Tony Greenwald

From: "Eric Vanman" <e.vanman@psy.uq.edu.au>
To: "Tony Greenwald" <agg@u.washington.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2008 1:21 AM
Subject: Re: More data for Vanman et al. (2004)

Hi again,

No problem. I just re-ran the analyses using the listwise option. Please see the tables below, using the same keys for the variables that I sent in the prior email. I do believe that zygbias and corbias were associated with differences in positive and negative affect, respectively, which may not always be consistent with the IAT. I'd like to explore the extent that zygomaticus and corrugator activity actually are "implicit" in future research.

It's a great coincidence to be corresponding with you right now, as I just presented your Allen Edwards lecture on Level 2 (available through iTunes) to my Social Neuroscience course here at the University of Queensland. In a discussion afterwards, the students were generating ideas about looking at implicit biases in the Australian population. You gave a great lecture, by the way!

Good luck with your final run of analyses. I am looking forward to seeing the final article when it appears in print.

-Eric

Correlations[a]

		corbias	zygbias	choose	iat	mrs
corbias	Pearson Correlation	1.000	.348	-.099	-.045	-.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.122	.669	.847	.953
zygbias	Pearson Correlation	.348	1.000	.315	-.270	.137
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.122		.164	.236	.553
choose	Pearson Correlation	-.099	.315	1.000	.295	.410
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.669	.164		.195	.065
iat	Pearson Correlation	-.045	-.270	.295	1.000	.106
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.847	.236	.195		.646
mrs	Pearson Correlation	-.014	.137	.410	.106	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.953	.553	.065	.646	
a. Listwise N=21						

Correlations[a]

		choose	iat	mrs
choose	Pearson Correlation	1.000	.170	.251
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.197	.055
iat	Pearson Correlation	.170	1.000	.042

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.197		.750
mrs	Pearson Correlation	.251	.042	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.055	.750	
a. Listwise N=59				

On 08/26/2008, at 2:57 PM, Tony Greenwald wrote:

> Hi Eric -
>
> Unfortunately, I can't use the tables exactly as you sent because I need subsamples with subjects having data on all the measures that are intercorrelated.
>
> I was hoping that you could give me one correlation table for the 22 subjects who had both IAT and EMG data (i.e., omit the subjects who had EMG but no IAT), and a second correlation table for the 59 subjects who had both IAT and "choose" data (whether or not they also had EMG data). I don't need the two samples to be totally independent. Most important is for N to be constant in each table.
>
> I'd appreciate your opinion if there's any reason to regard zygomatic activity in this experiment as something other than a measure of positive affect, and similarly whether corrugator is anything other than a measure of negative affect. I will go with your judgment on this. If you regard them as appropriately interpreted as measures of affect, I should include them as criterion measures in the meta-analysis (even though the correlation of zygomatic with IAT is directionally opposite from expectation).
>
> There are only 21 subjects for corrugator-IAT correlation. If I should use both EMG measures, then it would be best for the EMG table just to have the 21 subjects who have data on all of the measures I will use for that sample - corrugator, zygomatic, IAT, and MRS.
>
> The table with N=59 should have IAT, MRS, and choose. (I won't use MCPR, which I understand as a moderator rather than as having a direct relation with discrimination.)
>
> I'm sorry to make this complicated, and I greatly appreciate your willingness to help.
>
> Thanks,
> -Tony

****
Eric J. Vanman, Ph.D.
Senior Lecturer
School of Psychology

University of Queensland

Phone: +61 7 3365 6404
email: e.vanman@uq.edu.au

Mailing address:
School of Psychology
McElwain Building, Level 3
University of Queensland
St Lucia, QLD 4072
AUSTRALIA

Office address:
McElwain Building (24a), Room 406