**Unconscious information integration: A replication and the role of spatial window in
masking experiments**

Filip Van Opstal* & Molly Rooyakkers

Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

* Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Filip Van Opstal, Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Email: f.vanopstal@uva.nl

Keywords: Information integration, consciousness, masking, subliminal priming

Word Count (excluding title page, acknowledgments, footnotes, bibliography and figures):
3017

Abstract

Consciousness and high-level information integration have commonly been closely related to each other (Baars, 2002; Dehaene & Naccache, 2001; Tononi, 2004). Different results, however, have challenged this assumption by showing that information integration can occur for stimuli presented outside of conscious awareness. More recently, a re-examination of some of the data and different replication attempts questioned these results thereby again suggesting a close link between consciousness and information integration. The current study aimed at (i) replicating another piece of evidence for unconscious information integration and (ii) investigating if the size of the spatial window in which the information to be integrated is presented could explain why unconscious information integration sometimes fails. Results showed a reliable replication so providing further evidence for unconscious information integration in a subliminal priming paradigm. Furthermore, our results revealed that unconscious integration depends on the size of the spatial window in which the information is presented.

Prominent theories in the field of consciousness research have emphasized the relation between consciousness and the integration of information (see Mudrik, Faivre, & Koch, 2014). Especially high-level semantic integration has been held to be unique for conscious (as opposed to unconscious) processing (Dehaene & Naccache, 2001). High-level semantic integration has been operationalized in many ways but overall indicates the ability to generate a novel semantic representation by combining distinct semantic stimuli. For example, when presented with the three stimuli 5, $\times$, and 4, these can be integrated to form the novel representation 20. Other examples of high-level semantic integration are the combination of words into sentences (Schuberth & Eimas, 1977) or judging the semantic similarity of stimuli (Van Opstal & Verguts, 2011).

The relation between conscious processing and high-level semantic integration has been extensively tested during the last decade. Initially, this resulted in a significant number of studies showing that integration also occurs for unconsciously presented stimuli. For example, using a continuous flash suppression (CFS) paradigm, it was shown that participants can subtract three numbers or understand sentences without being aware of the presentation of the distinct stimuli (Sklar et al., 2012). Unconscious information integration was also observed with CFS when processing visual scenes. Participants were faster to become aware of visual scenes that included incongruent objects (Mudrik, Breska, Lamy, & Deouell, 2011). This result was also found in a masking experiment in which subliminally presented (in)congruent scenes primed the response to conscious (in)congruent scenes (Mudrik & Koch, 2013). Other evidence from subliminal masking experiments include unconscious addition (Ric & Muller, 2012; Van Opstal, de Lange, & Dehaene, 2011), and multiplication of Arabic digits (Garcia-Orza, Damas-Lopez, Matas, & Rodriguez, 2009), or integrating negations in word pairs (Armstrong & Dienes, 2013).

Recently, however, a critical re-analysis of the data supporting unconscious information integration put some of the reported effects into question. Moors and colleagues re-examined the data on unconscious subtraction in CFS using Bayesian statistics and found no support for the original claims (Moors & Hesselmann, 2018). Recent replication studies also casted doubt on the work investigating the role of awareness in object-scene integration. A direct replication of the finding that in CFS participants become faster aware of scenes with incongruent objects failed to find the same results as the original study (Moors, Boelens, van

Overwalle, & Wagemans, 2016). Also in subliminal masking, no compelling evidence was found in a replication study that investigated the unconscious processing of object-scene congruency (Biderman & Mudrik, 2018).

Although for CFS the current consensus seems to be directed towards no unconscious information integration, for subliminal masking the evidence is still mixed. One piece of evidence that still supports unconscious information integration is our work showing that the semantic similarity of subliminally presented stimuli can be processed (Van Opstal, Gevers, Osman, & Verguts, 2010; Van Opstal, Calderon, Gevers, & Verguts, 2011). In these studies, two prime letters were presented unconsciously followed by two target numbers. The task of the participants was to judge if the two target stimuli were the same or different. What we found in a series of experiments is that the same/different relation of the primes influenced the response to the targets: Reaction times (RTs) were smaller when the relation between the two prime letters was the same as the relation between the two targets (i.e., a congruency effect). Interestingly, this task could not be solved by low-level processing because the similarity of the primes was based on their meaning rather than on their visual appearance (i.e., the prime letters ‘a D’ are different because they are visually dissimilar but also because they denote a different letter. The prime letters ‘a A’ are visually equally dissimilar but denote the same letter; they are only the same on a higher-level, semantic dimension). Because other work on unconscious information integration failed to replicate, a first aim of the current study is to replicate our earlier findings and establish their reliability.

A second aim of the current study is to investigate why unconscious integration would work in our same-different task but not in other experimental tasks. According to one suggestion, the spatial window in which information can be integrated (i.e, the spatial integration window; SIW) is smaller for unconscious compared to conscious stimuli (Hirschhorn, Kahane, Gur-Arie, Faivre, & Mudrik, 2021; Mudrik et al., 2014). In our same-different task, the stimuli were presented at a close distance to each other, spanning a spatial window of 1.53°. In contrast, the study that used subliminal object-scenes used stimuli that were larger in size, subtending to 6.51° in width and 9.07° in height (Mudrik & Koch, 2013), or 7.27° in height and 5.20° in width (Biderman & Mudrik, 2018). According to the SIW hypothesis, the failure to integrate information for the object-scene stimuli could be caused by the size of the stimuli used in the experiment. To test this hypothesis, the stimuli to be integrated in the current experiment were presented in different SIWs: A small SIW of 1.53° (as in Van Opstal

et al., 2010), a large SIW of 6.51° (as in Mudrik & Koch, 2013), and a medium sized SIW of 4.02°.

In sum, the current study aims to replicate the results of Van Opstal et al. (2010) and investigate the effect of the SIW on unconscious information integration. It is expected that a congruency effect for masked primes will only be found in a small SIW. In contrast, when the primes are not masked, a congruency effect is expected independent of the size of the SIW.

Experiment

Methods

Participants.

The sample size was calculated based on an unpublished experiment ($n = 40$) identical to the one presented here with the only difference that the size of the stimuli were not scaled to the size of the spatial window in which they were presented¹. The effect size of the critical 3-way interaction of that experiment ($\eta_p^2 = .067$) was used to calculate the required sample size for the current experiment. The G*Power tool (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) was used to estimate the sample size to reach 98% power with $\alpha = .05$. We assumed only a small correlation among the repeated measures (0.1) rather than the default value (i.e., 0.5) to not overestimate the obtained power. This resulted in an sample size of 56 participants.

Anticipating the possibility of minor data loss, we decided to test 64 participants in total.

One participant failed to show up for the experiment and one participant experienced a technical problem. The remaining 62 participants (15 males, mean age 23.6 years) participated in this experiment for course credits or a small amount of money (8 Euros). Prior to the experiment all participants gave their informed consent and were debriefed afterwards. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences at the University of Amsterdam. All participants had normal or corrected-to-normal vision.

¹ The full experiment is reported in the Supplementary Materials

Apparatus and Stimuli.

Apparatus and stimuli were taken from Experiment 3 of Van Opstal et al. (2010). Stimuli were presented on a 60 Hz monitor. Stimulus presentation was synchronized with the vertical refresh rate (16.67 ms) and programmed in MATLAB 2017a (Mathworks Inc.) with a Psychtoolbox extension (Brainard, 1997; Pelli, 1997). Prime stimuli were upper and lower case letters. Two different sets of letters were used between participants (ADEG and LMQR). Primes consisted of one upper case and one lower case letter. The physical similarity between the letters was minimized using Boles and Clifford's similarity rating (Boles & Clifford, 1989). Targets were the numbers 1, 3, 5 and 7. The lay-out of a trial was similar to that of Experiment 3 in Van Opstal et al. (2011) with the only differences being that the SIW varied between blocks and that the primes were unmasked for half of the participants (see Figure 1). The SIW was identical for the prime and target and was equal to 1.53°, 4.02°, or 6.51°. The size of the stimuli was scaled with the size of the SIW according to Strasburger et al. (2011).

$$S = S_0 \left(1 + \frac{E}{E_2} \right)$$

With S being the stimulus size at eccentricity E, S_0 the threshold size in the center of the fovea (i.e., $E = 0$), and E_2 a constant (here $E_2 = 2.6$ according to Drasdo (1991)). The sizes of the stimuli are listed in Table 1.

Spatial Window	Width	Height
Small	0.34	0.51
Medium	0.54	0.79
Large	0.68	1.02

Table 1. The size of the stimuli was scaled with the size of the spatial window to compensate for peripheral vision. All sizes are in visual degrees.

To ensure that the SIWs would be stable and identical for all participants, they were asked to place their heads on a chin rest located 60 cm from the screen. The SIW varied between blocks in a random order. Each SIW block contained 160 trials. The main experiment thus consisted of 480 trials in total. Every 80 trials, participants were offered a short break and

presented with their mean RT and accuracy. The different set of letters (ADEG and LMQR), and the masking condition (hash masks or no masks; see Figure 1) were between-subjects variables and counterbalanced across participants.

Figure 1. Lay-out of a trial. Each trial started with the presentation of a cue for 300 ms. This was followed by the presentation of a pre-mask for 67 ms, the primes (33 ms), and a post-mask (67 ms). Then the targets appeared until a response was given. The masks were hash marks in the mask condition (shown on the left); nothing was presented in the no-mask condition (shown on the right). The spatial integration window in which the stimuli were presented (i.e., the SIW) varied between blocks and was equal to 1.53°, 4.02°, or 6.51°.

Procedure.

Participants were told that they were going to see a series of flashes ending with two simultaneously presented numbers. They were instructed to indicate on every trial if these numbers were the same or different by pressing the corresponding keys on the keyboard. Participants pressed the ‘d’ key to indicate a ‘same’ response, and ‘l’ to indicate a ‘different’ response. Prior to the experiment, participants performed five exercise trials in which feedback about their accuracy was given after every trial. After this short exercise block, the main experiment started.

After the main experiment, a prime visibility task was performed that was identical to the main experiment, but participants were now instructed to respond to the primes rather than

the targets. Participants were fully informed about the lay-out of a trial before the start of this part of the experiment.

Results.

All analyses were done with JASP 0.14.1 (JASP Team, 2020). A 2 (Mask: Masked or Unmasked) $\times$ 2 (Congruency: Congruent or Incongruent) $\times$ 3 (SIW: Small, Medium or Large) repeated measures (rm)ANOVA with Mask as a between-participants variable was performed on the median reaction times of the correct trials. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity. This showed a main effect of SIW, $F(1.83, 109.65) = 5.62, p = .006, \eta^2 = .011$, with RTs of 467, 479 and 472 ms for the small, medium and large SIW respectively. There was also a significant main effect of Congruency, $F(1, 60) = 40.96, p < .001, \eta^2 = .012$, with faster RTs to congruent (468 ms) compared to incongruent trials (478 ms), and a significant interaction between Mask and Congruency, $F(1, 60) = 11.62, p < .001, \eta^2 = .003$. Most importantly, the critical 3-way interaction between Mask, SIW and Congruency was also significant, $F(1.88, 112.60) = 4.20, p = .019, \eta^2 = .001$. To further analyze this 3-way interaction, a 2 (Congruency) $\times$ 3 (SIW) rmANOVA on the median RTs for the masked condition revealed main effects of SIW, $F(1.88, 56.27) = 3.90, p = .028, \eta^2 = .087$, and congruency, $F(1, 30) = 4.71, p = .038, \eta^2 = .015$. Crucially, also the interaction between the two factors was significant, $F(1.93, 57.84) = 6.75, p < .005, \eta^2 = .025$. Planned comparisons with Holm corrections revealed a significant difference between congruent and incongruent trials for the small SIW, $t(30) = 4.17, p_{holm} < .001$. No difference were observed for the medium and large SIWs (both t 's < 1). The same analysis for the unmasked condition only showed a significant effect of congruency, $F(1, 30) = 45.78, p < .001, \eta^2 = .149$, but no significant interaction was observed ($F < 1$). These results are summarized in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Median RTs on incongruent and congruent trials for the different SIWs used in the experiment for the (A) masked and (B) unmasked condition. Error bars denote the standard 95% confidence intervals.

The same analysis on the mean error rates was performed. The results were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity and revealed a significant main effect of Congruency, $F(1, 60) = 29.70, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = .026$, with a higher error rate on incongruent trials (6.44 %) compared to congruent trials (4.89 %). The interaction between SIW and Congruency was also significant, $F(1.97, 117.94) = 5.89, p = .004, \eta^2 = .009$. Post-hoc tests revealed that significantly more errors were made on incongruent trials compared to congruent trials when the SIW was small, $t(60) = 5.94, p_{holm} < .001$, but not when the SIW was medium or large.

Prime Visibility.

Because of technical error, the data of one participant from the unmasked condition was not recorded properly. The following analysis were thus performed on 61 participants only. Visibility of the primes was investigated by calculating a d' for the different widths for both masked and unmasked conditions. A 3 (SIW: Small, Medium or Large) $\times$ 2 (Mask: Masked or Unmasked) rmANOVA on the average d' with Mask as a between subjects factor was performed. Results only showed a main effect of Mask, $F(1, 59) = 17.82, p < .001, \eta^2 = .204$, with a higher d' for unmasked compared to masked trials. Given that testing visibility depends on testing the null, both student's and Bayesian one sample t -test were performed on

d' and are summarized in Table 2. While the Bayes Factors (BFs) for the d' s in the unmasked conditions provided very strong evidence in favor of a difference from 0, the BF for the small and medium SIW in the masked condition gave substantial evidence in favor of the null. For the large SIW in the masked condition, the BF gave no reliable evidence in favor or against 0.

	SIW	d'	% Correct (range)	Student's t	BF ₁₀
No Mask	Small	.36	59 (43-88)	$t(30) = 4.13, p < .001$	106.3
	Medium	.36	59 (44-84)	$t(30) = 4.56, p < .001$	310.4
	Large	.34	59 (46-86)	$t(30) = 4.50, p < .001$	304.9
Hash Mask	Small	.009	50 (42-59)	$t(29) = 0.42, p = .680$	0.211
	Medium	.06	51 (44-56)	$t(29) = 1.11, p = .278$	0.339
	Large	.06	51 (43-58)	$t(29) = 2.00, p = .055$	1.111

Table 2. d' s for all different conditions. BF₁₀ = Bayes Factor for the alternative versus the null hypothesis.

Discussion

The results of this experiment showed a clear congruency effect when the stimuli were unmasked, independent of the SIW size. In contrast, in the masked condition a congruency effect was found in the small and medium sized SIW only; no effect was found for the largest SIW. These results replicate our earlier work (Van Opstal et al., 2010) and support the hypothesis that the SIW is smaller for masked compared to unmasked stimuli.

The effect of SIW for masked stimuli offers a potential explanation for the absence of unconscious information integration in previous work, e.g. in object-scene integration (Biderman & Mudrik, 2018; Moors et al., 2016). Because of the size of the object-scene stimuli, the incongruence between the scene and the object could have taken place outside the scope of the SIW. Furthermore, object-scene stimuli are more complex than the letter stimuli used in this study and might therefore even be subject to a smaller SIW than those that allowed unconscious information integration in the present study (Mudrik, Faivre, & Koch, 2014b). Similarly, the large SIW needed to integrate multiple words into a sentence could be one of the contributing factors for the failure to find unconscious sentence processing

(Rabagliati, Robertson, & Carmel, 2018). Earlier work already showed that barely visible words presented a few visual degrees from fixation are not semantically processed (Duscherer & Holender, 2002; Paap & Newsome, 1981), further suggesting that a string of perceptually degraded letters in a larger SIW cannot be integrated to form a meaningful word. It should, however, be noted that the results of the current experiment might only apply for subliminal masking experiments. To extrapolate our findings to other research paradigms (e.g., CFS), future research should test this explicitly.

The results from our visibility experiment showed that d' in the masked conditions was not significantly different from 0. Furthermore, in the condition that showed an unconscious congruency effect (i.e., the small window), also the Bayes Factor provided substantial evidence in favor of the null hypothesis. In medium and large condition, where the Bayes Factor supported the null nor the alternative hypotheses, no congruency priming was observed. The results of this study can therefore not be explained by the visibility of the masked primes. Although the use of a post-experimental objective visibility test certainly has its limits, and an alternative such as trial-by-trial subjective measurements would be more suitable, the choice of measuring visibility like this was primarily based on the fact that we wanted to replicate our initial findings (Van Opstal, et al., 2010), and that other subjective measures might be too liberal (e.g., Stein et al., 2021, for a recent demonstration and overview of the objective/subjective debate).

In sum, contrary to recent replication studies, this study provides further support for unconscious information integration in subliminal masking experiments. However, further research is needed to investigate if this only holds when stimuli are easy to segregate and fall within a small spatial window.

272

Acknowledgements

273 F.V.O is a CIFAR Azrieli Global Scholar in the Brain, Mind & Consciousness Program, to
274 which he is grateful. Thanks are due to Cas Becker, Stijn Fischer, Anna Immink and Bouke
275 van Balen for running the pilot experiment, and to Cerasela Somersall and Fatma Batcioglu
276 for their help in the data acquisition of the main experiment.

277

References

- Armstrong, A. M., & Dienes, Z. (2013). Subliminal understanding of negation: Unconscious control by subliminal processing of word pairs. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 22(3), 1022–1040. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2013.06.010>
- Baars, B. J. (2002). The conscious access hypothesis: origins and recent evidence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 6(1), 47–52.
- Biderman, N., & Mudrik, L. (2018). Evidence for Implicit—But Not Unconscious—Processing of Object-Scene Relations. *Psychological Science*, 29(2), 266–277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617735745>
- Boles, D. B., & Clifford, J. E. (1989). An upper- and lowercase alphabetic similarity matrix, with derived generation similarity values. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 21, 579–586.
- Brainard, D. H. (1997). The Psychophysics Toolbox. *Spatial Vision*, 10(4), 433–436. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156856897X00357>
- Dehaene, S., & Naccache, L. (2001). *Towards a cognitive neuroscience of consciousness : basic evidence and a workspace framework*. 79, 1–37.
- Drasdo, N. (1991). Neural substrates and threshold gradients of peripheral vision. In *Limits of vision* (Vol. 5, pp. 250–264). London: Macmillan Press.
- Duscherer, K., & Holender, D. (2002). No negative semantic priming from unconscious flanker words in sight. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 28(4), 839–853. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0096-1523.28.4.839>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/148/1/012022>

303 Garcia-Orza, J., Damas-Lopez, J., Matas, A., & Rodriguez, J. M. (2009). “2x3” primes
 304 naming “6”: Evidence from masked priming. *Attention Perception and*
 305 *Psychophysics*, 71(4), 712–723. <https://doi.org/10.3758/APP>

306 Hirschhorn, R., Kahane, O., Gur-Arie, I. Faivre, N. & Mudrik, L. (2021). Windows of
 307 integration hypothesis revisited. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 14: 617187.

308 Moors, P., Boelens, D., van Overwalle, J., & Wagemans, J. (2016). Scene Integration
 309 Without Awareness: No Conclusive Evidence for Processing Scene Congruency
 310 During Continuous Flash Suppression. *Psychological Science*, 27(7), 945–956.
 311 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616642525>

312 Moors, P., & Hesselmann, G. (2018). A critical reexamination of doing arithmetic
 313 nonconsciously. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 25(1), 472–481.
 314 <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1292-x>

315 Mudrik, L., Breska, A., Lamy, D., & Deouell, L. Y. (2011). Integration Without Awareness :
 316 Expanding the Limits of Unconscious Processing. *Psychological Science*, 22(6), 764–
 317 770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611408736>

318 Mudrik, L., Faivre, N., & Koch, C. (2014a). Information integration without awareness.
 319 *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(9), 488–496.
 320 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.04.009>

321 Mudrik, L., Faivre, N., & Koch, C. (2014b). Information integration without awareness.
 322 *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(9), 488–496.
 323 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.04.009>

324 Mudrik, L., & Koch, C. (2013). Differential processing of invisible congruent and
 325 incongruent scenes : A case for unconscious integration Liad Mudrik. *Journal of*
 326 *Vision*, 13(13), 24:1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1167/13.13.24.doi>

327 Paap, K. R., & Newsome, S. L. (1981). Parafoveal information is not sufficient to produce
 328 semantic or visual priming. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 29(5), 457–466.
 329 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03207359>

330 Pelli, D. G. (1997). The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: Transforming
 331 numbers into movies. *Spatial Vision*, 10(4), 437–442.
 332 <https://doi.org/10.1163/156856897X00366>

333 Rabagliati, H., Robertson, A., & Carmel, D. (2018). The Importance of Awareness for
 334 Understanding Language. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 147(2),
 335 190–208.

336 Ric, F., & Muller, D. (2012). Unconscious addition: When we unconsciously initiate and
 337 follow arithmetic rules. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 141(2), 222–
 338 226. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024608>

339 Schuberth, R. E., & Eimas, P. D. (1977). Effects of context on the classification of words and
 340 nonwords. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and*
 341 *Performance*, 3(1), 27–36. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.3.1.27>

342 Sklar, A. Y., Levy, N., Goldstein, A., Mandel, R., Maril, A., & Hassin, R. R. (2012). Reading
 343 and doing arithmetic nonconsciously. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
 344 *Sciences*, 109(48), 19614–19619. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211645109>

345 Stein, T., & Peelen, M. V. (2021). Dissociating conscious and unconscious influences on
 346 visual detection effects. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 5, 612–624

347 Strasburger, H., Rentschler, I., & Jüttner, M. (2011). Peripheral vision and pattern
 348 recognition: A review. *Journal of Vision*, 11(5), 13–13.
 349 <https://doi.org/10.1167/11.5.13>

350 Tononi, G. (2004). An information integration theory of consciousness. *BMC Neuroscience*,
 351 5(1), 42. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2202-5-42>

352 Van Opstal, F., de Lange, F. P., & Dehaene, S. (2011). Rapid parallel semantic processing of
 353 numbers without awareness. *Cognition*, 120(1), 136–147.
 354 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2011.03.005>

355 Van Opstal, F., Gevers, W., Osman, M., & Verguts, T. (2010). Unconscious task application.
 356 *Consciousness and Cognition*, 19, 999–1006.
 357 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2010.05.002>

358 Van Opstal, F., & Verguts, T. (2011). The origins of the numerical distance effect: The
 359 same–different task. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 23(932363966), 112–120.
 360 <https://doi.org/10.1080/20445911.2011.466796>

361 Van Opstal Filip, F., Calderon, C. B., Gevers, W., & Verguts, T. (2011). Setting the stage
 362 subliminally: Unconscious context effects. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 20(4),
 363 1860–1864. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2011.09.004>
 364
 365

[Supplement to Van Opstal & Rooyakkers (2022) that describes a first experiment that investigates the role of the spatial integration window. The experiment is similar to the one in the main paper, with the exception that the size of the stimuli in this experiment is not scaled with the size of the integration window. The results are similar to the one reported in the main experiment.]

Experiment

Methods

Participants.

The sample size was calculated based on the results of Experiment 3 of Van Opstal and colleagues (2010). To get an estimate of the effect size of that experiment, we performed a paired t -test to compare incongruent to congruent trials. This showed a significant effect, $t(15) = 3.42$, $p = .004$, with an effect size of $d = .854$. The G*Power tool (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) was used to estimate the sample size to reach 95% power with $\alpha = .05$. This revealed a sample size of 20. Because the type of mask (hash mask or no mask) was set as a between-participants variable to investigate the role of prime visibility on information integration, the total sample size of the experiment was set to $2 \times 20 = 40$ participants.

Forty participants (12 males, aged between 18 and 32) participated in this experiment for course credits. Prior to the experiment all participants gave their informed consent and were debriefed afterwards. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences at the University of Amsterdam.

Apparatus and Stimuli.

Apparatus and stimuli were taken from Experiment 3 of Van Opstal et al. (2010). Stimuli were presented on a 60 Hz monitor. Stimulus presentation was synchronized with the vertical refresh rate (16.67 ms) and programmed in MATLAB 2017a (Mathworks Inc.) with a Psychtoolbox extension (Brainard, 1997; Pelli, 1997). Key presses were recorded with a keyboard. Participants pressed the 'd' key to indicate a 'same' response, and 'l' to indicate a 'different' response. Prime stimuli were upper and lower case letters. Two different sets of letters were used between participants (ADEG and LMQR). Primes consisted of one upper case and one lower case letter. The physical similarity between the letters was minimized

using Boles and Clifford's similarity rating (Boles & Clifford, 1989). Targets were the numbers 1, 3, 5 and 7. The lay-out of a trial was similar to that of Experiment 3 in Van Opstal et al. (2011) with the only differences being that the SIW varied between blocks and that the primes were unmasked for half of the participants (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Lay-out of a trial. Each trial started with the presentation of a cue for 300 ms. This was followed by the presentation of a pre-mask for 67 ms, the primes (33 ms), and a post-mask (67 ms). Then the targets appeared until a response was given. The masks were hash marks in the mask condition (shown on the left); nothing was presented in the no-mask condition (shown on the right). The spatial integration window in which the stimuli were presented (i.e., the SIW) varied between blocks and was equal to 1.53°, 4.02°, or 6.51°.

Procedure.

To ensure that the SIWs would be stable and identical for all participants, they were asked to place their heads on a chin rest located 60 cm from the screen. They were then told that they were going to see a series of flashes ending with two simultaneously presented numbers. Participants were instructed to indicate on every trial if these numbers were the same or different by pressing the corresponding keys on the keyboard. The prime set and type of mask were set as between participant factors. Participants were thus randomly distributed over four different groups (i.e., 10 participants per group). Prior to the experiment, participants performed five exercise trials in which feedback about their accuracy was given after every trial. After this short exercise block, the main experiment started. The SIW varied between blocks in a random order. Each SIW block contained 160 trials. The main experiment thus consisted of 480 trials in total. Every 80 trials, participants were offered a short break and presented with their mean RT and accuracy.

After the main experiment, a prime visibility task was performed that was identical to the main experiment, but participants were now instructed to respond to the primes rather than the targets. Participants were fully informed about the lay-out of a trial before the start of this part of the experiment.

Results.

A 2 (Mask: Masked or Unmasked) $\times$ 2 (Congruency: Congruent or Incongruent) $\times$ 3 (SIW: Small, Medium or Large) repeated measures (rm)ANOVA with Mask as a between-participants variable was performed on the median reaction times of the correct trials. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\epsilon = 0.889$). This showed a main effect of SIW, $F(1.71, 68.40) = 11.65, p < .001, \eta^2 = .233$, with larger RTs for larger SIWs (476, 480 and 497 ms for the small, medium and large SIW respectively). There was also a significant main effect of Congruency, $F(1, 76) = 20.91, p < .001, \eta^2 = .353$, with faster RTs to congruent (480 ms) compared to incongruent trials (488 ms). The 3-way interaction between Mask, SIW and Congruency was only close to significance, $F(2, 76) = 2.74, p = .071, \eta^2 = .065$. However, because it was hypothesized that the SIW would influence the congruency effect in the unconscious condition but not in the conscious condition, this 3-way interaction was further explored. A 2 (Congruency) $\times$ 3 (SIW) rmANOVA on the median RTs for the masked condition revealed main effects of SIW, $F(1.48, 28.08) = 9.30, p < .005, \eta^2 = .329$ ($\epsilon = 0.739$), and congruency, $F(1, 19) = 9.08, p < .01, \eta^2 = .323$. Crucially, also the interaction between the two factors was significant, $F(2, 38) = 3.45, p = .042, \eta^2 = .042$. Planned comparisons revealed a significant difference between congruent and incongruent trials for the small SIW, $t(19) = 4.50, p < .001$, and for the medium SIW, $t(19) = 2.13, p = .046$. No significant difference was observed for the large SIW ($t < 1$). The same analysis for the unmasked condition showed a significant effect of SIW, $F(2, 38) = 4.15, p = .023, \eta^2 = .179$, and of congruency, $F(1, 19) = 12.54, p < .005, \eta^2 = .398$, but no significant interaction ($F < 1$). These results are summarized in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Median RTs on incongruent and congruent trials for the different SIWs used in the experiment for the (A) masked and (B) unmasked condition. Error bars denote the standard error of the mean following Cousineau (2005). * $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$

The same analysis on the mean error rates was performed. The results were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\epsilon = 0.816$) and revealed a significant main effect of SIW, $F(1.63, 72.112) = 5.29$, $p = .012$, $\eta^2 = .121$, (error rates of 5.65, 7.13, and 5.70% for Small, Medium and Large SIWs respectively). There was also a main effect of Congruency, $F(1, 76) = 7.37$, $p = 0.010$, $\eta^2 = .162$, with a higher error rate on incongruent trials (6.90 %) compared to congruent trials (5.42 %). No other main or interaction effects were observed.

Prime Visibility.

Because of technical issues, the data of one participant from the unmasked condition was not recorded. The following analysis were thus performed on 39 participants only. Visibility of the primes was investigated by calculating a d' for the different widths for both masked and unmasked conditions. A 3 (SIW: Small, Medium or Large) $\times$ 2 (Mask: Masked or Unmasked) rmANOVA on the average d' with Mask as a between subjects factor was performed. The degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\epsilon = 0.838$). Results showed a significant effect of SIW, $F(1.68, 62.00) = 9.82$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .196$

with a smaller d' for larger SIWs. There was also a main effect of Mask, $F(1, 37) = 13.02$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .26$, with a higher d' for unmasked ($d' = 0.61$) compared to masked ($d' = 0.12$) trials. The interaction between Mask and SIW was also significant, $F(1.68, 62.00) = 3.37$, $p = .049$, $\eta^2 = .067$. Planned comparisons showed that all d' 's differed significantly from 0, except the d' in the masked, large SIW condition (see Table 1). Given that testing visibility depends on testing the null, we also performed a Bayesian one sample t -test on d' . This showed that the evidence in favor of the alternative hypothesis (i.e., the hypothesis that the stimuli were detected by the participants) was only anecdotal for the Small and Medium SIW when the primes were masked. For the masked large SIW, the evidence was in favor of the null hypothesis, indicating that participants could not detect the primes in this condition.

	SIW	d'	% Correct	T	Df	p	BF ₁₀
No Mask	Small	.85	68.6	4.06	18	< .001	48.18
	Medium	.58	64.6	3.78	18	.001	27.95
	Large	.38	59.8	3.78	18	.001	28.26
Hash Mask	Small	.16	53.1	2.56	19	.019	2.97
	Medium	.19	54.1	2.55	19	.020	2.92
	Large	.02	50.3	0.50	19	.624	0.26

Table 1. d' 's for all different conditions. Df = degrees of freedom; BF₁₀ = Bayes Factor for the alternative versus the null hypothesis.

Replication Bayes Factor.

To investigate if the current results replicated our previous results, the replication Bayes Factor (BF) from evidence updating was calculated by dividing the complete BF by the BF of the original study (Ly, Etz, Marsman, & Wagenmakers, 2018). A Bayesian paired t -test with default priors on the data of Experiment 3 of Van Opstal et al. (2010) revealed a BF₁₀ of 6.92, which is moderate evidence in support of the alternative hypothesis compared to the null hypothesis. The complete BF₁₀ was calculated on the combined data of our previous work and that of the masked, small SIW condition of the present study. This revealed a complete BF₁₀ of 4440. The replication BF (4440/6.92) of 641.62 provides very strong evidence for H₁ over H₀.