



Figure 1. **A.** Participants first indicate the direction and strength of their voting intention for the upcoming election, and then rate to what extent they agree with 12 statements selected to differentiate between the two political coalitions (e.g. concurring with “the tax on petroleum should be raised” would tally a point in agreement with the left-wing coalition, etc.). Meanwhile, the experimenter (leftmost in the image) pretends to take notes, but instead monitors the markings of the participants, and creates an alternative answering profile favoring the opposite view. The new set of ratings is written on a slip of paper identical to the rating section on the questionnaire. **B.** After completion, the participants hand over the questionnaire to the experimenter, who has hidden the alternative answer-slip under his notebook. It is prepared with a non-permanent adhesive, and when the experimenter swipes the notebook over the questionnaire it attaches and occludes the section containing the original ratings. **C.** Next, the participants are confronted with the reversed answers, and are asked to justify the manipulated opinions. **D.** Then the experimenter covers the (manipulated) ratings of the participants with a color-coded, semi-transparent correction template, and sums up the results indicating which coalition the participants favor (8 right-wing vs. 4 left-wing, or 2 right-wing vs. 10 left-wing, etc.). Finally, they are asked to justify their aggregate position, and once again indicate the direction and strength of their voting intention for the upcoming election.