

Correspondence Bias in the Attribution of Political Attitudes (A Replication of Jones and Harris's (1967) Experiment on Correspondence Bias)

Ma. Jenina N. Nalipay
Philippine Normal University

Author Notes

The author would like to acknowledge the assistance provided by the Psychology Laboratory of De La Salle University for this study.

The study investigated correspondence bias in the attribution of political attitudes by finding out if choice and behavior direction would influence participants' estimates of a person's true attitude on a controversial political issue. In a replication of Jones and Harris's (1967) classic experiment on correspondence bias, a sample of 145 college students were randomly assigned in one of the four treatment conditions wherein they were instructed to read an essay that is: a) pro-Reproductive Health (RH) Law, written in choice condition; b) pro-RH Law, written in no choice condition; c) anti-RH Law, written in choice condition; or d) anti-RH Law, written in no choice condition. The participants were then asked to estimate the true attitude of the essay-writer. Results showed that the participants estimated the writer's true attitude as being more in favor of the side of the issue in which the direction of the essay was written, regardless of whether it was written in the choice or no choice condition. Thus, correspondence bias was evident in the participants' attribution of political attitudes.

Keywords: Correspondence bias, political attitudes, replication

Correspondence Bias in the Attribution of Political Attitudes

In understanding another person's behaviors, inferences are made as to what a person is and what motivates him or her to behave that way. These inferences can be arrived at either by explaining the behavior in terms of the person's disposition or the nature of the situation in which the behavior occurs (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2013). In the current scenario of Philippine politics, however, it is a common observation (especially in social media and online forum sites) that agreement or disagreement on a certain political issue could easily lead to generalizations about one's personal dispositions, such as being prejudiced toward or against a specific political party or political movement. On the contrary, the context or situation upon which the attitude was expressed is given very little consideration.

For instance, this observation is very much apparent on the issue of the "war on drugs" being waged by the administration of President Duterte. Those who oppose the actions taken by the administration are easily labeled as "Yellowtards," who are loyal supporters of former president Benigno Aquino III, and who cannot accept the defeat of their presidential candidate in the previous election. On the other hand, those who support the administration are referred to as "Dutertards," who are blind followers of the president, and who treat him as someone who can do no wrong (Butuyan, 2016). Another example is on the issue of the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act (also known as RH Law), where those who are in favor of it are labeled as "modern-day Herods," "fascists," and "mass murderers," while those who are against are said to be "stuck in the dark ages" or "stupid" (Curato & Ong, 2012). These labels are often given on the basis of the person's statement of agreement or disagreement on the issue alone, without considering the context or situation that led the person to take that side of the issue.

Why is it that people tend to overestimate dispositional factors and downplay situational determinants in the attribution of political attitudes? This observation in Philippine politics is actually predictable and has been demonstrated in a number of studies in the field of social psychology and in various contexts. Social psychologists refer to this phenomenon as correspondence bias (also known as fundamental attribution error), or the tendency to draw inferences regarding an individual's unique and enduring characteristics based on behaviors that can completely be explained by the situations in which they occur (Gilbert & Malone, 1995).

Correspondence bias has been exhibited in a number of studies. In the classic series of experiments conducted by Jones and Harris (1967), participants were shown persuasive messages. Although the participants had been told that the speaker or writer of the essay was given no choice as to which side of the issue to support, participants still believed that the speaker's or writer's true attitude toward the issue is consistent with the one that he reported. Replications of these experiments have since been conducted, and correspondence bias in the attribution of attitudes on general knowledge (Ross, Amabile, & Steinmetz, 1977), personality traits (Miller, Smith, & Uleman, 1981), political orientation (Gilbert & Jones, 1986), prejudice against gays and lesbians (Alicke, Zerbst, & LoSchiavo, 1996), affirmative action on racial discrimination (Bauman & Skitka, 2010), and success in entrepreneurship (Fiore & Lussier, 2015) have likewise been demonstrated.

A number of studies have examined the relationship of correspondence bias with other constructs. One factor found to be associated with correspondence bias is culture. Individualist cultures (e.g., American) are more likely to demonstrate correspondence bias than collectivist cultures (e.g., Japanese, Korean) as collectivists tend to be more sensitive to salience of situational constraints (e.g. Choi & Nisbett, 1998; Masuda & Kitayama, 2004; Miyamoto & Kitayama, 2002). While there is a difference between cultures, significant correspondence bias can

be observed in both individualist and collectivist cultures (Krull et al., 1999).

Correspondence bias is prevalent among college students, but is also observed, albeit to a lesser degree, in the general American population, where it was found to be stable across age, geographic region, income, and level of education, and correlated significantly with dispositionist but not with situationist and interactionist lay philosophies of behavior (Bauman & Skitka, 2010). On the other hand, some studies revealed age differences, as older adults are more likely to demonstrate correspondence bias than younger ones (Maxfield, Pyszczynski, Greenberg, & Bultmann 2017; Stanley & Blanchard-Fields, 2011). Correspondence bias has been found to be predictive of stereotypical beliefs (Nier, Bajaj, McLean, & Schwartz, 2012), as well as consequential judgments and decisions such as blaming people for accidental harm, believing coerced confessions, and sensitivity of job evaluation to job difficulty (Scopelliti, Min, McCormick, Kassam, & Morewedge, 2017).

Some explanations have been offered for the phenomenon of correspondence bias. Gilbert and Malone (1995) stipulated that correspondence bias can occur due to: (1) the person's lack of awareness regarding situational constraints; (2) having unrealistic expectations regarding the influence of situational factors on behaviors; (3) assimilation effects that inflate the categorization of the observed behavior; and (4) motivational and capacity constraints that lead to incomplete correction. Moreover, perceptual salience can give rise to correspondence bias. Because of the lack of information about situational context or the difficulty to come up with an accurate interpretation about it, people tend to ignore its importance; instead, focus is given to the person, who is more "perceptually prominent" (Aronson et al., 2013).

Correspondence bias can also take place when the two-step process in making attributions is not performed completely. When making attributions about another person's behaviors, a spontaneous processing of the other person's mental states

(Moran, Jolly, & Mitchell, 2014) is made before thinking about possible situational explanations, which may be used to adjust the original internal attribution. However, since the second step requires more effort and conscious attention, insufficient adjustment of the initial attribution to consider the prevailing situation may lead to correspondence bias (Aronson et al., 2013).

The current study intends to demonstrate correspondence bias in the attribution of attitudes on a controversial topic in Philippine politics—the RH Law. It aims to provide a plausible explanation for the common observation of the preference for dispositional over situational attributions toward political issues in the Philippines. By doing so, this study could help understand the phenomenon better, and awareness of it could help individuals become more considerate about the situation before making judgments about another person.

To fulfill the aims of the study, a replication of Jones and Harris's (1967) classic experiment on correspondence bias was conducted a few months after the RH Bill was passed into law. Using the attitude-attribution paradigm, participants were asked to estimate an essay-writer's true attitude toward the RH Law. The objective was to find out whether choice (whether the writer has a choice on which side of the issue to write about or not) and behavior direction (whether the essay is written in pro- or anti-RH Law position) would influence the estimates of the writer's true attitude. Based on the notion of correspondence bias, it was hypothesized that behavior direction would have more influence on the attribution of attitudes than choice.

METHODS

Experimental Design

The study, which is a replication of Jones and Harris's (1967) Experiment I on correspondence bias, made use of a 2 x 2 factorial design. The independent variables are choice (choice and no choice) and behavior direction (pro-RH Law and anti-RH Law). There are four treatment conditions: (a) choice – pro-RH Law

condition; (b) choice – anti-RH Law condition; (c) no choice – pro-RH Law condition; and (d) no choice – anti-RH Law condition. The participants were randomly assigned to these four conditions by distributing the research materials in a randomly determined sequence. The dependent variable of the study is the participants' estimate of the essay-writer's true attitude toward the issue of RH Law.

Participants

The participants of the study were college students selected through convenience sampling. Initially, 146 students took part in the study. However, one of them failed to complete a significant portion of the questionnaires and was excluded in the analysis, leaving a total of 145 participants. The sample consisted of 45.5% ($n = 66$) males, 49.7% ($n = 72$) females, and 4.8% ($n = 7$) who did not indicate their gender. The mean age of the participants is 19.54 years old ($SD = 1.12$).

Materials and Procedures

To manipulate the independent variables of the study, the participants were given a folder containing a “political science assignment” essay. The essay began with the instruction given to the writer in three ways: (a) “Write a short essay *regarding* the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act (RH Law) as if you were giving the opening statement in a debate”; (b) “Write a short essay *defending* the RH Law as if...”; or (c) Write a short essay *criticizing* the RH Law as if...” It was followed by an essay of approximately 200 words that was either pro- or anti-RH Law in the choice conditions, and the direction called for by the instruction in the no choice conditions (see appendices A and B). Along with the essays that were used for the manipulation of the treatment conditions, the following response measures were given to the participants:

To measure the favorability of trait attribution, or how positive/negative the participants view the essay-writer, a 12-item semantic differential scale for rating various personal qualities of the essay-writer was used. Participants rated the target person on

the 12-item 7-point scale with pairs of adjectives such as weak-strong, foolish-wise, etc. Higher scores indicated more favorable views toward the essay-writer. The scale had a reliability of Cronbach's alpha .89.

A 10-item Likert-type scale was used in order to measure the dependent variable, which is the participants' estimate of the writer's true attitude toward RH Law. The scale was composed of five items stated in pro-RH Law direction (e.g., "Addressing the overpopulation issue, which directly affects the country's unemployment rate, is viable solution to the problem on poverty.") and five items in anti-RH Law direction (e.g., "The government needs to provide more jobs to its people rather than control the population in order to address the country's problem on poverty."). Participants rated their estimates of the essay-writer's agreement or disagreement with each statement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scores indicate the participants' view of the target person as more in favor of the RH Law. The same scale was used by the participants to record their own attitudes. This scale has a reliability of Cronbach's alpha .89 for the estimate of the essay-writer's true attitude and .61 for the participants' own attitude.

The present study followed the procedures based on the attitude-attribution paradigm used by Jones and Harris (1967) in Experiment I of their classic study on correspondence bias. Data gathering was conducted four months after the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act was passed into law. Permission was sought from the class instructors to conduct an experiment in their classes. Once permission was secured, the schedule of the experiment was coordinated. Informed consent was obtained from the participants prior to the conduct of the experiment, and all applicable ethical considerations were taken in the course of the study.

The experimenter explained that the purpose of the study was to find out if participants would be able to give valid judgments about a person's personality and attitudes based on very limited information. The participants were told that they

were given different personal materials written by the same college student, such as an excerpt from the person's autobiographical essay, a short essay prepared for a creative writing course regarding conflicting values in contemporary society, and an essay from a political science assignment.

Furthermore, the participants were told that the conditions would be compared to see which kind of written material would give the most valid judgments about the person's personality and attitudes, as measured by other additional information that they did not know about. They were also told that other participants would evaluate other target persons. However, all the participants were given the essay from a political science assignment. Information about the essay-writer that was given was that he was a college student and the son of an automobile sales company employee. The participants were then instructed to read the material.

After reading the essay, the participants were instructed to answer the response measures. As a manipulation check, the participants were asked about their understanding of the instructions given to the writer in composing the essay, and if they thought this person was able to follow the instructions properly. They were also asked about what they thought about the essay-writer and what they thought about the experiment. The participants were debriefed and the true nature and purpose of the experiment was revealed after all of them had turned in the folder containing the research materials.

Data Analysis

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to see if there are any differences in the participants' own attitude toward RH Law and in the favorability of their trait attribution. To test the main hypothesis of the experiment, a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA was conducted with choice (choice and no choice) and behavior direction (pro- and anti-RH Law) as independent variables, and participants' estimates of the essay-writer's true attitude toward the RH Law as dependent variable. Pearson

correlations were also computed to find out if there is a relationship between (a) the participants' own attitudes and the estimates of the essay-writer's true attitude and (b) the favorability of trait attribution and the estimates of the essay-writer's true attitude.

RESULTS

The participants' responses in the manipulation check indicated that they understood the instructions given to the essay-writer and that they thought this person was able to follow the instructions properly. The means and standard deviations of the participants' ratings of their own attitude, estimates of the essay-writer's true attitude, and trait attribution are shown in Table 1. The participant's own attitudes toward the RH Law are not significantly different across conditions ($F(3, 141) = 2.417, p = .069$). In general, the participants were in favor of the RH Law ($\bar{X} = 46.641, SD = 8.119$; since the lowest possible score is 10 and the highest is 70, the midpoint is at 40). Likewise, there is no significant difference in the participants' favorability of trait attribution toward the essay-writer across conditions ($F(3, 141) = 1.596, p = .193$). Participants rated the essay-writer toward the more favorable traits ($\bar{X} = 58.630, SD = 10.329$; since the lowest possible score is 12 and the highest possible score is 84, the midpoint is at 48). Significant, albeit weak, positive correlation was found between the participants' ratings of their own attitude and their estimates of the essay-writer's true attitude ($r = .171, p = .040$). However, no significant correlation was found between the favorability of trait attribution and estimates of the essay-writer's true attitude.

Table 1. Results of Descriptive Statistics

	<i>N</i>	<u>Own Attitude</u>		<u>Essay Writer' Attitude</u>		<u>Trait Attribution</u>	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Pro-Choice	38	49.421	8.179	53.974	8.849	57.553	10.944
Anti-Choice	36	44.694	8.779	33.306	11.326	59.976	7.970
Pro-No Choice	35	46.629	6.778	52.752	7.289	60.914	10.947
Anti-No Choice	36	45.667	8.096	31.500	11.428	56.199	10.862

The findings of 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA are shown in Table 2, and estimated marginal means are presented in Table 3. It was found that there is a significant difference in the participants' estimates of the essay-writer's true attitude toward the RH Law when behavior direction is considered ($F(1) = 162.997, p = .000$), but not when choice is taken into account ($F(1) = .850, p = .358$). There was also no significant interaction found between choice and behavior direction ($F(1) = .032, p = .859$). This indicates that behavior direction influenced the participants' estimates of the essay-writer's true attitude. Participants who were assigned the pro-RH Law conditions rated the essay-writer's true attitude as being more pro-RH Law than those who were assigned the anti-RH Law conditions. On the other hand, whether the essay-writer had a choice on the direction of the essay or not, it did not affect the participants' estimates of that person's true attitude. The findings are indicative of correspondence bias in the attribution of attitudes among the participants.

Table 2. Results of 2x2 Factorial ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Choice	1	.850	.358
Behavior Direction	1	162.997*	.000
Choice*Behavior Direction	1	.032	.859

* $p < .01$

Table 3. Estimated Marginal Means

	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Choice				
No Choice	42.126	1.173	39.808	44.444
Choice	43.640	1.149	41.368	45.911
Behavior Direction				
Anti-RH Law	32.403	1.164	30.101	34.705
Pro-RH Law	53.363	1.157	51.075	55.651
Choice*Behavior Direction				
Pro-Choice	53.974	1.603	50.805	57.142
Anti-Choice	33.306	1.647	30.050	36.561
Pro-No Choice	52.752	1.670	49.450	56.054
Anti-No Choice	31.500	1.647	28.245	34.755

DISCUSSION

The results demonstrated correspondence bias in the attribution of attitudes toward a controversial political issue. As anticipated, behavior direction influenced the participants' estimates of the essay-writer's true attitude toward the controversial topic (i.e., RH Law), but choice did not. No interaction effect between behavior direction and choice was found. The finding that participants still based their inferences on the behavior of the essay-writer even though they had been made aware of the situational context is consistent with that of previous studies (e.g., Bauman & Skitka, 2010; Fiore & Lussier, 2015, Jones & Harris, 1967).

Even if the participants in the no choice conditions category were made aware that the position on the issue the essay-writer has taken was just assigned to him, they still paid more attention to that person's behavior direction. This is comparable to what is currently being observed in Philippine political issues, such as that of the Duterte's administration's "war on drugs" and the RH Law, where people tend to assign labels or attributions to individuals merely on the basis of their agreement or disagreement with certain issues, with little regard for the context or situation that could possibly account for the person's stand (e.g., Butuyan, 2016; Curato & Ong, 2012).

A possible explanation for the findings is that, despite being aware of the essay-writer's situation, there was not enough information about how that person understood and interpreted the instructions given to him. On the other hand, the essay-writer's position on the issue that is made evident in the essay he wrote is more "perceptually prominent," thus leading the participants to make personal attributions rather than situational ones (Aronson et al., 2013). The participants may have also failed to make a conscious effort to adjust their initial automatic attributions (based on the direction of the essay) to the information that the writer was given no choice as to which direction to take in writing the essay (Moran et al., 2014)—this

incomplete correction may have led to correspondence bias (Aronson et al., 2013; Gilbert & Malone, 1995).

Moreover, unlike behavioral constraints that affect the person's capacity to enact certain options regardless of his/her understanding of it, psychological constraints—such as the ones employed in the study—do not have much effect on the person's ability to enact these options (Gilbert and Malone, 1995). Indeed, although instructions were given regarding the direction the essay-writer in the current study is supposed to write toward, he was still free as to whether to follow the instructions or not. This makes the direction of the essay appear more as a reflection of the writer's disposition rather than as a function of the situation.

There was also a tendency for the participants to estimate the essay-writer's behavior based on how they think they would react when placed in the same situation (Gilbert & Malone, 1995). Thus, if the participants thought that they could disregard the instructions in order to express their true attitudes, so could the essay-writer. However, estimating another person's behavior based on one's own imagined response may not be reliable, because aside from the possibility that the other person may behave differently, one may not always behave in a way that he/she thinks he/she would (Gilbert & Malone 1995).

Although the current study intended to replicate Jones and Harris's (1967) experiment on correspondence bias, a few differences from the original experiment must be noted. The sample in the present study came from a primarily collectivist Philippine society, whereas the sample in the original experiment were from an individualist one. Even though previous studies showed that collectivist cultures are less likely to exhibit correspondence bias than individualist cultures (Choi & Nisbett, 1998; Masuda & Kitayama, 2004; Miyamoto & Kitayama, 2002), the current study still demonstrated correspondence bias. This affirms Krull et al.'s (1999) assertion that even in collectivist cultures, significant correspondence bias can be observed. This is also consistent with other studies that used the attitude-attribution paradigm in which no difference between collectivists

and individualists were found, unless situational constraints were made more salient (e.g., Choi & Nisbett, 1998). Another difference is that in the original experiment, one position was more conventional than the other to a large extent, while in the present experiment, although the participants' own attitude toward the RH Law was generally positive, it was not as extreme as in the original experiment. This could explain the lack of interaction between behavior direction and choice. In Experiment I of Jones and Harris's (1967) study, it was hypothesized that in the conventional position, attribution of attitude would not vary as a function of perceived choice, but in the unconventional position, it would; nevertheless, this was also not confirmed in the original experiment.

The findings of the study demonstrating correspondence bias in the attribution of attitudes toward a controversial political issue have important implications. They show how vulnerable people are to making dispositional attributions about others without thoroughly considering possible situational explanations. Being aware of this susceptibility can prompt one to become more considerate in making hasty judgments about another person, especially in situations where there is limited contextual information (e.g., social media, online forums). Nevertheless, ways of countering correspondence bias have been suggested, such as by increasing one's mindfulness (Hopthrow, Hooper, Mahmood, Meier, & Weger, 2017) and perspective taking (Hooper, Erdogan, Keen, Lawton, & McHugh, 2015).

The present study has some limitations. First, while the findings demonstrated correspondence bias in the attribution of attitudes toward a political issue, they were based only on a single experiment; and while this is already a replication of Jones and Harris's (1967) Experiment I on correspondence bias, further replication in the same context may be necessary in order to strengthen the study's assertion. Future studies may also build on these findings by replicating the rest of Jones and Harris's experiments in the context of this study. Second, the study focused on a very specific political issue (i.e., the RH Law). Further studies may be needed in order to determine if the same results

would apply to other controversial political issues in the Philippines, and future studies should also consider including other variables such as cultural orientation, age of the participants, and strength of the arguments. Lastly, the present study involves college students, a population that was found to be highly vulnerable to correspondence bias (Bauman & Skitka, 2010). It is suggested that the study be replicated with the involvement of other populations as base rates, for correspondence bias might differ across different populations.

Notwithstanding its limitations, the study has some strengths. By replicating Jones and Harris's (1967) experiment, the study was somehow able to address the issue on the replicability of psychological concepts, and provided additional evidence on the applicability and generalizability of correspondence bias. This reinforces the importance and value of doing replication studies in psychological science. Furthermore, the study was able to provide support for a plausible explanation as to why Filipinos tend to prefer dispositional attribution of attitudes toward a political issue: correspondence bias.

REFERENCES

- Alicke, M. D., Zerbst, J. I., & LoSchiavo, F. M. (1996). Personal attitudes, constraint magnitude, and correspondence bias. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 18* (2), 211-228.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (2013). *Social psychology* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bauman, C. W., & Skitka, L. J. (2010). Making attributions for behaviors: The prevalence of correspondence bias in the general population. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 269-277.
- Butuyan, J. R. (2016, September 12). "Dutertards" versus "Yellowtards." Retrieved from Inquirer.net: <http://opinion.inquirer.net/97266/dutertards-versus-yellowtards>.
- Choi, I., & Nisbett, R. E. (1998). Situational salience and cultural differences in the correspondence bias and actor-observer bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*(9), 949-960.
- Curato, N. P., & Ong, J. C. (2012, October 22). The RH Bill debate and responsible participation. Retrieved from GMA News Online:

- <http://www.gmanetwork.com/news/opinion/content/279248/the-rh-bill-debate-and-responsible-participation/story/>.
- Fiore, R. A., & Lussier, R. N. (2015). Measuring and testing general fundamental attribution error in entrepreneurship effecting public policy. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy*, 4(2), 171-186.
- Gilbert, D. T., & Jones, E. E. (1986). Perceiver-induced constraint: Interpretations of self-generated reality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 269-280.
- Gilbert, D. T., & Malone, P. S. (1995). The correspondence bias. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 21-38.
- Hopthrow, T., Hooper, N., Mahmood, L., Meier, B. P., & Weger, U. (2017). Mindfulness reduces the correspondence bias. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 70(3), 351-360.
- Hooper, N., Erdogan, A., Keen, G., Lawton, K., & McHugh, L. (2015). Perspective taking reduces the fundamental attribution error. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 4(2), 69-72.
- Jones, E. E., & Harris, V. A. (1967). The attribution of attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 3, 1-24.
- Krull, D. S., Loy, M. H. M., Lin, J., Wang, C. F., Chen, S., & Zhao, X. (1999). The fundamental attribution error: Correspondence bias in individualist and collectivist cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(10), 1208-1219.
- Masuda, T., & Kitayama, S. (2004). Perceiver-induced constraint and attitude attribution in Japan and the US: A case for the cultural dependence of the correspondence bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(3), 409-416.
- Maxfield, M., Pyszczynski, T., Greenberg, J., & Bultmann, M. N. (2017). Age differences in the effects of mortality salience on the correspondence bias. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 84(4), 329-342.
- Miller, F. D., Smith, E. R., & Uleman, J. (1981). Measurement and interpretation of situational and dispositional attributions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 17(1), 80-95.
- Miyamoto, Y., & Kitayama, S. (2002). Cultural variation in correspondence bias: The critical role of attitude diagnosticity of socially constrained behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(5), 1239-1248.
- Moran, J. M., Jolly, E., & Mitchell, J. P. (2014). Spontaneous mentalizing predicts the fundamental attribution error. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 26(3), 569-576.
- Nier, J. A., Bajaj, P., McLean, M. C., & Schwartz, E. (2013). Group status, perceptions of agency, and the correspondence bias: Attributional

- processes in the formation of stereotypes about high and low status groups. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 16(4), 476-487.
- Ross, L. D., Amabile, T. M. & Steinmetz, J. L. (1977) Social roles, social control, and biases in social perception processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 485-494.
- Scopelliti, I., Min, H. L., McCormick, E., Kassam, K. S., & Morewedge, C. K. (2017). Individual Differences in Correspondence Bias: Measurement, Consequences, and Correction of Biased Interpersonal Attributions. *Management Science*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2016.2668>
- Stanley, J. T., & Blanchard-Fields, F. (2011). Beliefs about behavior account for age differences in the correspondence bias. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 66(2), 169-176.

APPENDIX A

Pro-RH Law Essay

The Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act (RH Law) is indeed the solution to the ever increasing problem on overpopulation, which is the root cause of poverty in our country. The RH Law is a way to open up choices for couples to control the number of children to have based on how many they can support, which in turn, will help with the problem on overpopulation. Furthermore, it can create awareness, especially among the youth, about gender roles and other sexuality issues. Aspects of sexuality that are not fully taught to the youth will become accessible to them, and they will be educated accordingly. This will help them make informed decisions, make them become more responsible with their actions, and become more aware of their rights, especially the women and children. With the RH Law, they will be taught about the freedom to choose, as well as the responsibilities that come with it such as the proper use of contraceptives to regulate unwanted pregnancies. Sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) will be prevented since they will be better informed about it and ways to prevent STDs. Likewise, the RH Law advocates the provision of basic care and other medical needs for women in order to avoid and decrease maternal deaths.

APPENDIX B

Anti-RH Law Essay

The Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act (RH Law)'s assumption that overpopulation causes poverty is erroneous. Contrary to the overpopulation equals poverty equation that the RH Law emphasizes, a country's workforce, when utilized properly, can actually help boost the economy. Hence, it is not the overpopulation itself that is creating the problems, but the inability of the government to maximize its human resources. Furthermore, the introduction of reproductive health education and promotion of the use of contraceptives to the youth may encourage irresponsible sexual attitude. The assertion that the law is pro-choice may mislead individuals into thinking that it is fine to have sex as long as one uses contraceptives and does not get pregnant. Contraceptives do not necessarily mean safe sex, as the use of them is not an assurance to prevent pregnancy, and some contraceptives may even induce abortion. For a country that is known for its respect for life, this seems to contradict its people's beliefs. In addition, the RH Law may actually be used as a tool for more corruption to occur. Maternal care funds promised upon the approval of the law would most likely fall into the pockets of greedy government officials, thereby creating a law that will actually help corruption to further increase.