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ABSTRACT

The current study investigated cross-cultural differences in anger and aggression as a function of the perceived intent and blameworthiness of a hypothetical provocateur in adverse social situations. A survey experiment method was used to test differences in perception, self-reported anger, indirect, and overt aggression across cultures, genders, and in- vs. outgroup targets of hostility. The study sample consisted of 410 college students in the US (N=125), Turkey (N=127), and China (N=158). Results show that the US and Turkish respondents were more likely than their Chinese counterparts to perceive aggressive intent in a provocateur’s actions and blame the provocateur for the negative outcome in ambiguous social interactions. Also, the US and Turkish participants were more angered by the negative interaction compared to the Chinese. The Turkish alone were more likely to show indirect (“do something to get even”) and overt (“have it out with him/her right then and there!”) aggression towards the provocateur. Males in all cultures were more likely than females to get even as a result of the adverse interaction. No outgroup effect was found. Blameworthiness was a more potent instigator of overt aggression than perceived intent. Also discussed are how perceptions of hostility can be endemic to a particular culture and used to explain the root causes of violent conflict.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my advisor, Craig Jenkins for his support, encouragement, and insightful comments that made this thesis possible. Without his encouragement and valuable feedback, the research funding necessary to conduct the experiments in the US and abroad, and, the conceptual framework crucial to write a coherent thesis would be an insurmountable task.

Several individuals also contributed to the conceptual development and actual implementation of this study: I thank Marilynn Brewer, Kazmierz Slomczynski, Pam Paxton, Jim Moody, Randy Hudson, Peter Gries, Ozgur Orhangazi, Yusuf Ziya Ozcan, Goksel Demirer, and Peter Furia for their valuable support. Finally, Jin Lu spent many long hours with me to perfect the research instruments used in this study. I am grateful to her for her able research assistance and generous help.

This research was supported by the National Science Foundation Grant, SES-0081907, and research fellowships from the Mershon Center for International Security and the Department of Sociology at The Ohio State University.
VITA

January 10, 1965............................... Born – Ankara, Turkey

1988.............................................. B.S. Economics
Ortadogu Teknik Universitesi

1998.............................................. M.A. Interdisciplinary Programs
The Ohio State University

1996 – present ......................... Graduate Research and Teaching
Associate, The Ohio State University

Major Field: Sociology
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abstract</strong></td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acknowledgments</strong></td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vita</strong></td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>List of Tables</strong></td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>List of Figures</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapters:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Hostile Intent and Social Cognitive Bases of Aggression</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Hypotheses and Theoretical Background</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research Design</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Subjects</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness of the Samples</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Survey Questionnaire</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity of the Questionnaire</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Perceived Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger, Indirect, and Overt Aggression Across Cultures, Genders, in Vs. Out-Group Targets of Hostility: Anova Results

Manipulation Check

Main Effects

Culture

Summary of the Results: Ambiguous Scenarios

Hostile and Benign Scenarios

Summary of the Results

Hostile Scenarios

Benign Scenarios

Gender

Indirect Aggression

Overt Aggression

Overall Summary

4. Hostile Attributions and Behavioral Outcome:
A Cross-Cultural Test

Regression Results

Predictive Power of Perceived Intent and Blameworthiness

Overt Aggression

The US

Turkey

China

Summary of the Results

Cognition – Emotion – Action:
A Mediational Model

General Model

Results:

Perceived Intent – Anger – Overt Aggression
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The US.................70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey..................72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China....................74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of the Results..................76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discussion.................................................................78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Differences......................................................78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences........................................................82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup Effects............................................................85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Causes of Aggression................................................88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of the Study...............................................90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding Remarks.......................................................91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of References.........................................................92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Appendix: Questionnaire
  Ingroup and Outgroup: the US version.................................101 |
 LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary of ANOVA Results: Intent</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US, Turkey, and China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summary of ANOVA Results: Blame</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US, Turkey, and China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Summary of ANOVA Results: Anger</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US, Turkey, and China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Summary of ANOVA Results: Indirect Aggression</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US, Turkey, and China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Summary of ANOVA Results: Overt Aggression</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US, Turkey, and China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mean Ratings on Intent: Type</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mean Ratings on Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Aggression: Ambiguous Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mean Ratings on Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Aggression: Hostile Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mean Ratings on Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Aggression: Benign Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Regression Analysis Summary for Perceived Intent,</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blameworthiness, Gender, Age and Overt Aggression: The US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pearson Correlation Coefficients: The US</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Regression Analysis Summary for Perceived Intent,</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blameworthiness, Gender, Age and Overt Aggression: Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table

13. Pearson Correlation Coefficients: Turkey ................................................. 58

14. Regression Analysis Summary for Perceived Intent,
Blameworthiness, Gender, Age and Overt Aggression: China ...................... 63

15. Pearson Correlation Coefficients: China ................................................. 63

16. Mediation Analyses Summary for Perceived Intent,
Anger and Overt Aggression: The US ......................................................... 71

17. Mediation Analyses Summary for Perceived Intent,
Anger and Overt Aggression: Turkey ......................................................... 73

18. Mediation Analyses Summary for Perceived Intent,
Anger and Overt Aggression: China ......................................................... 75
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A Social Information Processing Model of Aggression</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Main Effect of Culture on Perceived Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger, Indirect, and Overt Aggression: Ambiguous Scenarios</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Main Effect of Culture on Perceived Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger, Indirect, and Overt Aggression: Hostile Scenarios</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Main Effect of Culture on Perceived Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger, Indirect, and Overt Aggression: Benign Scenarios</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Main Effect of Gender on Indirect Aggression: Ambiguous Scenarios</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Main Effect of Gender on Indirect Aggression: Hostile Scenarios</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Main Effect of Gender on Indirect Aggression: Benign Scenarios</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Main Effect of Gender on Overt Aggression: Ambiguous and Hostile Scenarios</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Main Effect of Gender on Overt Aggression: Ambiguous and Hostile Scenarios</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mediated Model for Perceived Intent and Overt Aggression</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Aggression is an important social problem that has been studied from a variety of perspectives. Decades of research have been devoted to understand its biological and sociocultural bases. Anthropological records and research in social psychology show that a clear distinction between peaceful and violent cultures can be made (Staub, 1989/2003; Dentan, 1999; Fry, 1998; De Bonta, 1997/1993; Farver, et. al. 1997, George, 1995). The exact mechanisms for such differences are much debated, however. Several investigators advanced ecological arguments (e.g. Chagnon, 1988/1997; Ferguson, 1984/1992; Harris, 1984) in that culture specific violence is explained in terms of enhancing reproductive success (Chagnon, 1988/1997), responding to the demands of population growth with respect to land and availability of food sources (Harris, 1984), and using an instrumental force to enhance access and control over scarce tools and materials in the environment (Ferguson, 1984/1992).

In addition to the ecological pressures on populations, the importance of observational learning and social perception, that are complimentary to the ecological arguments, have been implicated for the differences observed in aggressive behavior.
How the social environment is perceived and how this information is stored and automatically accessed in similar situations are the focus of the social cognitive bases of aggressive behavior (Mussweiler, Forster, 2000; see Todorov and Bargh, 2002 for a review). Culture provides a context in which social learning, perception, and modeling of aggressive behavior occur. Accordingly, the current study aimed to understand whether biased perceptions regarding the intent and blameworthiness of a provocateur in ambiguous social situations would account for the cross-cultural differences in anger and aggression in three nations; the US, Turkey, and China.

*Perception of Hostile Intent and Social Cognitive Bases of Aggression*

Aggressive individuals tend to see the world around them as more hostile than it actually is, and, react more aggressively. Numerous studies with preschoolers (Katsurada et. al., 1998), school-aged children (DeCastro et. al., 2002; Crick and Dodge, 1994; Dodge, 1986), adolescents (Crick and Dodge, 1994; Graham et. al, 1992), adults (Epps and Kendall, 1995), and clinical populations (Dodge et. al, 1990) indicate that individuals rated as aggressive by clinical measures, self-reported questionnaires, teachers and/or peers show a marked bias in attributing hostile intent to a provocateur when the intent of the provocateur is in fact ambiguous (DeCastro et.al. 2002; Crick and Dodge, 1994; Dodge, 1990; Dodge, 1986). Largely led by Dodge and his colleagues’ work (see Crick and Dodge, 1994, de Castro et. al, 2002 for a review), this phenomenon is referred to as “Hostile Attribution Bias” or “Hostile Attribution of Intent”. Perceived aggressive intent of the provocateur is in turn shown to increase aggression measured by the intensity of
electrical shock, heightened autonomic arousal indicated by increased blood pressure, skin conductance rate, and self reported anger (Epstein and Taylor, 1967).

Attribution of hostile intent is considered as a key element in the development and persistence of aggressive behavior (de Castro et al., 2002). Supporting evidence show that biased attributions in childhood predict later aggression (Zelli et al. 1999; Dodge et al., 1990). It is also shown that aggression is stable over time (Pulkkinen and Pitkanen, 1993; Huesmann et al., 1990). Both peer nominations and teacher ratings on aggression at age 8 and 14 predict criminality and self-reported aggression at age 26 (Pulkkinen and Pitkanen, 1993). According to a 22-year longitudinal study, future antisocial aggression is predictable from the agonistic behavior displayed by children in everyday life (Huesmann et al., 1990). Taken together, these data provide support for a learning model of aggression (Crick and Dodge, 1994; Dodge, 1986; Huesmann, 1988; Bandura, 1973). If culture provides a context in which social learning occurs then it is expected that some cultures would be more conducive to aggressive behavior.

Formal Hypotheses and Theoretical Background

Perception of hostile intent and subsequent aggressive reactions, that is, social cognitive bases of aggressive behavior, are derived from formal attribution theories advanced by Heider (1958), subsequently adjusted and modified by Jones and Davis (1965), Kelly (1967, 1973), and Weiner (1985, 1986). Attributions refer to the inferences made by the lay person on the causes of everyday events. People are “naïve
psychologists” (Heider, 1958). They are constructive thinkers who search for causes of everyday events they encounter and who respond behaviorally on the basis of the inferences they made (Dodge, 1986). Accordingly, research on the social cognitive bases of aggression has largely focused on this cognition (attribution) –to-action (behavioral reaction) sequence (e.g. Dodge, 1988, Crick and Dodge 1994, Huessmann, 1988).

Dodge and his colleagues have proposed a social information processing model of aggression in children (Crick and Dodge, 1994; Dodge et. al., 1990; Dodge; Dodge, 1986) which has subsequently been tested and confirmed with adolescents (Crick and Dodge, 1994; Graham et. al, 1992), adults (Epps and Kendall, 1995), and clinical populations (Dodge et. al, 1990). The current study partially adopted Dodge and his colleagues’ model to examine cross-cultural differences in perception of hostile intent, blameworthiness and subsequent angry and aggressive reactions. The model is simplified and revised as in Figure.1:

People come to social situations with three sets of factors. The first is biological dispositions, such as temperament. In other words, a person’s genetic and biological (e.g. endocrine) make-up creates a potential for aggression. The second set is an established database/memory of past experiences in social encounters. The third set is the specific culture or environment they belong to that affects the interpretation of social encounters. The specifics of aggressive behavior, its forms and frequency would be determined by a combination of these factors. The proposed model in Figure.1 below consists of six steps of which Step 2 is the focus of this study and much of the hostile attribution literature.

**Figure.1 A Social Information Processing Model of Aggression**
Step1: The first step of processing information from the social interaction is to encode cues from the environment. Suppose our actor Bob is flying home from abroad and passport check-in is extremely crowded with people who want to catch their connecting flights. Bob is being pushed very hard while trying to get into the next available window for passport check-in.

Step2: The second step involves the interpretation of cues from the external and internal environment. The cues in the external environment in this case represent the airport conditions. The cues in the internal environment represent emotional arousal as a result of the negative interaction. For example, Bob may think that the person who pushed him wants to get ahead of him. In other words, at this stage, the actor is making a causal analysis, including perception of intent that is influenced by his previous encounters in this situation, or in similar situations, his temperament, and the “code of conduct” of waiting for one’s turn in his culture. This step is dynamic in that interpretation of cues also results in encoding of further cues.

Step3: The third stage involves clarification of goals as to how to respond to the other passenger. It also entails arousal regulation, such as suppression of anger. The anger arousal is a direct function of the perceived intent.

Step4: The fourth step is the response access or construction. If the situation is novel, Bob may construct new sets of behavior based on the social cues. If he has
encountered this negative social interaction before, he would be more likely to retrieve an available response set from memory.

**Step5:** At this stage, an appropriate behavioral response would be evaluated based on the appropriateness of the selected response, self-efficacy to enact the response, and the outcome expected (e.g. reaction from the other passenger) while interacting with response construction at Step 4.

**Step6:** Behavioral response is enacted (e.g., Bob shouts at the passenger). This is a dynamic process, thus, it also influences encoding of further cues through social interaction.

Focusing on **Step2: Interpretation of Cues** of the Social Information Processing Model of Aggression, the following formal hypotheses have been proposed:

**H1:** Perceptions of hostility and blameworthiness for ambiguous social interactions will vary cross-culturally. Specifically, people from the US and Turkey will be more likely than people from China to find intent in a provocateur’s actions in ambiguous situations and blame the provocateur in these adverse social encounters. Also, Americans and the Turkish will be more angered by the provocateur and react in more hostile terms compared to the Chinese.
Culture provides a context in which social learning, perception, and modeling of aggressive behavior occur. Therefore, in order to better explore the social cognitive bases of aggressive behavior, the current study focused on three distinct cultures, the US, Turkey, and China. Cross-cultural research classifies the US, as an individual- (Triandis, 1989; Fiske et. al., 1998 for a review), China as a group- (see Fiske et. al., 1998 for a review; Markus and Kitayama, 1991), and Turkey as an honor- (Sever and Yurdakul, 2001) oriented culture.

The above categorization is a result of the focus the US place on the individuals, individual autonomy (Fiske et. al., 1998, Triandis, 1989), and accountability (Vasquez et. al., 2001), China on group norms, family and community (Fiske et. al., 1998; Markus and Kitayama, 1991), and Turkey on honor (Sever and Yurdakul, 2001) in social interactions. The emphasis each culture places on a) individuals and individual responsibility; b) group and interdependence of individuals; and c) honor is assumed here to constitute the social cognitive bases of aggressive behavior. There is evidence that perceptions on the causes of the same violent events, such as a murder, are individual focused (e.g., bad temper) in the U.S. and group focused (e.g. isolation from the community) in China (Morris and Peng, 1994). Also, insults and threats in honor cultures result in a heightened angry and aggressive reaction towards the provocateur (Mosquera et.al, 2002; Faqir, 2001; Sever and Yurdakul, 2001; Cohen et. al., 1999; Nisbett and Cohen, 1996; Cohen et. al, 1996; Nisbett, 1993). As a result, the criminal law in Turkey permits reduced sentences in honor killings (Sever and Yurdakul, 2001). Therefore, it is predicted that the US and Turkey will perceive more hostile intent in the negative action of others and react more
aggressively in ambiguous settings compared to the Chinese. The reasons are different for the US and Turkey. Americans will be more likely to look at the personal characteristics of the provocateur, such as bad temper (i.e., Morris and Peng, 1994). The Turkish, on the other hand, will perceive the negative acts of others as a violation of honor code and react in hostile terms. The tendency for the Chinese to focus on situational factors should help them better evaluate the circumstances surrounding the negative acts of others compared to Americans and the Turkish, and, attribute less blame to the provocateur which in turn should result in less anger and aggression.

**H2: Perceptions of hostility and blameworthiness will predict indirect (e.g. “do something to get even”) and overt aggression (e.g. have it out with him/her right there”) in all cultures.**

Regardless of the cross-cultural differences in perception, it is expected that a universal psychological mechanism will be at work in linking social cognition to action. That is, perception of hostile intent and blameworthiness in ambiguous social interactions will predict aggression in line with evidence from previous research (e.g. Epstein and Taylor 1967, Betancourt and Blair, 1992; Wingrow and Bond, 1998). It is important to note that anger is likely to mediate the relationship between hostility attributions and aggression (Graham et. al., 1992; Betancourt and Blair, 1992; Weiner, 1985,1986). That is, perceived intent and blameworthiness would elicit anger, and anger would then function as a guide to aggressive behavior (Graham et. al., 1992). However, exploring the independent effects of attribution on aggression without the influence of anger may better
explain social learning bases of aggression. Therefore, Chapter 4 will test both the independent and mediated influence of hostility attributions on aggression to give a thorough analysis of the root causes of aggression.

Additional hypotheses are given as follows:

**H3. Women in general will show more indirect aggression towards a provocateur in ambiguous social interactions than males. Males, on the other hand, will show more overt aggression than females. Gender differences in indirect and overt aggression will follow a universal pattern.**

Gender differences in agonistic behavior have been studied extensively. Laboratory research, natural observations, and crime statistics show a male bias in overt aggression (Kruttschnitt, 1994; Maccoby and Jacklin, 1980). On the other hand, there is strong evidence that females exhibit more indirect aggression (i.e. “do something to get even”) through social rejection, “stigmatizing”, “gossiping” in response to an aggressive encounter compared to males (see a review in Osterman et. al., 1998).

**H4: When the provocateur belongs to an outgroup member, people in all cultures will be more likely to perceive hostile intent and blame the provocateur. They will also be more likely to get angry at the outgroup member and act in more hostile terms towards him/her.**
There is a tendency to attribute negative outgroup behavior to personal causes (see Hewstone, 1990 for a review). This bias is also associated with affect (Islam and Hewstone, 1993). This suggests arousal regulation in Step 3 of the Information Processing Model would be influenced by the target of aggression. Accordingly, it is expected that the expression of anger and aggression will be stronger towards a provocateur when she/he represents an outgroup member. In line with this reasoning, intent and blame attribution scores will show an outgroup bias in each culture.

In order to test the major hypotheses above, the study used an experimental procedure that is described in detail in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH DESIGN

Selection of Subjects

The current study employed a survey experiment method to test the major hypotheses. The U.S subjects were chosen among male and female American born (Caucasian origin) undergraduate students attending a large public university in the U.S (N= 125). They were selected among volunteering students and given two free tickets to a local movie theater as incentives. They represented the individual oriented culture. The group oriented culture was represented by male and female Chinese college students attending a large public university in PRC (N=158). They were paid $ 8 for their participation in the study. The honor oriented culture, on the other hand, was represented by male and female college students attending a large public university in Turkey (N=127). They were also paid $ 8 for their participation. The total sample consisted of 410 college students.

Representativeness of the Samples

It is essential to elaborate on the representativeness of the above samples. Most social psychological research has been conducted with North American and European subjects. There is now a large and still growing body of research conducted with East Asian cultures. There are robust research findings in this recent body of knowledge, of which
Chinese studies constitute a large portion, that the two cultural settings differ remarkably from each other in social cognition and perception (see Fiske et al., 1998 for a review). Culture of honor has also been studied extensively (Mosquera et al., 2002; Faqir, 2001; Nisbett and Cohen, 1996; Greenberg, 1996; Nisbett, 1993; Gilmore, 1987; Abu-Lughod, 1986; Wyatt-Brown, 1982; Bourdieu, 1966). Because of its geographical location, societal characteristics that place great emphasis on honor, heightened anger response to insults and threats described in previous pages and elsewhere (Sever and Yurdakul, 2001; Fiske et al, 1998), Turkey has often be referred to as an honor culture (see Sever and Yurdakul, 2001).

The study used a college population in the US, China, and Turkey. One may argue that in each country college students would differ from the less educated and older populations, making the current sample somewhat less representative of the cultural orientations I have been studying. Lower levels of education and older age would presumably mean less exposure to foreign influence and stronger attitudes towards observing traditional norms and values. I, however, would argue that college populations would render the study only a more conservative analysis of the cross-cultural differences should the effect of culture be significant in subsequent statistical tests.

_The Survey Questionnaire_

Subjects were given a questionnaire that consisted of 12 hypothetical scenarios. These scenarios were based on 12 story themes that described a negative personal interaction. The subjects were then asked whether the actor who caused the negative
outcome intended to do so or not. The subjects were also asked about their emotions and behavioral response to the negative interactions in the scenarios. The negative outcomes described events in a range of social situations that may happen to anyone in everyday life (e.g., being harassed in traffic or having a “date” fail to show up). There were also situations that are most relevant to a college student population (e.g., a forgotten letter of recommendation or a student cutting in the line of people waiting in a computer lab). The scenarios had three conditions of “intent” across 12 story themes. These were 4 ambiguous, 4 hostile, and 4 benign intent conditions for the total of 12 scenarios. For example, a negative personal interaction with an ambiguous intent read:

Steve was applying for graduate programs. He had asked for recommendation letters from three of his professors. He had given each a month advance notice before the admission deadline. He was now following up on his application documents. All but Professor Smith had sent their letters. Steve had a very tense relationship with Professor Smith. But, Professor Smith had a great reputation. And, Steve’s grade in Professor Smith’s class was not too bad. When Steve was discussing the forgotten letter with another classmate he found out that Professor Smith had already written a recommendation letter for his classmate about two weeks ago.

In the hostile scenarios, the intent of the provocateur was manipulated to be agonistic. An example is presented below.
Jim had a volleyball game Thursday night. The last game had been a tie almost until the end. But, Jim was an excellent server, which won his team the last set. On Thursday night, he could sense that everybody was eager to get started. They were all playing pretty fast and Jim was just superb. Before he knew it the score was 2-2, a tie again before the last set. In the final set, Richard, the member of the opposite team hit Jim’s arm constantly in a series of fault defenses while blocking Jim’s spikes at the net. In one instance, Richard pushed Jim so hard that Jim hit his head to the metal pole. With agonizing pain, Jim turned to Richard to say he should take it easy. Richard responded: “You’re just a cry baby. Play like a real man.”

The negative outcome caused by the provocateur was accidental in the benign scenarios. For example, a benign scenario read:

Ann-Marie had finally managed to buy a computer. Her roommate, Cathy, was happy too. Ann-Marie had already told her that she would be welcome to use it. One day, Ann-Marie was in class and Cathy wanted to use the computer. She surfed the Internet and checked her e-mail. She noticed that Ann-Marie was using an old version of the e-mail software, so she downloaded the new version from the Internet. When Ann-Marie got home she sat down by the computer, checked her e-mail only to find out that her incoming and outgoing mailboxes were empty. She rushed upstairs to Cathy to ask what might have happened. Cathy said: “Oh I’m so sorry. I must have done something wrong when I downloaded a new version of the software. I’ll come down and help you recover your files.”
Dependent Variables

Partially adapted from Graham et. al., (1992), subjects made 7 judgments for each scenario, all reported on a 5-point rating scale. The first question assessed the intent attributions. Participants were reminded of the negative outcome again and then asked whether the hypothetical provocateur meant to cause the negative outcome. Following the first example of the scenarios with ambiguous intent, the first question read:

Now, think of the forgotten letter again.

1. Do you think Professor Smith meant to do that to Steve?

1 2 3 4 5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

The next set of questions dealt with subjects’ emotional reactions to the negative outcome. The focus was on the emotions “theoretically linked to perceived responsibility in others” (Graham et. al., 1992; see also Weiner, 1985, 1986). Thus, questions two and three asked:

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward Professor Smith?

1 2 3 4 5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

3. Would you blame Professor Smith for what happened to you?

1 2 3 4 5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no
After these three questions, subjects were then presented four behavioral choices as follows:

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all
   1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely would would do this
   would not do this

5. Tell it to the Department Chair
   1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely would would do this
   would not do this

6. Do something to get even
   1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely would would do this
   would not do this

7. Have it out with Professor Smith right then and there
   1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely would would do this
   would not do this

The behaviors in questions 4 through 7 were categorized as neutral (Q.4); appealing to authority (Q.5); indirectly aggressive (Q.6); and overtly aggressive (Q.7). Questions four and five were omitted from the analyses since the focus of this study is on perceptions of intent, blameworthiness, anger emotions, and aggressive behavior.
Validity of the Questionnaire

It has been shown that hostile interpretation questionnaires are a valid and reliable source of measuring aggression in violent offenders (Simourd and Mamuza, 2000), anger (Felsten and Hill, 1999), and aggression (Buss and Perry, 1992; Crick and Dodge, 1994) in normal populations.

Independent Variables

The independent variables were culture, gender, and ingroup vs. outgroup targets of hostility.

Procedure

Subjects were recruited through the flyers distributed in introductory Sociology and Psychology classes in each country. The contacts were made through the instructors of Sociology and Psychology classes who sought volunteers to participate and made announcements in their classes. The Chinese contacts were initiated through the Mershon Center for International Security at Ohio State. Once the contact has been established, I made arrangements to personally supervise the conduct of the Chinese portion of the study in Beijing, China. The experiments in China were run by the graduate research assistants who constantly interacted with me while I was in China. In Turkey, I ran the experiments myself after the course instructors sought out the volunteers.
Subjects were administered the questionnaire in groups consisting of 5-7 people in the US, 10 to 50 people in Turkey and China. The order of presentation of the questions was constant. Graham et al, (1992) caution that this may lead subjects to confirm the proposed model. However, Schmidt and Weiner (1988) found the order of asking questions did not influence subjects’ judgments.

Subjects were randomly allocated to two experimental conditions; 1) ingroup target of hostility and 2) outgroup target of hostility. Subjects who were in the ingroup target of hostility condition read stories that depicted a Caucasian engaging in negative behavior towards a Caucasian in the US, a Turkish towards a Turkish in Turkey, and a Chinese towards a Chinese in China. Subjects who were in the outgroup target of hostility read scenarios that depicted an outgroup member engaging in negative behavior towards a Caucasian in the US, a Turkish in Turkey, and a Chinese in China. Outgroup condition was achieved by a name manipulation. In this condition, hypothetical scenarios presented the person engaged in the negative behavior as an outgroup member (i.e., an African American name for the U.S; Armenian for the Turkish; Japanese for the Chinese sample). There were two outgroup member scenarios per intent; i.e, half of the four benign, four hostile, and four ambiguous scenarios contained an outgroup member as the target of hostility.

Each subject made 84 judgments with 7 dependent variables. The entire procedure took about 20 minutes. Brief demographic information regarding ethnicity, gender, age, and mother tongue were also included as a first page of the questionnaire. After the completion of the questionnaire, each subject was debriefed about the purpose of the
study. The Institutional Review Board at Ohio State approved of this experiment through the Protocol Number 00B0110.

The scenarios were first developed for the US sample. Twenty faculty members at Ohio State served as judges for the planned hostile, benign, and ambiguous condition of the scenarios. The judges first evaluated a total of twenty-one scenarios. Six scenarios were eliminated in this process because of the disagreement on the scaled responses over the intent of the negative interaction. The remaining twelve, that constitute the current study, were selected as a result of perfect agreement on the scaled responses among judges regarding the intent of the provocateur. The scenarios were then adapted to the appropriate Turkish and Chinese populations to ensure that each one of them captures what it purports to measure along with different cultural meanings. The adaptation was achieved as follows:

Once the US scenarios were developed, a Chinese graduate student at Ohio State translated the stories into Chinese. The stories were then edited by two Ohio State Chinese graduate students other than the translator. After the editing/adaptation, two separate pretests were conducted in the US with Chinese native speakers. The first pretest was run with five first year graduate students (other than the editor and translator) who had just arrived in the US, hence were more likely to represent the actual study sample in China. After the first pretest, comments and suggestions for further adaptation were collected and revised stories were prepared for the second pretest. The same procedure was replicated for the second pretest with another five first year Chinese graduate
students at Ohio State. The pretests clearly established that the stories were adaptable to the Chinese population as there was no disagreement over the stories/response items. The next step involved the translation of the scenarios into Turkish. Although Turkish is my mother tongue, I had the stories translated by another native Turkish speaker, a graduate student in the US to avoid any bias. The scenarios were then edited by two judges in Turkey who reached perfect agreement on the applicability of the stories to the Turkish sample. As for the specifics of the adaptation, the below examples illustrate the procedure:

Two of the scenarios involved several food items. The original items in the US version of the questionnaire were changed to represent the ethnic food in China and Turkey. Another example involved switching genders in an ambiguous scenario for the Turkish sample. The US version spoke about a woman attending a play alone. In Turkey it is highly unusual for a woman to attend a play alone, especially at night. Accordingly, the actor became a man in the Turkish version. To control for any confounding factors due to the gender of the target who engaged in aversive behavior, the target was also switched to a male, which was originally a female in the US sample.

All questionnaires were administered in their original language. The US version of the scenarios with the two conditions (i.e. ingroup vs. outgroup) are given in Appendix.

The following chapters present the results of the survey experiment. Specifically, Chapter III will provide the results on perceptions of intent, blameworthiness, anger emotions, and aggressive reaction towards a hypothetical provocateur across cultures,
genders, and in vs. outgroup targets of hostility through an ANOVA procedure. Chapter IV will present the regression results for the predictive power of perceived intent and blameworthiness on anger and aggression across the three cultures. In this chapter, the results pertaining to the mediating influence of anger as a guide to aggressive behavior will also be tested as part of the cognition-emotion-action model.
CHAPTER 3

PERCEIVED INTENT, BLAMEWORTHINESS, ANGER, INDIRECT, AND OVERT AGGRESSION ACROSS CULTURES, GENDERS, IN VS. OUT-GROUP TARGETS OF HOSTILITY

ANOVA RESULTS

The emphasis the US place on individuals and autonomy, Turkey on honor code, and China on group norms predicts that social perception would differ cross-culturally. To the extent which social perception is linked to emotion and behavior, angry and aggressive reactions to provocation should also show different patterns across cultures. Moreover, previously reported ingroup favoritism, a male bias in overt aggression, and a female bias in indirect aggression would predict different patterns of social perception, emotion, and agonistic reaction to provocation across genders and in vs. outgroup targets of hostility.

Accordingly, a 3x2x2[3x2] (Culture X Group X Gender X [Type of the Scenario X Condition of the Scenario] analysis of variance procedure with repeated measures on the last two factors was performed to analyze the intent, blame, anger, and aggression measures across cultures, genders, and outgroup vs. ingroup targets of hostility. Preliminary analysis showed no outgroup effects. Accordingly, the two factors, group and
condition of the scenarios, were eliminated. ANOVA summary tables for the main and interaction effects for each dependent variable were given through Tables 1 & 5. The focus of this study is on the ambiguous scenarios, where the provocateur’s intentions were ambivalent (i.e., the hostile attribution bias literature). Accordingly, the overall discussion chapter will be based on the pooled sample results with ambiguous scenarios. The findings pertaining to the hostile and benign scenarios will be reported here for reference purposes.
### Table 1 Summary of ANOVA Results: Intent, The US, Turkey, and China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Between and Within Subjects Effects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.7818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.0342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group*Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.5690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group*Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.3507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1784.35</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.3831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.6641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.8803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.6104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.0873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.4037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Type)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.8118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.0419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.0654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.4977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Condition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81.68</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.8659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.79</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.5603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group*Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.5996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.9402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.7654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Type*Condition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Dependent Variable: Blame**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Between and Within Subjects Effects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.4751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82.75</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group*Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.6201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group*Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.6414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.5582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.3903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>718.77</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.0471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.0469 *one-tailed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.6142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.9441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.5047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.8251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Type)</td>
<td></td>
<td>796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.5491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.0810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.8236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.6589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Condition)</td>
<td></td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Condit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151.39</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.6657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.3950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group*Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.3127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.8366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.5834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group<em>Culture</em>Gend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.9155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table.2 Summary of ANOVA Results: Blame, The US, Turkey, and China**
Dependent Variable: Anger

Source                  df  F     p
(Between and Within Subjects Effects)
Group                   1  0.47   0.4925
Culture                 2  32.90 <0.0001
Gender                  1  3.32   0.0693
Group*Culture           2  1.08   0.3407
Group*Gender            1  0.11   0.7440
Culture*Gender          2  1.12   0.3280
Group*Culture*Gender    2  0.48   0.6207
Error                   398
Type                    2 1021.76 <0.0001
Type*Group              2  2.75   0.0677
Type*Culture            4  20.23 <0.0001
Type*Gender             2  3.32   0.0393 *one-tailed
Type*Group*Culture      4  0.64   0.6255
Type*Group*Gender       2  0.07   0.9209
Type*Culture*Gender     4  0.50   0.7259
Type*Group*Culture*Gender 4  1.26  0.2851
Error (Type)            796
Condition               1  49.65 <0.0001
Condition*Group         1  0.62   0.4313
Condition*Culture       2  8.50   0.0002
Condition*Gender        1  0.02   0.8829
Condition*Group*Culture 2  0.91   0.4053
Condition*Group*Gender  1  0.77   0.3819
Condition*Culture*Gender 2  5.11  0.0064
Condition*Group*Culture*Gender 2  0.41  0.6625
Error (Condition)       398
Type*Condit             2 152.16 <0.0001
Type*Condition*Group    2  0.07   0.9320
Type*Condition*Culture  4  8.74 <0.0001
Type*Condition*Gender   2  2.23   0.1103
Type*Condition*Group*Culture 4  0.22  0.9237
Type*Condition*Group*Gender 2  0.45  0.6307
Type*Condition*Culture*Gender 4  1.85  0.1207
Type*Condition*Group*Culture*Gender 4  0.46  0.7598
Error (Type*Condition)  796

Table 3 Summary of ANOVA Results: Anger, The US, Turkey, and China
## Dependent Variable: Indirect Aggression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>(F)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.8400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.39</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group* Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.8373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group*Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>0.0208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.5146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error</strong></td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>354.52</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.8848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.56</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.5240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.0516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.1702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error (Type)</strong></td>
<td>796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.5806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.7246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.0743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.2487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.2487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.6216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error (Condition)</strong></td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.76</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.9574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.0407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group*Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.0510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.6961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.0502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.6510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error (Type*Condition)</strong></td>
<td>796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Summary of ANOVA Results: Indirect Aggression, The US, Turkey, and China
### Dependent Variable: Overt Aggression

**(Between and Within Subjects Effects)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.4819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group* Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.5204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group*Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.4318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.2674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.7883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Error**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>226.16</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.0601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.9759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.1533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.8863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Group</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.9613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Error (Type)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.0329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.2064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.36</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition*Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.4703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.6280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.5151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.0201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition<em>Group</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.7214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Error (Condition)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type*Condit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56.29</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.9842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.6431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group*Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.2838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group*Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.6758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Culture*Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.9233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type<em>Condition</em>Group<em>Culture</em>Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.6717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5 Summary of ANOVA Results: Overt Aggression, The US, Turkey, and China**
Manipulation Check

The scaled responses over the intent of the provocateur in the story themes were used as a basis for the manipulation check. The analysis of variance results show that each scenario, hostile, benign, and ambiguous, significantly differed from each other in all cultures in terms of mean scores for the dependent variable intent ($P<0.0001$, see Table.1 below for the detailed results). Hostile scenarios were rated as the most hostile, benign as the least, and ambiguous in between in all cultures. It is therefore concluded that the scenarios created the planned effect across cultures.
Main Effect: Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benign</th>
<th>Ambiguous</th>
<th>Hostile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US (N=125)</td>
<td>1.72 a</td>
<td>3.01 b</td>
<td>4.16 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F[2,372]</td>
<td>186.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt;0.00001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey (N=127)</td>
<td>1.74 a</td>
<td>3.15 b</td>
<td>3.96 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F[2,381]</td>
<td>102.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt;0.00001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (N=158)</td>
<td>1.88 a</td>
<td>2.54 b</td>
<td>3.85 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F[2,471]</td>
<td>181.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt;0.00001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means that do not share a common letter for each country are significantly different from each other (The least square means for the effect "type" with Tukey-Kramer adjustment, p<0.05)

Table 6 Mean Ratings on Intent: The US, Turkey and China

Main Effects:

Culture

The main effect of culture was significant for all independent variables. As shown in Figure.2 and Table.2, compared to the Chinese, both the US and Turkish respondents were more inclined to find intent in other’s actions that created a negative outcome ($F[2, 407]=15.32; P<0.0001$). The US and the Turkish were also more inclined than the
Chinese to blame the provocateur for the negative outcome ($F[2, 407]=86.61; P<0.0001$).

The US and the Turkish reported being more angered by the negative interaction than the Chinese ($F[2, 407]=34.41; P<0.0001$). On the other hand, the Turkish respondents alone were more likely to endorse an aggressive retaliation compared to the US and Chinese respondents in both indirect aggression (i.e., do something to get even, $F[2, 407]=24.84; P<0.0001$) and direct aggression (i.e., have it out with him/her right there and then, $F[2, 407]=16.74; P<0.0001$).
The US and Turkish respondents were more likely than the Chinese to perceive hostile intent in a provocateur’s actions and blame the provocateur for the negative outcome in ambiguous social situations ($p<0.0001$). The US and Turkish were also more angered than the Chinese of the negative outcome ($p<0.0001$). The Turkish alone endorsed more indirect (i.e., “do something to get even”) and overt aggression (i.e., “have it out with him/her right there”) than the US and Chinese ($p<0.0001$). There were no differences in indirectly and overtly aggressive responses between the US and Chinese respondents ($p<0.05$).
### Table 7: Mean Ratings on Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger, and Aggression: The US, Turkey, and China: Main Effect Culture, Ambiguous Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>US (N=125)</th>
<th>Turkey (N=127)</th>
<th>China (N=158)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.01&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.15&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.54&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blame</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.47&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.60&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.60&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anger</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.60&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.74&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.95&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Aggression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.67&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.36&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.79&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overt Aggression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.89&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.51&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.93&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means that do not share a common letter for each dependent variable are significantly different from each other (The least square means for the main effect "culture" with Tukey-Kramer adjustment, p<0.05).

Summary of the Results: Ambiguous Scenarios: It was previously predicted that people from the US and Turkey would be more likely than people from China to find intent in a provocateur’s actions in ambiguous social situations and blame the provocateur in these adverse social encounters. The results supported the predictions. Previous hypotheses also indicated that the American and the Turkish will be more angered by the provocateur and react in more hostile terms compared to the Chinese. The
results partially supported this prediction. Although both the US and Turkish respondents showed more anger towards the provocateur, the Turkish alone were more likely than the Americans and Chinese to react aggressively as a result of the provocation. Apparently, the Turkish honor code was sufficient enough to elicit an angry and aggressive reaction, but the US tendency to focus on individual action, responsibility, and moral accountability (Vasquez et.al., 2001; Miller and Bersoff, 1992) was only sufficient in eliciting anger, not aggression. Behavioral evidence indicates that the association between anger and moral violation is stronger for Americans compared to the people from group-oriented cultures, i.e., Filipinos (Vasquez, et. al., 2001). However, it is curious as to why heightened anger did not result in as much aggressive reaction in the US as in Turkey. Perhaps, Americans employ greater control mechanisms over their emotions, or, this finding is just an artifact of social desirability. The answers on the aggression measures were worded positively. That is, the participants were first reminded of the negative action and outcome. They were then asked whether they would do something to get even, or, have it out with the provocateur right there. The answers started and were worded as “definitely would do this” then went on to reflect the decrease in aggressive reaction on a five-point scale. Had the answers been started and worded as “definitely NOT do this” by reversing the five point scale response items, the aggression scores of Americans might have been higher. In fact, it has been shown that the reversal of item scales results in significant changes in the main effect of the independent variable in question (Bae and Brekke, 2003). It is unlikely that the lower aggression scores in the Chinese sample are due to this response bias. Several studies, including natural observations have consistently found Chinese to be less aggressive than North Americans.
Moreover, the tendency for the Chinese to favor situational explanations for negative events (Morris and Peng, 1994) would predict a less aggressive reaction, because perceived blameworthiness of the provocateur would presumably be reduced. This in fact corroborated with the current results. The Chinese attributed much less blame to the provocateur in adverse social situations compared to Americans and the Turkish.

*Hostile and Benign Scenarios:*

The following figures and tables (Figure.3&4, Table.3&4) report the cross-cultural differences in perceived intent, blameworthiness, anger, indirect, and overt aggression for the hostile and benign scenarios, respectively.
Figure 3 Main Effect of Culture on Perceived Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger, Indirect, and Overt Aggression: Hostile Scenarios

The US respondents were more likely than their Turkish and Chinese counterparts to perceive intent in a provocateur’s actions in hostile social situations ($p<0.0001$; the mean scores and standard deviations are given in Table.3). The US and Turkish participants blamed the provocateur for the negative outcome in hostile social situations more than the Chinese did ($p<0.0001$). They were also more angered than the Chinese because of the negative outcome. The Turkish alone were more likely to endorse an indirect aggressive response compared to the US and Chinese respondents ($p<0.0001$). There were no significant differences between the mean scores in the US and China ($p<0.05$). For the overt aggression, however, the Turkish and Chinese were more likely than the US respondents to endorse a hostile reaction. There were no differences in the mean scores for this dependent variable between the Turkish and Chinese participants ($p<0.05$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Main Effect: Culture</th>
<th>Hostile Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US (N=125)</td>
<td>Turkey (N=127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>4.16 $a$</td>
<td>3.96 $b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>4.30 $a$</td>
<td>4.38 $a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>4.49 $a$</td>
<td>4.46 $a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>2.41 $a$</td>
<td>3.01 $b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>2.53 $a$</td>
<td>3.08 $b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means that do not share a common letter for each dependent variable are significantly different from each other (The least square means for the main effect "culture" with Tukey-Kramer adjustment, $p<0.05$)

Table 8 Mean Ratings on Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger, and Aggression: The US, China, and Turkey: Main Effect Culture: Hostile Scenarios
Figure 4 Main Effect of Culture on Perceived Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger, Indirect, and Overt Aggression: Benign Scenarios

All three cultures showed the same pattern of response regarding the intent of the provocateur in benign social situations ($p<0.0001$). There were no differences in the mean scores (the means and standard deviations are given in Table 4). The mean scores regarding the blameworthiness of the provocateur, on the other hand, differed significantly across the three cultures. The US respondents were most likely to blame the provocateur, the Chinese the least, and the Turkish in between. The US alone were more likely than the Turkish and Chinese to be angered by the provocateur's actions in benign social situations ($p<0.0001$). The Turkish and Chinese were more likely to endorse both an indirect and direct aggressive response compared to the US respondents ($p<0.0001$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>US (N=125)</th>
<th>Turkey (N=127)</th>
<th>China (N=158)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.72 (a)</td>
<td>1.74 (a)</td>
<td>1.88 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blame</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.08 (a)</td>
<td>2.74 (b)</td>
<td>2.38 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anger</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.08 (a)</td>
<td>2.67 (b)</td>
<td>2.55 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Aggression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.29 (a)</td>
<td>1.68 (b)</td>
<td>1.88 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overt Aggression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.60 (a)</td>
<td>1.94 (b)</td>
<td>2.19 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means that do not share a common letter for each dependent variable are significantly different from each other (The least square means for the main effect "culture" with Tukey-Kramer adjustment, \(p<0.05\)).

Table 9 Mean Ratings on Intent, Blameworthiness, Anger, and Aggression: The US, Turkey and China, Main Effect Culture, Benign Scenarios

Summary of the Results:

*Hostile Scenarios:* Unlike the ambiguous scenario condition, Americans alone were more likely to perceive intent in negative actions of others compared to the Turkish and Chinese respondents. The agonistic act in the hostile scenarios was not justified and represented an unfair attitude towards the actor. The greater scores of Americans on
perceived intent may again be related to the greater emphasis the US society places on individuals. This emphasis should also predict greater blameworthiness (of) and anger towards the provocateur. This is in fact what happened. Americans along with the Turkish respondents blamed the provocateur in hostile situations more than the Chinese did. Americans and the Turkish were also more angered than the Chinese. The Turkish alone were more likely to endorse an indirectly aggressive response. For the overt aggression, however, the Turkish and Chinese were more likely than the US to endorse an overtly aggressive reaction. There were no differences in aggression scores between the Turkish and Chinese. Obviously, the less aggressive reaction in ambiguous situations for the Chinese was contingent upon the degree of hostility. The Chinese appeared to tolerate ambiguous adverse social interactions, but reacted aggressively to the hostile ones. The lower scores of Americans for indirect and overt aggression might again be due to the item response bias elaborated in previous paragraphs.

Benign Scenarios: There were no significant cross-cultural differences regarding the perceived intent of the provocateur in benign situations. However, blameworthiness scores differed significantly among the three cultures. Consistent with the previous US emphasis on individual responsibility, the US respondents were more likely to blame the provocateur and were more angered by his/her actions compared to the Turkish and Chinese. The Turkish had higher scores on blameworthiness than the Chinese. There were no differences between the anger scores of the Turkish and those of the Chinese. The Turkish and Chinese were more likely to endorse both an indirect and overt action. The consistently lower aggression scores of the Americans despite their higher hostile
attribution scores were observed in the benign social situations as well. I again suggest that the Americans may be more sensitive than the Turkish and Chinese to the scaled items in questionnaires and the lower aggression scores of Americans may be partly explained by a response bias.

**Gender**

**Indirect Aggression**

Perceptions of intent, blameworthiness, responsibility, and anger did not differ significantly between genders for ambiguous scenarios. However, indirect aggression did (Figure 5). This effect was independent of culture. Males in all cultures were more likely to do something to get even in the ambiguous scenario condition compared to females ($F[2, 407]=6.79; P=0.0095$). It was previously predicted that females would show more indirect aggression (i.e., “do something to get even”) in adverse social situations. This prediction was based on strong evidence showing a female bias in indirect aggression (see Osterman, 1988 for a review). The results are contrary to the predictions. The limitations of this study may help explain the contradictory findings.

First, the participants read hypothetical scenarios that were not necessarily related to their own life experiences. Thus, they were unlikely to be provoked enough in order for the expected response to occur. Studies show that unprovoked men are more aggressive than women, however, the gender differences either decrease or show a female bias under provocation (Bettencourt and Miller, 1996; Anderson, 1993; Frodi et al, 1997; Mancini and Wells, 1971; Tylor and Epstein, 1967). Among the studies that showed a female bias in indirect aggression, either peer ratings (e.g. Osterman et. al.,
1998) or, observational methods (Feschbach, 1969) were among the methods used to assess aggressive behavior in agonistic encounters which inherently assumes provocation.

Second, the indirect aggression response item might not have been able to measure what it purported to measure. “Getting even” has been conceptualized as a measure of an indirectly hostile response in agonistic encounters in the US (see, Graham, et. al., 1992). To my knowledge, however, there are no cross-cultural studies indicating that “doing something to get even” can be clearly understood as an indirectly aggressive response in cultures other than the US. In fact, cross-cultural studies in particular and research in the US and West Europe in general usually define indirect aggression as “gossiping, ostracizing, social rejection, “social manipulation”, “attacking a target person circuitously, thereby avoiding a counter attack” (Campbell, 1999; Bjorkqvist et. al., 1994; Osterman, 1988). Although these social interactions do indicate a malicious intent of getting even with a provocateur, I cannot confidently state that in each culture the response item “doing something to get even” actually tapped into the usual treatment of indirect aggression. Taken together, although the indicators of indirect and overt aggression may constitute two different theoretical constructs, the indicator for indirect aggression does not seem to establish a clear continuity with previous research and does not measure what it purports to measure. Therefore, the subsequent analyses in Chapter 4 will be based on overt aggression only.
The main effect of gender on indirect aggression (i.e., “do something to get even”) was significant ($p<0.05$). This effect was independent of culture. In other words, compared to females, males in all cultures endorsed a significantly higher proportion of indirectly aggressive response towards a hypothetical provocateur in ambiguous social situations.

Figure 5: Main Effect of Gender on Indirect Aggression: Ambiguous Scenarios

Figure 6 & 7 in the following pages depict gender differences in indirect aggression in the hostile and benign conditions.
The main effect of gender on indirect aggression was significant for hostile scenarios where the social interaction was agonistic ($p<0.05$). This effect was independent of culture. Compared to females, men in all cultures endorsed a significantly higher proportion of indirectly aggressive response towards a hypothetical provocateur in agonistic encounters.
The main effect of gender on indirect aggression was not significant for benign scenarios where the negative outcome as a result of provocateur’s actions was of accidental nature.

Figure 7: Main Effect of Gender on Indirect Aggression: Benign Scenarios

The main effect of gender on indirect aggression was not significant for benign scenarios where the negative outcome as a result of provocateur’s actions was of accidental nature.
Overt Aggression

The main effect of gender on overt aggression was not significant for ambiguous scenarios. Although the focus of the study is on the ambiguous social interactions, it is important to note that for the gender effect to occur, the scenarios had to have a clear hostile component in them (Figure.8). That is, when the provocateur’s intentions were hostile in adverse social encounters, males endorsed more overt aggression (i.e., “have it out with him/her right there”) compared to females (p<0.05). No cross-cultural differences were observed for the main effect of gender on overtly aggressive responses.
The main effect of gender on overt aggression was not significant for ambiguous scenarios. In order for the gender effect to occur, the scenarios had to have a clear hostile component in them. That is, when the provocateur’s intentions were hostile in adverse social encounters, males endorsed more overt aggression (i.e., “have it out with him/her right there”) compared to females (p<0.05). No cross-cultural differences were observed for the main effect of gender on overtly aggressive responses.

The next graph reports on the overt aggression where the provocateur’s intentions were benign.

Figure 8: Main Effect of Gender on Overt Aggression: Ambiguous and Hostile Scenarios
The main effect of gender on overt aggression was not significant for benign scenarios where the negative outcome as a result of provocateur’s actions was of accidental nature.
Overall Summary: The current analyses investigated the differences in perception, self-reported anger and indirect and overt aggression across cultures, genders, and in- vs. outgroup targets of hostility in adverse social situations. These adverse social interactions, as depicted in the hypothetical scenarios, focused on negative outcomes where the intent of the provocateur was ambiguous. The results indicate that the US and Turkish respondents were more likely than their Chinese counterparts to perceive aggressive intent and blame the provocateur. Also, they reported being more angered by the negative interaction than the Chinese. The Turkish alone were more likely to manifest indirect ("do something to get even") and overt ("have it out with him/her right then and there!") aggression. Males were more likely than females to endorse an indirectly aggressive response as a result of the adverse interaction. No outgroup effect was found. The lack of findings for the outgroup effect might be due to the specific design of the study. Previous research implicated an outgroup bias in evaluating the negative acts of others (see Hewstone, 1990 for a review). This suggested a more angry and aggressive reaction towards an outgroup member in adverse social encounters. Perhaps because the outgroup members in the ambiguous scenarios were not portrayed as passive victims, but rather provocateurs, this effect was not observed. In fact, there is suggestive evidence showing that when the victim of aggression is an outgroup member or in lower status, the behavioral inhibition to aggress is reduced (Carlson, et. al., 1990).

Moreover, no significant interactions were found between culture and gender in any of the dependent variables ($F[2, 398]=2.01; P=0.1348$ for intent; $F[2, 398]=0.58; P=0.5582$ for blame; $F[2, 398]=1.12; P=0.3280$ for anger; $F[2, 398]=0.67; P=0.5146$ for
indirect aggression; $F[2, 398]=1.32$; $P=0.2674$ for overt aggression). That is, when there was a male bias in indirect aggression for ambiguous and overt aggression for hostile social interactions, these effects were independent of culture.
Biased perceptions of hostility and blameworthiness appear to be a key element in the development and persistence of aggressive behavior (de Castro et. al., 2002; Dodge et. al., 1994; Dodge, 1990). Attributions of blame correlate with trait hostility (Wingrow and Bond, 1998). Also, biased attributions in childhood predict later aggression (Zelli et. al., 1997; Dodge et. al., 1990). The previous analyses have entirely focused on the differences in attributions, emotion, and aggression across cultures and genders. The results indicated that the Chinese, Turkish, and Americans differed significantly in the degree to which they perceived intent and blameworthiness in the negative actions of others, felt angry as a result of the action, and reacted aggressively. The predictive power of perceived intent and blameworthiness on anger and aggression, however, was not explored in these analyses. The main research questions of this chapter are then as follows:

a) Do intent and blame predict anger and aggression in all cultures? Despite the cross-cultural differences in the degree to which attributions, anger, and aggression were manifested, there should be a universal pattern in aggressive behavior. That is, cognition
should be related to anger and aggression in all cultures. However, the importance each culture places on intention and responsibility might be different. Thus,

b) Is intent or blame more central to anger and aggression in the US, Turkey, and China?

c) If the results do not show an independent effect of intent or blame on aggression in any culture, is this because intent or blame affects aggression through the mediating influence of anger?

Accordingly, a regression procedure was used to first test whether the predictive power of perception of intent and blameworthiness on anger and aggression differed among the US, Turkish, and Chinese respondents in ambiguous social interactions. The results were further tested through the cognition (perception) - emotion (anger) – action (aggression) model to incorporate the mediating influence of anger on perceptions, which in turn are expected to affect the behavioral outcome.

Regression Results

*Predictive Power of Perceived Intent and Blameworthiness*

The subsections below will be presented as follows: First, the influence of intent and blameworthiness on overt aggression will be investigated in keeping with the
literature on hostile attributions and aggression. The predictive power of intent and blameworthiness on anger will also be examined along with this subsection to provide the ground for a mediational model.

**Overt Aggression**

**The US:**

In the US, while perceptions of intent and blameworthiness predicted overt aggression ($Beta=0.24, P=0.0100; Beta=0.27, P=0.0039$, respectively, age and gender controlled, blame was the best predictor), only blameworthiness influenced anger ($Beta=0.80, P<0.0001$). Table.10&11 below provide the regression results and correlations. A closer look at the correlation coefficients (Table.11), however, quickly reveals that the interpretation of the above statistical results requires caution. Perceived intent and blameworthiness are significantly correlated ($r=0.38, p<0.0001$). Significant correlations between independent variables would affect regression coefficients and the corresponding probability values making the interpretations of the independent effects difficult. In the current analysis, results show that intent has no influence on anger when it is included as a regressor together with blame. Previous research (e.g, Epstein and Taylor, 1967; Epps and Kendall, 1995) and theoretical conceptualization indicate that perceived intent should result in anger. In fact, if blame is omitted from the regression equation, perceived intent predicts anger ($Beta=0.35; P<0.0001$; age and gender controlled). Elimination of blameworthiness from the regression equation is not an appropriate solution, however, to tease out the effect of perceived intent on anger. This is
due to the fact that the correlation between perceived intent and blame is moderate, the
two variables are conceptually distinct, and they both have theoretical importance.
Therefore, it should be concluded that intent is likely to influence anger together with
blame, although the current study indicators were not able to show the independent
effects of intent both on anger and aggression because of significant correlations. The
presence of significant correlations among key variables becomes even a more serious
issue in exploring the attribution-anger-aggression sequence. Specifically, Table.11
shows a very high correlation between anger and blame ($r=0.79$, $p<0.0001$). Although
anger and blame are two very distinct theoretical constructs in this study, a correlation
coefficient of 0.79 indicates that the two variables are in essence a unified index of “cold
cognitions”\(^1\). Although blame and anger may help illuminate the changes in aggression
scores in an experimental setting that used hypothetical scenarios, they cannot be used to
explore the mediating influence of anger in blame attributions and aggression. This issue
will further be elaborated in the following section, namely, Cognition – Emotion – Action:
A Mediational Model.

\(^1\) i.e., judgments about blame and anger were performed in the absence of an emotional state and actual experience
### Overt Aggression: The US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.7865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.8624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.18\ (N=124, \ p<0.0001)$

### Anger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.2466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.6420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.4336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.63\ (N=124, \ p<0.0001)$

Table.10 Regression Analysis Summary for Perceived Intent, Blameworthiness, Gender, Age and Overt Aggression: the US

(N = 124, Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>intent</th>
<th>blame</th>
<th>aggress</th>
<th>anger</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intent</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.37817</td>
<td>0.34111</td>
<td>0.35554</td>
<td>0.08368</td>
<td>0.08847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.3535</td>
<td>0.3265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blame</td>
<td>0.37817</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.36053</td>
<td>0.78760</td>
<td>0.23353</td>
<td>-0.07385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
<td>0.4131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggress</td>
<td>0.34111</td>
<td>0.36053</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.41068</td>
<td>0.09136</td>
<td>0.02022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.3109</td>
<td>0.8229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anger</td>
<td>0.35554</td>
<td>0.78760</td>
<td>0.41068</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.14652</td>
<td>-0.06466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.1030</td>
<td>0.4738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.08368</td>
<td>0.23353</td>
<td>0.09136</td>
<td>0.14652</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-0.28315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3535</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
<td>0.3109</td>
<td>0.1030</td>
<td>-0.28315</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>0.08847</td>
<td>-0.07385</td>
<td>0.02022</td>
<td>-0.06466</td>
<td>-0.28315</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3265</td>
<td>0.4131</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.4738</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table.11 Pearson Correlation Coefficients: The US
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Turkey:

In Turkey, the same pattern as that of the US was observed. Perceptions of intent and blameworthiness predicted overt aggression ($\beta=0.24, P=0.0109$; $\beta=0.36$, $P=0.0001$, respectively, age and gender controlled, blame was the best predictor), and blameworthiness predicted anger ($\beta=0.84$, $P<0.0001$) while correlations between independent variables were significant. The regression results and correlations are given in Table.12&13 below. Specifically, perceived intent and blameworthiness were significantly correlated, ($r=0.54$, $p<0.0001$). If blame was omitted from the regression equation, perceived intent predicted anger ($\beta=0.47$; $P<0.0001$; age and gender controlled). Therefore, intent is likely to influence anger together with blame in the Turkish sample as well. The significant correlation between blame and anger was also evident in this sample ($r=0.85$, $p<0.0001$). Apparently, anger and aggression have similar root causes in the US and Turkey. Also, there was virtually no difference between the indicators of anger and blameworthiness; i.e., the two indicators measured essentially the same construct, “cold cognitions” in hypothetical conflict situations.
### Overt Aggression: Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.8807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.5986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.29$ ($N=127$, $p<0.0001$)

### Anger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.6390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>$&lt;0.0001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.0085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.6932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.74$ ($N=127$, $p<0.0001$)

Table 12: Regression Analysis Summary for Perceived Intent, Blameworthiness, Gender, Age and Overt Aggression: Turkey

(N = 127, Prob $>|r|$ under H0: Rho=0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>intent</th>
<th>blame</th>
<th>aggress</th>
<th>anger</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intent</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.54370</td>
<td>0.43658</td>
<td>0.48212</td>
<td>0.10277</td>
<td>-0.01069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.2502</td>
<td>0.9051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blame</td>
<td>0.54370</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.49963</td>
<td>0.85320</td>
<td>0.21409</td>
<td>-0.02156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0157</td>
<td>0.8099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggress</td>
<td>0.43658</td>
<td>0.49963</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.48032</td>
<td>0.14185</td>
<td>-0.00500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.1116</td>
<td>0.9555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anger</td>
<td>0.48212</td>
<td>0.85320</td>
<td>0.48032</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.18248</td>
<td>-0.13959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0400</td>
<td>0.1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.10277</td>
<td>0.21409</td>
<td>0.14185</td>
<td>0.18248</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-0.15042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2502</td>
<td>0.0157</td>
<td>0.1116</td>
<td>0.0400</td>
<td>0.0914</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>-0.01069</td>
<td>-0.02156</td>
<td>-0.00500</td>
<td>-0.13959</td>
<td>-0.15042</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9051</td>
<td>0.8099</td>
<td>0.9555</td>
<td>0.1175</td>
<td>0.0914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Pearson Correlation Coefficients: Turkey
**China:**

In China, blame was the sole predictor of anger and aggression ($Beta=0.44$, $P<0.0001; Beta=0.78$, $P<0.0001$, respectively with age and gender controlled). Table.14&15 below provide the regression results and correlations. Because the same pattern of significant correlations among variables were observed in China as in the US and Turkey, the interpretation of this result also requires caution. In this sample, the correlation between intent and blame was significant ($r=0.39$, $p<0.0001$). Because much of the hostile attribution literature indicates a significant positive relationship between perceived intent and aggression (see de Castro, et. al., 2002; Crick and Dodge, 1994 for a review), it is very likely that the significant correlation between intent and blame suppressed the independent effect of intent on aggression when both variables were in the equation. In fact, a closer look at the correlations in Table.15 reveals a modest, but significant relationship between intent and aggression in the Chinese sample ($r=0.27$, $p<0.0006$). If blame is omitted from the regression equation while age and gender serve as control variables, a significant positive relationship emerges between intent and aggression ($Beta=0.26$, $P<0.0011$). The same is true for the relationship between intent and anger. The correlation between intent and blame is high ($r=0.71$ $p<0.0001$). When blame is omitted from the equation to explore the indicators of anger, perceived intent predicts anger ($Beta=0.37$, $P<0.0001$, age and gender controlled). In both cases, however, the elimination of blameworthiness from the equations is not theoretically sound strategies, because:
a) Perceived intent is likely to affect blame attributions as shown in this sample. When confronted with a provocateur, an individual’s attribution of blame is likely to vary with how much malicious intent s/he perceives in the provocateur’s negative actions. Intent and blame attributions are in turn likely to affect an aggressive response. But, what is the independent contribution of perceived intent to the level of aggression net of blame? An answer to this question is an important contribution to the hostile attribution literature that has not dealt so far with cross-cultural comparisons.

b) The current analyses for the Chinese sample failed to tease out an independent effect of intent on aggression, probably due to a significant correlation between the two independent variables. However, perceived intent and blame are two distinct and equally important theoretical constructs in exploring the social cognitive bases of aggression. Therefore, with caution I conclude that perceived intent is likely to influence aggression in the Chinese sample along with blame since the pattern of relationships among variables was very similar to that of the US and Turkey. Perhaps because, blameworthiness had more weight on aggression scores in China compared to the US and Turkey, it was able to suppress the relationship between perceived intent and aggression ($\beta=0.44, P<0.0001$ in China; $\beta=0.36$ in Turkey, $P=0.0001$; $\beta=0.27, P=0.0039$ in the US). Apparently, intent attributions are linked to blame to a greater extent in China compared to the US and Turkey. Perhaps in group-oriented cultures, like China, the emphasis on situational cues in interpreting social events results in attributing less malicious intent to a provocateur (as shown in Chapter 3), thus attenuating the effect of intent on agonistic behavior. However, aggressive reaction to provocation would still be a
function of perceived intent to the extent which malicious intent is associated with blameworthiness of the provocateur. On the other hand, in individual- and group-oriented cultures, such as the US and Turkey, respectively, perceived malicious intent alone is sufficient enough to generate an aggressive reaction.

c) Intent and blame are also important theoretical constructs in measuring anger. As in aggression, both perceived intent and blameworthiness are likely to affect anger. China has shown exactly the same pattern as that of the US and Turkey with very high correlation between anger and blame. Therefore, it is highly likely that blame suppressed the effect of intent on anger like in the US and Turkey.

d) In keeping with the above, it is also very likely that in China intent first influenced anger, and anger in turn guided aggressive reactions indicating the presence of an indirect effect of intent on aggression.

Taken together, in China blame independently predicted both anger and aggression, although the current design was not able to tease out the independent effects of intent on anger and aggression net of blame despite significant positive relationships between intent and anger, and, intent and aggression in the absence of blame. This is very likely to be an indicator of a cognition (intent) - to emotion (anger) – to action (aggression) relationship. That is, perceived intent influenced anger, and anger in turn
guided aggressive reactions to provocation in China. The formal tests for this mediational model, will be performed in the below section on Cognition – Emotion – Action: A Mediational Model.
Overt Aggression: China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.3142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.7381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.24$ (N=158, p <0.0001)

Anger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.3598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.4757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.68$ (N=158, p <0.0001)

Table.14 Regression Analysis Summary for Perceived Intent, Blameworthiness, Gender, Age and Overt Aggression: China

$R^2$= 0.24 (N=158, p <0.0001)

Table.15 Pearson Correlation Coefficients: China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>intent</th>
<th>blame</th>
<th>anger</th>
<th>aggress</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intent</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.39026</td>
<td>0.35942</td>
<td>0.27073</td>
<td>-0.01208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.8803</td>
<td>0.0273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blame</td>
<td>0.39026</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.71366</td>
<td>0.46277</td>
<td>-0.00383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.9619</td>
<td>0.3763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anger</td>
<td>0.35942</td>
<td>0.71366</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.36507</td>
<td>-0.07305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.3617</td>
<td>0.9078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggress</td>
<td>0.27073</td>
<td>0.46277</td>
<td>0.36507</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.02466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.7584</td>
<td>0.2260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>-0.01208</td>
<td>-0.00383</td>
<td>-0.07305</td>
<td>0.02466</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8803</td>
<td>0.9619</td>
<td>0.3617</td>
<td>0.7584</td>
<td>0.6899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>0.17557</td>
<td>-0.07086</td>
<td>-0.00929</td>
<td>0.09685</td>
<td>0.03199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0273</td>
<td>0.3763</td>
<td>0.9078</td>
<td>0.2260</td>
<td>0.6899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table.15 Pearson Correlation Coefficients: China
Summary of the Results: Blameworthiness appeared to be a key factor in expression of overt aggression in all countries. Also, perceived intent independently predicted aggression in the US and Turkey, but not in China net of controls for blame. Overall, blameworthiness was a more potent instigator of aggression than perceived intent across all three cultures. The absence of an independent effect of perceived intent in China is likely to be a result of the greater impact of blameworthiness on aggression compared to the US and Turkey, and, a mediational relationship between intent attributions and overt aggression. That is, blameworthiness muted the influence of intent on aggression where the two variables were positively associated with each other. Also, perceived intent was probably linked to aggression through the mediating influence of anger in China.

Moreover, very high correlations were observed between attributions of blame and anger in all countries reducing the two distinct theoretical constructs into essentially one index of “cold cognitions” in an experimental setting where hypothetical scenarios were used to assess the social cognitive bases of aggression. This pattern also helps explain the above finding on the lack of direct influence of intent on aggression net of blame in China. Blameworthiness acted “in effect” as a mediator in this country. In other words, perceived intent was linked to agonistic behavior in ambiguous social interactions through the blameworthiness of the provocateur.
Apparently, in group oriented cultures like China, perceived intent is not sufficient enough to elicit an aggressive reaction unless the provocateur is found responsible for the negative outcome in social interactions. The emphasis on the external environment may result in attributing less malicious intent to a provocateur’s actions in China. In fact, previous results in Chapter 3 indicated that in China perceived hostility scores were significantly lower compared to those of the US and Turkey. However, once the individual is found guilty of the negative outcome, that is, once the individual responsibility is assigned in China, the provocateur is no longer given the benefit of the doubt to account for the situational factors behind his/her negative actions and a hostile reaction is elicited.

In individual-oriented cultures like the US and honor-oriented cultures like Turkey, perceptions of malicious intent and attribution of blame appear to be more automatic responses to provocation compared to the group-oriented cultures. One implication for this suggestion would be that aggressive reaction to provocation would be more pronounced in the US and Turkey compared to China. An emphasis on situational cues in interpreting negative social events would presumably require more elaboration and a relatively more deliberate evaluation of numerous factors in explaining individual behavior instead of a quick attribution of trait hostility. On the other hand, an emphasis on personal dispositions (i.e., the hostile nature of the provocateur) in the US and hypervigilence to provocation in Turkey (which should also emphasize the hostility of the provocateur for the negative outcome) might elicit a rapid aggressive response. The results in Chapter 3 partially supported this conclusion. The Turkish responded more
aggressively to provocation, whereas Americans did not have significantly higher aggression scores than the Chinese. However, I had previously suggested that the lower aggression scores of Americans despite their higher malicious intent, blame, and anger scores might be due to a response bias. I had indicated that numerous studies found Americans more aggressive than the Chinese (e.g. Breshnan et. al., 2002; Lafreniere, et. al., 2002; Crystal et., al., 1994; Chiu, 1990), and reversing score items (hence, response bias) led to significant changes in main effects (Bae and Brekke, 2003).

In summary, the similar patterns observed in expression of anger and aggression in the US and Turkey indicate that the social psychological mechanisms in expression of anger and aggression are similar across these two cultures. There was essentially no difference between the US and Turkey regarding the role of intent and blame attributions on the expression of aggression. In China, however, perceived intent did not seem to elicit an aggressive reaction net of blame. Also, the relationship between intent and aggression appeared to be dependent on anger in China. Accordingly, the subsequent analyses will look at the mediational role of anger on intent attributions and subsequent aggressive response. These analyses will also further explore the tentative conclusion that the root causes of aggression are similar in the US and Turkey.

_Cognition – Emotion – Action: A Mediational Model_

To investigate the mediating influence of anger in attribution and aggression, I turn to Weiner’s (1985, 1986) attribution theory of motivation and emotion. The theory
holds that attributions precede emotion and they are linked to behavior through the mediating influence of emotion. The mediating mechanisms for the proposed attribution (perception)-emotion (anger)-action (aggression) sequence have received experimental support. For example, Graham and her colleagues (1992) examined the attribution-emotion-action sequence among young African American and Latino adolescents. In this study, perceptions of hostile intent elicited anger, and anger then functioned as a guide to aggressive behavior. Also, Betancourt and Blair’s (1992) cognition-emotion model of violence in conflict situations with adults supported this attribution-emotion-action sequence.

Applied to the current study, hostility attributions should elicit anger, and anger should in turn influence aggression. In this section, mediated models for aggression will be tested for the perception of intent only. Previous section results indicated very high correlations between anger and blameworthiness across cultures rendering the test of the mediational model not applicable, because anger and blame essentially measured the same cognitive construct as an indicator of aggression.

**General Model**

The general mediation model depicts a causal relationship where the independent variable (i.e., intent) causes the mediator (i.e., anger), which in turn causes the dependent variable (i.e., aggression). To test for the mediation, three regression estimations should be made (MacKinnon and Dwyer, 1993; Baron and Kenny, 1986; Judd and Kenny, 1981).
The first step is to regress the dependent variable on the independent variable (Equation.1). The second step is to regress the mediator on the independent variable (Equation.2). Finally, the last step is to regress the dependent variable both on the mediator and independent variable (Equation.3). In order for the mediation to occur, the independent variable should influence the dependent variable in the first equation. The independent variable should affect the mediator in the second equation. Finally, the mediator should affect the dependent variable in the third equation while the effect of the independent variable is reduced (MacKinnon and Dwyer, 1993; Baron and Kenny, 1986). Perfect mediation occurs if the independent variable has no effect on the dependent variable when the mediator is controlled (Baron and Kenny, 1986). Applied to the current analysis, the following regression estimations were made for each country in terms of perceived intent:

**Equation.1**  
\[ \text{Aggression} = a_0 + a_1\text{Intent} + e \]

**Equation.2**  
\[ \text{Anger} = b_0 + b_1\text{Intent} + u \]

**Equation.3**  
\[ \text{Aggression} = c_0 + c_1\text{Anger} + c_2\text{Intent} + z \]

The model in turn is depicted as follows:
The coefficients pertaining to the mediated (indirect), direct, and total effects are as follows:

Mediated Effect: \( b_1 c_1 \)
Direct Effect : \( a_1 \)
Total Effect : \( a_1 + b_1 c_1 \)

Additional measures were also introduced by Baron and Kenny (1986), Sobel (1982), and Goodman (1960) to statistically test whether the mediated effect is significant. Preacher and Leonardelli (2003) provide an interactive web site to calculate the significance of the mediated effects based on the above formulations by Sobel and Goodman. These additional tests were performed on the Preacher and Leonardelli web site for each country along with the three steps introduced earlier in order to correctly assess the mediational models.
Results: Perceived Intent – Anger – Aggression

The US:

The results in the US sample indicated a partial mediation between intent and aggression. That is, perception of intent influenced anger, which in turn influenced aggression in the three steps described in earlier paragraphs (see Table.16 below). Because partial mediation also indicates a direct relationship between the independent and dependent variables, intent is also said to predict aggression above and beyond anger. The coefficients for the mediated, direct, and total effects were calculated based on the below equation.

Accordingly,

Mediated effect:  \( b_1 c_1 = 0.41 \times 0.25 = 0.66 \)

Direct Effect :  \( a_1 = 0.29 \)

Total Effect :  \( a_1 + b_1 c_1 = 0.29 + 0.66 = 0.95 \)

Mediated effect was further statistically tested with the interactive tool developed by Preacher and Leonardelli (2003) and found significant at p<0.05 (\( Sobel=2.18, P=0.0295 \)).

Aggression: The US Sample

Perceived Intent

Equation.1  \[ \text{Aggression} = 3.55 + 0.29 \text{Intent} + 0.70 \]

Equation.2  \[ \text{Anger} = 1.90 + 0.41 \text{Intent} + 1.22 \]

Equation.3  \[ \text{Aggression} = 3.08 + 0.25 \text{Anger} + 0.19 \text{Intent} + 0.63 \]
The US

Equation.1  
Overt Aggression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R^2 = .12 (N=124, p < .0001)

Equation.2  
Anger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R^2 = .13 (N=124, p < .0001)

Equation.3  
Overt Aggression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R^2 = .21 (N=124, p < .0001)

Table.16 Mediation Analyses Summary for Perceived Intent, Anger and Overt Aggression: The US
Turkey:

The results for the Turkish sample followed the same pattern as that of the US showing a partial mediation between the variables. Perceived intent influenced anger, which in turn guided aggressive reactions (Table.17). As indicated in partial mediation, intent also influenced aggression beyond and above anger. The coefficients for the mediated, direct, and total effects were as follows:

\[ \text{Mediated effect: } b_1 c_1 = 0.42 \times 0.53 = 0.22 \]
\[ \text{Direct Effect: } a_1 = 0.42 \]
\[ \text{Total Effect: } a_1 + b_1 c_1 = 0.42 + 0.22 = 0.64 \]

The statistical test on the mediated effect was also significant at p<0.05 (Sobel=3.54, P=0.0004).

Overt Aggression: The Turkish Sample

Perceived Intent

Equation.1  \[ \text{Aggression} = 2.76 + 0.42 \text{Intent} + 0.77 \]
Equation.2  \[ \text{Anger} = 1.40 + 0.53 \text{Intent} + 0.97 \]
Equation.3  \[ \text{Aggression} = 2.33 + 0.31 \text{Anger} + 0.26 \text{Intent} + 0.68 \]
Turkey

Equation.1  Overt Aggression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .19 \ (N=126, \ p<.0001)$

Equation.2  Anger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.23 \ (N=126, \ p<0.0001)$

Equation.3  Overt Aggression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.29 \ (N=126, \ p<0.0001)$

Table.17 Mediation Analyses Summary for Perceived Intent, Anger and Overt Aggression: Turkey
China:

The results for the Chinese sample were also in congruence with the partial mediation model. (Table.18). Intent attributions predicted aggression beyond and above anger. In addition, intent caused anger, which in turn influenced aggressive reaction to provocation. The coefficients for the mediated, direct, and total effects were calculated as follows:

\[\text{Mediated effect: } b_1c_1 = 0.35 \times 0.21 = 0.07\]

\[\text{Direct Effect: } a_1 = 0.18\]

\[\text{Total Effect: } a_1 + b_1c_1 = 0.18 + 0.07 = 0.25\]

The statistical test on the mediated effect was also significant at p<0.05 (Sobel=3.04, P=0.0020).

Aggression: The Chinese Sample

Perceived Intent

Equation.1 \hspace{1cm} \text{Aggression} = 4.04 + 0.18\text{Intent} + 0.56

Equation.2 \hspace{1cm} \text{Anger} = 2.56 + 0.35\text{Intent} + 1.15

Equation.3 \hspace{1cm} \text{Aggression} = 3.50 + 0.21\text{Anger} + 0.11\text{Intent} + 0.53
### China

#### Equation.1

**Aggression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SEB$</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.07 \ (N=157, \ p=0.0006)$

#### Equation.2

**Anger**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SEB$</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.13 \ (N=157, \ p<0.0001)$

#### Equation.3

**Aggression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SEB$</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.0445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.16 \ (N=157, \ p<0.0001)$

Table.18 Mediation Analyses Summary for Perceived Intent, Anger and Overt Aggression: China
Summary of the Results:

This chapter attempted to answer whether perceived intent and blameworthiness predicted aggression in all cultures. The first major aim of this question was to provide continuity to the existing hostile attribution literature by cross-culturally testing the previously observed relationship between hostile attributions and aggressive behavior. The second major aim of the question was to underline the importance of social cognition, hence culture, on aggression by exploring the independent effects of attribution on aggression without the influence of anger. The results indicate that blame was more central than intent in expression of aggression in all cultures. In other words, blame was a more potent instigator of aggression than perceived intent in social conflict situations. Intent also independently predicted aggression (net of blame), albeit to a lesser degree, in the US and Turkey, but not in China. Apparently, in group-oriented cultures, perceived intent is not a sufficient instigator of aggression without attribution of individual responsibility. This suggests that the emphasis group-oriented cultures place on environment does not absolve individuals from being accountable for negative outcomes in ambiguous social conflict situations. Once a provocateur is blamed for the negative outcome, anger and aggression are elicited through similar mechanisms observed in individual-, and, honor-oriented cultures. Therefore, blame appeared to be the central factor in explaining social cognitive bases of aggressive behavior in China, whereas both intent and blame contributed to the explanation of the social cognitive bases of aggression in the US and Turkey.
In keeping with the hostile attribution literature’s emphasis on the positive relationship between perceived intent and aggression, a closer look at the results also indicated that intent predicted aggression above and beyond anger in the US, Turkey, and China. This conclusion was achieved through the mediational analyses that showed partial mediations between intent and aggression across all three cultures. Results indicate that although the Chinese had a lower propensity to perceive malicious intent and blameworthiness in negative social interactions compared to Americans and the Turkish (as shown in Chapter 3), once attribution of hostile intent is made and personal responsibility is assigned, anger and aggression are elicited through similar psychological mechanisms across all three cultures.

In summary, the inclusion of the mediating influence of anger in hostile attribution-to-aggression model may help better assess cross-cultural differences in agonistic behavior. Testing the independent effects of attributions on aggression as a complement, on the other hand, may help identify the importance of perceived intent and blameworthiness over the other in each cultural setting.

The following chapter will discuss the major findings on the differences in social cognition, emotion, and aggression across cultures, genders, and in vs. outgroup targets of hostility in light of these results.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The current study investigated the social cognitive bases of aggression in three cultural settings; an individual oriented society represented by the US, an honor oriented society represented by Turkey, and a group oriented society represented by China. The current analyses explored cross-cultural, gender, and intergroup differences in cognition, self-reported anger, and aggressive reaction to a hypothetical provocateur in adverse social situations. These adverse social interactions focused on negative outcomes where the intent of the provocateur was ambiguous. The study also aimed to understand whether hostile perceptions would account for the expression of anger and aggression in each culture.

Cultural Differences:

It was originally proposed that perceptions of hostility for ambiguous social interactions would vary cross-culturally. The emphasis the US place on individuals and personal responsibility, Turkey on an honor code, and China on group norms and personal interdependence constituted the basis of this proposition. Specifically, it was
predicted that people from the US and Turkey would be more likely than people from China to find intent in a provocateur’s actions in ambiguous situations and blame the provocateur in these adverse social encounters. Also, the American and the Turkish would be more angered by the provocateur and react in more hostile terms compared to the Chinese.

The results partially supported the proposed hypothesis. Perceptions of intent, blameworthiness, anger, and aggression differed significantly across cultures. The US and the Turkish respondents were more likely than their Chinese counterparts to perceive hostility in negative social interactions and blame the provocateur. Furthermore, they reported being more angered by the negative outcome. Contrary to the predictions, the Turkish alone were more likely than the US and Chinese to endorse an indirect (i.e., “do something to get even”) and overt (i.e., “have it out with him/her right there and then”) aggressive response.

Several reasons may help explain cross-cultural differences in attributions of intent, blame, anger, and aggression. Previous research on the relationship between perceived hostile intention and subsequent aggressive response has focused on individual oriented cultures in North America. Individual oriented cultures are known to display a marked tendency to attribute causality to personal factors while interpreting events surrounding them (Lee et. al., 1996; Morris and Peng, 1994; Miller, 1984; Sheweder and Bourne, 1982). On the contrary, group oriented cultures do not show this tendency (see Fiske et. al., 1996 for a review). For example, when asked to interpret the cause of a car
accident, people from individual oriented cultures would be more inclined to see the cause as due to a careless driver, a personal factor. On the contrary, group oriented cultures would be more inclined to see the cause of the accident as due to road conditions, a situational factor. In fact evidence show that perceptions on the causes of the same violent events, such as a murder, are individual focused (e.g., bad temper) in the U.S. and group focused (e.g. isolation from the community) in China (Morris and Peng, 1994). It appears that the focus on individuals in the US and the Western world prevents Americans from evaluating all possible explanations in interpreting social interactions. Accordingly, the tendency for the Chinese to favor situational explanations for negative events (Peng and Morris, 1994) should account for the lower hostile perceptions, blameworthiness, thus, anger and aggression scores in this sample compared to that of the US and Turkey.

There is strong evidence that threats and insults in honor cultures are met with strong aggressive reactions to preserve the self-image and protect one’s honor (Mosquera et.al, 2002; Faqir, 2001; Sever and Yurdakul, 2001; Nisbett and Cohen, 1996; Cohen et. al, 1996; Nisbett, 1993). Justice may in turn be served with extreme forms of punishment, including murder. Many honor cultures in the Middle East, including Turkey have reduced sentences for honor killings due to insults (Sever and Yurdakul, 2001; Faqir, 2001) suggesting that preserving one’s reputation is an integral part of maintaining social order. Hypothetical scenarios used in this study involved social settings where the actor faced public humiliation or a clear threat towards the achievement of a goal. The Turkish
must have reacted to these negative acts in more hostile terms because of the violation of an honor code.

It is curious, though as to why higher hostile intent, blameworthiness, and anger scores in the US compared to the Chinese did not result in as much aggressive reaction as in Turkey. Although both the US and Turkish respondents attributed more hostile intent and blame to the provocateur, and showed more anger towards him/her, the Turkish alone were more likely than the Americans and Chinese to react aggressively as a result of the provocation. Apparently, the Turkish honor code was sufficient enough to elicit an angry and aggressive reaction, but the US tendency to focus on individual action, responsibility, and moral accountability (Vasquez et.al., 2001; Miller and Bersoff, 1992) was only sufficient in eliciting anger, not aggression. Behavioral evidence indicate that the association between anger and moral violation is stronger for Americans compared to the people from group-oriented cultures, i.e., Filipinos (Vasquez, et. al., 2001). Perhaps, Americans employ greater control mechanisms over their emotions, or, this finding is just an artifact of social desirability. The answers on the aggression measures were worded positively. Had the questions been worded negatively as “definitely NOT do this “(vs. “definitely would do this”), the aggression scores of Americans might have been higher. In fact, it has been shown that the reversal of item scales results in significant changes in the effect of the independent variable in question (Bae and Brekke, 2003). Nevertheless, I do not expect a substantial change in the Chinese scores as a result of this response bias. That is because behavioral research, including naturalistic observations, has consistently
found the Chinese as being less aggressive than North Americans (Breshnan et. al., 2002, Lafreniere, et. al., 2002; Crystal et., al., 1994; Chiu, 1990).

**Gender Differences:**

Social psychological research and criminal statistics indicate that males are physically more aggressive than females (Fry, 2003; Fry 2000; Campbell, 1999; Hines and Fry, 1994; Kruttschnitt, 1994; Burbank, 1994; Fry, 1992; Daly and Wilson, 1988; Burbank, 1987; Eagly and Steffen, 1986; Frodi et. al., 1977; Maccoby and Jacklin, 1980/1974). This male bias in physical aggression appears to be universal (Fry, 2003, Burbank, 1987; Daly and Wilson, 1988). On the other hand, there is strong evidence that females engage in more indirect aggression (i.e., do something to get even”) as measured by social rejection, stigmatizing, gossiping, ridiculing, ‘criticisms delivered in front of others or behind the victim’s back” (Fry, 2003; Campbell, 1999; Oesterman et. al., 1998; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Bjorkqvist et. al., 1992; Lagerspetz et. al., 1988; see a review in Bjorkqvist, 1994). Accordingly, it was predicted that women would exhibit more indirect aggression and males more overt aggression towards a provocateur in adverse social interactions in all cultures. The results are contradictory to the predictions. Although a universal pattern was implicated, a significant male bias in indirect aggression was found. Males in all cultures were more likely to get even with a provocateur as a result of a negative interaction where the provocateur’s intentions were ambiguous. Also, the results failed to show a male bias in overt aggression as predicted. There were no sex differences in overt aggression in ambiguous social situations. It is
worth nothing that when the scenarios depicted a clear hostile intent on the part of the provocateur, males were more likely to endorse both an indirect and overt aggressive reaction in all cultures.

Taken together, these results suggest that there is a male bias in indirect aggression in ambiguous social situations. Also, males tend to be more indirectly and overtly aggressive when there is an actual threat and the provocateur in the adverse social interaction has an unambiguous hostile intent. These patterns appear to be universal. Two major factors may account for the male bias in both indirect and overt aggression. One factor is socialization, the other is the gender differences in perceived intensity of provocation and retaliation.

Male gender roles may be more conducive to aggression while “traditional female gender role places little emphasis on female aggressiveness” (Eagly and Steffen, 1986). Perhaps not mutually exclusive, men tend to rate instigations to aggression more provoking than females in ambiguous social situations (Bettencourt and Miller, 1996). Provocation is in turn considered as an important facilitator of aggressive behavior resulting in escalation of hostility and conflict (Berkowitz, 1989; Carlson and Miller, 1988). Because confrontations with an antagonist may lead to physical aggression, females would be most likely to avoid a violent conflict due partly to gender roles and norms in the society (Eagly and Wood, 1999; Eagly and Steffen, 1986; Bettancourt and Miller, 1996) and due to the physical demands of a fight as a result of retaliation. Behavioral evidence shows that women differ from men in their assessment of dangerous
retaliation (Bettencourt and Miller, 1996; Eagly and Steffen, 1986). This suggests that “the more women’s fear of retaliation exceeds that of men, the larger the gender difference in aggression” (Bettencourt and Miller, 1996). Taken together, the near universal socializing practices emphasizing a passive female role in social interactions, males’ greater reaction to provocation, and females’ greater fear of retaliation must account for the male bias in indirect aggression in ambiguous and hostile social interactions and overt aggression in agonistic encounters.

But, why is there still overwhelming evidence that show a female bias in indirect aggression (e.g., Bjorkqvist, 1994) when gender differences in instigation to provocation and fear of retaliation suggest otherwise? Provocation again appears to be the key attenuating sex differences in aggression (Hoaken and Pihl, 2000; Bettencourt and Miller, 1996). Although unprovoked men were found to be more aggressive than women, under provocation the gender differences either greatly diminish (Bettencourt and Miller, 1996), or, show a female bias (Anderson, 1993; Frodi et. al., 1977; Mancini and Wells, 1971; Tylor and Epstein, 1967). The limitations of the current study may help explain the conflicting findings. The participants read hypothetical scenarios that were not directly related to their own life experiences, thus they were unlikely to be provoked enough for the gender effect to occur. Also, there was only one indicator to measure indirect aggression (i.e., Question No: 6 “do something to get even”). This indicator, as it stands, might not have been able to measure what it purported to measure. “Getting even” has been conceptualized as a measure of an indirectly hostile response in agonistic encounters in the US (see, Graham, et. al., 1992). To my knowledge, however, there are no cross-
cultural studies indicating that “doing something to get even” can be clearly understood as an indirectly aggressive response in cultures other than the US. In fact, cross-cultural studies in particular and research in the US and West Europe in general usually define indirect aggression as “gossiping, ostracizing, social rejection, “social manipulation”, “attacking a target person circuitously, thereby avoiding a counter attack” (Campbell, 1999; Bjorkqvist et. al., 1994; Osterman, 1988). Although these social interactions do indicate a malicious intent of getting even with a provocateur, I cannot confidently state that in each culture the response item “doing something to get even” actually tapped into the usual treatment of indirect aggression. Although the indicators of indirect and overt aggression used in the current study may constitute two different theoretical constructs, the indirect aggression response item does not seem to establish a clear continuity with the previous research, and consequently, may not measure what it purports to measure. Taken together, these three factors may partly explain the failure to replicate the previous findings on the female bias in indirect aggression. Studies that used multiple scales (e.g., Osterman et. al, 1998; Crick, 1995; Hines and Fry, 1994); direct relevance to the participants’ experiences (Whitney and Smith, 1993); and peer ratings or observations, which inherently assumes provocation (Osterman et. al, 1998; Feschbach, 1969) all confirmed a female bias in indirect aggression.

**Outgroup Effects:**

Outgroup effects, were also contrary to much of the research evidence. It was predicted that when the provocateur belongs to an outgroup member, people in all
cultures would be more likely to perceive hostile intent and blame the provocateur. They would also be more likely to get angry at the outgroup member and act in more hostile terms towards him/her.

The results did not support these predictions. No outgroup effect was found for perceived intent, blameworthiness, anger, indirect, and overt aggression. The predictions were based on previous studies on intergroup attributions (e.g., Islam and Hewstone, 1993; Hewstone, 1990; Pettigrew, 1979) and target-based facilitation of aggression (Carlson et. al., 1990).

Intergroup attributions are causal explanations offered by people for the behavior of their respective ingroup and outgroup members. These attributions tend to favor one’s own group (see Stringer et. al., 1994; Hewstone, 1990 for a review). For example, Hunter et. al. (1991) found that Irish Catholics and Protestants’ explanations of intergroup violence favored their own group. Outgroup violence was judged to be caused by personal dispositions of the outgroup members, such as “bloodlust” (Hunter et. al., 2001, 2000). In contrast, ingroup violence was judged to be caused by situational factors, such as “fear of attack” (Hunter et. al., 2001, 2000).

In addition, aggression related cues, such as names associated with past violence that are present in the environment appear to increase agonistic reactions (Carlson, et. al., 1990; Berkowitz and Frodi, 1979; Berkowitz and Green, 1967; Berkowitz and Green, 1966). The name of an outgroup member in a scenario was expected to serve as a cue,
facilitating aggressive reactions to provocation. Name manipulation in questionnaires has been widely used and known to create the intended ingroup - outgroup effects (e.g., Sharkarchi and von Hippel, 1997; Joseph et. al., 1997; Carpenter, 1993; Ostrom, et. al., 1993). For example, African Americans were judged as more blameworthy for an accident than Caucasians (Shakarchi and von Hippel, 1997). Likewise, Irish Catholics saw Protestant unemployment as a result of personal characteristics of Protestants that are persistent in time and place. In contrast, Protestants saw the Catholic unemployment as due to the personal dispositions of Catholics that are persistent across time and place (Joseph et. al., 1997). All these effects were achieved by merely a name manipulation procedure.

Moreover, there is strong evidence that forenames moderate rapid access to stereotypical thinking (Macrae et. al., 2002) and implicitly measure racial prejudice (Greenwald, et. al., 1998; also see Fazio and Olson, 2003 for a general review on implicit measures in social cognition). However, in this experiment the outgroup name manipulation did not support the predictions. Perhaps, because the outgroup member in the stories was a provocateur rather than a victim, this effect was not observed. The outgroup member as a provocateur engaged in a negative behavior that had adverse circumstances for the actor. In both of the scenarios where the outgroup name manipulation were administered, there was an imminent danger of retaliation, had the actor confronted the outgroup member. In one case, the outgroup target of aggression was a well known Professor who had forgotten to write a recommendation letter for his student (actor). The Professor could withdraw his support all at once, or, write a bashing
recommendation letter for the student ensuring rejection from graduate programs. In the second scenario, the outgroup target of aggression was a promising date who stood the actor up and appeared not to recognize her on a later occasion where other people were present. The actor could face the danger of public humiliation, had she confronted him. In neither of the cases were the outgroup members victims, rather, they were provocateurs. Supporting evidence indicates that when the victim of aggression is an outgroup member, or, in lower status, the behavioral inhibition to aggress is reduced (Carlson, 1990). Perhaps, dominance hierarchies observed in humans and other species play a role in the manifestation of aggression (see Campbell, 1999 for a review). For example, teasing and bullying among youth are considered as an expression of dominance in which bullies dominate unassertive children (Shapiro et. al., 1991). Obviously, further studies are necessary to explore the effect of outgroup on perceived intent, blameworthiness, anger, and aggression while manipulating the outgroup member status so as to represent a victim or an aggressor.

Roots Cause of Aggression:

Despite the cross-cultural and gender differences in the degree to which hostile attributions, anger, and aggression were manifested, attributions predicted anger and aggression in all cultures through similar mechanisms. The results indicate that blame was more central than intent in expression of overt aggression in all cultures. In other words, blame was a more potent instigator of aggression than perceived intent in social conflict situations.
Intent also independently predicted aggression (net of blame), albeit to a lesser degree, in the US and Turkey, but not in China. Apparently, in group-oriented cultures, perceived intent is not a sufficient instigator of aggression without attribution of individual responsibility. This suggests that the emphasis group-oriented cultures place on environment does not absolve individuals from being accountable for negative outcomes in ambiguous social conflict situations. Therefore, blame appeared to be the central factor in explaining social cognitive bases of aggressive behavior in China, whereas both intent and blame contributed to the explanation of the social cognitive bases of aggression in the US and Turkey.

In keeping with the hostile attribution literature’s emphasis on the positive relationship between perceived intent and aggression, a closer look at the results also indicated that intent predicted aggression above and beyond anger in the US, Turkey, and China. This conclusion was achieved through the mediational analyses that showed partial mediations between intent and aggression across all three cultures. Although the Chinese had a lower propensity to perceive malicious intent and blameworthiness compared to Americans and the Turkish in negative social interactions, once attribution of hostile intent is made, anger and aggression are elicited through similar psychological mechanisms across all three cultures.

Overall, the inclusion of the mediating influence of anger in the hostile attribution-to-aggression model, where attributions influence anger, and anger in turn guides aggressive behavior, may help better understand cross-cultural differences in
agonistic behavior. Testing the independent effects of attributions on aggression, on the other hand, may help identify the importance of perceived intent and blameworthiness over the other in each cultural setting.

**Limitations of the Study:**

The interpretation of the results pertaining to the root causes of aggression requires caution because of the nature of the current design. In this survey experiment method, causality cannot be assured leaving a room for reciprocal relationships between dependent and independent variables. That is, as the current study stands, one cannot confidently state that, say, perceived intent results in anger, and anger influences aggressive reactions. Perhaps, the negative outcome as a result of the provocateur’s actions elicits anger first. The actor of the agonistic encounter then interprets his/her angry feelings as due to the malicious intent on the part of the provocateur. As a consequence, s(he) responds aggressively. Another scenario could be that the negative outcome angers the actor causing impulsive aggression without any cognitive processes involved regarding the malicious intent of the provocateur. The current design is not able to address to these issues, because it did not employ implicit cognitive measures, such as priming the subjects with implicit aggression cues, nor did it use natural observations. However, the results are in congruence with the literature that employed such methods (see reviews in Todorov and Bargh, 2002; Crick and Dodge, 1994). Therefore, it is very likely that that the social cognitive bases of aggression are rooted in biased perceptions of hostility where attributions precede aggressive behavior.
Concluding Remarks

The study results may have important implications for the root causes of violent conflict and terrorism in the Middle East. The Turkish respondents received significantly higher overt and indirect aggression scores compared to those of the US and China. It appears that hypervigilance to threats and insults, as generally experienced in honor cultures and Turkey in this particular study, constitutes an important marker of hostility and aggression. Like Turkey, honor is one of the prevalent societal characteristics of the other Middle Eastern countries (Fakir, 2001; Abulughod, 1986; Jamous, 1981; Bourdieu, 1966). It has been suggested that honor cultures predate Islam (Sever and Yurdakul, 2001) and they are based on land and property ownership, as well as herding economies (Nisbett and Cohen, 1996; Cohen et. al, 1996; Nisbett, 1993). Therefore, we must perhaps consider shifting the current focus on Islamic fundamentalism in explaining terrorist acts in the region to the violation of an honor code. Moreover, the results of this study corroborate with previous research showing that perceived hostile intent of a provocateur results in aggressive reaction. Perceived external and internal threats constitute the core of national security policies and are often used by political decision makers to initiate armed conflict. The empirical knowledge gained as a result of this study may be used to better understand the escalation of violent conflict among nations.
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APPENDIX

QUESTIONAIRES: INGROUP AND OUTGROUP

THE US VERSION
Please fill out the following information. We do not require any names in this form. Your responses will be kept confidential.

1. Date of Birth: _____________________
   month       day     year

2. Please check where appropriate
   a. Male □     Female □
   b. Black, non-Hispanic □
   c. American Indian or Alaskan Native □
   d. Asian or Pacific Islander □
   e. Hispanic □
   f. White, non-Hispanic □

3. Is English your native language? Yes □ No □

Please turn the page now.
In this booklet, there are several short stories. These stories describe ordinary things, which may happen to anyone in everyday life. At the end of each story you will be reminded of certain aspects of these stories. Please pay close attention, because you will be asked to make several judgments about them. You will also answer some questions about how you would think, feel, or do if these stories actually happened to you. Circle the best answer; there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Do not skip any questions. Now, please turn the page and start to answer this questionnaire.

Thank you.
1. Alice wanted to have some exotic food for lunch today. She drove over to “Gourmet Kitchen.” She ordered “Harvest Ravioli” first, but changed it to “Iceland Salmon.” After another change of heart she finally told the waitress that she would like to have “Louisiana Gourmet Cajun.” While waiting for her food, she noticed that some people who came after her had already been served. She called the waitress to check out what was taking so long. She found out that the order never reached the kitchen. The waitress said: “I am terribly sorry. Today is my first day at work. I will now serve you immediately and you’ll have a free dessert as well.”

*Now, think of the forgotten order again.*

1. Do you think the waitress meant to do that to Alice?

   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

*How would you feel if this happened to you?*

2. Would you feel angry toward the waitress?

   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

3. Would you blame the waitress for what happened to you?

   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

*Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.*

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

   1  2  3  4  5
   definitely would do this may do this definitely would NOT do this

5. Tell it to the waitress’ supervisor

   1  2  3  4  5
   definitely would do this may do this definitely would NOT do this
6. Do something to get even

1  
2  
3  
4  
5
definitely  
may do this  
would do this

2. Marie had a ticket for a play by the local theater company. Her friends could not make it, so she was alone and running a bit late for the performance. There were no seat numbers. She just hoped that she would be able to get a good seat. Luckily, she saw one for only one person, very close to the stage. She moved toward it only to be bumped by another woman so hard that she almost fell down.

Now, think again of the fact that Marie moved toward the empty seat and got bumped so hard that she almost fell down.

1. Do you think the woman meant to do that to Marie?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5
for sure yes  
probably yes  
maybe  
probably no  
for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward the woman?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5
for sure yes  
probably yes  
maybe  
probably no  
for sure no

3. Would you blame the woman for what happened to you?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5
for sure yes  
probably yes  
maybe  
probably no  
for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.
4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

1             2           3          4         5
definitely     may do this    definitely
would          do this        would NOT
do this

5. Tell it to a friend later

1             2           3          4         5
definitely     may do this    definitely
would          do this        would NOT
do this

6. Do something to get even

1             2           3          4         5
definitely     may do this    definitely
would          do this        would NOT
do this

7. Have it out with the woman right then and there

1             2           3          4         5
definitely     may do this    definitely
would          do this        would NOT
do this

3. Steve was applying for graduate programs. He had asked for recommendation letters from three of his professors. He had given each a month advance notice before the admissions deadline. He was now following up on his application documents. All but Professor Smith had sent their letters. Steve had a very tense relationship with Professor Smith. But, Professor Smith had a great reputation. And, Steve’s grade in Professor Smith’s class was not too bad. When Steve was discussing the forgotten letter with another classmate he found out that Professor Smith had already written a recommendation letter for his classmate about two weeks ago.

Now, think of the forgotten letter again.

1. Do you think Professor Smith meant to do that to Steve?

1            2           3          4         5
for sure yes  probably yes    maybe     probably no    for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?
2. Would you feel angry toward Professor Smith?

1            2           3          4         5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

3. Would you blame Professor Smith for what happened to you?

1            2           3          4         5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

1            2           3          4         5
definitely may do this definitely would NOT
do this do this

5. Tell it to the Department Chair

1            2           3          4         5
definitely may do this definitely would NOT
do this do this

6. Do something to get even

1            2           3          4         5
definitely may do this definitely would NOT
do this do this

7. Have it out with Professor Smith right then and there

1            2           3          4         5
definitely may do this definitely would NOT
do this do this

4. Tom was about to finish his final paper, which was due in half an hour. He just needed a printout and he would be on his way to deliver it to the professor. He patiently waited for the next available computer in the lab. He thought, “I am obviously the first to get a computer, there is no one else waiting.” He then spotted
someone leaving a computer free. Before he could make a move, another student walked by him and sat down by that computer. Tom approached him and told him that it was his turn. The student said: “You should have moved more quickly if you want something bad enough. You simply were too slow.”

Now, think again of the fact that Tom waited in line for the next available computer, but another student walked by him and sat down by that computer.

1. Do you think the student meant to do that to Tom?

   1 for sure yes  2 probably yes  3 maybe  4 probably no  5 for sure no

   How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward the student?

   1 for sure yes  2 probably yes  3 maybe  4 probably no  5 for sure no

3. Would you blame the student for what happened to you?

   1 for sure yes  2 probably yes  3 maybe  4 probably no  5 for sure no

   Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

   1 definitely would do this  2 may do this  3 definitely would NOT do this

5. Tell it to the lab’s supervisor

   1 definitely would do this  2 may do this  3 definitely would NOT do this
6. Do something to get even

1  2  3  4  5
---  ---  ---  ---  ---
definitely  may do this  definitely
would do this  would NOT do this

7. Have it out with the student right then and there

1  2  3  4  5
---  ---  ---  ---  ---
definitely  may do this  definitely
would do this  would NOT do this

5. Leila and John had been planning to see the movie “Gladiator” since its previews. They finally got together one weekend and drove to the movies. There was quite a line with only two ticket counters, and it was moving very, very slowly. The movie was about to start. At last they could finally purchase their tickets, and John took out his wallet from his pocket to make the payment. Just then the clerk put a sign “CLOSED” on the counter. The clerk said: “I am very sorry; I had already gone far beyond my hours.” He then added: “There is a desk inside before you enter the theaters; you can buy tickets there. My name is Tim, tell them that I sent you; they’ll be able to help.”

Now, think again of the fact that when John could finally purchase tickets, the ticket counter got closed.

1. Do you think Tim, the clerk, meant to do that to John?

1  2  3  4  5
---  ---  ---  ---  ---
for sure yes  probably yes  maybe  probably no  for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward the clerk?

1  2  3  4  5
---  ---  ---  ---  ---
for sure yes  probably yes  maybe  probably no  for sure no

3. Would you blame the clerk for what happened to you?

1  2  3  4  5
---  ---  ---  ---  ---
for sure yes  probably yes  maybe  probably no  for sure no
Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>would NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Tell it to the clerk’s supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>would NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do something to get even

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>would NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Have it out with the clerk right then and there

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>would NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Kevin was driving back home from work. The traffic was progressing slowly, so he wanted to take another route to get to an easier and less crowded road. He was in the right lane, gave a signal and tried to change lanes to make a left turn, but the car in the left lane behind him would not let him do that. He almost missed the intersection. He opened his window and signaled with his arm that he intended to make a left turn. The guy in the other car opened his window, too, and shouted: “Get the hell out of my way!”

Now think again of the fact that Kevin almost missed the intersection because his way was blocked.

1. Do you think the man meant to do that to Kevin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for sure yes</td>
<td>probably yes</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>probably no</td>
<td>for sure no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward him?

1            2           3          4         5  
for sure yes      probably yes      maybe     probably no     for sure no

3. Would you blame him for what happened to you?

1            2           3          4         5  
for sure yes      probably yes      maybe     probably no     for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

1            2           3          4         5  
definitely     may do this    definitely    would NOT do this
would do this

5. Report him to a traffic officer

1            2           3          4         5  
definitely     may do this    definitely    would NOT do this
would do this

6. Do something to get even

1            2           3          4         5  
definitely     may do this    definitely    would NOT do this
would do this

7. Have it out with the man right then and there

1            2           3          4         5  
definitely     may do this    definitely    would NOT do this
would do this
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7. Jim had a volleyball game Thursday night. The last game had been a tie almost until the end. But, Jim was an excellent server, which won his team the last set. On Thursday night, he could sense that everybody was eager to get started. They were all playing pretty fast and Jim was just superb. Before he knew it the score was 2-2, a tie again before the last set. In the final set, Richard, the member of the opposite team hit Jim’s arm constantly in a series of fault defenses while blocking Jim’s spikes at the net. In one instance, Richard pushed Jim so hard that Jim hit his head to the metal pole. With agonizing pain, Jim turned to Richard to say he should take it easy. Richard responded: “You’re just a cry baby. Play like a real man.”

Now, think again of the fact that Richard constantly hit Jim’s arm at the net and in one instance he pushed him so hard that Jim hurt his head.

1. Do you think Richard meant to do that to Jim?

   1            2           3          4         5
   for sure yes      probably yes      maybe probably no for sure no

   How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward Richard?

   1            2           3          4         5
   for sure yes      probably yes      maybe probably no for sure no

3. Would you blame Richard for what happened to you?

   1            2           3          4         5
   for sure yes      probably yes      maybe probably no for sure no

   Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

   1                  2                 3          4         5
   definitely would do this         may do this definitely would NOT do this
5. Tell it to the referee

1 2 3 4 5
definitely may do this definitely would do this
would NOT do this

definitely may do this definitely would NOT do this

6. Do something to get even

1 2 3 4 5
definitely may do this definitely would do this
would NOT do this

7. Have it out with Richard right then and there

1 2 3 4 5
definitely may do this definitely would do this
would NOT do this

8. Lisa was at a grocery store. She had run out of her favorite ice cream. That Cappuccino Chocolate Chunk was so hard to find. She walked towards the aisle where frozen foods and ice cream were located. In the aisle, she saw another woman and started to talk to her. Lisa said: “Oh, that cappuccino chocolate chunk; I have such a craving for it. It is so delicious and so hard to find.” While Lisa was talking, the woman opened the refrigerator and found apparently what she was looking for. Lisa looked at her cart; it was Cappuccino Chocolate Chunk! The woman walked by Lisa without saying any words.

Now think again of the fact that the woman got exactly the same ice cream as Lisa was craving

1. Do you think the woman meant to do that to Lisa?

1 2 3 4 5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward the woman?

1 2 3 4 5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no
3. Would you blame her for what happened to you?

   1          2          3          4          5  
   for sure yes    probably yes    maybe    probably no    for sure no  

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

   1          2          3          4          5  
   definitely    may do this    definitely    would NOT do this
   would do this

5. Tell it to a friend later

   1          2          3          4          5  
   definitely    may do this    definitely    would NOT do this
   would do this

6. Do something to get even

   1          2          3          4          5  
   definitely    may do this    definitely    would NOT do this
   would do this

7. Have it out with the woman right then and there

   1          2          3          4          5  
   definitely    may do this    definitely    would NOT do this
   would do this

9. Jenny had just met a nice young man named Alan in the bookstore while browsing through the mystery books, her favorite kind. The bookstore was in a huge 3-story building with a coffee shop on the first floor. Later, they had coffee together. Alan said he would like to meet her again at the bookstore, 6 pm next Saturday. Excited, she said yes. She was there on Saturday, slightly before 6 pm. She waited and waited but he didn’t show up. Disappointed, she left only to return a week later with the hope of seeing him again. There he was. He then walked by Jenny without noticing her.
Now, think again of the fact that a week ago Jenny had waited for Alan and he didn’t show up.

1. Do you think he meant to do that to Jenny?

   1            2           3          4         5
   for sure yes      probably yes      maybe      probably no     for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward him?

   1            2           3          4         5
   for sure yes      probably yes      maybe      probably no     for sure no

3. Would you blame him for what happened to you?

   1            2           3          4         5
   for sure yes      probably yes      maybe      probably no     for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

   1            2           3          4         5
   definitely     may do this    definitely     would NOT do this
   would do this                                        do this

5. Tell it to a friend later

   1            2           3          4         5
   definitely     may do this    definitely     would NOT do this
   would do this                                        do this

6. Do something to get even

   1            2           3          4         5
   definitely     may do this    definitely     would NOT do this
   would do this                                        do this
7. Have it out with him right then and there

1            2           3          4         5
definitely     may do this    definitely
would do this   would NOT do this

10. Scott was very excited about his class presentation. The class gathered in the morning. When his name was called he made his introduction. He said that questions for clarification were welcome during the presentation, then there would be a 15-minute session for discussion. Each time he presented a different overhead he was interrupted by Paul for clarification. He eventually ran out of time for the 15-minute discussion session; he had only 3 minutes left! In these last 3 minutes, Paul started to quiz him again. He said: “Your presentation was all common sense and uninteresting. Except for some fancy terms, what have you told us that’s new? ”

Now, think again of the fact that Scott ran out of time because his presentation was interrupted by Paul.

1. Do you think Paul meant to do that to Scott?

1            2           3          4         5
for sure yes   probably yes   maybe       probably no   for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward him?

1            2           3          4         5
for sure yes   probably yes   maybe       probably no   for sure no

3. Would you blame him for what happened to you?

1            2           3          4         5
for sure yes   probably yes   maybe       probably no   for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

1            2           3          4         5
definitely     may do this    definitely
would do this   would NOT do this
5. Tell it to the class instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>would NOT</td>
<td>do this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>do this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do something to get even

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>would NOT</td>
<td>do this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>do this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Have it out with him right then and there

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>would NOT</td>
<td>do this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>do this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Tony was on his way to the dry cleaner. He had stained his best pants while checking the oil in his car. He had a business meeting in the afternoon and nothing else to wear. At the counter, he presented his payment coupon and realized he hadn’t made the last payment yet. While thinking he would straighten this out later, the person at the counter excused herself to get his pants. When she came back he noticed that the stained spot was still there, also, the chemical they used discolored his khaki pants. He showed it to her. She said: “We didn’t do a good job, did we? Sorry for the inconvenience; we’ll pay for your pants and give you three coupons for free dry cleaning.”

Now, think of Tony’s discolored khaki pants again.

1. Do you think the dry cleaners meant to do that to Tony?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for sure yes</td>
<td>probably yes</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>probably no</td>
<td>for sure no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward the dry cleaners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for sure yes</td>
<td>probably yes</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>probably no</td>
<td>for sure no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Would you blame the dry cleaners for what happened to you?

for sure yes  probably yes  maybe probably no  for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

definitely may do this definitely would would NOT do this

5. Tell it to the upper management

definitely may do this definitely would would NOT do this

6. Do something to get even

definitely may do this definitely would would NOT do this

7. Have it out with the dry cleaners right then and there

definitely may do this definitely would would NOT do this

12. Ann-Marie had finally managed to buy a computer. Her roommate, Cathy, was happy too. Ann-Marie had already told her that she would be welcome to use it. One day, Ann-Marie was in class and Cathy wanted to use the computer. She surfed the Internet and checked her e-mail. She noticed that Ann-Marie was using an old version of the e-mail software, so she downloaded the new version from the Internet. When Ann-Marie got home she sat down by the computer, checked her e-mail only to find out that her incoming and outgoing mailboxes were empty. She rushed upstairs to Cathy to ask what might have happened. Cathy said: “Oh I’m so sorry. I
must have done something wrong when I downloaded a new version of the software. I’ll come down and help you recover your files.”

Now, think again of the fact that when Ann-Marie got home she found her incoming and outgoing mailboxes empty.

1. Do you think Cathy, the roommate, meant to do that to Ann-Marie?

   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes    probably yes    maybe    probably no    for sure no

   How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward the roommate?

   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes    probably yes    maybe    probably no    for sure no

3. Would you blame her for what happened to you?

   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes    probably yes    maybe    probably no    for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

   1  2  3  4  5
   definitely would do this    may do this    definitely would NOT do this

5. Tell it to a friend later

   1  2  3  4  5
   definitely would do this    may do this    definitely would NOT do this

6. Do something to get even

   1  2  3  4  5
   definitely would do this    may do this    definitely would NOT do this
7. Have it out with the roommate right then and there

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>would NOT</td>
<td>would do this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please fill out the following information. We do not require any names in this form. Your responses will be kept confidential.

1. Date of Birth: _____________________
   month       day       year

2. Please check where appropriate

   a. Male ☐  Female ☐

   b. Black, non-Hispanic ☐
   c. American Indian or Alaskan Native ☐
   d. Asian or Pacific Islander ☐
   e. Hispanic ☐
   f. White, non-Hispanic ☐

3. Is English your native language? Yes ☐  No ☐

Please turn the page now.
In this booklet, there are several short stories. These stories describe ordinary things, which may happen to anyone in everyday life. At the end of each story you will be reminded of certain aspects of these stories. Please pay close attention, because you will be asked to make several judgments about them. You will also answer some questions about how you would think, feel, or do if these stories actually happened to you. Circle the best answer; there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Do not skip any questions. Now, please turn the page and start to answer this questionnaire.

Thank you.
1. Alice wanted to have some exotic food for lunch today. She drove over to “Gourmet Kitchen.” She ordered “Harvest Ravioli” first, but changed it to “Iceland Salmon.” After another change of heart she finally told the waitress that she would like to have “Louisiana Gourmet Cajun.” While waiting for her food, she noticed that some people who came after her had already been served. She called the waitress to check out what was taking so long. She found out that the order never reached the kitchen. The waitress said: “I am terribly sorry. Today is my first day at work. I will now serve you immediately and you’ll have a free dessert as well.”

Now, think of the forgotten order again.

1. Do you think the waitress meant to do that to Alice?
   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes  probably yes  maybe  probably no  for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward the waitress?
   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes  probably yes  maybe  probably no  for sure no

3. Would you blame the waitress for what happened to you?
   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes  probably yes  maybe  probably no  for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all
   1  2  3  4  5
definitely would do this  may do this  definitely would NOT do this

5. Tell it to the waitress’ supervisor
   1  2  3  4  5
definitely would do this  may do this  definitely would NOT do this
6. Do something to get even

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely would do this</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely would NOT do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Have it out with the waitress right then and there

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely would do this</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely would NOT do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Marie had a ticket for a play by the local theater company. Her friends could not make it, so she was alone and running a bit late for the performance. There were no seat numbers. She just hoped that she would be able to get a good seat. Luckily, she saw one for only one person, very close to the stage. She moved toward it only to be bumped by another woman so hard that she almost fell down.

Now, think again of the fact that Marie moved toward the empty seat and got bumped so hard that she almost fell down.

1. Do you think the woman meant to do that to Marie?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for sure yes</td>
<td>probably yes</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>probably no</td>
<td>for sure no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward the woman?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for sure yes</td>
<td>probably yes</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>probably no</td>
<td>for sure no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Would you blame the woman for what happened to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for sure yes</td>
<td>probably yes</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>probably no</td>
<td>for sure no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.
3. Steve was applying for graduate programs. He had asked for recommendation letters from three of his professors. He had given each a month advance notice before the admissions deadline. He was now following up on his application documents. All but Professor Jamal Brown had sent their letters. Steve had a very tense relationship with Professor Brown. But, Professor Brown had a great reputation. And, Steve’s grade in Professor Brown’s class was not too bad. When Steve was discussing the forgotten letter with another classmate he found out that Professor Brown had already written a recommendation letter for his classmate about two weeks ago.

Now, think of the forgotten letter again.

1. Do you think Professor Jamal Brown meant to do that to Steve?
   
   1. for sure yes  2. probably yes  3. maybe  4. probably no  5. for sure no
How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward Professor Brown?
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

3. Would you blame Professor Brown for what happened to you?
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   definitely may do this definitely may do this
   would do this would NOT do this

5. Tell it to the Department Chair
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   definitely may do this definitely may do this
   would do this would NOT do this

6. Do something to get even
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   definitely may do this definitely may do this
   would do this would NOT do this

7. Have it out with Professor Brown right then and there
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   definitely may do this definitely may do this
   would do this would NOT do this
4. Tom was about to finish his final paper, which was due in half an hour. He just needed a printout and he would be on his way to deliver it to the professor. He patiently waited for the next available computer in the lab. He thought, “I am obviously the first to get a computer, there is no one else waiting.” He then spotted someone leaving a computer free. Before he could make a move, another student walked by him and sat down by that computer. Tom approached him and told him that it was his turn. The student said: “You should have moved more quickly if you want something bad enough. You simply were too slow.”

Now, think again of the fact that Tom waited in line for the next available computer, but another student walked by him and sat down by that computer.

1. Do you think the student meant to do that to Tom?
   1 for sure yes  2 probably yes  3 maybe  4 probably no  5 for sure no

   How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward the student?
   1 for sure yes  2 probably yes  3 maybe  4 probably no  5 for sure no

3. Would you blame the student for what happened to you?
   1 for sure yes  2 probably yes  3 maybe  4 probably no  5 for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all
   1 definitely  2 may do this  3 definitely  4 may do this  5 definitely

   would do this  would NOT do this

5. Tell it to the lab’s supervisor
   1 definitely  2 may do this  3 definitely  4 may do this  5 definitely

   would do this  would NOT do this
6. Do something to get even

1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely
would do this
would NOT do this

7. Have it out with the student right then and there

1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely
would do this
would NOT do this

5. Leila and John had been planning to see the movie “Gladiator” since its previews. They finally got together one weekend and drove to the movies. There was quite a line with only two ticket counters, and it was moving very, very slowly. The movie was about to start. At last they could finally purchase their tickets, and John took out his wallet from his pocket to make the payment. Just then the clerk put a sign “CLOSED” on the counter. The clerk said: “I am very sorry; I had already gone far beyond my hours.” He then added: “There is a desk inside before you enter the theaters; you can buy tickets there. My name is Rasheed, tell them that I sent you; they’ll be able to help.”

Now, think again of the fact that when John could finally purchase tickets, the ticket counter got closed.

1. Do you think the clerk, Rasheed, meant to do that to John?

1  2  3  4  5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward Rasheed?

1  2  3  4  5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

3. Would you blame Rasheed for what happened to you?

1  2  3  4  5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no
Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely would do this
would do this would NOT do this

5. Tell it to Rasheed’s supervisor

1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely would do this
would do this would NOT do this

6. Do something to get even

1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely would do this
would do this would NOT do this

7. Have it out with Rasheed right then and there

1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely would do this
would do this would NOT do this

6. Kevin was driving back home from work. The traffic was progressing slowly, so he wanted to take another route to get to an easier and less crowded road. He was in the right lane, gave a signal and tried to change lanes to make a left turn, but the car in the left lane behind him would not let him do that. He almost missed the intersection. He opened his window and signaled with his arm that he intended to make a left turn. The guy in the other car opened his window, too, and shouted: “Get the hell out of my way!”

Now think again of the fact that Kevin almost missed the intersection because his way was blocked.

1. Do you think the man meant to do that to Kevin?

1  2  3  4  5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no
How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward him?

   1            2           3          4         5
   for sure yes      probably yes      maybe probably no     for sure no

3. Would you blame him for what happened to you?

   1            2           3          4         5
   for sure yes      probably yes      maybe probably no     for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

   1            2           3          4         5
   definitely     may do this    definitely would NOT do this
   would                          would NOT do this

5. Report him to a traffic officer

   1            2           3          4         5
   definitely     may do this    definitely would NOT do this
   would                          would NOT do this

6. Do something to get even

   1            2           3          4         5
   definitely     may do this    definitely would NOT do this
   would                          would NOT do this

7. Have it out with the man right then and there

   1            2           3          4         5
   definitely     may do this    definitely would NOT do this
   would                          would NOT do this
7. Jim had a volleyball game Thursday night. The last game had been a tie almost until the end. But, Jim was an excellent server, which won his team the last set. On Thursday night, he could sense that everybody was eager to get started. They were all playing pretty fast and Jim was just superb. Before he knew it the score was 2-2, a tie again before the last set. In the final set, Monroe, the member of the opposite team hit Jim’s arm constantly in a series of fault defenses while blocking Jim’s spikes at the net. In one instance, Monroe pushed Jim so hard that Jim hit his head to the metal pole. With agonizing pain, Jim turned to Monroe to say he should take it easy. Monroe responded: “You’re just a cry baby. Play like a real man.”

Now, think again of the fact that Monroe constantly hit Jim’s arm at the net and in one instance he pushed him so hard that Jim hurt his head.

1. Do you think Monroe meant to do that to Jim?

   1          2          3         4        5
   for sure yes  probably yes  maybe  probably no  for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward Monroe?

   1          2          3         4       5
   for sure yes  probably yes  maybe  probably no  for sure no

3. Would you blame Monroe for what happened to you?

   1          2          3         4       5
   for sure yes  probably yes  maybe  probably no  for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

   1          2          3         4       5
   definitely  may do this  definitely  would NOT
   would do this                               do this
5. Tell it to the referee

1 2 3 4 5

definitely may do this definitely
definitely
would would NOT

do this do this

6. Do something to get even

1 2 3 4 5

definitely may do this definitely

definitely
would would NOT

do this do this

7. Have it out with Monroe right then and there

1 2 3 4 5

definitely may do this definitely

definitely
would would NOT

do this do this

8. Lisa was at a grocery store. She had run out of her favorite ice cream. That Cappuccino Chocolate Chunk was so hard to find. She walked towards the aisle where frozen foods and ice cream were located. In the aisle, she saw another woman and started to talk to her. Lisa said: “Oh, that cappuccino chocolate chunk; I have such a craving for it. It is so delicious and so hard to find.” While Lisa was talking, the woman opened the refrigerator and found apparently what she was looking for. Lisa looked at her cart; it was Cappuccino Chocolate Chunk! The woman walked by Lisa without saying any words.

Now think again of the fact that the woman got exactly the same ice cream as Lisa was craving

1. Do you think the woman meant to do that to Lisa?

for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward the woman?

for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no
3. Would you blame her for what happened to you?

1  2  3  4  5
for sure yes  probably yes  maybe  probably no  for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

1  2  3  4  5
definitely  may do this  definitely would NOT do this
would do this

5. Tell it to a friend later

1  2  3  4  5
definitely  may do this  definitely would NOT do this
would do this

6. Do something to get even

1  2  3  4  5
definitely  may do this  definitely would NOT do this
would do this

7. Have it out with the woman right then and there

1  2  3  4  5
definitely  may do this  definitely would NOT do this
would do this

9. Jenny had just met a nice young man named Leroy in the bookstore while browsing through the mystery books, her favorite kind. The bookstore was in a huge 3-story building with a coffee shop on the first floor. Later, they had coffee together. Leroy said he would like to meet her again at the bookstore, 6 pm next Saturday. Excited, she said yes. She was there on Saturday, slightly before 6 pm. She waited and waited but Leroy didn’t show up. Disappointed, she left only to return a week later with the hope of seeing him again. There he was. He then walked by Jenny without noticing her.
Now, think again of the fact that a week ago Jenny had waited for Leroy and he didn’t show up.

1. Do you think Leroy meant to do that to Jenny?

   1 for sure yes   2 probably yes  3 maybe  4 probably no  5 for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward Leroy?

   1 for sure yes   2 probably yes  3 maybe  4 probably no  5 for sure no

3. Would you blame him for what happened to you?

   1 for sure yes   2 probably yes  3 maybe  4 probably no  5 for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

   1 definitely would do this   2 may do this   3 4 5 definitely would NOT do this

5. Tell it to a friend later

   1 definitely would do this   2 may do this   3 4 5 definitely would NOT do this

6. Do something to get even

   1 definitely would do this   2 may do this   3 4 5 definitely would NOT do this
7. Have it out with Leroy right then and there

1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely would NOT do this
would do this

10. Scott was very excited about his class presentation. The class gathered in the morning. When his name was called he made his introduction. He said that questions for clarification were welcome during the presentation, then there would be a 15-minute session for discussion. Each time he presented a different overhead he was interrupted by Tyrone for clarification. He eventually ran out of time for the 15-minute discussion session; he had only 3 minutes left! In these last 3 minutes, Tyrone started to quiz him again. He said: “Your presentation was all common sense and uninteresting. Except for some fancy terms, what have you told us that’s new?”

Now, think again of the fact that Scott ran out of time because his presentation was interrupted by Tyrone.

1. Do you think Tyrone meant to do that to Scott?

1  2  3  4  5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward Tyrone?

1  2  3  4  5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

3. Would you blame Tyrone for what happened to you?

1  2  3  4  5
for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely would NOT do this
would do this
5. Tell it to the class instructor
   1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely
definitely would may do this definitely
would would do this would NOT do this

6. Do something to get even
   1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely
would may do this definitely
would would do this would NOT do this

7. Have it out with Tyrone right then and there
   1  2  3  4  5
definitely may do this definitely
would may do this definitely
would would do this would NOT do this

11. Tony was on his way to the dry cleaner. He had stained his best pants while
    checking the oil in his car. He had a business meeting in the afternoon and nothing
    else to wear. At the counter, he presented his payment coupon and realized he
    hadn’t made the last payment yet. While thinking he would straighten this out later,
    the person at the counter excused herself to get his pants. When she came back he
    noticed that the stained spot was still there, also, the chemical they used discolored
    his khaki pants. He showed it to her. She said: “We didn’t do a good job, did we?
    Sorry for the inconvenience; we’ll pay for your pants and give you three coupons for
    free dry cleaning.”

    Now, think of Tony’s discolored khaki pants again.

1. Do you think the dry cleaners meant to do that to Tony?
   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no

   How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward the dry cleaners?
   1  2  3  4  5
   for sure yes probably yes maybe probably no for sure no
3. Would you blame the dry cleaners for what happened to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for sure yes</td>
<td>probably yes</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>probably no</td>
<td>for sure no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.*

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely would not do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Tell it to the upper management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely would not do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do something to get even

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely would not do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Have it out with the dry cleaners right then and there

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely would not do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Ann-Marie had finally managed to buy a computer. Her roommate, LaToya, was happy too. Ann-Marie had already told her that she would be welcome to use it. One day, Ann-Marie was in class and LaToya wanted to use the computer. She surfed the Internet and checked her e-mail. She noticed that Ann-Marie was using an old version of the e-mail software, so she downloaded the new version from the Internet. When Ann-Marie got home she sat down by the computer, checked her e-mail only to find out that her incoming and outgoing mailboxes were empty. She rushed upstairs to LaToya to ask what might have happened. LaToya said: “Oh I’m
so sorry. I must have done something wrong when I downloaded a new version of
the software. I’ll come down and help you recover your files.”

Now, think again of the fact that when Ann-Marie got home she found her incoming and
outgoing mailboxes empty.

1. Do you think the roommate, LaToya, meant to do that to Ann-Marie?

   1                     2                     3                     4                     5
   for sure yes           probably yes        maybe               probably no        for sure no

How would you feel if this happened to you?

2. Would you feel angry toward LaToya?

   1                     2                     3                     4                     5
   for sure yes           probably yes        maybe               probably no        for sure no

3. Would you blame LaToya for what happened to you?

   1                     2                     3                     4                     5
   for sure yes           probably yes        maybe               probably no        for sure no

Below are some responses other people have said they would do if this story happened to
them. Please think about what you would do and circle the best answer.

4. Just forget it and do nothing at all

   1                     2                     3                     4                     5
   definitely            may do this          definitely            definitely            definitely
   would                 would                  do this               would NOT              would NOT
   do this               do this               do this               do this               do this

5. Tell it to a friend later

   1                     2                     3                     4                     5
   definitely            may do this          definitely            definitely            definitely
   would                 would                  do this               would NOT              would NOT
   do this               do this               do this               do this               do this
6. Do something to get even

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>would NOT</td>
<td>do this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Have it out with LaToya right then and there

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>may do this</td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>would NOT</td>
<td>do this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td>would</td>
<td>do this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>