

Floorack, Scarabos, & G 104 report

(X) new

du = food / choc chora,

IAT = self IAT } milla-
 att IAT } ratta

EM = att

- (10) food = 0/4
- (10) Sing(1), p 10
- (12) self / att IATS milla/ratt
- (13) on = (1) att, p 11
- (14) obs (1), p 10
- (15) obs (5), p 10
- (16) ~~scan~~ algorithm, p 11
- (17) ~~st. m. r.~~ pictures (1), p 10
- (18) 2 IATS

- (26) 1, p 10
- (27) 2, p 11
- (28) 10, p 10
- (29) 5, p 10
- (30) 5, p 10-11
- (31) ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ race-not (0), p 2
- (32) ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~
- (33) dnd (2), p 10

discrepancy since not
reported before

ICCs, ECCs, IES page 27

not reported
before = previous
version
= discrepancies
Nov 1995 9-11

- (19) 2, p 1
- (20) 3rd
- (21) 1st
- (22) after (2)
- (23) after (2)
- (24) same (0)
- (25) same (0)

DONE

page 27:

affairs focus $N=105$

$$IE = \overset{\text{self}}{.61}, \overset{\text{alt}}{.47}$$

$$ICC = \overset{\text{self}}{.55}, \overset{\text{alt}}{.36}$$

$$ECC = .71$$

Log focus ($N=108$)

$$IE = \overset{\text{(self)}}{.51}, \overset{\text{(alt)}}{.41} \quad \text{alt}$$

$$ICC = .50, .46$$

$$ECC = .75$$

Abstract

To shed further light on the impact of automatic preferences on consumer choice, the authors conducted an experiment in which participants had to choose between two alternatives. They found that automatic product preferences were better at predicting the choice when participants made fast decisions and had clear self-reported attitudes.

10
32

carefully analyze their reasons and to list at least five arguments concerning each brand.

Brand choice and choice latency. After participants analyzed their reasons or focused on their feelings concerning the two chocolate brands, they clicked a button on the screen to proceed. They now read that they had the opportunity to choose between two bars of chocolate as a reward for their participation. The bars of chocolate were "Milka Alpenmilch" and "Ritter Sport Vollmilch". The two products were represented on the screen with two big pictures. Participants made the choice by clicking on one of the two pictures. The time participants needed to decide was recorded. We refer to this measure as choice latency. Because the reaction time distribution was positively skewed, the reaction times were transformed using a natural logarithmic transformation (Fazio 1990b).

Automatic brand preference. We used two different versions of the implicit association test as a measure of automatic brand preference (IAT, Greenwald et al. 1998). Participants first completed a pleasant-unpleasant IAT, and then a self-other IAT. In both versions, participants had to classify pictures of bars of chocolate as belonging to the brand Milka or Ritter Sport. This task was combined either with the classification of positive or negative pictures to the categories pleasant or unpleasant (pleasant-unpleasant IAT), or with the classification of words as fitting to themselves or to others (self-other IAT). Participants used two response keys for the classification. In the relevant phases of the task, the categories were combined so that each response key was assigned to two categories (e.g., left key: "self" and "Milka"; right key "other" and "Ritter Sport"). Participants with an automatic preference for Milka should respond faster when one key is assigned to "Milka" and "self" ("Milka" and "pleasant") and the other to "Ritter Sport" and "other" ("Ritter Sport" and

DV

30

29

28

11

14

15

19-25

29

33

31

17

33 IAT
12
26

"unpleasant") compared to the reverse combination. Both versions included five phases. Three phases included a simple classification of the brands, the self and other related words, or the pleasant and unpleasant pictures. Two phases included the classification with the combined assignment of the response keys. Altogether the classifications were made in the following order: 1.) self-other (pleasant – unpleasant); 2.) Milka – Ritter Sport; 3.) self – other (pleasant – unpleasant) / Milka – Ritter Sport; 4.) Ritter Sport – Milka; 5.) self – other (pleasant – unpleasant) / Ritter Sport – Milka. The order of phases 2+3 and 4+5 was transposed for half of the participants. To prepare the data for statistical analyses we followed the procedure recommended by Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji (in press), with a few exceptions. To devise a measure for automatic preferences, we computed the differences between the combined classification phases. However, before computing this difference we eliminated the first two trials of each phase, because after clicking the "start" button with the mouse, participants first needed to find the keys and therefore the reaction time on these trials was often slow. Furthermore, we replaced the latencies of error trials with the block mean plus two standard deviations. Applying this procedure, we computed a self-other IAT score and a pleasant-unpleasant IAT score. On both measures, positive values indicate an automatic preference for Milka, negative values an automatic preference for Ritter Sport.

Self-reported product preference and ambiguity of preference. The self-reported product preferences were measured with ten unipolar 9-point-scales. Participants were asked to indicate the degree to which several adjectives applied to the two chocolate brands (1 = not at all; 9 = very much). Half of the adjectives were positive (tasty, nutty, healthy, digestible, natural), the other were negative (harmful, icky, unpleasant, greasy, repelling). First, the ratings were combined into a single

EM
(27)
(13)

(16)

(19-25)

(30)

Table 1

Intercorrelations Between Preference Measures and Choice for Participants in the Affective and Cognitive Focus Conditions

	1	2	3	4	
Affective Focus (n = 105)					
1. Self-reported Preference	-	.61***	.47***	.71***	ECC
2. Self-Other IAT	-	-	.59***	.55***	ICC
3. Pleasant-Unpleasant IAT	-	-	-	.36***	ICC
4. Choice	-	-	-	-	
Cognitive Focus (n = 108)					
1. Self-reported Preference	-	.51***	.41***	.75***	ECC
2. Self-Other IAT	-	-	.47***	.50***	ICC
3. Pleasant-Unpleasant IAT	-	-	-	.46***	ICC
4. Choice	-	-	-	-	

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 2

Intercorrelations Between Automatic Preferences and Choice for Participants as a Function of Choice Latency and Ambiguity of Preference

	Choice Latency		Ambiguity of Preference	
	Fast (n=107)	Slow (n=106)	Low (n=105)	High (n=108)
1. Self-Other IAT	.62***	.41***	.63***	.38***
2. Pleasant- unpleasant IAT	.57***	.26**	.47***	.34***

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$