
The Unconscious Relational Self

Susan M. Andersen Inga Reznik Noah S. Glassman
New York University

To appear in R. Hassin, J.A. Bargh & J.S. Uleman (Eds.) *The New Unconscious*. New York: Oxford University Press.

RUNNING HEAD: Unconscious Relational Self

This research was funded in part by National Institute of Mental Health Grant R01-MH48789. Address correspondence to Susan M. Andersen, Department of Psychology, New York University, 6 Washington Place, Ste. 468, New York, NY 10003. Electronic mail may be sent via the Internet to sma1@nyu.edu

The Unconscious Relational Self

The notion that previous knowledge is brought to bear in extracting and constructing meaning is fundamental in social cognition. This process can be understood in terms of mental representations of self and of others, representations that give both idiosyncratic and shared meaning to experience, and reflect not only what is personal but what is interpersonal. The self, experienced in relation to others, involves what is individual and what is social in the self.

The self and on self-regulation can be seen in terms of an interpersonal social-cognitive theory of the relational self that draws on personality and clinical theory as well (Andersen & Chen, in press). It assumes that significant others play a critical role in both self-definition and self-regulation. In short, each individual has an overall repertoire of selves, each of which stems from a relationship with a significant other, and this overall repertoire of selves is a repository for, and later, a source of, the interpersonal patterns that characterize the individual. Each self is keyed to a mental representation of a significant other. When activated, significant-other representations and aspects of the self linked to them imbue experience with different meaning, depending on their content and the context in which they are used. People may then have nearly as many selves as they have significant interpersonal relationships (Sullivan, 1953; see also Kelly, 1955), providing for both contextual variability and the longstanding representations as a chronic influence.

We assess idiosyncratic knowledge representations in memory and track their influence on affect and motivation. We also examine how self-regulatory processes further modulate these responses. Our conceptualization focuses on the ways the self is linked to other people who are (or had been) significant, who have had an impact on one's life, and in whom one is (or once was) emotionally invested. Because mental representations of significant others and their relational linkages to the self are central in the model, the emotional investments one has in significant others play a role in determining one's responses, including one's self-regulatory efforts. One has a relatively unique relationship with each significant other in one's life and a relatively unique way of seeing and experiencing the self in relation to this person. Relationship elements and self-experiences may be quite subtle. People define and experience both the self and others in idiographic terms (see Allport, 1937; Kelly, 1955).

By knowledge structures denoting the self and others, we mean whatever bundles of knowledge one

wishes to assume people hold in memory about significant others, as well as the linkages to the self encapsulating the self-other relationship. These are often activated in everyday social encounters in response to new people. And this is the social cognitive process we have identified as transference in everyday social relations. Aspects of the self that are unique to the relationship with the significant other, self-with-other units or entangled selves, are called to the fore (Andersen & Chen, in press). The transference process is at the heart of the relational self and operates in accord with basic processes of transient and chronic cognitive accessibility (e.g., Higgins, 1996). Thus, the process requires little in the way of attention or volition. In this way, the unconscious can be construed in terms of basic cognitive processes, refined to include motivation, the self, and affect (e.g., (Bargh : Higgins, 1996). In these terms, the relational self can be considered largely unconscious; the procedures by which it operates are unconscious.

The New Unconscious in Our Framework

In our view, research in the realm of the new unconscious has clearly demonstrated that unconscious processes occur. Normal cognitive processes can occur outside of awareness and not require much in the way of attention or effort—influencing perception, judgment, emotion, and motivation. This is increasingly well understood. Moreover, cold cognitive processes can be distinguished from hot ones involving emotion and also from motivation (goal states, intentions, plans), and still further from self-regulation. But all appear to transpire outside of awareness under the right circumstances. For us, it is what is interpersonal in the new unconscious and also relevant for the self that we highlight. The cognitive processes at issue occur without special effort and are in play in relation to mental representations, specifically, of the self in relation to specific, significant others.

We believe relational selves arise according to basic principles of social cognition. Mental representations, whether concerned with objects, ideas, or persons, and the processes by which they are used, are at the basis of social cognition. Processes like transient and chronic accessibility, contextual priming of a representation, and its use in part based on its apparent applicability to a stimulus are basic. These processes are known to require little attention, consciousness, or need for effortful, deliberative processing. Representations like social categories or constructs (e.g., stereotypes or trait categories) are often the focus of research in social cognition, whereas our focus is on exemplars of individual persons. But the same cognitive processes act on significant-other representations, as we have shown in our research (e.g., Andersen &

Glassman, 1996).

We assume that most of our evidence on significant-other representations and the self in transference can be seen as arising on the basis of relatively automatic processes. This leads to contextual variation in the relational self across interpersonal situations. Of course, exactly which elements of the process of transference and activation of the relational self tend to be unconscious and which are not is a complex question with a multi-layered answer, and perfect evidence on these matters is hard to come by, we present a wide array of findings that speak to it and enable a number of conclusions.

Overall, our experimental research in social cognition has demonstrated that the activation of significant-other representations occurs such that they are used with a newly encountered individual to make sense of the person (Andersen & Baum, 1994; Andersen & Cole, 1990; Andersen, Glassman, Chen, & Cole, 1995; Andersen, Reznik, & Manzella, 1996; Hinkley & Andersen, 1996). The transference process is a basic mechanism by which the past comes to play a role in the present and it depends on relatively automatic social cognitive processes. The work offers a relational, social-cognitive framework for understanding how past relationships re-emerge in current ones as patterns of responding in the self and personality (Andersen & Chen, in press; Mischel & Shoda, 1995; Sullivan, 1953). Chronic tendencies to have particular kinds of relationships are based significant-other representations and relevant relational knowledge, and are used in responding to new people (as are relational schemas, e.g., Baldwin, 1992). Stability and variability in the self are a function of triggering cues in new interpersonal contexts that activate previously stored relational knowledge (Andersen & Chen, in press).

Our research demonstrates the social-cognitive process of transference based on transient contextual cues that trigger a given significant-other representation and a given relational self — beyond the chronic and longstanding influence of these representations on perception and interpretation. Social cognitive processes transpiring when a mental representation is activated are known to operate largely automatically and hence, the mechanisms we examine are not likely to be dependent on systematic or strategic processing (e.g., see Bargh, 1994; Chaiken & Trope, 1999). Beyond this, we have direct evidence for the automatic activation of significant-other representations, because it can readily occur unconsciously and without effort. We have direct evidence for relative automaticity of in

the spread of activation in memory from the significant other to the self in transference. Hence, transference processes and those involving the relational self reveal the new unconscious. Given the sequelae of transference we have demonstrated, and their relevance to the relational self, it is not inconsequential that research suggests relative automaticity in affect elicitation based on activation of significant-other representations. This suggests that affect may arise in transference relatively immediately rather than later downstream in the processing sequence when effortful thought is more likely.

The associative processes presumed to underlie transference do not presuppose or require the intention to think about a significant other or investment of effort in considering what various kinds of significant-other knowledge one has stored in memory and which bundles of knowledge one should apply to any particular new person. The transference process is likely to be largely in the domain of unintended thought — or in the realm of the new unconscious. While we have not systematically examined how effortful and intentional the process of transference is or how readily it can be corrected through strategic effort, and no doubt both components of transference exist, we assume that mental representations of significant others are subject to relatively automatic activation and use in interpersonal contexts. Overall, we believe that cognitive, affective and motivational concomitants of transference are likely to arise relatively effortlessly — without any special strategic thought or even conscious awareness. More broadly, evidence shows that motivations can be activated unconsciously by contextual cues (**Gollwitzer & Bargh, 2001, JPSP; see also Grainne and Bargh, 2002 (authors); jpsp too?**)

Recent work on unconscious processes in social cognition suggests that lack of awareness in processing is considered, of course, to be only one dimension of automatic social information processing (Bargh, 1994). Automaticity is not unidimensional, but rather, can be defined in terms of multiple cognitive characteristics that do not always co-occur. Along with consciousness, other dimensions of automaticity include the effort one must exert, the intention one must have, and the potential controllability of the process. In some of the work we present, we focus on the effortlessness or processing efficiency aspect of transference, while in other work it is the unconscious nature of transference that is our focus.

There is now little doubt that associative processes are influenced by stimuli presented and perceived outside of awareness (e.g., Bornstein & Pittman, 1992; **Dijksterhuis, this vol;** Kihlstrom,

1987; Bornstein & Pittman, 1992; although see Holender, 1986) and, as such, unconscious influences can affect social perception, in part by biasing interpretations — for example, of otherwise ambiguous behavior in a new person (e.g., Bargh, Bond, Lombardi, & Tota, 1986; Bargh & Pietromonaco, 1982; Devine, 1989). Both chronic accessibility, based on long term patterns of activation, and transient accessibility, based on local, particular experience, are profoundly important in construct use and interpretation (e.g., Bargh, 1989; Bargh et al., 1986; Higgins & Brendl, 1995; see also Andersen, Glassman, Chen, & Cole, 1995). That significant-other representations have been shown to be chronically accessible, and hence, more susceptible to transient contextual triggering, suggests their likely unconscious role in social perception

Our results cannot easily be explained either by the intention to think of the significant other per se or by the intention to use one's knowledge of this significant other in social perception —because in virtually all of our work, we instruct participants to be accurate in their inferences and memory, and such an accuracy goal should work against any strategy to show bias toward the significant other. On the other hand, participants in our typical paradigm have some intention to think about a new person in order to respond to questions about him or her —e.g., to indicate what they think and how they feel about the person —so we cannot rule out all intentionality in our effects. Certainly the intention to think about the new person in some manner is part of our typical paradigm, while no special conscious desire to think about the significant other should be. It would be of value to determine whether or not the transference process can be corrected or controlled—for example, when people have the motivation and the cognitive resources to attempt to do so. The story in our work thus offers cause for optimism that a more precise and better integrated understanding of the role of automaticity and unconscious processes in transference will emerge

We argue that our evidence thus far supports four conclusions about the unconscious and the relational self:

- that significant-other representations are activated relatively automatically in transference;
- that relatively automatic affect arises in transference as a function of activation of a significant-other representation and the affect associated with this significant other;
- that the relational self is activated relatively automatically when the significant-other representation is activated in transference;

- that some self-regulatory processes evoked in response to threat (e.g., negative cues) in transference take place automatically.

In this chapter, we review our primary social cognitive findings that tap inference and memory, as well as affective and motivational findings that involve the self-with-significant-other in transference. Evidence especially relevant to the themes of this volume is presented in greater detail, in particular, research showing that the transference process can be activated subliminally, i.e., is readily precipitated outside of awareness.

As indicated, lack of consciousness is an element of automaticity (see Bargh, 1989, 1994). When we examine the impact of contextual triggers presented outside of awareness, we obviously tap this component (Glassman & Andersen, 1999). Indeed, these procedures also tap the efficiency and the lack-of-control elements, as these apply to initial activation (when control is defined in terms of whether or not the process requires control rather than whether or not it can be controlled). Hence, subliminal priming procedures directly address automaticity in significant-other activation (see also Baldwin et al., 19xx —POPE STUDY).

Our work also addresses automatic effects in terms of cognitive accessibility. That is, we have shown that both the chronic likelihood of use and transient contextual cueing are responsible for the use of significant-other representations in transference (Andersen et al., 1995; Glassman & Andersen, 1999; Chen et al., 1999). The chronic accessibility of these representations, or their likelihood of being used in processing than comparison representations such as nonsignificant-other representations or stereotypes, combines with transient cueing in evoking these effects.

Next, we present evidence suggesting that automatic affect arises when significant-other representations are activated in transference. The affect associated with the representation comes to the fore in facial expressions of affect that are evoked relatively immediately, a key element of our model. We then present evidence showing the relatively automatic spread of activation from the significant other to the self in transference—indexed by heightened cognitive accessibility of relevant aspects of the self with corresponding shifts in self-evaluation. We examine the automaticity of the relational self in transference by tapping changes in cognitive accessibility (ease of processing) of particular aspects of self. Another key element of our model is thus the assumption that those aspects of self typically experienced with the significant other should come into play automatically, and hence, should come to be judged with more ease or efficiency when the relevant significant-other representations is activated.

Finally, we consider self-regulatory processes in transference and consider self-regulation that takes place relatively automatically relative to that which does not, again using ease of processing measures as well as facial affect expressed with relative immediacy. We argue that these measures should tap such self-regulatory processes because they do appear to occur with some immediacy rather than further downstream in the processing sequence.

Of course, contemporary research in social cognition has contributed greatly to our understanding of automaticity and the new unconscious—in terms of effort, lack of intention, and lack of control—and this literature is crucial in locating our work in broader scholastic context. In the interest of being succinct now, however, we turn directly to our theory and evidence and later in the chapter address the broader literature in more depth in terms of its implications for questions that remain unanswered in our work. In so doing we briefly address the literatures on automatic/subliminal priming, automatic evaluation, familiarity effects (perceptual fluency), implicit stereotyping, dual-process models, stereotype inhibition, control of automatic processing, and the potential automaticity in self-regulation or self-correction. We also give some consideration to automatic motivation as well as to the motivation to self-correct, and the demands on cognitive capacity that may pre-empt such motivation from being acted upon. In conclusion, we raise more nuanced implications of our work—involving both vulnerability and resilience in the relational self—in the context of the new unconscious.

Our Theory of the Relational Self

Our Social-Cognitive Model

Significant-other representations are linked to knowledge about the self as experienced with the other and transient activation of a significant-other representation, by immediate contextual cues, spreads to the relational self-with-this-other aspects. The model is based on a widely held assumption that all knowledge about the self cannot be activated in its entirety, and that only a subset is active in working memory at any given moment (e.g., Linville & Carlston, 1994). Thus, the self may be essentially newly constructed in each interpersonal context, as contextual cues trigger particular self-attributes that are then recruited into the working self concept. When contextual cues activate a significant-other representation, the subset of self-aspects with the significant other is then recruited into the working self-concept and becomes available in working memory. This should lead to shifts in the phenomenal self toward the self one is when in the presence

of this significant other. In fact, our research has demonstrated that when a significant-other representation is activated in an encounter with a new person, one tends to become the version of oneself one typically is with this significant other (Hinkley & Andersen, 1996). This shift in the contents of the working self-concept also prompts other self-relevant processes, including the emotional and self-regulatory.

Our model is consistent with the relational-schema approach (Baldwin, 1992), which assumes the existence of memory linkages between the significant other and the self that contain self-significant-other relationship patterns. However, whereas much of the research on relational schemas has focused on generic definitions of relational patterns (e.g., Baldwin, Fehr, Keedian, Seidel, & Thomson, 1993), and of aspects of the self (e.g., Baldwin & Sinclair, 1996), we have focused more on the idiographic nature of significant-other representations, and the unique version of the self one is in relation to each significant other in one's life (Hinkley & Andersen, 1995; see Chen & Andersen, 1999). We have also extended our thinking to normative representations of the self and of the self-other relationship, and overall, we track the activation of the relational self and its sequelae in transference.

Contextual Activation, the Self, and Personality

As noted, our research has shown that even in the absence of transient, contextual cues, significant-other representations have a high activation readiness, i.e., they are chronically accessible (e.g., Andersen, Glassman, Chen, & Cole, 1995). Research has also shown that cues emanating from a new person that overlap to some extent with stored knowledge about a significant other provide additional contextual activation. People encounter such contextual cues in their daily social interactions (Chen, Andersen, & Hinkley, 1999). In our experimental work, we rely on cues about a new person to transiently activate transference. That is, we manipulate the interpersonal context that participants are faced with, such that a new person is or is not characterized by descriptors participants themselves provided weeks earlier about a significant other.

Contextual variability in the self should depend on whether or not transference is set into motion by the presence of contextual cues. We argue that the self is partly determined by contextual cues—the presence of overlap between cues in a new person and the knowledge one holds about a significant other. Just as non-interpersonal contextual cues, such as those within a professional setting, are associated with the self one is at work, a new person may constitute a "context" which activates a relevant significant-other representation and, accordingly, the associated self-with-significant-other (Andersen & Chen, in press).

These assumptions about the self are highly compatible with conceptualizing personality in terms of IF-THEN relations, with IFs representing situations or contexts and THENs representing particular behaviors that are elicited in them (Mischel & Shoda, 1995). Accordingly, personality reflects an individual's overall pattern of IF-THEN relations. Our theory parallels this model in the idea that variability across different situations is fundamental to self and personality (see also Higgins, 1990; Mischel, 1999). However, our focus is specific in its emphasis on interpersonal IFs—newly encountered individuals who, by virtue of their resemblance to a significant other, serve as contexts that activate significant-other representations and thus bring to the fore the relevant changes in the self. An individual's overall repertoire of relational selves— aspects of the self tied to a significant other— represents a major source of the interpersonal patterns that characterize his or her personality across contexts (Andersen & Chen, in press).

The Uniqueness of Significant-Other Representations and Their Activation

How are significant-other representations different from various other representations? We have proposed (e.g., Andersen & Glassman, 1996) that each mental representation of a significant other designates a specific, unique individual, rather than a shared notion of a social category, type, or group (e.g., Andersen & Klatzky, 1987; Brewer, 1988; Cantor & Mischel, 1979; Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Higgins & King, 1981). Representations of significant others are n-of-one representations or exemplars (Linville & Fischer, 1993; E.R. Smith & Zarate, 1992). While they contain generic knowledge about the significant person, as well as unique knowledge and experience, it is the representation of the person that accounts for the coherence of these associations in memory. No generic label referring to more than one person can quite serve this function. Thus, significant-other representations contain descriptive knowledge generalized from experiences with the represented individual as well as specific memories about him or her (Brooks, 1987; Gilovich, 1981), which are both brought to bear in interpreting new people in the context of transference.

Research evidence supports the distinction between exemplars and generic constructs by showing that memory is far more specific than would be expected if only generic knowledge were retained (e.g., E.R. Smith & Zarate, 1990, 1992; E.E. Smith, 1998; see also Macrae et al., 1998). Although both exemplars and generic social constructs are connected in memory, can activate each other, and are used in social perception, exemplar-based processing is readily distinguishable from category-based processing (e.g., E.R. Smith, Stewart,

& Buttram, 1992; Karylowski, Konarzewski, & Motes, 1999). Our research has shown that significant-other representations are a type of exemplar that is more chronically accessible than a generic social construct (e.g., Andersen et al., 1995; Andersen, Lambert, & Dick, 1999; Chen et al., 1999; see also Karylowski et al., 1999).

Consistent with exemplar notions, our past work has emphasized the uniqueness of each significant other in a person's life. Representations of significant others contain assorted idiographic knowledge such as physical characteristics, ways of relating, interests, habits, and other personality attributes (e.g., Andersen & Cole, 1990; Prentice, 1990) —including not only interpersonal behaviors (e.g., Andersen et al., 1998), but also the significant other's inner feelings and motivations (e.g., Andersen et al., 1998; Chen, 2001; Johnson & Boyd, 1995). Such knowledge is activated as part of the activation of a significant-other representation when a new person is seen as similar to the significant other (e.g., **Higgins & King, 1981; for related analogy-based models, see Gilovich, 1981; Read & Cessa, 1991; Spellman & Holyoak, 1992**).**OLD**

CITES OK? UPDATE?

When attributes relevant to a significant other are encountered in a new target person, the internal organization of the significant-other representation should facilitate spread of association within the representation from encountered attributes to those not encountered and yet relevant to the significant other, resulting in inferences about the target person that go beyond what was learned about the individual (Collins & Loftus, 1975). This structural property of inner organization, combined with the chronic accessibility of significant-other representations, makes these representations very likely to be activated outside of awareness, the central theme of this chapter.

Of course, it is important to note that although we characterize our model of transference and the activation of significant-other representations in terms of spread of activation —which assumes an associative network model of knowledge activation (e.g., Collins & Loftus, 1975; Higgins & King, 1981) —we acknowledge that alternative models exist. For instance, in connectionist models (e.g., Smith, 1996), conjoint activation takes place simultaneously based on connection weights. We have no investment in which of these models is the more accurate —and to a large extent they make the same predictions. Our theoretical investment is in the special linkages within the significant-other representations that are modeled either as connection weights or as spread of activation, and in the linkages between the significant other and the self. In any event, we argue that there is an automatic tendency to use significant-other representations in social

perception and interpersonal relations, and that the relational self is called into play automatically as well.

Activation of Generic Relational Knowledge Linked to the Significant Other

Knowledge about each significant other is linked in memory with unique aspects of the self and unique relational patterns. We highlight the importance of idiographic elements of significant others and relational selves and go further by positing that when an idiographic significant-other representation is activated, this in turn activates not only idiographic self-with-significant-other knowledge, but also generic, socially-shared constructs, such as social categories or social identities, associated with the significant other. In support of this assumption, recent research has shown that when significant-other representations are primed, the gender category to which the person belongs is automatically activated, providing evidence for a link in memory between significant-other representations and generic social categories (Karylowski et al., 1999). This evidence also supports the relative effortlessness or efficiency with which activation spreads from significant-other representations (or a hefty connection weight) to categorical social knowledge.

In transference, then, activation of a significant-other representation should spread to shared social constructs with normative implications. One form of generic knowledge that should be linked to significant others and self-with-other representations is one's interpersonal role with the significant other. This hypothesized linkage reflecting shared social knowledge with normative implications is important given increasing interest in relational roles (e.g., **Bersheid et al., 19xx**; A.P. Fiske, 1992; **Mills & Clark, 1994**; see also Bugental, 2000). The role relationship with the other should be invoked when transference occurs in an encounter with a new person. As a result, role-based expectations and goals, along with any affective consequences linked to such expectations, such as role violations, should emerge in the transference (Baum & Andersen, 1999). While much theoretical work on roles defines them in terms of the broad survival goals they serve (e.g., Bugental, 2000; Kenrick, 2001) or the types of roles that exist (e.g., A.P. Fiske, 1992; Mills & Clark, 1994), our work focuses specifically on a single, actual relationship and the self-other roles in it that likely involve (or involved) communal relations—based on mutuality and needs for connection and belonging.

Generic, socially shared elements of one's relational selves should also include notions about the significant other's standards, such as significant other's wishes about whom one should ideally be (ideals) or ought to be (oughts). In self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987; Higgins, 1996b), such standards for the self are defined in normative, categorical terms (although they tend to be assessed idiographically), and may be

inconsistent with perceptions of the actual self. Such normative elements of self-other relationships may become activated in transference in the form of self-standards and self-discrepancies. When a significant-other representation is activated, self-standards linked to the representation may become activated as well, with the corresponding negative affective experience arising from one's perceived failure to meet these standards (Reznik & Andersen, 1998).

Beyond self-aspects linked to a significant other, it is clear that self-knowledge involves many other elements, such as one's abilities, values, and goals. Some of the relational self also reflects generic knowledge, such as one's own opinions or standards about how all people should be treated. Hence, not all self-aspects are captured by the relational self. Nonetheless, the profound emotional-motivational importance of significant others combined with the chronic accessibility of significant-other representations suggests a strong baseline influence of significant-other representations on day-to-day functioning.

While representations of anyone one knows or has known, whether significant or not, may exert an influence on social perception in this way (e.g., Karylowski et al., 1999), the depth, extensiveness, and detail of the knowledge represented about significant others (Andersen & Cole, 1990), as well as both the mundane and sublime in what is known, should make significant-other representations particularly likely to be activated in response to new people. Indeed, features of significant others are called to mind more rapidly than the features of others who are not important in one's life or features of generic categories (Andersen & Cole, 1990; Andersen, Glassman, & Gold, 1999; Chen, 1997), and these representations are also used more efficiently in making simple judgments (Andersen et al., 1999; Karylowski et al., 1999). When combined with the presence (vs. absence) of relevant transient cues in a new person that indicating some applicability of the representation, this further readies the representation for use.

Evidence Supporting Transference and the Relational Self

We now turn to the evidence that supports our theoretical model, highlighting findings that most directly address the new unconscious in transference. The evidence obtained speaks to the nature of the unconscious in transference even when it does not contain explicit measures unconscious processes. This is so because our model and methods rely entirely on the activation and use of social constructs or exemplars, which are known to operate outside of awareness in well-specified ways. In reviewing this body of work we emphasize findings concerning automatic activation of significant other representations, their related affect, the spread of

activation to the relational self (and self-evaluation) from the significant-other representation, and the elicitation of self-regulation.

Inference and Memory Effects

Our early research on transference measured primarily inference and memory effects that could be traced to activation and use. The evidence shows that knowledge about significant others is used to go beyond the information given (Bruner, 1957) in perceptions of new people (Andersen & Cole, 1990). In our experimental paradigm, participants encounter a new person resembling a significant other —by reading sentences about that person derived from descriptions of a significant other they provided earlier. Participants then complete a memory task, in which they are especially confident about having seen descriptions of this new person that were not in fact presented about him or her, but that are characteristic of the significant other (e.g., Andersen & Cole, 1990).

Put differently, when learning about various fictional characters or about one person allegedly seated next door, and when later tested for recognition-memory confidence about possible attributes of each person, participants show greater representation-based memory confidence for the character/person who had some minimal resemblance to a significant-other representation than to a control representations. They are especially likely to go beyond what they learned about a new individual who resembled a significant other rather than a nonsignificant other (Andersen et al., 1995; Andersen & Cole, 1990), a stereotype (Andersen & Cole, 1990; Chen, Andersen, & Hinkley, 1998), or another person's significant other (with exactly the same triggering and testing content as in the transference condition (Andersen & Baum, 1994; Andersen et al., 1995, 1996; Chen et al., 1998; Glassman & Andersen, 1999; Hinkley & Andersen, 1996; Reznik, 2001).

Such memory effects have been obtained repeatedly and are not accounted for by the self-generated (see Greenwald & Banaji, 1989) nature of these descriptors, or by reliance on generic stereotypes (Andersen et al., 1995). Hence, significant-other representations may be more ubiquitous in social perception even than stereotyping or other kinds of social-construct-based processing. Clearly, this would argue for ease in unconscious activation of these representations and for a profound relevance of this process for the relational self.

Of course, these representations, being highly familiar and chronically accessible, have a special

readiness to be activated and used (Bargh et al., 1986; Higgins, 1996; Higgins & Brendl, 1995; Higgins & King, 1981; Prentice, 1990). In fact, our research indicates that significant-other representations require no priming to be used, just as would be expected of other chronically accessible constructs (Andersen et al., 1995, Study 1). Likewise, significant-other representations are so readily accessed and used that no applicability-based transient cuing in a new person is necessary for such inferences to occur. Still, significant-other-based memory is greater when relevant triggering cues are present in the target than when not, and transient sources of activation appear to combine additively with chronic accessibility to increase the likelihood of their use (Andersen et al., 1995, Study 2; see also Bargh et al., 1986).

We assume that the chronic accessibility of significant-other representations leads to their heightened processing efficiency (see Karylowski et al., 1999; Andersen et al., 1999). Such chronic accessibility should give these representations a heightened susceptibility to the contextual triggering process, which itself should occur relatively effortlessly, efficiently, and unconsciously. Thus, we assume that the activation process need not be strategic or intentional on the perceiver's part. Hence, it should be possible to activate a significant-other representation outside of awareness, leading to the emergence of transference. On the basis of descriptors presented subliminally, the same findings in perceivers' inferences should emerge (Glassman & Andersen, 1999).

Unconscious Activation of Transference

As the preceding discussion implies, transient triggering of significant-other representations may arise through exposure to consciously perceived triggering cues. We also argue that transference is likely to have unconscious basis—that is, that a significant-other representation may become activated without awareness based on the attributes of a new person perceived only unconsciously (Glassman & Andersen, 1999). Similarly, changes in the self may involve conscious experience of the self in the context of significant-other activation and transference in addition to less conscious effects.

Because significant-other representations should not require effort to be activated, they should readily be activated subliminally, and such a finding would lay the groundwork for a claim of the potentially ubiquitous role of significant-other representations in social perception and social relations. The question of the extent to which transference can take place outside of conscious awareness, moreover, is noteworthy because of its

longstanding historical interest. Freud, along with most psychoanalysts, believed that transference is unconscious. If the data were to support the unconscious triggering of transference, this would rule out the necessity of being consciously reminded of a significant other as a precondition for the process to occur (Glassman & Andersen, 1999c).

In short, one need not try to think of — or try to be influenced by — significant-other representations in the course of everyday relations. Hence, we argue that transference does not need to be evoked consciously as it can be activated subliminally. The evidence of unconscious activation of transference is also important because it provides a basis for the possibility that most of the basic processes of transference — emotional, motivational, and cognitive — emerge without the need for conscious awareness or effortful processing. In addition, demonstrating the unconscious nature of transference would lend important support to long-standing clinical assumptions (e.g., Ehrenreich, 1989; Luborsky & Crits-Christoph, 1990).

Studying the unconscious. Although research on subliminal perception has a controversial history in the cognitive and social-psychological literatures (e.g., Bowers, 1984; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Holender, 1986; Kihlstrom, Barnhardt, & Tatarzyn, 1992), our work is informed by a growing body of evidence showing that subliminally presented stimuli can be processed outside of awareness, influencing lexical decision tasks (Marcel, 1983; Blair & Banaji, 1996; Greenwald, Klinger, & Schuh, 1995), self-evaluation (Baldwin, Carell & Lopez, 1990), impressions and recall of otherwise ambiguous target persons (Bargh et al., 1986; Devine, 1989; Erdley & D'Agostino, 1988; Lewicki, 1986; Macrae, Bodenhausen, & Milne, 1995), and even social behavior (e.g., Bargh & Gollwitzer, 1994; Neuberg, 1988).

Subliminal methodologies are "high-tech" and may seem disconnected from normal experience, yet there are analogies to subliminal activation in real life (cf., Bargh, 1992). For instance, the most important attribute or feature that triggers transference may not be the one we know we have seen, possibly because our attention was elsewhere at the time, or because the feature was exhibited or expressed by a target person so briefly that we were not aware of perceiving it. The subliminal method provides a way to ensure that the activation process is literally taking place without the participant's knowledge.

Ways of being unconscious. In our framework, we assume that transference can be unconscious in

several ways. For example, the content of what is transferred in transference may not be available to consciousness, or by contrast, one may be aware of the content but not aware of the cues that end up triggering the effect (Kihlstrom, 1987; Luborsky, Crits-Christoph, Friedman, Mark, & Schaffler, 1991; Singer & Salovey, 1991). That is, relevant triggering cues may be unconscious (for definitions of awareness, see also Bargh, 1994; Uleman, 1987). On another level, one may not be conscious of making a significant-other-based interpretation about a new person. We know of no other empirical evidence that has examined the unconscious nature of transference, though the subliminal activation of significant-other representations has been shown in other work (e.g., Baldwin, 1992; Baldwin, Carrel, & Lopez, 1990). In our work, we examined unconscious activation of transference using cues presented subliminally.

Subliminal paradigm. In the experiment, participants sat at a computer terminal to play a computer game with a partner seated elsewhere. They were told to focus their attention on a white dot in the center of a computer screen in order to read supraliminal stimuli presented there, while simultaneously responding to random flashes on the left and right of the screen by pressing "left" or "right" on a response box. The flashes were subliminal descriptors consisting of four or fewer words, flashed for less than 100 ms in parafoveal vision and then pattern-masked (as in Bargh et al., 1986). Supraliminal stimuli were irrelevant to the participant's significant other. Subliminal descriptors, however, were derived from either: participant's own significant-other descriptors (generated in a pretest session) —experimental condition; a yoked participant's significant-other descriptors —yoked control condition; or the participant's own descriptors generated earlier that constituted no particular category or mental representation —no-representation control condition (cf. Greenwald, 1981; Greenwald & Banaji, 1989).

After completing the "computer game," participants offered their impression of their "game partner" by rating the descriptiveness of several statements. Participants exposed to subliminal presentations derived from their own significant other (experimental condition) performed the inference task by assessing the new person based on descriptors derived from their own significant other. Similarly, participants in the yoked control condition, even though they were exposed subliminally to a yoked participant's significant-other features, also performed the inference task by assessing the new person using the features of their own significant other. Finally, participants in the no-representation control condition, having been exposed

subliminally to their own no-representation features, later performed the inference task using these same kinds of no-representation features, those presented and not presented. In all conditions, we focused on the inferences based on descriptors that were not subliminally presented to participants. Importantly, the results of subliminality check performed at the end of experiment indicated that participants were not able to guess at better than chance levels the content of the subliminal exposures. Hence, the data suggest they were unaware of the content of the subliminal triggering cues.

Subliminal results. Of greatest interest, and as Figure 1 shows, participants in the experimental condition—that is, those for whom their game partner subliminally resembled their own significant other—made stronger significant-other-derived inferences than did those in both control conditions. Specifically, as predicted, participants in the significant-other condition rated not-presented items from their own significant other as describing the new person more than did participants in the yoked control condition.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

In the yoked-control condition, there should have been no triggering of participants' own significant-other representation. Each control participant was exposed subliminally to the exact same features to which one participant in the experimental condition was exposed. That is, he or she was yoked on a one-to-one basis (without replacement) with a participant in the experimental condition, which perfectly controlled for subliminal content across the experimental and control conditions, even while assessing each participant's own significant-other-derived inferences about the new person. Hence, this control condition reflected use of the significant-other representation in the absence of relevant triggering cues.

In short, these data support our hypothesis about the unconscious activation of transference. On the other hand, because the subliminal cues presented in the own-significant-other condition were self-generated, this factor alone could conceivably have accounted for the apparent effect. That is, the subliminal significant-other condition involved self-generated cues and the yoked-control condition did not. However, as Figure 1 also shows, our additional control condition was able to rule out self-generation effects (Greenwald & Banaji, 1989) because inference ratings in the own-significant-other condition were greater than those in the no-representation condition.

Subliminal replication. In another study that conceptually replicated this work, we included both

the experimental and the yoked control conditions, and we also controlled for the valence of the significant-other representation. In Study 1, the affect associated with the significant other was unspecified, in Study 2, the examined significant-other representations were explicitly positive. As shown in Figure 2, the results of the study indicated that participants went beyond the subliminally given information to a greater extent when their game partner subliminally resembled their own rather than a yoked participant's significant other. This evidence clearly shows that transference can be triggered unconsciously, and that the phenomenon of transference does not appear to depend on perceivers being consciously reminded of a significant other. Our data also support the argument that unconscious processes should arise based on well-established or over-learned constructs, such that frequently rehearsed experiences acquire a special readiness to be activated unconsciously (Singer & Bonanno, 1990; see also Meichenbaum & Gilmore, 1984; **see also Jacoby; Logan; Smith &).**

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

Rather than discuss the implications of these data at length now, we turn to a wider review of a variety of findings concerning transference and the relational self, emphasizing those that speak relatively directly to unconscious or to automatic processes, and highlighting what is affectively and motivationally relevant about transference and the relational self.

Evoking Positive Evaluation

The simplest affective finding emerging from our work is that the activation of a significant-other representation elicits the affect typically experienced in relation to the significant other, as in the theory of schema-triggered affect which emphasizes how evaluation is ascribed to a new person (Fiske & Pavelchak, 1986). When participants learn about a new individual who resembles their own, rather than someone else's, significant other, they are not only more likely to demonstrate inference and memory effects for both positive and negative significant others, but they are also more likely to evaluate the person resembling a positive significant other vs. a negative significant other in a far more positive way (e.g., Andersen & Baum, 1994). We have repeatedly demonstrated that more liking of a new person in a positive transference occurs even though an equal number of positive and negative features are encountered about the new person in positive and negative transference conditions. We argue that this process takes place in the real world, when a newly-encountered individual activates a positive or negative significant-other representation. Thus, one may come to like or dislike the new person by virtue of some minimal resemblance to a significant other according to the

overall affect associated with the significant other (Andersen & Baum, 1994; Andersen et al., 1996; Baum & Andersen, 1994; Berk & Andersen, 2000).

Eliciting Automatic Positive Facial Affect

We obviously assume that evaluation is evoked when the significant-other representation is activated along with the associated affect linked to the representation—due to content-based transient triggering. Because significant-other representations are known to be activated outside of conscious awareness and without effort, the affect should be triggered with little cognitive effort or consciousness. Although our self-report evaluation measure does not permit conclusions about the relative effortlessness of schema-triggered evaluation, parallel effects have been obtained in nonverbal behavior. This provides converging evidence for the elicitation of affect in transference, by tapping people's relatively immediate facial expressions. That is, when people encounter transference-triggering cues, their immediate facial affect—when reading each descriptive sentence about the new person—reflects the affect associated with the significant other. Participants' relatively immediate affect in the transference context was derived from how positively or negatively they regarded the significant other. As shown in Figure 3, participants in transference expressed more positive affect on their faces when the new person resembled their positive vs. negative significant other, which did not occur in the control condition.

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

Because of the relative immediacy of this measurement, the observed changes in facial displays of affect can be conceptualized in terms of little deliberation and hence presumably relative effortlessness. These data thus imply that schema-triggered affect in transference may arise relatively automatically (by virtue of this relative immediacy), though the methods we employed do not permit unequivocal conclusions. The data do, however, provide some grist for the notion that, as with affect, the evaluation of a new person in transference may arise relatively automatically. Later, we present more nuanced findings with regard to the relatively immediate expressions of facial affect that address the issues of self-regulation in transference.

Evoking Motivation for Interpersonal Closeness

Along the same lines of affectively charged responses, people's self-reported motivation to approach and to be emotionally intimate with significant others, or to withdraw from them and to be closed and distant,

have also been observed in transference. People want to be emotionally close to new others as a function of whether or not a new person resembles a significant other with whom there is/was such closeness (Andersen et al., 1996). This finding has replicated (Berk & Andersen, 2000) and is provocative given other evidence on the automatic activation of goal states and related behavior (Bargh & Barndollar, 1996; Bargh & Chartrand, 1999; Bargh & Gollwitzer; see also Aarts & Dijksterhuis, 2000), although we have not studied automaticity of goal activation explicitly.

Triggering Expectancies for Acceptance vs. Rejection

Beyond motivation, we have demonstrated that participants' expectations for acceptance by or rejection from significant others come into play with new people in the context of transference, again as a function of the affect associated with the significant other (e.g., Andersen, Reznik, & Manzella, 1996). When the new person resembles a positive significant other, people report expecting to be accepted rather than rejected by the new person, an effect that has also been replicated (Berk & Andersen, 2000). The growing literature on rejection sensitivity and the ease with which it can be triggered supports the possible automaticity of such processes, although we have yet to explicitly examine this question in our research. In particular, this related work suggests that people who are especially sensitive to rejection have a vigilance system about approval/disapproval by others that is readily activated, and in which automatic negative expectations are typically evoked. When such automatic processes are set in motion, it is only strategic attention deployment (to non-rejection related information) that may counteract negative interpersonal consequences (Ayduk, Mendoza-Denton, Mischel, Downey, Peake, & Rodriguez, 2000).

Eliciting Interpersonal Behavior: Positive Affect Expressed in Conversation.

Another line of research extends this evidence to overt behavior, more specifically, dyadic interpersonal behavior in the context of an unstructured telephone conversation. Although the research did not address automaticity per se, it did show that when a new person activated a significant-other representation, interpersonal behavior with the new person reflected the affect associated with the relationship (Berk & Andersen, 2000). In the experiment using a classic paradigm (Snyder, Tanke, & Bersheid, 1977), we assessed the conversational behavior of two people—a target person in an interaction with a perceiver who was experiencing either a positive or a negative transference (or no transference). Supporting our predictions,

behavioral confirmation arose in the conversational behavior of the target person in the context of transference. That is, the target's conversational behavior came to reflect the affect associated with the significant other, as coded by independent judges who could not hear the perceiver's contributions to the conversation. And even though these data are silent on the potentially automatic elicitation of this behavior, behavioral confirmation is not thought to require a conscious intention to lure the other person into becoming what one anticipates. The affect triggered is also virtually instantaneously in perceivers and appears to unfold sequentially in the interaction such that it is ultimately reciprocated by the new person's behavior. Because behavioral confirmation has been shown to occur nonconsciously (Chen & Bargh, 1997), we assume that this process occurred without perceivers being consciously aware of it.

Evidence Specific to Triggering the Relational Self

Activating Idiographic Self-with-Other Knowledge

Of importance to our thinking about the relational self is research showing that encounters with people who bear some resemblance to a significant other lead one to become the self one typically is when *with* this significant other (Hinkley & Andersen, 1996). When a new person activates a significant-other representation, this activation should spread to elements of the self linked with the significant other, resulting in an influx of these self-with-significant-other features into the working self-concept. This process should take place relatively automatically.

In addition, changes in self-evaluation should also occur in transference. That is, the relational self activated should be associated with a positive self-evaluation in the positive transference and with negative self-evaluation in the negative transference, whereas this should not occur in the control condition. Hence, activation should spread from the significant other to the self, based on significant-other activation, a process central to our model. This process should occur without particular effort, and its potential automaticity addressed in research described shortly.

Specifically, in our working self-concept paradigm, participants generate sentences to characterize the self at the moment—an idiographic measure of the working self-concept. They complete this task both in a preliminary session and in the experiment itself. An idiographic measure of self-evaluation is also used—in which participants classify each sentence they list as either positive or negative. In the preliminary session, though, participants also list sentences reflecting aspects of the self experienced when with the significant

other. The number of overlapping sentences between participants' working self-concept in the experiment and their self when with the significant other could then be computed and examined, controlling for the similar overlap at pretest. The evidence supported the predicted self-concept change by showing increase in overlap when the new person resembled participants' own significant other (relative to the control condition) -- for both positive and negative significant others.

Moreover, for the working self-concept items reflecting the relational self—the self with the other—we also calculated the self-evaluation associated with the change in the content of the working self-concept. The data showed that self-evaluation was significantly less positive (or more negative) in the negative vs. the positive transference conditions—when the new person resembled the participant's own significant other, relative to when he or she did not. As shown in Figure 4, participants' self-evaluation associated with the change in the relational working-self-concept—for those features that overlapped with the self-with-significant-other in the working self-concept—was more positive (covarying out the same scores at pretest) when the new person resembled the participants' positive, rather than negative, significant other. This pattern did not occur in the no-resemblance control condition. The change in self-evaluation was simply assessed as the sum of the positive and negative classifications participants ascribed to each relational working-self-concept sentence they listed during the experiment.

INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE

We now turn to other evidence about activation of aspects of the self in the context of transference, briefly reviewing empirical work showing that activation of a significant-other representation activates the self in ways that involve shared relational constructs that are normative or prescriptive.

Activating Interpersonal Roles and Associated Affect

As one example, we have shown that the interpersonal role one occupies in relation to a significant other is activated in transference. When a role activation occurs, it should lead to negative or dysphoric mood under the circumstance that role expectations are violated, and our research supports this assumption (Baum & Andersen, 1999). While eliciting affect associated with role violation in transference does not speak to self-evaluation, it certainly shows the activation of the relational self defined in terms of roles. These findings are worthy of note given the increasing importance of roles (along with associated motives and expectancies) in

contemporary personality and social psychology (e.g., Mills & Clark, 1994; A. P. Fiske, 1992; see also Bugental, 2000; Kenrick, 2001).

Activating Standards and Self-Discrepancies

Another example of activating, in transference, shared relational constructs linked to significant others can be found in the standards a significant other holds for the self. Such self-standards are linked to the significant other in memory, according to self-discrepancy theory (e.g., Higgins, 1996). In line with the theory, our evidence shows that activating a significant-other representation activates the self-standards and self-discrepancies held from the standpoint of the significant other (e.g., between the ideal and the actual self). That is, significant-other activation results in the kind of affective consequences—indexed by self-report mood measures—that self-discrepancy theory would predict. Ideal-discrepant participants manifest dejection-related (depressed) affect in transference, while ought-discrepant participants manifest agitation-related affect, hostility and resentment, the pattern predicted by self-discrepancy theory (Reznik & Andersen, 1998).

In self-discrepancy theory, in addition to influencing mood states, standards also determine self-regulatory processes. A self-regulatory focus on obtaining (or not losing) positive outcomes originates from ideal self-standards, while a self-regulatory focus on avoidance or prevention of negative outcomes stems from ought self-standards (e.g., Higgins, 1987; Higgins, 1996b). Our evidence largely supports the notion that self-regulatory focus is activated in transference, yielding a pattern consistent with self-discrepancy theory. Ideal-discrepant individuals are more eager to engage with the new person while thinking about interacting with him or her than when no longer expecting to do so, whereas ought-discrepant individuals are more likely to wish to avoid the other while thinking about interacting rather than when no longer expecting to do so (Reznik & Andersen, 1998). In short, ideal-discrepant individuals strive for positive outcomes (or not to lose them) and ought-discrepant individuals strive to avoid negative outcomes, and these self-regulatory processes of self-discrepancy theory arise in transference.

Like interpersonal roles, self-discrepancies are normative constructs, in that they reflect shared social knowledge and are thought to be general across people and are prescriptive in nature. The fact that research shows spread to normative self-aspects (i.e., to roles and standards) extends our prior work on idiographic aspects of the self (Hinkley & Andersen, 1996), and also links exemplar representations to shared social constructs (see Karylowski et al., 1999; Smith & Zarate, 1992). Of course, although both sets of evidence

make use of fairly indirect, downstream indicators of transference such as self-reported mood, they support the activation of relevant aspects of the self on the basis of significant-other activation, and we assume that the basic underlying mechanisms are likely to occur automatically. Indeed, even self-regulatory processes may sometimes be automatic, which we take up next

Evidence on Triggering Self-Regulation.

We argue that self-regulatory responses occur in transference because significant others and relationships with these individuals are imbued with special emotional resonance. Significant others are uniquely positioned both to provide comfort and to disrupt affective equilibrium—because one cares about these others, how they perceive things, how they feel, and what they do. For these reasons, it is possible that the transference context provides not only familiarity and a sense of closeness, but also vulnerability and the need for self-regulation.

One way to think about self-regulation is that when a threat to the self is presented in transference, a kind of compensatory self-enhancement should occur. Self-enhancement, positive illusions, and ego-defensive biases have been commonly observed (e.g., Greenberg & Pyszczynski, 1985; Steele, 1988; Taylor & Brown, 1988; Showers, 1992), and the familiarity and closeness activated in transference make such processes likely when threat to the self is experienced. When a significant-other representation laden with negative affect is activated, such that there is a threat to the self, compensatory self-enhancement is likely to occur, assuming that this self-regulatory response is not compromised by such factors as depression or low self-esteem.

In addition, individuals in transference should not only show self-enhancement in response to a threat to the self, but should also show other-enhancement or relationship-enhancement, in response to a threat to the regard one has for the significant other. In this instance, a kind of compensatory enhancement of the other may be observed. The automaticity of these effects remains to be demonstrated. We refer to these two processes of self-regulation as self-protective and relationship-protective, highlighting who or what is being protected on the basis of some threat. We consider each in turn, beginning with self-protective self-regulation, and explore the matter of effortful processing in conjunction with these two kinds of self-regulation.

Evoking Self-Protective Self-Regulation

Our research on the working self-concept in transference described earlier (Hinkley & Andersen,

1996), involved shifts in the content of the working self-concept—in the direction of the self with the significant other. Given that in the negative transference condition, this shift in self-evaluation was negative, and hence threatening, we assumed that self-protective self-regulation should be activated. That is, the negative shift in self-evaluation ought to be accompanied by shifts in self-evaluation directed against the negative blow to the self, and we found support for this assumption (Hinkley & Andersen, 1996). The insult to the self may evoke efforts to repair self-esteem through some compensatory self-enhancement. (Greenberg & Pyszczynski, 1985; Tice & Bratslavsky, 2000).

In support of this self-regulatory hypothesis, participants' evaluations of those aspects of their working self-concept that did not reflect their relational self with the negative significant other were actually the most positive (controlling for pretest evaluation) of all the conditions. As shown in Figure 5, when the new person resembled participants' own negatively regarded significant other, their overall self-evaluation— not changing to reflect the content of the precise self-with-the-other (the vast majority of descriptors)— reversed the blow to self-evaluation that also occurred in that condition. Indeed, overall, this condition resulted in the most positive self-evaluation of all. In the negative transference, an overwhelming number of positively evaluated self-descriptors entered into the working self-concept, directly contrasting the average valence of the overlapping descriptors associated with the self-with-negative-other and bolstering the self in the context. We argue (e.g., Andersen, Chen, & Miranda, in press) that such self-enhancement reflects a self-protective, self-regulatory response to the influx of negative self-aspects into the working self-concept, much as observed in self-affirmation theory (e.g., Steele, 1988) or in terror management theory (e.g., Greenberg, Pyszczynski, Solomon, & Chatel, 1992)—to name a few models that propose protective self-regulation in response to threat (Hinkley & Andersen, 1996).

INSERT FIGURE 5 ABOUT HERE

The above evidence verifies once again that the self as experienced in relation to the significant other is activated in transference, leading to consistent changes in self-evaluation, but also that self-evaluation inconsistent with the affect associated with the significant other can arise as well. This process presumably occurs as the spread of activation to the relevant relational aspects of the self that activates negative self-evaluations provokes self-protective self-regulation. Clearly, such self-regulation promotes feeling better about

the self, and it suggests that some consequences of a negative transference may be relatively controlled as they are able to charge the self-evaluation that would otherwise emerge. Hence, it is important to examine whether these processes occur in a relatively strategic and deliberative way or with relative ease.

Next, we present research that conceptually replicates the evidence just described and also examines changes in the accessibility of various elements of the self, as an indicator of automaticity in spread of activation to the self, and also in self-protective self-regulation.

Evoking the Dreaded Self

This research addresses the question of whether or not transference-based changes in self-evaluation can occur relatively automatically, and also addresses whether or not the self-regulatory processes that such changes set in motion are relatively effortless or strategic in nature. It conceptually replicates prior work (Hinkley & Andersen, 1996), focusing on positive significant others only, rather than on comparisons of positive and negative significant others, and especially on significant others who happen to be associated with, or lead one to manifest, a desired self or a dreaded self (Reznik, 2001). Since desired and dreaded selves are among many possible selves an individual may tap, these should be activated in transference, and a dreaded self may readily be linked with a positive significant other. One may love someone and yet find oneself behaving dreadfully around this person or feeling dreaded things about the other or the self. Hence, a positive significant-other representation linked to a dreaded self should, when activated, then activate this dreaded self, leading to similar consequences for the self as observed when a negative significant-other representation is activated. Using our working self-concept paradigm (Hinkley & Andersen, 1996), we assessed changes in self-evaluation — in the working self-concept features in transference.

Expanding the paradigm, this research also adopted a reactive measure — response latency of participants self-judgments of positive and negative adjectives as self-descriptive, and their rate of endorsement of these adjectives. In a preliminary session, participants described two positively-toned significant others (from their families of origin), with whom they tend to be at their best or at their worst, and also identified adjectives from a list — either as descriptive of their desired or their dreaded self, respectively. In the experimental session conducted several weeks later, participants completed the free-listing working self-concept task (as in Hinkley & Andersen, 1996), and also this new reactive measure. In the latter, participants judged each adjective from their dreaded or desired self by making YES/NO decisions about self-relevance while

their response latency was recorded. Response latency was used as an index of its accessibility. The simple rate of endorsement of adjectives, much as the free-response measure, tapped the availability of desired and undesired self-attributes in one's self-conception, and not necessarily their accessibility (Higgins, 1996a). In the experimental session, participants learned about a new person who either did or did not resemble a positive significant other associated with a desired or dreaded self.

Freely listed working self-concept. As in prior research (Hinkley & Andersen, 1996), when the new person resembled their significant other, the contents of participants' working self-concept shifted in the direction of the self-when-with-the-significant-other. This shift was indexed by the influx of features of the self-with-the-significant-other into the working self-concept (controlling for the same score at pretest). When the new person resembled participants' significant other with whom participants tend to be at their best, the contents of their working self-concept shifted in the direction of their desired self. Similarly, when the new person resembled participants' own significant other with whom they tend to be at their worst, their self-concept features shifted in the direction of their dreaded self. This content overlap verifies the relational self being contextually triggered.

In terms of the self-evaluation, when the significant other associated with the participant's dreaded self was activated, those self-descriptors shifting toward the self-with-significant-other in the experiment were significantly more negative than they were when the desired self was activated. This did not occur in the no-resemblance control condition. Hence, the dreaded self and the desired self, respectively, can be activated in transference, with corresponding implications for self-evaluation. Indeed, when the dreaded self was activated in transference, participants also recruited more positive self-attributes into their working self-concepts not linked to the significant other, again showing compensatory self-regulation. As in prior research, self-evaluation shown in the working self-concept not only shifted in accord with the valence of the relational self, but it also revealed a marked tendency—in the context of activation of a dreaded relational self—to engage in self-protective self-regulation.

Response latency and the working self-concept. As noted, however, the free-response data, as provocative as they are, do not address the issue of cognitive accessibility or ease of processing associated with self-definition and self-evaluation. The response latency data, however, address this question more directly.

That is, the results showed that when the new person resembled participants' own significant other with whom they experience their dreaded self vs. their desired self, participants did in fact say YES far more quickly to items descriptive of the dreaded-self, which was presumably automatically activated, yielding increased cognitive accessibility for these aspects of self. Thus, in transference, the dreaded self-attributes were not only more likely to be freely listed among other working self-concept descriptors, but were also more cognitively accessible. Of course, the inverse is also true—that the data show slower YES responses to dreaded-self adjectives when the new person resembled a significant other associated with participants' desired self rather than the dreaded self.

We thus conclude that spread of activation from the significant other to the self occurs relatively effortlessly, heightening accessibility of the desired or dreaded self, respectively. The faster response latency to dreaded self items in this task suggests increased accessibility of negative self-evaluation in transference, based on activation of the dreaded self. We assume this heightened accessibility arose relatively automatically from the activation of the significant other and the associated relational self, rather than being dependent on a concerted effort by participants to speed up responses to negative self-descriptors. Hence, although we cannot rule out effortful processing altogether because self-presentational concerns and intentions can affect accessibility, but there is no likely reason why participants would have taken up the strategy of responding particularly quickly to dreaded self items. On the other hand, no similar effect emerged in the desired self condition—for desired-self items—probably due to relatively small deviations from any baseline accessibility of the desired self. On this basis, it makes sense that the effect for the dreaded self in transference might be more readily detectable.

Regarding self-protective self-regulation, the data provided no support for a heightened accessibility of desired-self items or other especially positive self-attributes in the dreaded-self condition of transference—which would be expected if these self-aspects are brought to bear relatively automatically to counteract the threat to the self in this condition. Simple changes in accessibility of this kind—that might have suggested relative automaticity in self-protective self-regulation—did not occur using this paradigm.

It is instructive to consider whether participants said YES or NO in their responses to each kind of descriptor, to see if a correction process, effortful or otherwise, might be assumed to be present in these

responses. In fact, in the context of the significant-other resemblance associated with a dreaded self, participants endorsed significantly more dreaded-self items, as expected. But as it turns out that they also endorsed just as many desired-self items as did participants in the desired-self condition in transference. Hence, all that changed was the emergence of their dreaded self. Maintaining the desired self can be interpreted as a self-regulatory process—in this case, to maintain positive self-esteem, even when the dreaded self is activated, although not one, as in the free-listing data, that bolsters the self outweighing the dreaded self.

The aim of such self-regulation is presumably to counteract the influx of negativity into the working self-concept, so as to preserve self-integrity and equilibrium (Andersen & Chen, in press; Hinkley & Andersen, 1996; see also Steele, 1988, Steele, Spencer & Lynch, 1993; Showers, Abramson & Hogan, 1998). Because there was no heightened accessibility of positive self-attributes in the dreaded-self, transference condition, however, these self-regulatory effects do not appear to operate automatically, even though the data provide evidence for relatively effortless activation of the relational self—and relatively immediate self-evaluative implications.

Relationship-Protective Self-Regulation

As indicated, another form of potentially automatic responding can be found in relatively immediate expressions of facial affect. Such measures provide evidence for schema-triggered affect in transference—more positive facial affect based on the activation of a positive significant-other representation rather than a negative one (Andersen et al., 1996), perhaps evoked with little mental effort. We now turn to another set of findings relevant to self-regulation—self-regulation that has a relationship-protective function—using this measure of facial affect.

When one encounters a negative descriptor of a new person that is characteristic of a positively regarded significant other, this negative aspect of the person may pose a threat to the positivity of the significant other and the relationship. A positive transference involves the motivation for emotional closeness and connection, even while the negative aspects of a person evoke negative responses (see Andersen et al., 1997; Andersen & Berenson, 2000). Hence, a compensatory process in transference should occur that somehow softens the negative implications of the threatening information when the new person resembles a positive significant other—to maintain the connection.

Our data on facial affect—from the study described earlier—do, in fact, support this prediction (Andersen et al., 1996). As shown in Figure 6, in the context of transference, participants showed significantly more pleasant facial affect in response to the negative, disliked characteristics of their positive significant other—in the new person—than they expressed in other conditions. Thus, the overall positive evaluation associated with the significant-other representation and not the valence of individual significant-other characteristics determined facial affect. Participants' own classification of these negative characteristics (in a preliminary session) was reversed in the positive facial affect they expressed in this condition of the experiment. Especially heightened positivity of facial affect in response to negative vs. positive cues in transference—related to a positive significant other—is presumably a self-regulatory response that functions to protect the relationship by transforming negatives into positives.

INSERT FIGURE 6 ABOUT HERE

We believe that this finding arises from the need for connection with positive significant others despite their flaws. Being reminded (consciously or unconsciously) of negative attributes of a significant other in the context of transference may pose a threat to one's connection needs, and thus the same response may arise in transference. Finding ways to perceive these negative attributes positively may be critical in maintaining close relationships and may thus be well-practiced. Research on romantic relationships has shown that people neutralize negative attributes of their romantic partners. In fact, recalling a negative event from a current romantic relationship can result in even more positive evaluation of the partner and in viewing him or her in an especially positive light (e.g., Holmes & Rempel, 1989; Murray & Holmes, 1993, 1994).

Furthermore, because people should be well practiced in this form of self-regulation, it may well come to take place relatively automatically. Although we found no direct support for self-protective self-regulation in transference occurring automatically—it seemed to be effortful, at least in that paradigm—the evidence on relationship-protective self-regulation suggests that it may well occur relatively automatically. It at least occurs relatively immediately. Of course, differences in these two methods preclude simple comparison and prevent definitive conclusions on differential automaticity in these forms of self-regulation. Nonetheless, the data indicate that one can protect one's relationship in transference through affect regulation in ways that may require little effort.

Relationship-Protective Self-Regulation in Potentially Dangerous Relationships

Another line of research making use of the same measure of facial affect conceptually replicates and extends these general conclusions (Berenson, 2001). This research addressed whether or not the relationship-protective process in the context of positive transference would extend to somewhat ambiguous threat/danger cues—among those individuals exposed to violence in the relationship with significant other. To the degree that a similar pattern occurs, presumably to protect the positivity of the transference relationship, this could be quite maladaptive—if there is any reality to the perception of similarity (unconscious or otherwise) that provokes the transference initially. (We discuss vulnerability in more detail when we consider the overall implications of our work.) Even though we regard transference as a normal process that generalizes across people and across positive significant others in their lives, this phenomenon might have different implications for dangerous relationships with people who are well loved—for example, for individuals who have a parent who has been physically abusive. Moreover, if these processes are relatively automatic, questions about their potential intractability or at least the challenges that might arise in attempting remediation become more intricate—if remediation is warranted by problematic consequences. In a different vein, if this kind of transformation process (of positively transforming the negative features of a positive significant other) were to emerge for painful, negative material linked to prior abuse history with an otherwise loved parent, it would suggest that the phenomenon observed in our prior work is far from trivial (Andersen et. al, 1996).

In a study focused on the role of child abuse on interpersonal patterns in young adults, we examined the activation of mental representations of parents who had previously been physically violent (e.g., threatened the participant, while growing up, with a gun or knife) (Berenson, 2001). Female college students exposed to physical and psychological abuse by a parent they love, along with nonabused students, participated in a study, in which they learned about a new person who did or did not resemble this parent and was or was not said to be particularly irritable at that moment. That is, after reading the descriptors of the new person, participants, in one condition, were presented with an additional descriptive statement that allegedly reflected a trained interviewer's summary assessment of how the new person seemed right now, and indicated that he or she was getting increasingly tense and irritable. This contextual cue was clearly regarded by participants across the board as negative.

Nonetheless, the results showed that regardless of abuse history, all participants expressed more

positive facial affect at the moment of encoding the features of the new person who resembled their own parent —i.e., a highly positive significant other —rather than resembling someone else's parent. This shows that the overall positive tone of the parental representation was evoked in transference at the level of immediate, automatic, non-verbal responding. As predicted, participants abused by their parent while growing up showed this response as well, even though in their later self-reports they indicated more anticipatory mistrust of the new person in transference than did nonabused participants. They also reported significantly higher expectancies for rejection, as well as an indifference to being liked by the new person —relative to non-abused participants. This evidence suggests that the transference experience was aversive for previously abused participants, and in spite of this, their immediate schema-triggered facial affect was just as positive as that of non-abused participants.

Moreover, both previously abused and non-abused participants showed especially positive facial affect in response to the statement indicating that the new person was in an irritable mood when in the context of transference —relative to the control condition. Both groups of participants were able to transform the irritability cue into something positive in the transference involving a well loved parent. This latter finding conceptually replicates our previous work (Andersen et al., 1996) with especially problematic relationships, and again suggests that this well-practiced phenomenon of transforming negative features (e.g., construing them as endearing) that is basic to close relationships may well arise relatively automatically in positive transference (Holmes & Rempel, 1989; Murray, 1999; Murray & Holmes, 1993, 1994, 1996). On the other hand, although abused individuals may have even more extensive practice than their non-abused peers with enhancing negative qualities of parents, or of working harder to do so and under duress, we found no greater affect among abused participants than among those who were not abused. Still, they did show the effect and in the case of a transference experience involving a significant other who is (or has been) physically abusive, the response of transforming a negative into a positive could conceivably be equivalent to transforming a danger cue into a more positive information.

Once again, we argue that these data provide suggestive evidence that there may be some forms of self-regulation in transference that transpire relatively automatically. Thus far, our data indicate that relationship-protective self-regulation can at times proceed quite automatically and yet we have no evidence that self-protective self-regulation can also proceed in an automatic fashion. On the other hand, the methods employed

to assess these two forms of self-regulation in our research have little in common and cannot be compared directly. Moreover, findings from other research indicate that there are circumstances under which compensatory self-enhancement occurs efficiently (e.g., Baldwin & Wesley, 1996; Harmon-Jones, Simon, Greenberg & Pyszczynski, 1997; Showers, 2000), which suggests that more research is needed to draw definitive conclusions on this important issue.

Our Evidence and the Unconscious

To summarize our evidence, we believe we have shown that the relational self arises according to basic principles of social cognition, such as transient and chronic accessibility, priming, and applicability processes known to transpire with little cognitive effort, attention, consciousness, or necessity for effortful control, and we therefore assume that most of our evidence on significant-other representations and the self in transference can be seen as arising on the basis of relatively automatic processes. This leads to contextual variation in the relational self across interpersonal situations. The interpersonal in the new unconscious and its relevance for the self is highlighted in our work. The processes we examine arise, we presume, largely unconsciously and without effort. Of course, exactly which elements of the model are directly verified as being relatively automatic is not fully addressed, but a wide array of findings speaks to these processes and enables a number of specific conclusions.

Our evidence supports four main conclusions. First, the automatic activation of significant-other representations in transference—in the form of unconscious, subliminal triggering of significant-other representations—clearly occurs. Second, the automatic activation of affect occurs when a significant-other representation is activated in transference. Third, the automatic spread of activation from the significant-other representation to the self in transference—specifically the relational self with this other and the self-evaluation (positive or negative) that goes along with it—also occurs in transference (**for related work see Baldwin et al., 1990; Baldwin & Sinclair, 1996**) (**make sure to say things like this and the para above earlier in the intro too**). And fourth, self-regulation clearly arises in transference—to protect the self or to protect the significant-other relationship in response to some infringement—and the data suggest that sometimes self-regulation may not be especially effortful, even though it may not typically arise immediately, i.e., may occur relatively further downstream in the processing sequence..

Ways of Self-Regulating in the Relational Self

Our data clearly demonstrate self-regulatory phenomena in the relational self, making it especially interesting to ask how far downstream in transference process such self-regulation occurs. Given the importance of self-regulation in understanding the self, and its proposed sovereignty (Higgins, 1997; Higgins & May, 2001), the degree of consciousness or effort or control required in its operation is of considerable importance.

In the case of our work, when a relationship with a significant other is laden with negative affect, its activation evokes this affect relatively automatically and thus threatens the self, as any insult is likely to do—a process that may invoke compensatory self-enhancement (although such processes do not always occur, Erber & Erber, 2000). Assuming self-regulatory responses are not compromised by factors such as depression or low self-esteem, however, they very often do occur (e.g., Steele et al., 1993; Greenberg & Pyszczynski, 1985; Greenberg et al., 1992). Self-protective self-regulation is fairly well understood, and chronically accessible negative significant-other representations, triggered by relevant contextual cues in transference, set it in motion in our work. And although this process may demand attentional resources rather than being effortless and efficient, as indicated by our data, we suspect that there may be conditions under which it may be automatic.

Individuals also engage in relationship-enhancement (as contrasted with self-enhancement) in response to threatening cues relevant to the significant other. The evidence indicates that when a person's overall regard for a positive significant other is threatened, such as when presented with cues reflecting negative aspects of this person—compensatory enhancement of the other occurs. Highly positive affect is expressed facially in response to these relationship-threatening cues, and this happens relatively immediately in the transference context (Andersen et al., 1996). People thus appear to transform negative cues into positive affect in a positive transference, even people with a very problematic relationship evoked in the transference, such as those physically abused by a parent whom they still say they love. That is, in response to feedback that a new person seems to be getting into an increasingly irritable mood, participants experiencing a positive (parental) transference show more positive affect than control participants, regardless of abuse history with this parent. At the very least, these findings seem to concern relationship-protective responses and may turn out to be quite general—as a response to negative cues involving a positive significant other in a positive transference (see also Murray & Holmes, 1993).

The relative immediacy of the facial affect suggests that these affective findings are not likely to have taken place deliberately or especially effortfully, and these effects may thus be relatively automatic. Other evidence we have shows the relatively automatic elicitation of affect consistent with the overall tone of the significant-other representation and relationship—in the context of transference. This significant-other-consistent affect thus need not occur at a point particularly downstream in the processing sequence; nor even should self-regulation always occur relatively downstream, even though we assume most forms of self-regulation do, i.e., require effortful processing.

Indeed, this is just what one might expect based on what we know about the automatic evaluation effect, shown with attitude objects (e.g., Bargh, Chaiken, Gendler, & Pratto, 1992; Bargh, Chaiken, Raymond & Hymes, 1996; Chen & Bargh, 1999; Fazio, Sanbonmatsu, Powell, & Kardes, 1986; Giner-Sorolla, Garcia, & Bargh, 1999), in implicit stereotyping (e.g., Banaji, Hardin, & Rothman, 1993; Dasgupta, McGhee, Greenwald, & Banaji, 2000; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995), and mere exposure and familiarity effects (e.g., Banse, 1999; Monahan, Murphy, & Zajonc, 2000; see also Russell, in press). The self-regulatory process that can presumably correct for insults to the self arising automatically may presumably become one that is automatic, even if self-regulation is often effortful and relatively downstream as a process. Self-regulatory responses are likely to vary in the degree to which they are intentional, deliberative, or effortful. Our evidence for the automatic activation of the self in transference—in the self-evaluation associated with the self-with-significant-other—further suggests that these affective responses are evoked more proximally than are self-regulatory processes. Self-evaluation associated with the relational self becomes highly accessible and compensatory self-aspects do not become even more accessible by comparison.

On the other hand, for other-protective self-regulation, which was assessed by facial affect, it arose in such a way that one could argue for its automaticity. While it is tempting to conclude on this basis that other-protective self-regulation is automatic whereas self-protective self-regulation is not, we suspect this is too simplistic. In transference, automaticity in self-regulation may depend on the exact context and person variables at issue, but significant others are like to evoke self-regulatory processes that have been frequently practiced and thus to have become automatic.

Nonetheless, it seems likely that both self-regulation that protects others and that which protects the self can occur in ways that do not depend on deliberation and effort. Some forms of self-regulation for some

people under some circumstances should occur relatively automatically, while others require virtually Herculean effort. We consider this in more depth later, but first consider the overall literature on the nature of the unconscious in order to evaluate our findings in this scholarly context.

Our Evidence in Light of the Broader Literature on the Unconscious

One influential way of thinking about the unconscious, as noted, is in terms of automatic evaluation, and this may be relevant to the automaticity of transference. New stimuli—persons, things, places—evoke an immediate positive or negative response—in the domain of attitudes (e.g., Bargh et al., 1992; 1996; Fazio, 1986; see also Russell, in press). Similarly, stimuli associated with social stereotypes also evoke automatic evaluation in research on implicit memory and stereotyping (Banaji & Greenwald, 1995; Banaji et al., 1993; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). For example, differences in automatic positive evaluation arise based on both race and gender (e.g., Banaji & Hardin, 1996; Banaji & Dasgupta, 1998) in a way that is unintended, outside of awareness, and difficult to control (Banaji & Dasgupta, 1998). Moreover, measures of such implicit social cognitive effects are substantially intercorrelated (Cunningham, Preacher, & Banaji, 2001). Moreover, the automatic evaluation effect arises even for unfamiliar, novel stimuli (Chaiken, Bargh, & Duckworth, in press), and likewise, alternative interpretations of implicit stereotyping, based on differential familiarity, have also been ruled out (Dasgupta, McGhee, Greenwald, & Banaji, 2000). Nonetheless, the overall evidence lends credence to our understanding of automatic affect arising based on highly familiar significant-other representations.

Indeed, familiarity is pivotal. The mere exposure effect (Zajonc, 1968) in which exposure to a stimulus, and especially repeated exposure, increases liking (Bornstein, 1989; Kunst-Wilson & Zajonc, 1980) has consistently been demonstrated—even when the stimuli are presented subliminally (e.g., Murphy, Monahan, & Zajonc, 1995). In fact, the magnitude of the effect even increases with the relative unconsciousness of the stimuli (Bornstein, 1989). Overall, this says that familiarity has a profound importance in affect and that its unconscious nature may be important as well (Monahan, Murphy, & Zajonc, 2000). This is of obvious relevance for our work, given how familiar significant others are (see also Keenan & Bailett, 1980; Prentice, 1990).

Conceptions of automatic affect based on mere exposure (Zajonc, 1998) predicts that previously encountered stimuli are easier to encode and process than are novel stimuli, and this ease of processing or

perceptual fluency is interpreted by the experiencing person as liking (Bornstein & D'Agostino, 1994; E.R. Smith, 1998). While the processes in play are no doubt more complicated, repeated exposure—and even subliminally—clearly enhances overall positive affect in ways that are rather diffuse. This affect attaches not only to original source stimuli and also to novel but similar stimuli, the central phenomenon. In addition, the affect even extends to unfamiliar, distinct stimuli experienced in this state (Monahan et al., 2000). In other words, positive affect generated from subliminal repeated exposure spills over to unrelated objects. Since significant others are highly familiar (one is repeatedly exposed to them), automatic affect arising from that familiarity no doubt is part of what we observe in our work, spilling over into the experiences in response to a new (and different) person.

Moreover, in our work, we rely on the notion of chronic accessibility (of significant-other representations), defined in terms of frequency of prior activation. This is akin to repetition over an extended period of time, though not identical to repeated exposure of a perceptual stimulus. We also rely on transient cueing. If a social construct is sufficiently chronically accessible, it should not need to be especially applicable to a given stimulus (e.g., Higgins & Brendl, 1995). Yet transient triggering combines additively with chronicity to enhance use (Andersen et al., 1995; Bargh et al., 1986). Still, the diffuse effects observed in automatic affect are in some ways similar to the diffuse effects we have observed in inferences (Andersen & Cole, 1990). There is generalization to a new person of the features that are relevant only because they belong to the significant other, and of liking and emotion in parallel. OLDFOOT

The diffuse nature of affect in the mere exposure effect also indicates that a portion of this automatic affect elicited is undedicated in the sense that it is independent of cognition (see Monahan et al., 2001; Zajonc, 2000), defined in terms of any mental representations or cognitive process. NEW FOOT. Of course, there is more to significant others than familiarity-induced positive affect. Not all significant others are positive, nor is the relatively automatic affect elicited exclusively positive. It depends on the overall positivity or negativity associated with the significant other. Moreover, negative and positive significant-other relationships function quite differently in the relational self—under the circumstance that these representations are triggered. And in any event, the literature on mere exposure suggests that unconscious priming of affect is independent of the mere exposure process which heightens **familiarity**

(Zajonc, 19xx).

Beyond this, we also make the assumption that most significant others start out positively (at least in expectancy and hope). Indeed, some of our evidence hints that there may be a general ease and comfort with all significant others even those that have quite negative or problematic qualities. This implies that whether or not one's hopes and needs in relation to a significant other are met, having experience these motives and that sense of relatedness or interdependence sticks with the significant-other representation. The profound motivational and emotional relevance of significant others because of our need for them renders motives of the essence in the process of transference and in the relational self. —regardless of the evaluation associated with the significant other—even though we also know negative and positive significant-other relationship function quite differently in the relational self. Indeed, we know that motivational material is activated when a significant-other representation is activated in transference and thus the relational self is activated. As indicated, the motivation to be personally close with a new person is triggered in a positive transference, and there is abundant evidence, more generally, that motives can be automatically activated just as social constructs can be, and with differentiable consequences (e.g., **Bargh & Chartrand, 1999; more Bargh cites**). On this basis, we assume that motives evoked in transference may arise automatically and operate without much effort.

All told, affect, motivation, and familiarity, in the form of perceptual fluency, are all involved in transference and the relational self. Indeed, the role of familiarity in automatic affect may help explain how infants across species bond not only with their caregivers, but also with their surroundings and are extremely hesitant to separate from either (Monahan et al., 2000, p. 466; see also Zajonc, 1971). Of course, such effects need not imply that no cognition of any sort is ever part of an evaluative or affective response (see also Lazarus, 1982). Cognitive representations and meaning matter. When a known construct or attitude object, is triggered, it is activated and evokes a positive or negative response (e.g., Banaji & Greenwald, 1995), even on the basis of subthreshold activation. When the name or other designation for the construct or object does not come to mind, the affect nonetheless does (Niedenthal, Halberstadt, & Innes-Ker, 1999; Niedenthal, Halberstadt, & Setterlund, 1997), although automatic evaluation appears to occur even for novel stimuli (**Chaiken, Bargh, & Duckworth, in press**).

In spite of the relative specificity of our experimental research in social cognition, a precise

estimate of conscious and unconscious influences, respectively, in the process, has eluded us thus far in our work, just as has any formal independent examination of affective vs. cognitive triggering cues. In the study of process dissociation, people are exposed, for example, to names of both famous and nonfamous people, and are later more likely to say that the nonfamous names to which they were exposed are names of famous people (relative to nonfamous names to which they were not previously exposed). The assumption is that exposure, and especially repeated exposure, create perceptual fluency with the person's name, and this is then misattributed to something else, in this case, fame (e.g., Jacoby, Kelley, Brown, & Jaeschko, 1989). This implicit memory effect occurs without conscious awareness, control, or intent. Although "process pure" measures of the unconscious relative to conscious experience (Jacoby et al., 1992) may not exist — and thus requiring such can define unconscious experience out of existence (Bowers, 1984; Merikle & Reingold, 1992) — process-dissociation research takes the extra step of separating the respective contribution of conscious and unconscious influence, by placing the two in opposition to each other experimentally (Jacoby et al., 1992; Jacoby & Kelley, 1990; see also Greenwald, Klinger, Schuh, 1995). In opposition, qualitative differences in the influences resulting from conscious vs. unconscious processes can be observed under the right conditions (Merikle, 1992; Merikle & Reingold, 1992) — such as when people have the cognitive capacity available to do otherwise (e.g., Jacoby, Woloshyn, & Kelley, 1989), and presumably the motivation.

We have demonstrated that the significant-other representation can be triggered outside of awareness in transference. We have also shown that affect linked to the significant other arises relatively automatically in transference. The representation in memory of this significant other evokes a relatively immediate affective response, as we have observed, and not always positive in spite of the high familiarity, which thus rules out mere exposure or familiarity provoking positive affect as the sole basis of the phenomenon. At the same time, we do know that the phenomenon is often unconscious.

And unconscious processes can be considered in terms of the degree to which they can be controlled through effortful cognitive processes; these concerns are embodied in dual-process models (e.g., Chaiken & Trope, 2000; see also Brewer, 1988; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). These models typically focus on stereotypes, attitudes, or other social categories or processes that are activated automatically, and in turn, on the kinds of self-regulatory processes that might be undertaken to correct an activated response after the fact (e.g., Glaser &

Banaji, 1999; Macrae et al., 1999; Martin, 1986). The general notion is that it takes some cognitive capacity to engage in correction processes vis-à-vis categorization, congruent evaluation, or automatic other-consistent processing.

In this way, stereotypes can be understood as energy saving devices (e.g., Bargh, 1999; Devine, 1989; Macrae, Milne, & Bodenhausen, 1994), as categories generally are (**Taylor, 1981, cognitive misers?**). In this respect, it is relevant that individual-person exemplars, even if not significant to the perceiver, can unintentionally and efficiently be brought to mind (Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, Castelli, Schloerscheidt, & Greco, 1998), as we know significant others can be (and more so than other social constructs; Andersen & Cole, 1990; Andersen, Glassman, & Gold, 1998; Chen et al., 1999; Karylowski et al., 1999).

Automatic processes, then, are often assessed in dual-task paradigms, which speak to the nature of executive functions in social cognition (Macrae, Bodenhausen, Schloerscheidt, & Milne, 1999; see also Andersen, Spielman, & Bargh, 1992; Bargh & Tota, 1988). In such paradigms, one task requires so much attention that little remains for another task that requires it as well. The latter task should no longer proceed efficiently because attention is impaired. Dual-task paradigms are valuable for identifying relatively effortless processes.

Of course, the question of whether or not one's attentional capacity is compromised is not entirely predictive in showing automatic processing because even if capacity is available, the crucial variable of motivation must be taken into account. The motivation to use executive functions to regulate and correct one's own path-of-least-resistance responses is fundamental (Devine & Monteith, 1999; Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink, & Elliot, 1991; Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, Thorn, & Castelli, 1997; see also Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Motivated social cognition delineates the circumstances under which relatively automatic processes are likely to be overridden. For example, a stereotype may be activated and yet not applied to a target person — based on the motivation not to think stereotypically (**Kunda, 1990; Kunda & Sinclair, 1999**). When it is in their self-protective interests to do so, people can inhibit stereotyping (Sinclair & Kunda, 1999), and similarly prejudice, under the right circumstances (Devine, 1989; **Fiske, 19xx**), and this may depend on the degree to which the desire to do so — the standards that suggest it is the right thing to do — are internalized. Similarly, conditions that promote accountability — i.e., having to justify one's inferences to others later — can promote systematic processing and differentiation relative to global stereotyping (Pendry & Macrae, 1996; see also

Lerner & Tetlock, 1999).

Of course, the fact that implicit processes are difficult to control does not mean this is impossible, or that other factors do not heighten or curtail this ability—for example, one's mood state (Park & Banaji, 2000), and the extremity, and thus contrast, of a prime (Glaser & Banaji, 1999). In particular, having a counter-stereotypic intention (or goal) and the availability of cognitive capacity to use it can interfere with implicit stereotyping (Blair & Banaji, 1996). The exact circumstances under which stereotyping can in fact be regulated requiring attention and effort (or possibly neither) is the subject of much continuing research (e.g., Bargh, 1999; Higgins, 1996c; Mischel, Feldman, & Cantor, 1996). As our data suggest, the apparent ease with which facial affect associated with the significant other—liking/loving or disliking/detesting—arises in transference appears to be mediated by the representation of the significant other in memory. Moreover, the fact that the correction processes accentuating the positive affect in response to negative cues in a positive transference occurs relatively immediately, suggesting that regulation can perhaps occur automatically, if sufficiently well practiced (e.g., E.R. Smith & Lerner, 1986). In this sense, the person may be complicit in what is thus a kind of strategic automaticity (Bargh, 1999).

Early work on stereotyping made clear that even people who are not prejudiced automatically activate disparaging assumptions stored in memory about stigmatized groups and will apply these disparaging inferences to members of the group if their attentional resources are depleted. The assumption that strategic effort—and cognitive capacity—is needed to remediate stereotyping and prejudice is supported by some evidence (e.g., Devine, 1989). Yet research has also challenged this position by showing that some nonprejudiced responses may in fact be so well learned for some people as to operate relatively automatically (Moskowitz, Gollwitzer, Wasel, & Schaal, 1999). That is, it appears that stereotype activation can be controlled through intent, even at a preconscious level, without requiring resources. As an example, chronic egalitarian goals as well as perspective taking can control activation of stereotypes at both preconscious and conscious levels (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Moskowitz et al., 1999; Moskowitz, Salomon, & Taylor, 2000). Overall, it is becoming increasingly clear that prejudice is not inevitable and that correction processes themselves can become automatic (Lepore & Brown, 1997). On the other hand, rebound effects (e.g., Wegner, 1994) can also occur in stereotyping. After consciously trying not to think about someone or something in particular terms (e.g., Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, & Jettenn, 1994; Monteith, Sherman, & Devine, 1998), stereotypic thoughts

may come flooding back. Hence, questions as to the process dissociation in unconscious and conscious aspects of transference, the ease with which people can interfere with it, and the risk for rebound in the process are compelling about whether, when, and how transference and the relational self can be controlled.

Implications of Unconscious Relational Selves

We believe that relatively automatic aspects of transference and of the relational self speak to the new unconscious. Along with automatic processes in transference and the relational self, the mechanisms by which people can short-circuit their automatic responses, which presumably typically arise at a point further downstream in the processing sequence, co-exist. If such strategies become so well-practiced that they also become automatic in their own right, they will no longer require attentional resources and motivation. Automaticity in transference and the relational self also has implications for both resilience and vulnerability (Andersen, Chen, & Miranda, in press).

As for resilience, in the context of positive transference based on a liked or loved significant other, one may be willing to give a new other the benefit of the doubt. One may assume mutual positive regard as one's motivation for emotional connection and openness is activated in the context. Hence, a positive relationship with a significant other may serve as a model for a new positive relationship. It may become the basis for making positive assumptions about new people, thus facilitating the formation of new positive relationships characterized by mutual trust and respect. Hence, we view significant others and the relational self as a potential source of resilience.

We argue that positive relationships with significant others contribute to individual's resilience by providing positive self-other relationship templates and resources for protective self-regulation in negative transference, and our research is consistent with this notion. In particular, the self-protective self-regulatory efforts we observe in normal college students may be associated with effective and resilient functioning in challenging interpersonal situations—when negative significant-other relationships are evoked. We have argued that the observed recruitment of positive self-aspects into working memory in a negative transference, or in a transference evoking a dreaded relational self (even with a positive significant other), serves a self-protective function. Self-protective self-regulation is thus possibly of value in resilience (Hinkley & Andersen, 1996; Reznik, 2001). Supporting this view, we know that self-enhancement phenomena are less likely among those suffering from depression or low self-esteem than among normals or those high in self-esteem (e.g.,

Taylor & Brown, 1988). We therefore speculate that if self-protective self-regulation were to be compromised—for example, by insufficient cognitive, emotional, or social resources—increased accessibility of negative self-aspects may lead to contextual drops in self-esteem (e.g., Crocker & Wolfe, in press). Of course, whether or not the self-protective self-regulation we have observed fully protects against blows to self-esteem is a matter deserving more empirical clarification. Traditional measures of self-esteem, however, show compensatory enhancement when the dreaded self is evoked that does not fully ward off decreases in self-esteem

At the same time, we acknowledge that self-enhancement in its many forms can well become problematic in its own right—if taken to extremes—and can thus become destructive in relationships, as may be the case with narcissistic individuals (Morf & Rhodewalt, in press). Highly narcissistic people are particularly self-protective and self-enhancing in response to threat, which can be problematic for the health of their relationships, as they give the self more benefit of the doubt than they give others. Thus, such responding is not always healthful. Yet it is certainly associated with resilience on the whole (e.g., Taylor & Brown, 1981).

Hence, it is not simply the positivity or negativity of one's significant-other representations that brings about resilience or vulnerability in transference, but rather how the self is experienced in the relationship. A positive transference can lead to suffering in its own right by being linked to standards that disrupt positive affect (Reznik & Andersen, 1998). It can also do so by involving content that is painful, destructive, or dangerous even if associated with a positive significant other (Berenson, 2001; Reznik, 2001). Indeed, many significant-other relationships are ultimately neither entirely negative nor entirely positive, and we suspect most if not all begin positively and at worst become highly ambivalent—all the while emotionally invested and laden.

In our research, we identify social-cognitive mechanisms by which past interpersonal patterns reemerge in new relationships. We believe that it is the content of the significant-other representation, the dynamics of the relationship, the nature of the relational self, and the particular self-regulatory patterns that are triggered in transference that determine whether transference becomes problematic for the person (Andersen et al., in press). As with self-protective self-regulation, it is likely that the severity and extremity of relationship-protective self-regulation determines whether or not it promotes resilience or vulnerability. If one employs extreme relationship-protective efforts in transference that lead to negative evidence about a new person to be discounted, one may not be aware of potential interpersonal cues suggesting problems or even danger.

Indeed, our evidence on young adults who were physically abused as children by their positively regarded significant others provides some support for this (Berenson, 2001). Transforming significant other's neglectful, rejecting, or abusive qualities through employing relationship-protective self-regulation—as reflected in immediate facial affect—could conceivably facilitate the initiation and/or maintenance of maladaptive relationship patterns, even fatal ones. Our evidence shows that something like this can occur relatively automatically. We assume, on average, that the maintenance of relationships with significant others is of value to the human organism as is the capacity to do what is needed to accomplish this task, skills that are no doubt part of resilience (**see also Kenrick, in press**).

As indicated, just as positive transference may facilitate development of positive relationships, negative transference may lead to negative perception and mistrust of new others. Moreover, negative relationships with significant others can also lead to self-fulfilling prophecies (just as positive relationships can) and this process can conceivably make negative transference self-defeating—by superimposing the old negative relationship onto the new one and ultimately eliciting the very behaviors expected from the other person. Put differently, a negative transference may involve automatic negative responses that impact interpersonal perception and relations negatively with little intention or effort. Indeed, self-protective self-regulation may well operate automatically at times, but our evidence suggests it may also require more cognitive effort and attentional resources, at least for some people and under some circumstances. Since the self-enhancement inherent in this process may at times be off-putting to others and even designed to shut others out, it can perhaps interfere with developing positive relationships.

Of course, if negative transference is veridical—i.e., is based on a relatively accurate perception of problematic characteristics in a new person, reliance on prior knowledge of the negative significant-other relationship might well serve an adaptive (even possibly an alerting) function. The question of veridicality in transference is thus extremely important because of the utility of veridical perceptions—whether positive or negative—in better enabling people to navigate their lives, through making effective use of their prior knowledge. Our data suggest that there is a veridicality component to the activation and use of significant-other representations in transference (Andersen & Cole, 1990), in addition to inferences that go beyond the information given about the new person. This suggests appropriate and effective utilization of different elements of the self in different contexts (e.g., Banaji & Prentice, 1994) and in different relationships (e.g.,

Chen & Andersen, 1999). Of course more work remains to be done on the place and function of veridical cueing and inference in the context of research on transference and the relational self. Veridicality in perception, of course, as we know from other work (not on inferences about new people) is not uniformly useful (e.g., Alloy & Abramson, 1980). Convenient interpretations may be equally useful.

Beyond this fascinating question of when elements of transference and the relational self operate automatically vs. in an effortful way. Automatic transference processes are likely to become maladaptive when they involve mindless or rigid activation and application of significant-other representations in new contexts (**Langer, 19xx; book**). This prevents the individual from an accurate perception of reality and from correcting for misperceived interpersonal cues. When the content of the transference is problematic for a new relationship, it will result in interpersonal difficulties, perhaps repeatedly (Andersen & Berk, 1998). Hence, being mindful and taking control of the transference process may well be important, especially if otherwise problematic, painful, or dangerous.

Can people control the transference process and their relational selves? Presumably they can under the right circumstances. One way to control for a problematic transference process may be to become aware of what goes through one's mind, one's own interpersonal patterns and their consequences, and the cues that trigger them, particularly if they are habitual and self-defeating. Attention and monitoring may help the individual to reveal problematic interpersonal patterns that are based on past relationships with significant others, and may provide the motivation necessary to be inspired to try out and practice new, more adaptive ways of being and relating. Attention to one's stream of associations, thoughts, feelings, sensations, and emergent self-aspects that are triggered in transference may be an essential first step in being able to disrupt the cycle of self-defeating or self-destructive relationship patterns (Glassman & Andersen, 1999; see also Andersen & Berk, 1998). Just as with the use of stereotypes in social perception, if problematic transference patterns are noticed, based on activation of a significant-other representation, they may then be critically examined and corrected, when cognitive capacity is available, and with practice may become relatively effortless or automatic themselves, and integrated into one's sense of identity.

Under conditions of relative mindfulness, moreover, if one is presented with an opportunity to develop more trustworthy and positive relationships with others (or with even just one other person), one may begin to break the cycle of negative relationships by forming a new significant-other representation and relationship in

the context of which there is a loving, caring, mutually respectful self-other relationship. New relationship templates develop and thus become the basis for new and positive transference experiences, breaking the self-defeating cycle. Even though all significant-other representations may produce relatively automatic associations, especially when cued, the formation of new associations is still possible, and when responses to these others become well-practiced they may become well practiced, they may become automatic in their own right (see also Moskowitz et al., 1999, 2000).

In sum, we argue that the nature of the self is fundamentally interpersonal and relational—providing all people with a repertoire of relational selves grounded in the web of important personal relationships in their lives. It is a contextual model based in social cognitive processes that are known to transpire outside of awareness and without effort, though they may also be corrected for under some conditions, either effortfully or in well practiced, routinized ways. Many questions remain to be examined more explicitly about the nuances of the relational self and self regulation, and the degree to which they transpire relatively automatically or in a way that demands attention and effort, but our evidence leaves little doubt that contextual, relational selves play a profound role in the shape our interpersonal lives take. Self-regulation is central in. The process of transference provokes self regulation; it has self-regulatory consequences. Moreover, the process can be triggered largely outside of awareness. The role of the unconscious in the relational self is thus quite clear, as is perhaps the promise of mindfulness and its cultivation through practice and some openness to the unexpected and to change, and of course, also some discernment.

Footnotes

Footnote from last study: Self-protective self-regulation occurs in relation to a negative significant other and was not examined in this research which concerned only positive representations.

*FOOT for page 40 about** (zajonc, end section) It is worth noting, however, that our various effects, and specifically, the subliminal activation effect we have obtained, cannot be reduced to mere exposure. Although our data certainly involve differential familiarity of one's own vs. a yoked control participant's significant other (in features), in each case, participants were in fact exposed to equal numbers of stimulus repetitions subliminally and in fact were exposed to the exact same subliminal stimuli. Moreover, when the stimuli are self-generated and thus familiar and also subliminally repeated at an equal rate, the effect is significantly less. Familiarity alone is thus insufficient to account for our effects. OLD foot*

FOOT for page 40-41: FOOTNOTE (from round page 40): While precise debates about the cognitive mediation of affect are not well addressed by our data, we show that the activation of mental representations of significant others, defined cognitively, evoke affect. We acknowledge as well that affect arising from activation of a significant-other representation—or from another source—should have additional cueing functions for significant-other representations that share this affect (e.g., Andersen et al., 1996). Hence, although we manipulate featural similarity as the trigger in our work, we assume that affect elicited in the process also provides a cueing function in transference as well (Niedenthal et al., 199x).

References

- Allport, G. (1937). Personality: A psychology interpretation. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Andersen, S. M., & Baum, A. (1994). Transference in interpersonal relations: Inferences and affect based on significant-other representations. Journal of Personality, *62*, 459-498.
- Andersen, S.M. & Berenson, K. (2000). Perceiving feeling, and wanting: Motivation and affect deriving from significant-other representations and transference. In J.P. Forgas, K.D. Williams, & L. Whenner (Eds.), The social mind: Cognitive and motivational aspects of interpersonal behavior. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Andersen, S.M., & Berk, M.S (1998). Transference in everyday experience: Implications of experimental research for relevant clinical phenomena. Review of General Psychology, *2*, 81-120.
- Andersen, S. M., & Cole, S. W. (1990). "Do I know you?": The role of significant others in general social perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *59*, 383-399.
- Andersen, S. M., & Glassman, N. S. (1996). Responding to significant others when they are not there: Effects on interpersonal inference, motivation, and affect. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), Handbook of motivation and cognition (Vol. 3, pp. 262-321). New York: Guilford.
- Andersen, S. M., Glassman, N. S., Chen, S., & Cole, S. W. (1995). Transference in social perception: The role of chronic accessibility in significant-other representations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *69*, 41-57.
- Andersen, S.M., Glassman, N.S., & Gold, D. (1998). Mental representations of the self, significant others, and nonsignificant other: Structure and processing of private and public aspects, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *75*, 845-861.
- Andersen, S. M., & Klatzky, R. L. (1987). Traits and social stereotypes: Levels of categorization in person perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *53*, 235-246.
- Andersen, S.M., Lambert, L., & Dick, W. (1999). Significant-other exemplars: Processing efficiency in instance-based judgments. Unpublished manuscript, New York University.**
- Andersen, S. M., Reznik, I., & Chen, S. (1997). The self in relation to others: Motivational and cognitive underpinnings. In J. G. Snodgrass & R. L. Thompson (Eds.), The self across psychology: Self-recognition, self awareness, and the self-concept. New York: New York Academy of Science.
- Andersen, S. M., Reznik, I., & Manzella, L. M. (1996). Eliciting facial affect, motivation, and expectancies in transference: Significant-other representations in social relations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *71*, 1108-1129.
- Andersen, S. M., Spielman, L. A., & Bargh, J. A. (1992). Future-event schemas and certainty about the future: Automaticity in depressives' future-event predictions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *63*, 711-723.
- Ayduk, O., Mendoza-Denton, R., Mischel, W., Downey, G., Peake, P.K., & Rodriguez, M. (2000). Regulating the interpersonal self: Strategic self-regulation for coping with rejection sensitivity. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, *79*(5) 776-792.
- Baldwin, M. W. (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of information. Psychological

Bulletin, 112, 461-484.

Baldwin, M.W., Carrell, S.E., & Lopez, D.F. (1990). Priming relationship schemas: My advisor and the Pope are watching me from the back of my mind. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 26, 435-454.

Baldwin, M.W., Fehr, B., Keedian, E., Seidel, M., & Thompson, D.W. (1993). An exploration of the relational schemata underlying attachment styles: Self-report and lexical decision approaches. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19, 746-754.

Baldwin, M.W., & Sinclair, L. (1996). Self-esteem and "if...then" contingencies of interpersonal acceptance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 1130-1141.

Banaji, M.R., & Dasgupta, N. (1998). The consciousness of social beliefs: A program of research on stereotyping and prejudice. In V.Y. Yzerbyt & Lories, G (Eds.), Metacognition: Cognitive and social dimensions (pp. 157-170). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Banaji, M.R., & Greenwald, A.G. (1995) Implicit gender stereotyping in judgments of fame. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 181-198.

Banaji, M.R., & Hardin, C.D. (1996). Automatic stereotyping. Psychological Science, 7, 136-141.

Banaji, M.R., Hardin, C., & Rothman, A. (1993). Implicit stereotyping in person judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65 (2), 272-281.

Banaji, M.R., Hardin, C., & Rothman, A.J. (1993). Implicit stereotyping in person judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 272-281.

Banaji, M.R., & Prentice, D.A. (1994). The self in social contexts. Annual Review of Psychology, 45, 297-332.

Banse, R. (1999). Automatic evaluation of self and others: Affective priming in close relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 16 (6), 803-821.

Bargh, J. A. (1989). Conditional automaticity: Varieties of automatic influence in social perception and cognition. In J. S. Uleman & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), Unintended thought (pp. 3-51). New York: Guilford

Bargh, J. A. (1992). Does subliminality matter to social psychology?: Awareness of the stimulus versus awareness of its influence. In R. F. Bornstein & T. S. Pittman (Eds.), Perception without awareness (pp. 236-255). New York: Guilford

Bargh, J. A. (1994). The four horsemen of automaticity: Awareness, intention, efficiency, and control in social cognition. In R. S. Wyer, Jr., & T. K. Srull (Eds.), Handbook of social cognition (Vol. 1, pp. 1-40). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bargh, J.A. (1997). The automaticity of everyday life. In R.S. Wyer, Jr. (Ed.), Advances in social cognition (Vol. 10, pp. 1-61).

Bargh, J.A. (1999). The cognitive monster: The case against the controllability of automatic stereotype effects. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), Dual-process theories in social psychology (pp. 361-382). New York: Guilford.

Bargh, J.A., & Barndollar, K. (1996). Automaticity in action: The unconscious as repository of

chronic goals and motives. In P.M. Gollwitzer & J.A. Bargh (Eds.), The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior (pp. 457-481). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Bargh, J. A., Bond, R. N., Lombardi, W. L., & Tota, M. E. (1986). The additive nature of chronic and temporary sources of construct accessibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 869-878.

Bargh, J.A., & Chartrand, T (1999). The unbearable automaticity of being. American Psychologist, 54, 462-479.

Bargh, J. A., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (1994). Environmental control of goal-directed action: Automatic and strategic contingencies between situations and behavior. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 41, 71-124.

Bargh, J.A. Chaiken, S., Govender, R., & Pratto, F. (1992). The generality of the automatic attitude activation effect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 893-912.

Bargh, J.A., Chaiken, S., Raymond, P., & Hymes, C. (1996). The automatic evaluation effect: Unconditionally automatic attitude activation with a pronunciation task. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 32, 185-210.

Bargh, J. A., & Pietromonaco, P. (1982). Automatic information processing and social perception: The influence of trait information presented outside of conscious awareness on impression formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 437-449.

Bargh, J.A., & Tota, M.E. (1988). Context-dependent automatic processing in depression: Accessibility of negative constructs with regard to self but not others. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 925-939.

Baum, A., & Andersen, S.M. (1999). Interpersonal roles in transference: Transient mood states under the condition of significant-other activation. Social Cognition, 17, 161-185.

Baumeister, R.F. (1997). Esteem threat, self-regulatory breakdown, and emotional distress as factors in self-defeating behavior. Review of General Psychology, 1, 145-174.

Berk, M.S., & Andersen, S.M. (2000). The impact of past relationships on interpersonal behavior: Behavioral confirmation in the social-cognitive process of transference. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79, 546-562.

Blair, I. V., & Banaji, M. R. (1996). Automatic and controlled processes in stereotype priming. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 1142-1163.

Bonanno, G. A., David, P. J., Singer, J. L., & Schwartz, G. E. (1991). The repressor personality and avoidant information processing: A dichotic listening study. Journal of Research in Personality, 25, 386-401.

Bonanno, G. A., & Singer, J. L. (1990). Repressive personality style. Theoretical and methodological implications for health and pathology. In J. L. Singer (Ed), Repression and dissociation (pp. 435-470). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bonanno, G. A., & Singer, J. L. (1993). Controlling one's stream of thought through perceptual and reflective processing. In D. M. Wegner & J. W. Pennebaker (Eds), Handbook of mental control (pp. 149-170). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bornstein, R. F. (1992). Subliminal mere exposure effects. In R. F. Bornstein & T. S. Pittman (Eds.), Perception without awareness (pp. 191-210). New York: Guilford Press.

Bornstein, R. F., & D'Agostino, P. R. (1992). Stimulus recognition and the mere exposure effect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63, 545-552.

Bornstein, R. F., & Pittman, T. S. (Eds.). (1992). Perception without awareness. New York: Guilford.

Bowers, K. S. (1984). On being unconsciously influenced and informed. In K. S. Bowers & D. Miechenbaum (Eds.), The unconscious reconsidered (pp. 227-272). New York: Wiley.

Brewer, M.B. (1988). A dual process model of impression formation. In T.K. Srull & R.S. Wyer, Jr. (Eds.), A dual process model of impression formation (pp. 1-36). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bruner, J. S. (1957). Going beyond the information given. In H. E. Gruber, K. R. Hammond, & R. Jessor, Contemporary approaches to cognition (pp. 41-69). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bugental, D.B. (1992). Affective and cognitive processes within threat-oriented family systems. In I.E. Sigel, A. McGillicuddy-de Lissi, & J. Goodnow (Eds.), Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children (2nd ed., pp. 219-248). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bugental, D.B. (2000). Acquisition of algorithms of social life: A domain-based approach. Psychological Bulletin, 126, 187-219.

Cantor, N. & Kihlstrom, J.F. (1987). Personality and social intelligence. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypes in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 12 pp. 3-52). New York: Academic Press.

Chaiken, S., & Trope, Y. (1999). Dual process theories in social psychology. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Chen, M., & Bargh, J.A. (1999). Nonconscious approach and avoidance: Behavioral consequences of the automatic evaluation effect. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25, 215-224. **CORRECT TITLE?**

Chen, S. (2001). The role of theories in mental representations and their use in social perception: A theory-based approach to significant-other representations and transference. In G.B. Moskowitz (Ed.), Cognitive social psychology: The Princeton Symposium on the Legacy and Future of Social Cognition (pp.125-142). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Chen, S., & Andersen, S.M. (1999). Relationships from the past in the present: Significant-other representations and transference in interpersonal life. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 31, pp. 123-190). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Chen, S., Andersen, S.M., & Hinkley, K. (1999). Triggering transference: Examining the role of applicability and use of significant-other representations in social perception. Social Cognition, 17, 332-365.

Collins, A.M., & Loftus, E.F. (1988). A spreading-activation theory of semantic processing. In A.M. Collins & E.E. Smith (Eds.), Readings in cognitive science: A perspective from psychology and artificial intelligence (pp. 126-136). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann, Inc.

Collins, Allan M. (Ed); Smith, Edward E. (Ed). (1988)

Crocker, J., & Wolfe, C. T. (2001). Contingencies of worth. Psychological Review, 108(3) 593-623

Cunningham, W.A., Preacher, K.J., & Banaji, M.R. (2001). Implicit attitude measures: Consistency, stability, and convergent validity. Psychological Science, 12, 163-2001.

Dasgupta, N., McGhee, D.E., Greenwald, A.G., & Banaji, M.R. (2000). Automatic preference for White Americans: Eliminating the familiarity explanation. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36 (3), 316-328.

Devine, P.G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 5-18.

Devine, P.G., & Monteith, M.J. (1999). Automaticity and control in stereotyping. In S. Chaiken, & Trope, Y. (Eds.), Dual process theories in social psychology (339-360). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Devine, P.G., Monteith, M.J., Zuwerink, J.R., & Elliot, A.J. (1991). Prejudice without compunction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 817-830.

Ehrenreich, J. H. (1989). Transference: One concept or many? The Psychoanalytic Review, 76, 37-65.

Erber, R., & Erber, M.W. (2000). The self-regulation of moods: Second thoughts on the importance of happiness in everyday life. Psychological Inquiry, 51, 360-392.

Erdley, C. A., & D Agostino, P. R. (1988). Cognitive and affective components of automatic priming effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 741-747.

Fazio, R.H., Sanbonmatsu, D.M., Powell, M.C., Kardes, F.R. (1986). On the automatic activation of attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 229-238.

Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. Psychological Review, 99, 689-723.

Fiske, S.T., & Pavelchak, M. (1986). Category-based versus piecemeal-based affective responses: Developments in schema-triggered affect. In R.M. Sorrentino & E.T. Higgins (Eds.), Handbook of motivation and cognition (pp. 167-203). New York: Guilford.

Fiske, S.T., & Taylor, S.E. (1991). Social Cognition (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Freud, S. (1958). The dynamics of transference. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 12, pp. 99-108). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1912)

Fiske, S.T. & Neuberg, S.L. (1990). A continuum model of impression formation from category-base to individuating processes: Influences of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. In M.P. Zanna (Ed), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 23, p. 1-74).

Galinsky, A.D., & Moskowitz, G.B. (2000). Perspective-taking: Decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group evaluation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78 (4), 708-724.

Gilovich, T. (1981). Seeing the past in the present: The effect of associations to familiar events on judgments and decisions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 797-808.

Glaser, J., & Banaji, M.R. (1999). When fair is foul and foul is fair: Reverse priming in automatic evaluation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77, 669-687.

Glassman, N.S., & Andersen, S.M. (1999). Streams of thought about the self and significant others: Transference as the construction of interpersonal meaning. In J.A. Singer & P. Salovey (Eds.), At play in the fields of consciousness. Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Glassman, N.S., & Andersen, S.M. (1999c). Activating transference without consciousness: Using significant-other representations to go beyond what is subliminally given. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77, 1146-1162.

Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (1985). Compensatory self-inflation: A response to the threat to self-regard of public failure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 273-280.

Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Chatel, D. (1992). Terror management and tolerance: Does mortality salience always intensify negative reactions to others who threaten one's world view? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 308-318.

Greenwald, A. G. (1981). Self and memory. In G. H. Bower (Ed.), Psychology of learning and motivation (Vol. 15, pp. 201-236). New York: Academic Press.

Greenwald, A. G. (1992). New look 3: Unconscious cognition reclaimed. American Psychologist, 47, 766-779.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1989). The self as a memory system: Powerful, but ordinary. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 41-54.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. Psychological Review, 102, 4-27.

Greenwald, A. G., Klinger, M. R., & Schuh, E. S. (1995). Activation by marginally perceptible ("subliminal") stimuli: Dissociation of unconscious from conscious cognition. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 124, 22-42.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. Psychological Review, 94, 319-340.

Higgins, E.T. (1990). Personality, social psychology, and person-situation relations: Standards and knowledge activation as a common language. In L.A. Pervin (Ed.), Handbook of personality (pp. 301-338). New York: Guilford

Higgins, E. T. (1996a). Knowledge: Accessibility, applicability, and salience. In Higgins, E.T., and A.W., Kruglanski (Eds.) Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles (pp. 133-168). New York: Guilford.

Higgins, E. T. (1996b). Ideals, oughts, and regulatory focus: Affect and motivation from distinct pains and pleasures. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), The psychology of action (pp. 91-114). New York: Guilford.

Higgins, E.T. (1996c). The self-digest: Self-knowledge serving self-regulatory functions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 1062-1083.

Higgins, E.T. (2000). Beyond the pleasure and pain. In E.T. Higgins & A.W. Kruglanski (Eds.), Motivational science: Social and personality perspectives (pp. 231-255). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology

Press/Taylor & Francis

Higgins, E. T., & Brendl, C. M. (1995). Accessibility and applicability: Some "activation rules" influencing judgment. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31, 218-243.

Higgins, E. T. & King, G. (1981). Accessibility of social constructs: Information processing consequences of individual and contextual variability. In N. Cantor & J. F. Kihlstrom (Eds.), Personality, cognition and social interaction (pp. 69-121). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Higgins, E.T., & May, D. (2001). Individual self-regulatory functions: It's not we regulation, but it's still social. In C. Sedikides & M. Brewer (Eds.), Individual self, relational self, collective self (pp. 47-67). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis.

Higgins, E.T., & May, D. (2001). Individual self-regulatory functions: It's not we regulation but it's still social. In C. Sedikides & M.B. Brewer (Eds.), Individual self, relational self, collective self (pp. 47-67). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis

Hinkley, K., & Andersen, S. M. (1996). The working self-concept in transference: Significant-other activation and self change. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 1279-1295.

Holender, D. (1986). Semantic activation without conscious identification in dichotic listening, parafoveal vision, and visual masking: A survey and appraisal. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 9, 1-23.

Holmes, J.G., & Rempel, J.K. (1989). Trust in close relationships. Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 187-219.

Horney, K. (1939). New ways in psychoanalysis. New York: Norton.

Jacoby, L. L., & Kelley, C. M. (1987). Unconscious influences of memory for a prior event. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 13, 314-326.

Jacoby, L. L., Toth, J. P., Lindsay, D. S., & Debnar, J. A. (1992). Lectures for a layperson: Methods for revealing unconscious processes. In R. F. Bornstein and T. S. Pittman (Eds.), Perception without awareness (pp. 81-120). New York: Guilford.

Jacoby, L. L., Woloshyn, V., & Kelley, C. M. (1989). Becoming famous without being recognized: Unconscious influences of memory produced by dividing attention. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 118, 115-125.

Johnson, J.T., & Boyd, K.R. (1995). Dispositional traits versus the content of experience: Actor/observer differences in judgments of the authentic self. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 375-383.

Karylowski, J.J., Konarzewski, K., & Motes, M. (1999). Recruitment of exemplars as reference points in social judgments. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36, 275-303.

Kelly, G.A. (1955). The psychology of personal constructs. New York: Norton.

Keenan, J.M., & Baillet, S.D. (1980). Memory for personally and socially significant events. In R.S. Nickerson (Ed.), Attention and performance (Vol. 8, pp. 651-669). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kenrick, D.T. (2001). Evolutionary psychology, cognitive science and dynamical systems: Building an

integration paradigm. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 10 (1), 13-17.

Kihlstrom, J. F. (1987). The cognitive unconscious. Science, 237, pp. 1445-1452.

Kihlstrom, J. F. (1990). The psychological unconscious. In Pervin, L. A., (Ed.), Handbook of personality (pp. 445-464). New York: Guilford

Kihlstrom, J. F., Barnhardt, T. M., & Tataryn, D. J. (1992). The psychological unconscious: Found, lost, and regained. American Psychologist, 47, 788-791.

Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. Psychological Bulletin, 108 (3), 480-498.

Kunda, Z. & Sinclair, L. (1999). Motivated reasoning with stereotypes: Activation, application, and inhibition. Psychological Inquiry, 10 (1) 12-22.

Kunst-Wilson, W. R., & Zajonc, R. B. (1980). Affective discrimination of stimuli that cannot be recognized. Science, 207, 557-558.

Lazarus, R.S (1982). Thoughts and relations between emotion and cognition. American Psychologist, 37 (9), 1019-1024.

Lepore, L., & Brown, R. (1997). Category and stereotype activation: Is prejudice inevitable? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 275-287.

Lerner, J.S., & Tetlock, P.E (1999). Accounting for the effects of accountability. Psychological Bulletin, 125 (2), 255-275.

Lewicki, P. (1986). Nonconscious social information processing San Diego, CA: Academic Press

Linville, P.W., & Carlston, D.E. (1994). Social cognition of the self. In P.G. Devine, D.C. Hamilton, & T.M. Ostrom (Eds.), Social cognition: Impact on Social Psychology (pp. 143-193). New York: Academic Press

Linville, P.W., & Fischer, G.W. (1993). Exemplar and abstraction models of perceived group variability and stereotypicality. Social Cognition, 11, 92-125.

Logan, G.D. (1989). Automaticity and cognitive control. In J.L. Uleman & J.A. Bargh (Eds.), Unintended Thought (pp. 52-74). New York: Guilford Press

Luborsky, L., & Crits-Christoph, P. (1990). Understanding transference: The CCRT method. New York: Basic Books.

Macrae, C.N., & Bodenhausen, G.V. (2000). Social cognition: Thinking categorically about others. Annual Review of Psychology, 51, 93-120.

Macrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., & Milne, A. B. (1995). The dissection of selection in person perception: Inhibitory processes in social stereotyping Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69, 397-407.

Macrae, C.N., Bodenhausen, G.V., Milne, A.B., Castelli, L., Schloerscheidt, A.M., & Greco, S. (1998). On activating exemplars. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 34, 330-354.

Macrae, C.N., Bodenhausen, G.V., Milne, A.B., & Jetten, J. (1994). Out of mind but back in sight:

Stereotypes on the rebound. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *67*, 808-817.

Macrae, C.N., Bodenhausen, G.V., Milne, A.B., Thorn, T.M-J., & Castelli, L. (1997). Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, *33*, 471-489.

Macrae, C.N., Bodenhausen, G.V., Schloerscheidt, A.M., & Milne, A.B. (1999). Tales of the unexpected: Executive function and person perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *76*, 200-213.

Macrae, C.N., Milne, A.B., & Bodenhausen, G.V. (1994). Stereotypes as energy saving devices: A peek inside the cognitive toolbox. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *66*, 37-47.

Martin, L.L. (1986). Set/reset: Use and disuse of concepts in impression formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *51*, 493-504.

Martin, L.L., Tesser, A., & McIntosh, W.D. (1993). Wanting but not having: The effects of unattained goals on thoughts and feelings. In D.M. Wegner & J.W. Pennebaker (Eds.), The handbook of mental control (pp. 552- 572). New York: Prentice Hall.

Meichenbaum, D., & Gilmore, J. B. (1984). The nature of unconscious processes: A cognitive-behavioral perspective. In K. Bowers & D. Meichenbaum (Eds.), The unconscious reconsidered. New York: Wiley.

Merikle, P. M. (1992). Perception without awareness: Critical issues. American Psychologist, *47*, 792-795.

Merikle, P. M., & Reingold, E. M. (1992). Measuring unconscious perceptual processes. In R. F. Bornstein & T. S. Pittman (Eds.), Perception without awareness (pp. 55-80). New York: Guilford.

Mills, J., & Clark, M.S., (1994). Communal and exchange relationships: Controversies and research. In R. Erber & R. Gilmour (Eds.), Theoretical frameworks for personal relationships (pp. 29-42). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mischel, W. (1999). Personality coherence and dispositions in a cognitive-affective personality (CAPS) approach. In D. Cervone & Y. Shoda (Eds.), The coherence of personality: Social-cognitive bases of consistency, variability, and organization (pp. 37-60). New York: Guilford Press.

Mischel, W., Cantor, N., Feldman, S (1996). Principles of self-regulation: The nature of willpower and self-control. E.T. Higgins & A.W. Kruglanski (Eds.), Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles (pp. 329-360). New York: Guilford.

Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system theory of personality: Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. Psychological Review, *102*, 246-268.

Monahan, L.M., Murphy, S.T., & Zajonc, R.B. (2000). Subliminal mere exposure: Specific, general, and diffuse effects. Psychological Science, *11* (6), 462-466.

Morf, C. C., Rhodewalt, F. (in press). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. Psychological Inquiry.

Moskowitz, G.B., Gollwitzer, P.M., Wasel, W., & Schaal, B. (1999). Preconscious control of stereotype activation through chronic egalitarian goals. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *77* (1),

167-184.

Moskowitz, G.B., Salomon, A.R., & Taylor, C.M. (2000). Preconsciously controlling stereotyping: Implicitly activated egalitarian goals prevent the activation of stereotypes. Social Cognition, 18 (2), 151-177.

Murphy, S.T. (2001). Feeling without thinking: Affective primacy and the unconscious processing of emotion. In J.A. Bargh & D.K. Apsley (Eds.), Unraveling the complexities of social life: A festschrift in honor of Robert B. Zajonc (pp. 39-53). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Murphy, S.T., Monahan, J.L., & Zajonc, R.B. (1995). Additivity of nonconscious affect: Combined effects of priming and exposure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69 (4), 589-602.

Murray, S.L., & Holmes, J.G. (1993). Seeing virtues in faults: Negativity and the transformation of interpersonal narratives in close relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 707-722.

Murray, S.L., & Holmes, J.G. (1994). Storytelling in close relationships: The construction of confidence. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 650-663.

Niedenthal, P.M., & Beike, D.R. (1997). Interrelated and isolated self-concepts. Personality & Social Psychology Review, 1, 106-128.

Niedenthal, P.M., Halberstadt, J.B., & Setterlund, M.D. (1997). Being happy and seeing happy: Emotional state mediates visual word recognition. Cognition and Emotion, 11, 403-432.

Niedenthal, P.M., Halberstadt, J.B., & Innes-Ker, A.H. (1999). Emotional response categorization. Psychological Science, 11, 179-182

Neuberg, S.L. (1988). Behavioral implications of information presented outside of conscious awareness: The effect of subliminal presentation of trait information on behavior in the Prisoner's Dilemma Game. Social Cognition, 6, 207-230.

Ohman (1999). Distinguishing unconscious from conscious emotional processes: Methodological considerations and theoretical implications. In T. Dalgleish & M.J. Power (Eds.), Handbook of cognition and emotion (pp. 321-352). Chichester: Wiley.

Park, J., & Banaji, M. (2000). Mood and heuristics: The influence of happy and sad states on sensitivity and bias in stereotyping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78, 1005-1023.

Pendry, L.F., & Macrae, N.C. (1996). What the disinterested perceiver overlooks: goal-directed categorization. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22, 249-256

Plant, E.A., & Devine, P.G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, 811-832.

Prentice, D. (1990). Familiarity and differences in self- and other-representations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 369-383.

Read, S.J., & Cessa, I.L. (1991). This reminds me of the time when: Expectation failures in reminding and explaining. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 27, 1-25.

Reznik (2001). Desired and undesired self in transference: Managing Bad self-aspects in Good relationships. Doctoral dissertation submitted to the department of psychology at New York University.

Reznik, I., & Andersen, S.M. (1998). Individual differences in transference: The roles of self-discrepancy in affect and motivation. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society, Washington, DC.

Russell, J.A. (in press). Core affect and the psychological construction of emotion. Psychological Review.

Showers, C. (1992). Compartmentalization of positive and negative self-knowledge: Keeping bad apples out of the bunch. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *62*, 1036-1049.

Showers, C.J. (2001). Self-organization in emotional contexts. In J.P. Forgas (Ed.), Feeling and thinking: The role of affect in social cognition (pp. 283-307). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Showers, C.J., Abramson, L.Y., & Hogan, M.E. (1998). The dynamic self-concept: How the content and structure of self-concept change with mood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *75*, 478-493.

Sinclair, L., & Kunda, Z. (1999). Reactions to a black professional: Motivated inhibition and activation of conflicting stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *77*, 885-904.

Singer, J. L. (1988a). Reinterpreting the transference. In D. C. Turk & P. Salovey (Eds.), Reasoning, inference, and judgment in clinical psychology (pp. 182-205). New York: Free Press.

Singer, J. L. (1988b). Sampling ongoing consciousness and emotional experience: Implications for health. In M. J. Horowitz (Ed.), Psychodynamics and cognition (pp. 297-346).

Singer, J. L. (Ed.). (1990). Repression and dissociation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Singer, J. L., & Bonanno, G. (1990). Personality and private experience: Individual variations in consciousness and in attention to subjective phenomena. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp. 419-444). New York: Guilford

Singer, J. L., & Pope, K. S. (1978). The use of imagery and fantasy techniques in psychotherapy. In J. L. Singer & K. S. Pope (Eds.), The power of imagination: New methods in psychotherapy (pp. 3-34). New York: Plenum.

Singer J. L., & Salovey, P. (1991). Organized knowledge structures and personality: Person schemas, self-schemas, prototypes, and scripts. In M. J. Horowitz (Ed.), Person schemas and maladaptive interpersonal patterns (pp. 33-79). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Singer, J. A., & Singer, J. L. (1994). Social-cognitive and narrative perspectives on transference. In J. M. Masling, & R. F. Bornstein (Eds.), Empirical perspectives on object relations theory (pp. 157-193). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Smith, E.E., Patalino, A.L., & Jonides, J. (1998). Alternative strategies of categorization. Cognition, *65*, 167-196.

Smith, E.R. (1992). The role of exemplars in social judgment. In L.L. Martin & A. Tesser (Eds.), The construction of social judgments (pp. 107-132). Hillsdale, NJ; Erlbaum.

Smith, E.R. (1996). What do connectionism and psychology have to offer each other? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *70*, 893-912.

Smith, E.R., & Lerner, M. (1986). Development of automatism of social judgments. Journal of

Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 246- 259. (Regina, practice then infer)

Smith, E.R., Stewart, T.L., & Buttram, R.T. (1992). Inferring a trait from a behavior has long-term, specific effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 753-759.

Smith, E. R., & Zarate, M. A. (1990). Exemplar and prototype use in social categorization. Social Cognition, 8, 243-262.

Smith, E. R., & Zarate, M. A. (1992). Exemplar-based model of social judgment. Psychological Review, 99, 3-21.

Snyder, M., Tanke, E.D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 656-666.

Spellman, B.A., & Holyoak, B.A. (1992). If Saddam is Hitler then who is George Bush? Analogical mapping between systems of social roles. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 913-933.

Steele, C.M. (1988). The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 21, pp. 261-302). New York: Academic Press.

Steele, C.M., Spencer, S.J., & Lynch, M. (1993). Self-image resilience and dissonance: The role of affirmation resources. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 885-896.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: Norton.

Taylor, S.E., & Brown, J.D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. Psychological Bulletin, 103, 193-210.

Tice, D.M., & Bratslavsky, E. (2000). Giving in to feel good: The place of emotion regulation in the context of general self-control. Psychological Inquiry, 11, 149-159.

Uleman, J. S. (1987). Consciousness and control: The case of spontaneous trait inferences. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 13, 337-354.

Wachtel, P. L. (1981). Transference, schema, and assimilation: The relationship of Piaget to the psychoanalytic theory of transference. Annual of Psychoanalysis, 8, 59-76.

Wegner, D.M. (1994). Ironic processes of mental control. Psychological review, 101, 34-52.

Zajonc, R. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9, 1-27.

Zajonc, R.B. (1971). Attraction, affiliation, and attachment. In J.E. Eisenberg & W.S. Dillon (Eds), Man and beast: Comparative social behavior (pp. 141-179). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Zajonc, R. (1998). Emotions. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds), The handbook of social psychology (4th ed., pp. 591-632).

Zajonc, R.B. (2000). Feeling and thinking: Closing the debate over the independence of affect. In J.P. Forgas (Ed.), Feeling and thinking: The role of affect in social cognition (pp. 31-58). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Automatic Activation, Study 1: Significant-Other-Derived Inference as a Function of Subliminal Exposure Condition. (Adapted from Bargh & Andersen, 1999.)

Figure 2. Subliminal Activation, Study 2: Significant-Other-Derived Inference as a Function of Subliminal Exposure Condition. (Adapted from Bargh & Andersen, 1999.)

Figure 3. Automatic Evaluation: Judges' average rating of positivity in facial affect at encoding as a function of significant-other-resemblance and overall evaluative tone. (Adapted from Andersen, Reznik, & Manzella, 1996).

Figure 4. Changes in Self-Evaluation Deriving from the Relationship: Valence of working self-descriptors overlapping with the relevant self-with-significant-other, corrected for pretest valence, as a function of significant-other-resemblance and overall evaluative tone. (Adapted from Hinkley & Andersen, 1996).

Figure 5. Self-Protective Self-Regulation: Valence of working self-descriptors nonoverlapping with the relevant self-with-significant-other, corrected for pretest valence, as a function of significant-other-resemblance and overall evaluative tone. (Adapted from Hinkley & Andersen, 1996).

Figure 6. Automatic Relationship-Protective Self-Regulation: Judges' average rating of positivity in facial affect at encoding as a function of significant-other-resemblance, overall evaluative tone, and target-descriptor valence. (Adapted from Andersen, Reznik, & Manzella, 1996).