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Opening new horizons
introduction

· since 1960s little methodological innovation in language attitudes research (until recently)

→ can we take advantage of the enormous productivity in attitude research in social psychology?

· exploring potential of P-IAT for linguistic attitude research

→ importing situational context into the P-IAT
outline

1. P–IAT 101

2. contextualizing language attitudes research using the P–IAT?

3. case study: introducing context in the P–IAT
P-IAT 101

- reaction time based task to measure association between two concepts

- recently adopted in linguistics

# P-IAT 101

**how does it work?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category names</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stimuli</td>
<td>variety1/variety2</td>
<td>I like / I don’t like</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# P-IAT 101

## how does it work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category names</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>variety1/variety2</td>
<td>I like / I don’t like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1</td>
<td>v2</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Dog" /> <img src="image_url" alt="Beach" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**stimuli**
5 blocks of trials
P-IAT 101

5 blocks of trials
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I don't like

experimental blocks 3 & 5
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P-IAT 101

experimental blocks 3 & 5
incongruent pairing $\rightarrow$ slower
congruent pairing $\rightarrow$ faster

experimental blocks 3 & 5
P-IAT 101

comparing reaction times in blocks with reverse pairings of target & attribute labels

experimental blocks 3 & 5
contextualizing the P-IAT

- decontextualization of attitude object

  \[ \leftrightarrow \] context dependency of language evaluation

- (e.g. Soukup 2012, 2015; Eckert 2012; Levon & Buchstaller 2015, 341; Campbell–Kibler 2009, Lybaert 2014; Purschke 2015)
contextualizing the P-IAT

• decontextualization of attitude object

<→ context dependency of language evaluation

• recontextualizing the P-IAT

how?

• social psychological research: possible
  • during IAT & before IAT

contextualizing the P-IAT

• decontextualization of attitude object

←→ context dependency of language evaluation

• recontextualizing the P-IAT

how?

• social psychological research: possible
• during IAT & before IAT

importing context possible for P-IAT as measure of language attitudes?
case study: experiment design

- previous studies: (e.g. Lybaert 2014; Geeraerts & Van de Velde 2013)

attitudes towards regional language variation in Dutch speaking Belgium are context dependent

- standard Belgian Dutch (SBD) → formal situations
- regionally accented speech → informal situations

- can we measure this variation using the P–IAT?
case study: experiment design

- target varieties:
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• target varieties:
  – SBD accented speech
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- target varieties:
  - SBD accented speech
  - Limburg accented speech
case study: experiment design

- target varieties:
  - SBD accented speech
  - Limburg accented speech

- participants:
  160 Limburgian students in Leuven

\[ M_{\text{age}} = 20.96 \]

gender → 55% f
case study: experiment design

- two manipulations:
  - context: formal (news) vs. informal (socializing with friends & family)
  - context presentation: background image vs. multiple images between blocks
case study: experiment design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># participants</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
case study: experiment design

- reaction times $\rightarrow D$ scores

- context effect = difference of $D$ scores
case study: experiment design

- 2 IATs followed by explicit rating task

a. Hoe sta je tegenover de accenten die je in het experiment gehoord hebt, in een informele situatie (bv. aan tafel of tijdens een avondje uit met vrienden of familie)?

Kleur een bolletje: hoe dichter bij een accent, hoe positiever je dat accent vindt.

Limburgs accent O O O O O O O O neutraal accent

b. Hoe sta je tegenover een Limburgs accent (zoals gehoord in het experiment) in een informele situatie (bv. aan tafel of tijdens een avondje uit met vrienden of familie)?

negatief O O O O O O O O positief

c. Hoe sta je tegenover een neutraal accent (zoals gehoord in het experiment) in een informele situatie (bv. aan tafel of tijdens een avondje uit met vrienden of familie)?

negatief O O O O O O O O positief
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case study: results

• P–IAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>predictor</th>
<th>estimate</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>n.s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intercept (grand mean)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{formal–informal}</td>
<td>−0.042</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{background}</td>
<td>−0.013</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{BO1}</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context order x block order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{formal first x BO1}</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>$&lt; .01$</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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case study: results

- **P–IAT**

<table>
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<tr>
<th>predictor</th>
<th>estimate</th>
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</tr>
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<td>−0.013</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
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<td>block order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>n.s.</td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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case study: results

- P–IAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>predictor</th>
<th>estimate</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intercept (grand mean)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>formal–informal</em></td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>background</em></td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BO1</em></td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context order x block order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>formal first x BO1</em></td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
case study: results

- P-IAT

  first block in BO1
  - SBD: I like
  - Limburg: I don’t like

  first context: formal

  first block in BO1
  - SBD: I like
  - Limburg: I don’t like

  first context: informal

  first block in BO2
  - Limburg: I like
  - SBD: I don’t like

  first context: formal

  first block in BO2
  - Limburg: I like
  - SBD: I don’t like

  first context: informal
case study: results

• P–IAT

first block in BO1

SBD | Limburg
I like | I don’t like

first context: formal

first block in BO1

SBD | Limburg
I like | I don’t like

first context: informal

first block in BO2

Limburg | SBD
I like | I don’t like

first context: formal

first block in BO2

Limburg | SBD
I like | I don’t like

first context: informal
case study: results

- explicit ratings
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- explicit ratings
case study: results

- explicit ratings
case study: discussion

- why no overall context effect?
  - methodological aspects
    - context stimuli
    - context not activated
  - hypothesis not detailed enough (cf. asymmetry in explicit measurement)
  - is every participant equally sensitive to situational context? (individual variation)
case study: conclusions

• contextualizing P–IAT?
  possible, but not straightforward
  successful application in social psychology suggests further explorations are worthwhile

• explicit attitudes:
  further research needed into the asymmetric attitudes towards SBD and regional varieties in context
thank you!

for further information:
laura.rosseel@kuleuven.be
http://wwwling.arts.kuleuven.be/qlvl/laura
case study: discussion

• role norm sensitivity

– $\approx$ ambivalence (Petty & Briñol 2009)

$\rightarrow$ hypothesis: ambivalent language users are more sensitive to context cues
case study: discussion

- explicit ratings as a proxy for ambivalence
norm sensitivity may have a mediating role for contextualised language attitudes → avenue for further studies on individual differences in language evaluation
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