

THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL IDENTITY ON DECISION MAKING  
OF NEGOTIATION OUTCOME

by

AYŞE BÜŞRA TOPAL

Submitted to the Institute of Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Sabancı University

July 2018

EFFECT OF SOCIAL IDENTITY ON DECISION MAKING OF  
NEGOTIATION OUTCOME

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çağla Aydın  
(Thesis Supervisor)



Prof. Dr. Ayşe Betül Çelik



Doç. Dr. Müjde Peker Booth



DATE OF APPROVAL: JULY 26, 2018

**© Ayşe Büşra Topal 2018**

**All Rights Reserved**

## ABSTRACT

### THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL IDENTITY ON DECISION MAKING OF NEGOTIATION OUTCOME

AYŞE BÜŞRA TOPAL

M.A. Thesis, July 2018

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Çağla Aydın

**Keywords:** social identity, decision making, loss aversion, negotiation, social identity priming

Social identity influences the perception and action of individuals based on the context they are found in. Therefore, it is expected to be effective on conflict and the conflict resolution process. The present study examined whether reminders of social identity influences decision-making of individuals in a negotiation context. In an experimental design, participants who were primed with a social identity (n=81) were compared with a control group (n=83) with regards to their loss averse behavior in a negotiation task. Various negotiation contexts such as business, political and school contexts, were provided in order to observe the change in behavior. Participants reminded of their social identity were expected to present more loss averse behavior in each context. Participants additionally received the Group Integration Scale for manipulation check purposes. Several other control variables were measured via the Conflict Management Style scale; Kagitcibasi Self-Construal Scale, and the Locus of Control scales. Results revealed that across the three contexts, there were no differences between the experimental and control conditions in terms of their loss averse behavior. The implications of the findings are being discussed within the literature.

## ÖZET

### MÜZAKERE SIRASINDA KARAR VERMEYE SOSYAL KİMLİĞİN ETKİSİ

AYŞE BÜŞRA TOPAL

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Temmuz 2018

Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çağla Aydın

**Anahtar sözcükler:** sosyal kimlik, karar alma, kayıptan kaçınma, sosyal kimlik uyarımı

Sosyal kimlik bulunduğu bağlama göre bireylerin algı ve davranışlarını etkilemektedir. Bu sebeple, çatışma ve çatışma çözümü süreçlerinde de etkin olması beklenir. Bu çalışma bireylere sosyal kimlikleri hatırlatıldığında bunun müzakere sırasındaki karar alma mekanizmalarını nasıl etkilediğini incelemektedir. Deneysel yöntem kullanılan çalışmada, belirli bir sosyal kimlikle uyarılan katılımcılar müzakere sırasında risk alma veya riskten kaçınma davranışları üzerinden kontrol grubuyla karşılaştırıldı. Davranışların olası değişimlerini gözlemlemek için iş, siyaset ve okul gibi farklı müzakere bağlamları sunuldu. Sosyal kimlikleri hatırlatılan katılımcıların her bağlamda daha kayıp reddeden bir tavır almaları beklenmektedir. Takiben, Grup Bağlılık ölçeği manipülasyon kontrolü için kullanıldı. Bazı ek kontrol değişkenleri Çatışma Yönetim Tipi ölçeği; Kağıtçıbaşı'nın Benlik Tipi ölçeği, ve Rotter Denetim Odağı ölçeği ile ölçüldü. Çalışma sonuçları üç bağlamın hiçbirinde gruplar arasında kayıp kaçınma davranışında fark olmadığını gösterdi. Çalışmanın katkıları literatür bağlamında tartışıldı.

*To my dearest family*  
&  
*all chained elephants*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to first thanks to Çağla Aydın, for not being only supervisor of my thesis but also my academic life. Her sincere and unique support helped me to find my way. I would like to thanks to my jury members Ayşe Betül Çelik and Müjde Peker Booth for their enthusiastic and valuable feedbacks, which helped me to carry this study to a better place and encouraged me for further studies. I would also like to acknowledge my professors and a special administrator from faculty, support of my professors Asuman Büyükcan Tetik, Emre Hatipoğlu and Kerimcan Kavaklı and administrator Sumru Küçüka always being priceless and great motivation for me.

Since Sabancı became a home to me, acknowledgment list includes many valuable people for me. Great thanks to Hilal, Sevde and Merve, who made home this place from very beginning. I would like to thanks all CONF fellows of my cohort and specially to Greta, Güzin and Zeqine. It was great pleasure to me to be a part of such a great cohort, even though what brought us together is conflict's itself, hopefully resolution will make us stay together. Followingly, I would like to thanks to my three supportive, sincere and be loved friends Melike, Elif and Yeşim, for their all support and special friendship. I would like to specially thanks to my fastidious friend Faruk for his patient, endless and sincere support and friendship, not just with my thesis but also with my career and life. My other special thanks to my great sensei Osman, for all valuable lessons he taught about life and academia, and for his great support anytime I needed. I also like to thanks to all my friends and participants who helped me with and participated to my study.

Last but not least, I would like to thanks to all my family members, which not just includes blood and law but also heart relatives Betül, Elif and Zeynep, for their great support and believing in me since the beginning. My two precious, Havva and Sümeyye, deserve greatest thanks for making my life harder and great, mostly great, and for their support and trust. My dearest Mom and Dad, since words are not enough for my enormous gratitude to you, I would like to thank you endlessly for everything you gave to me.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Decision Making and Prospect Theory.....	2
1.2. Social Identity Theory.....	4
1.3. Negotiation as a Conflict Resolution Method.....	7
1.4. The Present Study.....	9
2. Method.....	11
2.1 Participants.....	11
2.2 Procedure.....	12
2.3. Priming Procedure.....	13
2.4. Materials.....	14
2.5. List of Measures.....	14
2.5.1. Group Integration Scale.....	15
2.5.2. Autonomous-self and Related-self Scales.....	15
2.5.3. Test for Conflict Handling Style.....	16
2.5.4. Rotter’s Internal-External Locus of Control Scale.....	16
3. Results.....	17
3.1 Descriptive Analyses.....	17
3.2. Impact of Social Identity Reminders on Loss Averse Behavior.....	20
3.3. Context Based Impact of Social Identity Reminders on Loss Averse Behavior.....	21
3.4. Prospect Theory Confirmation.....	21
3.5. Additional Analyses.....	22
3.6. Relationship between Tasks and Scales.....	25

3.7. Open-ended Questions.....	27
4. Discussion.....	29
5. Implications and Limitations.....	34
6. Conclusions.....	36
References.....	37
Appendix A.....	45
Appendix B.....	45
Appendix C.....	46
Appendix D.....	49
Appendix E.....	51
Appendix F.....	52
Appendix G.....	53
Appendix H.....	57

## Figures and Tables

Table 2.1. Mean and SD of age groups.....	12
Table 2.2. Demographics of the participants.....	12
Table 2.3. Summary of the experimental protocol.....	14
Table 3.1. Descriptive statistics of scales.....	18
Table 3.2. Descriptive statistics regarding categorization of LOC and self-scales.....	19
Table 3.3. Context effect on social identity and loss aversion relationship.....	21
Table 3.4. Prospect Theory confirmation based on conditions and contexts.....	22
Table 3.5. Correlation coefficients of primed group.....	25
Table 3.6. Correlation coefficients of not primed group .....	25
Table 3.7. Coefficients of all sample.....	24
Table 3.8. Relationship between total scores of risk-averse and risk-seeking and scales based on conditions.....	26
Table 3.9. Relationship of each frame and context with scales.....	26
Table 3.10. Number of participant for each task and conditions.....	27

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Conflict scholars agree on the definition of conflict mostly but there are some slight variations; Rubin, Pruitt and Kim (1994) define conflict as a “perceived divergence of interest, or a belief that parties’ current aspirations cannot be achieved simultaneously” (p. 4) while Fisher’s (2012) definition of conflict is “a social situation involving perceived incompatibilities in goals or values between two or more parties, attempts by the parties to control each other, and antagonistic feelings by the parties toward each other” (p. 6).

Despite the minor differences in the definition of conflict, conflict resolution is an approach that is engaged with various disciplines in social sciences, such as psychology, sociology, political science and international relations. Each discipline focuses on various points of conflict analysis; such as, inter-personal, inter-group and international level; all based on the unit of analysis they are interested in. Galtung (1965) categorizes conflict at the individual and collective level, the latter changing between intra-system and inter-system dimensions. He adds that group level conflict involves conflict within and between class, ethnic, racial and other interest groups. According to Fisher (2012) intergroup cleavages occur in contexts such as communal, organizational and international levels.

Despite the common negative perception of conflict, it also has the practical function to reconstruct societies based on dynamic interests of people considering social change is necessary to protect group effectiveness and solidarity (Rubin, Pruitt, & Kim, 1994). Therefore, studying conflict is a way to identify more effective solutions which would reduce the negative consequences of conflict and increase benefits from positive outcomes.

Social psychologists were interested in the topic of conflict since the beginning of the field which stands out especially when compared to other disciplines (Fisher, 1985). The old mutual affinity is expected considering the ongoing discussion about the nature of conflict, which emphasizes two basic assumption about the origin of conflict: human nature and social learning (Rubin, Pruitt, & Kim, 1994). According to Fisher (2012), individuals and social groups have a set of basic needs and rights such as those for security, dignity, respect and

control over their lives. The clash of interests that relate to these needs and the unnegotiable nature of some of them is what causes conflict. Some social psychology scholars accept a binary relationship between groups which is affected by the perception, motivation and the action of individuals during conflict and the resolution process. Also, cognition, attitude and values of the individual actor exert an important effect on their behavior during intergroup conflict (Fisher, 2012).

In the present work, I mostly focused on the significance of social identities in conflict and the negotiation process which I combined psychology and conflict resolution fields. I believe that analyzing the effect of social identity on our judgements and decisions is valuable considering people behave and judge more depending on their social identities which in turn has a positive relationship with grouping which is increasingly popular in global world. Considering the last century of the human history, we can observe a considerable number of conflict cases in the times of rising grouping and polarization, therefore, understanding the dynamics of social identity on decision making is even more valuable in the quest to provide efficient suggestions for conflict resolution and negotiation processes. Besides this practical benefit, to my knowledge, the relationship between social identity and decision making in the context of negotiations is an under-studied subject of the field.

In Literature review chapter, first I will discuss relevant decision-making literature in terms of risk perception, rationality assumption and loss aversion concepts. Followingly, I will explain social identity theory and will briefly mention negotiation as a part of conflict resolution method. Lastly, I will explain present study.

### **1.1. Decision Making and Prospect Theory**

Within the decision-making literature, rational choice theory is used to determine action and analyze the behavior of individuals from different backgrounds such as politicians, voters and consumers. The model of rational choice is dependent on the assumption that people are successful in detecting their aims and the theory puts an emphasis on the rational individuals compared to what it claims as less rational ones (Quattrone & Tversky, 1988). Often the case in literature is that rationality is defined based on risk perception and behavior. Decision-making scholars distinguish the risky and riskless choice in terms of the analysis of the decision-making process and define “risky choice” as accepting an outcome within a

specified probability rather than accepting a transaction which has a certain outcome in return of an investment (Tversky & Kahneman, 1983). Additionally, certainty enhances the aversion of sure loss as it enhances the preference of sure gain (Kahneman & Renshon, 2009).

In order to capture these ideas with a framework, prospect theory suggests that the psychological analysis of the outcome varies in terms of gains and losses in terms of the total outcome under risky circumstances (Kahneman & Tversky, 1995). People are categorized as risk-averse if they prefer a certain outcome over a risky offer which has a greater or equal value; and they are categorized as risk-seeking if they reject a certain outcome by taking the risk of lower or equal expectation (Quattrone & Tversky, 1988; Tversky & Kahneman, 1983). Tversky and Kahneman's (1981) study on the psychology of choice revealed that individuals who are obligated to make a decision might change their preferences under the effect of different framing of choice even though they are usually unaware of the potential effect of different framing and how this might change the perception of the relative attractiveness of choice. This has been known as the framing effect in the literature (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981).

Cognitive process of individual decision making also involves dynamic of psychological approaches which focus on conflict. However, cognitive process does not always function in an expected way and produces cognitive biases which are predictable errors of individuals when they interpret an information. Cognitive biases such as perceiving someone as dangerous because of racial appearance, in a conflict situation, may favor hawkish decision making which in turn may lead to suspicion, hostility and aggression during the conflict process and a less cooperative and trusting attitude for resolution (Kahneman & Renshon, 2009). Individuals who have this kind of attitude in a conflict situation are more likely to exhibit excessive threats and produce extra conflict (Kahneman & Renshon, 2009). Previous research has also revealed that in general, individuals are more likely to perceive the intention of the opponent as unreasonably negative and their own situation as optimistic (Kahneman & Renshon, 2009; Kahneman & Tversky, 1995).

Despite the fact that decision makers are risk averse in the majority of situations, there are indicators of unrealistic optimism which promotes a greater risk-taking behavior under the setting of goals and plans (Kahneman & Tversky, 1995). Overconfident optimism induces

a situation in which individuals accept risk because they deny its probability to happen. The causal mechanism of unrealistic optimism may be to prevent extreme aversion of risk taking in a negotiation (Kahneman & Lovallo, 1993; March & Shapira, 1987). Risk taking behavior also varies over conditions and context. Under favorable and acceptable conditions, voters are more likely to prefer the riskless incumbent, considering their risk averse tendency. However, this preference may reverse when the conditions or the status-quo become unacceptable (Quattrone & Tversky, 1988).

Generally, decision problems are accepted as choice between status quo and the alternative to it which advantages are considered as gains and disadvantages as loss. Considering the fact that “losses loom larger than gains”, decision makers are expected to have the tendency to protect status quo, which is a loss averse behavior, in a case of risky possibility (Tversky & Kahneman, 1983) and agents are risk seeking in situations with a slim chance of escaping from a bigger loss (Kahneman & Renshon, 2009). So, according to the prospect theory: the attitude of individuals towards risk is determined by whether they perceive the outcomes as gain or loss (Quattrone & Tversky, 1988). The perception of loss aversion is also related to the retention of the status quo, since its disadvantages outweigh the advantages. These arguments are valid above the individual level, for the international context as well since states which defend the status quo have a bargaining advantage aware that states will be more willing to take risk under the possibility of loss (Jervis, 1992). In this study, I plan to focus on the “loss aversion” concept and investigate how people who are reminded a social identity, will behave in response to gain and loss to bring a conflict to an end. In this section, I briefly shared useful information from decision making literature and mentioned prospect theory, in the next section I will explain social identity theory.

## **1.2. Social Identity Theory**

Social identity and personal identity are differentiated as two separate categories for individuals; the former one originates from group membership and determines the group’s and the related individual’s behavior, while the latter originates from the individual’s personal experience and characteristics which also influence the individual and interpersonal behavior (Herriot, 2007). Tyler (2000) defines social identity as “the portion of the person’s image of himself or herself that develops out of the groups to which he or she belongs” (p.

143) and therefore individuals have tendency to categorize people as “we” and “they” which are in-group members and out-group members (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Sherif et al., 1961; Tajfel, 1970; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Social identity has three components which depend on group’s status and size, cognitive element, belongingness to a category, evaluative element, comparing categories between groups and the affective element which is the degree of commitment (Herriot, 2007). Considering these components, the social identity theory provides a good testing ground for an experimental study. Here, I plan to mostly focus on individual level tendency of group members to feel as “we” and their belongingness, rather than out-group bias behavior.

The group-based identity shapes intergroup behavior in a similar way as personal characteristics do (Herriot, 2007). Categorizing others based on social identity facilitates individuals’ understanding of how to behave and what to expect from others in certain situations (Herriot, 2007). Furthermore, categorization shapes social norms and reduces uncertainty by regulating people’s actions in different situations, it particularly influences behavior related to the group and the individual as a group member (Herriot, 2007; Tajfel, 1970; Tajfel & Turner, 1979;). Most of the time this type of categorization motivates behavior in a way that favors in-group members and discriminates the other group’s (Herriot, 2007; Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Sherif et al., 1961; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Social identity also builds a connection between the status of selves and groups and this connection motivates people to seek the success of the group and bring into prominence favorable group identities in order to enhance self-esteem and self-worth (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Tyler, 2000). People may consider the group’s status and success as their own and share their feelings with this status to some extent (Tyler, 2000). We perceive threats against our social group as if directed to our social identity and we feel danger for ourselves and our self-esteem considering this bond between social identity and self (Herriot, 2007; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

People do not feel a sense of belonging to an only one group but rather to several different social groups and categories. Social identity requires certain conditions for it to influence our behavior throughout a conflict situation (Herriot, 2007). The first condition is the *internalization* into the self of that social identity, as the preference among the probable internalized social identities will be determined by the importance and accessibility according

to the given conditions. The second condition for determining social identity which will influence behavior is *immediate social context*; individuals should have the opportunity to observe the competition for a comparison with other groups (Herriot, 2007). It should be noted, however that some social identities, such as ethnic identity, might be relatively stable through time and context, even group based social identity studies suggest that individual's identity builds upon social context (Abrams, 1999; Alwin, Cohen, & Newcomb, 1992; Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Sears & Henry, 1999; Turner et al., 1994). The level of identification between various social identities is deterministic on the salience of the identity itself (Korostelina, 2007).

Behavior patterns related to a certain group also may get affected by relevant social identities in cases when group members or individuals engage as group members. Such behavior may increase the conformity with the particular group, stereotyping and discrimination against individuals from other groups and favoring in-group members (Herriot, 2007; Sheriff et al, 1961; Tyler, 2000). Belongingness to a social group can trigger psychological threat concerns and someone who is a member of a group might be more concerned about the achievement in a specific task because of the feeling of representing a group, which defined as stereotype threat that the situation people face with societal stereotypes because membership of a specific group (Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999). For example, a woman who will take a mathematics test might be concerned about the risk of confirming the negative stereotypes about the success rate of women in math (Cohen & Garcia, 2008; Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999). Similarly, researches show that people with a specific social identity might be concerned about confirming negative stereotypes attached to their group and they will thus get affected by this though while making certain decision (Carr & Steele, 2010). Consequently, this insecurity causes ego depletion, which defined as one's self control depends on low mental activity (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, & Muraven, 2018), which increases the loss aversion (Carr & Steele, 2010).

Cultural values also might have a say in perception of social identities. One set of such values, studied widely in cultural psychology comprised of autonomy and relatedness. Kagitcibasi's self-construal model (1996) has been influential in characterizing cross sectional model which has autonomousness and relatedness dimensions and the model refuses the claim that being a part of only one dimension at a time. Thus, in the present study,

I would like to examine the relationship between self construals and social identity.

In this section, I have discussed social identity theory with some aspects related with the study which effective on perception and behavior of individuals. In the following section, I will explain negotiation concept with some fundamentals.

### **1.3. Negotiation as a Conflict Resolution Method**

Negotiation is an essential part of daily life of those who interact with other people in business, academic, political and similar environments. The study of negotiation behavior has spread to research fields such as, psychology, economics, industrial relations, organizational behavior, sociology and the law (Thompson, 1990). As I have mentioned earlier in Introduction section, interest of social psychologists to conflict field is as old as almost field's itself, by time studies of social psychologists to understand nature of conflict evolved to studies to understand the way of getting benefit of it and resolving it by decreasing possible damage as much as possible. Therefore, I will focus on negotiation context as a conflict resolution method.

Negotiation as a process has been thought to have five characteristics; conflict of interest, possibility of communication, possibility of compromise or solution, chance to make offers for all parties and offers & proposals not influencing the outcome until they are accepted by the parties in the process (Chertkoff & Esser, 1976; Cross, 1965; Schelling, 1960) According to a simpler definition of the negotiation, it includes parties, interests, the negotiation process and outcome (Thompson & Hastie, 1990).

Complex social processes occur during negotiation, beyond the give and take to accomplish an agreement as many of the important factors that affect the negotiation's outcome take place even before the negotiation start (Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 2016). The cultural background of the parties, emotional and psychological characteristics of negotiators, historical heritage of parties and power relationships are some of the important points that shape the result before the negotiations start.

One of the factor that will be effective on negotiation might be related with the preferred conflict management strategy of individuals. Pruitt and Rubin (1986) analyzed possible strategy types in a two-dimensional model named dual concern model. According

to this model, conflict management functions in two dimensions, high-low concern for self and high-low concern for others (Dreu et al., 2001). High concern for both self and others result in preference towards problem-solving which is oriented towards the satisfaction of both sides. Low concern for both self and others refers to the preference of avoiding. Low concern for self and high concern for others means a yielding strategy which involves accepting and cooperating with others. High concern for self and low concern for others result in preference for forcing which involves threats and bluffs. Additionally, some scholars accept compromising which refers to an intermediate level concern for self and others as valid too (Dreu et al., 2001). Considering negotiation as a conflict resolution method, it is expected to find relevance of these strategies with negotiation behavior.

In order to determine the most productive behavior path and to detect significant previous knowledge about negotiation, a variety of theoretical methods have been developed (Thompson, 1990). The measures testing behavior and performance during negotiations are grouped as psychological and economic measures. Economic measures mostly target outcome and product which are based on rationality and normative analysis assumption (Nash, 1953). On the other hand, psychological measures focus on the process and the outcome of negotiation and based on social perception (Thompson & Hastie, 1990). Individuals may attribute the source of success and failure of these outcomes to their own selves or an external factor. The locus of control theory defines this phenomena as internal and external locus of control with the former one attributing the source of incidence to fate or luck and the latter one attributing it to herself. In addition to that, locus of control also has relationship with the style that we prefer during the conflict management. Previous research has revealed the relationship between locus of control and conflict management strategies. According to this relation, people tend to use more problem-solving strategies as they show more characteristics of internal locus of control (Dijkstra, Beersma & Evers, 2011). In this study, I will use Conflict Management Style scale to observe whether conflict management style has any effect negotiation and decision making and Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control scale to observe its relationship with conflict management styles and decision-making behavior in negotiation.

One of the greatest motivation of parties in a conflict to sit negotiation table is interdependence since they need each other to reach their aimed outcome and objectives.

Considering this key characteristic of the negotiation, they must coordinate or work together because the possible outcome is better than the one they can achieve on their own. The level of interdependence is based on the goals and structure of the situation at hand (Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 2016). In a situation that only one of the parties could reach the goal, the competitive scenario known as zero-sum or distributive situation occurs. In contrast, when the gain at stake for the parties might be linked and the success of one helps the other to reach their goals, a scenario defined as mutual-gains situation or as a non-zero-sum or integrative situation occurs (Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 2016).

In this section, I have summarized some definitions of negotiation that I have considered for this study and essentials from literature and some additional factors that might be effective during the negotiation. In the following section, I will outline the present study.

### **1.5. The Present Study**

In this study, I mainly explore whether reminding one's social identity has any influence on the decision-making when one must choose for a risky option in a negotiation context. Social identity is manipulated with a priming method. I expect to observe more risk averse behavior for gains and risk seeking behavior for losses from the individuals that are under the social identity conditions compared to those that are not because group identity shapes the behavior of people when it is triggered, and members of groups move with the motivation of protecting the group's status thus implicitly their personal status and self-esteem too. Therefore, my two main hypotheses are:

**H1.** Individuals who are reminded of a social identity in a negotiation context will be more risk averse when a gain is possible compare to those who are not reminded.

**H2.** Individuals who are reminded of a social identity in a negotiation context will be more risk seeking when a lost is possible compare to those who are not reminded.

My additional hypotheses are:

**H3.** Individuals who have higher group integration will be more risk averse when a gain is possible in a negotiation context compare to those who have lower group integration.

**H4.** Individuals who have higher group integration will be more risk seeking when a lost is

possible in a negotiation context compare to those who have lower group integration.

**H5.** Group integration level of individuals has a positive relationship with the Related-Self construal.

**H6.** Group integration level of individuals has a negative relationship with the Autonomous-Self construal.

**H7.** Locus of control level of individuals has positive relationship with the level of avoiding conflict management style.

**H8.** Locus of control level of individuals has negative relationship with the level of problem-solving conflict management style.

**H9.** Locus of control level of individuals has negative relationship with the risk seeking behavior in a negotiation context.

**H10.** Locus of control level of individuals has positive relationship with the risk averse behavior in a negotiation context.

## 2. METHOD

The present chapter demonstrates which sampling type was used, the indicator of the sample size and the demographic details of the participants. Under the Procedure headline, I explain the steps that were followed for both the experimental and control conditions. The section on the priming procedure discusses the manipulation method that was used for the experimental condition and explains in detail the development of this method. In the Materials section, I explain the procedure and the details of experimental material. At the last part of this section, I explicate important features of the surveys used in the experiment.

### 2.1. Participants

Participants were employed through the convenience sampling method. The study was advertised in the university psychology courses and the university webpage. The data was collected with hard-copy materials in a controlled classroom environment, and the participants were randomly assigned to one of the two conditions.

In order to determine the required sample size, a power analysis was conducted with G\*Power 3.1 (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). It indicated that based on a medium effect size ( $f = .25$ )<sup>1</sup>, an error probability of .05, and a power of .80 (Cohen, 1992), 158 participants were needed to conduct the experiment. Among 164 participants (103 female, 50 male), eleven of them did not share their demographic information. The participants' age ranges between 20 and 28, and 6 participants did not report their year of birth, mean and standard deviation are reported in Table 2.1. Alongside age, information about their major programs and faculty that they enroll was requested. 81 participants reported that they study in the Faculty of Art and Social Sciences while 57 were Psychology majors. 49 individuals reported that they are students of the Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, whereas 23 of the participants were from the School of Management. 105 participants received bonus points for courses with PSY code in return of their participation.

Table 2.1.

*Mean and SD of age groups*

	Mean	SD
Age between 20-23	22	0.84
Age between 24-28	24	1.07

Demographic information is summarized in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2.

*Demographics of the participants*

	N	Percentage (%)
Missing demographic	11	7
Female	103	67
Male	50	33
Age between 20-23	110	71
Age between 24-28	37	25
Missing age data	6	4
Students from FASS	81	53
Psychology Students	57	37
Students from FENS	49	32
Students from FMAN	23	15

## **2.2. Procedure**

Ethics approval for the study was taken from Sabancı University Research Ethics Council (SUREC). Participants were randomly assigned to either experimental or control condition and invited to the room in which the experiment would be conducted.

After signing their consent form (see Appendix A), participants in the experimental condition received the priming task (see Appendix B). The priming procedure consisted of an extra assignment which is presented as an extra assignment related to the school's external department, this will be further explained in the next section. Participants were informed that

the experiment will follow upon the completion of this assignment. The duration of the priming procedure was ten minutes.

The participants, then, read scenarios in the experimental task and answered the related questions –these will be further explained below. Participants in the control condition directly took the experimental task without receiving any prior manipulation. The presentation order of questions in the experimental task was randomized in order to avoid any order effect. Afterward, each participant answered the prepared measures including Group Integration scale, Autonomous-self and Related-self scales, Conflict Management Style scale and Rotter’s Locus of Control scale. Lastly, participants received the debriefing form (see Appendix H) which discloses the real purpose of the priming task and the list to fill their demographic information and students from PSY courses asked the course for which they would want to receive extra point for their participation to the experiment. The detailed explanations of each of these steps are explained below. Table 2.3. summarizes what the experimental and control conditions consist of.

Table 2.3.

*Summary of the experimental protocol*

	Experimental Condition	Control Condition
Priming	✓	
Experimental Task	✓	✓
Group Integration Scale	✓	✓
Self-Scales	✓	✓
Conflict Handling Style Scale	✓	✓
Locus of Control Scale	✓	✓

**2.3. Priming Procedure**

A pilot study was conducted to develop the best priming scenario. As the pilot study of the priming procedure, 10 individuals were asked to write their feelings about “being a member of Sabancı University”. Then their feedback was asked to see whether the priming question works to make people think about their social identity or not, in terms of group

integration scale. The Priming task was finalized considering the received feedback. The aim of this process is to develop it and upgrade to a version that will be easier to focus on and that would promote ideas about being a member of Sabancı University. The final task consisted of a paper-pencil form that offers participants to express their opinion with a hashtag in order to create a sense of social media experience (see Appendix B).

## **2.4. Materials**

The experimental tasks were developed considering previous studies in which simulations about negotiation and decision making were conducted. Pilot studies/ interviews were held with ten individuals to improve and get feedback on the storylines in the experiment. Three different stories on various contexts were provided offering an organizational, political, or educational setting. Each story specifies the role of the participant, her interests in negotiation, parties that were involved in negotiation, negotiation subjects, and two final offers that came out from negotiation. As an example: “In this scenario, you are negotiating with a possible business partner for a future project as CEO of the Orange Day Company. You are expected to protect gain and dignity of the company as a CEO. You have been through in a hard negotiation for partnership rates, profit sharing and investment zones. As a result, other party offered two possible contracts as A and B.”

Also, the numbers in final offers are set to make the expected utility of both offers equal to each other (see Appendix C). Stories were presented in both gain- loss frames. Also, they were randomly presented to prevent the order effect. In addition, participants gave an open-ended answer as “I chose this answer because ...” only for the last question.

## **2.5. List of Measures**

In this study, I will focus on some additional variables which will be detected with three scales because they may be effective on decision-making process and the perception of social identity: (1) Self-construals are about how one relates to herself and others, I will use Kagitcibasi’s (1996) model because it provides chance to analyze individuals in a two-dimensional model and this model is significant to understand what is the aptness of an individual to get under effect of a social identity. (2) Individual differences for conflict managing ways, I will use Dreu’s conflict management styles (2001) to categorize individuals

because it useful to predict their attitude in negotiation and understand decision making processes (3) Attribution of source of events which will be detected with Rotter's locus of control (1966) is also important to observe if people belief to control events has a relationship with their decision making in negotiation and its relationship with conflict management styles.

### **2.5.1. Group Integration Scale**

In measuring belongingness to a specific social group, Aslan and Dönmez's (2013) group integration scale was used (see Appendix D). The scale included 12 items and one of the items was reversed. Examples of the original items were as follows: "There is a positive vibration between group members", "I am proud of to be a member of this group". The word "group" was changed with "Sabancı University" considering the study aims to observe the participant's state of belonging to her university as a social group. Items were rated on 5-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree; 7= strongly agree). Cronbach's Alfa was indicated as .90 (Aslan & Dönmez, 2013). The scales' internal reliability in this study was .86. Higher scores imply better sense of belonging to the group. Furthermore, one 5-point Likert scale question was added to the end of this part to ask the happiness level of the student from being a member of the university as follows: "Being a member of Sabancı University".

### **2.5.2. Autonomous-self and Related-self Scales**

In order to measure participants' self-construals (i.e., how they relate to others), the Autonomous-self and Related-self scales developed by Kagıtcıbası (2010) were provided (see Appendix E). Both scales consisted of 9 items and some of the items were reversed. The autonomous-self part included items such as "People who are close to me have little influence on my decisions.", "The opinions of those who are close to me influence me on personal issues." (reverse item). The related-self scale contained items such as "I need the support of persons to whom I feel very close." and "I prefer to keep a certain distance in my close relationships" (reverse item). Answers were scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree; 5= strongly agree). Cronbach's alfa of Autonomous-self scale reported .74 while Related-self scale has Cronbach's a= .78. Internal reliability of scales was detected as .80 for Autonomous-self scale and .75 for Related-self scale in this study. Higher score than the average indicates autonomous-related self and the lower score shows that person has

heteronomous separate self. If the related-self score is above the average while autonomous is lower, this implies having a heteronomous related self, and contrary to autonomous separate self.

### **2.5.3. Conflict Management Style Scale**

The original version of this test was developed to measure conflict management strategies in the workplace (Dreu et al., 2001). The scale was translated into Turkish for the first time for this study and presented in a general context in line with the research purposes of this thesis (see Appendix F). The scale analyzes conflict management strategies on the two-dimensional model as concern for others and concern for self, additionally it provides five different categories based on placement on the model. The scale consists of 20 items and each of the four items was constructed for one of the strategies. Some of the examples from the scale would be “I give in to the wishes of the other party”, “I concur with the other party” and “I do everything to win”. The respondent rated items on 5-point Likert scale (1= not at all; 5= very much). Higher total score on items of a particular strategy indicates that respondent has a tendency to choose that coping strategy. Cronbach’s alpha was not reported in referenced article but internal reliability score detected as .63 in this study.

### **2.5.4. Rotter’s Internal-External Locus of Control Scale**

Rotter (1966) created the Locus of control scale to measure how individuals vary in general expectancy of the internal-external control of life events in different contexts. The translation and adaptation of the scale were effectuated by Dag (1991) (see Appendix G). The scale includes 29- items with 6 distraction items to conceal the real purpose of the inventory. Respondents were asked to choose one of the two statements that offer either external or internal explanations for a situation such as “Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to a bad luck” or “People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make”. Options that indicate external explanation were given a one-point score and higher scores demonstrate a better tendency to believe in an external locus of control. Cronbach’s alpha of adapted version is reported as .71. Internal reliability in this study is indicated as .71 as well.

## **3. RESULTS**

### **3.1. Descriptive Analyses**

I first provide descriptive information regarding Group Integration scale score, Locus of Control scale score, Autonomous vs Related Self-types score and conflict management type scores for the prime, non-prime conditions and total sample. Then I move on to describe the individual differences; i.e., how the participants were categorized into groups based on the above measures. The means and standard deviations for group integration score, locus of control score, two self-type scores and five conflict management style scores are summarized in Table 1. Considering evaluation methods, descriptive below are more significant for group integration and conflict management types. Mean and standard deviations are also provided for locus of control and self-types at total level, see Table 3.2. for categorized scores of locus of control and self-types.

Table 3.1.

*Descriptive statistics of scales*

	Primed Condition			Not Primed Condition			TOTAL		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Group Integration	40.20	8.85	81	42.82	5.79	83	42.51	7.44	164
Locus of Control	12.32	4.03	81	11.76	4.52	83	12.04	4.28	164
Self-Types									
Autonomous	26.23	5.15	81	26.89	5.87	83	26.57	26.57	164
Related	34.81	4.67	81	34.73	5.60	83	34.77	37.77	164
Conflict M. Styles									
Yielding	11.72	2.20	81	11.64	2.43	83	11.68	11.68	164
Compromising	15.20	2.23	81	14.76	2.11	83	14.98	14.98	164
Problem Solving	16.09	2.43	81	15.73	2.41	83	15.91	15.91	164
Avoiding	10.84	2.09	81	10.42	2.34	83	10.63	10.63	164
Forcing	13.88	2.73	81	13.24	2.99	83	13.55	13.55	164

The descriptive statistics regarding locus of control type and self-type are presented based on conditions and including mean scores, standard deviation and number of participants in Table 3.2. I hypothetically categorized participants as high and low locus of control based on cut off value which is determined as exact half of highest possible score of 23. Higher score indicates better tendency for external explanation while lower score means internal explanation for a situation. Autonomous and related self-scale scores also categorized based cut off value based on highest possible score of 45. Results that above the cutoff point of both Autonomous and Related Self scales were categorized as autonomous-related self, scores that above for related self and below for autonomous self-categorized as heteronomous-related self. Please see Table 3.2 for descriptive.

Table 3.2.

*Descriptive statistics regarding categorization of LOC and self-scales*

	Primed			Not-Primed			TOTAL		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
High LOC	15.53	2.55	49	15.1	2.42	39	15.34	2.49	88
Low LOC	8.9	1.82	32	7.7	2.39	44	8.21	2.24	76
Autonomous-Related Self									
Autonomous	28.22	3.93	59	28.72	4.49	61	24.48	4.22	120
Related	34.31	4.24	59	34.25	4.96	61	34.27	4.60	120
Heteronomous-Related Self									
Autonomous	20.19	2.54	21	20.60	5.25	20	20.39	4.03	41
Related	36.95	4.34	21	37.50	5.67	20	37.22	4.97	41
Autonomous-Separated Self									
Autonomous	36	0	1	34	1.41	2	34.67	1.52	3
Related	20	0	1	22	0	2	21.33	1.15	3

The Group Integration scale was given after the task in order to check the social identity priming of Sabancı University. An independent sample t-test was conducted to test the manipulation effect comparing control and experiment groups. There was not a significant difference between scores for primed ( $M=42.20$ ,  $SD=8.85$ ) and not primed ( $M=42.82$ ,  $SD=5.79$ ) conditions,  $t(162)=0.53$ ,  $p=.59$ . Autonomous-Related Self scale, Conflict Management Style scale and Locus of Control scale were given following the Group Integration scale. Independent sample t-test was conducted to all scales to control whether control and experimental groups are different in characteristics these scales detect. There was not a significant difference between high locus of control scores for primed and not primed conditions,  $t(87)=-0.7$ ,  $p=.21$ . However, low locus of control was significantly different for primed and not primed conditions,  $t(75)=-2.37$ ,  $p=.009$ . Also, none of the autonomous ( $t(163)=0.76$ ,  $p=.22$ ) and related ( $t(163)=-0.09$ ,  $p=.53$ ) self-scores were significantly different between primed and not primed groups. Please see Table 2 for further details. Independent sample t-test result revealed that any of the yielding ( $t(163)=0.22$ ,  $p=.58$ ), compromising ( $t(163)=1.29$ ,  $p=.90$ ), problem-solving ( $t(163)=0.95$ ,  $p=.82$ ), avoiding ( $t(163)=1.21$ ,  $p=.88$ ), forcing ( $t(163)=1.43$ ,  $p=.92$ ) conflict management types were

significantly different between conditions. Please see Table 1 for further details.

### **3.2. Impact of Social Identity Reminders on Loss Averse Behavior**

An independent sample t-test was conducted for hypotheses testing, total risk averse and risk seeking behaviors compared between the conditions considering gain and loss frames.

Please recall that the particular predictions regarding the relationship between loss aversion and reminders of social identity were:

**H1.** Individuals who are reminded of a social identity in a negotiation context will be more risk averse when a gain is possible compare to those who are not reminded.

**H2.** Individuals who are reminded of a social identity in a negotiation context will be more risk seeking when a lost is possible compare to those who are not reminded.

There was no significant difference between risk averse behavior at total level in primed ( $M=1.62$ ,  $SD=.91$ ) and not primed ( $M=1.66$ ,  $SD=.96$ ) conditions  $t(162)=-.30$ ,  $p=.76$ . No main effect of social identity priming on risk averse behavior in gain frame was found statistically significant. Also, the total risk seeking behavior in loss frame did not significantly differ between primed ( $M=2.32$ ,  $SD=.80$ ) and not primed ( $M=2.30$ ,  $SD=.90$ ) conditions  $t(162)=.14$ ,  $p=.88$ . These results suggest that social identity priming also did not has a significant effect on risk seeking behavior. Therefore, the findings did not support Hypotheses 1 and 2.

In addition to condition-based comparison, total sample is splitted based on the median value of Group Integration scale (43) and risk aversion and risk seeking scores were compared with independent t-test. There was no significant difference between risk averse behavior of above median ( $M=1.69$ ,  $SD=.95$ ) and below median ( $M=1.60$ ,  $SD=.95$ ) groups  $t(162)=-.64$ ,  $p=.52$  (H3). Therefore, having median above or below score in Group Integration scale has not a significant effect on risk averse behavior. Besides, above median ( $M=2.35$ ,  $SD=.84$ ) and below median ( $M=2.28$ ,  $SD=.86$ ) groups were not statistically different  $t(162)=-.47$ ,  $p=.63$  on risk seeking behavior (H4). This result suggests that having median above or below score in Group Integration scale has not a significant effect on risk seeking behavior.

### 3.3. Context Based Impact of Social Identity Reminders on Loss Averse Behavior

The same hypotheses were tested with chi-square analysis for each story-line to understand whether different negotiation context have a different impact on social identity and loss aversion relationship. Chi square analysis was preferred due to categoric and binary nature of the data in context level analysis. The test was conducted to observe the effect of social identity priming on risk averse and risk seeking behavior in two different frame types and in business, political and school contexts. The tendency to risk averse or risk seeking behavior was not significantly differing between the conditions in any of three contexts (see *Table 3.3.*).

Table 3.3.

*Context effect on social identity and loss aversion relationship*

Task	$\chi^2$	df	P
G-Business choice	.004(a)	1	.949
G-Political choice	.031(a)	1	.86
G-School choice	.698(a)	1	.403
L-Business choice	.073(a)	1	.787
L-Political choice	1.069(a)	1	.301
L-School choice	.744(a)	1	.389

### 3.4. Prospect Theory Confirmation

In addition to the original hypotheses, risk averse and risk seeking behavior in each context and both conditions were separately compared. T-tests revealed that there was a significant difference between risk averse behavior and risk seeking behavior for gain frame of business context in the primed and not-primed conditions which was favoring risk aversion. Also, the t-test results of both conditions in school context presented a significant risk seeking behavior for gain frame, which was contrary to the results according to the expectations based on prospect theory. Results presented significant risk averse behavior for political context in primed condition but the risk aversion in the not-primed condition did not differ. Also, there was a significant risk seeking behavior in loss frames of all contexts in both of the conditions. Means and standard deviations for each combination were presented

in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4.

*Prospect Theory confirmation based on conditions and contexts*

	Primed					Not-Primed				
	Risk-Aversion		Risk-Seeking		t	Risk-Aversion		Risk-Seeking		t
	M	SD	M	SD		M	SD	M	SD	
G-B	0.69	0.22	0.31	0.22	5.23**	0.69	0.22	0.31	0.22	5.15**
G-P	0.57	0.25	0.43	0.25	1.73*	0.55	0.25	0.45	0.25	1.39
G-S	0.36	0.23	0.64	0.23	-3.74**	0.42	0.25	0.58	0.25	-2.03**
L-B	0.26	0.19	0.74	0.19	-6.94**	0.24	0.19	0.76	0.19	-7.75**
L-P	0.31	0.22	0.69	0.22	-5.23**	0.39	0.24	0.61	0.24	-3.01**
L-S	0.11	0.1	0.89	0.1	-15.65**	0.07	0.07	0.93	0.07	-21.15**

\*\* p<.01 \* p<.05

### 3.5. Additional Analyses

The Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to appraise the relationship between group integration, locus of control, self-types and conflict management styles regarding conditions and total sample. Correlation coefficient scores of primed group were presented in Table 3.5., while of the not primed group in Table 3.6. and total sample in Table 3.7.

Table 3.5.

*Correlation coefficients of primed group*

Variables	Self-Type Score					CMT Score			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.GIS Score	-								
2.LOC Score	-.15	-							
Self-Type Score									
3.Autonomous	.13	-.12	-						
4.Related	.18	.05	-.41**	-					
CMT Score									
5.Yielding	.20	.08	-.13	.10	-				
6.Compromising	.06	-.00	-.04	.16	.40**	-			
7.Problem Solving	.06	-.01	.06	.20	.35**	.63**	-		
8.Avoiding	-.08	.00	-.19	.01	.16	.03	.05	-	
9.Forcing	.04	-.11	.13	-.14	-.07	-.27*	.04	.07	-

\*\* p&lt;.01 \* p&lt;.05

Table 3.6.

*Correlation coefficients of not primed group*

Variables	Self-Type Score					CMT Score			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.GIS Score	-								
2.LOC Score	.18	-							
Self-Type Score									
3.Autonomous	-.14	.05	-						
4.Related	.19	.08	-.55**	-					
CMT Score									
5.Yielding	.29**	.01	-.18	.15	-				
6.Compromising	.18	.02	-.02	.07	.42**	-			
7.Problem Solving	.25*	.13	-.00	.12	.42**	.35**	-		
8.Avoiding	-.04	.14	-.16	-.03	.25	.20	-.02	-	
9.Forcing	.01	-.00	-.18	.18	-.08	-.26*	-.02	-.01	-

\*\* p&lt;.01 \* p&lt;.05

Table 3.7.

*Coefficients of all sample*

Variables	Self-Type Score					CMT Score			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.GIS Score	-								
2.LOC Score	-.12	-							
Self-Type Score									
3.Autonomous	.01	-.02	-						
4.Related	.18*	.07	-.49**	-					
CMT Score									
5.Yielding	.23**	.04	-.16*	.13	-				
6.Compromising	.10	.01	-.04	.11	.41**	-			
7.Problem Solving	.13	.06	.02	.16*	.39**	.49**	-		
8.Avoiding	-.07	.09	-.18*	-.01	.21**	-.13	.01	-	
9.Forcing	.02	-.04	-.05	-.04	-.08	-.25**	.02	.03	-

\*\*  $p < .01$  \*  $p < .05$

A correlational analysis was conducted separately based on the conditions, in order to observe the relationship between each scale in two different samples. Tests showed that group integration score of the not primed group were weakly and positively correlated with both yielding and problem-solving conflict management styles ( $r(82)=.29, p < .01, r(82)=.25, p < .05$ ). However, there was no difference observed in the primed group ( $r(80)=.20, p=.06, r(80)=.06, p=.54$ ).

Coefficient scores revealed that GIS and LOC were not significantly correlated in any of the conditions, while a slightly negative relationship for primed and slightly positive relationship for not primed group were detected ( $r(80)=-.15, p=.17, r(82)=.18, p=.10$ ). There was not a significant relationship between GIS and self-types in terms of autonomy and relatedness for any of the conditions. However, slightly negative relationship between GIS and autonomous scale for the not primed group and slightly positive relationship for the primed group ( $r(80)=-.14, p=.20, r(82)=.13, p=.24$ ) were observed. The primed and not primed groups did not significantly differ in relationship between self-types and conflict management styles, but there were opposite and not significant correlations between

autonomous self-type and forcing management styles for the primed and not primed groups ( $r(80)=.13, p=.24, r(82)=-.18, p=.09$ ). In addition, related self-type and forcing conflict management style had an opposite and not significant correlation for the primed and not primed groups ( $r(80)=-.14, p=.18, r(82)=.18, p=.10$ ).

Correlational analysis of total sample revealed that group integration scale was positively correlated with related self-score ( $r(164)=.18, p=.01$ ) (H5), however, not a negative relationship detected between group integration and autonomous self-score ( $r(164)=.01, p=.84$ ) (H6). Also, group integration scale was positively correlated with yielding conflict management type ( $r(164)=.23, p=.002$ ) and autonomous self-type was negatively correlated with both yielding ( $r(164)=-.16, p=.03$ ) and avoiding ( $r(164)=-.18, p=.01$ ) conflict management types while related self-type was positively correlated with problem solving ( $r(164)=.16, p=.03$ ) conflict management type. Locus of control score was not positively correlated with avoiding conflict management style ( $r(164)=.09, p=.24$ ) or negatively correlated with problem-solving conflict management style ( $r(164)=-.06, p=.4$ ) as it was hypothesized (H7) (H8).

### **3.6. Relationship between Tasks and Scales**

A multiple regression analysis was conducted with two conditions and total sample to predict the total risk averse and risk seeking behavior based on group integration, locus of control, self-type and conflict management style scores. A significant regression equation was not found for any of the hypotheses (H9) (H10). Coefficient scores and significant predictions can be seen in Table 3.8.

Table 3.8.

*Relationship between total scores of risk-averse and risk-seeking and scales based on conditions*

	Primed		Not Primed		TOTAL	
	Total RA	Total RS	Total RA	Total RS	Total RA LA	Total RS RS
GIS Score	.009	.28*	.03	.04	.02	.15*
LOC Score	.001	.001	.02	-.03	.005	-.02
A.-Self Type	.10	.09	.02	.16	.07	.12
R.-Self Type	.10	-.131	.04	.11	.08	.03
Yielding	.09	-.17	.11	-.39**	.08	-.28**
Compromising	.23	-.06	.05	.25	.17	.11
Problem-Solving	-.04	.10	-.30*	.06	-.17	.02
Avoiding	-.15	.27**	-.01	.02	-.07	.13
Forcing	.04	-.18	.05	.12	.05	.01

\*\*p<.01 \*p<.05

A logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict the effect of each negotiation context of gain and lost frames with group integration, locus of control and self-types separately. A significant regression equation was not found for any of the variations. The test revealed that there was not a significant association between any of the framing and negotiation contexts with group integration, and locus of control and self-types. Coefficient scores can be seen in Table 3.9.

Table 3.9.

*Relationship of each frame and context with scales*

	Primed						Not Primed					
	G-B	G-P	G-S	L-B	L-P	L-S	G-B	G-P	G-S	L-B	L-P	L-S
GIS Score	.048	.006	-.029	.056	.022	.031	-.03	.048	-.007	.009	.020	-.120
LOC Score	-.013	-.000	.021	.070	-.085	.045	.026	.007	-.034	-.021	-.050	.180
A.Self Type	-.025	.115	.006	.027	.000	.050	.015	-.055	.029	.012	.100	.141
R.Self Type	-.041	.042	.123	.002	-.047	-.075	.022	-.041	.035	-.008	.081	.112

**Note.** G denotes gain frame; L denotes lost frame; B denotes business context; P denotes political context; S denotes school context.

### 3.7. Open-Ended Questions

Qualitative analyses were conducted to the open-ended questions in order to see what the participants thought while answering the provided questions and to have a chance to observe the reasoning behind their answers. The distribution of open-ended questions between different framing contexts were not equal since participants received the randomly ordered tasks in order to avoid order effect. Table 3.10. demonstrates the number of participants and the only missing answer was in gain frame of business task in primed condition. Answers for each group were analyzed under the two groups; relevance of primed social identity and propriety with the prospect theory. More precise explanation is that answers analyzed whether there is any sign for impact of social identity and if answer of participant is compatible with claims of the prospect theory.

Table 3.10.

*Number of participant for each task and conditions*

Task	G-B	G-P	G-S	L-B	L-P	L-S
Primed group	15	19	8	15	6	17
Not-Primed group	13	12	14	12	20	12

**Note.** G denotes gain frame; L denotes lost frame; B denotes business context; P denotes political context; S denotes school context.

Participants answers mostly confirm the prospect theory in both of the conditions and all framing types; that is evaluating outcome based on probabilistic lost and gain, and taking risk averse or risk-taking attitude. A participant from the not primed condition in business task with gain framing reported: “Because it is certain. I prefer to have a gain.” While another participant from not primed condition shared a similar reasoning:” A is the choice that I ensure myself, I will have a certain gain, and while I have 600.000 I will not take a risk for 400.000. I may not take anything from B choice.” Also, participants from two different conditions in loss frame expressed their reasoning that complied with the prospect theory, while some participants clearly stated their consciousness of prospect theory: “A is a sure loss however for B, even with 40%, there is a chance to not lose anything.” Additionally, answers did not show any relevance with social identity priming in any of the conditions of gain and loss framing of business context. Participants were mostly concerned with either

only cost-benefit, as mentioned above complying with the prospect theory, or with the context of the offers. One participant from primed condition with gain frame expressed that he was making the particular choice “Because I cannot risk the gain of my company as CEO.” An answer from loss frame showed similar reasons: “It is expected from me to protect the dignity of the company.”

Participants who answered the open-ended question about political context presented similar motivations such as loss-gain calculations or they seemed to internalize the context of the story with variations between framing types and conditions. One of the participant from the gain frame said: “I have chosen the certain option since my priority is the increasing number of my votes.” However, there were some participant who were willing to take a risk considering rates, two of the participants from both conditions reported that 65% is a rate that would be worth to take the risk for. In loss frame, participants reported more prospect theory relevant motivations compared to those in the gain frame, and their reasoning was less concerning the being mayor rather about the gain: “Rather than accepting an option that is loss, even before we start, I prefer the one where I have the opportunity to gain.”, “I prefer Y because choosing the other option, while I have chance to win, sounds illogical. In a case that I have risk loss in both scenarios, I prefer the one that I may have a gain.”

The answers to school scenario in two conditions and frames revealed that participants considered this scenario on a more personal level by taking into account their GPA. However, there was not any sign of the effect of social identity rather the personal student identity. One of the participant from the not primed condition group reported that: “Because I want to increase my GPA, percentages in D option is so close and my GPA may not increase.” Another interesting finding from open-ended questions, participants who answer this question were seem more willing to take risk in gain framing to increase their GPA: “Rather than .15 increase. I would prefer the .30 or nothing.”. “55% is not a percentage to reject so I would take that risk.” However, answers from loss frame were more compliant with the prospect theory with relevant cognitive reasoning and personal motivations such as not willing to decrease in GPA: “Even with less chance than 50%, I may save my .20 point.”, “I cannot accept decrease in my GPA, I will take chance not to lose .10 point.”

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The main goal of the present study was observing whether reminding a social identity in a negotiation has any impact on decision-making of an individual who are under the effect of that particular social identity. With regards to particular predictions; recall that Hypothesis 1 suggested that reminding one's social identity increases risk-averse behavior in gain framing situation compare to ones who are not. Considering the reason that individuals with social identity act more certain about their decisions and more concerned about their self-presentations, they are expected to act in a more risk-averse way. In Hypothesis 2, participants who reminded a social identity were expected to be more risk seeking in loss framing situation compared to those not reminded, due to their need to protect the personal status which is directly connected to the group's status. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported by the findings meaning that social identity was not found to have an effect on risk averse and risk seeking behavior at total level or in any specific context that was presented. Additionally, I hypothesized that individuals with higher group integration were expected to be more risk averse in possible gain situation and risk seeking in possible lost situation. Group integration level did not have effect on risk averse and risk seeking behavior considering that results did not support H3 and H4.

Further analyses revealed that participants who received social identity priming did not differ from those who did not in any of the business, political and school context on their risk aversion or risk seeking scores. Among the reasons to why hypotheses were not supported are, a faulty assumption about the effectiveness of priming, manipulation assumption on non-existing or weak social identity, lack of solid linkage between manipulated social identity and contexts and absence of some key points in story-lines that arouse social identity.

When we consider the manipulation check two groups did not show any difference in terms of the group identification scores. Even though the writing task in the study is a method that was used in previous studies in the field (Otten & Wentura, 1999), the priming task might

have failed to trigger Sabancı social identity. This point strengthens after considering the priming effect is open to discussion since it displayed reliability issues with its replication for some studies (Bargh, Chen & Burrows, 1996). Another reason of the possible failure might be related with the particular social identity that was triggered. Recall that we chose being a member of Sabancı University as a potential social identity, and we confirmed it through pilot studies and interviews. However, the pilot study results might be not representative since it had a small sample, or it might be a that social identity in general for Sabancı University's students is weak. Based on the previous studies, participants were expected to use Sabancı social identity to define their self-worth (Tyler, 2000), however, the experiments which were conducted on campus might be preventing this since the high status feeling based on social identity were not unique to any of the participants.

Considering the stories in different contexts, some missing key points or lack of a salient relationship between the social identity and context might be relevant as for why no relationship between social identity and lost aversive and risk seeking tendency were detected. Social identity triggers the tendency to award group and group members compared to out-group members and other groups (Herriot, 2007; Tajfel, 1982) and individuals relate their social identity based on social contexts, which builds the opportunity for comparison and competition between groups (Herriot, 2007). However, other parties in each scenario were given as neutral opposite groups to create more implicit intergroup situations and this might be the cause to the lack of developing an out-group idea. We preferred that option since presenting a solid opposite party (in a more explicit way) was considered as another variable. Social identities were defined based on membership in different social groups and expected to be a tool for the analysis of social reality. Additionally, Korostelina (2007) states that "Depending on the perception and the assessment of social situations and conditions of activity, a person can have different levels of awareness on her or his social identity". In the storylines given in this study, we tried to provide at least one context (school) that participants may link some way with their Sabancı University social identity. However, the storylines in three different social contexts might have failed to increase the relevant social identity awareness as they were expected to, having said that, this explanation also might be relevant for non confirming results of group integration level based hypotheses (H3) (H4). Furthermore, during the open-ended questions, participants gave priority to their personal

objectives rather than considering their social identity even in the mostly relevant scenario which was the school context.

Despite the fact that hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported, all frames in each condition and context were compatible with the prospect theory except the political context in gain frame of not primed conditions and the contrary results of educational context in both condition of gain frame. There was a difference between risk averse and risk seeking behavior of both primed and not-primed groups in gain frames of business; participants preferred the more risk averse choice which enables them to seek a certain gain instead of taking the risk for a better outcome. On the other hand, all conditions of lost frame differed between risk averse and risk seeking behavior; participants were more risk seeking under the risk of a certain loss, they were willing to take risk of greater loss in order to have a chance to not experience any. Research on individual decision making revealed that probabilistic advantages, in turn related to the certainty effect, might be a possible explanation of these results considering the open-ended questions for not showcasing a prospect theory-based results in the political context of the not primed group (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979b). According to relationship between loss aversion and status quo bias, which is accepting current case as a baseline and perceiving any negative change as a loss (Kahneman & Renshon, 2009), participants were expected to protect status quo, however, considering the given rates, students may thought that there is a chance to change statu quo and non-conservative political attitude of university students might relevant explanation for this deviation considering the relationship of university students with politics. Contrary results in educational context might be explained with overconfident optimism, considering answers of open-ended questions. Participants seem to believe that they have more control over the school context and perceive probability of risk as lesser compare to other situations.

Even though behavioral decision-making theories are open to discussion since rationality of choice is assumed as highly culture dependent (Quattrone & Tversky, 1988; Sharp & Salter, 1997), prospect theory is one of the theories which universal precision is accepted as intermediate to high level (Glöckner & Betsch, 2011). The results of the study support the universality claim for prospect theory in general. However, the convenient sample of the study raises doubts about the representativeness of the results for the Turkish culture. Therefore, the correlational and descriptive results of surveys may give an idea about which

kind of sample was reached.

A novelty of the present study was to include individual differences variables, such as, locus of control and self-construal types. Neither the decision-making literature, nor the negotiation literature systematically considered these variables. The results revealed that in both conditions, the number of participants who have higher locus of control scores, according to cut off point-based categorization, is more than the number of participants who have lower locus of control score. However, the number of participants who have low level locus of control was also close to half of the sample. Considering previous studies (Dijkstra, Beersma & Evers, 2011) and relevance of locus of control with belief to have control over life, I hypothesized that locus of control is positively correlated with avoiding conflict management type (H7) and negatively correlated with problem-solving conflict management type (H8), however, results revealed that no relationship was exist for any of the predictions. Also, considering the idea that people might be more willing to take risk when they believe to have more control over the situation, I suggested that locus of control has negative relationship with risk seeking and positive relationship with risk averse behavior (remind that lower scores indicate internal and higher scores indicate external explanation for source of control over our lives). There were not such relationships as suggested in two hypotheses, in any of the conditions or for the total sample (H9) (H10).

Regarding the self-construal types, a considerable number of participants had high scores from both related and autonomous self-scale, which indicates that the participants in the study mostly have autonomous-related self-style. Also, there was considerable number of participants who have lower than average score from the autonomous self- scale and higher than average score from the related self-scale, which can be defined as the heteronomous-related self-type. In conflict management style profile, participants showed a greater tendency to compromising, problems solving and forcing styles and there was no difference observed between the conditions. Considering Dual Concern theory (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986), these management types might be a sign of a higher self-concern in conflict management styles. In addition to that, there was a positive relationship between group integration and yielding in not primed and total group and problem-solving style only in not primed group. Considering that yielding and problem-solving styles were an indicator for higher other concern, according to Dual Concern Theory, this relationship was not unexpected, however, difference

between conditions requires a further research. Also, related-self construal was expected to have a positive relationship with group integration level (H5) while autonomous was expected to have a negative one (H6). There was such a positive relationship between group integration and related-self as hypothesized. However, a relationship between autonomous-self and group integration were not detected.

## 5. IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Decision making analysis in the negotiation process, effects of social identity on negotiation and conflict resolution, and the relationship between social identity and decision making are of great interest to both academia and practitioners which focus on peace, organizational, conflict and economic studies. However, to my knowledge based on literature review, no prior research has established a claim or theory on decision making and social identity variables in the negotiation context. Although the results of this study do not confirm the hypotheses as discussed in detail earlier, the study might be a starting point to analyze the triple relationship mentioned above. The study provides us some clues about the possible problems with social identity priming which might be useful to consider in future studies by whoever wants to use the social identity priming method. Additionally, the conflict management style scale is translated and adapted to Turkish within the developing experimental design process. Last but not least, the participant profile with the descriptive and correlational analysis was analyzed based on relevant scales of the study and presenting this type of information is important since a great number of psychological studies in Turkey are applied to university students similar to inter-national studies. The characteristics of university students are expected to be more or less similar with other studies in Turkey since Psychology is mostly widespread in private high education institutions.

The current research has certain limitations to cover each with possible resources. I examined my results in a convenience sample which consists of young adults from a private college, which makes it possible to expect the sample being from a higher socio-economic status. Therefore, the sample does not reflect the general population of Turkey. In addition, I used multiple additional surveys to analyze the profile of the sample and preferred to give them sequentially due to the lack of any assistance. Considering to length of the time (approx. 20-30 min) fatigue of the participants may impact the reliability of the results. Finally, with regards to societal sensitivity to social identities in the last years, I preferred to use the

“Sabancı University” social identity which was an interdependent variable of the study. Identity preference needs to be varied instead of using a not salient social identity or another methodology should be considered to manipulate social identity in future research altogether.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS**

In conclusion, social identity may not have an effect on decision making process in negotiation based on the result of the current study, however, the influence of social identity should be taken under review considering the facts that were mentioned in discussion. Secondly, the current study indicates that the prospect theory does not apply for GPA driven calculations in school context under the gain situation. Considering the increased interest on studies that focus on inefficient occasions of the prospect theory, future research could benefit from this detection. Finally, this study suggest that group integration behavior might be a good predictor for the conflict management style and practitioners may benefit from the dynamics of individual-group relationship to assess the conflict management strategies of an individual.

## REFERENCES

- Abrams, D. (1999). Social Identity, Social Cognition, and the Self: The Flexibility and Stability of Self-Categorization. In *Social Identity and Social Cognition*, ed. D. Abrams and M. Hogg, 197–229. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Alwin, D. F., Cohen, R. L., & Newcomb, T. M. (1992). *Political Attitudes over the Life Span: The Bennington Women after Fifty Years*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Aslan, S., & Dönmez, A. (2013). Gençlerde Kimlik Yönelimi, Toplumsal Karşılaştırma, Arkadaşlara Bağlılık ve Grupla Bütünleşme/The Identity Orientations, Social Comparisons, Attachments To Friends And Group Integration Levels Among Young People. *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 37(3), 141-174.
- Bargh, J. A., Chen, M., & Burrows, L. (1996). Automaticity of social behavior: Direct effects of trait construct and stereotype activation on action. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 71(2), 230.
- Barry, B., Lewicki, R. J., & Saunders, D. M. (2011). The nature of negotiation In *Essentials of negotiation* (pp.1-27). McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., & Muraven, M. (2018). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource?. In *Self-Regulation and Self-Control* (pp. 24-52). Routledge.
- Brenner, L. A., Koehler, D. J., & Tversky, A. (1996). On the evaluation of one-sided evidence. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 9(1), 59-70.
- Carr, P. B., & Steele, C. M. (2010). Stereotype threat affects financial decision making. *Psychological Science*, 21(10),1411 – 1416.
- Chertkoff, J. M., & Esser, J. K. (1976). A review of experiments in explicit bargaining. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 12(5), 464-486.

- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological bulletin*, 112(1), 155.
- Cohen, G. L., & Garcia, J. (2008). Identity, belonging, and achievement: A model, interventions, implications. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(6), 365-369.
- Cross, J. G. (1965). A theory of the bargaining process. *The American Economic Review*, 55(1/2), 67-94.
- Dağ, İ. (1991). Rotter'in İç-Dış Kontrol Odağı Ölçeği (RİDKOÖ)'nin üniversite öğrencileri için güvenilirliği ve geçerliği. *Psikoloji dergisi*, 7(26), 10-16.
- De Dreu, C. K., Evers, A., Beersma, B., Kluwer, E. S., & Nauta, A. (2001). A theory-based measure of conflict management strategies in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 22(6), 645-668.
- Dijkstra, M. T., Beersma, B., & Evers, A. (2011). Reducing conflict-related employee strain: The benefits of an internal locus of control and a problem-solving conflict management strategy. *Work & Stress*, 25(2), 167-184.
- Ethier, K. A., and Deaux, K. 1994. Negotiating Social Identity When Contexts Change: Maintaining Identification and Responding to Threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67: 243–251.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior research methods*, 39(2), 175-191.
- Fisher, R.J. (1985, June). *The social psychology of intergroup conflict: Toward eclectic theory and effective practice*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W. L., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. Penguin.

- Fisher, R. J. (2012). Introduction: The Pervasive Enigma of Intergroup Conflict In *The social psychology of intergroup and international conflict resolution* (1-16). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Galtung, J. (1965). Institutionalized conflict resolution: A theoretical paradigm. *Journal of Peace Research*, 2(4), 348-397.
- Gelfand, M. J., & Christakopoulou, S. (1999). Culture and negotiator cognition: Judgment accuracy and negotiation processes in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 79(3), 248-269.
- Glöckner, A., & Betsch, T. (2011). The empirical content of theories in judgment and decision making: Shortcomings and remedies. *Judgment & Decision Making*, 6(8).
- Herriot, P. (2007). Social identity theory. *Religious fundamentalism and social identity* (pp. 25-40). New York: Rotledge
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. London - New York: Routledge.
- Jaspars, J. M. F., & Warnae, S. (1982). Intergroup relations, ethnic identity, and self-evaluation in Indonesia. *Social identity and intergroup relations*, 335-366.
- Jervis, R. (1992). Political implications of loss aversion. *Political psychology*, 187-204.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1996). The autonomous-relational self. *European Psychologist*, 1(3), 180-186.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2010). *Benlik, aile ve insan gelişimi: Kültürel psikoloji*. Koç Üniversitesi.
- Kağıtçıbaşı Ç., Baydar N., & Cemalcılar Z. (in progress). Assessment, analysis, and cross-cultural validation of autonomous and related self construals. Istanbul: Koc University
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Intuitive prediction: Biases and corrective

- procedures. *Management Science*, 12, 313-327.
- Kahneman, D., & Lovallo, D. (1993). Timid choices and bold forecasts: A cognitive perspective on risk taking. *Management science*, 39(1), 17-31.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1995). Conflict resolution: A cognitive perspective. In K. Arrow et al. (Ed.), *Barriers to Conflict Resolution* (pp. 44-61). New York: He Stanford Center on Conflict & Negotiation.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (2000). Choices, values, and frames. In D. Kahneman & A. Tversky (Ed.), *Choices, values, and frames* (pp.1-16). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kahneman, D., & Renshon, J. (2009). Hawkish biases. *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear: Threat Inflation Since*, 9(11), 79-96.
- Korostelina, K. (2007). *Social identity and conflict: Structures, dynamics, and implications*. Springer.
- Küçükkaragöz, H., Akay, Y., & Canbulat, T. (2013). Rotter iç-dış kontrol odağı ölçeğinin öğretmen adaylarında geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 35, 1-12.
- Lee, C. T., Beckert, T. E., & Goodrich, T. R. (2010). The relationship between individualistic, collectivistic, and transitional cultural value orientations and adolescents' autonomy and identity status. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39(8), 882-893.
- March, J. G., & Shapira, Z. (1987). Managerial perspectives on risk and risk taking. *Management science*, 33(11), 1404-1418.
- Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations, Software of the Mind*, 255-258
- Nash, J. (1953). Two-person cooperative games. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 128-140.
- Otten, S., & Wentura, D. (1999). About the impact of automaticity in the Minimal Group

Paradigm: Evidence from affective priming tasks. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29(8), 1049-1071.

Pruitt, D. G., & Rubin, J. Z. (1986). Social conflict: Escalation, impasse, and resolution. *Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley*.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological monographs: General and applied*, 80(1), 1.

Rubin, J. Z., Pruitt, D. G., & Kim, S. H. (1994). Overview. In *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement* (pp. 1-10). McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Schelling, T. C. (1960). The strategy of conflict. *Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press*.

Sears, D. O., and Henry, P. J. 1999. Ethnic Identity and Group Threat in American Politics. *The Political Psychologist* 4 (2): 12–17.

Sharp, D. J., & Salter, S. B. (1997). Project escalation and sunk costs: A test of the international generalizability of agency and prospect theories. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28(1), 101-121.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). Intergroup cooperation and competition: The Robbers Cave experiment (pp. 150-198). Norman, OK: University Book Exchange.

Sinha, D., & Tripathi, R. C. (1994). Individualism in a collectivist culture: A case of coexistence of opposites. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kâğıtçıbaşı, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Cross-cultural research and methodology series, Vol. 18. Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 123-136). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Spencer, S. J., Steele, C. M., & Quinn, D. M. (1999). Stereotype threat and women's math performance. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 35(1), 4-28.

- Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American*, 223(5), 96-102.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, 33(47), 74.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European journal of social psychology*, 1(2), 149-178.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual review of psychology*, 33(1), 1-39.
- Thompson, L. (1990). Negotiation behavior and outcomes: Empirical evidence and theoretical issues. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(3), 515.
- Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A., & McGarty, C. (1994). Self and collective: Cognition and social context. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 20(5), 454-463.
- Turner, M. E., Pratkanis, A. R., Probasco, P., & Leve, C. (1992). Threat, cohesion, and group effectiveness: Testing a social identity maintenance perspective on groupthink. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(5), 781.
- Thompson, L., & Hastie, R. (1990). Social perception in negotiation. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 47(1), 98-123.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *science*, 211(4481), 453-458.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1983). Extensional versus intuitive reasoning: The conjunction fallacy in probability judgment. *Psychological review*, 90(4), 293.
- Tyler, T.R., (2000). Social identity and cooperative behavior. In T.R. Tyler & S.L. Blader (Ed.), *Cooperation in groups* (pp. 143-151). Ann Arbor: Tyler & Francis

Quattrone, G. A., & Tversky, A. (1988). Contrasting rational and psychological analyses of political choice. *The American political science review*, 719-736.

Yildiz, M. A. (2016). Ölçme eşdeğerliği üzerine ve Genel Aidiyet Ölçeğinin (GAÖ) ölçme eşdeğerliğinin genç yetişkinlerde cinsiyete göre incelenmesi. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(26).

## Appendix A

Influence of Social Identity on Decision Making about Negotiation Outcome

**Sabancı University**

**Consent to Participate in a Research Study**

**Study Title:** Influence of Social Identity on Decision Making about Negotiation Outcome

**Principal Investigator:** Dr. Çağla Aydın

**Co-Investigator & Interviewer:** Ayşe Büşra Topal

### **BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ ONAM FORMU**

Değerli Katılımcı,

Bu araştırma Sabancı Üniversitesi, Sanat ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi öğretim üyelerinden Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çağla Aydın sorumluluğunda Uyuşmazlık Çözümü ve Analizi programı öğrencisi Ayşe Büşra Topal'ın tez çalışması için bilgi toplamayı amaçlar.

Araştırmanın amacı, bireylerin münazara sonuçlarına dair aldıkları kararları incelemektir. Bunun için sizden bazı ölçekleri (anketler) doldurmanız ve verilen senaryolardaki sorulara cevap vermeniz istenmektedir. Tüm soruların yanıtlanması yaklaşık olarak 20 dakika sürmektedir. Çalışmaya katılımınızın çalışma kapsamında incelenen konuya katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir. Sonuçlarının yalnız bilimsel amaçlarla kullanılacak olan bu çalışmaya katılımınız tamamen sizin isteğinize bağlıdır. Araştırmada yer almayı reddedebilir, herhangi bir aşamada çalışmadan çekilebilirsiniz. Çalışmaya katılımınız için size para verilmeyecek ya da karşılığında herhangi bir şey istenmeyecektir. Sizden herhangi bir kimlik bilgisi alınmayacak ve vereceğiniz bilgiler tamamen gizli kalacaktır. Çalışmadan elde edilen veriler grup olarak değerlendirilecek ve yalnızca bu çalışma kapsamında kullanılacaktır.

Anketlerde yer alan sorular için doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur. Araştırma sonuçlarının sağlıklı olması için soruları eksiksiz ve içtenlikle, sizi tam olarak yansıtacak şekilde cevaplamanız çok önemlidir. Katkılarınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederim.

**Uygulayıcının Adı:** Ayşe Büşra Topal

**Email:** aysebusratopal@sabanciuniv.edu

### **Katılımcının beyanı**

Yukarıda okuduğum çalışma ile ilgili bilgiler bana sözlü olarak da iletildi. Bu çalışmaya gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

**Katılımcının** (dolduracağınız formlarda isminiz alınmayacak, gizliliğiniz korunacaktır)

Adı soyadı ve imzası .....

**Uygulayıcının Adı soyadı ve imzası: Ayşe Büşra Topal**

## Appendix B

### BAGEM FORMU

Her üniversite içerisinde kendi değerlerini yansıtan bir dünya yaratır. Toplumun her kesimden insanın yollarının kesiştiği Sabancı Üniversitesi, tüm paydaşlarının gereksinimlerine duyarlılığıyla aslında biz olmanın zor olmadığına 16 yıllık bir kanıttır. Sabancı Üniversitesi kurulduğundan itibaren koruduğu ve geleceğe taşımaya amaçladığı değerleriyle tüm üyelerini “Sabancı’lı” kimliğinde tek potada birleştirmeyi başarmıştır.

Peki sizin için “Sabancı’lı olmak” nedir?

Bu konuda ki duygu ve düşüncelerinizi

*#bencesabancılıolmak ve #iyikisabancılıyımçünkü* hastaglerini kullanarak 40’ar kelime limitini doldurmaya çalışarak sosyal medya mecramızda paylaşınız. (Lütfen en az 20 kelime kullanmaya çalışın)

Lütfen siz de “Sabancı’lı olmaya dair” iki adet hastag bulunuz ve bu hastaglerle 40’ar kelime limitini doldurmaya çalışarak sosyal medya mecramızda paylaşımında bulununuz. (Lütfen en az 20 kelime kullanmaya çalışın)

## Appendix C

### Katılımcı ID:

Aşağıda okuyacağınız hikayelerde farklı müzakere ortamlarında vereceğiniz kararlar öğrenilmek istenmektedir ve vereceğiniz cevapların doğru veya yanlışı yoktur. Lütfen her hikayeyi birbirinden ayrı değerlendiriniz ve okuduktan sonra altındaki sizin için en uygun olan seçeneği seçip bir sonraki hikayeye geçiniz. Kararınızı verdikten sonra gerideki hikayelere dönmeyiniz.

**1. Okuyacağınız senaryoda Turuncu Gün firmasının CEO'su olarak bir iş projesinin muhtemel ortaklarıyla olan görüşmeleri yönetiyorsunuz. Müzakerelerde şirket CEO'su olarak firmanın karlarını ve itibarını korumanız bekleniyor. İki şirket olarak ortaklık yüzdeleri, kar paylaşımı, yatırım bölgeleri gibi konular hakkında sıkı pazarlıklar yaptınız. Müzakereler sonucunda karşı taraf A ve B anlaşmaları olmak üzere iki potansiyel anlaşma önerisinde bulundu. Yaptığınız hesaplara göre:**

**Eğer A anlaşmasını seçerseniz:** firmanızı kesinlikle 600.000 tl kara geçirecek.

**Eğer B anlaşmasını seçerseniz:** firmanızı % 60 ihtimalle 1,000,000 tl kazandıracak ya da % 40 ihtimalle hiçbir kara geçirmeyecek.

Sadece bu iki seçeneğe sahip olduğunuz bir durumda hangisini seçerdiniz?

..... seçeneğini seçtim.

**2. Okuyacağınız senaryoda Küçükköy ilçesinin belediye başkanıdır. Belediye meclisinde kendi parti grubunuz ve karşı parti grubu ilçedeki terk edilmiş barınakların olduğu alanın değerlendirilmesi hakkında müzakereler yürütmekte. Müzakerelerde alana yapılacak parkın proje modeli ve bütçesi tartışılmakta. Seçeceğiniz projenin seçmen grubunuza hitap etmesini ve gelecek seçimlerdeki oy oranınıza katkıda bulunmasını istiyorsunuz. Müzakereler sonucu karşı taraf X ve Y projeleri olmak üzere iki potansiyel proje önerisinde bulundu. Danışmanlarınızın öngörülerine göre:**

**Eğer X projesini seçerseniz:** oy sayınız önceki seçimlere göre kesinlikle 30,000 kişi civarında artacak.

**Eğer Y projesini seçerseniz:** oy sayınızı önceki seçimlere göre % 65 ihtimallerle 50,000 kişi civarında artacak yada % 35 ihtimalle hiçbir artışta bulunmayacak.

Sadece bu iki seçeneğe sahip olduğunuz bir durumda hangisini seçerdiniz?

..... seçeneğini seçtim.

**3. Okuyacağınız senaryoda ders seçimleri sırasında prosedürlere bağlı bazı aksaklıklar yaşayan öğrencilerden birisiniz ve bir dersinizi seçemediniz. Okulun ders seçimleriyle ilgili birimi özel prosedür değişikliklerine kesinlikle karşı çıkmakta ve aksaklık yaşayan öğrenciler olarak müzakereye oturdunuz. Seçeceğiniz dersin makul bir syllabusa sahip olmasını, ilginizi çeken bir konusu olmasını ve ortalamanıza katkı sağlamasını istiyorsunuz. Aranızdaki müzakere sonucunda alabileceğiniz iki ders opsiyonu sunuldu ve sizin hesaplarınıza göre:**

**Eğer C dersini seçerseniz:** ortalamanız kesinlikle 0,15 puan artacak.

**Eğer D dersini seçerseniz:** ortalamanız % 55 ihtimallerle 0,30 puan artacak ya da % 45 ihtimalle hiçbir artışta bulunmayacak.

Sadece bu iki seçeneğe sahip olduğunuz bir durumda hangisini seçerdiniz?

..... seçeneğini seçerdim.

**4. Okuyacağınız senaryoda Turuncu Gün firmasının CEO'su olarak bir iş projesinin muhtemel ortaklarıyla olan görüşmeleri yönetiyorsunuz. Müzakerelerde şirket CEO'su olarak firmanın karlarını ve itibarını korumanız bekleniyor. İki şirket olarak ortaklık yüzdeleri, kar paylaşımı, yatırım bölgeleri gibi konular hakkında sıkı pazarlıklar yaptınız. Müzakereler sonucunda karşı taraf A ve B anlaşmaları olmak üzere iki potansiyel anlaşma önerisinde bulundu. Yaptığımız hesaplara göre:**

**Eğer A anlaşmasını seçerseniz:** firmanızı kesinlikle 600,000 tl zarar ettirecek.

**Eğer B anlaşmasını seçerseniz:** firmanızı % 60 ihtimalle 1,000,000 tl zarar ettirecek ya da % 40 ihtimalle hiçbir şey kaybettirmeyecek.

Sadece bu iki seçeneğe sahip olduğunuz bir durumda hangisini seçerdiniz?

..... seçeneğini seçerdim.

5. Okuyacağınız senaryoda Küçükköy ilçesinin belediye başkanıdır. Belediye meclisinde kendi parti grubunuz ve karşı parti grubu ilçedeki terk edilmiş barınakların olduğu alanın değerlendirilmesi hakkında müzakereler yürütmekte. Müzakerelerde alana yapılacak parkın proje modeli ve bütçesi tartışılmakta. Seçeceğiniz projenin seçmen grubunuza hitap etmesini ve gelecek seçimlerdeki oy oranınıza katkıda bulunmasını istiyorsunuz. Müzakereler sonucu karşı taraf X ve Y projeleri olmak üzere iki potansiyel proje önerisinde bulundu. Danışmanlarınızın öngörülerine göre:

**Eğer X projesini seçerseniz:** oy sayınız önceki seçimlere göre kesinlikle 35,000 kişi civarında azalacak.

**Eğer Y projesini seçerseniz:** oy sayınız önceki seçimlere göre % 65 ihtimallerle 50,000 kişi civarında azalacak ya da % 35 ihtimalle hiçbir kayıp olmayacak.

Sadece bu iki seçeneğe sahip olduğunuz bir durumda hangisini seçerdiniz?

..... seçeneğini seçtim.

6. Okuyacağınız senaryoda ders seçimleri sırasında prosedürlere bağlı bazı aksaklıklar yaşayan öğrencilerden birisiniz ve bir dersinizi seçemediniz. Okulun ders seçimleriyle ilgili birimi özel prosedür değişikliklerine kesinlikle karşı çıkmakta ve aksaklık yaşayan öğrenciler olarak müzakereye oturdunuz. Seçeceğiniz dersin makul bir syllabusa sahip olmasını, ilginizi çeken bir konusu olmasını ve ortalamanıza katkı sağlamasını istiyorsunuz. Aranızdaki müzakere sonucunda alabileceğiniz iki ders opsiyonu sunuldu ve sizin hesaplarınıza göre:

**Eğer C dersini seçerseniz:** ortalamanız kesinlikle 0,20 puan düşecek.

**Eğer D dersini seçerseniz:** ortalamanız % 55 ihtimalle 0,30 puan düşecek ya da % 45 ihtimalle hiçbir kayıpta bulunmayacak.

Sadece bu iki seçeneğe sahip olduğunuz bir durumda hangisini seçerdiniz?

..... seçeneğini seçtim.

**Bu soruda ..... şıkkını seçmemin sebebi (lütfen bir ya da birkaç cümleyle açıklayınız):**

## Appendix D

<p>Sayın katılımcı,            Bu anket, üyesi olduğunuz Sabancı Üniversitesi'ne yönelik duygu ve düşünceleriniz hakkında bilgi edinmek amacıyla hazırlanmıştır.            Aşağıda yer alan cümlelerin doğru veya yanlışlığı yoktur. Sizden, kişisel görüşünüze uygun olarak, 13 tane cümlenin karşısındaki kutulardan bir tanesini (x) işareti ile işaretlemeniz istenmektedir.</p> <p>Lütfen boş bırakmayınız.</p>	KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM	KATILMIYORUM	KARARSIZIM	KATILIYORUM	TAMAMEN KATILIYORUM
1. Sabancı Üniversitesi'nde üyeleri arasında olumlu bir etkileşim vardır.					
2. Sosyal ilişkilerde her zaman öncelikle Sabancı Üniversitesi'nin üyelerini tercih ederim.					
3. Sabancı Üniversitesi'nin bir üyesi olmaktan gurur duyuyorum.					
4. Sabancı Üniversitesi'nin üyeleri grubun amaçlarına yönelik tüm yeteneklerini kullanırlar.					
5. Sabancı Üniversitesi'nin üyeleri buldukları ortamı neşelendirir, renklendirir.					
6. Sabancı Üniversitesi'nin üyelerinin ortak değerleri olduğunu zannetmiyorum.					
7. Sabancı Üniversitesi'nin üyeleri birlik ve bütünlük içinde hareket eder.					
8. Sabancı Üniversitesi'nin üyelerinin amaçları benim amaçlarımla uyumludur.					
9. Sabancı Üniversitesi'nin üyeleri birbirlerine mümkün olduğunca yardım ederler.					
10. Sabancı Üniversitesi'nin içerisinde arkadaşlık ilişkileri çok iyidir.					
11. Sabancı Üniversitesi'nde kendimi oldukça rahat hissediyorum.					
12. Sabancı Üniversitesi'nin bir üyesi olarak anılmayı istiyorum.					

	Hiç mutlu değilim	Mutlu değilim	Kararsızım	Mutluyum	Çok mutluyum
13. Sabancı Üniversitesinin bir üyesi olmaktan:					

## Appendix E

### BENLİK TÜRÜ BELİRLEME ÖLÇEĞİ

Lütfen aşağıdaki maddelerin her birini, birbirinden bağımsız olarak, günlük hayatınızda sizin için uygunluğu derecesine en iyi uyan şekilde X koyarak işaretleyiniz.

	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1. Kararlarımnda yakınlarımın etkisi çok azdır.					
2. Çok yakın hissettiğim bir kişinin hayatıma karışmasından hoşlanmam.					
3. Kendimi yakınlarımdan bağımsız hissederim.					
4. Hayatımı kendimi çok yakın hissettiğim kişilerin düşüncelerine göre yönlendiririm.					
5. Benimle ilgili bir konuda çok yakın hissettiğim kişilerin fikirleri beni etkiler.					
6. Kararlarımı alırken yakınlarıma danışırım.					
7. Benimle ilgili bir konuda çok yakın hissettiğim kişilerin aldığı kararlar benim için geçerlidir.					
8. Genellikle kendime çok yakın hissettiğim kişilerin isteklerine uymaya çalışırım.					
9. Kararlarımı yakınlarımla isteklerine göre kolayca değiştirebilirim.					
10. Kendimi çok yakın hissettiğim insanların desteğine ihtiyaç duyarım.					
11. Yakınlarımla olan ilişkimde mesafeli olmak isterim.					
12. Genelde kendimle ilgili şeyleri kendime saklarım.					
13. Kişiliğimin oluşmasında yakınlarımla etkisi büyüktür.					
14. Kendime çok yakın hissettiğim kimseler sık sık aklıma gelir.					
15. Yakınlarımla hakkımda ne düşündüğü benim için önemli değildir.					
16. Özel hayatımı çok yakınım olan birisiyle bile paylaşmam.					
17. Yakınlarımla aramdaki bağ, kendimi huzur ve güven içinde hissetmemi sağlıyor.					
18. Yakınlarımla hayatımda en ön sıradadır.					

## Appendix F

### UYUŞMAZLIKLA BAŞA ÇIKMA STİLLERİ

Lütfen aşağıdaki her ifadeyi dikkatlice okuyunuz ve sorunlar karşısında aldığınız tavrı en iyi yansıtan cevabı işaretleyiniz.

<b>Bir anlaşmazlıkla/çatışmayla karşılaştığımda, şöyle davranırım:</b>	ASLA	NADİRE N	BAZEN	SIKLIKLA	HER ZAMAN
1. Karşı tarafın isteklerini veririm.					
2. Orta yol bir çözüm bulmaya çalışırım.					
3. Kendi görüşlerim üzerinde diretirim.					
4. Karşı tarafı ve kendimi gerçekten tatmin edecek bir çözüm bulana kadar konuyu incelerim.					
5. Farklılıklarımızla yüzleşmekten kaçınırım.					
6. Karşı tarafla fikir birliği/iş birliği yaparım.					
7. Karşılıklı olarak uzlaşmacı bir çözüm bulunması gerektiğini vurgularım					
8. Kazançları araştırırım.					
9. Kendimin ve başkalarının amaçları ve çıkarları için mücadele ederim.					
10. Mümkün oldukça görüş farklılıklarını görmezden gelirim.					
11. Karşı tarafın isteklerine uyarım.					
12. İki tarafın da az taviz vermesi için ısrar ederim.					
13. Kendim için iyi olacak bir sonuç için mücadele ederim.					
14. İki taraf için de karşılıklı en fazla faydayı sağlayacak çözüm için fikirleri incelerim.					
15. Farklılıkların en az zararı vermesine çalışırım					
16. Karşı tarafın amaç ve çıkarlarına kendimi alıştırırım.					
17. Olabildiği durumlarda yarı yarıya uzlaşma için gayret sarfederim.					
18. Kazanmak için her şeyi yaparım.					
19. Hem kendi çıkarlarım hem de karşı tarafın çıkarları için mümkün olabilecek en iyi çözümü bulmak için uğraşırım.					
20. Diğerleriyle karşı karşıya gelmekten kaçınırım.					

## Appendix G

### ROTTER DENETİM ODAĞI ÖLÇEĞİ

Bu anket, toplumumuzdaki bazı önemli olayların farkı insanları etkileme biçimini bulmaya amaçlamaktadır. Her maddede “a” ya da “ b “ harfiyle gösterilen iki seçenek bulunmaktadır. Lütfen, her seçenek çiftinde sizin kendi görüşünüze göre gerçeği yansıttığına en çok inandığınız cümleyi (yalnız bir cümleyi ) seçiniz ve net bir şekilde işaretleyiniz.

Seçiminizi yaparken, seçmeniz gerektiğini düşündüğünüz ve yada doğru olmasını arzu ettiğiniz cümleyi değil, gerçekten daha doğru olduğuna inandığınız cümleyi seçiniz. Bu anket bazı durumlara ilişkin, kişisel inançlarla ilgilidir, bunun için “**doğru**” ya da yanlış cevap diye bir durum söz konusu değildir.

Bazı maddelerde her iki cümleye de inandığınızı ya da hiçbirine inanmadığınızı düşünebilirsiniz. Böyle durumlarda kendi görüşünüz açısından gerçeğe uygun olduğuna daha çok inandığınız cümleyi seçiniz seçim yaparken her bir cümle için bağımsız karar veriniz; önceki tercihlerinizden etkilenmeyiniz.

1. a) Ana babaları çok fazla cezalandırdıkları için çocuklar çok problemlili oluyor.  
b) Günümüz çocuklarının çoğunun problemi, ana-babaları tarafından aşırı serbest bırakılmalarıdır.
2. a) İnsanların yaşamındaki mutsuzlukların çoğu biraz da şanssızlıklarına bağlıdır.  
b) İnsanların talihsizlikleri yaptıkları hataların sonucudur.
3. a) Savaşların başlıca nedenlerinden biri, halkın siyasetle yeterince ilgilenmemesidir.  
b) İnsanlar savaşı önlemek için ne kadar çaba harcarsa harcasın, her zaman savaş olacaktır.
4. a) İnsanlar bu dünyada hak ettikleri saygıyı er geç görürler.  
b) İnsan ne kadar çabalarsa çabalasın ne yazık ki değeri genellikle anlaşılmaz.
5. a) Öğretmenlerin öğrencilere haksızlık yaptığı fikri saçmadır.  
b) Öğrencilerin çoğu, notların tesadüfi olaylardan etkilendiğini fark etmez.
6. a) Koşullar uygun değilse insan başarılı bir lider olamaz.  
b) Lider olamayan yetenekli insanlar, fırsatları değerlendirememiş kişilerdir.

7. a) Ne kadar uğraşsanız da bazı insanlar sizden hoşlanmazlar.  
b) Kendilerini başkalarına sevdiremeyen kişiler, başkalarıyla nasıl geçinileceğini bilmeyenlerdir.
8. a) İnsanın kişiliğinin belirlenmesinden en önemli rolü kalıtım oynar.  
b) İnsanların nasıl biri olacaklarını kendi hayat tecrübeleri belirler.
9. a) Bir şey olacaksa eninde sonunda olduğuna sık sık tanık olmuşumdur.  
b) Ne yapacağıma kesin karar vermek kadere güvenmekten daima daha iyidir.
10. a) İyi hazırlanmış bir öğrenci için, adil olmayan bir sınav hemen hemen söz konusu olamaz.  
b) Sınav soruları derste işlenenle çoğu kez o kadar ilişkisiz oluyor ki çalışmanın anlamı kalmıyor.
11. a) Başarılı olmak çok çalışmaya bağlıdır; şansın bunda ya hiç ya da çok küçük payı vardır.  
b) İyi bir iş bulmak, temelde, doğru zamanda doğru yerde bulunmaya bağlıdır.
12. a) Hükümetin kararlarında sade vatandaş da etkili olabilir.  
b) Bu dünya güç sahibi birkaç kişi tarafından yönetilmektedir ve sade vatandaşın bu konuda yapabileceği fazla bir şey yoktur.
13. a) Yaptığım planları yürütebileceğimden hemen hemen eminimdir.  
b) Çok uzun vadeli planlar yapmak her zaman akıllıca olmayabilir, çünkü bir çok şey zaten iyi yada kötü şansa bağlıdır.
14. a) Hiçbir yönü iyi olmayan insanlar vardır.  
b) Herkesin iyi bir tarafı vardır.

15. a) Benim açımdan istediğimi elde etmenin talihle bir ilgisi yoktur.  
b) Çoğu durumda, yazı tura atarak da isabetli kararlar verebiliriz.
16. a) Kimin patron olacağı genellikle, doğru yerde ilk önce bulunma şansına kimin sahip olduğuna bağlıdır.  
b) İnsanlara doğru şeyi yaptırmak bir yetenek işidir; şansın bunda payı ya hiç yoktur yada çok azdır.
17. a) Dünya meseleleri söz konusu olduğunda çoğumuz, anlayamadığımız ve kontrol edemediğimiz güçlerin kurbanıyız.  
b) İnsanlar, siyasal ve sosyal konularda aktif rol alarak dünya olaylarını kontrol edebilirler.
18. a) Birçok insan, rastlantıların yaşamlarını ne derece etkilediğinin farkında değildir.  
b) Aslında “şans” diye bir şey yoktur.
19. a) İnsan, hatalarını kabul edebilmelidir.  
b) Genelde en iyisi insanın hatalarını örtbas etmesidir.
20. a) Bir insanın sizden gerçekten hoşlanıp hoşlanmadığını bilmek zordur  
b) Kaç arkadaşınızın olduğu, ne kadar iyi olduğunuza bağlıdır.
21. a) Uzun vadede yaşamımızdaki kötü şeyler, iyi şeylerle dengelenir.  
b) Çoğu talihsizlikler yetenek eksikliğinin, ihmalin, tembelliğin ya da her üçünün birden sonucudur.
22. a) Yeterli çabayla siyasal yolsuzlukları ortadan kaldırabiliriz.  
b) Siyasetçilerin kapalı kapılar ardında yaptıkları üzerinde halkın fazla bir kontrolü yoktur.
23. a) Öğretmenlerin verdikleri notları nasıl belirlediklerini bazen anlamıyorum.

- b) Aldığım notlarla çalışma derecem arasında doğrudan bir bağlantı vardır.
24. a) İyi bir lider, ne yapacaklarına halkın bizzat karar vermesini bekler.  
b) İyi bir lider herkesin görevinin ne olduğunu bizzat belirler.
25. a) Çoğu kez başıma gelenler üzerinde çok az etkiye sahip olduğumu hissedirim.  
b) Şans ya da talihin yaşamımda önemli bir rol oynadığına inanmam.
26. a) İnsanlar arkadaşça olmaya çalışmadıkları için yalnızdırlar.  
b) İnsanları memnun etmek için çok fazla çabalamanın yararı yoktur, sizden hoşlanırlarsa hoşlanırlar.
27. a) Okullarda atletizme gereğinden fazla önem veriliyor.  
b) Takım sporları kişiliğin oluşumu için mükemmel bir yoldur.
28. a) Başıma ne gelmişse kendi yaptıklarımındandır.  
b) Yaşamımın alacağı yön üzerinde bazen yeterince kontrolümün olmadığını hissediyorum.
29. a) Siyasetçilerin neden öyle davrandıklarını çoğu kez anlamıyorum.  
b) Yerel ve ulusal düzeydeki kötü idareden uzun vadede halk sorumludur.

## Appendix H

Influence of Social Identity on Decision Making about Negotiation Outcome

**Sabancı University**

**Debriefing form of the Research Study**

**Study Title:** Influence of Social Identity on Decision Making about Negotiation Outcome

**Principal Investigator:** Dr. Çağla Aydın

**Co-Investigator & Interviewer:** Ayşe Büşra Topal

### SON BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ ONAM FORMU

Değerli Katılımcı,

Bu araştırma Sabancı Üniversitesi, Sanat ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi öğretim üyelerinden Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çağla Aydın sorumluluğunda Uyuşmazlık Çözümü ve Analizi programı öğrencisi Ayşe Büşra Topal'ın tez çalışması için bilgi toplamayı amaçlar.

Araştırmanın amacı, bireylerin münazara sonuçlarına dair aldıkları kararların üzerine sosyal kimliğin etkisini incelemektir. Ancak çalışmanın yapısı gereği bu bilgilendirme başta eksik olarak yapılmış ve sadece "bireylerin münazara sonuçlarına dair aldıkları kararların" inceleneceği bilgisi verilmiştir. Çalışmaya katılımınızın çalışma kapsamında incelenen konuya katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir ve sonuçlarının yalnız bilimsel amaçlarla kullanılacaktır. Çalışmaya katılımınız tamamen sizin isteğinize bağlıdır araştırmada yer almayı reddedebilir ve çekilebilirsiniz. Çalışmaya katılımınız için size para verilmeyecek ya da karşılığında herhangi bir şey istenmeyecektir. Sizden herhangi bir kimlik bilgisi alınmayacak ve vereceğiniz bilgiler tamamen gizli kalacaktır. Çalışmadan elde edilen veriler grup olarak değerlendirilecek ve yalnızca bu çalışma kapsamında kullanılacaktır.

**Uygulayıcının Adı:** Ayşe Büşra Topal  
**Email:** aysebusratopal@sabanciuniv.edu

#### **Katılımcının beyanı**

Yukarıda okuduğum çalışma ile ilgili bilgiler bana sözlü olarak da iletildi. Bu çalışmada verilerimin kullanılmasını gönüllü olarak kabul ediyorum.

**Katılımcının** (dolduracağınız formlarda isminiz alınmayacak, gizliliğiniz korunacaktır)

Adı soyadı ve imzası .....

#### **Uygulayıcının**

Adı soyadı ve imzası: Ayşe Büşra Topal