



Do social dominance orientation and right wing authoritarianism similarly predict both explicit and implicit attitudes?

A recommendation by [Thomas Evans](#)  based on peer reviews by [Luisa Liekefett](#)  and 1 anonymous reviewer of the STAGE 2 REPORT:

Jesse S Reid, Yoel Inbar (2024) Implicit Ideologies: Do Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation Predict Implicit Attitudes? PsyArXiv, ver. 6, peer-reviewed and recommended by Peer Community in Registered Reports.

<https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/8udps>

Submitted: 04 May 2024, Recommended: 04 October 2024

Cite this recommendation as:

Evans, T. (2024) Do social dominance orientation and right wing authoritarianism similarly predict both explicit and implicit attitudes?. *Peer Community in Registered Reports*, 100756. [10.24072/pci.rr.100756](https://doi.org/10.24072/pci.rr.100756)

Published: 04 October 2024

Copyright: This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Measurement is a vital activity for all research areas, but we so often fail to provide sufficient clarity, rigor and transparency about it, undermining the validity of our studies' conclusions (Flake & Fried, 2020). This concern is of wide societal interest when applied to the domains of ideology and attitudes where measurements of both implicit and explicit attitudes are assumed to reflect the same underlying concept. The extent to which this can be accepted is undermined by mixed evidence demonstrating a lack of consensus on the extent to which relevant psychological factors similarly predict both implicit and explicit attitudes. In the current study, Reid & Inbar (2023) question these assumptions through use of the Project Implicit dataset, exploring the extent to which social dominance orientation (SDO) and right wing authoritarianism (RWA) similarly predict implicit and explicit attitudes. This work was ideally suited for publication through the Registered Reports format because whilst it may have been expected that relationships between SDO/RWA are similar in effect size across measures of both implicit and explicit attitude (because they tap into the same underlying attitude), there was great scope to acknowledge a more complex set of findings which may not be immediately interpretable or coherent. As expected, the results were not completely unambiguous, but the mostly consistent relationships between implicit attitudes and RWA/SDO provided evidence towards both implicit and explicit measures capturing the same underlying construct. These results also provide a useful step forward in our discussion of measurement in this domain, acknowledging the complexity of the tradeoff between reliability and specificity. The Stage 2 manuscript was evaluated over two rounds of in-depth review. Based on detailed responses to the reviewers' comments, the recommender judged that the manuscript met the Stage 2 criteria and awarded a positive

recommendation. **URL to the preregistered Stage 1 protocol:** <https://osf.io/zv4jw> **Level of bias control achieved:** Level 5. *All of the data or evidence that was used to answer the research question existed before the research commenced but was inaccessible to the authors and thus unobservable prior to IPA.* **List of eligible PCI-RR-friendly journals:**

- [Advances in Cognitive Psychology](#)
- [Collabra: Psychology](#)
- [International Review of Social Psychology](#)
- [Peer Community Journal](#)
- [PeerJ](#)
- [Royal Society Open Science](#)
- [Social Psychological Bulletin](#)
- [Studia Psychologica](#)
- [Swiss Psychology Open](#)

References:

1. Flake, J. K. & Fried, E. I. (2020). Measurement schmeasurement: Questionable measurement practices and how to avoid them. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 3, 456-465. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245920952393>
2. Reid, J. & Inbar, Y. (2024). Implicit Ideologies: Do Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation Predict Implicit Attitudes? [Stage 2]. Acceptance of Version 6 by Peer Community in Registered Reports. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/8udps>

Reviews

Evaluation round #2

Reviewed by anonymous reviewer 1, 03 October 2024

Dear Authors,

I have carefully reviewed the revised version of your manuscript, and I must say that it was a pleasure to do so. I am impressed by the thoroughness with which you addressed the feedback provided during the review process. This reflects a strong commitment to improving the manuscript, while also maintaining transparency in managing the changes made to the sections approved during Stage 1. As you mentioned in your response letter, the revisions were primarily minor, but it is evident that you approached them with due care, identifying and resolving any issues with clarity and precision.

Reviewed by [Luisa Liekefett](#) , 12 September 2024

The authors have addressed my comments in a convincing manner, and I do not have additional comments. I appreciate the changes they made to the manuscript, particularly regarding implications for the IAT and the open acknowledgement of the relatively poor model fit. I enjoyed being a part of this review process!

Evaluation round #1

DOI or URL of the preprint: <https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/8udps>

Version of the preprint: 4

Authors' reply, 02 September 2024

[Download author's reply](#)

[Download tracked changes file](#)

Decision by [Thomas Evans](#) , posted 11 June 2024, validated 11 June 2024

Revision invited

Dear authors,

Thanks so much for submitting your Stage 2 Registered Report. I now have the views of the two original reviewers and I am pleased to confirm that their assessments of your work are extremely helpful, and favourable. There are a few areas where they have noted additional detail would be of benefit, particularly in some of the nuances of the analyses, and I therefore encourage you to consider these fully to enhance the transparency and rigor of the work presented. Please make all changes to the manuscript in tracked changes or similar, and provide a systematic response to all their comments. I will look forward to reviewing your revised submission and I encourage you to reach out if you have any further questions or concerns.

Thanks,

Dr Thomas Rhys Evans

Reviewed by anonymous reviewer 1, 11 June 2024

I have finally had the opportunity to review Stage 2 of the article titled "Implicit Ideologies: Do Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation Predict Implicit Attitudes?".

Firstly, I want to state that the sections revised in Stage 1 have not been modified, and the hypotheses declared then are those reported in the current version of the manuscript. My revisions will therefore primarily focus on unrevised sections.

According to the method, you tested 24 models (12 tasks for the two independent variables). This is also evident from the R script where you estimated the models using a for loop. Therefore, it is unclear why the fit indices are reported for only two models. I strongly recommend clarifying this point.

From the script, it is also evident that you tested the measurement model for RWA and SDO. For clarity, I would report the results of these models, as they provide important details on the quality of the measurements, which could be relevant for contextualizing the results of the structural models. For example, the lower predictiveness of SDO might be due to measurement issues of the construct.

Additionally, you used dynamic cut-offs. As reported in the cited paper, this method can be applied to measurement models in the SEM framework but not to structural models as you did. Moreover, the method is uncommon, and reading the results without contextual information makes understanding difficult. For instance, what are the implications of choosing a cut-off with a low level of misspecification versus a high level?

I strongly suggest providing more information on this method to improve reader comprehension. To further refine the comprehensibility of your results, I recommend incorporating the B-H Critical Value present in Table 6 into Table 3.

This comment bridges both the method and results sections. Therefore, I consider it a secondary addition, although it is highly relevant. The question I asked myself while reading the results is: how do implicit and explicit measures correlate for the same pairs of words? This could provide further details on whether explicit and implicit measures capture the same or a similar latent construct.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the authors for the excellent work they have done on this research project, which provides relevant results. While the manuscript is robust in its current form, I believe that addressing the points raised will enhance further its clarity and rigor.

[Download the review](#)