# Supplementary Materials

## Initial Replication Bayes Factor Analysis from Study 1

The initial calculation yielded BF10 (replication | original) = 1.39, failing to exceed 3 and providing inconclusive evidence for replication success, a notable departure from replication success observed with the other two criteria.

Upon inspection, the discrepancy between the EU-BF and the other measures of replication success appears to be due to a problem in how the initial EU-BF was computed. Note that (original + replication) combined the participants from the replication and original datasets, but when data were averaged for each item, the same number of pride-valuation item pairs (n = 25) were generated as (original). The replication Bayesian analysis assumes the replication contributes more data to the combined data set, but because the correlation was over items and not participants, the analysis was mostly insensitive to additional data. In the interest of full disclosure and as a cautionary note to others attempting similar analyses over items instead of participants, we have reported the EU-BF analysis above even though it is inappropriate. Because this initial replication Bayes Factor analysis was invalid, we took the two alternative approaches reported in the main text to calculate a valid Bayesian measure of replication success. These two alternatives were more valid than the initial attempt since they more appropriately take into account the additional data provided by the replication.

**Priming-Control Analyses for Study 1 – Pride**

To reanalyze the data from Study 1, we excluded participants who completed the Shame Study prior to the Pride Study.

### Is the correlation between pride and valuation significantly different from zero and in the same direction as in the original study?

Yes. For each scenario, we calculated the mean pride ratings provided by participants in the pride condition, and the mean valuation ratings provided by participants in the audience condition. The pride means and the valuation means were positively correlated, *r*(23) = 0.81, *p* < 0.001, 95% CI [0.60, 0.91].

**Is the effect size different from zero and not different from the original effect size?**

Using *r* as a measure of effect size, the 95% confidence interval from the replication study, 95% CI [0.60, 0.91], was not consistent with an effect size of zero. Second, the *r*from the replication study, *r*(23) = 0.81, fell within the 95% confidence interval from the original study, 95% CI [0.69, 0.93].

**Is the replication Bayes Factors greater than 3 and in favor of the alternative hypothesis relative to the null hypothesis?**

Yes.We used the two alternative Bayesian approaches from Study 1 since the initial approach was invalid. On the first alternative approach, we combined the 25 item pairs from the original and replication studies as if they were separate items to calculate (original + replication). Dividing this by BF10(original) yielded BF10(replication|original) = 7.26 x 104, exceeding a Bayes factor of 3. On the second alternative approach, we generated a posterior for  from the original study and used it as the prior for the replication study. The recalculated BF10 (replication|original) was 1.12 x 105, which exceeded a Bayes factor of 3. These results are consistent with the frequentist replication analyses, and together provide evidence for replication of the original results

**Priming-Control Analyses for Study 2 – Shame**

To reanalyze the data from Study 2, we excluded participants who completed the Pride Study prior to the Shame Study.

**Is the correlation between shame and devaluation significantly different from zero and in the same direction as in the original study?**

Yes. For each scenario, we calculated the mean shame ratings provided by participants in the shame condition, and the mean devaluation ratings provided by participants in the audience condition. The shame means and the devaluation means were positively correlated, *r*(27) = 0.72, *p* < 0.001, 95% CI [0.49, 0.86].

**Is the effect size different from zero and not different from the original effect size?**

Using *r* as a measure of effect size, the 95% confidence interval from the replication study, 95% CI [0.49, 0.86], was not consistent with an effect size of zero. Second, the *r*from the replication study, *r*(27) = 0.72, fell within the 95% confidence interval from the original study, 95% CI [0.48, 0.86].

**Is the replication Bayes Factors greater than 3 and in favor of the alternative hypothesis relative to the null hypothesis?**

Yes.We used the two alternative Bayesian approaches from Study 1 since the initial approach was invalid. On the first alternative approach, we combined the 29 item pairs from the original and replication studies as if they were separate items to calculate (original + replication). Dividing this by BF10(original) yielded BF10(replication|original) = 7.91 x 103, exceeding a Bayes factor of 3. On the second alternative approach, we generated a posterior for  from the original study and used it as the prior for the replication study. The recalculated BF10 (replication|original) was 1.57 x 104, which exceeded a Bayes factor of 3. These results are consistent with the frequentist replication analyses, and together provide evidence for replication of the original results.