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ABSTRACT

EFFECTS OF EFFORT, SOCIABILITY AND SEX ON REACTIONS TO A "HAPPY ACCIDENT"

by

Bebe Audrey Jacobson

Master of Arts in Psychology

May, 1975

The present study does not find support for the hypothesis that females would react more favorably towards a sociable Stimulus Person than one about whom no information is given. It was hypothesized that a three-way interaction of sex x sociability x effort would occur for the dependent variables of liking, similarity and foreseeability of consequences. There was support for the hypothesis that females would be more likely to predict that they would be better able to foresee consequences in the sociable, effort condition. There was no support for the additional hypothesis that females in the effort condition would exhibit "fear of success."

One hundred and thirteen undergraduates enrolled in beginning Psychology courses at California
State University, Northridge, served as the subjects. There were 53 males and 60 females. In a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design, male subjects and female subjects were each randomly assigned to one of the following treatment conditions: (1) sociable Stimulus Person or no information about sociability (2) effortful Stimulus Person or no information about effort. In addition, a chi square analysis was performed on the dependent variable of fear of success.

Some possible reasons for failure to find expected sex differences are examined.
An accident can happen to anyone. Both good and bad accidents seem to be a part of living. Who knows what disaster lurks around the corner, or possibly some fortuitous circumstance which will make us feel that Lady Luck is indeed with us. Accidents are no respectors of race, creed, color or sex.

When an accident occurs, an observer may ascribe the result, be it positive or negative, to the person involved, a person attribution, or to the circumstances, an external attribution, involving luck, chance, or powerful others.

This investigation has been prompted as a result of a study of attribution of responsibility in which some puzzling results were obtained. McMartin and Shaw (1974) presented subjects with a male Stimulus Person in a chemistry laboratory who was involved in either a mild, happy accident (pleasant odor results) or a severe, happy, accident (production of a known but unusual compound). McMartin and Shaw sought to determine if effort had a significant effect in the attribution of responsibility in the mild and severe happy accident case. They manipulated the Stimulus Person's prior effort by describing him as spending many extra hours in the laboratory in an attempt to duplicate classic findings. In the control
case, no information was provided about the Stimulus Person's prior effort. They observed an interaction of effort with sex of subject on four dependent variables. These variables were, liking, similarity, morality and foreseeability of consequences.

The interactions of sex and effort was due to the facilitating effect of effort for male Subjects such that males liked the Stimulus Person more, saw him as more similar to themselves, more moral and more likely to foresee the consequences of mixing the chemicals, whereas effort had the opposite effect for female Subjects, that is, females judge him to be less likeable, less similar to themselves, less moral, and less able to foresee consequences than in the no information condition.

It would seem as if these are interesting results that are worth exploring. The focus of this investigation will be on the effects of sex and effort on liking, similarity, morality and foreseeability of consequences in the "happy accident" situation.

Considering McMartin and Shaw's (1974) findings, it may be possible to view their results from the standpoint of information theory. It could be hypothesized that because men have written the conditions in the aforementioned investigation, certain key bits of information that women attend to, have been left out, thereby
leaving a different impression on females than on males. Heider (1958) has defined the attribution process as the organization into meaningful units of a continuous stream of information from another's behavior. It may be that because the Stimulus Person expends long hours in the laboratory, females see him as a friendless, anti-social, rather unattractive kind of person, maybe what is known as a "greasy grind." Through the process of socialization, females tend to use verbal and social skills more than males, (Sherman, 1971), leaning more heavily on interactions with people (Douvan and Adelson, 1966), and see these skills as necessary and desirable for a person they might find likeable, desirable to know and be like (Coleman, 1963). It therefore might be difficult for females to relate to a solitary figure spending long lonely hours in a chemistry laboratory, she would likely seek company in such a situation. A Stimulus Person who chooses to seek this situation alone, might well indicate to her that this person is one who has no friends, a loner who spends long hours in the laboratory only because he has nothing much better to do. It is indeed possible, that where males see the Stimulus Person as someone they can identify with and like in the effort condition of a happy accident, females different point of view, gives them a different slant altogether.

There is another aspect that is worth some
consideration. When a male figure expends long solitary hours in a chemistry laboratory and after much effort produces a known but unusual compound, he has achieved something in our society. Perhaps the "accident" of finding this compound is not perceived as an accident at all, but instead is viewed as a success resulting from his hours of effort. An attribution model suggests achievement motivation be defined as a "capacity for perceiving success as caused by internal factors, particularly effort" (Weiner, Frieze, Kukla et al., 1972). Considering this, it may be that the addition of high effort to the happy accident causes it to be seen by women as an achieving situation.

It should be considered that because of the way females are socialized in our society, women may see achievement and the means to achievement goals differently than men do. Bem and Bem (1970) refer to the concept of a nonconscious ideology in our society that trains women to know their place. These ideologies are exemplified in beliefs and attitudes which are accepted implicitly, but remain outside awareness because alternative conceptions of the world remain unimagined. These nonconscious beliefs motivate many subtle practices which are effective in keeping women "in her place." Sex role training begins very early. Achievement for women in our society has been by and large defined in
social terms, be popular, get married, be a good mother. Achievement as defined for males, may be viewed as a deviancy from their roles as women, as defined by society.

Brown (1965) mentions a 1961 study by Field in which female scores go up in measures of achievement motivation when the arousal conditions stressed popularity and social acceptance rather than intelligence and leadership. Brown comments that status ranks for females in the United States have more to do with social grace and popularity than with leadership, and he sees their achievement motivation geared to their status system. It is no great surprise then, to find that females who have been propagandized to "get their man" and who are trained by society and the mores of their culture as to their "proper" role as a woman, see achievement in a non-social way as less desireable than their brothers.

Horner (1970) has found achievement related anxieties aroused in females in achievement oriented situations. Horner finds women facing the conflict of maintaining their feminine image and developing their ability, by disguising their ability and withdrawing from the competition in the world. She suggests that society is legally opening its doors of opportunity to women, while teaching them to fail outside the home. In studies investigating the achievement motive in women, Horner (1968) used a standard TAT using verbal rather
than pictorial cues. Women subjects were given a cue which referred to Anne finding herself at the top of her medical school class after final examinations. Male subjects were given the same cue except that John was substituted for Anne. Stories given by the subjects about Anne fell into three main categories. Fear of social rejection was the most frequent. These stories involved fear of losing one's friends, or one's dateability or marriage chances. Also included in this category were fear of loneliness or isolation as a result of the success, and desires to keep the success a secret and pretend that intelligence is not there. A second category was concern over one's normality and included doubts about one's femininity, and the feeling of guilt or despair about the success. The third category involved denial. Females in this category denied the reality or possibility of the cue by either distorting it or refusing to believe it. This was the second largest category and even included stories attributing Anne's success to cheating.

The most common themes running through all the stories concerned Anne's physical unattractiveness and her "lonely Friday and Saturday nights." If success could bring about all these negative consequences for females, it may be that females have good reason for not wishing to be similar or even not like the Stimulus
Person who succeeds in producing a known but unusual compound in a chemistry laboratory.
Hypothesis

From the previous discussion, it is hypothesized that females have perceived the male Stimulus Person as an anti-social person whom they are not inclined to like or be similar to. Furthermore, it may be possible to demonstrate that females do not see the "happy" accident as an accident so much as an achievement oriented situation when the variable of effort is introduced. It is hypothesized, that if the "happy" accident situation is restructured to occur in a social context, and if information is given regarding the social nature of the Stimulus Person, females will respond positively in the effort condition as should the males. It is further hypothesized that if Horner's fear of success theory is applicable, females will ascribe negative inferences about the future only in the effort condition.

The present study modifies and changes the "happy" accident situation encountered in McMartin and Shaw's (1974) study. The class situation is changed from a chemistry laboratory, to a history class, with the rationale that sex role stereotypes are less likely to be manifest in the more neutral setting of a class required of all undergraduates at California State
University, Northridge. Secondly, the "happy" accident occurs within the context of a social interaction, in one case with a friend, and in the other with a relative, in contrast to the isolation of the Stimulus Person in the McMartin and Shaw (1974) experiment. In addition, sociability is introduced as an independent variable in order to ascertain whether it was this bit of missing information that caused differential responses between males and females for the variables of liking, similarity, morality and foreseeability of consequences. Lastly, a female Stimulus Person is employed.

The predictions of this study are, (1) If females perceived the Stimulus Person as anti-social when exerting effort, then it seems reasonable to expect that a sociable Stimulus Person will be regarded more favorably by females than one about whom no information about sociability is provided, whereas with males it may be predicted that the findings of McMartin and Shaw (1974) will be replicated, that is, they will regard an effortful Stimulus Person favorably regardless of sociability. Therefore, a three way interaction of sex X sociability X effort is anticipated for the dependent variables of liking, similarity and foreseeability of consequences. (2) The achievement motivation model of Weiner, Frieze and Kukla (1972) suggests that perceiving success as caused by effort, may change the "happy accident" into
an achievement situation, thus females in the effort condition can be expected to exhibit significant "fear of success."
Method

The subjects are one hundred and thirteen undergraduate students enrolled in beginning Psychology courses at California State University, Northridge. There were fifty three males and sixty females. Ten to fifteen males and fifteen females are randomly assigned to one of the following four conditions: 1. Effort, prior social life; 2. Effort, no information about prior social life; 3. No information about effort, prior social life; 4. No information about effort, no information about prior social life.

The Stimulus Person is a female, Judy M. who is enrolled in a California History class. This situation should be relevant because such a course is a requirement for graduation at California State University, Northridge. After reading the description in whatever condition that they were assigned to, Subjects were requested to answer a questionnaire containing questions to be answered on a Likert type scale ranging from one to eleven, and also a verbal TAT question, similar to that used by Horner (1968), in which subjects are asked to describe what they think will happen to Judy M. in the future. All subjects were tested within a twenty
four hour period of time. They were told that the experiment has to do with person perception and to answer as truthfully and honestly as they can. When all of the questionnaires were turned in, the Subjects were debriefed and discharged.

1. Prior social, effort condition

Judy M. is a student at C.S.U.N. who is enrolled in a California history class. She is a bright girl who has lots of friends and an active social life. Judy had not been seeing too much of her friends, however, because she was spending all of her free time in the library researching a paper on a famous figure in California history. One day, her friend Susan called her and asked her to go to the movies. Judy mentioned that she had to write a paper on a famous figure in California history for her term paper. Susan explained that her grandmother was personally once acquainted with the famous man's granddaughter and could help her with her term paper. Judy M. met the grandmother and was able to include an anecdote about the famous person that earned her an A on her paper, and praise from the instructor.

2. No information about prior social life or effort

Judy M. is a student at C.S.U.N. who is enrolled in a California history class. One day her
cousin called, and Judy told her about the paper she was writing on a famous figure in California history for her term paper. The cousin exclaimed that her friend's grandmother, who lived in Los Angeles, was personally once acquainted with the famous man's granddaughter and could help her with her term paper. Judy M. met the grandmother and was able to include an anecdote about the famous person that earned her an A on her paper and praise from the instructor.

3. Prior social life, no information about effort condition

Judy M. is a student at C.S.U.N. who is enrolled in a California history class. She is a bright girl who has lots of friends and an active social life. One day, her friend Susan called her and asked her to go to the movies. Judy mentioned that she had to write a paper on a famous figure in California history for her term paper. Susan exclaimed that her grandmother was personally once acquainted with the famous man's granddaughter and could help her with her term paper. Judy M. met the grandmother and was able to include an anecdote about the famous person that earned her an A on her paper, and praise from the instructor.
4. No information about social life, effort condition

Judy M. is a student at C.S.U.N. who is enrolled in a California history class. Judy has been spending all of her free time in the library researching a paper on a famous figure in California history. One day, her cousin called her and Judy told her of the long hours she was spending in writing the paper. The cousin exclaimed that her friend's grandmother, who lived in Los Angeles, was personally once acquainted with the famous man's granddaughter and could help her with her term paper. Judy M. met the grandmother and was able to include an anecdote about the famous person that earned her an A on her paper and praise from the instructor.
Results

A 2x2x2 independent group analysis of variance was run for each of sixteen dependent variables. The "fear of success" dependent variable was analyzed using chi square.

Results are presented in three categories (1) assessment of the experimental manipulations (2) tests of hypotheses and (3) additional findings.

A. Checks on the Manipulation

Effort

That effort was successfully manipulated was shown by significant main effects for effort in the appropriate direction for each of the four manipulation checks. These items were asked, "How much effort did Judy put into her term paper assignment? Compared to most college students, how hard did Judy work in her history class? To what extent did Judy want to do well in her history class? How hard did Judy try to write the paper?"

Response to the question about how much effort Judy put in to her assignment reveals a significant main effect for effort (F = 20.8, p < .00001) with a mean of 7.9 in the no information about effort condition and 9.7
in the effort condition.

There is, in addition, a significant main effect of effort on trying hard (F = 21.8, p< .00001). When S's are given information about the Stimulus Person's effort, they judge the Stimulus Person as trying harder than in the no information about effort condition, with a mean of 9.5 and 7.8 respectively.

To the query comparing Judy to most college students for working hard in her history class, a significant main effect is found for the effort condition (F = 14.9, p< .0002) with a mean of 9.3 in the effort condition, and 7.7 in the no information about effort condition.

For the item, "To what extent did Judy want to do well?," responses reveal a significant main effect of effort (F = 23.9, p< .00000+). In the no information about effort condition, the mean is 8.6, and in the effort condition the mean is 10.4. Thus the S's see the Stimulus Person as intending to do well more often in the effort condition.

Analysis of variance also reveals that sociability had a significant effect on perceived effort (F = 10.92, p< .001). In the no information about sociability condition, the mean was 9.4, while in the sociable condition, the mean was 8.1, showing that the Stimulus Person was regarded as expending less effort
when portrayed as a sociable person.

To the item asking how hard Judy tried to write the paper, analysis also reveals a significant relationship between trying hard and sociability ($F = 5.3, p < .02$). In the no information about sociability condition, the mean is 9.0 while in the sociable condition, the mean is 8.2.

As indicated by these results, the effort manipulation was successful, however, it was found that two of these ratings were also affected by the sociability manipulation. It was found that ratings of perceived effort ($F = 10.9, p < .001$) as well as how hard Judy tried ($F = 5.3, p < .02$) were significantly decreased in the sociability condition relative to the no information about sociability condition.

Sociability

"How sociable a person is Judy?" was the item for the manipulation check on sociability. There was no significant main effect for sociability, thus it appears that the sociability manipulation was not successful. It does appear that sociability is affected by sex ($F = 6.6, p < .012$) with females having a mean of 8.3 in contrast to a mean of 7.5 for males. This significant main effect of sex is in the expected direction.

In addition, sociability appears to be affected by effort ($F = 16.34, p < .0001$). The mean for the no
information about effort condition is 8.6, while that for the effort condition is 7.2. Thus, unexpectedly, information that the Stimulus Person expended effort resulted in decreased ratings of sociability.

B. Tests of the Hypotheses

Liking, Similarity, Mortality

Analysis of the data reveal no significant main effects for liking, similarity, and morality. A three way interaction has been predicted of sex X sociability X effort and liking, similarity and morality. These interactions were not significant.

Foreseeability of Consequences

When S's were asked if they would have been able to foresee the consequences of seeing the grandmother if they were Judy, responses were significantly affected by an interaction of sex and effort (F = 3.97, p < .05). Females see the Stimulus Person as better able to foresee consequences when effort is expended (mean = 6.1), whereas when effort is expended (mean = 5.1), males see the Stimulus Person as less likely to foresee consequences than in the no information about effort condition (mean = 6.5). Thus, these results do not support the hypothesized three-way interaction.

Fear of Success

A chi square analysis was performed for the
question measuring fear of success which was, "What do you think will happen next to Judy?" Stories were rated for presence or absence according to the following criteria adapted from Horner (1970), a. negative consequences because of the success; b. anticipation of negative consequences because of the success, c. negative affect because of the success; d. instrumental activity away from present or future success, including leaving school; e. any direct expression of conflict about success; f. denial of effort in attaining the success (also cheating or any other attempt to deny responsibility or reflect credit for the success); g. denial of the situation described by the cue; or h. bizarre, inappropriate, unrealistic or nonadaptive responses to the situation described by the cue.

Stories were rated by two judges (r = .84). No evidence was found for fear of success as may be seen by Table 1, and thus the hypothesis that females would ascribe negative inferences in the effort condition was not supported.
Table 1
Fear of Success - Effort Condition 
(Raw Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of Success</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>No information about effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Success</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Fear of Success</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = \text{Effort condition, fear of success} = .17$

$\chi^2 = \text{Effort condition, no fear of success} = .08$

$\chi^2 = \text{No information about effort condition, fear of success} = .24$

$\chi^2 = \text{No information about effort condition, no fear of success} = .09$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of Success</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>No information about effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Success</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Fear of Success</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = \text{Effort condition, fear of success} = .39$

$\chi^2 = \text{Effort condition, no fear of success} = .02$

$\chi^2 = \text{No information about effort condition, fear of success} = .55$

$\chi^2 = \text{No information about effort condition, no fear of success} = 2.02$

All d.f. = 1
All p. = n.s.
C. Additional Findings

Attribution of Responsibility

When S's were asked to what extent that the Stimulus Person was responsible for obtaining the information from the grandmother, no significant effects were revealed. Thus the facilitative effects of effort on attribution of responsibility obtained by McMartin and Shaw (1974) was not replicated.

Chance

S's were asked to respond to what extent Judy's getting the information was by chance. Responses indicate a main effect of effort (F = 17.3, p < .00006). In the no information about effort condition, the mean is 9.0 and in the effort condition, the mean is 7.0. Thus, S's see less chance involved when there is effort expended.

Identification

A significant interaction of sex and sociability was obtained on the item asking S's how much they identify with the Stimulus Person (F = 9.18, p < .004). Females identify more with the Stimulus Person when there is no information about sociability (mean = 7.1) than when the Stimulus Person is described as sociable (mean = 4.8). Males identify more with a social Stimulus Person (mean = 6.6) than with one in which no information about
sociability is given (mean = 5.6). This is contrary to the expected hypothesis that females identify more with sociability.
DISCUSSION

Females in this study saw the Stimulus Person as significantly more sociable than males did. There are two interpretations: females pick up social cues with greater frequency than males or a response bias is operating for females.

In the present study, both males and females rate a sociable person as exerting less effort than one about whom no information about effort is provided. It appears that both sexes take the effort of a sociable person less seriously than when they have no knowledge of her social life. This effect was not anticipated. These results may be viewed against our cultural Puritan ethic of "getting down to business," where pleasure or frivolity discounts the seriousness of work. Another explanation for these results may be found in the description of Judy as a bright girl in the sociable condition. It may be possible that this cued off a response which implied that a bright person who does well does not have to expend as much effort, in contrast to a person about whom one knows nothing concerning their intelligence. This appears to be supported by findings of Weiner and Kukla (1970), who studied the evaluative consequences of ability versus effort attributions, requiring S's to
provide rewards based on information concerning ability, present or absent, effort, present or absent, and exam performance. Findings revealed that given either effort or no effort information, low ability pupils are rewarded more and punished less by S's than those who are believed to possess ability.

It was hypothesized that female S's would react more favorably to the Stimulus Person in the sociability and effort condition, than to one about whom no information is provided concerning sociability, as regards similarity, liking and morality, but the sociability manipulation was not successful so that an adequate test of the hypothesis could not be made. No significant main effects were found for these variables. However, the context of the "happy accident" situation itself did involve an interaction between the Stimulus Person and another person even in the no information about sociability condition. The data reveals that females implied sociability to the Stimulus Person even where none was mentioned. This can be seen as previously discussed, as a result of the conditions in this study being constructed by a female, and including key bits of information that males might not attend to and females do pick up, such as interactions with people. Thus it might be that the social cues in the situation itself may have caused females to view the Stimulus Person less negatively than

Interestingly enough, identification with the Stimulus Person which may be seen as not far different from similarity, directly contradicts the hypothesis that female S's would see a sociable Stimulus Person more favorably. Males identified more with a sociable Stimulus Person than did females. Males may be reacting to the description of a friendly female, one who has an active social life, presumably including males, rather than a person about whom nothing is known concerning social relationships. On the other hand, it is known that females in the sociability and the no information about sociability condition see the Stimulus Person as social. Perhaps females who read the description of Judy's active social life, may wish to be taken more seriously, and thus do not wish to identify with a "dilettantish" female. They may see her sociability in this condition as a threat to being taken seriously themselves, a threat that men do not perceive since the Stimulus Person is of the opposite sex. A further investigation into this area may be a fruitful topic for future study.

The hypothesis that females would be more likely to predict that they would be better able to foresee consequences in the sociable, effort condition is supported, since the data shows that females see the
Stimulus Person as social in both the sociability and no information about sociability condition. The opposite effect was found for males, however, contradicting the hypothesis that males would view effort favorably regardless of information about sociability. In fact, males see themselves as less likely to foresee consequences in the effort condition. It must be remembered that in McMartin and Shaw's (1974) study, the opposite effects occurred. That is, females saw themselves as less likely to foresee consequences in the effort condition while the contrary was found for males. In both studies these effects occur with opposite sex Stimulus Persons, and thus what had been considered to be sex differences, now appear to be a reaction shared by males and females to opposite sex Stimulus Persons, making for consistency between these results. It is not clear from this study what caused this effect.

There were no significant differences between males and females for liking, morality and similarity (except as it is related to identification). This is consistent with the hypothesis that lack of cues about sociability may have caused differences found in previous studies.

The hypothesis that females would ascribe negative inferences in the effort condition did not receive support. This failure to find significant
effects of anxiety about success may be due to the fact that the female described herein was in a history class, a place that females may not find as anxiety provoking as for instance, a chemistry laboratory. Tressemer (1974) has attempted to replicate Horner's fear of success findings by rewriting the story cues, and has suggested that fear of success may be more of a fear of sex role deviancy than of success. Horner (1970) found fear of success in a narrow situation. Her female Stimulus Person was number one in a male dominated field (medicine). The Stimulus Person in this study did not achieve a very strong success (getting an A on her paper and praise from the professor). In addition, the Stimulus Person in the situation presented here is not in competition for male type roles, as in Horner's study.

Hoffman (1972) observes that females have greater affiliative needs and therefore conflict between affiliation and achievement motivation will occur often for women. The Stimulus Person in this experiment is seen in an interaction with other people, because of this perceived social intercourse, conflict may not arise.

Conclusions

It is apparent that sociability does have an effect on perceived effort. This experiment did not clear the air as to sex differences found in other
studies involving the "happy accident" because of the failure of the sociability manipulation. More investigation in the area of sociability, effort and sex differences seems warranted. Another fruitful area for investigation might be an exploration of anxiety about success as a function of sex role deviancy. It is suggested that this area could be investigated utilizing a physical science laboratory or classroom setting as opposed to a social science class.
References


APPENDICES
As students in psychology, you are aware of the fact that you are required to participate in a number of experiments. The psychology department is planning to study how people form impressions of others. You can assist us in selecting materials and procedures for the proposed research project.

On the page that follows is a description of a person identified as Judy. Subjects in the actual experiment will be asked to read descriptions of Judy and to form impressions based on the limited information that is available.

This description is one of several we are considering for use in the actual experiment. Please assist us by first reading over the description, and then expressing your own opinions, reactions and hunches on the same kind of questionnaire that the real subjects will be given. In this way, we hope that you will help us to eliminate any descriptions that are misleading or too ambiguous. After answering the questions, please give your opinion on the intelligibility of the description and any other comments you might have about this proposed experiment.
Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions as well as you can. There are a number of questions and it is important that you answer each of them. Read carefully and circle the appropriate number on the lines below. Make only one circle on each line.

1. How much effort did Judy put into her term paper assignment?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
   Very little                       Very much

2. How sociable a person is Judy?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
   Not sociable at all              Extremely so

3. How hard did Judy try to write the paper?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
   Very little                     Extremely hard

4. To what extent was Judy's getting the information by chance?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
   Not at all by chance            Entirely due to chance

5. If you were Judy, do you feel that you would have been able to foresee the consequences of seeing the grandmother?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
   Definitely not be able           Definitely able to foresee consequences
6. In your opinion, how moral was Judy in using the information from the grandmother?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all moral</td>
<td>Extremely moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Do you feel that what happened to Judy in getting the information from the grandmother could possibly happen to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Could never happen to me</td>
<td>Could very easily happen to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How much do you identify with Judy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Identify very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How involved were you in reading the story of what happened to Judy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all involved</td>
<td>Extremely involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How much do you like Judy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How similar are you to Judy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all similar</td>
<td>Extremely similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. To what extent were the consequences of seeing the grandmother good or positive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all positive</td>
<td>Extremely positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. How lucky was Judy?

Not at all lucky

Extremely lucky

14. To what extent did Judy want to do well in her history class?

Not at all

Very much

15. Compared to most college students, how hard did Judy work in her history class?

Not hard at all

Extremely hard

16. To what extent can Judy be said to be responsible for obtaining the information from the grandmother?

Not at all

Totally responsible

17. Write one or two sentences describing what you think will happen next, to Judy?

__________________________________________

Comments and Opinions

Please indicate any comments you have about the proposed experiment. Thank you for helping in the preparation of these research materials.