Blame Attribution and Information Processing

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

by

Deniz Yılmaz

Boğaziçi University

2006

Introduction

The aim of the present research was to investigate the process of blame attribution within the context of interpersonal relationships, specifically a love triangle. Two studies were conducted. The first study had two aims. First, to generate possible causes for an occurrence where a person (the protagonist) dated a person of the opposite sex (accomplice) in whom a friend of the protagonist (the victim) either had a romantic interest or was involved in a serious relationship. Unlike the typical attribution study where the locus of causality is considered either as internal or external to the actor, seven causal categories (loci of causality) were defined, three related to each person in the event, three related to the three dyadic relationships between the persons involved, and one related to factors external to persons or relationships involved in the event. Thus the loci included were the following: the protagonist, the victim, the accomplice, the relationship between the protagonist and the victim, the relationship between the protagonist and the accomplice, the relationship between the victim and the accomplice, and external factors.

The second aim of the first study was to investigate the effect of severity of the action (dating either friend's fiancé or someone that the friend was interested in) on the number of possible causes generated under the seven causal categories. The third aim was to see whether gender of participants and/or gender of the protagonist had any effects on the number of possible causes generated under the different categories.

An information processing approach to blame attribution was adopted on the second study. First, the effects of severity of event, and decision strategy on the judged relevance of the information under different categories as possible causes of the event were investigated. The two decision strategies were inclusion of all relevant information

versus exclusion of irrelevant information. Second, the relationships between the proportion of information chosen under different categories, attributions of responsibility and blame were examined.

In short, the present investigation aimed to contribute to the existing literature in attribution of blame in several ways. First, a distinction was made between different loci of attribution formerly grouped under the 'external' to the protagonist category. In other words, relationships as well as persons were conceived as possible loci of causality. Thus, what is generally considered as 'external' locus was partitioned into several loci in the present study. Second, information generation as well as judgment of relevance of information was investigated in relation to transgressions of different severity. Third, the investigation of the effect of decision criteria for information judgment on the consequent responsibility and blame attributions constituted an application of the information processing framework to the issue of blame attribution. Lastly, the investigation of the effect of gender of the judges and the actors involved in the triangle on both generation and judgment of relevance of possible causes was intended to contribute to the study of gender effects in personal relationships.

Concepts Involved in Blame Attribution

To blame someone for a negative event is to make a social judgment. Like other social judgments, it involves making attributions about the cause of the negative event. Furthermore, it involves assignment of responsibility for the consequences of the negative event. Responsibility refers to "a judgment made about a person when he or she 'should' or 'ought to' have done otherwise" (Weiner, 1995, p. 8). Attribution of responsibility refers to judgments dealing with individual's accountability for an event

(Bradbury & Fincham, 1990). Responsibility attributions have an evaluative character that compares the behavior with normative criteria (Fincham, Beach, & Baucom, 1987).

The constructs of responsibility and blame are used interchangeably in everyday language (Weiner, 1995, p. 14) and the term moral responsibility has been treated as equivalent with blame and moral accountability (e.g., Schultz, Schleifer, & Altman, 1981; Shaver,1985). Shaver (1985) noted that a conceptual distinction between responsibility and blame is needed in order to propose a complete and adequate theory of blame attribution. He claimed that the consideration of justifications and excuses would be a way of making a conceptual distinction between responsibility and blame. He argued that moral responsibility precedes offering justifications and excuses after an accusation and that excuses generally offer mitigating circumstances for reducing the actor's blameworthiness. Therefore, justifications may reduce the actor's blameworthiness but not his/her moral responsibility (Shaver, 1985). In short, blame is "the attribution that is assigned after the perceiver assesses and rejects the validity of the offending person's justification or excuse for an action that the perceiver believes was intentionally brought about" (Shaver & Drown, 1986, p. 701).

Causal Attribution

Theories of Causal Attribution

Social psychological research on causal attribution may be traced to the pioneering work of Heider (1958). Heider introduced two important concepts, namely personal and impersonal causality. Personal causality refers to occurrences in which a person causes something *intentionally.* Heider proposed that unless intention ties together the cause-effect relations, the event could not be regarded as a case of true personal causality. True personal causality is seen in instances where the effect of the

event is the goal of the person (Heider, 1958). Heider excluded outcomes that were the results of impersonal antecedents like physical laws and the forces of nature from the concept of personal causality. Environmental factors as well as internal but unintentional factors like ability are examples of impersonal causality.

Following the work of Heider, social psychologists investigated and proposed different theoretical frameworks for studying the process of causal attribution. Jones and Davis (1965) proposed a theory of correspondent inference that systematically explained a perceiver's inferences about what an actor was trying to achieve by a particular action. In order to achieve this purpose, they tried to show the meaning of an action, its intentional significance, for a perceiver. An important concept presented in the theory was correspondence. Correspondence was defined as "the extent that the action and the underlying characteristic or attribute are similarly described by the inference" (Jones & Davis, 1965, p. 223). Correspondent inference is associated with perceiver's certainty about the cause of the action.

According to correspondent inference theory, the observed behaviors of an actor, which may have motivational significance for the actor, are informative for a perceiver. The observed consequences of an action may also have significant rewarding or punishing implications for the perceiver, i.e. "hedonic relevance". The hedonic relevance refers to the "function of its motivational significance for the perceiver" (Jones & Davis, 1965, p. 237). In other words, hedonic relevance refers to whether or not the consequences of a specific action fulfill a purpose for the perceiver. The consequences that fulfill a specific purpose have positive relevance; those that hinder a purpose have negative relevance. The hedonic relevance of an action for a perceiver is important in terms of achieving correspondent inference. The theory proposed that

relevance and correspondence have a joint effect on the evaluations of the perceiver. It was argued that as relevance increases, the perceiver will more confidently make dispositional inferences about the actor, which in turn increase the correspondence value of the action. Empirical studies showed that the perceiver's evaluations become more extreme when both relevance and correspondence increase.

Another important conceptualization of the process of causal attribution is the ANOVA model proposed by Kelley (1967; as cited in Fincham & Hewstone, 1996). The ANOVA model argued that people make causal attributions by using a process similar to analysis of variance. ANOVA model was based on the "covariation" principle and the effects (occurrences) were attributed to one of the possible causal factors with which they covaried. Kelley stated three possible causes: (a) person (b) entity, and (c) time. Variation over responses of different persons provided consensus information, variation over different entities provided distinctiveness information, and variation over time provided consistency information. Different combinations of the three types of information were associated with different causes. For example, if an actor performed an action consistently (high consistency), and if the actor was the only person engaging in the action (low consensus), and if the actor engaged in the action in the presence of different entities (low distinctiveness) the cause of the action was attributed to something (personality trait/motivation) about the actor. Later, researchers criticized the ANOVA model, arguing that the ANOVA model was not appropriate for everyday thinking. The critics proposed that the average person generally does not use the covariation principle in making causal attributions (e.g., Alloy & Tabachnik, 1984; Garland, Hardy, & Stephenson, 1975).

Critics of Kelley's ANOVA model suggested that the everyday perceiver was not as rational as the model proposed. Empirical studies later indicated that everyday man generally does not think rationally and researchers concluded that people generally engage in attributional biases or errors (Fincham & Hewstone, 1996). In 1977, Lee Ross offered the term "fundamental attribution error" to describe a well-known attribution bias. In a series of empirical studies, Ross and his colleagues demonstrated that there was a tendency for perceivers to underestimate the power of situations and to overestimate dispositional factors (e.g., Ross, Amabile & Steinmetz, 1977).

Gilbert and Malone (1995) extended the phenomenon of "fundamental attribution error" and suggested "correspondence bias" in order to describe the causes and consequences of attributional errors. Correspondence bias refers to "the tendency to infer an actor's personal characteristics from his or her observed behaviors even when the inference is unjustified because other possible causes of the behavior exist" (Fincham & Hewstone, 1996, p. 209). Gilbert and Malone (1995) offered four distinct causes of correspondence bias: a) lack of awareness, b) unrealistic expectations, c) inflated categorization, and d) incomplete corrections. In many cases, people do not take into account the situational forces because they do not recognize them. Even when people recognize situational constraints, they do not take them into account (Kunda, 1999). People generally automatically draw inferences about a person's dispositional properties. Then, they "correct" these inferences and perform effortful situational corrections if they have enough cognitive capacity and motivation (Kunda, 1999).

Kelley (1972) also stated that the ANOVA model was an idealized model and many people drew causal attributions on the basis of the beliefs, conceptions, and knowledge that were acquired in advance. Deriving from this statement, Kelley (1972)

introduced the concept of "causal schemata". A causal schema refers to "a conception of the manner in which two or more causal factors interact in relation to a particular kind of effect" (Kelley, 1972, p. 152). The significance of causal schema is that people can infer underlying causes from the observed effect. Even when people lack information about the causes, they can use causal schemata for making causal attributions (Kelley, 1972).

One causal schema is the multiple sufficient causal schema. According to this causal schema, each cause can produce the effect individually (Kelley, 1973). The multiple sufficient causal schema is associated with the "discounting" principle: "the role of a given cause in producing a given effect is discounted if other plausible causes are also present". Kelley (1973) proposed that multiple sufficient causal schema is employed for common events. Another causal schema is the multiple necessary causal schema. According to this schema, more than one cause is needed to produce the effect (Kelley, 1973). Unusual and extreme events are associated with the multiple necessary causal schemas (Kelley, 1973). Kelley also stated that different schemata or combinations of causes may be associated with different categories of events (Kelley, 1973). Later, empirical studies indicated that the kind of event determined the type of causal schema utilized by perceivers (e.g., Kun & Weiner, 1974). Kun and Weiner (1974) examined the nature of causal schema in relation to success and failure. In accordance with Kelley's arguments, the study indicated that success at an easy task (a usual event) elicited the multiple sufficient causal schema. However, success at a difficult task or failure at an easy task (unusual events) elicited multiple necessary causes.

Dimensions of Causal Attribution

Beginning with Heider's leading work (1958), there has been a great emphasis on the dimensions of causal attribution. Weiner and his colleagues (1972) proposed a scheme for classifying causal dimensions of an achievement-related event. Weiner and his colleagues (1972) claimed that individuals use four elements for explaining the outcome (success or failure) of an achievement-related event. These elements were ability, effort, task difficulty, and luck. Two of the four components in the model (ability and effort) were considered as describing the qualities of the person, while two remaining components (task difficulty and luck) were considered as qualities external to the person (Weiner, Frieze, Kukla, Reed, Rest, & Rosenbaum, 1972). According to Weiner's model, ability and task difficulty are permanent characteristics of the person or the task whereas effort and luck were relatively variable characteristics. On the basis of these statements, Weiner categorized these four elements of attributions on two dimensions: locus of causality (internal versus external) and of stability (stable versus unstable). The relationship between the attributions and dimensions are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Weiner's Causal Dimensions of Attributions (Weiner et al., 1972, p. 96)

Stability	Locus of Causality	
	Internal	External
Stable	Ability	Task Difficulty
Unstable	Effort	Luck

Kelley (1973) stated that different causal schemata might be employed by perceivers in different situations and discussed the possibility of person-entity, person-time, entity-time and person-entity-time interactions as causes. In line with this statement, several researchers argued that the context of interpersonal relationships might require different conceptual distinctions regarding the internal-external locus of cause dimension (e.g., Fincham, 1985; Hortaçsu & Karancı, 1987). It was stated that internal-external causal dimension must be modified for studying interpersonal relationships. Causal dimension might involve the actor, his/her partner/spouse, the relationship between the spouse and the actor, and the factors outside the relationship. Both studies (Fincham, 1985; Hortaçsu & Karancı, 1987) provided results supporting the existence of four distinct loci in relation to the locus dimension.

Attribution of Responsibility

The elaboration of the process of responsibility assignment began with the leading work of Heider (1958). According to Heider, a person's responsibility for an event depends on the relative contribution of personal agency for the event (Shaver, 1985). On the basis of this general principle, Heider (1958, p. 113) described five criteria for responsibility attribution: actor-outcome association, causality, foreseeability, intentionality, and justifiability. Heider presented these criteria as progressing from the most *primitive level* to the *highly sophisticated level*. Fincham and Jaspars (1980, p. 90) argued that these criteria are ordered according to the relative contribution of environmental and personal forces to the action outcome.

In the most primitive level called *association*, the person is held responsible for each outcome of an action that is not causally connected with him or her in any way (Heider, 1958, p. 113). At this level, someone is held responsible for an outcome even

though he or she has not produced the outcome under consideration. For instance, a person may be accused of the past misdeeds of his family.

In the next level, *causality,* a person is held responsible for anything that is caused by him/her. Someone is held accountable for an event although neither the intention nor the motivation is ascribed to the person. Impersonal causality rather than personal causality is in effect in responsibility attribution at this level (Heider, 1958, p. 113). For example, a person may be held responsible for breaking something by accident.

In the *foreseeability* level, a person is held responsible for any outcome that he might have foreseen. As it is seen, personal causality is still not operating in responsibility assignment (Heider, 1958, p. 113). In this stage, neither intention nor motivation may be attributed to the person, but it is thought that person should have predicted the outcome of the event (Shaver, 1985).

Next, a person is regarded responsible only for the intentional outcomes of his/her actions: this may be described as personal causality. It is thought that the actor intended to cause the effect of the event. Importantly, the actor's action is regarded as sufficient cause of the event outcome.

The final stage, *justifiability***,** is the stage at which the causes of the person's actions are not entirely assigned to him but may be sought in the environment. For example, poverty or lack of equal opportunity in education may be given as a justification for stealing intentionally. In this case system rather than the person is the cause of the deviant act. In other words, under similar circumstances, anyone would be expected to act similarly. Since the causes of the action are found to be in the

environment and not in the person himself, the responsibility for the act is at least shared by the environment (Heider, 1958, p. 114).

Later research investigated the generality of Heider's model (e.g., Fincham, 1980; Fincham & Jaspars, 1979). His model was criticized for being unclear about several important issues such as a) whether it applied equally to positive and negative events, b) the effect of outcome intensity, and c) the nature of the relationship between causal attribution, responsibility attribution and blame attribution (Fincham & Jaspars, 1980). Consequently, the main point of the criticisms was that his model was not a model of responsibility attribution but a model of causal attribution.

Shaver (1985) offered five prescriptive dimensions of the construct of responsibility based on the previous philosophical and psychological literature. The first dimension is the causal dimension that is the extent to which the actor is the direct cause of the outcome. In other words, the causal dimension explains the degree of the actor's participation in the production of the outcome. The second dimension is coercion and it refers to personal choice. In the absence of coercion, the responsible actor under consideration, at the time in question, under the circumstance in question, could have done something different from the action for which he or she is held responsible. The third dimension is the actor's knowledge of the consequences. This dimension is characterized by whether the actor is aware or unaware of the consequences of the action. The fourth dimension is intentionality. Shaver proposed that intentionality represents the voluntary behaviors of the actor. The last dimension is the appreciation of the moral implications of the action. This last dimension seems to be absent in Heider's definitions of responsibility.

Intention is the central feature of responsibility (Shaver, 1985). It has been recognized that intention has an important role in the process of blame attribution. Shaver (1985) proposed that an intentional action is more than desire, ability, and knowledge of the consequences but each of these factors is a characteristic of intention. He also considered intention as the motivational aspect of the action. The greatest amount of causality and blameworthiness will be attributed to the actor who has produced the action-outcome intentionally (Shaver, 1985). Moreover, personal responsibility varies with the relative contribution of environmental factors to the action outcome: The more the environmental factors influence the outcome, the less personal control, therefore the less the person is held responsible.

Responsibility and Blame

Responsibility attribution and blame attribution are often used interchangeably within the existing social psychological literature (e.g., Camper, Jacobson, & Holtzworth-Munroe, 1988; Kyle & Falbo, 1985; as cited in Lussier, Sabourin, & Wright, 1995), Fincham and Jaspars (1980) clarified the relationships among causality, responsibility and blame attributions under their entailment model. They suggested that causal attributions influence responsibility attributions, which, in turn lead to blaming. In other words, causal dimensions, responsibility criteria, and capacities influence attributions of responsibility which determine assignment of blame**.** Consequently, according to the entailment model, responsibility attributions have a *mediational* role between causal attributions and blame.

Accepting the essentials of the entailment model, Weiner (1995) drew attention to the need for clarifying the nature of the relationship between causality and responsibility. The first step of responsibility attribution, according to him, is to

determine the locus of causality, namely personal versus environmental causality. Similar to Heider, Weiner claimed that personal causality is a necessary but not a sufficient precursor of responsibility attribution (1995, p. 6). Responsibility attributions necessitate causal beliefs of human involvement. However not all human causality involve personal responsibility (Weiner, 1995, p. 6). The second dimension Weiner introduced for responsibility attributions is controllability of the cause. If the cause of an event is beyond the control of the person, then an assignment of responsibility will not be made (Weiner, 1995). Assignment of responsibility for an action requires that the person acts with free choice. Consequently, responsibility attribution necessitates personal and controllable causality (Weiner, 1995, p. 7).

According to Weiner (1995, p. 13), the degree and the magnitude of responsibility varies with the intentionality of action. Intentional acts are the ones that the person wanted to engage in with predictability and with knowledge of outcomes (Weiner, 1995, p. 13). Perception that an action is committed intentionally results in a judgment of high responsibility. Although the causes are personal and controllable, the individual is not judged responsible for the outcome if the action is unintentionally preformed (Weiner, 1995, p. 14).

In sum, the different theoretical models discussed above underline two important common features of responsibility attribution: personal causality and intentionality of action. The entailment model on which Fincham, Jaspars, Shaver and Weiner agreed can be summarized in diagram below:

Figure 1. The process of blame attribution

Causal attribution → Responsibility attribution → Blame attribution

Information Processing and Attribution

Most attitude change research based on dual process model since the 1980's namely, elaboration likelihood model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b) and the heuristic-systematic model (Chen & Chaiken, 1999). Both models are comprehensive frameworks of attitude change.

Petty and Cacioppo (1986b) state that there are two "routes" to persuasion: central and peripheral. Central route involves effortful consideration of message arguments and other relevant information. When a receiver is doing central processing, he or she is being an active participant in the process of persuasion. Ability and motivation are required for doing central processing (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b). The peripheral route involves low effort mechanisms such as conditioning and the use of heuristics. If a person has limited time and cognitive resources, he or she more likely engages in peripheral processing (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986b).

The other dual-process model of attitude change is proposed by Chaiken and her colleagues. Chaiken and her colleagues suggested an information processing analysis view of message analysis in the area of attitude change. Their heuristic-systematic model of attitude change distinguishes two modes of information processing (Chen & Chaiken, 1999). *Systematic processing* is defined as a comprehensive and analytic mode in which an individual accesses all potentially relevant information and integrates all useful information in forming a judgment (Chen & Chaiken, 1999). *Heuristic processing* is a more limited mode of information processing that requires less cognitive effort and capacity (Chen & Chaiken, 1999; Maheswaran & Chaiken, 1991). Heuristic processing is the activation and application of *heuristics,* which are learned knowledge structures in

memory. Heuristic processing is activated by the presence of heuristic cues (Chen & Chaiken, 1999).

The empirical research related to the systematic-heuristic model implies that many factors influence the tendency for systematic processing (e.g., Bohner, Rank, Reinhard, Einwiller, & Erb, 1998). The most frequently investigated factor is *motivation.* In these empirical studies, motivation is conceptualized as "task importance", "task relevance", "personal relevance", or "issue involvement" (Bohner et al. 1998). The systematic-heuristic model suggested *sufficiency principle* in order to explain how motivational factor influences systematic processing. The sufficiency principle states that people strive for sufficient confidence in their attitudinal judgments. What is sufficient is determined by two constructs: the *sufficiency threshold* or desired confidence, and the *actual confidence.* Sufficiency threshold is the desired level of confidence of the perceiver (Chen & Chaiken, 1999). Actual confidence is the subjectively experienced level of confidence of the perceiver (Chen & Chaiken, 1999). According to the sufficiency principle, systematic processing is elicited as "a function of the discrepancy between the actual threshold and the sufficiency threshold" (Maheswaran & Chaiken, 1991). Both the actual and the sufficiency thresholds vary as a function of situational and dispositional factors (Maheswaran & Chaiken, 1991). For example motivational factors like personal relevance, issue involvement, personal involvement, and need for cognition can raise the sufficiency threshold and these motivational factors may influence the level of actual confidence. When the actual confidence is lower than the sufficiency threshold, people will be motivated to process more information. In other words, the larger the gap between actual confidence and sufficiency threshold, the more likely people will engage in systematic processing (Chen

& Chaiken, 1999). The systematic-heuristic processing model proposes that people engage in systematic rather than heuristic processing under high personal relevance or high task importance conditions because such conditions raise the sufficiency threshold and increase the discrepancy between actual confidence and sufficiency threshold.

The information-processing framework proposes that attribution is an inferential process during which the perceiver elaborates on the available information by inferring the causal factors of a particular event (Hamilton, 1988, p. 380). In other words, attribution is a process that involves comprehending, understanding, storing, and using information and making causal inferences (Hamilton, 1988, p. 381). This perspective highlights two important stages of attribution process, namely, information gathering and the final attribution. It is claimed that people search for relevant information during the information gathering stage. Then, when they conclude that they have enough information they make a final attribution (Choi, Dalal, Kim-Prieto, & Park; 2003).

Most attribution research primarily focused on the final attribution process and ignored the issue of informational relevance at the information gathering stage. One recent study conducted by Choi and his colleagues explored the effects of different information processing strategies on attributions. Their major aim was to address the question of whether there are any cultural differences in the type of information taken into account in making causal attributions. Specifically, they investigated whether there was a relationship between culture and the type and amount of information utilized at the information gathering stage as well as whether there was a relationship between culture and the locus of causal attribution at the final attribution stage.

Choi and coworkers conducted two studies. In the first study, the participants were given a paragraph about a deviant behavior (a murder case in which a graduate

student was suspected of killing a professor) committed by a person together with a list of information that might or might not be relevant. The participants were asked to judge the relevance of the different bits of information using one of two judgmental procedures: exclusion versus inclusion. In the inclusion condition the participants are asked to generate a subset of possible causes by including *relevant information from an initial set of alternatives.* In the exclusion (or elimination) condition, the participants are asked to generate a subset by eliminating irrelevant information from the initial set. On the basis of the findings of previous research (e.g., Levine, Jasper, & Forbes, 1998; Yaniv & Schul, 1997), it was predicted that the amount of information in the subset in the exclusion condition would be larger than that in the inclusion condition.

The results, indicating that the size of choice set was significantly larger in the exclusion than the inclusion condition, were consistent with past research. In addition, the size of the information sets generated by Americans and Asians differed when the exclusion procedure was employed but no differences due to culture were observed when the inclusion procedure was employed. The difference in the sizes of the choice sets in the exclusion condition compared to the inclusion condition was largest among Koreans compared to Americans and Asian Americans whereas the size of the choice set did not differ significantly in the inclusion condition in terms of culture. In order to explain cultural differences in the exclusion condition, the researchers conducted several analyses aiming to investigate the interrelationship among culture, judgment procedure, and type of information (internal vs. external). They classified all information related to personal traits of the actor as internal whereas the remaining items related to the victim, the relationship between the victim and the actor, and the circumstances were classified as external factors. The results indicated that Asians included more external items in

their sets than Americans in both the inclusion and the exclusion conditions as well as more internal items in exclusion condition. The cultural groups did not differ with respect to the size of the internal information set in the inclusion condition. The second study was a replication of the first study in the domain of prosocial behavior. Similar findings emerged in the second study.

Choi and colleagues later examined the relationship between the information gathering stage and final attribution. The subjects judged the relevance of each item of information and also made their final attribution. The analysis demonstrated that the paths from culture to the amount of information and from the amount of information to external attribution were significant. The direct path from culture to external attribution was not significant. Thus, amount of external information played a mediating role between culture and external attribution for external items. For internal attributions, the path between the amount of information and internal attribution was not significant but the direct effect of culture on the internal attribution was significant. These results supported the two-stage attribution process; namely information judgment and final attribution.

Choi and his colleagues explained the pronounced cultural difference with regard to type of information (external versus internal) in the exclusion condition. They proposed that since little information is given about the case in the vignettes of both studies (murder case and prosocial behavior), it is almost impossible to know the real reason for the act. It is very difficult to judge the information items as surely relevant for participants. This means that the decision criterion for inclusion is quite high (many are excluded). On the other hand, the decision criterion for exclusion is low due the minimal information (because one cannot say for sure that a certain item on the list was not

relevant). In other words, subjects need very convincing evidence to eliminate irrelevant information. Hence, the choice set that includes the "not eliminated" information in the exclusion condition would be larger. The researchers speculated that Koreans, who believe that everything in the universe is related to each other, have the lowest level exclusion criterion among the three cultural groups and, accordingly, they could not easily eliminate any information. Therefore, the cultural difference in the size of information set is larger in the exclusion than the inclusion condition.

The study conducted by Choi and his colleagues can be criticized on several grounds. The first criticism is about categorization of items (internal versus external). They classified the items under two categories: internal and external. The internal category included the items related to the actor (graduate student) and external category included the items related to victim, the relationship between actor and victim and the circumstances (Choi et al., 2003). Kelley (1973) and other researchers (e.g., Fincham, 1987) stated that the relationship between the actor and the victim could be classified as a distinct category. Another criticism is that there was an imbalance between the size of external and internal items. Although the number of items in the external category was greater than that in the internal category, they used absolute numbers rather than proportions as the dependent variable in their analysis.

Inclusion and Exclusion as Decision Making Strategies

The study conducted by Choi and his colleagues was important in the sense that it was the first study investigating the effect of amount of information people consider to make a final attribution. As was previously stated, two different types of information judging strategies were utilized to manipulate the amount of information considered relevant, namely, inclusion and exclusion. The effect of inclusion and exclusion

strategies on the amount of information considered was examined in several studies (e.g., Levin et al., 1998; Yaniv & Schul, 1997; Yaniv, Schul, Raphaelli-Hirsch, & Maoz, 2002). In order to investigate whether inclusion and exclusion strategies make any difference in the amount of information utilized, Yaniv and Schul (1997) conducted two studies. In their studies, they asked the participants to mark the more likely correct answers from a list of questions about geography, history, science, arts, and sports. Along with each question, 20 alternative choices were given. However, only one of these alternatives was the correct answer. The results of these studies showed that the size of the choice set in the exclusion condition was larger than the one in the inclusion condition (Yaniv & Schul, 1997).

Theoretical Explanations

a) Complementary and sub complementary model of decision making

Yaniv and Schul (1997) introduced a theoretical framework, namely screening process, explaining the proposed difference between inclusion and exclusion conditions. According to this framework, the decision makers screen all the answers and evaluate the evidence for (or against) each one being correct during the screening process. Before considering the screening model, two important concepts should be introduced; namely strength of evidence and decision criterion. The strength of evidence for each alternative being the correct answer is indicated by S. Positive S values indicate that the alternative is likely to be correct whereas negative S values indicate that the alternative is unlikely to be correct. Decision criterion functions as a comparison standard for decision making. In order to decide whether an alternative is included or excluded from the choice set, the S value (the strength of evidence) is evaluated against the decision criterion.

Different models differing in setting decision criteria for screening information by inclusion and exclusion strategies are proposed: perfect complementary, with same criterion, and sub-complementary, with different criteria (Yaniv & Schul, 1997). The first model, perfect complementary, refers to the condition in which the eliminated alternatives in the exclusion procedure are exactly the same ones as the not-included ones in the inclusion procedure. The model which states that exclusion and inclusion strategies are invariant strategies has three underlying assumptions (Yaniv et al., 2002). First assumption is that an option's strength can be presented as a single value. For instance, in decision-making in the area of job selection, this would be previous job experience. The second assumption is that the evaluation of an option is independent of the context. Third assumption is that the value of an option will be compared to a consistent cut off criterion. This cut off criterion is the same for inclusion and exclusion procedures (Yaniv et al., 2002). In perfect complementary model, the sum of exclusion and inclusion probabilities is equal to 1. Hence the final information set created by each procedure should be identical (Yaniv & Schul, 1997).

The second, sub-complementary, model assumes that inclusion and exclusion strategies have different justification processes and therefore lead to different outcomes (Yaniv et al., 2002). This model emphasizes the role of justifiability in decision making strategies in line with Simonson and Twersky's (1992) suggestion that appropriate internal justification is needed for making a judgment (Yaniv et al., 2002). In inclusion, each option is included only if the evidence for it being the correct answer exceeds the criterion (Levin, et.al.1998). In elimination, each option is discarded only if there is strong evidence *against* it being correct answer (Yaniv & Schul, 1997). It is important to point out that the lack of support for being the correct answer is not enough for

elimination under exclusion condition. Instead, it requires some concrete evidence for being excluded (Yaniv & Schul, 1997). Therefore, the decision criterion set for each decision strategy is different. Therefore, the sub-complementary model refers to the condition in which the same information is more likely to be judged as relevant by the exclusion than the inclusion procedure (Yaniv et al., 2002). According to the sub-complementary model, the decision criterion set for inclusion and exclusion strategies is different. In technical terms, the sum of exclusion and inclusion probabilities is smaller than one (Yaniv & Schul, 1997).

Yaniv and his coworkers argued that the difference between inclusion and exclusion depends on the ambiguity of options. The utilization of different decision procedures would lead to different results for varying options. First, "*clear cut"* options for which mere positive (negative) evidence is sufficient to be included (excluded) in the choice set are less influenced by decision strategy. This means that either the strength of evidence (S value) is bigger than inclusion criterion (S>Cinc) or the strength of evidence (S value) is smaller than exclusion criterion (S< Cexc). Thus, clear cut options are either put inside the choice set by both strategies, or are left outside the choice set by both strategies (Yaniv et al., 2002). However, the value of strength of evidence for "*Middling"* options for which the decision maker does not have strong feelings for or against, lie between the criterion of inclusion and exclusion (Cexc< S< Cinc). For middling options the likelihood of being included (excluded) in the choice set will depend on the judgmental procedure. This state of middling options defies the complementary condition resulting in sub-complementary condition (Yaniv & Schul, 1997). In other words, the strength of evidence of middling options is neither strong enough to be included in the choice set nor low enough to necessitate exclusion. Hence,

this kind of alternatives would be more likely to be retained in choice set under exclusion than inclusion condition. Therefore, final choice set is much larger in the exclusion than in the inclusion condition (Yaniv & Schul, 1997). Past research (Levin et al., 1998; Yaniv & Schul, 1997; Yaniv et al., 2002) indicated that the size of the final choice set is much larger under the exclusion than the inclusion and was consistent with the predictions of sub-complementary framework. The results of the study also highlighted the finding that the discrepancy between inclusion and exclusion strategies was mainly due to the middling options. They found that the difference between inclusion and exclusion strategies was larger for middling options than clear-cut options (Yaniv et al., 2002).

(b) Dual threshold model of hypothesis testing

A dual-threshold model proposed in social hypothesis testing by Trope and Liberman (1996) is also relevant to the interaction between the decision-making strategies and middling and clear cut options. According to social hypothesis testing model, there are two confidence thresholds, one is confirming the hypothesis and the other is rejecting the hypothesis. In their model, under limited motivational and cognitive resource conditions, people are more likely to engage in heuristic strategy of hypothesis testing. However, when the perceiver has enough motivational and cognitive resources, systematic strategy of hypothesis testing is more likely to be used. When people engage in systematic hypothesis testing, the perceivers systematically assess the probability of the observed behavior to be evidence for the corresponding hypothesis as well as the probability of the observed behavior to be evidence against the corresponding hypothesis (Trope & Gaunt, 2003). But, engaging in systematic hypothesis depends on the motivational and cognitive resources of the perceiver. When the perceivers engage in

heuristic strategy of hypothesis testing, this strategy focuses on the probability of the observed behavior to be evidence for corresponding hypothesis. The probability of behavior under alternative hypotheses is given no consideration (Trope & Gaunt, 2003). In accordance with these statements, the inclusion decision-making strategy may be a heuristic strategy of hypothesis testing in the sense that in inclusion, each option is included only if the evidence for it being the correct answer exceeds the criterion. The exclusion strategy may be regarded as systematic strategy of hypothesis testing in the sense that in elimination, each option is discarded only if there is strong evidence *against* it being correct answer (Yaniv & Schul, 1997). In other words, in order to eliminate an option it requires some concrete evidence for being excluded. According to social hypothesis testing model, a hypothesis becomes feasible if it exceeds a certain acceptance threshold or it may not become feasible if the disconfirming evidence exceeds the rejection threshold. Hence, middling options will not exceed the acceptance and rejection thresholds. This leads to non-complementary.

Gender and Romantic Relationships

Carol Gilligan (1982) proposed an important framework that pointed out to the differences of women's development and stated that differences arise from the differences in their experience of relationships. Her primary interest was the moral development of girls. She began to criticize Kohlberg's moral development theory. Her critical perspective was mainly based on two grounds. First, she criticized the sample used in research because the sample was white American men. Second, she criticized the existing moral development literature in terms of the ignorance of the different understanding of males and females in moral questions. In her critical framework, Gilligan asserted that women have different moral and psychological tendencies than

men. According to Gilligan, men think in terms of rules and justice and women are more inclined to think in terms of caring and relationships. Gilligan argued that these gender differences in moral perspective are due to the contrasting images of self (Gilligan, 1982). Gilligan utilized the word "care" to identify women's moral perspective. According to Gilligan, the concern about hurting others was the major theme in the women's moral perspective. Another important issue considered by women in response to moral questions was the societal consensus of the actions**.** According to Gilligan, what distinguishes "ethic of care" from "ethic of justice" is the quantity and quality of relationships. She provided evidence for her theory from research on children. In her research with adolescents, the participants were asked to resolve one of the moral dilemmas devised by Kohlberg. The dilemma involved the resolution of a conflict with social norms. The typical story was about a man named Heinz who stole a drug for his wife having a very bad disease. Gilligan argued that there were differences between female and male adolescents in terms of the understanding of the moral question and exploration of the resolution of the moral dilemma. Females considered moral questions in a context of relationships whereas males considered moral questions within a system of logic (Gilligan, 1982). According to Gilligan, female adolescents see the world as consisting of relationships rather than systems of rules. Female adolescents resolved the moral question through a process of communication. According to female adolescents, the issue of responsibility was affected by the variations in people and circumstances. However, male adolescents considered the issue of responsibility as a mathematical problem.

There has been a criticism of Carol Gilligan's work. Carol Gilligan's claim that Kohlberg's theory is based against women is refuted. Walker (1984) did not evidence

significant gender differences. Thoma (1986, as cited in Juujärvi) conducted a meta-analysis that demonstrated small effect favoring women. A recent study conducted with Japanese adolescent boys and girls indicated that Japanese adolescent boys saw caring as a communal responsibility and combined care and justice in their moral thought (Shimizu, 2001).

Gender Differences in Infidelity

Infidelity is a moral issue involving intimate relationships. Understanding the nature and dynamics of intimate relationships is not only personally relevant issue. Social and cultural factors also play an important role in determining the nature and the dynamics of intimate relationships. The issue of reactions to infidelity is a research area in which various cultural and gender differences are investigated. Two different theoretical models dominate the research on gender differences in relation to infidelity, namely, evolutionary and sociocultural perspectives. Evolutionary theorists hypothesize that gender differences in the importance ascribed to the rival characteristics and reactions to emotional or sexual extrarelationship involvements of partners derive from different reproductive strategies of men and women (Buunk & Dijkstra, 2004). Sociocultural theorists, in contrast, have suggested that these differences emerge as a result of the acquisition of culturally determined roles regarding the behavior of men and women in romantic relationships (Wiederman & Allgeier, 1993).

Evolutionary Theory and Infidelity

Evolutionary theory argues that at a purely biological level, women's contributions to reproduction overshadow those of men by far. Men need only to expend a few sperms and very little time to reproduce whereas women must invest vast amounts of time and

effort for each child. Consequently, men can have many offspring and may afford to lose some whereas women can have fewer children and try to ensure the survival of the ones they have. Therefore reproductive ability of partner (signaled by youth and beauty) is important for men whereas commitment and capacity to protect and provide for the child is important for women. (Buss, 1992; Trivers, 1972; as cited in Sheets & Wolfe, 2001). On the basis of these assumptions, evolutionary theory proposed that the value of a woman as a partner is determined more by her physical attractiveness whereas the value of a man as a partner is determined more by his status-related characteristics (e.g., Buss, 1989, Singh, 1993, 1995). Consequently, reactions given to infidelity in romantic relationships may differ by gender. The reactions to infidelity by women are generally evoked by rival's physical attractiveness whereas reactions to infidelity by men are generally evoked by the status or social dominance of the rival (Buunk & Dijkstra, 2004).

Several authors (e.g., DeSteno & Salovey, 1996; Harris & Christenfeld, 1996a) noted that infidelity has different connotations for men and women**.** The "Doubleshot" hypothesis implies that men will be more distressed by a partner's sexual infidelity than women but also men will be more distressed by sexual infidelity than emotional infidelity. The reason behind doubleshot hypothesis is that a man cannot be sure about the paternity of his offspring if he is not sure about the fidelity of his partner. On the other hand, under normal conditions, women are sure about being the mother of their child and are threatened by possible desertion of a partner who is emotionally involved with another woman. In other words passing sexual involvements of partner that do not imply loss of partner's commitment threaten women less than emotional involvements

implying loss. Thus, gender differences in sensitivity to sexual and emotional infidelity may simply reflect these differences in reactions to infidelity, namely men generally react more strongly to cues that imply a partner has a sexual relationship with another man; women generally react more strongly to cues that entail that the partner has a emotional relationship with another woman (Sheet & Wolfe, 2001).

Sociocultural Theory and Infidelity

According sociocultural perspective, the reactions to infidelity in romantic relationships depend entirely on culturally specific socialization regarding behaviors that affects the perception of the infidelity (Hupka & Bank, 1996; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1993). Sociocultural theory stated three main explanations in order to discuss gender differences in infidelity: Gender differences in relationship beliefs, in gender roles, and in needs for intimacy and social support.

"Cognitive adaptation" hypothesis affords an additional explanation for gender differences to infidelity in romantic relationships. Specifically, because of a widespread belief that men have more freedom than women to engage in extra relational relationships, women may downplay the importance of men's infidelity and therefore react less strongly to their extra dyadic behavior (Shift & Wolfe, 2001).

Attributions about the partner infidelity are more likely to be affected by the cultural values and social norms in a society (Hortaçsu & Karancı, 1987). One of most significant cultural elements that arrange everyday human relationships in Mediterranean and Middle Eastern societies is "the code honor" in any given society (Lindisfarne, 1994). The code of honor distributes rights, responsibilities and duties

among kin members vis-à-vis each other. These rights, responsibilities and duties include those concerning the case of romantic and sexual relationships. A romantic or sexual relationship of one kin member that violates the code of honor brings dishonor to the rest of the kin members and makes it legitimate for them fulfill their responsibilities and duties by punishing that kin member. This punishment may range from censure to murder. The distribution of rights, responsibilities and duties among kin members is an uneven one (Lindisfarne, 1994). Kandiyoti (1987) proposed the connection between control over female sexuality and family or lineage honor. Women are vested with immense negative power because any misbehavior on their part may bring shame and dishonor to the male members of whole community (Kandiyoti, 1987). Thus strict external constraints are placed on women. However, the same cannot be proposed for man's sexuality and masculinity (Kandiyoti, 1987).

A final explanation for gender differences in jealousy-evoking stimulus sensitivities rests on gender differences in needs for intimacy and social support. Although research confirms the value of intimacy for both men and women, men are often socialized to remain emotionally independent whereas women are socialized to cultivate emotional bonds with others (Wood, 1996).

In short, in combination, sociocultural and evolutionary perspectives would predict that not only men and women may react differently to infidelity of relationship partners but that the gender of the person engaging in infidelity may also be a factor influencing the act of infidelity.

Study 1

The first study was concerned with generation of possible causes for an occurrence. Therefore, the participants were provided with one of four vignettes and asked to write the possible causes of the event under seven categories, namely, protagonist, victim, accomplice, the relationship between protagonist and victim, the relationship between protagonist and accomplice, the relationship between victim and accomplice and the external factors. Two factors were manipulated by variations of the basic vignette: the severity of outcome (mild and severe) and the gender of the protagonist (male and female). In the mild condition, the protagonist (male or female) dated a person of the opposite sex (accomplice) in whom a close friend of the protagonist (victim) was also interested. In the severe condition, the protagonist (male or female) dated the fiancé (accomplice) of a close friend (victim). The independent variables were severity of action, gender of protagonist, and the gender of the judge. Thus, the first study was conducted in order to fulfill three goals. First, manipulation checks of the high/low severity of the act related in the vignettes were conducted. Second, participants were asked to generate possible causes for the relationship event in question under three people, three relationship categories, namely protagonist, victim, accomplice, the relationship between protagonist and victim, the relationship between protagonist and accomplice, the relationship between the victim and accomplice, and external factors. Thus, in a way, the first study was aimed as a pilot study for Study 2. Third, variations in the number of possible causes generated in relation to participant and protagonist gender and severity of action were investigated. As such, the investigation of factors influencing information generation was aimed.

The study aimed to contribute to earlier work on blame attribution in several ways: 1) Consistent with Kelley's statements (1973) seven distinct loci of causality including relationships between the three actors as attribution categories were considered. 2) The relationship between the amount of information generated and specifics of the act (gender and severity) was an issue of interest.

Research demonstrating the prevalence of the fundamental attribution error suggests that seeking causes in dispositional properties of persons and especially the protagonists of an event should be a heuristic. Systematic processing, on the other hand, would imply consideration of possible causes other than the protagonist in particular and persons in general. Thus, when people engage in systematic processing, presence of alternative causes, relationships and/or persons other than the protagonist in the present case, would be considered and emphasis on the dispositional properties of the protagonist would be reduced, i.e. discounting schema would occur (Trope & Liberman, 1993; Trope & Gaunt, 2003). Systematic-heuristic model of information processing proposes that people will engage in systematic information processing when the observed behavior is sufficiently unambiguous, relevant, or novel for the perceiver.

In the present research, under mild condition, two friends are attracted to the same person and one gets to date him/her. In this condition, due to minimal information given in the vignette, the observed behavior is ambiguous for the participants. Furthermore, the event described does not fit the infidelity script because a committed relationship is part of that script and the script involves such roles as the deceived victim, deceiver, and the accomplice (or tempter/temptress) to the deceiver. Thus, because of the ambiguity of the occurrence, the participants are expected to engage in heuristic processing under the mild condition, that is resort to the fundamental

attribution error. In other words, they are expected to list more possible causes under the protagonist category in particular and person categories in general than under relationship categories. The severe condition, on the other hand, may be viewed as a case of an unusual event and as such should evoke the multiple necessary causal schema. It is also consistent with the infidelity script and therefore it is unambiguous. According to the heuristic-systematic information processing view, when the observed behavior is sufficiently unambiguous and perceivers have enough cognitive ability and motivation to process information alternative attributions are to be considered (Trope & Gaunt, 2003). Therefore, according to both schematic considerations and the tenets of the heuristic-systematic model, more items will be generated under relationship categories in the severe compared to the mild condition. Consequently,

1a) Participants are expected to generate more causal attributions about the actor categories in general and in the protagonist category in particular in the mild compared to the severe condition.

b) Participants are expected to generate more causal attributions under the relationship categories in the severe compared to the mild condition.

Sociocultural explanations of reactions to infidelity propose that more tolerance is evidenced in the face of acts of infidelity committed by men than women. Due to the association between women's misbehavior and family dishonor, strict external constraints are placed on women's sexuality. The same cannot be proposed for man's sexuality and masculinity (Kandiyoti, 1987). Therefore, it is predicted that

2. Especially under the severe condition, the participants are expected to generate more causal attributions about actors, especially under the female protagonist category.

Moreover, men may show greater adherence to the double standard about infidelity than women because of the self-serving nature of the double standard and/or because they may view men as the guardians of the honor code. Women, on the other hand do not stand to gain by the double standard and also, due to their relationship emphasis, may assign greater weight the breach of trust/loyalty in a relationship no matter who does it. Therefore, it is expected that

3. When the protagonist is female, there won't be a difference in the number of items written under the protagonist category between male and female participants whereas when the protagonist is male, male participants will write fewer items under protagonist category than female participants.

Method

Participants

Two hundred and twenty three university students participated in the study. All participants were students either in introductory or social psychology courses in Boğaziçi University. They received extra one credit for their participation in the study. One hundred and sixteen (52 %) participants were male and 107 participants (48%) were female. The duration of the existing relationships ranged between 1 to 115 months (M = 19.04, SD = 21.39). As it may be seen in Table 1, the percentage of women presently involved in a romantic relationship was higher than that of males.

Table 1

Past and present involvement in romantic relationship (percentages)

	Had a romantic relationship		Presently involved in a romantic relationship	
Subject Gender	Yes	No	Yes	No
Male	87 (42)	29 (16)	29 (14)	87 (44)
Female	95 (48)	12 (7)	50 (23)	57 (32)

Note. The values in parenthesis represent the numbers of participants.

Materials

Participants received booklets. Depending on the severity of the outcome (mild and severe) gender of protagonist (male and female) manipulations, first part of booklet included one of four versions of a brief vignette about a relationship triangle. In the low severity condition, the protagonist (protagonist) had a romantic relationship with a person of the opposite sex (accomplice) in whom a close friend (victim) was also interested but had no actual relationship. In the high severity condition, the protagonist was involved in a romantic relationship with her/his close friend's current fiancé. The protagonist and the victim (close friend) were either male or female and the accomplice (fiancé) was of the opposite sex. Gender was indicated by names. The actual scenarios in the vignettes were as follows.

Low severity

Seda (Can) and Emel (Mert) were close friends for a long time. Both were attracted to Barış (Pelin). After a while, Seda (Can) and Barış (Pelin) started to date.

High severity

Seda (Can) and Emel (Mert) were close friends for a long time. Emel (Mert) and Barış (Pelin) had been engaged for a long time. They were going to get married within three months. Seda (Can) and Barış (Pelin) started to date.

The participants were asked to read the vignette and write possible causes about the occurrence of the event under eight categories: namely, protagonist, victim, accomplice, the relationship between the protagonist and victim, the relationship between the protagonist and the accomplice, the relationship between the victim and the accomplice, external factors, and other factors.

The second part of the booklet included four items evaluating the severity manipulations. The questions were: " Can's (Seda's) behavior isn't tolerated among university students.", " Can's (Seda's) behavior isn't acceptable among university students", "Can's (Seda's) behavior is common among university students, Can's (Seda's) behavior is tolerated among university students." These items were rated on a 7-point scale varying along a continuum from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". The order generation of possible causes and judgment of normativeness of the protagonist's action were counterbalanced.

The third part of the booklet included several questions about whether the participants ever had a romantic relationship in their lives, the number of previous relationships, and whether they were involved in a romantic relationship at the time of the study, the duration of the current relationship, and the time elapsed since the last

break up. Moreover, the participants were asked to respond to several questions about whether or not they themselves or anybody they knew had been in the same situation as the protagonist, the victim, or the accomplice. As may be seen from Table 2, most participants reported knowing someone in the position of the protagonist, victim, and the accomplice but few reported being involved in a similar situation themselves.

Table 2

Participants' involvements in situations of actors of love triangle (n)

	Roles					
	Same as protagonist		Same as victim		Same as accomplice	
Sub-Gen	Myself	Other	Myself	Other	Myself	Other
Male	5	33	5	46	4	18
Female	4	44	5	58	6	17

Note. Sub-Gen= Subject gender, Same as protagonist= In the same situation with protagonist, Same as victim=In the same situation with victim, Same as accomplice= In the same situation with accomplice.

Procedure

Before the participants were given the booklets, they were asked to read and sign the consent form giving a brief description of the study, and assuring the confidentiality of their responses. After the participants signed the consent form, the booklets were distributed to the students. Completing the booklet took about half an hour.

Results

Manipulation Check of Severity Manipulation

High-low severity manipulation was tested by a 4-item norm violation measure. The reliability analysis using the four items revealed a reliability coefficient of .43. When the third item pertaining to the frequency of such event was discarded from the scale, the reliability coefficient increased to .87. Therefore the third item was excluded from the measure.

Independent Sample t-test comparing the norm violation ratings for the low and high severity conditions was conducted. A significant effect of severity resulted showing a higher norm violation rating for the high than the low severity condition (high severity: M=5.39, SD=1.316; low severity M=4.60, SD=1.429; t (111) = -2.850, p=.005 (two-tailed). This analysis indicated that the severity manipulation worked.

Coding of responses

The total number of different possible causes generated by the participants in the first study was 176. The number of possible causes generated by participants under eight categories varied between 0 and 8. The items generated by the participants were arranged in a list. Five judges (female psychology master students) were provided with labels of the seven attributional categories (protagonist, victim, accomplice, the relationship between the protagonist and the victim, the relationship between the protagonist and accomplice, the relationship between the victim and the accomplice, and the external factors) based on Kelley's (1973) attributional categories and were asked to include each item under one of 7 attributional categories (Table 3.). A criterion of 3/5 consensus was adopted for inclusion of items in any category. The consensus information for the items in each category is presented in Table 3. As may be seen in the

Table 3, the number of items under different categories was not equal. Next, the judges were asked to sort the items written under the protagonist, accomplice, and victim categories into evaluative categories as positive, negative and neutral. A criterion of 3/5 consensus was adopted in assigning items to evaluation categories. The consensus ratings for each item are presented in Table 3. Once the category assignments were made, items provided by each participant were examined and each participant received a score for each category depending on the items s/he wrote under each category.

Table 3

Consensus ratings of the items included in attributional categories

Categories	Number of items	5/5	4/5	3/5
Protagonist	32	11	12	9
Positive		4	3	4
Negative		10	5	4
Neutral		0	1	1
Victim	21	17	0	4
Positive		2	1	1
Negative		7	5	2
Neutral		1	2	0
Accomplice	25	15	1	9
Positive		5	3	0
Negative		9	1	4
Neutral		0	2	1

Table 3 (continued)

Act-Vic	13	9	2	2
Act-Acco	13	4	3	6
Acco-Vic	24	6	8	10
External	24	16	1	7

Note. Act-Vic= The relationship between protagonist and victim, Act-Acco= The relationship between protagonist and accomplice, Acco-Vic= The relationship between accomplice and victim, External= External factor.

Analysis strategy

Two overlapping but different ANOVAs were conducted. Participant Gender, Protagonist Gender and Severity served as between-subjects variables in both ANOVAs. The number of items was the dependent measure. In the first ANOVA, within-subjects factor was attributional category. It consisted of seven levels (protagonist, victim, accomplice, the relationship between the protagonist and the victim, the relationship between the protagonist and accomplice, the relationship between the victim and the accomplice, and the external factor). The second ANOVA had two within subjects factors. The first factor, Attributional Category, had three levels (protagonist, victim and accomplice) and the second factor was Valence (positive, negative and neutral). Thus, the second analysis provided more elaborate description of possible causes within the first three categories of the first ANOVA. Categorizing items into valence categories was impossible for the relationship categories and external factors. Therefore, these categories were excluded from the second ANOVA.

Analyses

The first ANOVA Severity (Low/High) x Participant Gender (Female/Male) x Protagonist Gender (Female/Male) x Category (7 categories including relationships) revealed significant Category, Severity x Category, and Category x Participant Gender x Protagonist Gender effects (see in Table 4). The second ANOVA (including the valence factor) revealed significant effects of Severity, Subject Gender, Category , Valence , Category x Participant Gender, Category x Valence, Category x Valence x Participant Gender, and Category x Valence x Severity effects (see in Table 4).

As may be seen in Table 5, analyses of the Category effect obtained from the first ANOVA revealed that the highest number of items was generated for the protagonist category followed by the accomplice, the protagonist-victim, victim-accomplice, the victim, and the protagonist-accomplice categories. The lowest number of items was generated for the external factors category. These results provided evidence for the existence of distinct locus of causality dimensions outside the actor. In addition, consistent with fundamental attribution error tendency, there was a tendency for seeking causes in persons rather than in relationships. However relationships were also considered as causes of interpersonal events.

Post ANOVA analyses comparing low and high severity conditions were conducted in order to analyze the significant Severity x Category interaction. There were significant differences between the high and low severity conditions for the number of items written for four categories: Protagonist, victim, protagonist-victim, and victim-accomplice categories, respectively. As may be seen in Table 5, the number of items written under the protagonist, victim, and accomplice categories was lower in the severe

Table 4
Significant effects of Analyses of Variance for Participant Generated Possible Causes

	ANOVA 1 (7 Attributional Categories)				ANOVA 2 (Category x Valence)			
	Between Subjects				Between Subjects			
Source	*df*	*F*	*η2*	*p*	*df*	*F*	*η²*	*p*
Severe (S)	1	.954	.009	.331	1	20.833	.167	.000
Subject Gender (SG)	1	3.969	.036	.049	1	4.020	.037	.048
Protagonist Gender (PG)	1	.455	.004	.501	1	2.350	.022	.128
Error	105				104			
	Within Subjects				Within Subjects			
Category (C)	6	21.160	.559	.000	2	9,814	.160	.000
Evaluation (E)					2	42.388	.451	.000
C x S	6	9.327	.359	.000	2	4.585	.082	.012
C x SG x AG	6	2.540	.135	.025				
C x E					4	7.195	.239	.000
C x E x AG					4	3.535	.123	.01
C x E x S					4	10.211	.288	.000
Error	100				10			

than the mild condition. Moreover, as the severity of the misdeed increased, the participants wrote more items under relationship categories than they did in the mild condition. In other words, when the misdeed was severe, there was a tendency to seek the cause of the event in relationships not including the protagonist. These results confirmed first and second predictions of the study.

Table 5

Severity and Attributions for the possible causes generated under seven categories by participants for mild and severe condition

Severity	Protagonist	Victim	Accomplice	Pro-Vic	Pro-Acc	Vic-Acc	External
Mild	2.39	1.76	2.21	1.64	.76	.95	.73
	(1.902)	(1.731)	(1.545)	(1.512)	(1.051)	(1.196)	(.963)
Severe	1.58	.76	1.79	1.11	1.03	2.47	.68
	(1.287)	(.971)	(1.545)	(1.060)	(1.262)	(2.140)	(.823)
F(1,112)	5.768	9.781	n.s.	4.201	n.s.	22.783	n.s.
p	.018	.002		.043		.000	

Note. The values in parenthesis represent the standard deviations. The sample size of mild condition = 75, the sample size of severe condition = 38. Pro-Vic=The relationship between protagonist and victim, Pro-Acc=The relationship between protagonist and accomplice, Vic-Acc=The relationship between victim and accomplice, External=External factor.

The significant Category x Valence x Severity emerging from the second ANOVA was analyzed by one way ANOVAs comparing the severity effect for the positive, negative and neutral items written for the protagonist, victim, and accomplice categories. Significant differences due to severity emerged for positive and negative

items related to the protagonist, negative items related to the victim, positive and neutral items related to the accomplice. As may be seen in Table 6, more negatively and positively valenced items about the protagonist and more negatively valenced items about the victim were written in the mild compared to the severe condition. In addition, more positive and neutral items were written about the accomplice in the mild as opposed to the severe condition. Thus, severity manipulation seemed to decrease victim-blame but did not lead to greater number of negatively valenced possible cause generation for the protagonist and the accomplice

Table 6

Severity and Valence evaluations for the possible causes generated under person categories

	Actor			Victim			Accomplice		
Severity	Pos	Neg	Neut	Pos	Neg	Neut	Pos	Neg	Neut
Mild	.57	1.48	.04	.15	1.35	.01	.63	.69	.72
	(.880)	(1.474)	(.226)	(.425)	(1.341)	(.115)	(.993)	(.1.013)	(.781)
Severe	.13	.97	.08	.05	.39	.05	.21	.95	.16
	(.243)	(1)	(.277)	(.226)	(.638)	(.226)	(.424)	(.957)	(.370)
F(1,111)	10.281	3.967	ns	ns	15.719	ns	11.069	ns	17.736
p	.002	.049	ns	ns	.000	ns	.001	ns	.000

Note. The values in parenthesis represent the standard deviations. Pos= Positive, Neg= Negative, Neut= Neutral

The third hypothesis of the study stated that especially under the severe condition, the participants were expected to generate more causal attributions about the female protagonist. The results did not confirm the third hypothesis In order to analyze the significant Participant Gender x Protagonist Gender x Category interaction effect obtained from the first ANOVA, one way ANOVAs comparing the number of items per category written by male and female participants were conducted separately for each protagonist gender. Participant Gender was the independent variable and the number of items per category served as the dependent measure in these analyses. The results of one- way ANOVAs provided confirmatory evidence for the fourth hypothesis of the study. When the protagonist was male, one-way ANOVAs showed significant differences between female and male participants with respect to possible causes related to the protagonist, the accomplice, and the relationship between the protagonist and the victim, $F(1,55)=8,754$, $p=.005$, $F(1,55)=5,530$, $p=.022$, and $F(1,55)=10,862$, $p=.002$, respectively. As may be seen in Table 7, when the protagonist was male, male participants wrote fewer items under the protagonist, accomplice, and the relationship between the protagonist and the victim categories than females. When the protagonist was female, participant gender effects were not significant for any category. Hence, as was predicted, there were no significant differences in the number of items written under the protagonist category between male and female participants when the protagonist gender was female. Moreover, male participants wrote significantly fewer items related to the male protagonist than did female participants. Thus, male participants had a greater tendency to seek the cause of the event outside the protagonist when the protagonist was male whereas, female participants attributed the cause of the event to

the protagonist regardless of the gender of the protagonist. These results supported hypothesis 3.

Table 7

The Means and Standard Deviations of the attributions generated by male and female participants for male actor and female protagonist

	Categories						
Par-Gen	Protagonist	Victim	Accomplice	Pro-Vic	Pro-Acc	Vic-Acc	External
			Female Protagonist				
Male	2.23	1.42	2.31	1.81	.54	1.08	.73
	(2.026)	(1.270)	(1.715)	(1.674)	(.905)	(1.547)	(.778)
Female	2.50	1.50	2.11	1.25	.86	1.79	.75
	(1.816)	(1.667)	(1.663)	(1.266)	(1.008)	(2.061)	(1.041)
			Male Protagonist				
Male	1.33	1.17	1.53	.93	.73	1.47	.77
	(1.155)	(1.731)	(1.545)	(1.512)	(1.051)	(1.196)	(.963)
Female	2.52	1.41	2.41	2.00	1.30	1.56	.56
	(1.827)	(1.526)	(1.421)	(1.301)	(1.353)	(2.423)	(.698)
F(1,55)	8.754	ns	5.530	10.862	ns	ns	ns
p	.005	ns	.022	.002	ns	ns	ns

Note. Par-Gen= Participant Gender, Pro-Vic=The relationship between protagonist and victim, Pro-Acc=The relationship between protagonist and accomplice, Vic-Acc=The relationship between victim and accomplice, External=External factor.

The Category x Valence x Participant Gender x Protagonist Gender effect was not significant for the second ANOVA. However, the Category x Valence x Participant Gender interaction effect was significant. One way ANOVAs comparing the number of positive, negative, and neutral items written by male and female participants under the three categories were conducted in order to analyze the significant Category x Valence x Participant Gender interaction effect. Significant differences between female and male participants emerged in negative evaluations of the protagonist $F(1,111) = 10.450$, $p=.002$ and positive evaluations of the accomplice $F(1,111) = 7.517$, $p=.007$. Female participants generated more negative items than male participants about the protagonist. Moreover, female participants wrote more positive items about the accomplice compared to male participants. This finding showed that females were more likely to focus on the protagonist and possibly blame him/her than males. However, they did not support the explanation that males were being particularly lenient to male protagonists

Discussion

The results of the study revealed that relationship categories were indeed used in attributions concerning interpersonal events and that partitioning the general 'external' category may be useful in investigating the process of attribution within relationships. They also showed that, although there was a general tendency supporting the fundamental attribution error, this tendency was not prevalent under all conditions. Consistent with the predictions, more items were generated under the protagonist category in the mild compared to the severe condition. However, the participants had a tendency to look for the cause of the event outside the protagonist when the severity of the misdeed increased. Particularly, the number of items generated for the relationship

between the victim and accomplice increased significantly as the severity of the misdeed increased.

Study 1 also provided confirmatory evidence for the predictions based on the gender of the protagonist and that of judges. The results confirmed the hypothesis that male and female participants would differ in attributing the cause to the protagonist when the protagonist was female. Moreover, the results provided evidence supporting for the prediction that male participants would write fewer items under the protagonist category than female participants when the protagonist gender was male. Thus, female participants looked for the cause of the event in the protagonist regardless of the gender of the protagonist whereas male participants attributed the cause of the event to protagonist when the protagonist was female and looked for the cause of the event outside the protagonist when the protagonist gender was male.

Study 2

Aim of Study 2

The issue in the second study was evaluation of available information related to different loci of causality rather than generation of possible causes related to the different foci.The effects of two different information processing strategies were investigated, namely inclusion of relevant information or exclusion of irrelevant information. As discussed in the introduction section, previous studies (Choi et al., 2003, Levine et al., 1998; Yaniv & Schul, 1997) found that the size of information set was significantly larger under the exclusion condition than the inclusion condition. Therefore, it is predicted that

1. The size of information set will be larger in the exclusion condition than in the inclusion condition.

As was proposed before, the strength of evidence for "*clear cut"* options is sufficient to be included (excluded) in the choice set regardless of the decision strategy. However, for middling options the likelihood of being included (excluded) in the choice set will depend on the judgmental procedure employed. This kind of possible alternative causes will be retained in the choice set under the exclusion strategy. Due to the minimal information given in the vignettes, it would be difficult to surely include the relevant information or surely exclude the irrelevant information. Most of the given information would be treated as "middling" alternatives. The results of previous studies indicated that the middling items would more likely to be chosen in exclusion than the inclusion condition. Since the fundamental attribution error heuristic would lead to preference for inclusion of alternatives related to persons in general and the protagonist in particular, the advantage of person categories over relationship categories would be more dominant under the inclusion (stricter criterion) than the exclusion (less strict) criterion. Therefore, it is predicted that

2. There will be fewer significant differences between the proportions of items chosen under different categories in the exclusion than the inclusion condition,

Furthermore, in accordance with the "code of honor", according to which females face with more reactions than males when females show non-normative behaviors, it is predicted that

3. When the protagonist gender is female, participants will choose more items under the protagonist category compared to the condition when the protagonist gender is male and alternatively

4. When the protagonist gender is male, participants are expected to choose more items under the categories outside the protagonist category compared to the condition when the actor gender is female

Furthermore, because of the negative power vested in women in relation to possible family dishonor, it is predicted that

5. Participants will choose more negative items under the protagonist category when the protagonist is female than male.

In accordance with "code of honor", men react more negatively to women's non-normative behaviors. Therefore it is predicted that

6 (a) Participants assign more responsibility and blame in the severe condition than mild condition.

(b) Male participants will attribute more responsibility and blame than female participants, especially for female protagonist.

The entailment model of blame attribution proposes that causality attributions influence responsibility attributions and responsibility attributions, in turn, influence blame attributions (Fincham & Jaspars, 1980). In addition, the study by Choi and coworkers indicated that the amount of information utilized related to different loci of causality influences responsibility attributions. Therefore, it is predicted that

7. The proportion of relevant items selected under different categories will influence responsibility judgments; which, in turn will influence blame attributions. In other words attribution of responsibility will mediate between the judged relevance of items in different categories and blame judgments.

Method

Participants

Two hundred and fifty nine university students participated in the study. All participants were sampled either from introductory psychology or social psychology classes at Boğaziçi University. They received one credit for their participation in the study. The duration of the relationships ranged between 1-108 months with a mean of 17.45 and standard deviation of 18.52. There were no gender differences in current or past involvement in romantic relationship.

Table 8

Past and present involvement in romantic relationship (percentages)

	Had a romantic relationship		Presently involved in a romantic relationship	
Participant Gender	Yes	No	Yes	No
Male	78 (96)	22 (27)	32.5 (40)	67.5 (83)
Female	77.9 (106)	22.1 (30)	39 (53)	61(83)

Note. The values in parenthesis represent the number of participants.

Table 9 Participants' involvements in situations of actors of love triangle (percentages)

	Roles					
	Same as protagonist		Same as victim		Same as accomp	
Sub-Gen	Myself	Other	Myself	Other	Myself	Other
Male	8.8	26.5	6.6	40.4	8.1	15.4
Female	7.3	31.7	8.91	33.3	4.1	22.8

Note. Sub-Gen= Subject gender, Same as protagonist= In the same situation with protagonist, Same as victim=In the same situation with victim, Same as accomplice= In the same situation with accomplice.

Material

Booklets including three different sections were used. The first section of the booklet contained one of the two vignettes (high/low severity - male/female protagonist) used in study 1. Participants were asked to read the given scenario and consider the relevance of a list of information for the occurrence of the event under two different decision making instructions. In the inclusion condition, they were asked to mark bits of information relevant to the event. In the exclusion condition, they were asked to mark bits of information they considered irrelevant for explaining the event. The instructions for the two conditions were:

In the inclusion condition,

"In the space below, you are presented with several potential pieces of information, each of which may or may not be relevant with respect to determining the cause of the action. You are asked to mark the every item information that *may be relevant for* the incident."

In the exclusion condition,

"In the space below, you are presented with several potential pieces of information, each of which may or may not be relevant with respect to determining the cause of the action. You are asked to mark the every item information that *is irrelevant for* the incident."

Participants were provided with 152 items of information related to the protagonist, victim, accomplice, the relationship between the protagonist and victim, the relationship between the protagonist and accomplice, the relationship between the victim and the accomplice, and the external factors. The items in the list were the causal possible causes generated by the participants in study 1 and categorized under different categories by five judges (female psychology master students). The number of items under different categories was not equal. There were 32 items about the protagonist, 21 items about the victim, 25 items about the accomplice, 13 items about the relationship between protagonist and victim, 13 items about the relationship between protagonist and accomplice, 24 items about the relationship between victim and accomplice, and 24 items about the external protagonists. Three different random orders of the items were created.

Second part of the booklet included fourteen items about the *controllability of the cause* (Seda (Can) could have controlled her/his behavior , Seda (Can) could predict the consequences of his/her behavior, It was not in Can's hand not to behave in this way, Seda (Can) could not behave in another way), *responsibility of the actor*(Seda (Can) is not responsible for the consequences of her/his behavior, Seda (Can) is responsible for the consequences of his/her behavior,), *intentionality of the action* (Seda (Can) did not have bad intentions, Seda (Can) intended to harm Emel (Mert), Seda (Can) intended to

harm Emel (Mert), Seda (Can) had planned his behavior. Seda (Can) could not anticipate how Emel (Mert) would feel.), and *blameworthiness of the protagonist* (Seda (Can) should be blamed for this event, Seda (Can) deserves to be blamed for her/ his behavior, Seda (Can) should not be blamed for her/his behavior). The participants were asked to respond to each on a 7-point scale varying along a continuum from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree".

The third part of the booklet included several questions about whether the participants had ever had a romantic relationship in their lives, the number of previous relationships, whether or not they were involved in a romantic relationship at the time of the study, the duration of the current relationship, and the time elapsed since the last break up. Moreover, the participants were asked to respond to several questions about whether or not they knew anybody who was in the same situation as the protagonist, the victim, or the accomplice.

Procedure

Before the participants were given the booklets, they were asked to read and sign the consent form giving a brief description of the study, and assuring the confidentiality of their responses. After the participants signed the consent form, the booklets were distributed to the students. Students were instructed to read the scenario carefully. Completing the booklet took about half an hour.

Results

Analysis strategy

The information set created based on the participant-generated possible causes in the first part of the study contained 152 items. The number of items under different categories was not equal. Therefore, the proportion of available items selected under

each category was computed for the inclusion and exclusion conditions. In the inclusion condition, each category proportion score was computed by dividing the number of checked items by the total number included in each category (X/n, x = number chosen, n = number in category). In the exclusion condition, each category proportion score was computed by subtracting the number of items checked by the participant from the number included in each category. Then, this number was divided by the total number of items included in each category [(n-x)/n, x = number chosen, n = number in category).

Two overlapping but different ANOVAs were conducted. Participant Gender, Protagonist Gender and Severity served as the between-subjects variables in both ANOVAs and the number of items was the dependent measure. The within subjects factor in the first ANOVA was Category. This factor consisted of seven levels (protagonist, victim, accomplice, protagonist-victim, protagonist-accomplice, victim-accomplice, and the external factors) in the first ANOVA. The second ANOVA had two within factors. The first factor was Category and had three levels (protagonist, victim and accomplice) and the second factor was Valence (positive, negative and neutral). Thus the second analysis provided more elaborate description of the possible causes within the first three categories. Categorizing items into valence categories was impossible for the relationship categories and external factors. Therefore, these categories were excluded from the second analyses.

Causal Relevance of information

A Severity (Low/High) x Participant Gender (Female/Male) x Protagonist Gender (Female/Male) x Decision Rule (Inclusion/Exclusion) x Category (protagonist/ victim/ accomplice/ protagonist - victim/ protagonist-accomplice/

accomplice-victim / external factors) was conducted where the proportion of items included from each category served as the dependent measure. Severity, Subject Gender, Protagonist Gender and Decision Rule were between-subjects variables and Category was the within-subjects variable. This analysis indicated significant Category, Severity x Category, Decision Rule x Category, Protagonist Gender x Category, and Decision Rule x Severity x Participant Gender x Category interaction effects.

The Severity (Low/High) x Participant Gender (Female/Male) x Protagonist Gender (Female/Male) x Decision Rule (Inclusion/Exclusion) x Category (Protagonist/Victim/Accomplice) x Valence (Positive/Negative/Neutral) ANOVA where the proportion of items chosen under each category/valence combination served as the dependent measure revealed several significant effects; namely Decision Rule, Severity, Valence x Severity, Valence x Decision Rule, Valence x Severity x Participant Gender x Decision Rule, Category x Valence , Category x Valence x Severity, Category x Valence x Protagonist Gender, Category x Valence x Decision Rule (Table 10) .

First, consistent with the first prediction, decision rule had a highly significant effect on proportion of items selected F (1,243) = 6.319, p=.013. Significantly a larger proportion of items were selected in the exclusion than in the inclusion condition (Exclusion M = 69.852 SD= 17.90, Inclusion M =34.073 SD=18.20).

Post ANOVA analyses were conducted in order to examine the significant Decision Rule x Category interaction effect. One way ANOVAs comparing the proportions selected under each category for inclusion and exclusion conditions showed that these conditions differed significantly for each category. In order to analyze whether there were significant differences within categories for each decision rule, Scheffé

Table 10
Analyses of Variance for Possible Causes Chosen and Evaluations

	ANOVA 1 (7 Attributional Categories)				ANOVA 2 (Category xValence)			
	Between Subjects				Between Subjects			
Source	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Severe (S)	1	.144	.001	.013	1	6.832	.027	.001
Participant Gender (SG)	1	.759	.003	.385	1	3.857	.016	.051
Protagonist Gender (PG)	1	.080	.000	.778	1	1.059	.004	.304
Decision Type (D)	1	6.319	.025	.013	1	451.170	.650	.000
Error	243				242			
	Within Subjects				Within Subjects			
Category (C)	6	62.096	.61	.000	2	106.485	.468	.000
Evaluation (E)					2	47.219	.281	.000
C x S	6	14.348	.266	.000	2	15.664	.115	.000
C x D	6	6.289	.137	.000	2	4.345	.035	.014
C x PG	6	2.443	.058	.026				
D x S x SG	6	2.292	.055	.036				

Table 10 (continued)

	ANOVA 1 (7 Attributional Categories)				ANOVA 2 (Category x Valence			
	Within Subjects				Within Subjects			
Source	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
E x S					2	42.257	.259	.000
E x D					2	7.449	.058	.001
E x S x SG x D					2	4.561	.036	.011
C x E					2	32.067	.348	.000
C x E x PG					2	4.072	.064	.003
C x E x S					2	16.098	.212	.000
C x E x D					2	16.062	.211	.000
Error	238				240			

analyses were conducted. The results confirmed the second prediction that stated that there will be fewer significant differences between the proportions of items chosen under the categories under the exclusion than the inclusion condition: significant differences within categories were more prevalent in the inclusion than the exclusion condition. In the inclusion condition, person categories (protagonist, victim, and accomplice categories) were significantly different from each other; relationship categories were not different from each other. In the exclusion condition, the difference between the victim and the accomplice categories disappeared.

Table 11

Decision Rule and Proportion of items chosen under different categories

	Protagonist	Victim	Accomplice	Pro-Vic	Pro-Acc	Vic-Acc	External
Dec-Rule							
Inc	$42._{d*}$	24.77_{a}	32.33_{bc}	26.14_{ab}	49.08_{e}	32.06_{bc}	30.40_{b}
	(16.56)	(16.96)	(17.23)	(21.78)	(19.31)	(19.02)	(16.59)
Exc	74.20_{cd}	64.33_{a}	66.32_{ab}	66.99_{ab}	78.83_{d}	72.57_{bc}	64.53_{a}
	(16.76)	(17.35)	(16.88)	(23.23)	(15.38)	(18.45)	(17.28)

Note. Dec-Rule= Decision Rule, Inc= Inclusion, Exc= Exclusion, Pro-Vic=The relationship between protagonist and victim, Pro-Acc=The relationship between protagonist and accomplice, Vic-Acc=The relationship between victim and accomplice, External=External factor.
* Different subscripted letters indicate significant mean differences within the same row.

Further analyses were conducted in order to elaborate the significant Category x Valence x Decision Rule interaction effect of the second ANOVA, Post ANOVA analyses indicated that that in the inclusion condition, positive items chosen under the protagonist category was significantly greater than the positive items chosen under the

victim and the accomplice categories. In the exclusion condition, positive items chosen under the victim category were fewer than those under the protagonist and accomplice categories, the latter two categories did not differ significantly. Furthermore, negative items chosen under the accomplice category were fewer than those under the protagonist and victim categories in the exclusion condition whereas the differences between the three categories with respect to negative items were not significant in the inclusion condition.

Table 12

Decision Rule and Valence evaluations for the possible causes generated under person categories

	Protagonist			Victim			Accomplice		
Dec-Rule	Pos	Neg	Neut	Pos	Neg	Neut	Pos	Neg	Neut
Inc	57.85_{b*}	31.80_{a}	48.72_{b}	25.21_{a}	26.54_{a}	18.36_{a}	34.63_{a}	25.72_{a}	53.10_{b}
	(24.92)	(21.21)	(34.25)	(32.27)	(19.52)	(23.30)	(23.65)	(23.72)	(34.65)
Exc	86.07_{b}	67.11_{b}	79.78_{cb}	64.53_{a}	66.05_{b}	57.68_{a}	81.29_{b}	57.49_{a}	68.55_{b}
	(18.99)	(24.56)	(26.03)	(33.82)	(18.60)	(30.82)	(18.27)	(26.86)	(29.21)

Note. Note. Dec-Rule= Decision Rule, Inc= Inclusion, Exc= Exclusion, Pos= Positive, Neg= Negative, Neut= Neutral

* Different subscripted letters indicate significant mean differences within the same row

Post ANOVA analyses were conducted in order to examine the significant Severity x Category interaction effect. One way ANOVAs comparing the proportions for items in each category for mild and severe conditions showed that the proportion of

items for mild and severe conditions differed significantly for the Victim and the Accomplice categories, F (1.257) = 9.620, p= .002, F (1,257)=4.294, p=.039, respectively. It may be seen in Table 13 that more items related to victim but fewer items related to accomplice were chosen in the mild than the severe condition. The differences between the mild and severe conditions for the protagonist and the relationship categories were not significant.

Table 13

Severity and Proportion of items chosen under different categories

	Protagonist	Victim	Accomplice	Pro-Vic	Pro-Acc	Vic-Acc	External
Severity							
Mild	57.50	50.99	47.94	46.99	67.09	51.27	50.09
	(20.93)	(26.06)	(22.62)	(29.21)	(22.57)	(28.53)	(24.75)
Severe	62.21	41.06	54.09	49.93	63.24	57.30	47.74
	(24.94)	(25.31)	(25.19)	(31.71)	(22.88)	(26.09)	(23.22
F(1,256)	ns	9.260	4.924	ns	ns	ns	ns
p	ns	.002	.039	ns	ns	ns	ns

Note. Pro-Vic=The relationship between protagonist and victim, Pro-Acc=The relationship between protagonist and accomplice, Vic-Acc=The relationship between victim and accomplice, External=External factor.

Means involved in the significant Category x Valence x Severity interaction are presented in Table 14. One way ANOVAs comparing the proportion of differently valenced items for each category for mild and severe conditions indicated significant differences due to severity in proportions of positive and negative items related to the protagonist, positive, neutral and negative items related to the victim and negative and neutral items related to the accomplice. For the protagonist, as the severity of the action

increased, fewer positively valenced items but more negative valence items were chosen. For the victim, there was a decline in all three kinds of items. For the accomplice, as the severity of action increased, there was a significant decline in the number of negatively valenced and neutral items chosen. Thus, severity of norm violation increased the number of negative attributes chosen related to the protagonist and the accomplice categories and reduced the number of negative causes chosen related to the victim category.

Table 14

Severity and Valence evaluations for the possible causes generated under person categories

	Actor			Victim			Accomplice		
	Pos	Neg	Neut	Pos	Neg	Neut	Pos	Neg	Neut
Severity									
Mild	77.30 (23.31)	45.06 (27.79)	64.96 (33.41)	54.37 (37.09)	51.45 (26.79)	47.93 (32.80)	62.77 (31.88)	73.96 (29.34)	73.96 (29.34)
Severe	68.62 (28.10)	57.72 (29.01)	66.39 (34.28)	37.90 (26.79)	44.14 (27.68)	30.60 (32.80)	56.96 (30.36)	54.09 (29.02)	47.54 (30.57)
F(1.257)	7.369	12.844	ns	12.362	4.660	18.012	ns	35.743	50.287
p	.007	.000	ns	.001	.032	.000	ns	.000	ns

Note. The values in parenthesis represent the standard deviations. Pos= Positive, Neg= Negative, Neut= Neutral

Further one way ANOVAs comparing protagonist gender for each category were conducted in order to analyze the significant Protagonist Gender x Category interaction

effect. None of the protagonist gender effects were significant for any of the categories. Therefore, third and forth predictions of the study were not confirmed. Further Scheffé analyses were conducted in order to examine differences between different categories for female and male protagonists separately. When the protagonist was female, the mean of the protagonist category and the relationship between the protagonist and the accomplice were significantly larger than the means of all categories. The other categories did not differ from each other. When the protagonist gender was male, the mean of the relationship between protagonist and accomplice was significantly greater than the mean of the protagonist category as well as the means of all other categories. Additionally, the mean of the relationship between victim and accomplice was significantly larger from the means of all victim, and victim, protagonist and external categories. Thus, as was predicted, when the protagonist was a male, the participants attributed the causes to factors outside the protagonist especially to relationships. However, when the protagonist was female, there was a tendency to choose more items for the protagonist category.

Table 15

Protagonist Gender and Proportion of items chosen under different categories

Pro-Gen	Protagonist	Victim	Accomplice	Pro-Vic	Pro-Acc	Vic-Acc	External
Male	58.29_{b*}	46.42_{a}	50.38_{ab}	45.03_{a}	67.12_{c}	55.71_{b}	51.04_{ab}
	(22.42)	(26.40)	(24.07)	(30.35)	(21.74)	(28.00)	(23.77)
Female	61.04_{b}	46.20_{a}	51.25_{a}	51.45_{a}	63.58_{b}	52.65_{a}	47.09_{a}
	(23.49)	(25.99)	(24.05)	(30.21)	(23.61)	(27.10)	(24.18)

Note. Pro-Gen= Protagonist Gender, Pro-Vic=The relationship between protagonist and victim, Pro-Acc=The relationship between protagonist and accomplice, Vic-Acc=The relationship between victim and accomplice, External=External factor.
* Different subscripted letters indicate significant mean differences within each row

The fifth prediction stated that participants would choose more negative items under the protagonist category when the protagonist was female than male. The significant Category x Valence x Protagonist Gender interaction effect confirmed the fifth prediction. The Category x Valence x Protagonist Gender interaction effect was examined by one-way ANOVAs. The means involved in the significant Category and Valence and Protagonist Gender interaction emerging from the second ANOVA are presented in Table 16. One way ANOVA comparing each category score for female and male protagonists indicated a significant Protagonist Gender difference only in negative evaluations of the protagonist, F (1,257) =5,191, p=.024. The results confirmed the fifth prediction. Consistent with the fifth prediction, higher proportion of negative items was chosen for the female than the male protagonist.

Table 16

Proportion of items chosen for valence of possible causes generated for protagonist, victim, and accomplice for female and male protagonist.

	Actor			Victim			Accomplice		
Pro-Gen	Pos	Neg	Neut	Pos	Neg	Neut	Pos	Neg	Neut
Male	75.14	46.77	65.32	44.55	50.17	37.63	60.78	41.12	62.90
	(25.29)	(29.37)	(32.62)	(37.11)	(27.27)	(32.36)	(32.16)	(29.13)	(33.79)
Female	71.44	54.93	65.92	48.51	46.03	41.72	59.36	44.76	60.24
	(26.58)	(28.23)	(34.30)	(39.67)	(27.49)	(35.20)	(30.49)	(30.71)	(31.67)
F(1,257)	n.s	5.191	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s
p	n.s	.024	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s	n.s

Note. The values in parenthesis represent the standard deviations. Pro-Gen= Protagonist Gender, Pos= Positive, Neg= Negative, Neut= Neutral

In order to examine the significant Decision Rule x Severity x Participant Gender x Category interaction effect, further Severity x Decision Rule x Category ANOVAs were conducted for males and females separately. The proportion of items chosen in each category served as the dependent measure. Significant Category x Severity interactions emerged from the analysis for both females, and males F (6,127) = 4,304, p=.001, η^2=, 169, F (6,114) =5,705, $p<.001$, η^2=, 231, respectively. Female participants chose more items under the protagonist category and fewer items under the victim category in the severe than the mild condition, whereas males chose fewer items under the victim category but more items under the accomplice category in the severe than the mild condition, F (1,121) = 7,526, p=.007, F (1,121) = 4,142, p=.044;

respectively. Thus, males seemed to shift emphasis from the protagonist to the victim and the accomplice whereas females emphasized causal relevance of the protagonist.

Table 17

Proportion of items chosen under different categories for mild and severe condition when the participant gender was male and female

	Protagonist	Victim	Accomplice	Pro-Vic	Pro-Acc	Vic-Acc	External
			Female Participant				
Mild	56.84	48.71	46.75	45.21	65.80	51.85	50.05
	(21.29)	(26.59)	(21.70)	(27.77)	(22.85)	(28.74)	(24.50)
Severe	60.83	40.78	50.70	50.62	63.77	57.32	47.44
	(26.15)	(26.40)	(28.33)	(33.90)	(22.04)	(26.03)	(24.15)
			Male Participant				
Mild	58.28	53.66	49.33	49.08	68.62	50.59	50.13
	(20.64)	(25.37)	(23.75)	(30.90)	(22.33)	(28.49)	(25.23)
Severe	63.64	41.34	57.60	49.23	62.69	57.29	48.05
	(23.77)	(24.36)	(21.14)	(29.54)	(23.90)	(26.38)	(22.41)

Note. The values in parenthesis represent the standard deviations. Pro-Vic=The relationship between protagonist and victim, Pro-Acc=The relationship between protagonist and accomplice, Vic-Acc=The relationship between victim and accomplice, External=External factor.

Factor Analysis Performed on Ratings of Blame and Responsibility Possible causes.

A varimax factor analysis was performed for ratings of the items related to blame, responsibility, controllability, and intentionality. Two factors emerged from this analysis and explained % 56,872 of the variance. Intention to harm, act intentionally, deserving to be blamed, being guilty, negative intentions, cannot be blamed, s/he planned it ahead of time, (s/he could not help it) loaded on the first factor. This factor had an eigenvalue of 6,407 explained % 45,764 of the variance, and was labeled Blame. Not being responsible, responsible for outcomes, predictability of the outcome, not being able to predict how the victim would feel, not being able to control the outcome, and could not behave otherwise loaded on the second factor, which had an eigenvalue of 1,555 and explained %11,107 of the variance. This factor was labeled Responsibility. Additional information about the factors can be seen in Table 18. The reliability analysis conducted using fourteen items yielded a reliability coefficient of .9062. The reliability analysis conducted using items related to blame yielded a reliability coefficient of .891. The reliability analysis conducted using items related to responsibility yielded a reliability coefficient of .7821.

Table 18

Results of Factor Analyses Performed on Possible causes Items

	Factor 1 Blame	Factor 2 Responsibility
Intention to harm	. 860	. 014
Act intentionally	. 852	. 063
Deserved to be blamed	. 790	. 375
Being blamable	. 771	. 384

Negative intentions	. 682	. 370
Not be blamed	. 611	. 41
To plan beforehand	. 600	. 115
Not capable to do	. 584	. 452
Not being responsible	. 202	. 757
Responsible for outcomes	.185	. 689
Predictability of the outcome	-. 017	.681
Not predict how to feel	.204	. 664
Not control the outcome	. 415	. 649
Can not behave otherwise	. 425	. 530

Blame and Responsibility

The sixth prediction of the second study which stated that participants would assign more responsibility and blame in the severe than mild condition. Further, male participants would attribute more responsibility and blame than female participants especially to a female protagonist. In order to test the sixth prediction of study 2, Two overlapping univariate ANOVAs were conducted. First, a Severity (Low/High) x Participant Gender (Male/Female) x Protagonist Gender (Male/Female) x Decision Rule (Inclusion/Exclusion) ANOVA was conducted with responsibility attribution as the dependent measure. A significant main effect of Severity emerged F (1,243) = 35.761, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .128$. Higher level of responsibility was attributed in the severe than the mild condition (Mild M =4.970 SD= 1.20, Severe M=5.799 SD= .96).

A Severity (Low/High) x Participant Gender (Male/Female) x Protagonist Gender (Male/Female) x Decision Rule (Inclusion/Exclusion) ANOVA was next conducted with blame as the dependent measure. Main effects for Participant Gender F

(1,243) = 18.073, *p<.001*, η² = .069 and Severity *F* (1,243) = 42.606, *p<.001*, η²= .149 emerged. In line with the sixth prediction, higher levels of blame were attributed in the severe than the mild condition (Mild *M*=3.054, *SD*=1.24, Severe *M*=4.069, *SD*=1.32). Female participants attributed less blame than male participants, (Female participant *M*=3.231 *SD*=1.32, Male participant *M*=3.892 *SD*=1.39). However, contrary to the sixth prediction male participants did not assign more blame to the female protagonist. Moreover, two interaction effects were also significant, Decision Rule x Participant Gender x Protagonist Gender *F* (1,243) = 4.761, *p*= .033, η²= .019 and Decision Rule x Severity x Participant Gender *F* (1,243) = 4.596, *p*.033, η²= .019.

In order to analyze the interaction effect of Decision Rule x Participant Gender x Protagonist Gender, later univariate ANOVAs were conducted for each inclusion and exclusion condition. For the inclusion condition, a main effect of participant gender was found, *F* (1,118) = 11.769, *p*=.001, η²=.094. In the inclusion condition, male participants (*M*=3.92, *SD*=.1.44) attributed more blame than female participants (*M*= 3.09, *SD*=1.36). In addition to this, a Participant gender x Protagonist gender interaction effect emerged, *F* (1,118) = 4.981 *p* = .028, η²= .042. One-way ANOVAs comparing blame for male and female protagonists were conducted separately for male and female participants in order to evaluate the significant interaction of Participant Gender and Protagonist Gender in the inclusion condition. For female participants, one way ANOVAs indicated that there was a significant difference between the male and female protagonists, *F* (1, 61) = 6.915, *p*=.011. Female participants attributed more blame to the female (*M*= 3.48, SD = 1.51) than to the male protagonist (*M*=2.60, *SD* = .97). The protagonist gender effect was not significant for male participants for the inclusion condition.

The same Participant Gender (Female/ Male) x Protagonist Gender (Female/Male) univariate ANOVA with blame as dependent measure was carried out for the exclusion condition. The results indicated that there was a main effect of participant gender, F (1,141) = 4.967, p=.027, η^2=.035. Like the inclusion condition, male participants (M= 3.85, SD= 1.33) attributed more blame than female participants (M=3.35, SD=1.27) in the exclusion condition. No interaction effect emerged for this analysis.

Table 19

Interaction Effect between Decision Rule, Participant Gender and Protagonist Gender on Blame

	Inclusion			
	Protagonist Gender			
Participant Gender	Female	Male	*F(1,60)*	*p*
Female	3.48	2.60	6.915	.011
	(1.51)	(.97)		
Male	3.78	4.04	ns	ns
	(1.46)	(1.47)		
	Exclusion			
	Protagonist Gender			
	Female Pro	Male Pro	*F(1,60)*	*p*
Female	3.5	3.17	ns	ns
	(1.43)	(1.09)		
Male	4.03	3.64	ns	ns
	(1.08)	(1.57)		

Note. The values in parenthesis represent the standard deviations.

Then, the significant Decision Rule x Severity x Participant Gender interaction effect was examined with separate univariate ANOVAs for each mild and severe condition. For mild condition, the results showed a significant participant gender main

effect, F (1,137) = 8.559, p=.004, η^2=.060. Male participants (M=2.75, SD=1.10) attributed more blame than female participants (M=3.37, SD=1.31) in the mild condition. The same analysis was done for the severe condition. Main effect of participant gender was found, F (1,122) = 7.330, p=.008, η^2=.058. Like the mild condition, male participants (M= 4.42, SD= 1.25) attributed higher level of blame than female participants (M= 3.81, SD= 1.33). Furthermore, a significant Participant Gender x Decision Rule interaction effect was found for the severe condition F (1,122) = 4.632 p=.033, η^2=. 038. Later one way ANOVAs were performed in order to examine the interaction effects for male and female participants in the severe condition. The results indicated that significant differences emerged between inclusion and exclusion conditions for female participants in the severe condition, F (1, 60) = 4.972, p=.030. In the severe condition, female participants attributed more blame when they were using an exclusion strategy than an inclusion strategy. The same analysis was done for male participants. However, no significant effect emerged. The preceding ANOVA results indicated that female participants chose more information related the protagonist category in the severe condition than in the mild condition whereas male participants chose more items related to the accomplice in the severe than in the mild condition. If we consider the preceding ANOVA results together with the univariate ANOVA results, it may be proposed that the usage of information by male and female participants in different ways may have an impact on the final blame attribution.

Table 20

Interaction Effect between Decision Rule, Participant Gender and Severity on Blame

	Mild			
Participant Gender	Inclusion	Exclusion	*F*	*p*
Female	2.78	2.72	ns	ns
	(1.22)	(1.02)		
Male	3.28	3.45	ns	ns

Table 19 (continued)

	(1.45)		(1.20)	
	Severe			
Participant Gender	Inclusion	Exclusion	*F(1,60)*	*p*
Female	3.43	4.16	4.972	.030
	(1.45)	(1.11)		
Male	4.56	4.29	ns	ns
	(1.13)	(1.35)		

Note. The values in parenthesis represent the standard deviations.

The previous ANOVA results demonstrated the significant effect of severity and decision rule on the amount and type of information. In order to understand whether severity had a direct effect on blame or indirect effect on blame by mediating the amount and type of information, a Severity (Low/High) x Participant Gender (Male/Female) x Protagonist Gender (Male/Female) x Decision Rule (Inclusion/Exclusion) was next conducted with blame as the dependent measure. Negative items related to actor and negative items related to victim served as covariates. The results indicated that the

negative information related to actor and victim, as covariates, had significant effects, F (1,259) = 86.676, p<.001, η^2= .265 and F (1,259) = 3.898, p=.049, η^2= .016 respectively. Moreover, main effects for decision rule (F (1,259) = 124.999, p=.003, η^2= .265), participant gender (F (1,259) = 14.160, p<.001, η^2= .055) and severity (F (1,259) = 16.039, p<.001, η^2=.062) were found. No interaction effect was found.

Regression (test of mediational model)

It was hypothesized that the amount of information chosen related to the protagonist, victim, accomplice protagonist- victim, protagonist-accomplice, victim-accomplice, and the external factors together with severity manipulation would predict responsibility, which, in turn, would influence blame. Two regression analyses were conducted in order to test this hypothesis. First a simultaneous regression predicting responsibility was conducted. The proportion of positive, negatively and neutral valenced items related to the protagonist, the victim, and the accomplice chosen by respondents and the proportion of checked items in each of the relationship categories (protagonist-accomplice, victim-accomplice, and protagonist-victim) and the external factors was entered at the same time. Table 21 indicates the first-order correlations between predictors. As may be seen in Table 21, the correlations among the predictors ranged from r=.014 for responsibility and the positive items related to the accomplice, and r=.788 for the negative items related to the protagonist and the accomplice. Table 22 reveals the results of the simultaneous regression analysis with responsibility ratings as the dependent measure. It may be seen that 28 % of the variation in responsibility was explained (F-change (10,248) = 9.782, p<.001). The proportion of the negatively valenced information selected about the protagonist was significantly positively (β=.496) and the proportion of negatively valenced information chosen about the victim

was significantly negatively (β= -.309) related to responsibility attribution. Inclusion of the items related to relationship categories (protagonist-accomplice, victim-accomplice, and protagonist-victim) and external factor in the second step did not make a significant contribution to explaining responsibility attribution.

Second, a hierarchical regression was conducted in order to find the predictor variables of blame. Blame score was the dependent variable. Responsibility was entered in the first step. The rationale behind this regression model was that responsibility is the necessary condition for blame. In the second step, the proportion of positively, negatively, and neutral valenced items related to the protagonist, victim, and proportion of items in each of the three relationship categories and the external category were included. Table 21 indicates the first-order correlations between predictors. As may be seen from table 21 the correlations among the predictors ranged from r= -.007 for blame and the negative items related to the victim, and r=.788 for the negative items related to the protagonist and the negative items of the accomplice. Table 23 indicates the results of the hierarchical regression analysis with blame as the dependent measure. The regression revealed that responsibility explained 43% of the variation in blame attributions, F-change (1,257) =198,744, p<.001. Inclusion of information related to the categories explained additional a 15% of the variation in blame attribution, F-change (13,244) =6.871, p<.001. Addition of information related to the categories in the second step of regression model decreased the β of responsibility from .660 to .464. Responsibility was still a significant predictor of blame. Choosing negatively valenced information about the protagonist (β= .231) and negatively valenced information about the accomplice (β=.189) were significantly positively related to blame. Moreover, adding information about the relationship between the protagonist and victim (β= .212)

and the relationship between the victim and accomplice (β= -.186) made a significant contribution to explanation of blame. Total variability was explained by responsibility, negative information about the protagonist and the accomplice, information about the relationship between protagonist and victim and information about the relationship between victim and accomplice.

Table 21

Intercorrelations among predictor variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Blame	_	.660*	.344*	.024	.050	-.010	-.117*	.482*	-.051	-.032	-.007	-.074	.022	.449*	-.179*
2. Respons	.660*	_	.207*	.020	.027	-.044	-.066	.373*	-.044	-.020	-.108*	-.099	.014	.329*	-.204 *
3. Pro-Vic	.344*	.207*	_	.548*	.655*	.601*	.422*	.783*	.365*	.342*	.614*	.444*	.614*	.619*	.172*
4. Pro-Acc	.024	.020	.548*	_	.711*	.652*	.625*	.485*	.505*	.384*	.646*	.450*	.672*	.377*	.327*
5. Vic-Acc	.050	.027	.655*	.711*	_	.732*	.534*	.587*	.464*	.377*	.768*	.484*	.666*	.541*	.273*
6. External	-.010	-.044	.601*	.652*	.732*	_	.580*	.524*	.421*	.493*	.737*	.500*	.667*	.480*	.306*
7. Pro-Pos	-.117*	-.066	.422*	.625*	.534*	.530*	_	.327*	.447*	.337*	.568*	.410*	.631*	.205*	.334*
8. Pro-Neg	.482*	.373*	.783*	.485*	.587*	.524*	.327*	_	.368*	.369*	.528*	.386*	.543*	.788*	.055*
9. Pro-Neu	-.051	-.044	.365*	.505*	.464*	.421*	.447*	.368*	_	.276*	.430*	.335*	.484*	.263*	.231*
10. Vic-Pos	-.032	-.020	.312*	.384*	.377*	.493*	.337*	.369*	.276*	_	.491*	.478*	.488*	.303*	.215*
11. Vic-Neg	-.007	-.108*	.614*	.646*	.768*	.737*	.568*	.528*	.430*	.491*	_	.623*	.643*	442*	.312*
12. Vic-Neu	-.074	-.099	.444*	.450*	.484*	.500*	.410*	.386*	.335*	.478*	.623*	_	.486*	.335*	.326*
13. Acc-Pos	.021	.014	.614*	.672*	.666*	.667*	.631*	.543*	.484*	.488*	.643*	.486*	_	.453 *	.337*

Table 21 (continued)

14. Acc-Neg	.449*	.329*	.619*	.377*	.541*	.480*	.205*	.788*	.263*	.303*	.442*	.335*	.453*	_	.012
15. Acc-Neu	-.179*	-.204*	.172*	.327*	.273*	.306*	.334*	.055	.231*	.215*	.312*	.326*	.337*	-.012	_

*. Correlation is significant at the .05 level (1-tailed)

Pro-Vic=The relationship between protagonist and victim, Pro-Acc= The relationship between protagonist and accomplice, Acc-Vic= The relationship between accomplice and victim, External=External factors, Pro-Pos=Positive valence related to protagonist, Pro-Neg=Negative valence related to protagonist, Pro-Neu=Neutral valence related to protagonist, Vic-Pos= Positive valence related to victim, Pro-Neg= Negative valence related to victim, Pro-Neu= Neutral valence related to victim, Acc-Pos= Positive valence related taccomplice, Acc-Neg= Negative valence related to accomplice, Acc-Neu= Neutral valence related to accomplice.

Table 22
Summary of multiple regression analyses of responsibility attribution

Step	ΔR^2	DF	F-change	*B*	SE	β	t
1.	.302	13,245	8.150*				
Pro-Vic				.001	.004	.033	
Pro-Acc				.005	.005	.101	
Acc-Vic				.001	.004	.012	
External				-.006	.005	-.115	
Pro-positive				.001	.003	.025	
Pro-negative				.020	.005	.496*	4.417
Pro-neutral				-.003	.002	-.094	
Vic-positive				.000	.002	.008	
Vic-negative				-.013	.004	-.309*	-3.032
Vic-neutral				-.003	.003	-.084	
Acc-positive				-.001	.003	-.035	
Acc-negative				.005	.004	.125	
Acc-neutral				-.003	.002	-.089	

Note. Pro-Vic=The relationship between protagonist and victim, Pro-Acc= The relationship between protagonist and accomplice, Acc-Vic= The relationship between accomplice and victim, External=External factors, Pro-positive=Positive valence related to protagonist, Pro-negative=Negative valence related to protagonist, Pro-neutral=Neutral valence related to protagonist, Vic-positive= Positive valence related to victim, Pro-negative= Negative valence related to victim, Pro-neutral= Neutral valence related to victim, Acc-positive= Positive valence related to accomplice, Acc-negative= Negative valence related to accomplice, Acc-neutral= Neutral valence related to accomplice.

Table 23
Summary of multiple regression analyses of blame attribution

Step	ΔR^2	DF	F-change	*B*	SE	β	t
1.	.436	1,257	198.744*				
Responsibility				.778	.055	.660*	14.098
2.	.151	13,244	6.871*				
Responsibility				.574	.058	.464*	9.431
Pro-Vic				.010	.003	.212*	2.822
Pro-Acc				.003	.004	.048	
Acc-Vic				-.009	.004	-.186*	-2.329
External				-.006	.004	-.108	
Pro-positive				-.005	.003	-.101	
Pro-negative				.011	.004	.231*	2.570
Pro-neutral				-.002	.002	-.059	
Vic-positive				-.002	.002	-.057	
Vic-negative				.006	.004	.117	
Vic-neutral				-.004	.002	-.108	
Acc-positive				-.003	.003	-.072	
Acc-negative				.009	.003	.189*	
Acc-neutral				-.001	.002	.019	

Note. Pro-Vic=The relationship between protagonist and victim, Pro-Acc= The relationship between protagonist and accomplice, Acc-Vic= The relationship between accomplice and victim, External=External factors, Pro-positive=Positive valence related to protagonist, Pro-negative=Negative valence related to protagonist, Pro-neutral=Neutral valence related to protagonist, Vic-positive= Positive valence related to victim, Pro-negative= Negative valence related to victim, Pro-neutral= Neutral valence related to victim, Acc-positive= Positive valence related to accomplice, Acc-negative= Negative valence related to accomplice, Acc-neutral= Neutral valence related to accomplice.

Discussion

The second study provided interesting results in terms of the effect of information processing on attribution process. The results of the second study indicated that using different decision rules influenced the amount of information utilized for making causal attributions. These findings confirmed first hypothesis of this study. Consistent with the previous literature, the size of information set was larger in the exclusion condition than in the inclusion condition.

The significant interaction effect of decision rule and category revealed that differences between categories were more prevalent in the inclusion condition than in the exclusion condition. Consistent with the second prediction of the study, there were fewer significant differences between categories. In the inclusion condition, significant differences between person categories rather than relationship categories were observed whereas differences between relationship categories became significant in the exclusion condition.

The results also provided evidence for the significance of the interaction between severity and category. Specifically, the difference between mild and severe condition was significant for the victim and accomplice categories. As the severity of the outcome increased, participants chose more items related to the accomplice and fewer items related to the victim. In line with the results of the first study, as the severity of outcome increased, the number of negative attributes related to the protagonist and accomplice categories increased and the number of negative possible causes related to the victim category declined.

The results did not confirm the third and fourth predictions of the second study. It was expected that when the protagonist gender was female, participants would choose more items under the protagonist category. On the other hand, when the protagonist gender was male, participants were expected to choose more items outside the protagonist category. However, no of significant protagonist gender effects were observed for any categories. Further, in line with the fifth prediction, it was found that a greater number of negative information was selected for female protagonists.

In order to test sixth prediction of the study 2, two overlapping but separate univariate ANOVAs were conducted. Consistent with the sixth prediction of the second study, first univariate ANOVA results indicated that male participants attributed more blame than female participants. As was predicted, participants attributed more blame in the severe condition than the mild condition. Moreover, the results indicated interaction effects: female participants attributed more blame to female protagonist than male protagonist by using inclusion strategy. Further, female participants attributed more blame by using exclusion strategy than inclusion strategy in the severe condition.

The second univariate ANOVA included the negative items related protagonist and victim as covariates. Covariates were significant. Addition of covariates removed the interaction effects. Like the first ANOVA, participants attributed more blame in the severe condition than mild condition. More blame was assigned by male participants than female participants. Different from the first ANOVA results, the main effect of decision rule was emerged: more blame was attributed in the inclusion condition than exclusion condition.

Later regression analyses pointed out relative contribution of various forms of information to blame attribution process. Two regression analyses were conducted. First

regression analyzed the predictor variables of responsibility possible causes. It was found that negative information about the protagonist and the negative information about the victim significantly contributed to responsibility possible causes process. Second regression revealed the predictor variables of blame. Consistent with the previous theoretical framework, responsibility was a significant predictor of blame. Negative information about the protagonist and accomplice, information about the relationship between protagonist and victim, and information about the relationship between victim and accomplice significantly contributed to the explanation of blame. These regressions indicated that different forms of information affected the attribution of responsibility and blame. Particularly, information about the relationships was significant predictors of blame

General Discussion

The main argument of the present research was that the amount and type of information considered by the judges affects every stage of the blame process; that is responsibility as well as blame attributions as well which is influenced by responsibility attribution and that causality attributions. Two studies were conducted. In the first study, the aim was to generate possible causes for an interpersonal event and investigate the effect of severity of misdeed on the number of possible causes generated in relation to different loci. The second aim of the first study was to see whether if gender of participants and/or gender of the protagonist had any effects on the number of possible causes generated under different loci.

The results of the first study confirmed the first hypothesis: Participants generated more causes for the protagonist of the event in the mild than the severe condition. Moreover first study indicated that as the severity of the misdeed increased, the participants generated causes outside the protagonist such as the relationship between the protagonist and the other characters in the event. First study also partially confirmed the predictions about the gender of protagonist and judges. The third hypothesis of the study stated that especially under the severe condition, the participants were expected to generate more causal attributions about the female protagonist. The results did not confirm the third hypothesis. Study 1 supported the fourth prediction and demonstrated that male and female participants did not differ in attributing the possible causes to the protagonist of the event when the actor was female. However, when the actor was male, male participants generated significantly fewer items referring to the protagonist of the event than female participants. The results were interesting in the

sense that female participants sought the cause of the event in the protagonist regardless of the gender of the protagonist and were not more lenient when the protagonist is their own gender.

The second study aimed to explore the effects of norm violation and information processing strategy (inclusion of all relevant information vs. exclusion of all irrelevant information) on the proportions of possible causes of event considered relevant and the relationship between the proportion of information considered and the process of attribution of responsibility and blame. Like the first study, the second aim of the second study was to investigate the effect of participant and protagonist gender on the proportion of information under different loci marked as relevant.

Consistent with the previous literature, the second study confirmed the first prediction: The participants took more information into consideration in explaining the causes of the misdeed in the exclusion than the inclusion condition. Further, the second study provided confirmatory results in terms of the role of the amount and type of information considered during the blame attribution the process. The results of the second study demonstrated that the type of information chosen differed in relation to different decision making strategies. The second prediction was confirmed: in the inclusion condition, participants chose higher proportion of information about person categories whereas in the exclusion condition, participants selected information about relationship categories in addition to person categories. Moreover, in the inclusion condition, more positive information about the actor rather than the victim and accomplice was chosen by participants. In the exclusion condition, positive information chosen for victim was significantly more than the information chosen for actor and accomplice.

The results also provided evidence for the interaction effect between misdeed severity and information chosen under different attribution loci. Specifically, as the severity of the misdeed increased, participants chose more items related to the accomplice and fewer items related to the victim. Later analyses showed that as the severity of misdeed increased, the number of negative attributes related to the actor and accomplice categories increased and the number of negative attributions related to victim category declined.

Study 2 partially confirmed the predictions about the gender of the protagonist and the judges. The third and fourth predictions of the second study were not supported. None of the protagonist gender effects were significant for any of the categories. However, fifth prediction of the second study was confirmed: Greater number of negative information was selected for female protagonist than the male protagonist.

The results of study 2 partially supported the predictions about blame and responsibility. The sixth prediction of study 2 was partially confirmed. As was predicted, participants assigned more blame in the severe condition than the mild condition and male participants attributed more blame than female participants. Further, interesting interaction effects were emerged: higher level of blame was attributed to female protagonist than male protagonist by female participants in the inclusion condition. Also, female participants attributed more blame by using exclusion strategy than inclusion strategy in the severe condition.

The second study examined the entailment model of blame attribution (e.g. Fincham & Jaspars, 1980; Shaver, 1985) and the relationship between the amount and type of information and the final blame attribution. Seventh prediction stated that the responsibility will mediate between the type and amount of information chosen under

different categories and blame judgments. Sixth prediction was confirmed. The regression results of the second study pointed out to the differential contribution of various forms of information to blame attribution process. First regression indicated that negative information about the actor and the negative information about the victim contributed significantly to responsibility attribution process. Second regression revealed the predictors of blame attribution. Consistent with the theoretical framework, responsibility was a significant predictor of the blame attribution. Negative information about the actor and accomplice, information about the relationship between actor and victim, and information about the relationship between victim and accomplice contributed significantly to the explanation of the variation of blame attribution. These regressions indicated that different forms of information affected the process of responsibility and blame attribution. Particularly, information about the relationships was significant predictors of blame attribution.

Locus of Causality and Fundamental Attribution Error

This research made important contributions to literature about the blame attribution process. The results of the present study revealed differences on some conceptual distinctions that have been related to the internal external causal dimension. The results indicated seven distinct attribution loci. Kelley (1973) proposed that the perceivers utilize different causal schemata in different situations. These different causal schemata included different person-entity; entity-time and person-time interaction causes (Kelley, 1973). For instance, Kelley (1973) suggested those interpersonal situations as disliking and hating required pairing schema consisting of the inference of reciprocation. If Ali hates Ahmet, the attributer draws the inference of reciprocation, that Ahmet also hates Ali. Moreover, Kelley (1973) argued that some perceivers might base

their attributions pairing causal schemata whereas other perceivers might base on the other kind schemata. In short, Kelley offered that perceivers used different causal schemata in different attributional circumstances. The results of the present study supported the view that perceivers utilize different kinds of causal schemata for different situations. In the present study, there was only one situation which was manipulated by severity of misdeed. Even in this condition, participants used two different kind of causal schemata, namely, in the severe condition they utilized multiple necessary causal schemata and in the mild condition they used multiple sufficient casual schemata. In line with these theoretical suggestions, previous literature (Fincham, 1985; Hortaçcu & Karancı, 1987) suggested that internal-external causal dimension must be adapted for studying interpersonal relationships. The results of this study and previous studies indicated the need of utilizing distinct relationship categories in examining the causal attributions in the interpersonal relationship context.

Another important contribution of this study is that fundamental attribution error may not be a universal phenomenon as argued by some social psychologists.The results of the first study provided evidence for the conditions under which the fundamental attribution error is reduced. Social psychological research argued that fundamental attribution error was a well-established attributional error that was observed universally. As summarized in the above paragraphs, the results of this study indicated that as the severity of event outcome increased, the numbers of generated possible causes related to the actors decreased, especially related to protagonist category. In accordance with this result it can be argued that with the increase in severity of the misdeed, the occurrence of fundamental attribution error is reduced.

A hint for understanding these results may be found in the multiple necessary schemata proposed by Kelley. Kelley (1972) proposed that perceivers utilized multiple necessary causal schemata for unusual events and more extreme effects. Kelley hypothesized that usual events generally elicit multiple sufficient casual schemata. According to the multiple necessary causal schema, several causes operate together to produce the effect (Kelley, 1972). In this study, it can be suggested that as the severity of the misdeed increases, the event becomes more extreme. In severe condition of this study, the participants were expected to use the multiple necessary casual schemata. As a result, there was a decrease in the number of possible causes generated for the protagonist category and an increase in the numbers of possible causes generated for the other attribution categories especially for relationship categories.

Another suggestion for understanding the evidence for the disappearance of the fundamental attribution errors can be found in the model of Gilbert and Malone (1995) and dual information processing models. Gilbert and Malone (1995) proposed an alternative concept, correspondence bias, for understanding the process of fundamental attribution error and discussed the conditions resulting in correspondence bias such as salience of the actor's behavior. Thus they argued that fundamental attribution bias was not inescapable. Further, it was stated that when people engage in effortful information processing with enough cognitive capacity and motivation, they "corrected" the dispositional inferences and performed situational corrections (Kunda 1999). The results of the present research provided evidence for correction of dispositional inferences. It was found that as the severity of the outcome increased, participants generated more causes outside the protagonist especially causes referring to the relationship between the protagonist and the other characters involved in the event and fewer causes related to the

protagonist. Thus, as the severity of misdeed increased, the occurrence of correspondence bias tended to disappear.

It was argued that the mild condition of the present study implies an ambiguous situation due to the minimal information given in the vignettes. As Trope and his colleagues (Trope & Liberman, 1993; Trope & Gaunt, 2003) stated that people engage in heuristic processing under ambiguous situations that leads to the occurrence of fundamental attribution error. Thus, participants may engage in heuristic processing in the mild condition and the consequence is the prevalence of fundamental attribution error. On the other hand, the severe condition of the present research was consistent with the infidelity script, a script that involves such roles as the deceived victim, deceiver, and the accomplice (or tempter/temptress) to the deceiver. Therefore, the severe condition implies unambiguous situation. According to heuristic-systematic processing approach, people generally engage in systematic processing under unambiguous situations that lead to "correction" of correspondence bias.

Decision Making Strategies

The present research also contributed to decision making and information processing research. First of all, consistent with pervious literature (e.g. Choi et al, 2003; Yaniv & Schul, 1997) the findings revealed that the size of information set was larger in the exclusion than the inclusion condition. Although the results of the present study provided confirmatory evidence for the main effect of decision-making strategy, the interaction effect between attribution categories and decision-making rule observed in the second study needs more discussion. It was found that the differences between attribution categories were larger in the inclusion condition compared to exclusion condition. The theoretical framework of subcomplementary suggests an explanation for

understanding the interaction effect. Yaniv and Schul (1997) argued that the sub-complementarity occurs most for the middling rather than clear-cut items. Middling items are the ones for which strength of evidence (S) for inclusion or exclusion lies between the criterion of inclusion and exclusion (Cexc< S< Cinc). In other words, the strength of evidence for middling options neither is large enough to exceed the inclusion criterion and *included in the choice set* nor so low to warrant exclusion and *excluded from the choice set* (Yaniv et al., 2002). For middling options the likelihood of being included (excluded) in the choice set will depend on the judgmental procedure. The choice set in the inclusion condition consists of the items that exceed the inclusion criterion. So, the middling options that can't exceed the inclusion criterion are not chosen in the inclusion condition (Yaniv et al., 2002). However, in the exclusion condition, the choice set included the options that can be chosen in the inclusion process as well as the middling options that cannot be included (Yaniv et al., 2002). In the present study, the information related to persons especially information related to the protagonist category can be treated as "*clear-cut"* options. On the basis of attribution research literature, attributional information including personal characteristics is easily elicited by the participants. Hence, the strength of evidence for information about person categories is enough large to be included. However, due to the minimal information given in vignettes, information related to relationship categories can be treated as "*middling options".* The strength of evidence of relationship items is so low to be included. From the subcomplementary perspective, the chosen of information related to relationship categories in the choice set is more likely in the exclusion condition.

Another explanation for the interaction effect between attribution categories and decision rule can be provided by the perspective of social hypothesis testing. From the

perspective of social hypothesis testing (Trope & Liberman, 1996), the inclusion decision making strategy may be considered as a heuristic strategy of hypothesis testing whereas the exclusion strategy may be regarded as systematic strategy of hypothesis testing (Yaniv, et al.; 2002). Since the inclusion strategy leads participants to engage in heuristic processing that lead to fundamental attribution error, information related person categories rather than relationship categories would be included. Conversely, the exclusion strategy may require perceivers employing in systematic processing, perceivers can put inside relationship items.

Gender and Attribution

The results of the present research partially confirmed the predictions about the gender of protagonist/and judge and attribution process heterosexual relationships. As summarized in preceding paragraphs, the results of study 1 indicated interesting points: female participants sought the cause of the event in the protagonist regardless of the gender of the protagonist. However, male participants sought the cause of the event in protagonist when the protagonist was female and attributed the cause of the event outside the protagonist when the protagonist gender was male.

The results stated above are meaningful when they are evaluated from the point of view of Carol Gilligan and the theories of infidelity. Carol Gilligan (1982) proposed that women are more disposed to think in terms of caring and relationships. Gilligan (1982) stated that hurting others was central issue in the women's moral perspective. On the other hand, Gilligan (1982) argued that men are more disposed to think in terms of rules and justice. In accordance with Gilligan's statements, women do not tolerate any situation which disrupt the commitment in the relationship and/or hurt one of the

partners in the relationship. Hence, female participants looked for the cause of the event in the protagonist regardless of the gender of the protagonist.

The results of the present research also contributed importantly to the sociocultural explanations of infidelity. Sociocultural perspective states that reactions to the partner infidelity in romantic relationships depend entirely on cultural socialization and cultural values and social norms in a society (Hupka & Bank, 1996). “The code of honor” (Lindisfarne, 1994) that specifies rights, responsibilities and duties in everyday life including the case of romantic and sexual relationships determine the relationship perceptions of men and women in Turkey (Kandiyoti, 1987). As stated by Lindisfarne and Kandiyoti, the one who violates the code of honor brings dishonor and should be punished. Importantly, distribution of rights, responsibilities and duties among men and women is an uneven one (Lindisfarne, 1994). In accordance with these proposals, Kandiyoti emphasized the control over female sexuality and “the code of honor” in Turkish society. She argued that men place strict external constraints on women in order to protect honor of whole community. Moreover, men are believed to have more freedom than women engaging in extra relational relationships. On the basis of these theoretical explanations, male participants sought the cause of the event in protagonist when the protagonist was female and attributed the cause of the event outside the protagonist when the protagonist gender was male. In addition, as it was indicated in the second study, the participants selected higher proportions of negative items for female protagonist than male protagonist.

Blame and Responsibility

Shaver (1985) argued that the conceptual distinction between blame and responsibility should be presented. Shaver (1985) stated “justifications” and “excuses”

in order to distinguish the concept of "blame" from "responsibility". Justifications and excuses diminish the protagonist's blameworthiness but do not alter the protagonist's responsibility (Shaver, 1985). Based on these statements, Shaver (1985) concluded that responsibility represents the protagonist's accountability for his or her behavior; blame is the protagonist's state after the accountability has been given. It may be argued that the results of the regressions analysis pointed out the distinction between responsibility and blame. Responsibility and blame regressions indicated that different types of information influenced each process. The information about actors (protagonist and victim) had significant contribution to the explanation of responsibility. The blame attribution process was explained with the information about the relationships and only the information about protagonist among other actor categories. Hence, it may be argued that the concept of responsibility and blame are conceptually distinct. Moreover, on the basis of regression analyses, it may be stated that the normativeness of the behavior determine the blameworthiness after the responsibility is assigned to the protagonist. In the present study, the circumstances including the relationships between actors influence the normativeness of the behavior. Further, information about the relationships provided "justifications" and "excuses" for protagonist's blameworthiness but did not influence the protagonist's responsibility.

The results of univariate ANOVA analyses can be explained from the perspective of dual-threshold model of hypothesis testing proposed by Trope and Lieberman (1996). In accordance with this model, the inclusion can be a heuristic way of hypothesis testing whereas exclusion can be systematic way of hypothesis testing. The second ANOVA conducted with negative information about protagonist and victim as covariates indicated the main effect of decision rule on blame: the participants

assigned more blame in the inclusion condition than exclusion condition. It may be argued that blaming the protagonist heuristic way of information processing.

Moreover, it was expected that the main effect of decision rule would disappear when the negative information about the actor and victim was put into the ANOVA analysis. As was indicated, the main effect of decision rule did not diminish. It may be argued that decision making rules influence directly the process of blame attribution. In addition, information about actors does not play a mediational role between decision making rules and blame attribution process. Hence, on the basis of previous one way ANOVA results and univariate ANOVA results, it may be stated that decision making rules had an impact on the process of blame attribution by influencing the amount of information and processing type of information.

Another important point that should be discussed the gender differences in the process of blame attribution. The univariate ANOVA findings indicated that male participants assigned more blame than female participants regardless of the outcome severity and decision making rules. However, female participants attributed more blame in the severe condition by using exclusion decision making rule. It may be argued that when female participants utilize systematic processing of information, namely exclusion, they assign higher level of blame.

Limitations and Future Directions

The limitations of this study should be noted. First, although the results confirmed the prediction related gender protagonist and participants, the expected interaction effect between severity of misdeed and participant gender and protagonist gender was not found in study 1. “The doubleshot” hypothesis proposes that men are more likely distressed by sexual infidelity of their partner whereas women are more

likely distressed emotional infidelity of their partner. However, in both studies of the present research, only one condition of infidelity, namely emotional infidelity, was presented in vignettes. The addition of the second condition that specifies the sexual infidelity of the partner may make important contributions to the present research. For instance, participants may generate different information under the attribution categories.

Second, the sample used in this study consisted of only university students. University students do not represent the general population in terms of the internalization of "the code of honor" since they are a relatively more westernized segment of the society than many other segment. Further, since the participants are presented a hypothetical situation, social desirability effect might be influentional.

The results of this research provided interesting results in terms of gender and infidelity research. As it was discussed previously, the cultural values and social roles play an important role in reaction to partner infidelity in romantic relationships. Hence, a cross-cultural research would be better able to describe the effect of gender in partner infidelity.

Concluding Remarks

The present research intended to investigate the process of blame attribution from the perspective of information processing. This research may be unique in making a research about the effect of different decision making procedure on the process of blame attribution. In this research, it was clearly indicated that utilization of different amount and kind of information made important contributions to the process of blame attribution. Moreover, the outcome severity and gender of protagonist and judge affected the process of blame attribution.

References

Alloy, L. B., & Tabachnik, N. (1984). Assessment of covariation by humans and animals: The joint influence of prior expectations and current situational information. *Psychological Review, 91,* 112-149.

Bohner, G., Rank, S., Reinhard, M. A., Einwiller S., & Erb, H.P. (1998). Motivational determinants of systematic processing: Expectancy moderates effects of desired confidence on processing effort. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28,* 185-206.

Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12,* 1-49.

Buss, D.M., Larsen, R.J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science, 3,* 251-255.

Buunk, B. P., & Dijkstra, P. (2004). Gender differences in rival characteristics that evoke jealousy in response to emotional versus sexual infidelity. *Personal Relationships, 11,* 395-408.

Chen, S., & Chaiken, S. (1999). The heuristic-systematic model in its broader context. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual process theories in social psychology* (pp.73-99). New York, NJ: Guilford Press.

Choi, I., Dalal, R., Kim-Prieto, C., & Park, H. (2003). Culture and judgment of causal relevance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84,* 46-59.

DeSteno, D. A., & Salovey, P. (1996). Evolutionary origins of sex differences in jealousy? Questioning the "fitness" of the model. *Psychological Science, 7*, 367-372.

Fincham, F. D. (1985). Attribution processes in distressed and nondistressed couples: 2. responsibility for marital problems. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 94,* 183-190.

Fincham, F. D., Beach, S., & Baucom, D. (1987). Attribution processes in distressed and nondistressed couples: 4. self-partner attribution differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 739-748.

Fincham, F. D., & Jaspars, J. M. (1979). Attribution of responsibility to the self and other in children and adults. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37,* 1589-1602.

Fincham, F. D., & Jaspars, J. M. (1980). Attributions of responsibility: From man the scientist to man as a lawyer. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology (*Vol.13, pp. 81-138). New York, NJ: Academic Press.

Fincham, F., & Hewstone, M. (2001). Attribution theory and research: From basic to applied. In M.Hewstone & W.Stroebe (Eds), *Introduction to social psychology, 3rd Edition* (pp.197-238). Oxford: Blackwell.

Garland, H., Hardy, A. & Stephenson, L. (1975). Information search as affected by attribution type and response category. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1*, 612-615.

Gilbert, D. T., & Malone, P. S. (1995). The correspondence bias. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 21-38.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Hamilton, D. L. (1988). Causal attribution viewed from an information-processing perspective. In D. Bar-tal & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *The social psychology of knowledge,* (359-385). Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Harris, C. R., & Christenfeld, N. (1996a). Gender, jealousy, and reason. *Psychological Science, 7,* 364-366.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations.* USA: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Hortacsu, N., & Karancı, A. N. (1987). Premarital breakups in a turkish sample: Perceived reasons, attributional dimensions and affective reactions. *International Journal of Psychology, 22,* 57-74.

Jones, E. E., & Davis, K. E. (1965). From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol.2, pp. 219-266). New York, NJ: Academic Press.

Juujärvi, S. (2003). *The ethic of care and its development: A longitudinal study among practical nursing, bachelor-degree social work and law enforcement students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki, Finland.

Kandiyoti, D. (1987). Emancipated but not unliberated? Reflections on the turkish case. *Feminist Studies, 13,* 317-337.

Kelley, H. H. (1972). Causal schemata and the attribution process. In E. E. Jones, D. E. Kanouse, H. H. Kelley, R. E. Nisbett, S. Valins & B. Weiner (Eds.), *Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior* (pp. 151-174). Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Kelley, H. H. (1973). The process of casual attribution. *American Psychologist, 28,* 107-128.

Kun, A. & Weiner, B. (1974). Necessary versus sufficient causal schemata for success and failure. In B. Weiner (Ed.), *Achievement motivation and attribution theory* (pp.93-102). Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Kunda, Z. (1999). *Social cognition: Making sense of people.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Levin, I. P., Jasper, J. D., & Forbes, W. S. (1998). Choosing versus rejecting options at different stages of decision making. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 11, 193*-210.

Lindisfarne, N. (1994). Variant masculinity, variant virginities: Rethinking 'honor and shame'. In A. Cornwall & N. Lindisfarne (Eds.), *Dislocating masculinity: Comparative ethnographies* (pp.82-97). New York, NJ: Routledge.

Lussier, Y., Sabourin, S., & Wright, J. (1993). On causality, responsibility, and blame in marriage: Validity of the entailment model. *Journal of Family Psychology, 7,* 322-332.

Maheswaran, D., & Chaiken, S. (1991). Promoting systematic processing in low-motivation settings: Effect of incongruent information on processing and judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61,* 13-25.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986b). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (vol. 19, pp. 123-205). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Ross, L., Amabile, T.M., & Steinmetz, J.L. (1977). Social roles, social control, and biases in social perception processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35,* 485-494.

Schultz, T, R., Schleifer, M., & Altman, I. (1981). Judgments of causation, responsibility, and punishment in cases of harm-doing. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 13,* 238-253.

Shaver, K. G. (1985). *The attribution of blame: Causality, responsibility, and blameworthiness.* New York, NJ: Springer-Verlag.

Shaver, K. G., & Drown, D. (1986). On causality, responsibility, and self-blame: A theoretical note. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 697-702.

Sheets, V. L., & Wolfe, M. D. (2001). Sexual jealousy in heterosexuals, lesbians, and gays. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research,* 255-275.

Shimizu, H. (2001). Japanese adolescent boys' senses of empathy (omoiyari) and carol gilligans' perpectives on the morality of care: A phenonelogical approach. *Culture and Psychology, 7,* 453-475.

Simonson, I., & Twersky, A. (1992). Choice in context: Tradeoff contrast and extremeness aversion. *Journal of Marketing Research, 29,* 281-295.

Singh, D. (1993). Adaptive significance of female physical attractiveness: Role of waist-to-hip-ratio. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65,* 293-307.

Singh, D. (1995). Female judgment of male attractiveness and desirability for relationships: Role of waist-to-hip-ratio and financial status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 1089-1101.

Trope, Y., & Liberman, A. (1996). Social hypothesis testing: Cognitive and motivational mechanisms. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp.239-270). New York, NJ: Guilford Press.

Trope, Y., & Gaunt, R. (2003). Attribution and person perception. In M. A. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.), *The sage handbook of social psychology* (pp.190-208). London: Sage Publications.

Walker, L. J. (1984). Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: A critical review. *Child Development, 55,* 677-691.

Weiner, B., Frieze, I., Kukla, A., Reed, L., Rest, S., & Rosenbaum, R. M. (1972). Perceiving the causes of success and failure. In E. E. Jones, D. E. Kanouse, H. H. Kelley, R. E. Nisbett, S. Valins & B. Weiner (Eds.), *Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior* (pp. 95-120). Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Weiner, B. (1995). *Judgments of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct.* New York, NJ: The Guilford Press.

Wiederman, M. W., & Allgeier, E. R. (1993). Gender differences in sexual jealousy: Adaptionist and social learning explanation? *Ethology and sociobiology,14,* 115-140.

Wood, J. T. (1996). She says/he says: Communication, caring, and conflict in heterosexual relationships. In J. T Wood (Ed.), *Gendered relationships* (pp. 149-162). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Yaniv, I., & Schul, Y. (1997). Elimination and inclusion procedures in judgment. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 10,* 211-220.

Yaniv, I., Schul, Y., Raphaelli-Hirsch, R., Maoz, I. (2002). Exclusive and inclusive modes of thinking: Studies of prediction, preference, and social perception during the parliamentary elections. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38,* 352-367.

APPENDIX A: Onay Formu

Bu çalışma insanların karar verme süreçleri ile ilgili bir araştırmadır. Araştırmaya katılmadan önce sizlere bu çalışma hakkında bilgi vermek istiyoruz. Aşağıdaki bilgileri okuduktan sonra araştırmaya katılmak istiyorsanız lütfen bu formu imzalayınız.

Bu çalışma 3 ayrı bölümden oluşmaktadır. Çalışmanın toplam süresi yaklaşık olarak 30 dakikadır. Bu çalışmaya katılarak şu anda almakta olduğunuz PSY 101 dersinden 1 kredi alacaksınız.

Size ait kişisel bilgiler (isim-soyad, yaş, e-mail) gizli tutulacaktır.Elde edilen verilerin tüm grup için ortalama değerleri kullanılacak ve daha sonra bu bilgiler yok edilecektir.

Araştırmanın sağlıklı devam edebilmesi için bu deneyin içeriğinden daha sonra deneye katılacak arkadaşlarınıza bahsetmemenizi rica ediyoruz.

Bu çalışmayla ilgili tüm sorularınızı istediğiniz zaman sorma hakkına sahipsiniz. Ayrıca çalışma bittikten sonra çalışmayla ilgili sormak istediğiniz tüm sorular için aşağıdaki e-mail adresinden araştırmacıya ulaşabilirsiniz.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya gönüllü olarak katılmaya karar verdim.

Araştırmacı:

Deniz Yılmaz

Katılımcı:

Adı Soyadı:

Öğrenci No:

Tarih:

İmza:

APPENDIX B:Turkish version of booklet of Study 1

Cinsiyet:

“Aşağıda kişilerarası ilişkilerle ilgili kısa bir olay okuyacaksınız. Olayı okuduktan sonra lütfen bu olayın olası nedenlerini düşünerek, aşağıda size verilen herbir kategorinin altına aklınıza gelen nedenleri yazınız.”

“Seda, yakın arkadaşı Emel’in de hoşlandığı Barış’la çıkmaya başladı.”

Seda ile ilgili:

Emel’le ilgili:

Barış’la ilgili:

Seda ve Emel arasındaki ilişki ile ilgili:

Seda ve Barış arasındaki ilişki ile ilgili:

Emel ve Barış arasındaki ilişki ile ilgili:

Çevresel koşullar:

Diğer Sebepler:

2. "Aşağıdaki olayı okuduktan sonra Seda ilgili aşağıdaki görüşlere ne derecede katıldığınızı lütfen size verilmiş ölçeği kullanarak belirtiniz.

"Seda, yakın arkadaşı Emel'in de hoşlandığı Barış'la çıkmaya başladı."

"Seda'nın bu davranışı üniversite gençliği arasında hoş görülmez."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum						**Tamamen Katılıyorum**

"Seda'nın bu davranışı üniversite gençliği arasında kabul görmez."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum						**Tamamen Katılıyorum**

"Seda'nın davranışına üniversite gençliği arasında sıkça rastlanır."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum						**Tamamen Katılıyorum**

"Seda'nın bu davranışı üniversite gençliği arasında hoş görülür."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum						**Tamamen Katılıyorum**

3- **Lütfen aşağıdaki soruları cevaplayınız.**

Bugüne kadar hiç erkek arkadaşınız oldu mu? Evet_____ Hayır_____

Olduysa kaç tane? _____

Şu anda erkek arkadaşınız var mı? Evet_____ Hayır_____

Varsa, ne kadar süredir devam etmektedir? (ay olarak yazınız)_____

Ayrıldıysanız, ne kadar süre önce ayrıldınız? (ay olarak yazınız) _____

Çevrenizde Emel'in durumunda olmuş birisi var mı? Evet____ Hayır____

Varsa kim? (aşağıdaki seçeneklerden bir veya birkaçını işaretleyiniz)

____Kendim
____Yakın Arkadaşım
____Aileden Birisi (akrabalık derecesini yazınız) _____
____Diğer (Sizinle ilişkisini (komşu vs gibi) yazınız _____

Eğer böyle bir olay olduysa nasıl sonuçlanmıştı?
Yazınız_____

Çevrenizde **Seda'nın durumunda olmuş olan** birisi var mı**?** Evet____ Hayır____

Varsa kim? (aşağıdaki seçeneklerden bir veya birkaçını işaretleyiniz)

____Kendim
____Yakın Arkadaşım
____Aileden Birisi (akrabalık derecesini yazınız) _____
____Diğer (Sizinle ilişkisini (komşu vs gibi) yazınız _____

Eğer böyle bir olay olduysa nasıl sonuçlanmıştı? _____
Çevrenizde Barış'ın durumunda olmuş olan birisi var mı? Evet____ Hayır____
Varsa kim? (aşağıdaki seçeneklerden bir veya birkaçını işaretleyiniz)

____Kendim
____Yakın Arkadaşım
____Aileden Birisi (akrabalık derecesini yazınız) _____
____Diğer (Sizinle ilişkisini (komşu vs gibi) yazınız _____

Eğer böyle bir olay olduysa nasıl sonuçlanmıştı? _____

APPENDIX C: English Version of Booklet Study 1

Gender_____

1. "After you read the event below, Please indicate how you agree with statements about Can by using scale given below.

Seda and Emel were close friends for a long time. They both were attracted to Barış. After a while, Seda and Barış started to date.

"Seda's behavior isn't tolerated among university students."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree						**Strongly Agree**

"Seda's behavior isn't acceptable among university students."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree						**Strongly Agree**

"Seda's behavior is common among university students."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree						**Strongly Agree**

"Seda's behavior is tolerated among university students."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree						**Strongly Agree**

2. “Below you will read an event about interpersonal relationships. After you read the event, please write the possible causes of that event under the categories you are given below.”

Seda and Emel were close friends for a long time. They both were attracted to Barış. After a while, Seda and Barış started to date.

About Seda:

About Emel:

About Barış:

About the relationship between Seda and Emel:

About the relationship between Seda and Barış:

About the relationship between Emel and Barış:

External Factors:

Other Factors:

3. Please answer the questions below.

Have you ever had a romantic relationship in their lives? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, how many? _____

Are you involved in romantic relationship now? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, how long has your current relationship been continuing?
(In months) _____

If you brought up, when did you break up? (In months) _____

Do you know anybody in the same situation as Emel? Yes____ No____

If yes, Who? (Please check one or more options)

____Myself
____Close Friend
____Family Member (degree of relative) _____
____Other (write the kind of relationship
with that person (e.g. neighbor) _____

If such an event happened, how did it conclude?
Please write_____

Do you know anybody in the same situation as Seda? Yes____ No____

If yes, who? (Please check one or more options)

____Myself
____Close Friend
____Family Member (degree of relative) _____
____Other (write the kind of relationship
with that person (e.g. neighbor) _____

If such an event happened, how did it conclude?
Please write_____

Do you know anybody in the same situation as Seda? Yes____ No____
If yes, Who? (please check one or more options)

____Myself
____Close Friend
____Family Member (degree of relative) _____
____Other (write the kind of relationship
with that person (e.g. neighbor) _____

If such an event happened, how did it conclude?
Please write_____

APPENDIX D: Turkish Version of Booklet of Study 2
Cinsiyet: _____

1-Lütfen aşağıdaki olayı okuyunuz.

Seda ve Emel uzun süredir çok yakın dost ve arkadaştırlar. İkisi de Barış'tan hoşlanmaktadır. Bir süre sonra Seda ve Barış çıkmaya başladılar.

"Aşağıdaki maddelerden yukarıda okuduğunuz senaryodaki davranışın nedenleriyle ***İLİŞKİLİ OLABİLECEKLERİ*** *yandaki boşluğa çarpı koyarak işaretleyiniz"*

1-Seda Barış'ı eğlendirmeyi ve onunla nasıl vakit geçireceğini biliyordu. _____
2-Emel Barış'ı kendinden soğutmuştu. _____
3-Emel ve Barış görüşmekte güçlük çekiyorlardı. _____
4-Seda kendine güvenen birisidir. _____
5-Seda Barış'ın baskıları sonucunda bu ilişkiye başladı. _____
6-Emel bir boşluk içindeydi. _____
7-Seda ve Barış biribirlerini gizliden gizliye seviyorlardı. _____
8-Emel içine kapanık biridir. _____
9-Seda Emel'in ve Barış'ın birbirlerinden hoşlanmadıklarını düşünüyordu. _____
10-Seda ve Barış'ın ortak noktaları çok fazladır. _____
11-Seda, Emel ve Barış arasında sorunlar olduğunu biliyordu. _____
12-Seda ve Barış arasındaki ilişki çıkar ilişkisidir. _____
13-Barış empati kuramaz. _____
14-Seda daha önceden olmuş bir olaydan dolayı Emel'den intikam almak istiyordu. _____
15-Barış sadakatsiz ve şehvet düşkünü birisidir. _____
16-Seda ve Barış birbirlerine aşık olmuşlardı. _____
17-Seda kendi çıkarlarını düşünen birisidir. _____
18-Seda ikiyüzlü birisidir. _____
19-Emel ilişkilerinde tutarsız bir insandır. _____
20-Arkadaş çevrelerinde bu tür ilişkilere rastlanmaktadır. _____
21-Emel ne istediğini bilmeyen birisidir. _____
22-Seda, Barış'a Emel'in gösteremediği ilgiyi göstermişti. _____

23-Emel, Barış'a hayal kırıklığı yaşatmıştı. _____

24-Arkadaş çevreleri Seda ve Barış'ın birbirlerine daha
uygun olduklarını düşünüyorlardı. _____

25-Emel'in sahiplenici tutumu Barış'ı sıkmıştır. _____

26-Seda ve Barış birlikte çok vakit geçiriyorlardı. _____

27-Barış, Seda ile çıkmak için çok uğraştı. _____

28-Barış Emel'le ilgili duygularından emin değildi. _____

29-Barış Emel'in kendisi için doğru insan olmadığını düşünüyordu. _____

30-Seda, dışa dönük ve girişkendir. _____

31-Emel erkeklere fazla değer vermeyen birisidir. _____

32-Barış popüler bir erkektir. _____

33-Barış, Emel ile olan ilişkisi uzun bir süredir devam
ettiği için ondan sıkılmıştır. _____

34-Barıl Emel'in asıl duygularının farkında değildir. _____

35-Bahar gelmiştir. _____

36-Barış Seda'yı Emel'den daha çekici bulmuştur. _____

37-Barış bencil birisidir. _____

38-Emel Barış'a karşı olan duyguları konusunda yeterince açık değildir. _____

39-Emel bir arkadaşıyla iddaya girmiştir. _____

40-Barış arkadaşlarının etkisinde kalmıştır. _____

41-Seda güvenilmez birisidir. _____

42-Emel Barış'ı aldatmıştır. _____

43-Emel daha duygusal ve kırılgan biriydi. _____

44-Seda Emel'in Barış'ı sevmediğini düşünüyordu. _____

45-Seda bencil birisidir. _____

46-Seda ve Barış aynı işyerinde çalışıyorlardı. _____

47-Tesadüfler sonucunda Seda ve Barış yakınlaşmışlardır. _____

48-Barış Emel'i sıradan bir arkadaşı olarak görüyordu. _____

49-Barış eski ilişkisini unutmak amacıyla Seda'yla çıkmaya başladı. _____

50-Barış'ın ailesi Emel'le olan ilişkisini onaylamamışdı. _____

51-Seda erkek arkadaşından yeni ayrıldığı için

yeni bir ilişkiye başlamak istiyordu. _____

52-Seda Barış'a duygularını bastıramayacak kadar çok aşıktı. _____

53-Barış başkalarının duygularını önemsemeyen birisiydi. _____

54-Çıkar ilişkilerinin ön planda olduğu, ahlaki değerlere
önem vermeyen bir çevrede yaşamaktadırlar. _____

55-Barış Emel'le olan ilişkisini ciddiye almamıştır. _____

56-Seda Barış'a sürekli ilgi gösteriyordu. _____

57-Emel, Barış'la tanıştıktan sonra farklı bir şehirde okumaya gitti. _____

58-Seda başka bir erkeği kıskandırmak için Barış'la çıkmaktadır. _____

59-Seda Emel'den daha güzel ve çekiciydi. _____

60-Seda, Barış'tan onunla tanışmadan önce de hoşlanıyordu**.** _____

61-Bu tür durumları hoş gören bir çevrede yaşamaktadırlar. _____

62-Emel ve Barış zıt karakterlerdi. _____

63-Seda Emel'e göre erkeklerle daha iyi diyalog kuruyordu. _____

64-Emel ve Seda birbirlerini içten içe kıskanıyorlardı. _____

65-Emel saf ve iyi niyetli birisidir. _____

66-Emel kıskanç birisidir. _____

67-Seda Emel'i üzmek için Barış'la çıkmaya başladı. _____

68-Barış dürüstlük kavramına önem veren birisi değildi. _____

69-Seda umursamaz birisidir. _____

70-Barış yakışıklı ve çekici bir erkektir. _____

71-Seda ikiyüzlüdür. _____

72-Emel Barış'a uzak ve ilgisiz davranıyordu. _____

73-Okul hayatlarındaki yoğunluktan dolayı stres yaşıyorlardı. _____

74-Emel Seda'ya zayıf yönlerini gösterdi. _____

75-Seda Barış'ın ona karşı olan samimi ve ilgili davranışlarını yanlış anladı. _____

76-Her üçüde üst ekonomik sınıfa dahil kişilerdir. _____

77-Barış düşüncesiz birisidir. _____

78-Seda Barış'ı elde etmek için çok uğraştı. _____

79-Barış iki arkadaşı birbirine düşürmek için Seda'yla çıkmıştır. _____

80-Emel başka bir erkekten hoşlanmaya başlamıştır. _____

81-Emel Barış'a kötü davranmıştı. _____

82-Seda Emel'e saygı duymamaktadır. _____

83-Barış yakışıklı, çekici bir erkektir. _____

84-Seda ve Emel birbirleriyle hislerini ve özel yaşamlarını paylaşmıyorlardı. _____

85-Olaylar Seda'nın dışında gelişti. _____

86-Emel ve Barış arasındaki ilişki maddi çıkarlara dayanıyordu. _____

87-Seda Emel'i çok kıskanıyordu. _____

88-Barış umursamaz birisidir. _____

89-Barış Emel'i kıskandırmak istiyordu. _____

90-Seda Barış'ı yakışıklı buluyordu. _____

91-Emel Barış'ı platonik olarak seviyor. _____

92-Emel olayları önceden kestiremeyen birisidir. _____

93-Seda Emel'in Barış'a karşı olan ilgisinin geçici
göründüğü kadar ciddi olmadığını düşündü. _____

94-Barış popüler bir erkektir. _____

95-Emel ve Barış farklı bölümlerde okumaktadırlar. _____

96-Seda ve Emel arasındaki ilişki bir çıkar ilişkisidir. _____

97-Üçü birlikte çok vakit geçiriyorlardı. _____

98-Seda, Emel'den daha önce kendisine yaptığı kötü bir olayın
intikamını almak istiyordu. _____

99-Emel erkeklere fazla değer vermeyen birisidir. _____

100-Barış Seda'yı gerçekten seviyor. _____

101-Emel Barış'la eskisi kadar ilgi göstermiyordu. _____

102-Seda erkeklere karşı zaafı olan birisidir. _____

103-Kendilerini yalnız hissediyorlardı. _____

104-Barış güvenilmez biridir. _____

105-Seda geleceği düşünmeyen birisidir. _____

106-Emel, Barış çok kıskanç olduğu için ondan bıkmıştır. _____

107- Emel ve Seda arasında gerçek anlamda bir dostluk yoktu. _____

108-Emel güvenilir birisidir. _____

109-Seda cesur ve yalanı olmayan biridir. _____

110-Emel, Barış'ın kendisini reddetmesinden korktuğu için ona açılamamıştı. _____

111-Seda başka bir erkeği kıskandırmak için Barış'la çıkmaktadır. _____

112-Seda ve Emel arasında samimi ve yakın bir ilişki bulunmamaktadır. _____

113-Emel ve Barış arasındaki ilişki zayıflamıştır. _____

114-Emel kendine güvensiz ve yetersiz birisidir. _____

115-Seda Emel'den daha kariyer sahibi ve zengindir. _____

116- Emel utangaç birisiydi. _____

117-Barış arkadaşlık kavramına önem veren birisi değildi. _____

118 Barış kararlı ve cesur birisidir. _____

119-Emel ve Seda arasında iletişim eksikliği vardı. _____

120-Barış ve Seda aynı takımı tuttukları için yakınlaşmışlardır. _____

121-Seda Barış'tan karşılık gördüğü için böyle davrandı. _____

122-Barış'ın ailesi Seda'yla arkadaşlık yapmasını istemişlerdir. _____

123-Emel ve Seda arasındaki arkadaşlık kıskançlık ve rekabet doluydu. _____

124-Arkadaş çevresi Barış'a Emel'le çıkmaması konusunda baskı yaptılar. _____

125-Emel dürüst birisidir. _____

126-Seda Barış'a Emel'in davrandığından daha sıcak davranıyordu. _____

127-Seda ve Emel arasında eskiye dayanan sorunlar vardı. _____

128-Seda Emel'in duygularına önem vermiyordu. _____

129-Emel ve Barış arasında dini ve sosyal bir ayrım vardı. _____

130-Seda Barış'ın kendisine aşık olması için elinden geleni yaptı. _____

131-Emel daha önceki bir zamanda Seda'ya kötü davranmış. _____

132-Emel yurt dışında öğrenim kazandı. _____

133-Seda erkek arkadaşından yeni ayrıldığı için yeni
bir ilişkiye başlamak istiyordu. _____

134-Emel Barış'a soğuk ve ilgisiz davranıyordu. _____

135-Emel duygularını ifade etmekte ağır davrandı. _____

136-Barış Emel'in kıskanç tutumları sonucunda ondan soğumuştur. _____

137-Seda aşkı dostluğun üzerinde tutuyordu. _____

138-Seda sevimli ve neşeli birisiydi. _____

139-Seda başkalarının duygularını önemsemeyen birisidir. _____

140-Barış Emel'den öç almak istiyordu. _____

141-Seda'yı Barıiş'la başlayacağı ilişkinin zorlukları cezbetti. _____

142-Seda ve Barış aynı mahallede oturuyor. _____

143-Seda, Barış'ı yeni biten ilişkisinden dolayı teselli ediyordu. _____

144-Barış uzun zamandır Seda'yı seviyordu. _____

145-Barış'ınhiçbirşeyden haberi yoktu. _____

146-Emel, Seda'ya daha önceden aynı şekilde davranmıştı. _____

147-Barış'ın gözü dışardadır. _____

148-Seda Barış'a karşı hislerini açıkça göstermiştir. _____

149-Seda, Barış'a Emel'in olduğundan daha yakındı. _____

150-Emel dostluğa aşktan daha fazla önem veren birisidir. _____

151-Seda'nın arkadaşlık anlayışı toplum normlarına uygun değildi. _____

152-Seda ve Barış aynı bölümde okuyordu. _____

2-**Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri size verilmiş ölçeği kullanarak değerlendiriniz.**

Seda ve Emel uzun süredir çok yakın dost ve arkadaştırlar. İkisi de Barış'tan hoşlanmaktadır. Bir süre sonra Seda ve Barış çıkmaya başladılar.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum						**Tamamen Katılıyorum**

Seda davranışının sonuçlarını tahmin edebilirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda'nın kötü bir niyeti yoktu.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda bu davranışının sonuçlarından sorumludur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda bu davranışını daha önceden planlamıştı.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda Emel'i üzmek niyetiyle bu davranışı yaptı.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bu davranışı yapmamak Seda'nın elinde değildi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda bu davranışını kontrol edebilirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda bu olayda suçludur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda bu davranışından dolayı suçlanmayı hakediyor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda Emel'in ne hissedeceğini düşünemezdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda bu davranışının sonuçlarından sorumlu değildir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda bu davranışı Emel'i incitmek amacıyla kasıtlı yapmıştır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda suçlu değildir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda bu durumda başka bir şekilde davranamazdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3.**Lütfen aşağıdaki soruları cevaplayınız.**

Bugüne kadar hiç kız arkadaşınız oldu mu? Evet_____ Hayır_____

Olduysa kaç tane? _____

Şu anda kız arkadaşınız var mı? Evet_____ Hayır_____

Varsa, ne kadar süredir devam etmektedir? (ay olarak yazınız)_____

Ayrıldıysanız, ne kadar süre önce ayrıldınız? (ay olarak yazınız) _____

Çevrenizde Emel'in durumunda olmuş olan birisi var mı? Evet____ Hayır____

Varsa kim? (aşağıdaki seçeneklerden bir veya birkaçını işaretleyiniz)

____Kendim
____Yakın Arkadaşım
____Aileden Birisi (akrabalık derecesini yazınız) _____
____Diğer (Sizinle ilişkisini (komşu vs gibi) yazınız _____

Eğer böyle bir olay olduysa nasıl sonuçlanmıştı?
Yazınız_____

Çevrenizde Seda'nın durumunda olmuş birisi var mı? Evet____ Hayır____

Varsa kim? (aşağıdaki seçeneklerden bir veya birkaçını işaretleyiniz)

____Kendim
____Yakın Arkadaşım
____Aileden Birisi (akrabalık derecesini yazınız) _____
____Diğer (Sizinle ilişkisini (komşu vs gibi) yazınız _____

Eğer böyle bir olay olduysa nasıl sonuçlanmıştı?
Yazınız_____

Çevrenizde Barış'ın durumunda olmuş olanbirisi var mı? Evet____ Hayır____
Varsa kim? (aşağıdaki seçeneklerden bir veya birkaçını işaretleyiniz)

____Kendim
____Yakın Arkadaşım
____Aileden Birisi (akrabalık derecesini yazınız) _____
____Diğer (Sizinle ilişkisini (komşu vs gibi) yazınız _____
Eğer böyle bir olay olduysa nasıl sonuçlanmıştı?
Yazınız_____

APPENDIX E: English Version of Booklet for Study 2

Gender: _____

1. Please read the event below.

Seda and Emel were close friends for a long time. They both were attracted to Barış. After a while, Seda and Barış started to date.

In the space below, you are presented with several potential pieces of information, each of which may or may not be relevant with respect to determining the cause of the action. You are asked to mark the every item information that ***is irrelevant for the incident.***

1- Seda knew how to amuse Barış and how to spend time with him.____
2- Seda alienated Barış from herself. ____
3- Emel and Barış had a difficulty in seeing each other. ____
4- Seda has self-confidence. ____
5- Seda engaged in this relationship due to Barış's pressures. ____
6- Emel was in a state of emptiness. ____
7- Seda and Barış loved each other in their hearts. ____
8- Emel is an introvert person. ____
9- Seda thought that Emel and Barış did not like each other. ____
10- Seda and Barış had many in common. ____
11- Seda knew that Emel and Barış had problems between each other. ____
12- The relationship between Seda and Barış is a relationship of interest. ____
13- Barış does not have empathy. ____
14- Seda wanted to revenge from Emel
because of an event happened in the past. ____
15- Seda is an infidel and sensual person. ____
16- Seda and Barış fell in love with each other. ____
17- Seda principally thinks of herself. ____
18- Seda is a hypocrite person. ____
19- Emel is an inconsistent person in his relationships. ____

20- Similar relationships are met in their friend circles. ____

21- Emel is someone who des not know what she wants. ____

22- Seda showed Barış the interest Emel did not show him. ____

23- Emel has made Barış to experience disappointment. ____

24- Their friend circles thought that Seda and Barış
are more appropriate to each other. ____

25- Emel's possessive behavior bored Barış. ____

26- Seda and Barış spent many time together. ____

27- Seda struggled very much to date with Barış. ____

28- Emel was not sure about her feelings towards Barış. ____

29- Barış thought that Emel was not the right person for him. ____

30- Seda is an extrovert and sociable person. ____

31- Emel is someone who does not value men much. ____

32- Barış is a popular man. ____

33- Barış was bored of Emel since their
relationship continued for a long time. ___

34- Barış has not noticed Emel's real feelings. ____

35- Spring has come. ____

36- Barış found Seda more attractive than Emel. ____

37- Barış is a selfish person. ____

38- Emel is not open enough in her feelings toward Barış. ____

39- Emel bet with her friend. ____

40- Barış was influenced by his friends. ____

41- Seda is an unreliable person. ____

42- Emel cheated Barış. ____

43- Emel was a more emotional and fragile person. ____

44- Seda thought that Emel did not love Barış. ____

45- Seda is a selfish person. ____

46- Seda and Barış was working in the same place. ____

47- Seda and Barış approached each other as a result of coincidences. ____

48- Barış regarded Emel as an ordinary friend. ____

49- Barış started dating with Seda for forgetting his past relationship. ____

50- Barış's family did not approve his relationship with Emel. ____

51- Seda wanted to engage in a new relationship
because she has recently separated from her boyfriend. ____

52- Seda loved Barış so much that she could not suppress her feelings. ____

53- Barış was a person who does not care about others' feelings. ____

54- They live in a circle in which morals are not
valued and relationships of interest are in the foreground. ____

55- Barış did not take his relationship with Emel serious. ____

56- Seda continuously showed an interest in Barış. ____

57- After meeting with Barış, Emel moved to another city for study. ____

58- Seda dates with Barış for making another man jealous. ____

59- Seda was more beautiful and attractive than Emel. ____

60- Seda already liked Barış before meeting with him. ____

61- They live in a circle which such situations are tolerated. ____

62- Emel and Barış had opposite characters. ____

63- Seda was communicating with men better than Emel. ____

64- Emel and Seda were jealous of each other in their hearts. ____

65- Emel is a naïve and well-intentioned person. ____

66- Emel is a jealous person. ____

67- Seda began dating with Barış for upsetting Emel. ____

68- Barış was not a person who valued the concept of honesty. ____

69- Seda is a reckless person. ____

70- Barış is a handsome and attractive man. ____

71- Seda is hypocrite. ____

72- Emel treated Barış far and disinterested. ____

73- They were stressed because of the difficulties in their studies. ____

74- Emel showed Seda her weaknesses. ____

75- Seda misunderstood Barış's sincere and
concerned behaviors toward herself. ____

76- All of them came from high socioeconomic status. ____

77- Barış is a careless person. ____

78- Seda paid much effort to have Barış. ____

79- Barış dated with Seda for making the
two friends to fall into conflict. ____

80- Emel began liking another man. ____

81- Emel treated Barış bad. ____

82- Seda does not respect Emel. ____

83- Barış is a handsome and attractive man. ____

84- Seda and Emel did not share their
feelings and private lives with each other. ____

85- The events happened out of Emel's control. ____

86- The relationship between Emel and Barış
was based on tangible interests. ____

87- Seda was jealous of Emel very much. ____

88- Barış is a reckless person. ____

89- Barış wanted to make Emel jealous. ____

90- Seda found Barış handsome. ____

91- Emel loves Barış in a platonic way. ____

92- Emel is a person who is not able to predict events. ____

93- Seda thought that Emel's feelings toward
Barış were momentary and not as serious as it seemed. ____

94- Barış is a popular man. ____

95- Emel and Barış studied different disciplines. ____

96- The relationship between Seda and Emel is one of interest. ____

97- All the three spent a lot of time together. ____

98- Seda wanted to revenge for an event
which Emel had committed against herself. ____

99- Emel does not value men much. ____

100- Barış really loves Seda. ____

101- Emel did not show an interest in Barış as she had showed before. ____

102- Seda has a weakness for men. ____

103- They were feeling alone. ____

104- Barış is an unreliable person. ____

105- Seda is a person who does not think of future. ____

106- Emel was bored of Barış since he was too jealous. ____

107- There was not a true friendship between Seda and Emel. ____

108- Emel is a reliable person. ____

109- Seda is a brave person without lies. ____

110- Emel could not open out Barış because
she was afraid of his refusal. ____

111- Seda dates with Barış for making another man jealous. ____

112- There is not a sincere and close relationship
between Seda and Emel. ____

113- The relationship between Emel and Barış weakened. ____

114- Emel is a person who is inadequate and not self-confident. ____

115- Seda is richer than Emel and has a better career. ____

116- Emel was a shy person. ____

117- Barış was a person who does not value the concept of friendship. ____

118- Barış is a determined and brave person. ____

119- There was a lack of communication between Seda and Emel. ____

120- Seda and Barış got closer since they supported the same team. ____

121- Seda behaved this way because he received return. ____

122- Barış's family wanted him to be friends with Seda. ____

123- The relationship between Emel and
Seda was full of jealousy and rivalry. ____

124- His friend circle pressured Barış not to be friends with Emel. ____

125- Emel is a honest person. ____

126- Seda treated Barış warmer than Emel did. ____

127- There were problems between Seda and
Emel resulting from the past. ____

128- Seda did not attach importance to Emel's feelings. ____

129- There were social and religious
differences between Barış and Emel. ____

130- Seda did her utmost for having Barış. ____

131- Emel treated Seda badly in the past. ____

132- Emel achieved opportunity to study abroad. ____

133- Seda wanted to begin a new relationship
because she recently separated from his boyfriend. ____

134- Emel treated Barış cold and disinterested. ____

135- Emel acted slowly in expressing her feelings. ____

136- Barış alienated from Emel due to her jealous attitude. ____

137- Seda valued love over friendship. ____

138- Seda was a pretty and cheerful woman. ____

139- Seda is a person who does not mind others' feelings. ____

140- Barış wanted to revenge from Emel. ____

141- The difficulties of the relationship that
she will begin together with Barış attracted Seda. ____

142- Seda and Barış were staying in the same neighborhood. ____

143- Seda consoled Barış for his recently-ended relationship. ____

144- Barış loved Seda for a very long time. ____

145- Barış was not aware of anything. ____

146- Before, Emel treated Seda in a similar way. ____

147- Barış's interested also in other women. ____

148- Seda showed Barış her feelings overtly. ____

149- Seda was closer to Barış than Emel was. ____

150- Emel is a person who values friendship more than love. ____

151- Seda's understanding of friendship
was not proper for the norms of society. ____

152- Seda and Barış studied in the same department. ____

2- Please rate the statements below.

Seda and Emel were close friends for a long time. They both were attracted to Barış. After a while, Seda and Barış started to date.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree						**Strongly Agree**

Seda could predict the consequences of her behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda did not have bad intentions..	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda is responsible for the consequences of her behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda had planned her behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda intended to harm Emel.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It was not in Seda's hand not to behave in this way.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda could control her behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda should be blamed for this event.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda deserves to be blamed for her behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda could not anticipate how Emel would feel.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda is not responsible for the consequences her behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Seda planned to harm Emel.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. Please answer the questions below.

Have you ever had a romantic relationship in their lives? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, how many? _____
Are you involved in romantic relationship now? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, how long has your current relationship been continuing?
(In months) _____
If you brought up, when did you break up? (In months) _____

Do you know anybody in the same situation as Emel? Yes____ No____
If yes, Who? (Please check one or more options)

____Myself
____Close Friend
____Family Member (degree of relative) _____
____Other (write the kind of relationship
with that person (e.g. neighbor) _____

If such an event happened, how did it conclude?
Please write_____
Do you know anybody in the same situation as Seda? Yes____ No____
If yes, who? (Please check one or more options)

____Myself
____Close Friend
____Family Member (degree of relative) _____
____Other (write the kind of relationship
with that person (e.g. neighbor) _____

If such an event happened, how did it conclude?
Please write_____
Do you know anybody in the same situation as Seda? Yes____ No____
If yes, Who? (please check one or more options)

____Myself
____Close Friend
____Family Member (degree of relative) _____
____Other (write the kind of relationship
with that person (e.g. neighbor) _____

If such an event happened, how did it conclude?
Please write_____