **pi\_upper** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IAT | 0.67 | 0.54 | 0.79 | 0.47 | 0.83 |
| Brief IAT | 0.55 | 0.40 | 0.70 | 0.34 | 0.75 |
| SC-IAT | 0.37 | 0.24 | 0.51 | 0.20 | 0.58 |
| AMP | 0.18 | 0.11 | 0.26 | 0.09 | 0.32 |
| GNAT | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.18 |
| EPT | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.18 |

Table X. Pairwise comparisons of the estimated marginal means from the logit-transformed linear mixed-effects model for RQ1.

| **comparison** | **p.value** |
| --- | --- |
| IAT - Brief IAT | 0.256 |
| IAT - (SC-IAT) | < .001 |
| IAT - AMP | < .001 |
| IAT - GNAT | < .001 |
| IAT - EPT | < .001 |
| Brief IAT - (SC-IAT) | 0.115 |
| Brief IAT - AMP | < .001 |
| Brief IAT - GNAT | < .001 |
| Brief IAT - EPT | < .001 |
| (SC-IAT) - AMP | 0.005 |
| (SC-IAT) - GNAT | < .001 |
| (SC-IAT) - EPT | < .001 |
| AMP - GNAT | 0.008 |
| AMP - EPT | 0.008 |
| GNAT - EPT | 0.917 |

**RQ2. Proportion of scores discriminable from other scores**

***Meta-analytic model***

The individual level proportions were entered into a similar logit-transformed linear mixed-effects model to the previous one:

proportion\_discriminable\_logit ~ 1 + measure + (1 | domain),

weights = 1/variance

A forest plot of the individual effect sizes for each domain and the meta-analyzed effect size for each measure can be found in Figure X. Data corresponding to the plot in Figure XX can be found in Table X. Table X contains the estimates for the pairwise comparisons of the estimated marginal means.

### **RQ3. Coverage of Individuals’ Confidence Intervals**

#### **Meta-analytic model**

The proportions were entered into a similar logit-transformed linear mixed-effects model to the previous two:

ci\_width\_proportion\_mean\_logit ~ 1 + measure + (1 | domain),

weights = 1/variance

A forest plot of the individual effect sizes for each domain and the meta-analyzed effect size for each measure can be found in Figure XX. Table X contains the data plotted in Figure X. Table X reports the pairwise comparisons of the estimated marginal means.