**Data Analysis Plan Experiment**

**Data-preparation:**

1.The data of participants who do not fully complete all questions and tasks will be excluded from analyses.

2. The data will be excluded of participants who had IAT error rates for any of the IATs above 30% across the entire task, or above 40% for any one of the four critical blocks or for participants who complete more than 10% of IAT trials faster than 400 ms.

3. The D4 algorithm will be used to create IAT scores (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003). These scores will be computed such that they indicate a more positive evaluation for the non-word (CS1/CS3) that was paired with positive words over the non-word (CS2/CS4) paired with negative words.

4. We will compute two explicit mean rating scores – one for CS1 and another for CS2. A differential explicit score will be computed reflecting explicit preference for CS1 over CS2.

Additionally, we will perform separate analyses on the data of participants with correct contingency memory (i.e., participants who answered all contingency questions correct). We will also examine whether results are different when excluding participants who were demand compliant (indicated this option in the question that probed demand compliance), hypothesis aware, or influence aware. We will indicate whether this changed results.

**Data-analyses:**

A one-way ANOVA will be performed on both the IAT and the explicit differential scores in order to test whether the differential score varies as a function of color matching. For both implicit and explicit attitude change, we will examine whether inclusion of the three method factors as covariate in the model improves model fit. We will conduct one-sample t-tests using each implicit and explicit differential score as criteria. For behavioral intentions, we will compare the proportion of choice CS1 vs. CS2 across the overall sample. Cohen’s d (for t-test) and partial eta-squared (for F-test) will be reported for all of the comparisons, along with their confidence intervals. We will also compute Bayesian factors in accordance with procedures outlined by Rouder, Speckman, Sun, Morey, and Iverson (2009) to estimate the amount of evidence for the hypothesis that there is a difference between implicit and explicit scores based on color matching (alternative hypothesis) or that there is no difference (null hypothesis).