**Experiment 1.**

**Method**

**Sample**

Data will be collected online via the Prolific Academic website. Based on an expected mean duration of 15 minutes, participants will be paid £1.25.

***Planned sample size & stopping rules***

Power analyses for interactions in mixed-effects models are difficult to determine, therefore no power analysis was conducted for our first analysis. For our second analysis, we used the pwr package in R to compute the number of subjects required to detect a medium f2 effect size (i.e., 0.15) in a regression analysis with a single IV, at the conventional alpha level (.05) and at 95% power. Given these criteria, 89 subjects would be required. We will collect data from 150 participants based on the availability of resources. Given the use of a fully within-subjects design and a high-powered analytic strategy (hierarchical modeling of trial-level data), this provides a reasonable expectation of sufficient power. 150 participants will be collected and exclusion criteria will be applied. Then participants will be added in batches of 10 until at there are at least 150 participants who meet both inclusion and exclusion criteria. Thereafter data collection will stop.

**Inclusion criteria*.*** Age 18-65, fluent English, Prolific rating >= 90%, no participation in similar studies by our research group.

**Exclusion criteria.**Completion time on Prolific < 3 minutes, and partial data on the demographics questionnaire or AMP.

**Design**

One within-subjects factor with two levels is manipulated by the experimental design: the valence of the prime stimulus (positive vs negative primes) that precedes the presentation of a target stimulus (Chinese character) within the AMP.

**IVs.**

1. Valence of the prime stimuli used in the AMP (positive vs. negative).

2. Subjective ratings for each trial of whether evaluation of the target stimulus was influenced by the prime stimulus or not. A Go/No-Go response format is employed: press spacebar if influenced, do not press if not influenced.

**DV.** Evaluations within the AMP as pleasant or unpleasant.

**Variables used for methodological counterbalancing (not analyzed).** None.

**Exploratory measures*.*** We will ask several exploratory questions after the AMP:

1. Influence awareness:

“Think back to the task you just completed. On how many trials was a valenced picture presented before the Chinese character? It is important that you are honest here.”

[1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = less than half, 4 = About half, 5= More than half, 6 = Most, 7 = All]

1. General influence:

“To what extent were your ratings of the Chinese symbols influenced by the pictures that appeared immediately before those symbols?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Intentional influence:

“How often did you *intentionally* base your rating of the Chinese symbol on the image that immediately appeared before it?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Unintentional influence:

“How often do you think that your rating of the Chinese symbol was *unintentionally* influenced by the pictures that appeared immediately before those symbols?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Self-exclusion:

“In your honest opinion, do you think should we use your data in our analysis?

There are many reasons why you might feel that we should exclude your data, such as a computer malfunction or a distraction at an important moment during the study.

Note, however, that being influenced by the pictures that came before the Chinese characters is NOT a reason to self-exclude from the study.

Your responses on this question will NOT affect your payment. However, if you choose 'No, exclude my data', please fill in the accompanying text box to let us know why.”

Questions 3 and 4 will be presented in a counterbalanced order.

**Procedure**

Participants will complete the demographics questionnaire, the modified AMP, and then the exploratory measures.

**Measures**

A modified version of the Affect Misattribution Procedure (AMP; Payne et al., 2005) with the following parameters: 10 practice trials, 120 main trials, 12 positive and 12 negative valence images, and 120 of 200 possible Chinese characters. At the end of each trial participants are given the opportunity to press the spacebar to indicate they were influenced by the prime when responding on that trial. This is achieved through the presentation of a cue to “press spacebar if you felt you were influenced by the picture” for a fixed 2000ms interval, presented after a 200 ms inter trial interval. The above sentence was removed from the screen following a response (although the response window was fixed regardless of whether a response was emitted or not).

**Hypotheses**

**M1 (manipulation check).** An AMP effect will be demonstrated. The target stimuli will be differentially evaluated based on the source stimuli that preceded them, such that targets preceded by negative primes will be rated more negatively than those preceded by positive primes.

**H1.** The influence of prime valence on the valence rating of the Chinese characters will be moderated by that subset of trials in which participants report being influenced by the prime stimulus.

**H2.** The magnitude of the AMP effect will be predicted by the proportion of influenced trials to non-influenced trials.

**H3.** We will investigate the extent to which online and offline measures of influence correlate.

**H4.** The magnitude of the AMP effect should be predicted by the online measure of influence more greatly than the offline measure of influence.

**Results**

**Analytic strategy**

**Manipulation & hypothesis tests.** Using the R package *lme4*, we will construct a frequentist logistic mixed-effects model. This will be used to assess the evidence for both the main effect for prime valence (M1) and the interaction between prime valence and influence ratings (H1). The model will include subject ID as a random intercept to acknowledge the non-independence of the multiple ratings provided by each participant. In-line with best practices for such analyses, we will use effect coding for the IVs, rescaling each to -.5 and .5. The Wilkinson notation for the model is as follows:

valence\_rating ~ prime\_valence \* reported\_influence + (1 | subject)

If no interaction effect is found, Bayesian analyses may be used may be used to quantify the evidence for the null hypothesis using the R package *brms*. This would likely employ default priors that are designed to be uninformative (i.e., Students t distribution [students\_t(3, 0, 10)] placed on all parameters).

We will also construct a standard regression model to assess whether a greater number of influenced trials predicts a greater AMP effect size (H2). For this, we will compute an AMP effect size for each subject by subtracting the number of ‘pleasant’ responses when the target was preceded by a positive prime from the number of ‘pleasant’ responses when the target was preceded by a negative prime. We will also compute the proportion of influenced trials to uninfluenced trials for each subject, and standarise and recentre this value. The Wilkinson notation for this model is:

AMP\_effect\_size ~ proportion\_influenced

We will conduct a standard correlation analysis between the online and offline measure of influence (i.e., Q2 from the exploratory measures section) in order to address H3. For H4, we will conduct a similar regression analysis to that of H2, this time using both online and offline measures of influence as IVs. These IVs will be standardized and recentred as appropriate. The Wilkinson notation for this model is:

AMP\_effect\_size ~ proportion\_influenced + general\_influence

**Potential exploratory tests*.*** We may conduct exploratory analyses relating to the exploratory measures outlined above, in addition to the use of question 2 (general influence) in our confirmatory analyses.

**Experiment 2.**

**Method**

**Sample**

Data will be collected online via the Prolific Academic website. Based on an expected mean duration of 20 minutes, participants will be paid £1.66.

***Planned sample size & stopping rules***

Power analyses for interactions in mixed-effects models are difficult to determine, therefore no power analysis was conducted for our first analysis. For our second analysis, we used the pwr package in R to compute the number of participants required to detect a medium f2 effect size (i.e., 0.15) in a regression analysis with a single IV, at the conventional alpha level (.05) and at 95% power. Given these criteria, 89 participants would be required. The aforementioned power analysis is also applicable for our third analysis. A power analysis with the aforementioned 89 participants at 95% power for a paired-sample t-test (i.e., for analysis 4) determined that this would be sufficient to detect a Cohen’s d of .4 at these criteria. We will collect data from 150 participants based on the availability of resources.

Finally, the equivalence bounds for H4’s equivalence test based on what could be adequately powered based on this sample size using the TOSTER R package. 150 participants, a standard alpha level of 0.05, and a desired power level of 0.8, determined that we will set equivalence bounds of Cohen’s dz = +/- .25.

**Inclusion criteria*.*** Age 18-65, fluent English, Prolific rating >= 90%, no participation in similar studies by our research group.

**Exclusion criteria.**Completion time on Prolific < 3 minutes, and partial data on the demographics questionnaire or either AMP.

**Design**

Two within-participants factors, each with two levels, are manipulated by the experimental design: the type of AMP completed (standard AMP vs. the modified intentional-assessment (IA)-AMP), and the valence of the prime stimulus (positive vs negative primes) that precedes the presentation of a target stimulus (Chinese character) within each AMP.

**IVs.**

1. Valence of the prime stimuli used in the AMP (positive vs. negative).
2. The type of AMP (standard vs. intention-assessment).

3. In the IA-AMP, subjective ratings for each trial of whether evaluation of the target stimulus was influenced by the prime stimulus or not. A Go/No-Go response format is employed: press spacebar if influenced, do not press if not influenced.

**DV.** Evaluations within the AMP as pleasant or unpleasant.

**Variables used for methodological counterbalancing (not analyzed).** Questions 3 and 4 in the self-report measures will be presented in a counterbalanced order.

**Self-report measures*.*** We will ask several exploratory questions after the IA-AMP, and specify that participants should answer them in relation to the IA-AMP only:

1. Influence awareness:

“Think back to the task you just completed. On how many trials was a valenced picture presented before the Chinese character? It is important that you are honest here.”

[1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = less than half, 4 = About half, 5= More than half, 6 = Most, 7 = All]

1. General influence:

“To what extent were your ratings of the Chinese symbols influenced by the pictures that appeared immediately before those symbols?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Intentional influence:

“How often did you *intentionally* base your rating of the Chinese symbol on the image that immediately appeared before it?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Unintentional influence:

“How often do you think that your rating of the Chinese symbol was *unintentionally* influenced by the pictures that appeared immediately before those symbols?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Self-exclusion:

“In your honest opinion, do you think should we use your data in our analysis?

There are many reasons why you might feel that we should exclude your data, such as a computer malfunction or a distraction at an important moment during the experiment.

Note, however, that being influenced by the pictures that came before the Chinese characters is NOT a reason to self-exclude from the study.

Your responses on this question will NOT affect your payment. However, if you choose 'No, exclude my data', please fill in the accompanying text box to let us know why.”

**Procedure**

Participants will complete the demographics questionnaire, the standard AMP, the IA-AMP, and then the self-report measures.

**Measures**

A standard Affect Misattribution Procedure (AMP; Payne et al., 2005) with the following parameters: 10 practice trials, 72 main trials, 12 positive and 12 negative valence images, and 72 Chinese characters. As well as this, a modified version of the Affect Misattribution Procedure (from experiment 1 of the current project; see <https://osf.io/uqs2d/>) with the same parameters, and the following addition: at the end of each trial participants are given the opportunity to press the spacebar to indicate they were influenced by the prime when responding on that trial. This is achieved through the presentation of a cue to “press spacebar if you felt you were influenced by the picture” for a fixed 2000ms interval, presented after a 200 ms inter trial interval. The above sentence was removed from the screen following a response (although the response window was fixed regardless of whether a response was emitted or not).

**Hypotheses**

**M1 (manipulation check).** An AMP effect will be demonstrated for both the standard AMP and the IA-AMP. The target stimuli will be differentially evaluated based on the source stimuli that preceded them, such that targets preceded by negative primes will be rated more negatively than those preceded by positive primes.

**H1.** For the IA-AMP, the influence of prime valence on the valence rating of the Chinese characters will be moderated by that subset of trials in which participants report being influenced by the prime stimulus.

**H2.** For the IA-AMP, the magnitude of the AMP effect will be predicted by the proportion of influenced trials to non-influenced trials.

**H3.** The rate of online influence in the IA-AMP will predict the magnitude of AMP effect in the standard AMP.

**H4.** The AMP effect produced in the subset of uninfluenced trials in the IA-AMP will be smaller than the AMP effect produced in the standard AMP. Should no evidence for differences be found, an equivalence test will be used to assess for practical equality.

**Results**

**Analytic strategy**

**Manipulation & hypothesis tests.** Using the R package *lme4*, we will construct two frequentist logistic mixed-effects model to assess the evidence for the main effect of prime valence in both the standard-AMP and the IA-AMP (M1). The model will include participant ID as a random intercept to acknowledge the non-independence of the multiple ratings provided by each participant. The Wilkinson notation for both models will be:

valence\_rating ~ prime\_valence + (1 | participant)

We will also construct a frequentist logistic mixed-effects model to quantify the interaction between prime valence and influence ratings in the IA-AMP (H1). The model will also include participant ID as a random intercept. In-line with best practices for such analyses, we will use effect coding for the IVs, rescaling each to -.5 and .5. The Wilkinson notation for the model is as follows:

valence\_rating ~ prime\_valence \* reported\_influence + (1 | participant)

If no interaction effect is found, Bayesian analyses may be used may be used to quantify the evidence for the null hypothesis using the R package *brms*. This would likely employ default priors that are designed to be uninformative (i.e., Students t distribution [students\_t(3, 0, 10)] placed on all parameters).

We will also construct a standard regression model to assess whether a greater number of influenced trials predicts a greater AMP effect size in the IA-AMP (H2). For this, we will compute an AMP effect size for each participant by subtracting the number of ‘pleasant’ responses when the target was preceded by a positive prime from the number of ‘pleasant’ responses when the target was preceded by a negative prime. We will also compute the proportion of influenced trials to uninfluenced trials for each participant, and standardise and recentre this value. The Wilkinson notation for this model is:

AMP\_effect\_size ~ proportion\_influenced

In order to assess H3, we will construct a similar regression model to that of H2, with the exception being that AMP\_effect\_size will now refer to the AMP effect from the standard AMP (i.e., proportion of trials rated as positive that include the positive prime minus that which included the negative prime)..

For H4, we will compute an ‘unintentional’ AMP effect size for the IA-AMP, such that only those trials which were not responded to as intentional are included. We will then conduct a paired-samples t-test between this unintentional AMP effect size and the standard AMP effect size. If this result is not significant, then we will use an equivalence test with equivalence bounds of Cohen’s dz +/- .25 to assess evidence for the null hypothesis (i.e., that the two effect sizes are statistically-equivalent).

**Experiment 3.**

**Method**

**Sample**

Data will be collected online via the Prolific Academic website. Based on an expected mean duration of 20 minutes, participants will be paid £1.66.

**Planned sample size & stopping rules.** Power analyses for interactions in mixed-effects models are difficult to determine, therefore no power analysis was conducted for our first analysis. For our second analysis, we used the pwr package in R to compute the number of participants required to detect a medium f2 effect size (i.e., 0.15) in a regression analysis with a single IV, at the conventional alpha level (.05) and at 95% power. Given these criteria, 89 participants would be required. The aforementioned power analysis is also applicable for our third analysis. We will collect data from 150 participants based on the availability of resources.

**Inclusion criteria*.*** Age 18-65, fluent English, US citizen, self-reported Democratic Party supporter on the Prolific site, Prolific rating >= 90%, no participation in similar studies by our research group.

**Exclusion criteria.**Completion time on Prolific < 3 minutes, partial data on the demographics questionnaire or either AMP, identifying as either Republican or Moderate on the political alignment self-report measure.

**Design**

All manipulated factors in the design are within-subjects. The first factor is that of AMP type, and has two levels: either the standard political AMP, or the modified positive/negative IA-AMP. For both AMPs, the prime-type is manipulated within the procedure, each with two levels. For the standard political AMP, the levels of prime type are images of Obama and images of Trump (taken from the Presidents-IAT materials from the Project Implicit Demos; see <https://osf.io/f38ag/>). For the IA-AMP, the levels of prime type are the generally positive and negative images used in the previous 2 experiments of this project.

**IVs.**

1. Identity of the prime stimuli used in the AMP (positive vs. negative in the IA-AMP; Obama vs. Trump in the standard AMP).
2. The type of AMP (standard vs. intention-assessment).

3. In the IA-AMP, subjective ratings for each trial of whether evaluation of the target stimulus was influenced by the prime stimulus or not. A Go/No-Go response format is employed: press spacebar if influenced, do not press if not influenced.

**DV.** Evaluations of Chinese characters within each AMP as pleasant or unpleasant.

**Variables used for methodological counterbalancing (not analyzed).** Questions 3 and 4 in the self-report measures will be presented in a counterbalanced order.

**Self-report measures*.*** We will ask several exploratory questions after the IA-AMP, and specify that participants should answer them in relation to the IA-AMP only:

1. Influence awareness:

“Think back to the task you just completed. On how many trials was a valenced picture presented before the Chinese character? It is important that you are honest here.”

[1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = less than half, 4 = About half, 5= More than half, 6 = Most, 7 = All]

1. General influence:

“To what extent were your ratings of the Chinese symbols influenced by the pictures that appeared immediately before those symbols?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Intentional influence:

“How often did you *intentionally* base your rating of the Chinese symbol on the image that immediately appeared before it?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Unintentional influence:

“How often do you think that your rating of the Chinese symbol was *unintentionally* influenced by the pictures that appeared immediately before those symbols?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Demand compliance:

“Think back to the task with the Chinese characters. During the task, we asked you after each trial to indicate whether your response to the Chinese character was influenced by the image that appeared before it. Please choose the following option that is the most true for you:”

[1 = My responses were based on what I thought the researcher wanted me to say, 2 = My responses were genuinely based on whether I was influenced or not, 3 = I’m not sure or don’t know why I responses the way I did]

1. Political alignment:

“In terms of the two major political parties in the US, do you consider yourself more Democratic or Republican?”

[1 = Very Republican, 2 = Somewhat Republican, 3 = A little Republican, 4 = Neither/Moderate, 5 = A little Democratic, 6 = Somewhat Democratic, 7 = Very Democratic]

1. Self-exclusion:

“In your honest opinion, do you think should we use your data in our analysis?

There are many reasons why you might feel that we should exclude your data, such as a computer malfunction or a distraction at an important moment during the experiment.

Note, however, that being influenced by the pictures that came before the Chinese characters is NOT a reason to self-exclude from the study.

Your responses on this question will NOT affect your payment. However, if you choose 'No, exclude my data', please fill in the accompanying text box to let us know why.”

**Procedure**

Participants will complete the demographics questionnaire, the standard AMP, the IA-AMP, and then the self-report measures.

**Measures**

A standard Affect Misattribution Procedure (AMP; Payne et al., 2005) with the following parameters: 10 practice trials, 72 main trials, 6 images of Obama and 6 images of Trump, and 72 Chinese characters. As well as this, a modified version of the Affect Misattribution Procedure (from Experiment 1 of the current project; see <https://osf.io/uqs2d/>) with the same parameters except with 12 positive images and 12 negative images, and the following addition: at the end of each trial participants are given the opportunity to press the spacebar to indicate they were influenced by the prime when responding on that trial. This is achieved through the presentation of a cue to “press spacebar if you felt you were influenced by the picture” for a fixed 2000ms interval, presented after a 200 ms inter trial interval. The above sentence was removed from the screen following a response (although the response window was fixed regardless of whether a response was emitted or not).

**Hypotheses**

**M1 (manipulation check).** An AMP effect will be demonstrated for both the standard AMP and the IA-AMP. The target stimuli will be differentially evaluated based on the source stimuli that preceded them, such that targets preceded by negative primes/Trump primes will be rated more negatively than those preceded by positive primes/Obama primes.

**H1.** For the IA-AMP, the influence of prime identity on the valence rating of the Chinese characters will be moderated by that subset of trials in which participants report being influenced by the prime stimulus.

**H2.** For the IA-AMP, the magnitude of the AMP effect will be predicted by the proportion of influenced trials to non-influenced trials.

**H3.** The rate of online influence in the IA-AMP will predict the magnitude of AMP effect in the standard AMP.

**Results**

**Analytic strategy**

**Manipulation & hypothesis tests.** Using the R package *lme4*, we will construct two frequentist logistic mixed-effects models to assess the evidence for the main effect of prime identity in both the standard-AMP and the IA-AMP (M1). The model will include participant ID as a random intercept to acknowledge the non-independence of the multiple ratings provided by each participant. The Wilkinson notation for both models will be:

valence\_rating ~ prime\_identity + (1 | participant)

We will also construct a frequentist logistic mixed-effects model to quantify the interaction between prime identity and influence ratings in the IA-AMP (H1). The model will also include participant ID as a random intercept. In-line with best practices for such analyses, we will use effect coding for the IVs, rescaling each to -.5 and .5. The Wilkinson notation for the model is as follows:

valence\_rating ~ prime\_identity \* reported\_influence + (1 | participant)

If no interaction effect is found, Bayesian analyses may be used may be used to quantify the evidence for the null hypothesis using the R package *brms*. This would likely employ default priors that are designed to be uninformative (i.e., Students t distribution [students\_t(3, 0, 10)] placed on all parameters).

We will also construct a standard regression model to assess whether a greater number of influenced trials predicts a greater AMP effect size in the IA-AMP (H2). For this, we will compute an AMP effect size for each participant by subtracting the number of ‘pleasant’ responses when the target was preceded by a positive prime from the number of ‘pleasant’ responses when the target was preceded by a negative prime. We will also compute the proportion of influenced trials to uninfluenced trials for each participant. The Wilkinson notation for this model is:

AMP\_effect\_size ~ proportion\_influenced

In order to assess H3, we will construct a similar regression model to that of H2, with the exception being that AMP\_effect\_size will now refer to the AMP effect from the standard AMP (i.e., proportion of trials rated as positive that include Obama as a prime minus that which included Trump as a prime).

**Experiment 4.**

**Method**

**Sample**

Data will be collected online via the Prolific Academic website. Based on an expected mean duration of 20 minutes, participants will be paid £1.66.

**Planned sample size & stopping rules.** Power analyses for interactions in mixed-effects models are difficult to determine, therefore no power analysis was conducted for our first analysis. For our second analysis, we used the pwr package in R to compute the number of participants required to detect a medium f2 effect size (i.e., 0.15) in a regression analysis with a single IV, at the conventional alpha level (.05) and at 95% power. Given these criteria, 89 participants would be required. The aforementioned power analysis is also applicable for our third analysis. With 89 participants, at a standard alpha level and a power of .9, we would be able to detect a correlation of *r* = .33. We will collect data from 200 participants (100 Democrats and 100 Republicans) based on the availability of resources. We consider this sample size sufficient to power our analyses for all 5 of our hypotheses.

**Inclusion criteria*.*** Age 18-65, fluent English, US citizen, self-reported Democratic Party or Republican Party supporter on the Prolific site, Prolific rating >= 90%, no participation in similar studies by our research group.

**Exclusion criteria.**Completion time on Prolific < 3 minutes, partial data on the demographics questionnaire or either AMP, identifying as neither Republican nor Democrat on the political alignment self-report measure.

**Design**

All manipulated factors in the design are within-subjects, with the exception of one between-subjects factor: political alignment (Democrat or Republican). Of the within-subjects factors, the first factor is that of AMP type, and has two levels: either politics IA-AMP, or the positive/negative IA-AMP. For both AMPs, the prime-type is manipulated within the procedure, each with two levels. For the political AMP, the levels of prime type are images of Obama and images of Trump (taken from the Presidents-IAT materials from the Project Implicit Demos; see <https://osf.io/f38ag/>). For the positive-negative AMP, the levels of prime type are the generally positive and negative images used in the previous 3 experiments of this project.

**IVs.**

1. Party alignment of the participant (Democrat or Republican).
2. Identity of the prime stimuli used in the AMP (positive vs. negative IA-AMP; Obama vs. Trump IA-AMP).

3. In each IA-AMP, subjective ratings for each trial of whether evaluation of the target stimulus was influenced by the prime stimulus or not. A Go/No-Go response format is employed: press spacebar if influenced, do not press if not influenced.

**DV.** Evaluations of target Chinese characters within each AMP as pleasant or unpleasant.

**Variables used for methodological counterbalancing (not analyzed).** Questions 3 and 4 in the self-report measures will be presented in a counterbalanced order.

**Self-report measures*.*** We will ask several exploratory questions after the IA-AMP, and specify that participants should answer them in relation to the IA-AMP only:

1. Influence awareness:

“Think back to the task you just completed. On how many trials was a valenced picture presented before the Chinese character? It is important that you are honest here.”

[1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = less than half, 4 = About half, 5= More than half, 6 = Most, 7 = All]

1. General influence:

“To what extent were your ratings of the Chinese symbols influenced by the pictures that appeared immediately before those symbols?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Intentional influence:

“How often did you *intentionally* base your rating of the Chinese symbol on the image that immediately appeared before it?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Unintentional influence:

“How often do you think that your rating of the Chinese symbol was *unintentionally* influenced by the pictures that appeared immediately before those symbols?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Demand compliance:

“Think back to the task with the Chinese characters. During the task, we asked you after each trial to indicate whether your response to the Chinese character was influenced by the image that appeared before it. Please choose the following option that is the most true for you:”

[1 = My responses were based on what I thought the researcher wanted me to say, 2 = My responses were genuinely based on whether I was influenced or not, 3 = I’m not sure or don’t know why I responses the way I did]

1. Political alignment:

“In terms of the two major political parties in the US, do you consider yourself more Democratic or Republican?”

[1 = Very Republican, 2 = Somewhat Republican, 3 = A little Republican, 4 = Neither/Moderate, 5 = A little Democratic, 6 = Somewhat Democratic, 7 = Very Democratic]

1. Self-exclusion:

“In your honest opinion, do you think should we use your data in our analysis?

There are many reasons why you might feel that we should exclude your data, such as a computer malfunction or a distraction at an important moment during the experiment.

Note, however, that being influenced by the pictures that came before the Chinese characters is NOT a reason to self-exclude from the study.

Your responses on this question will NOT affect your payment. However, if you choose 'No, exclude my data', please fill in the accompanying text box to let us know why.”

**Procedure**

Participants will complete the demographics questionnaire, both IA-AMPs, and then the self-report measures.

**Measures**

Two modified (from Experiment 1 of the current project; see <https://osf.io/uqs2d/>) Affect Misattribution Procedures (AMP; Payne et al., 2005). The first AMP has the following parameters: 10 practice trials, 72 main trials, 6 images of Obama and 6 images of Trump, and 72 Chinese characters. The second AMP has the same parameters except with 12 positive images and 12 negative images.

**Hypotheses**

**M1 (manipulation check).** An AMP effect will be demonstrated for both AMPs. The target stimuli will be differentially evaluated based on the source stimuli that preceded them, such that (i) in the positive-negative AMP for both groups, targets preceded by negative primes will be rated more negatively than those preceded by positive primes, (ii) in the politics AMP for Democratic supporters, targets preceded by Trump primes will be rated more negatively than those preceded by Obama primes, (iii) in the politics AMP for Republican supporters, targets preceded by Obama primes will be rated more negatively than those preceded by Trump primes.

**H1.** For both AMPs, the influence of prime identity on the valence rating of the Chinese characters will be moderated by that subset of trials in which participants report being influenced by the prime stimulus.

**H2.** For both AMPs, the magnitude of the AMP effect will be predicted by the proportion of influenced trials to non-influenced trials in that AMP.

**H3.** The magnitude of the AMP effect in one AMP will be predicted by the proportion of influenced trials to non-influenced trials in the other AMP.

**H4.** The influence rates of participants will correlate highly across the two AMPs.

**H5.** Differences in AMP effects between Democrats and Republicans will be greater when the AMP effect is calculated based only on influenced trials compared to when it is calculated based only on uninfluenced trials.

**Results**

**Analytic strategy**

**Manipulation & hypothesis tests.** Using the R package *lme4*, we will construct two frequentist logistic mixed-effects models to assess the evidence for the main effect of prime identity in both AMPs (M1). Both models will include participant ID as a random intercept to acknowledge the non-independence of the multiple ratings provided by each participant. The Wilkinson notation for the first model (i.e., for the positive-negative AMP) will be:

valence\_rating ~ prime\_identity + (1 | participant)

The second model (for the politics AMP) will also include participants’ political identity (Democrats or Republicans), given that we expect oppositional effects for Democrats and Republicans. Wilkinson notation for this model is:

valence\_rating ~ prime\_identity \* political\_affiliation + (1 | participant)

We will construct two frequentist logistic mixed-effects model to quantify the interaction between prime identity and influence ratings in each AMP (H1). The models will also include participant ID as a random intercept. In-line with best practices for such analyses, we will use effect coding for the IVs, rescaling each to -.5 and .5. The Wilkinson notation for the model for the positive-negative AMP is as follows:

valence\_rating ~ prime\_identity \* reported\_influence + (1 | participant)

The model for the politics AMP will also include political affiliation as a fixed effect. Wilkinson notation for the model for the political AMP is as follows:

valence\_rating ~ prime\_identity \* reported\_influence \* political\_afflication + (1 | participant)

If no interaction effect is found, Bayesian analyses may be used may be used to quantify the evidence for the null hypothesis using the R package *brms*. This would likely employ default priors that are designed to be uninformative (i.e., Students t distribution [students\_t(3, 0, 10)] placed on all parameters).

We will also construct two standard regression models to assess whether a greater proportion of influenced trials in each AMP predicts a larger effect size in that AMP, for both the positive-negative AMP and the politics AMP (H2). For both AMPs, we will compute an AMP effect size for each participant by subtracting the number of ‘pleasant’ responses when the target was preceded by a positive prime from the number of ‘pleasant’ responses when the target was preceded by a negative prime. For the politics AMP, given that we are not interested in directionality of the effect, and only the absolute magnitude, we will only consider the absolute magnitude of the effect in our analysis. We will also compute the proportion of influenced trials to uninfluenced trials for each participant on each AMP. The Wilkinson notation for this model is:

AMP\_effect\_size ~ proportion\_influenced

In order to assess H3, we will construct two regression models similar to those of H2, with one exception: while H2 assesses whether influence rates within one AMP (e.g., politics AMP) predict scores in that same AMP (i.e., in this example, the politics AMP), H3’s models will assess whether influence rates within one AMP (e.g., politics AMP) predict scores in the *other* AMP (i.e., in this example, the positive-negative AMP).

In order to assess H4, we will conduct a simple correlation analysis between the influence rate in the politics AMP, and the influence rate in the positive-negative AMP.

Finally, for H5, we will firstly compute two new scores for the politics AMP: the influenced AMP effect, and the uninfluenced AMP effect. These AMP effects are computed identically to the AMP effect detailed above, but with one exception: the influenced AMP effect is computed by only considering those trials where the participant reported having been influenced, while the uninfluenced AMP effect is computed by considering only those trials where the participant did not report having been influenced. We will then conduct two between-subjects t-tests between Democrats and Republicans: one with influenced AMP effect as DV, and one with uninfluenced AMP effect as DV. We will then compute the Cohen’s *d* effect sizes, and their 95% CIs, for both t-tests. We will then use the *d* from the uninfluenced AMP effect t-test as a zero point to compare with the influenced AMP effect t-test. Specifically, we expect that the lower-bound 95% CI for the *d* of the influenced AMP effect t-test will be greater than the *d* estimate of the uninfluenced AMP effect t-test.

**Experiment 5.**

**Method**

**Sample**

Data will be collected online via the Prolific Academic website. Based on an expected mean duration of 11 minutes, participants will be paid £0.95.

**Planned sample size & stopping rules.** Power analyses for interactions in mixed-effects models are relatively difficult to conduct due to the large number of parameters to be estimated, therefore no power analysis was conducted for analyses using mixed models. Due to the greater number of data points being employed (i.e., less information loss to the AMP scoring metric), the power of mixed models analyses will typically be better than those done on traditional fixed effects only models, for which power calculations are relatively easier. For our analysis in H1b, we determined on the basis of previous studies to power our analysis to detect a medium Pearson’s r effect size (i.e., 0.30). Using the pwr package in R, we computed the number of participants required to detect this medium effect size in a regression analysis with a single IV, at the conventional alpha level (.05) and at 95% power. Given these criteria, 138 participants would be required. For our H2 analysis, we expected (based on our previous studies) a slight reduction in the effect size relative to our second analysis. As such, we ran an identical power analysis to the former, but lowered the Pearson’s r to 0.20. For 95% power to detect this effect size, we would require 320 participants. These power criteria (i.e., 95% power to detect a Pearson’s r of 0.20) are also applicable to our analysis for H1b.

We opted to collect data from 320 participants. For our sampling strategy, we will firstly collect data from 320 participants. Then we will apply exclusion criteria, and will then sample in batches of 10 until a minimum of 320 eligible participants have been collected. Following this, data collection will be stopped.

**Inclusion criteria*.*** Age 18-65, fluent English , Prolific rating >= 90%, no participation in similar studies by our research group.

**Exclusion criteria.**Completion time on Prolific < 3 minutes, partial data on the demographics questionnaire or either AMP.

**Design**

Two within-participants factors, each with two levels, are manipulated by the experimental design: the type of AMP completed (modified standard AMP vs. the Modified IA-AMP), and the valence of the prime stimulus (positive vs negative primes) that precedes the presentation of a target stimulus (paintings) within each AMP.

**IVs.**

1. Valence of the prime stimuli used in the AMP (positive vs. negative).
2. The type of AMP (standard vs. influence-awareness).

3. In the Modified IA-AMP, subjective ratings for each trial of whether evaluation of the target stimulus was influenced by the prime stimulus or not. A Go/No-Go response format is employed: press spacebar if influenced, do not press if not influenced.

**DV.** Evaluations within the AMP as pleasant or unpleasant.

**Variables used for methodological counterbalancing (not analyzed).** Questions 3 and 4 in the self-report measures will be presented in a counterbalanced order.

**Self-report measures*.*** We will ask several exploratory questions after the Modified IA-AMP, and specify that participants should answer them in relation to the Modified IA-AMP only:

1. Influence awareness:

“Think back to the task you just completed. On how many trials was a valenced picture presented before the painting? It is important that you are honest here.”

[1 = None, 2 = A few, 3 = less than half, 4 = About half, 5= More than half, 6 = Most, 7 = All]

1. General influence:

“To what extent were your ratings of the paintings influenced by the pictures that appeared immediately before those paintings?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Intentional influence:

“How often did you *intentionally* base your rating of the painting on the image that immediately appeared before it?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Unintentional influence:

“How often do you think that your rating of the painting was *unintentionally* influenced by the pictures that appeared immediately before those symbols?”

[1 = Never, 2 = Very rarely, 3 = Somewhat rarely, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Somewhat often, 6 = Very often, 7 = Almost always]

1. Self-exclusion:

“In your honest opinion, do you think should we use your data in our analysis?

There are many reasons why you might feel that we should exclude your data, such as a computer malfunction or a distraction at an important moment during the experiment.

Note, however, that being influenced by the pictures that came before the paintings is NOT a reason to self-exclude from the study.

Your responses on this question will NOT affect your payment. However, if you choose 'No, exclude my data', please fill in the accompanying text box to let us know why.”

**Procedure**

Participants will complete the demographics questionnaire, a standard (Mann) AMP, the Modified IA-AMP, and then self-report measures.

**Measures**

A modified Affect Misattribution Procedure (from Mann et al., 2019, Experiment 6) with the following parameters: 10 practice trials, 60 main trials, 12 positive and 12 negative valence images, and 60 paintings. This modified AMP also includes an additional page of instructions relative to the standard AMP (see Mann et al., 2019, for specific text). As well as this, we use a modified Affect Misattribution Procedure which includes an option after each trial for the participant to indicate that their response was based on influence from the prime stimulus (from experiment 1 of the current project; see <https://osf.io/uqs2d/>). This modified IA-AMP has the same parameters as the modified AMP above, with the following addition: at the end of each trial participants are given the opportunity to press the spacebar to indicate they were influenced by the prime when responding on that trial. This is achieved through the presentation of a cue to “press spacebar if you felt you were influenced by the picture” for a fixed 2000ms interval, presented after a 200ms inter trial interval. That is, both the AMP and the IA-AMP were modified relative to Experiment 2 to include both of Mann et al.’s (2019, Experiment 6) modifications to the AMP.

**Hypotheses**

**M1 (manipulation check).** An AMP effect will be demonstrated for both the modified AMP and the modified IA-AMP. The target stimuli will be differentially evaluated based on the prime stimuli that preceded them, such that targets preceded by negative primes will be rated more negatively than those preceded by positive primes.

**H1a.** For the modified IA-AMP, the influence of prime valence on the valence rating of the targets will be moderated by influence awareness (whether between trials [H1a] or between participants using proportion of influenced trials [H1b]).

**H1b.** For the modified IA-AMP, the magnitude of the AMP effect will be predicted by the proportion of influenced trials.

**H2.** The rate of online influence in the modified IA-AMP will predict the magnitude of AMP effect in the modified AMP.

**Results**

**Analytic strategy**

**Manipulation & hypothesis tests.** Using the R package *lme4*, we will construct two frequentist logistic mixed-effects model to assess the evidence for the main effect of prime valence in both the AMP (M1) and the IA-AMP (M2). The model will include participant ID as a random intercept to acknowledge the non-independence of the multiple ratings provided by each participant. The Wilkinson notation for both models will be:

valence\_rating ~ prime\_valence + (1 | participant)

We will also construct a frequentist logistic mixed-effects model to quantify the interaction between prime valence and influence awareness ratings in the IA-AMP (H1a). The model will also include participant ID as a random intercept. In-line with best practices for such analyses, we will use effect coding for the IVs (i.e., coding as -.5 and .5). The Wilkinson notation for the model is as follows:

rating ~ influenced \* prime\_type + (1 | subject)

If no interaction effect is found, Bayesian analyses may be used may be used to quantify the evidence for the null hypothesis using the R package *brms*. This would likely employ default priors that are designed to be uninformative (i.e., Students t distribution [students\_t(3, 0, 10)] placed on all parameters).

We will also construct a standard regression model to assess whether a greater number of influenced awareness trials predicts a greater AMP effect size in the IA-AMP (H1b). For this, we will compute an AMP effect size for each participant by subtracting the number of ‘pleasant’ responses when the target was preceded by a positive prime from the number of ‘pleasant’ responses when the target was preceded by a negative prime. We will also compute the proportion of influence awareness trials to non-influence aware trials for each participant, and standardize and recentre this value. The Wilkinson notation for this model is:

IA\_AMP\_effect\_positive\_negative ~ influence\_rate

In order to assess H2, we will construct a similar regression model to that of H1b, with the exception being that AMP\_effect\_size will now refer to the AMP effect from the first completed AMP (i.e., proportion of trials rated as positive that include the positive prime minus that which included the negative prime).

AMP\_effect\_positive\_negative ~ influence\_rate