

----- Original Message -----

From: "Vivian Zayas" <vz29@cornell.edu> To: "Tony Greenwald" <agg@u.washington.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2008 8:18 PM Subject: Re: Your email of 26Mar08

Hi Tony,

I'm attaching a word document that contains two tables, each reporting the zero order correlations between implicit and explicit attitudes and the criterion. Information about sample size, percentage of men vs. women, and interpretation of the direction of the correlation is reported in the table notes. Also, the data reported in the first table come from a different sample of subjects than the data reported in the second table.

Let me know if you need any other information.

Best,
Vivan

----- Original Message -----

From: "Tony Greenwald" <agg@u.washington.edu> To: "Vivian Zayas" <vz29@cornell.edu>
Sent: Sunday, July 06, 2008 2:32 PM Subject: Your email of 26Mar08

Hi Vivian - I'm attaching a string of correspondence about which I have a few remaining questions for the meta-analysis. You may have provided answers to these questions once upon a time to Andy Poehlman, but I have not been able to obtain from him any records of his correspondence about the meta-analysis, so I don't know the basis for figures he had put into the data set.

I'll try to minimize your need to wade through the prior correspondence, and focus on just the things I need. We should include your mother-IAT and various partner-behavior measures that are on Slide 81 of the file that I've got named "Zayas.SESP99Tues11a.ppt.pdf". However, I need zero-order correlations, while the slide reports what I assume to be beta weights from a simultaneous regression. If you can provide those as zero-order correlations I can use the study in the meta-analysis. But I also need to make sure that I understand the direction of correlation that is expected (if the IAT has predictive validity). I'll need to know which signs should be reversed for use in the meta-analysis (i.e., such that positive rs will indicate predictive validity).

I need this for both columns of data, assuming that the left column involves an explicit measure of mother's supportiveness.

I also need to know what the N for these results are (is it the 85 reported on Slide 42?) (Were these all female subjects?)

The data on slide 86 (headed "Beta weights for attitudes toward mother (i.e., explicit and implicit) and infliction of psychological abuse") weren't in the last draft of the meta-analysis. For these data I need the same information as for the data on Slide 81. Also, I assume that there is no overlap of this sample with the N=85 on Slide 81.

I think we're OK for the 2005 PSPB paper.

Best,
-Tony

Slide 81

Zero-order correlation coefficients between implicit and explicit attitudes of one's mother and self-reports of psychological victimization.

	<i>Feelings toward mother</i>	
	Implicit	Explicit
Isolation & Emotional Control	-.05	.10
Undermining self –esteem	-.16	-.11
Jealousy	.12	.13
Verbal Abuse	-.13	-.14
Withdrawal	-.19	.00
Receipt of Abuse Index	-.09	-.01

Note. Higher numbers of the Psychological Abuse Measure (listed in the left column) indicates a higher frequency of receiving the particular psychologically abusive behavior. Thus, negative correlations indicate that attitudes of mother supportiveness are inversely related to self-reported frequency of psychological victimization. $N = 84$ (66 females; 22 males).

Slide 86

Zero-order correlation coefficients between implicit and explicit attitudes of one's mother and self-reports of inflicting psychological abuse.

	<i>Feelings toward mother</i>	
	Implicit	Explicit
Positive Items ^a	-.19	-.14
Isolation & Emotional Control	-.23	-.30 [†]
Undermining self –esteem	-.22	-.12
Jealousy	-.55***	-.12
Verbal Abuse	-.21	-.12
Withdrawal	-.56***	-.07
Threats of Physical Abuse	-.40*	.15
Infliction of Abuse Index	-.51***	-.16

Note. Negative correlations indicate that attitudes of mother supportiveness are inversely related to self-reported frequency of inflicting psychological abuse. ^a To maintain consistency with the other subscales, the Positive Items scale was reverse coded so that higher numbers reflect less positive behaviors. $N = 40$ males. *** $p < .001$. * $p < .01$. [†] $p < .10$.