Doing bad things can be justified?

The effects of television content on attitudes towards morally ambiguous behavior.

Student Name: Milena Dziadkowiec
Student Number: 417598

Supervisor: Dr. Julia Kneer

Doing bad things can be justified?

The effects of television content on attitudes towards morally ambiguous behavior.

ABSTRACT

Morally ambiguous protagonists represent a relatively new, but highly popular trend in television content. It was already explored that such characters might influence viewer's perception of harmful behaviors. Viewers are able to develop strong feelings towards morally ambiguous characters, and to create thorough evaluations of the character's attributes and behaviors, such as character's moral compass. In the light of above, it is important to investigate how these processes operate and what factors contribute in initiating positive attitudes towards morally ambiguous behaviors. The present study herby examines the importance of different influential factors in the evaluation of morally ambiguous characters and their behaviors. Specifically, it addresses the role of tendency to morally disengage, identification, involvement, enjoyment, justified violence, perceived attractiveness, and perceived successfulness in creating moral judgments. Moreover, in addition to explicit measurements, this study employs implicit measurements of attitudes towards justice and morality. The research question is: to what extent does the content presented in television series influence audience's attitude towards morally ambiguous behavior? Participants ($N = 72$) took part in the experiment in which they viewed either attractive and successful character or unattractive and unsuccessful character of drama series. The experiment was divided into two phases. Phase One: Introducing explicit measurements of the attitudes toward morally ambiguous character and his behavior. Phase Two: Change in perception of morality was verified by implicit measure, a reaction time task. The findings of this study enhance understanding of how viewers process morally ambiguous characters that violate moral standards. It was revealed that evaluation of morally

ambiguous characters is complex and depends not only on representations of a character and the content itself, but also on the context. Moreover, moral judgment was revealed to be a multidimensional construct, as audience's judgment of morally ambiguous character can contrast with a judgment of his behavior. Findings also demonstrate that different character's types are evaluated differently based on different reasons. However, although cognitive responses towards morally ambiguous characters were evaluated differently, automatic responses towards self-justice did not differ among both of the groups. Therefore, present study sheds light not only on the importance of multiple measures of moral judgment, but also indicates that implicit measurements are needed when examining attitudes. The paper concludes with limitations of this study and proposes avenues for future research.

KEYWORDS: morally ambiguous characters, television reception, moral reflection, experimental design, implicit and explicit measurements

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Media effects in general and in particular, television impact on social beliefs, emotions and behaviors, has long been an important subject in media literature. It is already known that exposure to the media content may profoundly affect different generations, especially adolescents, young adults, and children (Rieger, Wulf, Kneer, Frischlich & Bente, 2014; Vossen, Piotrowski, & Valkenburg, 2015; Ward & Carlson, 2013). As Buckingham (1993) argues, the media shapes the audience's view of reality, offering tools to define one's identities and interpret human relationships. With regards to television, its content may serve as a tool for mood control or script for exploring identities (Rivadeneyra & Ward, 2005). Indeed, social cognitive theory suggests that people are not only passive viewers, but are rather aware participants who reflect, regulate, and learn from the television material that they are exposed to (Bandura, 2001). Additionally, the concept of cultivation theory indicates that the more viewers are exposed to television programs, the more likely they are to perceive its content as the image of the reality (Gerbner, 1998). For instance, it was discussed that the viewer exposed to particular television content may change his/her attitude towards sexuality, marriage, body image, et cetera (Becker 2004; Segrin & Nabi, 2002; Ward, 2002). During the recent years the remarkable attention of media and communication scholarly has been brought to the relationship between television and morality. The study conducted by Krijnen (2011) has shown that audiences make associations with moral issues in television narratives as well as with the people involved in these issues. Moreover, morality is perceived to be the one of the most important features that the viewer is disclosed to, while experiencing televised characters (Busselle & Bilandzic, 2008; Raney, 2004). Yet, still little is known about the cognitive and affective processes involved in engagement with the television characters (Konijn & Hoorn, 2005). Moreover, given the fact that televised depictions of morality have altered throughout the years, this subject became even more important to examine.

Due to the media content changing and evolving over the years, it needs to constantly be re-defined. To illustrate, a study conducted on female video game characters has shown that portrayal of females has dramatically changed during the last twenty years, from being "damsels in distress" into "sexy superheroes" (Summers & Miller, 2014). With regards to television content, Murphy (2012) notices that there is a cultural shift in today's TV content, which has become significantly more obscene than in the past. She explored that nowadays high school students are engaging in sexual behavior at a younger age, with more partners,

and no protection. Television programming continues to evolve, Bradshaw (2013) remarks that trends of portraying male-centered programs (e.g. *The Sopranos, The Wire*) have shifted towards TV series depicting young or middle-aged females. Shafer and Raney (2012) also reflect on the changes in entertainment narratives, where antiheroes are becoming more ample than ever. Moreover, Harris (2012) explores that antihero is now redefined in terms of the experience of existential 'crisis'.

In the light of above, it is argued that examining how television material affects its viewers, and especially how it shapes the perception of ethical related issues is crucial. Hence, according to Silverstone (2007) the role of media, including television, is of great importance in the creation of a moral civil society in the future. Viewers are able to indicate right and wrong and to imagine themselves in similar situations (i.e. what would I have done?) as characters on television. Moreover, deciding whether or not a character's action was right or wrong is a part of entertaining process of television viewing (Dant, 2005).

Hoffner and Cantor (1991) identify several factors involved during television viewing that shape audiences impressions of characters. These might be characters' physical attractiveness, behaviors, emotional states, and nonverbal gestures. Among those, Livingstone (1992) points out the characters' behaviors as most important while reviling information about their moralities and personalities. Indeed, it is frequent that viewers rapidly identify character as a hero or antihero based on his actions. They constantly observe and judge the morality of character's actions. When character's actions are perceived to be moral, the character is accredited with positive attitudes. If his/her actions are perceived to be immoral, the character evokes negative connotations (Zillmann, 2000).

Model of perceiving and experiencing fictional characters indicates three stages of establishment of a character: encoding, comparison, and response (Konijn & Hoorn, 2005). During encoding, the viewer observes values in terms of the ethic, aesthetic and epistemic features of a character. In the comparison phase, the viewer compares which specific features are relevant to his/her own goals and concerns. In the response phase, involvement and distance affect the degree of the appreciation of a character. It is believed that the higher appreciation of a character leads to achieving a higher degree of enjoyment, and therefore, when enjoyment levels are high, attitudes towards the characters action are more positive. Following the disposition theory, viewer's attitudes towards characters shape the moral judgment of this character (Raney, 2004).

Another important factor that is claimed to influence attitudes towards the character and his/her behavior is the entertainment that particular television content supplies. In this

study it is assumed that when the viewer's enjoyment will be higher, attitude towards unethical behavior will differ when compared to a viewer's lower level of enjoyment.

While it is relatively easy to make judgments about a consistently good or bad character, morally ambiguous characters are more compound and unpredictable. Also, their motivations and intentions are not so evident. Because of this dichotomy, looking back in 1996, Edelstein argued that televised antiheroes will rapidly vanish as audience will become frustrated. Yet since then popularity of such characters has increased, attracting the attention of the audience and directors. Morally ambiguous characters (named also as antiheroes) were introduced in multiple television series, such as *The Sopranos, The Wire, Homeland, Dexter, Breaking Bad*, and many others. It is argued that it was a cable television that to a large extent contributed to a development of this genre (Malach, 2008). Specifically, scholar argues that HBO was the network that started the trend of morally ambiguous protagonists with the *Oz* series (1997) and with, much more successful, *The Sopranos* TV series (1999). In this series, protagonist Tony Soprano was portrayed from a dual perspective. On one hand, he possesses traits of a violent person who is a dangerous gangster, but on the other hand, he struggles with depression and is presented as a loving father who protects his children from becoming a criminal (Thornburn, 2008).

It is therefore interesting how viewers react to such characters. According to Bandura (2001), situations with moral entanglement include many elements that are responsible for overall judgment output. These elements vary in importance, they may be of lower or higher weight, and can depend on: the context, personal motivators, consequences of the actions, whether it caused human's injury, whether it turns to the corporations or individuals, as well as on characteristics of both, the wrongdoer and the harmed person, such as age, sex, ethnics, social status (p. 16). Herby, being exposed to morally ambiguous implications is considered to be complex. It is important to acknowledge that indicated above factors relate mostly to the narrative television content. In the narrative structure, entertainment-education messages enhance involvement in the storyline.

Taking into account all indicated above concepts, the thesis was intended to answer the question:

RQ: To what extent does the content presented in television series influence audience's attitude towards morally ambiguous behavior?

In order to answer the research question an experimental design was conducted, with

two groups: control and experimental. The *Revenge* television series set as the stimulus material for the experimental group.

The first reason for choosing this particular TV series was that the main character is a young and attractive woman. As Konijn and Hoorn (2005) notice, Hollywood productions tend to portray aesthetically pleasing characters in order to increase likeability of such characters. Additionally, physically attractive people are accredited with a variety of positive personal qualities, including moral goodness (Dion, Berscheid & Walster, 1972). Attractiveness of a character might therefore influence viewer's judgment of unethical behavior. The second reason for choosing *Revenge* was that the main character's unethical actions are seen to be done for a reason. Thus, she is taking a revenge on people that led to her father's death. Moreover, there are introspection moments incorporated, presenting motivations for character's unethical behavior. Starting from the point of her childhood, when she was an innocent little girl, her character has evolved based on experiences. Because of this, her morality integrates standards of both, justness and compassion, which based on Bandura's (1991) theory are concerned as more humane than an individual possessed only with justness. There is also some evidence that certain motives tend to justify unethical actions (Hoyt, 1970). Moreover, Moyer-Gusé (2008) remarks that motivations of a character are strongly related to the feeling of empathy. In the light of above, motivation of the main character's behavior may lead to increasing feeling of empathy and this in turn can affect the overall moral judgment of the character. It is also related to Zillmann's (1991) theory that identification is an empathic process. According to his concept, viewers imagine themselves in the position of the character, engaging by matching the character's emotions and by taking the perspective of the character. Connections to a character evoke feelings of mediated closeness, thus affecting the viewer's perception (Bilandzic, 2006). Hence, identification with a character and comparing one's own morality with morally ambiguous character can affect perception of good and bad. The third reason was that the main character is a successful and wealthy person. It is known that even though the character's behavior contradicts with the viewer's personal values (therefore factor of identification should not be relevant), viewer want to be like the successful character (Liss, Reinhardt, & Fredriksen, 1983). Thereby, observing a successful character can lead to increased level of identification, and in turn attitude towards unethical behavior of a character may be more positive.

In the present thesis, the narrative content, and in particular, the content of the narrative television series was examined. It is vital to investigate such material as it can be

observed that during the last few decades the popularity of television series has significantly grown. Moreover, there is an increasing demand for television series that represent morally ambiguous characters or behaviors. Popularity of antiheroes' narratives has been noticed by scholars, who tried to define what makes people attracted to such content. Krakowiak and Oliver (2012) explain that morally ambiguous character may be perceived as more realistic, as majority of people in the real world is not simply good or bad, but complex. Another explanation is provided by Raney and Janicke (2014). Scholars describe that complexity of antiheroes offers numerous facets to which viewers can relate. Thus, each viewer can find various features differently attractive and this can explain why antiheros' narratives are so successful.

1.1. Societal and scientific relevance

The line of research on the moral evaluation of morally ambiguous characters encloses several implications.

First and foremost, as it was indicated above, morally ambiguous characters have become extremely popular protagonists in the television content during recent years. Given the fact that there is an evident that viewers are influenced by these characters in the real world, it is crucial to develop a more concrete understanding of the persuasive strength of such content.

What is more, it is argued that it is important to study how media affect perception of morality as it might have consequences not only on emotions and attitudes of the viewer, but also on the social behavior (one may become more liberal and modern). This research contributes to the understanding of how viewers evaluate moral reactions towards morally ambiguous characters, and if these moral judgments have further implications on perception of morality in general. Since the subject deals with the effects that televised characters have on the audience, the research question is relevant for society. The show presenting morally ambiguous protagonists requires viewers to side with them and cheer for them, instead of wanting them to be held responsible for their immoral actions. What is more, audiences nowadays are exposed to the television series' characters not only on television itself, but also through the internet or downloaded streaming. As a result more and more people can be influenced by such characters, especially young people.

Except the societal relevance, this study is also considered to have a scientific relevance. As Krijnen (2011) claims, viewer's moral activities when watching television are under-researched. It is important to expand the knowledge about such activities especially

now, when morally ambiguous representations became pivotal ingredients of television content. It was already explored that viewers form their judgments about characters based on numerous intrinsic and extrinsic factors (Bazzini et al., 2010), as well as own dispositions of the viewer (Bandura, 2012). However, there is still an ongoing debate why these processes differ when giving different schemas. Moreover, it is considered to be a first study that employs all these domains together, hence, it sheds a new light on influential factors, by comparing and contrasting them together. Additionally, implicit measures were employed, and therefore besides cognitive responses, this study indicates how intuitive responses towards morality are shaped after being exposed to morally ambiguous behaviors. It is important to incorporate both, explicit and implicit measurements, as according to Hefner, Rothmund, Klimmt and Gollwitzer (2011), implicit measurements are underestimated by scholars and receive only little attention in communication science. Additionally, most of the previous research investigated the differences between perceptions of heroes and morally ambiguous characters. In this study differences between two different schemas of morally ambiguous content were examined.

1.2. Layout of the thesis

This thesis has a seven chapter structure. The theoretical framework, which follows this introduction, determines factors that have been shown to influence attitudes towards narrative characters in general, and in particular morally ambiguous characters. Before such analyses it seemed necessary to first discuss relation between television and morality, and firmly establish characteristics of morally ambiguous protagonist. Therefore, academic opinion about such characters is outlined, and the differences between hero, morally ambiguous characters (antihero), and villains are presented. The literature review also evaluates the most important concepts related to persuasive roles of television, such as disposition theory, social cognitive theory, and moral disengagement. Following on from the review of literature, next chapter introduces hypotheses that has been established in order to answer the research question. Next, methodology chapter provides a throughout explanation of research methods that were employed in this study. Here, details about experimental design along with information of how the research was carried out are presented. Moreover, this chapter also discusses all variables and measurements that were used in this study. It is followed by results chapter which demonstrates all the findings by means of analyses of data collected. This thesis utilizes quantitative method, therefore along all the necessary tables

are provided. After reporting all the findings, a discussion chapter is introduced. In this chapter the results are addressed and are referred back to the previous research and hypotheses. Finally, the concluding chapter draws together the most significant findings. Accordingly, suggestions for future research are proposed, and limitations of the study are discussed.

2. Theoretical framework

In this chapter it is firstly discussed what previous research has explored with regards to television impact on viewer's attitudes and moral judgment. Following, definition of morally ambiguous character is provided, along with information of which traits he was assigned with, and what scholars have already discovered with regards to perception and attitudes towards morally ambiguous characters. Here, the differences between villains, heroes, and antiheroes are determined. Next, the main assumptions of social cognitive theory and disposition theory are presented. After that, the main concepts of moral disengagement are discussed. It is followed by detailed information on previous theory regarding identification, involvement, attractiveness, and success. In the next section, external factors that affect moral judgments are explored. Finally, the last section presents the hypotheses of this study. For every variable hypothesis derives from the expectations that have arisen from the existing research.

2.1. Television and morality

Researchers of different academic fields have devoted a considerable amount of time and attention to the effects of television. Conclusions of these studies are however arguable, and often contradictory (Giles, 2003). Likewise, television's impact on the viewer's morality remains uncertain (Krijnen, 2011). Some scholars claim that the media lacks artistic qualities that are required in order to stimulate reflection (Nussbaum, 2001).

On the other hand, there are some authors who argue that television content is morally complex, and therefore gives its audiences various opportunities for moral reflections (Slade, 2002). Concerning narratives, its content can provide the opportunity to dwell on moral matters without having to experience real consequences of real commonplace decisions (Krijnen, 2011). Buselle and Bilandzic (2009) explain that television narratives provide information visually and aurally, which initiates opportunity for imagery. Also Krijnen (2011) explains that through the process of imagination viewers are able to understand that some issues are of moral significance, not because viewer experiences them, but because someone else does (e.g., protagonist). Likewise, Amit and Greene (2012) elaborate on the meaning of imagination in the processes of emotional responses in general, and in particular of moral judgments. They conducted experiments indicating that deontological judgments (disapproving of sacrificing one individual for the greater good of others), are maintained by the visual imagery. It means that deontological judgments depend on one's tendency to

visualize harmful consequences. Thus, when viewer considers sacrificing someone as an act without profound necessity, he will support the judgment that the end do not justifies the means.

Yet Krijnen (2011) draws attention not to the consequences, but rather to the motivation for immoral behavior. Feelings of the character in particular situation and the empathy play a pivotal role in moral reflection. When viewers put themselves in the situation of a character, they are willing to understand the reasons of the character's immoral actions. Identification is therefore important part of moral imagination (Krijnen, 2011). Nussbaum (1997) notes however that individual's personal characteristics (such as historical or social context) influence identification, and therefore identification can play greater or smaller role in the moral reflection. Importantly, during watching the viewer not only has insight into the character's feelings, but also explores his/her own emotions and opinions (Krijnen, 2011). Thus, the viewer can imagine what he/she would do if he/she was in the character's situation, and herby discovers his/her own moral position. Through this process television teaches recipient to understand that private affairs, such as friendship or love, have a moral aspect as well, and hence viewer can become "ethically more aware" while watching television (Krijnen, 2011, p. 69).

Additionally, Hoffner and Buchanan (2005) argue that the relationship which the viewer creates with the character during viewing is the most influential when is extended beyond the moment of watching. Moreover, Busselle and Bilandzic (2009) go a step further and claim that it is not only viewer's imagination or identification with the character that allows for emotional perspective, but sometimes it is necessary that viewers "switch to the time and location of the narrative, and to the subjective world of the characters" (p. 324). Thus, viewers might perceive televised world as more immediate than the real world, and undergo a process of transportation (Green & Brock, 2002).

Nevertheless, Krijnen (2011) emphasizes that the manner in which viewers react and reflect to the narrative depends on the genre. Her study has shown that moral reflection to the TV narrative is possible, but needs to have an "open" character. Meaning that, in order to induce moral reflection, multiple opinions have to be embraced, which gives opportunities for multiple interpretations. Other researchers draw attention to the characters as an integral part of television content and the main reason for emotional reactions (Krakowiak and Oliver, 2012), as well as the main reason for the enjoyment of the content (Hoffner & Cantor, 1991). Therefore, it should be emphasized that in this research there are two important implications. Firstly, the examined content has this kind of open nature that was

described by Krijnen (2011). Secondly, the character, his attributes, behaviors, and the relation that is created between the character and the viewer, is in a center of attention.

One of the genres that contains this kind of diversity is reality TV. Scarborough and McCoy (2002) remark on the duality of perception of this kind of programs. Thus, some believe that reality shows might educate viewers, for instance can teach ethical responsibility to care for others, or in terms of tolerance for race, class gender, or sexuality. Others claim that reality TV does not educate or provide information about the world and therefore does not offer a traditional morality schema for viewer. The study has shown that viewers are aware of immoral situations taking place in reality shows, but they rationalize it in a way that allows them for continued consumption of this programs. One of the justification is that reality TV is watched for entertainment purposes and therefore there is no need for a moral viewing. Other viewers rationalize an amoral viewing by maintaining social distance from the characters. When the distance is maintained characters are perceived as non-humanized and moral reflection is unnecessary (Scarborough & McCoy, 2002). Such rationalization is supported by viewers who perceive TV shows as fictional entertainment that utilizes actors, and not real people.

Another example of the genre with complex narrative are the 'Soap Operas'. Soap operas are normally continually returning to the same characters over a long period of time, therefore viewers have the opportunity to create strong attachments to these characters (Tamborini, Weber, Eden, Bowman & Grizzard, 2010). Authors emphasize that the role of disposition is crucial in creating a strong emotional reaction, and explain that even if the character is unambiguously good or bad, he/she is unlikely to evoke reflection if the disposition towards the character is weak. Because viewers of soap operas (and of other narratives with the serial nature) are exposed to characters over time, they have the opportunity to think thoroughly about complex moral issues, and to create long listings and complex relationships with them (Eden, Tamborini, Grizzard, Lewis, Weber & Prabhu, 2014). Janicke and Raney (2011) also note that this kind of relationship not only increases enjoyment of narratives, but also induces opportunities to look at one's own morality, and to compare it with those presented in television and reflect on them. Furthermore, Eden et al. (2014) notice that in order to protect positive dispositions toward favorite characters, viewer might justify their behaviors by engaging in moral disengagement.

Affective dispositions are also extremely important in the case of the drama genre. Raney (2005) explains that the feelings that viewers carry for the characters are essential for the enjoyment of watching. In dramas, such associations can vary from extremely positive to

extremely negative, and are strictly connected with emotional reactions. What is significant is that the selection of characters that are favored and un-favored has to be morally justified (Raney, 2002). It is argued therefore that audience acts as a moral monitor, who constantly make judgments about character's behavior (Zillmann, 2000). What is more, interrelations between affective dispositions and moral judgment allow for emotional involvement in the drama (Raney, 2004). That also leads to creating a kind of schema, which gives opportunity for impulsive identification of a character as a good one. Consequently, actions of a character who is identified as good are perceived as morally right.

However, there are some further differences within different types of characters. Thus, morally ambiguous characters are complex and therefore different schemas might apply to them. In the next subsection the differences between hero, villain, and morally ambiguous character will be determined.

2.2.   Defining morally ambiguous characters

Morally ambiguous characters (also known as antiheroes or morally complex characters) have become extremely popular in television content in recent years (Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2014). Indeed, when looking at the television dramas that have appeared on cable television during the last years, it would be difficult to find one without the antihero. Protagonists in *The Sopranos, The Wire, Nurse Jackie, Dr. House*, and in many others television series often behave in morally questionable ways, but they also carry some positive qualities that differentiate them from villains. To illustrate, Walter White from *Breaking Bad* is a chemistry teacher who finds out that he has a cancer, and in order to provide for his family and secure their future he becomes a drug dealer. Another example is Dexter Morgan, a protagonist in *Dexter* TV series. Dexter is a serial killer who is working as forensic blood spatter analyst in the police department. Guided by the rules of his adoptive father, he only targets other murderers, who evaded the justice system. Despite their immoral behavior, such characters are well liked by the audience, who wish them to succeed (Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2013). This research aims to answer the question how attitudes towards morally ambiguous characters are shaped, and therefore it is necessary to clarify and define what is understood by the term "morally ambiguous", and what differentiates morally ambiguous characters from villains and heroes.

In the simplistic definition, morally ambiguous characters have been identified as characters that possess characteristics of both, a hero and a villain (Lott, 1997). Similar

definitions have been proposed in other studies, where morally ambiguous characters were defined as characters that are morally complicated, and that contain both good and bad qualities (e.g., Ealy, 2005). Regarding bad qualities, West (2001) mentions about being manipulative and violent, cheating, torturing, and even killing. He argues however that such behavior is explained by good motivations, and it is the way of fulfilling these motivations that is morally questionable. Also Ealy (2005) mentions about motivations and characterizes morally ambiguous characters as those whose actions are bad, but whose motivations are good or justified so that the line between good and bad is blurred. Indeed, many scholars compare morally ambiguous character to a hero, and indicate that both have good motivations for their behaviors, but the means by which they pursue their goals is different (Janicke, 2013; Janicke & Raney, 2014; West, 2001). Despite positive motivations, Janicke (2013) points out other common features of a hero and antihero, which are positive attributes. She notices that antiheroes carry some characteristics that make them attractive (and therefore likeable). Similarly, Krakowiak and Tsay-Vogel (2013) indicate that antihero protagonists represent many positive qualities and emotions, such as ambition, courage, responsibility, and love. Possessing positive attributes is crucial, as it allows the viewer to like the character, even though his actions are immoral (Shafer & Raney, 2012). Researchers have found that antihero and hero are liked the same, and it can be the result of both, positive attributes of an antihero, as well as overall story behind immoral behavior (motivations). Another explanation has been proposed by Janicke and Raney (2011), who examined that morally ambiguous characters are perceived as more realistic when compared to the hero, which increases the identification with the character. They explain that ambiguous behavior of protagonists can remind the viewer of his/hers own moral ambiguity, and hereby such characters might seem more real. Moreover, even though their behavior is immoral, accordingly they uphold a kind of moral code (Janicke, 2013). To illustrate, as it was mentioned earlier, Dexter Morgan follows the rule of killing only murderers, and not innocent people. It is also important to notice that there is not just one schema for morally ambiguous characters, as moral ambiguity and the scale of good and bad actions can vary within different characters (Janicke & Raney, 2014). Additionally, scholars notice that this kind of range of good and bad does not accompany heroes (clearly moral) and villains (clearly immoral). Similar suggestions were proposed earlier by Collins and Zimmermann (1975), who observed that characters can be presented as bad, as good, or they may sometimes seems to be bad and sometimes seems to be good. Scholars have observed that children are more likely to behave aggressively after being exposed to morally ambiguous

character whose actions were aggressive, than when being exposed to clearly bad character whose actions were the same. These findings are also in line with other studies which indicated that older children are likely to judge positively immoral actions which were performed for good reasons (Berndt & Berndt, 1975).

Such duality emerges as a result of continuous upholding or violating different moral domains (Tamborini, Bowman, Eden, Gizzard, Organ, 2010). This approach derives from the moral foundation theory (Haidt, 2001; Haidt & Graham, 2007). Haidt (2001) proposed five domains of universally existent moral foundations, including: harm and care (feeling compassion and empathy for the suffering of others); fairness (feeling of justice); authority (respect for authorities); loyalty (trust and cooperation with group members); and purity (living godly). Based on these domains, Eden, Grizzard and Lewis (2011) have found that heroes and villains can be determined by specific patterns that indicate whether particular domain was violated or upheld. Other study conducted by Tamborini et al. (2010) pointed out that characters who both, violate and uphold different domains can be labeled as antihero.

It is therefore known that narrative schemas for a hero and antihero are introduced differently. Raney (2004) mentions that in the case of a hero's narratives, as soon as the viewer recognize the schema, he/she knows directly that protagonist is good and therefore should be liked. However for antihero narratives, the viewer cannot rely on the schema to create his/hers reaction to the actions of the character. Rather, he/she first creates moral justifications based on the narrative, and then he/she forms judgment and acceptance of the hero, based on these justifications (Janicke, 2013). Therefore, morally ambiguous characters place viewers in a "moral dilemma", where viewers are forced to weight positive and negative features of a character in order to judge this character's morality (Janicke, 2013, p. 9).

In this paper it is argued that this overall judgment depends not only on character's attributes, but also on other influential factors, which will be further explored in a later part of this chapter. In the next section some of these factors will be discussed, by presenting assumptions of social cognitive theory.

2.3. Social cognitive theory

Television is one of the most influential mediums, because people's constructions of reality strongly depend on what they see and hear, rather than on what they experience directly

(Bandura, 2004). As stated by the social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1977, 1991, 2001), individuals have developed an advanced ability for observational learning, which allows them to evolve their knowledge and skills directly through information transferred with numerous models. As a consequence viewers shape their attitudes and emotions based on specific behaviors (Eyal & Kunkel, 2008). As the theory suggests, people acquire knowledge and adapt behaviors as a consequence of observing others, including media characters. Regarding television, influences should be defined in terms of the contents being watched, rather than the amount of television being viewed (Bandura, 2001). For instance, some scholars draw attention to the realm of televised violence (Gentile, 2003). Nonetheless, multiple different determinants have an impact on the exploration of presented content. According to Bandura (1991) there are many circumstances that influence judgments and actions, and they rely on reasoning from a number of different moral standards. Thus, different peoples' judgments may vary, depending on which factors one considers (subconsciously or consciously) as relevant, and how these factors are weighted. On one hand, such determinants refer to the silence, attractiveness, and functional value of the modeled activity or character (Bandura, 2001). Decisional ingredients differ in importance and can be given lesser or greater weight. Among the factors that construct judgment, a scholar places: the nature of transgression; the contexts in which the event is performed along with situational and personal motivations; the direct and long-range consequences of the actions; whether it produces personal injury or property damage; whether it is directed towards individuals or corporations/agencies; and the personal attributes of the wrongdoers, such as age, sex, social status, as well as characteristics of the victims/harmed and their perceived blameworthiness.

Among one of the most important determinants scholars place the action's consequences (Eyal & Kunkel, 2008). Previous research (Bandura, 2001) indicated that watching televised violent actions that are followed by positive outcomes or rewards results in greater tendency to imitate these actions. Accordingly, observing violent behaviors and characters being punished for them results in less favorable attitudes toward these characters, what decreases likeability to imitate such behaviors. Bandura explains that this is possible due to a shift in attitudes regarding violent behavior, from negative to positive. Another important determinant is a perceived similarity to the character. When the character represents similar qualities to the viewer, and such character succeeds and overcomes the problems, the viewer becomes more optimistic about his/hers own life, and about overcoming his/hers own problems (Bandura, 2004). Lockwood and Kunda (1997) label this

process as the "upward social comparison". However other scholars provide evidence for so-called "downward social comparison" which claims that viewers feel better about themselves after observing others who are suffering or who are worse than them (Mares & Cantor, 1992). The explanation for this is that viewers feel more optimistic when they compare themselves to someone who is in a worse position, as it allows them to feel that they are doing better than others. Recently, Krakowiak and Tsay-Vogel (2014) conducted a research indicating how morality salience affects responses to different character types (hero, antihero, and villain). The study has shown that both, good and morally ambiguous characters offer positive outcomes for recipients' reactions. However, researchers have not found the support for the downward social comparison (bad characters). One of the explanations can be that individual can feel more similar to morally ambiguous characters (bad characters are less realistic), and therefore can be more able to make favorable comparisons between himself/herself and the character. Furthermore, what played a pivotal role was the moral self-perceptions of individuals. It can be therefore concluded that in opposition to characteristic of a character, the second type of influential factors are the cognitive skills, preconceptions, and value preferences of the observer (Bandura, 2001). Hereby, in general there are two important aspects involved in the process of responding to televised characters. Firstly, attention is obtained by the characteristic of the character, such as attractiveness or similarity, and secondly attitudes are formed by characteristic of the observer, such as cognitive skills or propensity for moral disengagement (Bandura, 2012).

Taking into account that the viewer's personal characteristics and tendency for moral disengagement might impact the reception of the character, in this research personal tendency of the viewer for moral disengagement was taken into account, and represents one of the variables. In the next section while presenting some principles of the disposition theory, other influential factors will be discussed.

2.4.   Disposition theory and enjoyment

While social cognitive theory focuses on learning and the attitude change in general, the central focus of disposition theory is devoted to the television enjoyment and character appeal. The concept of enjoyment has been established by Zillmann and others (e.g., Bryant & Zillmann, 1991; Raney, 2003; Zillmann, 1988) to characterize a general positive disposition and liking of media content. Raney (2004) explains that disposition-based theories of media enjoyment can help in understanding how and why people enjoy a

particular program, film, narrative, or character. Nabi and Krcmar (2004) notice that although enjoyment and liking are often used synonymously, enjoyment should be perceived as a more complex term. Thus, it reflects reaction not only to the message of the content (as in the case of liking), but also refers to the greater media experience, including situational and contextual components. The main idea of the concept suggests that viewer's feelings toward the character are the most significant to enjoyment. Therefore, enjoyment increases when liked characters experience positive outcomes, when disliked characters experience negative outcomes, or both. Accordingly, when liked characters experience negative outcomes or when disliked character experience positive outcomes, enjoyment decreases (Raney, 2003). It becomes more significant given the fact that regarding morally ambiguous characters, their immoral acts are continuously rewarded and the punishment for these acts is rather rare (Hoffner & Buchanan, 2005).

The important disposition-based theory in this particular project is a disposition theory of drama (Zillmann & Cantor, 1976). In the case of drama programs, the most important role is played by emotional reactions towards characters (from extremely positive to extremely negative). Such affiliations have been labeled as affective dispositions (Raney, 2004) and are directly associated with morally justified emotional side. It means that the viewer plays a role of "moral monitor", who constantly judges rightness and wrongness of character's behavior (Zillmann, 2000). Therefore, while viewing a drama, individual favors the character whose behavior or motivation is judged as morally correct, and dislike the character whose actions and motivations are judged as morally incorrect (Raney, 2004; Raney & Bryant, 2002). Based on this theory it can be therefore predicted that watching positive outcome with the hero will be enjoyed more than watching positive outcome with the morally ambiguous character. Nevertheless, Krakowiak and Tsay Vogel (2013) and Raney (2004) suggest that because viewers are motivated to derive enjoyment from the content, they tend to justify character's immoral behavior in order to maintain character liking, and thus enjoyment. Moreover, Krakowiak and Oliver (2012) explored that as morally ambiguous characters present good and bad qualities simultaneously, they can lead to more enjoyment through other factors, such as involvement. Previous study is in line with this thesis, as it has been demonstrated that morally ambiguous characters are enjoyed as good characters because they are transporting, thus are more suspenseful, because they are liked, and because they are realistic (Krakowiak & Oliver, 2012). Also Vorderer, Wulff and Friedrichsen (1996) explain that in order to enjoy narratives, individuals have to develop different emotions towards characters (not with character) from their own perspective, and to

understand this character. Scholars also suggest that morally ambiguous characters which are protagonist should be perceived differently than morally ambiguous antagonists, thus, on the contrary to reception of antagonists, while being exposed to protagonists viewers are able to take the perspective of a character even if they do not accept his/her behavior.

Another factor influencing enjoyment is empathy. Unlike involvement, empathy requires the viewer to feel the emotions of a character (not to understand him/her). As Raney (2004) explains, when the character's liking is obtained, viewer is willing to accept his/her negative actions, and wish him/her to succeed in achieving his/hers goals. The stronger the positive feelings are, the stronger the viewer's empathy is for the character. Additionally, Zillmann and Knobloch (2001) have observed that one of the ways in which individuals develop favorable dispositions is through identification. When the viewer understands the character's feelings and motivations, enjoyment increases. It has been explored that enjoyment of drama content can be explained to some extent by the events that happen to liked and disliked characters (Tsay & Krakowiak, 2011). Enjoyment increases if the outcomes that viewers wish to happen are fulfilled (character succeed), and if they are not, enjoyment decreases (Raney, 2003, 2004). Pleasure is therefore identified as an emotional response, and if the emotional response (pleasure) is not achieved, then there is no enjoyment (Raney, 2004).

It means that viewers are driven by a desire for fun, and neglect possible different experiences. However, Vorderer et al. (2004) suggest that except the desire for fun, enjoyment can be also explained by the notion of so-called "meta-emotions". Meta-emotions occur when viewers experience unpleasant emotions, but they can still derive enjoyment from them. Enjoyment can be therefore evoked by both, positive as well negative emotions, such as sadness, melancholy or being anxious. In line with such thesis, Busselle and Bilandzic (2009) explain that enjoyment may be derived from any emotion including those which at first would not seem enjoyable, such as sadness. Similar approach was proposed by Oliver (2010) who suggests that except seeking pleasure, viewers use television content as a means of contemplating human nature and meaningful life questions. Enjoyment can be therefore alternatively identified as an emotion (Vorderer et al., 2004), an attitude (Nabi & Krcmar, 2004), or gratification (Oliver, 2010). Furthermore, Tamborini et al. (2010) emphasize that these terms are used interchangeably.

Nevertheless, in general Raney (2003) explains that audience's main motivation is the enjoyment of the television content. Therefore, during watching the viewer ensures that his/her favorite character remains liked despite their immoral behavior. It means that in

order to achieve enjoyment, viewers will justify the behavior of protagonist and in turn will change the attitude towards them. In the light of above, enjoyment in this research is considered as an important persuasive factor that contributes to the moral judgment. One of the ways of deriving the enjoyment (also from sad emotions) regardless of morally ambiguous behavior of the character is through the process of disengagement. In the next section concept of moral disengagement will be discussed.

2.5.   Moral disengagement and justified violence

Mentioned-above concept of disengagement was proposed by Bandura (1999, 2004) and is defined as the process by which individuals accept, justify and defend immoral behaviors. A fundamental assumption of moral disengagement is that it involves viewer's attempt to justify certain immoral behaviors of a character. It is hereby unlikely that individuals will perceive particular actions as right, if they themselves have not justified it as "being personally, socially, or morally acceptable" (Tsay & Krakowiak, 2011, p. 5). Regarding antihero narratives, the viewer forms his/hers attitude toward character based on the positive components of this character through moral disengagement cues (Newby-Clark, 2004). The cues help to hinder negative components, and enhance positive. Nevertheless, morally ambiguous characters might also be perceived to have both, positive and negative qualities (Krakowiak & Oliver, 2012).

Moral disengagement can be obtained through different aspects, such as action itself, originator of the action (character), and the outcomes of the action (Bandura, 2004). For instance, it has been found that viewers justify an immoral behavior, such as torturing, by excusing this action to be unavoidable in order to ensure a greater good (Tsay & Krakowiak, 2011). There are also multiple factors that may enhance or impede the process of moral disengagement. To illustrate, it has been explored that moral disengagement can be facilitated by justifying the character's immoral actions through the viewer's similarity to a character or identification with a character (Tsay & Krakowiak, 2011). During watching viewers compare their own moral code to the behavior of the character, and because of it disengagement process can be evoked in order to restore the individuals' view of their own actions (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996; Raney, 2004; Tsay & Krakowiak, 2011). This allows the viewer to feel less guilty about his/her own actions, thus he/she becomes able to excuse more of his/her own immoral behavior (Bandura et al., 1996). Moreover, as it has been stated earlier, the character's motivation is an essential factor in

creating moral evaluations of a character's actions (Krakowiak & Oliver, 2012; Zillmann, 2000). It has been shown that when immoral behavior is evoked by good motivation, a viewer's positive attitude towards character does not change (Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2013). Tsay and Krakowiak (2011) also examined that especially altruistic motivations enhance moral disengagement, and result in perceiving morally ambiguous character's attributes as more positive. Alike, while making judgments about the character's actions, intentions (good or bad) are also taken into consideration (Leifer & Roberts, 1972). It means that characters induced by good intentions are perceived positively, and accordingly, when induced by bad intentions, are perceived negatively. Additionally, other studies have explored that it is easier to justify immoral behaviors when other characters do not suffer as a result of these actions (Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2013). Another approach was proposed by Konijn and Hoorn (2005), who suggest that morally ambiguous behavior can be excused by perceiving character as fictional because there are no real consequences of the character's immoral actions. However, study conducted by Krakowiak and Tsay (2011) contradicts this statement, as individual's perceptions of the trueness did no influence the moral disengagement, although fictional content was enjoyed less than the content that was perceived as real.

Further explanation for justifying immoral action is that viewers enjoy watching violent behavior when such behavior is performed in a name of justice (Raney, 2003). It means that violence is more acceptable when it is portrayed as a response to someone else's violent act. Similarly, another attribution of justification is the reasoning that the victims deserve what has happened to them (Bandura, 2004). Thus, viewers can claim that the victim provoked the revenge, and as a result he/she is getting what he/she deserves. Also, as it was briefly mentioned in a previous section, findings demonstrate that moral disengagement can predict the enjoyment of narratives. Thus, those who justify the protagonist harmful actions indicate greater tendency to feeling happy, and to perceive the content as entertaining (Tsay & Krakowiak, 2011). Interestingly, in other study scholars explored that viewers who morally disengage might continue to like a character even though he/she is aware of the negative traits that this character possesses (Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2013).

Again, like in the case of disposition, moral disengagement depends also on individual characteristics, thus, because every viewer is different, he/she perceives certain behaviors differently. Therefore, some researchers measure a person's propensity to morally disengage as a persuasive variable. Bandura et al. (1996) indicated that females are less likely to morally disengage than males. Similarly, females are also less likely to have aggressive

reactions while morally disengaging (Bandura, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Pastorelli & Regalia, 2001). Moreover, education levels, nationality and age differences have also been linked with tendency to morally disengage (McAlister, Bandura, Morrison & Gussendorf, 2006). Significantly, it has been found that individuals' tendency to morally disengage predicted their acceptance of the character's immoral behavior (Bandura, 2012; Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2013). Having said that, those who are more likely to morally disengage in real life also tend to excuse the immoral behavior of a morally ambiguous character.

One more aspect that should be taken into account is that scholars have been critical about dispositions towards character while considering serial dramas. In the case of serial narratives suspense and involvement are formed through a long period of time. Tamborini et al. (2010) have investigated how dispositions towards characters impact moral disengagement over 8 week period. They have explored that greater show exposure leads to less critical attitudes towards characters. Moreover, regarding morally ambiguous characters, researchers discovered that over time they were judged as moral as hero protagonists.

In brief, based on previous investigations, justified violence was discovered to play a pivotal role in forming dispositions towards morally ambiguous characters, and thus the overall moral judgment. Moreover, based on the prior theories, justified violence (e.g., doing bad things for a good reason) can contribute to the enjoyment of the narratives. Having discussed the role of moral disengagement and justified violence in the overall moral judgment of the character, in the next section other influential factor will be introduced, which is identification.

2.6.   The role of identification for moral judgment

One of the reasons for justifying morally ambiguous characters and their actions is identification with a character (Janicke & Raney, 2014). Authors explain (also Konijn and Hoorn, 2005), that if the character is perceived to be realistic, the level of identification increases, and this in turn influences the moral judgment. In the social cognitive theory, Bandura (2001) mentions about "psychological matching processes", by which individuals change their thoughts, attitudes, emotional responses or behaviors, in order to match those of another person (also of televised character). This process relates to the term of identification. Identification plays an important role in moral judgment, especially when taking into account that adolescents identify prosocial as well as antisocial traits as reasons for choosing favorite characters from a television series (Cohen, 1999).

The model of the perceiving and experiencing fictional characters indicates identification to emerge in the comparison phase, where individuals assess which specific features are relevant to their own attributes and concerns (Konijn & Hoorn, 2005). Similarly, Hoffner and Cantor (1991) found that viewers estimate the similarity between the features of the character and their own features and fortunes. What is more, Tian and Hoffner (2010) examined that perceived similarity was a significant predictor of identification. The essential concept in identification theory is therefore a similarity. Moreover, perceived similarity is further considered as a crucial factor for engagement, and positive attitudes towards character (Hoffner & Cantor, 1991). Similarity not only evokes the feeling of sympathy, but according to Konijn and Hoorn (2005), the subjectively perceived similarity between the viewer and the fictional character should be considered as one of several factors contributing to involvement. They further indicate that also similarities of situations may bring the viewer closer to a character. Authors mention here about the "relevance" and explain that whilst viewing, viewers can relate specific televised situations to the situations of his/her own life. According to Tian and Hoffner (2010) it is television series that bring audience into "social words" and requires the viewer to form a kind of interaction between him and characters. That being said, long-term attachments to character with whom viewer identifies may have a stronger influence.

Identification is understood and defined in a various different ways by different scholars (Cohen, 2001; Hoffner & Buchanan, 2005; Igartua, 2010; Moyer-Guse, 2008), but most of these definitions carry many similarities. Overall, there are two kinds of identification. First one is defined as wishful identification and describes the process through which individual wish to become like a certain portrayed character (Hoffner, 1996; Hoffner & Buchanan, 2005). It is a long-term process that extends beyond the viewing situation. However, the present study focuses on the other type of identification, the so-called "identification while viewing".

This form of identification refers to the process through which individuals share the perspective of the character during the program, and feel with the character, rather than about the character (Cohen, 2001). Cohen defines such identification as a response to narrative features that are evaluated to provoke identification. Directors create character with the purpose to interact with the audience and therefore, it is a result of constructed situation. It is also argued that this type of identification is temporary and may vary in intensity during a program (Tian & Hoffner, 2010). The basic dimensions of identification while viewing include: 1) emotional empathy (the ability to feel what the character feels; 2) cognitive

empathy (adopting the point of view or putting oneself in the place of the character; 3) sharing the character's goal (a temporal loss of self-awareness and perceiving the story as if one were the character) (Igartua, 2010).

Zillmann (1991) states that identification can be strongly influential as viewers develop favorable character dispositions, and because viewers are able to understand characters' emotions and motivations, enjoyment is acquired. Also Cohen (2001) discusses several consequences of identification. The most important is that being exposed to other perspectives and identifying with them can result in attitude change. For instance, greater identification can lead to increased enjoyment, and therefore to possibly greater impact. Such outcome is possible as one of the identification's components is empathy. That can also lead to increased involvement, which in turn influences the persuasive effects. Thus, elaboration likelihood model indicates that identification leads to higher involvement and involvement in turn results in greater persuasive effect (Cohen, 2001, p. 260). When strong emotional responses are evoked, it is less likely that the individual will produce critical reactions toward content. Cohen's findings were confirmed by a later study conducted by Igartua (2010). Scholar demonstrated that identification with character increases enjoyment, and "contributes to explaining its affective and cognitive impact" on the individual (p. 368). Similar conclusion has been established by Tsay and Krakowiak (2011), who examined that the greater identification (and especially empathy) between the viewer and the character is, the more likely he/she is to justify the immoral or harmful behavior of this character. Authors also suggest that identification with character leads to weaker moral standards used for the judgment. Furthermore, other study demonstrated that identification can explain evaluations of the character (Tal-Or & Cohen, 2010).

To conclude, identification is an important construct while creating emotional response by the viewer. It has been shown that identification with a character has a positive impact on the enjoyment derived from the content. Moreover, when the viewer identifies with a character, he/she is more willing to consider the character's immoral actions as justified. Most importantly, previous research determined that moral judgment can be predicted by identification. In the next section another persuasive factor, involvement, will be discussed.

2.7. The role of involvement for moral judgment

Alike identification, involvement is perceived to be a complex definition. Generally, the

term of involvement is used to describe the state of media recipients being captured by medium (Klimmt & Vorderer, 2003), or a method of processing narratives (Green & Brock, 2000). More preciously, researchers describe that involvement refers to "a distinct mental process, an integrative melding of attention, imagery, and feelings" (Green & Brock, 2000, p. 701). Moreover, some scholars label involvement also as a process of transportation (Green & Brock, 2000, Green, Brock & Kaufman, 2004).

Vorderer (1992) distinguishes two levels of involvement and, accordingly, two modes of reception. First level represents a distant, analytical way of witnessing the events (low involvement). Viewers who respond to media content in the analytical mode are conscious of the mediated nature of the experience. While making such knowledgeable judgments one's own assessing abilities become vital, and perceiving oneself as expert contributes to the enjoyment derived from exposure (Klimmt & Vorderer, 2003). Second level refers to emotionally and cognitively engaged way of enjoying the content (high involvement). Such viewers do not keep any distance with media figure and do not notice the mediated nature of the experience (Vorderer, 1992).

In the research conducted by Konijn and Hoorn (2005), involvement was identified as the element which discloses in the response phase of the perceiving and experiencing fictional characters model (PEFiC). Here, involvement and distance were found to be the parallel processes. As scholars explain, such involvement–distance conflicts might occur due to "subjective ambivalence", which is caused by simultaneously occurring of both positive and negative attitudes towards a character (p. 132). Moreover, it was explored that when involvement and distance coexist, they have the biggest impact on the appreciation of a character (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994). Also according to Tian and Hoffner (2010), the level of involvement with the character is strongly connected to the character types. Authors explain that involvement is stronger with the liked and neutral characters than with disliked characters. Moreover, Konijn and Hoorn (2005) found that character's types play an important role while getting involved, as in their study involvement was directly linked to the positive attributes of the character. When the involvement was lower, character attributes were perceived more negatively. In the same study authors discovered surprising findings that bad characters lead to more involvement when they are perceived as unattractive, and when they are perceived as attractive involvement decreases.

With regards to narratives in general, it has been also explored that high levels of transportation lead to less critical thinking and to the acceptance of presented behaviors and attitudes (Green & Brock, 2000; Green et al., 2004). Moreover, moral responses induced by

27

the viewer's moral judgment are stronger for involved viewers (Greene, Nystrom, Engell, Darley & Cohen 2004). Similarly, Igartua (2010) explains that involvement encompasses persuasive influence due to vanishing of critical capacity. Involvement is perceived as the influential factor also because it increases emotional responses (Felt, 2011). Moreover, Busselle and Bilandzic (2009), Green et al. (2004), and Tal-Or and Cohen (2010) discovered that involvement is strongly connected with the enjoyment of televised content. Those who experience higher level of involvement, reported higher level of enjoyment, and in turn they were more likely to favor morally ambiguous characters and their behavior.

Another scholar draws attention to the fact that involvement, identification, liking, and similarity interact with one another (Felt, 2011). Also Busselle and Bilandzic (2009) argue that all these constructs are similar, however it is unclear how exactly they relate to one another. Indeed, different scholars represent different opinions. For instance, Moyer-Guse (2008) argues that involvement is a component of identification, and Tal-Or and Cohen (2010) suggest that suspense predicts involvement. Additionally, Murphy, Frank, Moran and Woodley (2011) found that identification predicted higher levels of involvement, whereas involvement predicted evaluation of character's behavior. On contrary, Cohen (2001) explains that identification leads to an increased likelihood of adopting the behavioral tendencies of the character, due to an increased involvement. Nevertheless, what is common for all these terms is that they all correspond with the engagement of the narrative content (Busselle & Bilandzic, 2009). Furthermore, as Buselle and Bilandzic explain, numerous external factors might interfere with engagement. Occurrence of noise, hunger or stress can evoke distraction, and then thoughts might become unrelated to the narratives.

To conclude, researchers have examined that involvement is an important factor that contributes to the identification with a character, as well as to overall enjoyment. Furthermore, it has been discussed that involvement might result in justifying of character's behavior, and in shifts in moral judgment. So far it was discussed what is the role of enjoyment, justified violence, tendency to morally disengage, identification, and involvement in evoking overall responses and moral judgments by the viewer. In the next section it will be deliberated on the last two components that are considered as influential factors in this research, namely attractiveness and success. Those factors are directly attached to the personal attributes of the character.

2.8.   The role of attractiveness and success for moral judgment

It is a tendency that televised characters are generally better looking than average "real" person, especially with regards to females, who are normally portrayed as young, thin, and attractive (Signorielli, 2001). According to Hoffner and Cantor (1991) physical appearance is one of the most persuasive characteristics of a character as it is the first attribute that comes to the viewer's attention. According to scholars one of the important aspects in the physical appearance is also a manner of dress, which gives an information about social status or occupation of the character. It is believed that heroes are clean and well-dressed, and villains are dirty and messy.

One of the most popular conclusions from the research on physical attractiveness is proposed by Dion, Berscheid, and Walster (1972). Scholars point out that in people's reception, "what is beautiful is good" (p. 285). This statement indicates that beauty and goodness are associated, and imposes that physically attractive individuals possess positive personal values. Moreover, Dion (1972) has found that the same behavior is evaluated differently when is performed by attractive versus unattractive person. Studies conducted by Hoffner and Cantor (1985), and Sparks and Cantor (1986), confirm such thesis. They conclude that characters that are perceived as physically attractive are judged as "better" and "nicer" than less attractive characters. In line with these findings is what Bazzini, Curtin, Joslin, Regan & Martz (2010) discovered few years later. According to scholars, physical attractiveness positively predicts favorability of character's outcomes, as well as perception of goodness, intelligence, and friendliness. Also due to Eagly and Chaiken's (1991) discovery, attractive individuals are assigned with more positive attributes in general. Yet their findings suggest that good looking characters have an impact on perceiving social competence and intellectual competence, but no impact on believes towards integrity of this person. The research conducted by Hoffner (1996) explored that physical attractiveness predicts wishful identification, especially for girls. Moreover, it was found that physical appearance is the only influential factor of girls' wishful identification with female characters. This discovery indicates that for females, attractiveness is essential.

With regards to bad characters only, different conclusions were proposed by Konijn and Hoorn (2005). Authors placed aesthetics in the encoding phase of response to fictional character, which refers to a description of the characters physical attributes. Their findings explored that bad characters evoke less distance and more involvement when they are perceived as ugly, whereas distance increases and involvement decreases when they are

exposed to beautiful characters. Scholars explain that the reason for this phenomenon might be that ugly people are in a socially weaker position, and this can make wrongdoing more understandable.

Yet studies conducted by Bandura (1986) and Hoffner and Cantor (1991) indicate that people wish to be like successful characters. It was examined that children want to be like a successful character, regardless of character's behaviors conflicting with the viewer's personal values (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1963). Furthermore, according to Dion et al. (1972) attractiveness gives individual a message about successfulness of the observed person. They performed the research which indicated that people assign more favorable personality qualities and more successful life outcomes to the physically attractive individuals. Additionally, due to the affective disposition theory, viewers derive enjoyment when liked characters succeed, and disliked characters fail (Zillmann & Cantor, 1977).

To summarize, attractiveness and success are important traits of the television narratives, and it has been indicated that they play an important role in creating viewer's responses toward character. Attractive characters are automatically accredited with positive values, whereas successful characters are known to positively influence enjoyment, and identification with a character. In general, research has shown that television can influence viewer's moral thoughts and attitudes through various different factors. Having discussed all persuasive factors that are considered to influence viewer's attitude towards morally ambiguous behavior, the next section will reflect on some external processes that do not relate to television content itself, but are considered to influence moral responses.

2.9.   The role of external influences for moral judgment

With moral judgment being identified as a process of reasoning, most scholars draw attention to the viewers' reactions to moral issues. Yet, despite moral implications that rely on characteristics of such issues as well as on characteristics of the observer (Bandura, 2001), moral transgressions can also depend on intuitive processes (Fransson & Ask, 2010).

Greene and colleagues (Greene, Sommerville, Nystrom, Darley & Cohen, 2001; Greene, Nystrom, Engell, Darley & Cohen, 2004) applied two kinds of information processing to a dual-process models of moral judgment, and indicated that both, the cognitive system which is conscious and emotional, as well as implicit system which is unconscious, influence moral judgment's mechanisms. Moreover, scholars indicate that these processes exists and operate simultaneously. The concept derives from the foundation

of deontology and utilitarianism, and points at different principles when making judgments of good and bad (Janicke, 2013). Utilitarian judgments consider the amount of benefits and harms when taking into account everybody's interest, while deontological judgments rely on already existing moral principles in indicating if an action is right or wrong, regardless of consequences. Conscious reasoning is therefore linked to the utilitarian judgments, and automatic responses refer to deontological judgments (Greene et al., 2001). However, these judgments are considered to be complicated, especially when responding to morally complex issues. Thus, deontological response can contradict with utilitarian response (Greene et al., 2004). Nevertheless, both conscious and automatic reactions are of equal importance, and it is a context that determines which of these two processes will have greater influence on the moral reaction.

In addition to the Greene and her colleagues' concept (Greene et al., 2001; Greene et al., 2004), the dual-process model of moral judgment can be also understood as a reaction to known versus unknown moral dilemma (Fransson & Ask, 2010). Authors suggest that conscious processes are responsible for unfamiliar moral issues, whereas automatic processes arise as a response to the known obvious issues. It means that moral responses are fast when the characteristics of the stimuli are easily recognized as a moral transgression, and responses require longer processing while being exposed to unfamiliar moral issues. What is more, when representation is repeated and elaborated over time, the observer gradually develops the memory of this representation. Then, the judgment that was previously inclined through deliberate reasoning, can be prompt automatically. These immediate moral responses imply that viewer's control is not required, that he/she is unaware of the judgment process, and that this process follow rapidly and efficiently (Franson & Ask, 2010). Lewis, Tamborini and Weber (2014) conclude therefore that there are two types of media evaluation: one arises as a result of rapid, intuitive processing, and the other one from slower, reflective processing. What is significant, occurrence of slower and reflecting processing indicates that different intuitive preferences of the viewer are in conflict. Additionally, scholars argue that most judgments are made automatically, however when moral dilemma is faced, the viewer is more likely to deliberate on this moral conflict.

Similarly to the dual-processes model, social intuitionist model indicates that both, intuition and rational thinking affect moral judgment (Haidt & Björklund, 2008). Scholars observed that individuals normally are not able to give a moral reason for spontaneous moral judgment, because these judgments are made automatically. Yet in opposition to Greene et al.'s model (2001, 2004), the social intuitionist model indicates that moral reasoning is of

less importance when confronted with moral judgment. Thus moral reasoning is often applied after the intuitive judgment was already made.

However, other investigations indicate that the viewer's processing of information can vary to the extent to which it is explicit (as a result of conscious thinking), or implicit (as a result of spontaneous responses) (Wittenbrink, Judd & Park, 1997). According to scholars it can be further concluded that stereotypic knowledge of the observer might influence judgment differently, depending on whether the responses are prompt by conscious consideration or rather by spontaneous reaction. It has been explored that implicit attitudes (stereotypes and personal believes) contribute to the explicit responses on the questionnaire. Moreover, according to scholars, implicit and explicit responses might differ, as participants are motivated to portray themselves in a positive light. This finding is in line with social desirability theory which suggests that respondents create favorable images of themselves (Hoolbrock, Green & Krosnick, 2003). Due to the social desirability distortion, respondents under some conditions have a tendency to answer questions with a more socially desirable manner than they would answer under other conditions (Richman, Kiesler, Weisband & Drasgow, 1999). Furthermore, it has been explored that these biases can be made intentionally, as well unintentionally.

Another theory that implies the importance of the implicit measurements is named satisficing theory. According to this theory, questionnaire responses require from participants a cognitive work, which they are not always willing to follow, and therefore they shortcut cognitive processes (Krosnick, 1999). These shortcuts can be made in two ways, either by weak satisficing or by strong satisficing (Hoolbrook et al., 2003). Regarding weak satisficing, respondent follows all cognitive steps, but with bias and less attention. Regarding strong satisficing, respondent completely loses motivation and provide responses which seem reasonable to him.

According to Hefner, Rothmund, Klimmt and Gollwitzer (2011), when studying people's attitudes it is therefore necessary to employ both, explicit as well as implicit measures, thus implicit cognition cannot be consciously controlled. Implicit measurements cannot replace explicit measurements, but should be used as addition to explicit measurements. Researchers explain that due to implicit measures it is possible to assess the actual impact of media messages on viewers. Moreover, it is emphasized that implicit measures can be especially helpful when social desirable responding is likely to occur.

In brief, previous research has indicated that except explicit responses to the televised content, there are some implicit and external persuasive influences that are involved in the

processes of moral judgment. Specifically: intuition, stereotypic knowledge, and social desirability. Having discussed all persuasive factors that are considered to influence viewer's attitude towards morally ambiguous behavior, as well as external influences that are argued to play an essential role during the processes of moral judgment and creating responses in general, the next chapter presents hypotheses of this thesis.

2.10. Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are built upon the previously discussed theoretical foundations, as well as previous research regarding viewers' attitude towards morally ambiguous characters and immoral behaviors. The first three sets of hypotheses will predict how different factors influence one another. The last set of hypotheses will predict which factors influence moral judgment directly.

Previous investigations have indicated that enjoyment of morally ambiguous representations can be obtained through several different factors. It has been explored that in order to derive enjoyment viewers need to understand the character (Vorderer et al., 1996) or to feel the emotions of the character (Raney, 2003, 2004). Therefore, involvement and identification can positively influence the overall enjoyment. Another factors contributing to enjoyment are attractiveness and success, which were revealed to increase likeability of a character, and thus enjoyment (Bazzini et al., 2010, Hoffner & Cantor, 1991). Moreover, it was demonstrated that viewers tend to justify character's immoral actions because they are motivated to enjoy the televised content (Krakowiak & Tsay Vogel, 2013; Raney, 2004). Taking into account those findings the following set of hypotheses was formed:

H1.1: Identification with the character has a positive impact on enjoyment.
H1.2: Involvement with the character has a positive impact on enjoyment.
H1.3: Justified violence has a positive impact on enjoyment.
H1.4: Attractiveness of the character has a positive impact on enjoyment.
H1.5: Success of the character has a positive impact on enjoyment.

It has been previously examined that involvement is strongly correlated with identification. The more the viewer is able to understand a character, the more he/she identifies with this character (Cohen, 2001, Vorderer et al., 1996). Furthermore, it has been discussed that viewers want to be like the successful and attractive characters, even though

33

they behave immorally (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1963; Hoffner, 1996; Hoffner & Cantor, 1991). In the light of above the following set of hypotheses was established:

> H2.1: Involvement with the character has a positive impact on identification with the character.
>
> H2.2: Attractiveness of the character has a positive impact on identification with the character.
>
> H2.3: Success of the character has a positive impact on identification with the character.

Previously scholars have indicated that important reason for justifying morally ambiguous characters and their actions is viewer's identification with a character (Tsay & Krakowiak, 2011). Moreover, viewer's opinions about immoral behavior can be switched through the process of involvement (Green & Brock, 2000; Green et al., 2004), and also due to the positive traits of a character (such as attractiveness and success) (Dion, 1972; Dion et al., 1972; Newby-Clark, 2004). Hence, the following set of hypothesis was formed:

H3.1: Identification with the character has a positive impact on justified violence.

H3.2: Involvement with the character has a positive impact on justified violence.

H3.3: Attractiveness of the character has a positive impact on justified violence.

H3.4: Success of the character has a positive impact on justified violence.

Amongst scholars it has been argued that when viewer justifies the character's behavior, moral evaluations of this character also change (Tsay & Krakowiak, 2011). It has also been found that tendency to morally disengage can predict the acceptance of the character's immoral actions (Bandura, 2001; Bandura, 2012; Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2013). Additionally, the viewers are able to change their attitudes or responses in order to match those of another person (Bandura et al., 1996; Raney, 2004; Tsay & Krakowiak, 2011). Similarly, it has been shown that involvement influence emotional responses (Vorderer, 1992). Thus, identification and involvement can play an important role in the process of moral judgment (Green & Brock, 2000; Green et al., 2004; Konijn and Hoorn, 2005). Whilst creating judgment of a character another factor that is perceived to be a strong influential factor is enjoyment (Raney, 2003, 2004; Raney & Bryant, 2002; Vorderer et al.,

1996). What is more, it has been demonstrated that attractive people are accredited with positive values (Dion et al., 1972, Eagly et al., 1991; Hoffner & Cantor, 1991), and that individuals tend to adapt the behavior of successful people (Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963; Zillmann & Cantor, 1977). Drawn upon from these findings the following set of hypotheses was established:

H4.1: Tendency to morally disengage has a positive impact on moral judgment.

    H4.1a: Tendency to morally disengage has a positive impact on moral foundations of the viewer.

    H4.1b: Tendency to morally disengage has a positive impact on perceived character's attributes.

    H4.1c: Tendency to morally disengage has a positive impact on acceptance of the character's behavior.

H4.2: Identification with the character has a positive impact on moral judgment.

    H4.2a: Identification with the character has a positive impact on moral foundations of the viewer.

    H4.2b: Identification with the character has a positive impact on perceived character's attributes.

    H4.2c: Identification with the character has a positive impact on acceptance of the character's behavior.

H4.3: Involvement with the character has a positive impact on moral judgment.

    H4.3a: Involvement with the character has a positive impact on moral foundations of the viewer.

    H4.3b: Involvement with the character has a positive impact on perceived character's attributes.

    H4.3c: Involvement with the character has a positive impact on acceptance of the character's behavior.

H4.4: Justified violence has a positive impact on moral judgment.

    H4.4a: Justified violence has a positive impact on moral foundations of the viewer.

    H4.4b: Justified violence has a positive impact on perceived character's attributes.

    H4.4c: Justified violence has a positive impact on acceptance of the character's behavior.

H4.5: Enjoyment has a positive impact on moral judgment.

    H4.5a: Enjoyment has a positive impact on moral foundations of the viewer.

    H4.5b: Enjoyment has a positive impact on perceived character's attributes.

H4.5c: Enjoyment has a positive impact on acceptance of the character's behavior.

H4.6: Character's attractiveness has a positive impact on moral judgment.

> H4.6a: Character's attractiveness has a positive impact on moral foundations of the viewer.

> H4.6b: Character's attractiveness has a positive impact on perceived character's attributes.

> H4.6c: Character's attractiveness has a positive impact on acceptance of the character's behavior.

H4.7: Character's success has a positive impact on moral judgment.

> H4.7a: Character's success has a positive impact on moral foundations of the viewer.

> H4.7b: Character's success has a positive impact on perceived character's attributes.

> H4.7c: Character's success has a positive impact on acceptance of the character's behavior.

3. Methodology

After having considered prior research discussing how the television might influence the audience's perception, how morality is portrayed on television, and what are the influential factors of a viewer's perception, this methodological chapter is devoted to the methods that were chosen in this thesis and why.

3.1. Overview

In order to answer the research question 'to what extent does the content presented in television series influence audience's attitude towards morally ambiguous behavior?', quantitative research was conducted. Thus, quantitative research processes give the opportunity not only to predict phenomena, but also to explain the intensity of the relations between these phenomena (Tewksbury, 2009). Due to the tests of significance, a proven relationship between variables can be revealed (Babbie, 2008). Therefore, in order to determine to what extent there is an influence, quantitative method is required. Moreover, using of quantitative methods leads to statistically significant conclusions that can be drawn from the research (Babbie 2008), and provides relative accuracy and scrupulosity (Gilbert, 2008).

The main research activity was to examine the relation between different factors related to the content of TV series (presenting morally ambiguous character) and viewer's perception of morality. Factors that were examined are: *moral disengagement, identification, involvement, enjoyment, justified violence, attractiveness*, and *success*. These moderators were predicted to affect the attitude towards morally ambiguous behavior. The dependent variables that were intended to measure perception of morally ambiguous behavior, and thus moral judgment, are: *moral foundations, character's attributes*, and *character's behavior*. Additionally, implicit measures (*quantity of errors* and *response latencies*) were employed, examining whether automatic and intuitive responses were affected by the stimulus material.

To test mentioned-above factors, experimental design as a methodology technique was implemented. According to Cook and Campbell (1976), such method is best in defining cause-effect relationships. Firstly, the aim was to establish the relations between the independent and dependent variables and secondly, to "extract the maximum amount of information with the minimum expenditure of resources" (Kirk, 2013, p. 24).

There were two groups of participants. Each group was confronted with different TV series representing morally ambiguous character. Participants were randomly assigned to the

one of two control conditions. First group was exposed to the *Revenge* TV series representing attractive and successful character (Appendix A), and second group was exposed to the *Wentworth* TV series representing unattractive and unsuccessful character (Appendix B). For each group different questionnaire was prepared, including identical questions, but adjusted in terms of naming. This was caused only as a result of being exposed to different protagonists while watching different TV Series (e.g., the first group watched a series with the main character named Emily, the second group watched a series with the main character named Franky).

3.2.   Data collection and analysis

In the research two types of sampling were implemented. Among participants, 56.9% were gathered through random sampling. These participants were approached by asking them personally on campus to participate. They were told that they will participate in an experiment about attitudes towards morally ambiguous behavior. Additionally, they were asked if they are familiar with any of the TV series that was chosen for the study. Due to previous studies focusing mostly on fan's reactions towards characters, it was thus important contribution that viewers' attitude was not influenced by personal connections with the characters (Tian & Hoffner, 2010). Additionally, no further information was provided in order to eliminate influencing factors. After they agreed to participate in the research they were asked about the time availability. If they could participate immediately, they were asked to proceed to particular room. If they preferred another day for participating, they were asked for time preferences and email address, so that it was possible to confirm the meeting. Practically, every student studying at Erasmus University Rotterdam had the same chance to be chosen to participate in the experiment, therefore the condition of randomization was fulfilled.

Yet another 43.1% of participants were gathered using convenience based sampling method. Due to constraints of time and resources available it was decided to conduct the experiment among private social networks. Such method gave the access to the larger amount of data in a shorter amount of time. Participants were therefore approached by phone, email or private messages on social media sites and were further asked to promote experiments amongst their own social networks. All of these sessions were conducted in Poland, in a quiet room. In line with the sessions that were conducted in the Netherlands, the only information that participants received about the study was the topic of the research.

The gathered data was processed and analyzed in a statistical manner using the SPSS program. Several tests were used, such as independent sample t-tests, paired samples t-tests, stepwise regression analysis, and ANOVA with repeated measures test.

3.3. Sample

The participants of this research were young adults leaving in the Netherlands, and young adults living in Poland. The first criterion for the participants in the experiment was age. In order to participate contestant could not be older than 30 years old. For this thesis, young adults were selected as a sample because according to scholars (e.g., Coyne, Padilla-Walker & Howard, 2013), young people are the ones that the media have the biggest impact on. Coyne et al. explain that the emerging adulthood phase is the time of identity exploration (love, work, world views), and therefore people at this age are in a vulnerable position. The second criterion for participation was that individuals have not been familiar with the assigned TV series prior to the experiment.

In total, seventy five participants took part in the experiment of which three individuals were excluded from the analysis concerning the amount of time that they spent on filling in the questionnaire (lower than 30 minutes). Eventually, seventy two participants were qualified for the analyses ($N = 72$). Of these participants thirty seven were exposed to the *Revenge* TV series (experimental group, $N = 37$), and thirty five were exposed to the *Wentworth* TV series (conditional group, $N = 35$). Among contestants, forty two were female (58.3%) and thirty were male (41.7%). Participants' mean age was 23.97 ($SD = 2.9$). A closer look at the ages of the respondents shows that the youngest respondents were 18 years old and the oldest respondent was 30 years old. The most common age was 23 and 26. Among contestants, 34.7% completed their bachelor's degree, 31.9% completed their master's degree, 20.8% obtained a high school degree, and 12.6% of participants completed something else. Although most respondents were from Poland (43.1%), the sample includes respondents from 19 other countries as well, mostly from the Netherlands (16.7%) and from Indonesia (5.6%).

3.4. Stimulus material: Television narratives

For the experimental condition, drama *Revenge* was selected as the morally ambiguous narrative, and for the control condition drama *Wentworth* represented morally ambiguous behavior. The selection of the stimulus material was based on the personal general observation of the characters in the series.

With regards to *Revenge* TV series, two important parameters were taken into account: firstly, the main character is an attractive and successful female; secondly, her behavior is justified by certain motives. Additionally, in order to avoid external influences, it was important to select the TV series that is not widely popular. Hence, none of the participants was familiar with the *Revenge* prior to initial viewing.

Revenge is a Canadian drama TV series with the female protagonist, Emily Thorne. Emily is moving to the Hamptons seeking the revenge on people who separated her from her father and contributed to his death. Step by step she destroys everyone who betrayed her father. The important point is that drama uses flashbacks, providing the background of the story, and presenting the protagonist as an innocent little girl. Moreover, Emily is portrayed as a person who still carries some good emotions for her friends and the loved ones. On the one hand, she has friends that she cares for. On the other hand she is controlled by the craving for revenge. Importantly, although her actions are often illegal, she does not kill anybody. Therefore, Emily is shown as a morally ambiguous person. The episode that was chosen for the study was the episode 01x04 (title: "Duplicity"). In this episode Emily takes a revenge on the psychiatrist (Dr. Banks), who was responsible for institutionalizing her as a little girl, and separating her from her father. The revenge taken on Dr. Banks relied on ruining her career and placing her alone in a storage container for few hours. At the same time, the episode portrays how much Emily had to go through in her past.

For the second, control group, the Australian television drama series, the *Wentworth*, was selected. The action of the drama is taking place in a prison. One of the main characters is Franky Doyle, who was charged for intentionally causing serious injury. The attack was an act of revenge on the man who assaulted her. She is portrayed as unattractive lesbian, who is provocative and tattooed. Moreover, she is a natural born leader who is aiming to obtain power in prison. She avoids getting emotionally involved with people, because she is afraid to lose control. Besides the fact that this character is an unattractive and unsuccessful female, additional factor that was considered while selecting this series for a control group, was that the whole drama is portrayed in unaesthetic manner, and the life in prison

contradicts with the one that is portrayed in the *Revenge*. Similarly like in a case of *Revenge*, certain motives of the ambiguous behavior of the character are presented. Thus, retrospective moments are included, presenting Franky as an innocent little girl. Accordingly, Franky is also portrayed in a positive situations, such as conversations with her friends. She does not kill anybody, and in many situations she is presented as a person who is defending herself, rather than attacking. Hence, Franky is an example of a morally ambiguous person. The episode that was chosen for the research was the episode 1x03 (title: "The girl who waited"). In this episode, the act of revenge is presented as well as motives for the behavior of a character. Additionally, there are some retrospective moments presenting Franky as a child who was abandoned by her father. It is explained that Franky was raised by her mother, who was an alcoholic, and who mistreated her. In this episode Franky is also confronted with a visit from her father.

What is common for both of the series is that both characters were raised without their fathers in a difficult conditions. Secondly, both of them took a revenge on a person that hurt them. Thirdly, both of them are shown from two perspectives: first, when they were little girls, second, when they are adults. Most importantly, Emily and Franky carry both, positive and negative emotions, they are neither entirely bad nor entirely good people.

3.5. Measurements

Several explicit measurements were assessed for the study, including *moral disengagement, identification, involvement, enjoyment*, *justified violence, attractiveness, and success*. These variables served as independent variables, as well as moderators. Variables *attractiveness,* and *success* represented the experimental condition for the study. Dependent variables in these study were: *moral foundations, character's attributes, and character's behavior.* Furthermore, implicit measurements were established, namely *response latencies* and *quantity of errors*.

3.5.1. Explicit measurements

Moral disengagement. Certain personal characteristics might affect individuals' acceptance of immoral or harmful behaviors. To illustrate, Raney, Schmid, Niemann and Ellensohn (2009) discovered that the enjoyment of anti-hero narratives can be predicted by significance that individuals place on their own moralities, in a sense of behavior-guiding principles. Moreover, according to Bandura et al. (1996), those who have a greater tendency to morally

disengage are more willing for moral justification of certain actions. In this research it is assumed that an individual's tendency for moral disengagement might affect his/hers acceptance of a protagonist's immoral actions and the moral judgment. Tendency to morally disengage is named *moral disengagement* and was measured with 32 items adapted from the study conducted by Detert, Treviño and Schweitzer (2008). These researchers were using same items as proposed by Bandura et al. (1996), but modified them in order to fit the population of the study. For instance the statement: *It is unfair to blame a child who had only a small part in the harm caused by the group* was developed into: *You can't blame a person who plays only a small part in the harm caused by a group"*. The items were assessed on a 5-point Likert scale. Higher values indicate that individuals are more prone to morally disengage, whereas lower values suggest that individuals are less willing to morally disengage. Exemplary items include: *It is alright to fight to protect your friends; People who are mistreated have usually done things to deserve it; Someone who is obnoxious does not deserve to be treated like a human being* (Appendix C). Cronbach's Alpha indicated that this measure is reliable (Cronbach's Alpha = .846).

Identification. Identification in general is perceived to be a multidimensional construct. For the purpose of this study identification is conceptualized in four central dimensions, suggested by Cohen (2001). The first dimension is empathy or sharing the feelings with the character (not for the character). The second indicator is defined by the degree to which viewer feels or understands the character and the motivations for his/hers behavior. The third one is the degree to which the viewer internalizes and shares the goals of the character. Finally, the forth component is qualified by the degree to which self-awareness is lost during exposure to the narratives. In this research *identification* was measured with 7-point Likert scale including 12 items adapted from those proposed by Cohen (2001) and Igartua (2010). Example items include*: I tend to understand the reasons why the character does what he does; While viewing the show I could feel the emotions the character portrayed; I tried to see things from the point of view of the character*. (Appendix D). Cronbach's Alpha indicated that this measure is reliable (Cronbach's Alpha =.898).

Involvement. Involvement was found to have a strong connection with the enjoyment of narratives and with changes of attitudes and beliefs caused by exposure to narratives (Tal-Or & Cohen, 2010). Besides enjoyment, researchers also recognize involvement for its relation to the identification with characters. The level of involvement has an impact on attitudes of

the people identifying with the characters. Thereby, involvement was assessed by several detached measures proposed by Vorderer et al. (2004), concerning: *Attention Allocation* (1 item); *Spatial Presence* (2 items); *Higher Cognitive Involvement* (5 items, e.g., *I thought about just how much I know about the things in the series*); *Suspension of Disbelief* (4 items, e.g. *I wondered whether the situation could really exist like this*); *Domain Specific Interest* (1 item, *I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip*). All of this measures were assessed on 5-point Likert scale (Appendix E). Cronbach's Alpha indicated that measures of *spatial presence* (Cronbach's Alpha = .743); *higher cognitive involvement* (Cronbach's Alpha = .781), and *suspension of disbelief* (Cronbach's Alpha = .518) are reliable.

Justified Violence. Previous research has shown that individuals are willing to accept or justify bad behaviors when they are distorted by motivational factors (Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2013). Moreover, such justification might be provided by moral disengagement cues (Hartmann & Vorderer, 2010, Newby-Clark, 2004). Moral disengagement cues might lead to a kind of forgiveness, and evaluate harmful behaviors into a positive or acceptable actions (Janicke & Raney, 2014). Janicke and Raney argue that this can be done through the context, when viewer judges whether certain actions despite being immoral, could be justified. Because morally ambiguous narrative is complex (in a moral context), it might be expected that viewers will positively judge the character.

In this project it was examined if perceptions of character's immoral behavior can be influenced by judgments of blameworthiness. The assumption was that viewers during watching developed particular schema of morally ambiguous character, which includes moral disengagement cues. In order to measure impact of the justified violence, 7 items were implemented, for instance: *The actions of the protagonist were morally right in this situation; The actions of protagonist were justified*. All of the items were directly related to the judgment of character's behavior, and were adapted from previous study related to the assessment of judgments of moral dilemmas (Usoof-Thowfeek, Janoff-Bulman & Tavernini, 2011). Each item was measured with agree/disagree ratio (Appendix F). Cronbach's Alpha indicated that this measure is reliable (Cronbach's Alpha =.815).

Enjoyment. In general enjoyment is perceived as a pleasurable response to entertainment media (Reiss & Wiltz, 2004; Zillmann & Bryant, 1985). However, there are a few different concepts in trying to define its construct. In this project, the central component of enjoyment

is a need for hedonic pleasure (Tamborini et al., 2010). The enjoyment was therefore measured by using three items employed previously by Tal-Or and Cohen (2010) with 5-point Likert scale. The terms were adjusted in wording so that the items could be related to stimulus material, for instance: *This is a TV Series that I can enjoy* (Appendix G). Cronbach's Alpha indicated that this measure is reliable (Cronbach's Alpha = .948).

Attractiveness. Physically attractive characters are believed to possess positive personal qualities (Konijn & Hoorn, 2005). In this project attractiveness was measured by 5-point Likert scale including 3 items implied in the previous research by Hoffer and Buchanan (2009), for instance: *Character is good looking*. Additionally, reverse coded item, *Character is physically unattractive to me*, was included. Wording was adjusted for each condition (Appendix H, questions: 4, 5, 6). Cronbach's Alpha indicated that this measure is reliable (Cronbach's Alpha = .899).

Success. It has been shown that children want to be like a successful character, even if the character's behaviors contradict with the viewer's personal values (Hoffner & Buchanan, 2009). In this thesis success was measured by 5 items with 5-point Likert scale, adapted from Hoffer and Buchanan (2009). For instance: *Character has a lot of friends; Character is a successful person.* Moreover, amongst the items there were some reverse coded statements, such as: *Character did not get what he wanted.* Note: wording was adjusted (Appendix H, questions 1, 2, 3, 7, 8). Cronbach's Alpha indicated that this measure is reliable (Cronbach's Alpha = .847).

Moral judgment. The acceptance and appeal of morally ambiguous behavior can be influenced by different factors. In this research, perceptions of the morality were measured by few dependent variables.

The first variable is named *moral foundations*. This variable was intended to measure moral judgment of the viewer by the extent to which the behavior of protagonist violated or upheld viewer's personal sense of morality. According to Eden et al. (2011), the extent to which characters uphold or violate moral standard of the viewer is a fundamental part of a drama. The more characters uphold or violate viewer's morality, the more character evokes emotional reactions. Based on a Moral Foundations Questionnaire (Haidt, 2001) five moral domains were included, namely purity, harm, fairness, group loyalty, and respect for authority. This measure was intended to indicate whether characters upheld or violated the

domains of moral foundations, by using one item for each domain. These items were combined together as one measurement of moral foundations which was evaluated on 7-point Likert scale, from 1 - completely violated until 7 - completely upheld (Appendix I). Cronbach's Alpha indicated that this measure is reliable (Cronbach's Alpha = .731).

The second variable measuring moral judgment was named *character's attributes*. This variable was intended to measure how viewer judged the protagonist with regards to his attributes. In total 7 items measured with a 5-point Likert scale were introduced. For instance: *Character is agreeable; Character is devoted; Character is a bad person* (reverse coded item). Items were derived from the previous study conducted by Tamborini et al. (2010) (Appendix J). Cronbach's Alpha indicated that this measure is reliable (Cronbach's Alpha = .630).

The third variable assessing moral disengagement was *character's behavior*. This variable was implied in order to measure the perception and acceptance of character's behavior and is similar to *justified violence* variable. However, justifying of immoral behavior is not equal acceptance of this behavior. Thus, behavior's acceptance can be obtain also without justifying this behavior, and justifying of behavior might not lead to acceptance of this behavior. *Justified violence* was measured with 4 items assessed on a 5-point Likert scale adapted from the studies conducted by Krakowiak and Tsay-Vogel (2013), and Tsay and Krakowiak (2011), where moral disengagement was measured by the focus on character's behavior. The exemplary items includes: *I believe that in general character is an ethical person; I consider the character's actions as unethical* (reverse coded) (Appendix K). Cronbach's Alpha indicated that this measure is reliable (Cronbach's Alpha = .775).

3.5.2. Implicit Attitudes towards Self-Justice

In addition to the explicit measurement of perception of morality, implicit attitudes towards self-justice were assessed. Compared to explicit measurements (mostly done by Likert-scales) implicit measurements cannot be willingly influenced by the participant. In this study, implicit attitudes were measured via the single target IAT (ST-IAT). Such methods have received severe support as a tool for the assessment of affective components (Bluemke & Friese, 2008). The aim was to investigate if being exposed to morally ambiguous character leads to changes in overall perception of morality (not towards the character), and if the activation of different morally ambiguous characters (attractive versus unattractive) will impact this perception. Thus, moral assessments of character vary in their complexity

(Janicke, 2013), and the more complex situation is, the longer it takes to provide moral judgment (Lewis, 2014).

To examine the overall perception of morality, *response latencies* and *quantity of errors* measurements were employed. First one, *response latencies*, measured time that was spent on the responses. Second one, *quantity of errors*, measured how many mistakes were made during the test.

This experiment was run on computers. Participants were asked to categorize words as quickly and accurately as possible by pressing one of two labeled keys. All words were presented in a random order on the computer screen. The words differed on an evaluative dimension, and consisted of positive stimuli (e.g., justness, penalty) and negative stimuli (e.g., revenge, crime, murder). There were three blocks included, following those presented by Bleumke and Friese (2008). First one was a trial requiring orientation on single discrimination block of the evaluative stimuli (Appendix L); second block was an inverted response key assignment connecting target stimuli and negative items together (Appendix M). Third block was linking positive words on one response key, and negative stimuli on the other (Appendix N). If response latencies and quantity of errors were higher in round 2 than that of round 3, it means that perception of morality of the viewer was influenced by stimulus material.

3.6.   Procedure

The experiment was conducted either in the Netherlands or in Poland. If the experiment took place in the Netherlands, it was conducted in one of the rooms of Erasmus University. Additionally, due to limited time available for renting the room, few experiments were conducted in the canteen on the university campus (only at quiet times, such as early morning or late afternoon). If the experiment took place in Poland, it was conducted in the private, quite room. In general, in the rooms where the experiment was conducted, there were laptops and headphones available for each participant. There was a maximum of three participants per session. Upon arrival, contestants were randomly assigned to watch one of the control conditions.

Overall, the experiment took approximately 45 minutes and was divided into two parts. During the first part participants were asked to complete a questionnaire presented in the *Qualtrics* program. The questionnaire was designed according to the Likert-scale, which allowed participants to specify the extent to which they agree or disagree with particular

statement (Bryman, 2008). The opening page was the consent form, where participants had to state whether they understand the participation's outlines (Appendix O).

The first section of the questionnaire included questions which were intended to assess the overall participant's tendency for moral disengagement prior to video watching (variable *moral disengagement*). The second section of the questionnaire presented a video-clip with scenes of assigned TV series (approximately 25 minutes long). In the third part, participants specified their reaction to the clip that they watched (variables *identification, involvement, enjoyment, justified violence, attractiveness, success, moral foundations, character's attributes,* and *character's behavior*). In the last part of the questionnaire some demographic questions were included, such as age and level of education (Appendix P).

After completing the questionnaire, each contestant was asked to proceed to the second part of the experiment (explicit measures). During this part, each individual had to read the instructions on the screen, and following, to declare if he/she understood the guidelines. It was the only time during the experiment when participant could ask questions in case he/she misunderstood the requirements of the task, and when the actions which participant was required to take were briefly explained. After clarifying all uncertainties and queries, each participant performed the experiment individually, following instructions on the screen. The task was divided into three rounds, with the first round bring a trial attempt. Participants were notified to answer as quickly as possible, while maximizing accuracy.

After completing the second part of the experiment, each participant received a chocolate bar as a symbolic expression of the gratitude for the time and effort spent during the experiment.

3.7. Pre-analyses

Before conducting the experiment, a pre-test of the questionnaire was conducted. The reason for conducting the pre-test was to examine whether stimulus material is chosen properly. Specifically, it was necessary to investigate whether there are differences in the perception of the different TV series, and mainly, in the attitude towards two different protagonists that participants were exposed to. The intention was to determine whether the *Revenge* protagonist is perceived as an attractive and successful person, and the *Wentworth* protagonist is perceived as an unattractive and unsuccessful person.

Paired samples t-test was conducted to determine if there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for the *Revenge* series and the *Wentworth* series for

attractiveness and success. Two pairs of variables were tested, namely *attractiveness* and *success*. Pair 1 (*attractiveness*) indicated that there is a statistically significant difference between two video-clips, $t(20) = 4.20$, $p < .001$. Pair 2 (*success*) was found to have no significant difference, $t(20) = 1.97$, $p = .062$, however because the score was almost significant, it was decided to continue with chosen stimulus material during the experiment.

Furthermore, before analyses, the differences among the two groups were compared regarding ten variables in total, namely: *moral disengagement, identification, involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest), enjoyment, justified violence, attractiveness, success, moral foundations, character's attributes,* and *character's behavior.* T-test revealed that experimental group has significantly higher levels of identification with character, perceiving his attractiveness, justified violence and the overall acceptance of the character's behavior. However, *moral disengagement, involvement, enjoyment, success, moral foundations*, and *character's attributes* did not differ among both of the groups (table 3.7.1). In essence it can be therefore concluded that participants who were exposed to the *Revenge* TV series enjoyed the clip better than those who were exposed to the *Wentworth* series. Similarly, experimental group experienced higher identification level with the character, perceived the character as more attractive, and justified his behavior more than the conditional group. Taking this results into account, the new independent variable was created – *condition,* which represents two groups independently: 0 – conditional, 1 – experimental. This variable was included in further analyses as one of the predictors.

Table 3.7.1. t-tests for group differences. Note: M_1 is Conditional Group and M_2 is Experimental Group

	t	df	p	M_1 (SD)	M_2 (SD)
Moral disegagement	1.90	70	.247	2.30 (0.36)	2.50 (0.44)
Identification	2.50	70	.040	4.34 (0.73)	4.88 (1.10)
Attention allocation	1.00	69	.179	3.97 (0.58)	4.14 (0.79)
Spatial presence	2.44	70	.096	4.66 (1.76)	5.57 (1.38)
Higher cognitive involvement	2.24	69	.197	16.53 (2.56)	18.27 (3.80)
Suspension of disbelief	0.57	69	.838	12.54 (2.66)	13.75 (2.64)
Domain specific interest	2.82	70	.543	2.74 (1.09)	3.51 (1.21)
Enjoyment	4.70	70	.698	4.43 (0.96)	3.57 (1.09)
Justified Violence	3.13	70	.026	1.22 (0.25)	1.43 (0.32)
Attractiveness	7.15	70	.001	2.88 (0.94)	4.13 (0.47)
Success	6.51	70	.718	2.55 (0.64)	3.42 (0.50)
Moral Foundations	1.90	70	.232	3.53 (0.77)	3.93 (1.04)
Character's Attributes	3.19	70	.712	2.77 (0.56)	3.20 (0.58)
Character's Behavior	3.46	70	.017	2.58 (5.22)	3.15 (0.87)

4. Results

In this chapter the results of the analyses that were performed with the SPSS Statistics software (version 22) are presented.

4.1. Influences on *Enjoyment*

To determine whether *enjoyment* as the dependent variable could be predicted by *condition, identification* (H1.1)*, involvement* (H1.2)*, justified violence* (H1.3)*, attractiveness* (H1.4), and *success* (H1.5) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.1.1). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analyses were *condition, identification, involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest),* and *justified violence. Condition, identification, justified violence*, and *domain specific interest* together explained 77.1% of the variance in *enjoyment*. The second block showed that attractiveness and success did not enter the equation. The coefficients for the linear regression point at *identification, condition,* and one of the domains of *involvement* as the variables with the significant positive impact on the enjoyment level of the viewer, but the impact of *justified violence* is negative. Moreover, other *involvement*'s domains*, attractiveness,* and *success* have no predictive value. This means that the higher level of identification is, the more the viewer is interested in the topic of the clip, and the less he/she justifies the character's behavior, the higher enjoyment level is achieved. Furthermore, enjoyment can be predicted by watching a particular show (either *Wentworth* or *Revenge*). Hypotheses H1.1 and partially H1.2 can be therefore confirmed, but H1.3, H1.4 and H1.5 are rejected.

Table 4.1.1. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses with *enjoyment* as criterion Note: *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Condition	.30***	.19*
Identification	.32**	.32**
Attention allocation	-.05	-.10
Spatial presence	-.07	-.05
Higher cognitive involvement	.11	.11
Suspension of disbelief	-.03	.01
Domain specific interest	.56***	.57***
Justified violence	-.18*	-.21*
Attractiveness		.01
Success		.16
	R^2_{adj} = .74	ΔR^2 = .01
	p < .001	*n.s.*

In order to determine if the *enjoyment* as the dependent variable could be predicted in experimental group by *identification* (H1.1)*, involvement* (H1.2), *justified violence* (H1.3), *attractiveness* (H1.4) and *success* (H1.5) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.1.2). The predictors that were used in the first step of these analyses were *identification, involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest),* and *justified violence*. As expected, *identification* and *domain specific interest* together explained 75 % of the variance in *enjoyment*. *Justified violence* and *attractiveness* did not enter the equation, which contradicts with expectations. Moreover, second model indicated that *attention allocation* has a negative impact on *enjoyment*, and that *success* is a significant predictor for *enjoyment* in experimental group. Therefore hypotheses H1.5 can be partially confirmed. Briefly speaking, in the experimental group the higher level of identification is, the more the viewer is interested in the topic of the clip, and the more he/she perceives the character as successful, enjoyment level increases (positive impact). However, the more attention allocation increases, the enjoyment's level decreases.

51

Table 4.1.2. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses with *enjoyment* as criterion in experimental group

Note: *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Identification	.54**	.49*
Attention allocation	-.36	-.41*
Spatial presence	.08	.07
Higher cognitive involvement	.25	.10
Suspension of disbelief	.08	.21
Domain specific interest	.46**	.53**
Justified violence	-.22	-.22
Attractiveness		-.09
Success		.28*
	$R^2_{adj} = .69$	$\Delta R^2 = .06$
	$p < .001$	$p < .05$

To examine if the *enjoyment* as the dependent variable could be predicted in conditional group by *identification* (H1.1), *involvement* (H1.2), *justified violence* (H1.3), *attractiveness* (H1.4) and *success* (H1.5) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.1.3). The predictors that were used in the first step of these analyses were *identification, involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest)*, and *justified violence*. As expected, *domain specific interest* explained 75.2% of the variance in *enjoyment*, but other *involvement'*s domains, *identification,* and *justified violence* had no further significant predictive value, which contradicts with expectations. Similarly, the second block showed that *attractiveness* and *success* also did not enter the equation. It means that the more the viewer is interested in the topic of the clip, the greater enjoyment is experienced.

Table 4.1.3. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses with *enjoyment* as criterion in conditional group
Note: *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Identification	.20	.24
Attention allocation	.11	.17
Spatial presence	-.18	.-17
Higher cognitive involvement	.16	-.05
Suspension of disbelief	-.06	-.06
Domain specific interest	.73***	.75***
Justified violence	-.08	-.16
Attractiveness		.29
Success		-.27
	$R^2{}_{adj}$ = .68	ΔR^2 = .03
	p < .001	*n.s.*

4.2.   Influences on *Identification*

To determine whether *identification* as the dependent variable could be predicted by *condition, involvement* (H2.1)*, attractiveness* (H2.2), and *success* (H2.3) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.2.1). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *condition* and *involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest)*. H*igher cognitive involvement* and *domain specific interest* explained 54.5% of the variance in *identification*. *Condition,* other *involvement'*s domains*, attractiveness*, and *success* had no further significant predictive value. Therefore, hypothesis H2.1 is partially confirmed, but hypotheses H2.2 and H2.3 are rejected.

Table 4.2.1. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses with *identification* as criterion Note: *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Condition	.05	.01
Attention allocation	.12	.09
Spatial presence	-.01	.01
Higher cognitive involvement	.29*	.30*
Suspension of disbelief	-.15	-.13
Domain specific interest	.50***	.50***
Attractiveness		-.02
Success		.09
	$R^2_{adj} = .50$	$\Delta R^2 = .003$
	$p < .001$	*n.s.*

To determine whether *identification* as the dependent variable could be predicted in experimental group by *involvement* (H2.1), *attractiveness* (H2.2) and *success* (H2.3) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.2.2). The predictor that was used in the first step of these analyses was *involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest)*. Among these domains only *domain specific interest* explained 64.1% of the variance in *identification.* The second block showed that *attractiveness* and *success* did not enter the equation. Overall, in the experimental group the more viewer is interested in the topic of the clip, the identification level increases.

Table 4.2.2. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses with *identification* as criterion in experimental group
Note: *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Attention allocation	.21	.17
Spatial presence	.07	.18
Higher cognitive involvement	.22	.07
Suspension of disbelief	-.27	-.19
Domain specific interest	.54***	.55***
Attractiveness		.17
Success		.15
	R^2_{adj} = .58	ΔR^2 = .03
	p < .001	n.s.

In order to determine whether *identification* as the dependent variable could be predicted in conditional group by *involvement* (H2.1), *attractiveness* (H2.2) and *success* (H2.3) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (*table 4.2.3*). The predictor that was used in the first step of these analyses was *involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest).* Among these domains, only *higher cognitive involvement* explained 46.2% of the variance in *identification.* The second block showed that *attractiveness* and *success* did not enter the equation. Overall, in the conditional group the greater the higher cognitive involvement is, the identification level increases.

Table 4.2.3. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses with *identification* as criterion in conditional group

Note: *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Attention allocation	.07	-.04
Spatial presence	-.20	-.20
Higher cognitive involvement	.52**	.74**
Suspension of disbelief	.08	.13
Domain specific interest	.31	.27
Attractiveness		-.17
Success		.38
	R^2_{adj} = .36	ΔR^2 = .04
	p < .01	n.s.

4.3. Influences on *Justified violence*

In order to indicate whether *justified violence* as the dependent variable could be predicted by *condition, identification* (H3.1), *involvement* (H3.2), *attractiveness* (H3.3), and *success* (H3.4) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.3.1). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *condition, identification,* and *involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest). Condition* and *identification* together explained 37.3% of the variance in *justified violence. Involvement* did not enter the equation. Moreover, the second block showed that *attractiveness* and *success* had no further significant predictive value. In short, the higher level of identification is, the more viewers justify the behavior of the character. Moreover, evaluations of justified violence can be predicted by watching particular TV series. Hypothesis H3.1 can be therefore confirmed, however hypotheses H3.2, H3.3, and H3.4 are rejected.

Table 4.3.1. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses with *justified violence* as criterion Note: *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Condition	.26*	.08
Identification	.38*	.37*
Attention allocation	.19	.17
Spatial presence	-.19	-.15
Higher cognitive involvement	-.22	-.24
Suspension of disbelief	.04	.07
Domain specific interest	.20	.18
Attractiveness		.21
Success		.07
	$R^2_{adj} = .30$	$\Delta R^2 = .03$
	$p < .001$	*n.s.*

In order to determine if the *justified violence* as the dependent variable could be predicted in experimental group by *identification* (H3.1)*, involvement* (H3.2)*, attractiveness* (H3.3) and *success* (H3.4) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.3.2). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *identification* and *involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest). Identification, attention allocation, and spatial presence* explained 65.1% of the variance in *justified violence*. Other *involvement*'s domains*, attractiveness* and *success* had no significant predictive value. In the experimental group the higher identification level is, the more the viewer justifies the behavior of the character. *Spatial presence* and *suspension of disbelief* were found to have a negative impact whereas *attention allocation* was revealed to have a positive impact on *justified violence*, therefore hypothesis H3.2 can be only partially confirmed.

Table 4.3.2. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses with *justified violence* as criterion in experimental group
Note: *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Identification	.70**	.69**
Attention allocation	.63**	.63**
Spatial presence	-.50**	-.49**
Higher cognitive involvement	-.23	-.23
Suspension of disbelief	-.38*	-.40*
Domain specific interest	-.16	-.17
Attractiveness		.02
Success		-.02
	$R^2_{adj} = .58$	$\Delta R^2 = .001$
	$p < .001$	*n.s.*

To determine if the *justified violence* as the dependent variable could be predicted in conditional group by *identification* (H3.1), *involvement* (H3.2), *attractiveness* (H3.3) and *success* (H3.4) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.3.3). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *identification,* and *involvement* (*attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest*). Both of this variables were found to have no significant predictive value. Similarly, the second model showed that *attractiveness* and *success* also did not enter the equation. In essence, in the conditional group of the experiment, *justified violence* cannot be predicted by any of the variables.

Table 4.3.3. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses with *justified violence* as criterion in conditional group
Note: *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Identification	-.01	.02
Attention allocation	-.02	-.02
Spatial presence	-.14	-.11
Higher cognitive involvement	-.36	-.57
Suspension of disbelief	.12	.14
Domain specific interest	.50	.44
Attractiveness		.51
Success		-.29
	$R^2_{adj} = .07$	$\Delta R^2 = .12$
	n.s.	*n.s.*

4.4. *Moral foundations*

To examine whether *moral foundations* as the dependent variable could be predicted by *moral disengagement* (H4.1a), *condition, identification* (H4.2a), *involvement* (H4.3a), *justified violence* (H4.4a), *enjoyment* (H4.5a) *attractiveness* (H4.6a), and *success* (H4.7a) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.4.1). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *moral disengagement, condition, identification, involvement* (*attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest*)*, justified violence, and enjoyment*. Among all of these predictors, only *moral disengagement* and *justified violence* were revealed to have a significant impact on the *moral foundations*, and explained 34.9% of the variance. Moreover, the second block indicated that *success* is also a significant predictor whereas *attractiveness* has no significant predictive value. It means that the more viewer justifies the behavior of the character, the more he/she perceives him as successful, and the higher tendency for moral disengagement is, it is more likely that moral

foundations of the viewer will remain upheld. Therefore, hypotheses H4.1a, H4.4a, and H4.7a are confirmed, whereas hypotheses H4.2a, H4.3a, H4.5a, and H4.6a are rejected.

Table 4.4.1. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses *with moral foundations* as criterion Note: *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Moral disengagement	.25*	.24
Condition	-.06	-.24
Identification	-.12	-.09
Attention allocation	.08	-.02
Spatial presence	-.01	-.02
Higher cognitive involvement	.07	.10
Suspension of disbelief	.17	.23
Domain specific interest	-.10	-.02
Justified violence	.35*	.30
Enjoyment	.25	.13
Attractiveness		.01
Success		.34*
	R^2_{adj} = .24	ΔR^2 = .06
	p < .01	n.s.

To indicate if the *moral foundations* as the dependent variable could be predicted in experimental group by *moral disengagement* (H4.1a), *identification* (H4.2a), *involvement* (H4.3a), *justified violence* (H4.4a), *enjoyment* (H4.5a), *attractiveness* (H4.6a) and *success* (H4.7a) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.4.2). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *moral disengagement, identification, involvement* (*attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest*), *justified violence,* and *enjoyment*. All of these variables together were revealed to have no significant predictive value. However, the second block showed that *success* together with *suspension of disbelief* explained 61.4% of the variance in *moral foundations*. *Attractiveness* did not

enter the equation. In essence, in the experimental group the more character was perceived as successful, and the more critically viewer evaluated the actuality of presented content, the less moral foundations of the participant were violated. Therefore, hypothesis H4.3a can be partially confirmed.

Table 4.4.2. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses *with moral foundations* as criterion in experimental group
Note: *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Moral disengagement	.28	.23
Identification	.01	.12
Attention allocation	.47	.14
Spatial presence	-.14	-.02
Higher cognitive involvement	-.14	-.41
Suspension of disbelief	.10	.46*
Domain specific interest	-.19	-.25
Justified violence	.17	.14
Enjoyment	.22	-.34
Attractiveness		-.04
Success		.70**
	R^2_{adj} = .15	ΔR^2 = .27
	n.s.	*p < .01*

In order to determine if the *moral foundations* as the dependent variable could be predicted in experimental group by *moral disengagement* (H4.1a), *identification* (H4.2a), *involvement* (H4.3a), *justified violence* (H4.4a), *enjoyment* (H4.5a), *attractiveness* (H4.6a) and *success* (H4.7a) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.4.3). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *moral disengagement, identification, involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest), justified violence,* and *enjoyment.* All of these variables had no significant predictive value. The

second model indicated that *success* also did not enter the equation, however the score for *attractiveness* was significant and explained 49.7% of the variance in *moral foundations*. Overall, in conditional group the higher perceived attractiveness is, the more moral foundations remain upheld. It means that hypothesis H4.6a is partially confirmed.

Table 4.4.3. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses *with moral foundations* as criterion in conditional group
Note: *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Moral disengagement	.23	.23
Identification	-.30	-.23
Attention allocation	-.18	-.11
Spatial presence	-.11	-.15
Higher cognitive involvement	.10	-.17
Suspension of disbelief	.14	.17
Domain specific interest	-.10	.10
Justified violence	.26	.04
Enjoyment	.50	.27
Attractiveness		.60*
Success		-.35
	$R^2_{adj} = .15$	$\Delta R^2 = .27$
	n.s.	$p < .01$

4.5. Influences on perception of *Character's attributes*

To determine whether *character's attributes* as the dependent variable could be predicted by *moral disengagement* (H4.1b), *condition, identification* (H4.2b), *involvement* (H4.3b), *justified violence* (H4.4b), *enjoyment* (H4.5b) *attractiveness* (H4.6b)*, and *success* (H4.7b) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.5.1). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *moral disengagement, condition, identification, involvement* (*attention allocation, spatial presence, higher*

cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest), justified violence, and *enjoyment*. *Justified violence* explained 36% of the variance in *character attributes*. *Moral disengagement, condition, identification, involvement* and *enjoyment* had no significant predictive value. However, the second block showed that *higher cognitive involvement* and *attractiveness* together explained most of the variance, which is equal 46.5%. In short, the more viewer justifies the behavior of the character and the more he/she perceives the character as attractive, the perception of character's attributes becomes more positive, which is in line with expectations (H4.4b; H4.6b). However, the higher level of cognitive involvement viewer obtains, character's attributes are evaluated more negatively. Therefore hypothesis H4.3b is rejected. Similarly, hypotheses H4.1b, H4.2b, H4.5b, and H4.7b cannot be confirmed.

Table 4.5.1. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression
analyses *with character's attributes* as criterion
Note: *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Moral disengagement	.19	.16
Condition	.18	-.06
Identification	.03	.07
Attention allocation	.10	.11
Spatial presence	.08	.12
Higher cognitive involvement	-.33	-.40*
Suspension of disbelief	.02	.06
Domain specific interest	.17	.18
Justified violence	.33*	.24
Enjoyment	-.01	-.08
Attractiveness		.44**
Success		.04
	$R^2_{adj} = .25$	$\Delta R^2 = .11$
	$p < .01$	$p < .01$

To determine if the *character's attributes* as the dependent variable could be predicted in experimental group by *moral disengagement* (H4.1b), *identification* (H4.2b), *involvement* (H4.3b), *justified violence* (H4.4b), *enjoyment* (H4.5b) *attractiveness* (H4.6b)*,* and *success* (H4.7b) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.5.2). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *moral disengagement, identification, involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest), justified violence*, and *enjoyment*. *Moral disengagement, identification* and *higher cognitive involvement* explained 56.8% of the variance in *character's attributes*. However, *higher cognitive involvement* was found to have a negative impact on *character's attributes*. The second block showed that *attractiveness* and *success* had no significant predictive value. In essence, when taking into account only the experimental group, more positive perceptions of the character's attributes can be explained by tendency to morally disengage and identification with a character, and therefore hypotheses H4.1b and H4.2b are partially confirmed.

Table 4.5.2. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses *with character's attributes* as criterion in experimental group

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Moral disengagement	.52*	.54*
Identification	.73*	.80*
Attention allocation	.47	.41
Spatial presence	-.36	-.37
Higher cognitive involvement	-.90**	-.93**
Suspension of disbelief	.15	.22
Domain specific interest	.32	.43
Justified violence	-.22	-.26
Enjoyment	-.20	-.34
Attractiveness		-.06
Success		.13
	$R^2_{adj} = .42$	$\Delta R^2 = .01$
	$p < .01$	n.s.

In order to determine whether the *character's attributes* as the dependent variable could be predicted in conditional group by *moral disengagement* (H4.1b), *identification* (H4.2b), *involvement* (H4.3b), *justified violence* (H4.4b), *enjoyment* (H4.5b) *attractiveness* (H4.6b)*,* and *success* (H4.7b) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.5.3). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *moral disengagement, identification, involvement (attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest), justified violence*, and *enjoyment*. All of these variables had no significant predictive value. Accordingly, the second model indicated that *attractiveness* and *success* did not enter the equation. It means that when taking into account the conditional group, character's attributes cannot be predicted by any of the variables.

Table 4.5.3. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses *with character's attributes* as criterion in conditional group

Note: *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Moral disengagement	.02	-.01
Identification	-.18	-.22
Attention allocation	.10	.03
Spatial presence	.27	.22
Higher cognitive involvement	-.10	-.09
Suspension of disbelief	-.11	-.01
Domain specific interest	-.11	.02
Justified violence	.41	.20
Enjoyment	.23	.07
Attractiveness		.43
Success		.12
	$R^2_{adj} = -.06$	$\Delta R^2 = .20$
	n.s.	$p < .05$

4.6. Influences on acceptance of *Character's behavior*

To determine whether *character's behavior* as the dependent variable could be predicted by *moral disengagement* (H4.1c), *condition, identification* (H4.2c), *involvement* (H4.3c), *justified violence* (H4.4c), *enjoyment* (H4.5c) *attractiveness* (H4.6c)*,* and *success* (H4.7c) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.6.1). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *moral disengagement, condition, identification, involvement* (*attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest*)*, justified violence,* and *enjoyment*. *Identification* and *justified violence* are the only predictors that explained 74.7% of the variance in *character's behavior*. Other variables had no significant predictive value. Likewise, the second block showed that *attractiveness* and *success* did not enter the

66

equation. In short, the more the viewer identifies with a character, and the more he/she justifies the character's behavior, the acceptance of the character's behavior increases, therefore hypotheses H4.2c and H4.4c are confirmed, and hypotheses H4.1c, H4.3c, H4.5c, H4.6c, and H4.7c are rejected.

Table 4.6.1. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses *with character's behavior* as criterion

Note: *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Moral disengagement	.14	.13
Condition	.11	-.04
Identification	.24*	.23*
Attention allocation	.13	.10
Spatial presence	.02	.04
Higher cognitive involvement	-.01	-.02
Suspension of disbelief	.01	.05
Domain specific interest	.10	.12
Justified violence	.57***	.51***
Enjoyment	-.12	-.19
Attractiveness		.18
Success		.11
	R^2_{adj} = .70	ΔR^2 = .03
	p < .001	p < .05

To examine if the *character's behavior* as the dependent variable could be predicted in experimental group by *moral disengagement* (H4.1c)*, identification* (H4.2c)*, involvement* (H4.3c)*, justified violence* (H4.4c), *enjoyment* (H4.5c) *attractiveness* (H4.6c)*, and success* (H4.7c) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses were conducted (table 4.6.2). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *moral disengagement, identification, involvement* (*attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest*)*, justified violence,*

and *enjoyment*. *Identification* and *justified violence* together explained 87.3% of the variance in *character's behavior*. *Moral disengagement*, *involvement,* and *enjoyment* did not enter the equation. However, when including *attractiveness* and *success*, *suspension of disbelief* becomes significant predictor (as the only dimension of involvement). In essence, in line with expectations, in the experimental group the higher levels of identification and the more the viewer justifies the behavior of the character, the acceptance of the character's behavior increases. Furthermore, the acceptance of character's behavior increases due to the higher levels of suspension of disbelief, therefore hypothesis H4.3c can be partially confirmed.

Table 4.6.2. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses *with character's behavior* as criterion in experimental group
Note: *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Moral disengagement	.21	.12
Identification	.54**	.44*
Attention allocation	.14	.07
Spatial presence	-.17	-.06
Higher cognitive involvement	-.12	-.20
Suspension of disbelief	.16	.24*
Domain specific interest	.06	.11
Justified violence	.44*	.52**
Enjoyment	-.20	-.25
Attractiveness		.14
Success		.15
	$R^2_{adj} = .83$	$\Delta R^2 = .02$
	$p < .001$	n.s.

In order to determine whether the *character's behavior* as the dependent variable could be predicted in conditional group by *moral disengagement* (H4.1c)*, identification* (H4.2c), *involvement* (H4.3c), *justified violence* (H4.4c), *enjoyment* (H4.5c) *attractiveness* (H4.6c)*,* and *success* (H4.7c) as independent variables, stepwise linear regression analyses

were conducted (table 4.6.3). The predictors that were used in the first step of this analysis were *moral disengagement, identification, involvement* (*attention allocation, spatial presence, higher cognitive involvement, suspension of disbelief, domain specific interest*), *justified violence,* and *enjoyment*. *Justified violence* explained 52.1% of the variance in *character's behavior*, and *moral disengagement, identification, involvement,* and *enjoyment* had no significant predictive value. The second model indicated that *attractiveness* and *success* also did not enter the equation. It means that when taking into account the conditional group only, the more viewer justifies the behavior of the character, the acceptance of the character's behavior increases.

Table 4.6.3. standardized beta weights and R^2 of the hierarchical regression analyses *with character's behavior* as criterion in conditional group
Note: *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Predictor	Model 1	Model 2
Moral disengagement	-.11	-.14
Identification	.05	-.04
Attention allocation	.13	.01
Spatial presence	.28	.25
Higher cognitive involvement	-.25	-.05
Suspension of disbelief	-.21	-.12
Domain specific interest	.15	.17
Justified violence	.56**	.47*
Enjoyment	.16	.14
Attractiveness		.09
Success		.36
	$R^2_{adj} = .33$	$\Delta R^2 = .10$
	$p < .05$	n.s.

4.7. Influences on implicit attitudes towards self-justice

Because during the second part of the experiment participants were subjected to more than one trial, it was necessary to compare means of each response. ANOVA with repeated measurements allowed to see whether there is a difference between round two and round three in *response latencies* and *quantity of errors*, depending on the condition. Next, in order to determine the exact differences among the two groups of participants and *response latencies* in each round, as well as *quantity of errors* in each round, independent samples t-tests were conducted.

ANOVA with repeated measures concerning *response latencies* showed that there was a significant main effect for round, $F(1, 67) = 10.45$, $p = .002$, partial $\eta^2 = .13$. The interaction effect was found to be not significant, $F(1, 67) = 1.83$, $p = .181$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. The mean scores for *response latencies* in round 2 ($M = 1307.18$, $SD = 571.52$) were statistically significantly higher than *response latencies* in round 3 ($M = 1112.56$, $SD = 489.64$). Results from independent t-tests revealed that mean for *response latencies* among conditional and experimental groups did not differ significantly in round 2 ($t = 0.20$, $p = .425$) and round 3 ($t = 1.14$, $p = .440$) (table 4.7.1). Regarding experimental group only, t-test indicated that the mean for *response latencies* in round 2 ($M = 1293.13$, $SD = 458.75$) was statistically significantly higher than the mean score in round 3 ($M = 1180.63$, $SD = 594.07$), $t(33) = 1.86$, $p < .001$. When taking into account conditional group only, the test indicated that the mean score for *response latencies* in round 2 ($M = 1320.82$, $SD = 669.79$) was statistically significantly higher than the mean score in round 3 ($M = 1046.44$, $SD = 357.52$), $t(34) = 2.68$, $p < .01$ (table 4.7.2).

Table 4.7.1. t-test for the response latencies in rounds 2 and 3 Note: Equal variances assumed Grouping variable: Condition, M_1 = Conditional M_2 = Experimental

	F	p	t	df	M_1 (SD)	M_2 (SD)
Response latencies in round 2	.644	.425	0.20	67	1320.82 (669.80)	1293.13 (458.75)
Response latencies in round 3	.604	.440	1.14	67	1046.44 (357.52)	1180.63 (594.07)

Table 4.7.2. Mean differences and *SD* of differences for *response latencies* in rounds 2 and 3

	T	df	p	M (SD)
Pair 1 *Response latencies* in experimental group	1.86	33	.001	112.50 (352.06)
Pair 2 *Response latencies* in conditional group	2.68	34	.008	274.38 (605.48)

ANOVA with repeated measurements concerning *quantity of errors* showed that there was a significant main effect for round, $F(1, 67) = 20.83$, $p = .000$, partial $\eta^2 = .24$. The interaction effect was found to be not significant, $F(1, 67) = 0.27$, $p = .601$, partial $\eta^2 = .004$. The mean score for *quantity of errors* in round 2 ($M = 5.23$, $SD = 4.11$) was statistically significantly higher than mean for *quantity of errors* in round 3 ($M = 3.1$, $SD = 2.4$). Results from independent t-tests revealed that mean for *quantity of errors* among conditional and experimental groups did not differ significantly in round 2 ($t(64.76) = 0.30$, $p = .768$) and round 3 ($t(66.40) = 1.37$, $p = .177$) (table 4.7.3). Concerning experimental group only, t-test indicated that the mean for *quantity of errors* in round 2 ($M = 5.38$, $SD = 4.46$) was statistically significantly higher than the mean for *quantity of errors* in round 3 ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 2.46$), $t(33) = 2.96$, $p = .001$. With regards to conditional group only, t-test revealed that there was no statistically significant difference in the mean scores of *quantity of errors* in round 2 ($M = 5.09$, $SD = 3.81$) and round 3 ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 2.31$), $t(34) = 3.49$, $p = .233$ (table 4.7.4).

Table 4.7.3. t-test for the *quantity of errors* in rounds 2 and 3 Note: Equal variances not assumed Grouping variable: *Condition*, M_1 = Conditional M_2 = Experimental

	p	t	df	M_1 (SD)	M_2 (SD)
Quantity of errors in round 2	.768	0.30	64.76	5.09 (3.81)	5.38 (4.46)
Quantity of errors in round 3	.177	1.37	66.40	2.71 (2.31)	3.50 (2.46)

Table 4.7.4. Mean differences and *SD* of differences for *quantity of errors* in rounds 2 and 3

	t	df	p	M (SD)
Pair 1 *Quantity of errors* in experimental group	2.96	33	.001	1.88 (3.7)
Pair 2 *Quantity of errors* in conditional group	3.49	34	.233	2.37 (4.02)

5. Conclusion

The main focus of this master thesis has been on possible differences in how viewers morally evaluate televised characters, depending on content and its various influential factors. This study reveals some very interesting findings regarding the factors that influence young adults' perception of morally ambiguous behavior, and gives possibility to discuss, elaborate and expand previous knowledge about the influential role of contemporary television in initiating moral thoughts by the viewer.

In the research participants were divided into two control groups: experimental that watched the clip of the *Revenge* TV series, and conditional that was exposed to the *Wentworth* TV series. Initial analyses were consistent with predictions that participants will vary their assessment of a character and the content. In general, as predicted, it was found that participants who were exposed to the *Revenge* TV series perceived main character as more attractive than the character of the *Wentworth* series. Moreover, along with the assumption, watching *Revenge* TV series resulted in higher identification level with the character, to justifying his/her behavior more than the character in the *Wentworth* series, and to the higher acceptance of the character's behavior. However, being exposed to different content did not lead to differences in involvement, enjoyment, perceiving of successfulness and of character's attributes, as well in ratings of moral foundations.

Such outcome suggests that evaluation of morally ambiguous characters is multifaceted and complex, and depends on numerous different factors that are considered in the context of the narratives.

5.1. Predictors for *Enjoyment*

The first set of hypotheses examined the effects of different factors on the overall enjoyment of the televised content presenting morally ambiguous protagonist.

It was expected that increased identification level will lead to increased enjoyment (H1.1). Thus, as Zillmann (1991, 1994) observed, viewer develops his favorable dispositions through identification, and when identification is obtained, enjoyment is derived. Also, Igartua (2010) examined that identification with characters gives rise to enjoyment of televised content. Current study uphold this plea. Greater identification with a character results in more overall enjoyment of the video-clip.

Strongly related to identification with a character is viewer's involvement. As Vorderer et al. (1996) explain, in order to enjoy narratives, individuals have to most of all

understand the character. Even if the character's motivations are bad and the outcomes of his/hers immoral actions are harmful, the individual is able to derive enjoyment from the content when he/she understands the behavior of the protagonist. Similarly, Krakowiak and Oliver (2012) explain that one of the ways in obtaining enjoyment from watching morally ambiguous characters is through the process of involvement. Therefore it was expected that involvement will lead to increased enjoyment (H1.2). This hypothesis can be only partially confirmed, as only one of the involvement's dimensions was found to influence enjoyment. Specifically, it was revealed that if the viewer is interested in the topic of the TV series, the enjoyment level increases. In contradiction to Vorderer et al.'s (1996) suggestion, taking perspective of the character, and understanding of this character does not influence enjoyment. Instead, enjoyment is obtain due to being engaged in the topic of presentation. Therefore, to some extent this study support Busselle and Bilandzic's (2009), Green et al. (2004), Krakowiak and Oliver's (2012), and Tal-Or and Cohen's (2010) finding that involvement plays an important role in obtaining enjoyment while watching morally ambiguous characters. Yet, it also indicates that certain distinctions are needed as involvement indeed is a multidimensional construct. Furthermore, the difference between previous findings and current research could have occurred because the stimulus material in this research was a drama genre. Moreover, there were also some differences in deriving enjoyment through involvement between two different conditions. Thus, regarding involvement in a conditional group only, attention allocation domain had a negative impact on enjoyment. This domain represents the attention that the viewer draws to the content. Surprisingly, in conditional group the higher attention was obtain, the enjoyment level decreased. It may suggest that unattractiveness of a character or general esthetics of the content would affect this process. Herby, it is possible that involvement leads to increased enjoyment only under some other conditions, such as esthetics of the presented content. Drawing attention to something what is "ugly" might result in more negative emotions. Another explanation is that involvement is strongly related to the character's types (Tian & Hoffner, 2010). Authors argue that involvement is stronger with the liked and neutral characters, and likeability of a character in turn explains enjoyment. It is possible that in the conditional group, relation between involvement and enjoyment was interfered by the disliking of a character. However, this is just a prediction, thus in current study likeability was not measured.

In consistency with Krakowiak and Tsay-Vogel's (2013), Raney's (2004), and Raney and Bryant's (2002) findings, it was expected that justified violence will be strongly related

to the enjoyment of the video clip (H1.3), thus as researchers claim, because viewers' main motivation is to derive enjoyment from the content, they tend to justify character's immoral behavior. However, this study has explored that justifying of character's behavior does not lead to increased enjoyment level, but instead it decreases it (≠H1.3). The possible explanation can be that the viewer by justifying the behavior of morally ambiguous character (not purely good) feels guilty as he is aware that this behavior is immoral, and in turn enjoyment cannot be obtained. As Krakowiak and Oliver (2012) explain, morally ambiguous characters, in opposition to heroes or villains, present good and bad qualities simultaneously. It might be the case that because morally ambiguous characters behave immorally constantly, and their motivations are not always good and not always altruistic (as in the case of protagonists in the *Revenge* and the *Wentworth*), viewer is aware of it and feels uncomfortable about protagonists' actions. An alternative explanation is that although due to other influential factors (e.g., identification) viewers were able to justify the behavior of the character, they did not like this character due to short time of exposure. According to Krakowiak and Tsay (2011), when justifying immoral actions, character liking has to emerge before enjoyment can be obtained. In their study, justifying of immoral behavior of the character led to greater liking of this character, and this in turn increased level of enjoyment. It is possible therefore that viewers in present experiment although justified the behavior of protagonist, they did not like this character. Therefore, disliking of a character could interfere in the relation between justified violence and enjoyment. Study conducted by Shafer and Raney (2012) indicated that enjoyment process for antihero narratives is different from other narratives. Researchers suggested that multiple factors might influence the enjoyment of antihero narratives, but their study did not explore which factors it might be.

Additionally, previous research has shown that characters being perceived as attractive might increase enjoyment level (Janicke, 2013), and according to affective disposition theory greater enjoyment can also be obtained from watching successful character (Zillmann, 2000). Therefore it was expected that viewers will derive enjoyment from watching attractive (H1.4) and successful character (H1.5). However, the outcomes of this research did not validate expectations about attractiveness (≠H1.4). Regarding perceived success, hypothesis can be only partially confirmed. Thus, it was found that success leads to increased enjoyment's level, but only in experimental group. Therefore it has to be emphasized that success has an impact on enjoyment, but only under some other conditions, such as context. It is possible that in a conditional group success did not lead to increased enjoyment because the protagonist is a prisoner. Prisoner is stereotypically associated with a

failure. Watching a character who is on one hand successful, but on the other hand unsuccessful might lead to confusion or negative/sad emotions. Moreover, it is possible that in experimental group identification enhanced relation between success and enjoyment. As Bandura (2004) explains, when the character represents similar values as the viewer and this character overcomes his/her problems, viewer becomes more optimistic about his/her own problems. Such process is named upward social comparison and can explain increased enjoyment in experimental group. Another, but similar explanation is that participants in experimental group evaluated character as much more attractive. It is possible that perceived attractiveness although did not have a direct impact on greater enjoyment, could enhance the processes between perceived successfulness and enjoyment.

5.2.   Predictors for *Identification*

The second set of hypotheses determined the impact of different factors on the identification with morally ambiguous protagonist.

Along with the argument proposed by Cohen (2001) that greater identification with a character leads to a greater impact on viewer's attitudes acquired from the character through the process of involvement, it was expected that greater involvement will lead to higher levels of identification (H2.1). This hypothesis is partially confirmed as in general the greater identification can be predicted only by two dimensions of involvement, which are higher cognitive involvement and domain specific interest. Higher cognitive involvement refers to the intensive thinking about the meaning of presented content. The more viewers thought about meanings of the situations in the clip, the more they identified with a character. And the more viewers were interested in the topic of the content, the more they identified with the character. Therefore it can be concluded that involvement does lead to increased identification, but only due to a cognitive involvement, and due to viewer's interest in the subject of the content. Moreover, differences between groups were found. Regarding experimental group, domain specific interest was the only dimension of involvement with positive impact on identification. On contrary, in conditional group higher cognitive involvement was the only involvement's dimension with positive impact on identification. One possible explanation for this group differences is that perceived similarity differed between the viewers of the two groups. As Konijn and Hoorn (2005) explained, regarding fictional character, perceived similarity is one of the most important factors contributing to involvement. Accordingly, alternative explanation is that the overall process

of evaluation of two characters differed. It is possible that in conditional group identification with a character who is a prisoner required from a viewer a higher cognition, and more profound understanding of this character, than the one from experimental group. It is also possible that in experimental group, success indirectly supported the relation between involvement and identification (through domain specific interest), and in conditional group it did not. Moreover, according to Konijn and Hoorn (2005), involvement is directly linked to the positive attributes of the character (Konijn and Hoorn, 2005). Because in the conditional group the character was perceived as less attractive, it can be explained that even though the viewer understood the character and therefore to some extent involvement was obtained, perception of attractiveness could interfere between other involvement's dimensions and identification.

Previous study (Hoffner, 1996; Hoffner & Buchanan, 2005) has also explored that people wish to be like attractive characters. In line with this statement it was predicted that attractiveness will have a positive impact on identification with the character (H2.2). However, findings in this study contradict with previous literature on the subject. The reason for that can be that Hoffner (1996) and Hoffner and Buchanan (2005) focused on the wishful identification of the character. In this research identification was conceptualized based on Cohen's (2001) description, by means of sharing the perspective of the character and sharing emotions with him while watching. Another explanation is based on Konijn and Horn's (2005) finding that bad characters evoke more involvement when they are perceived as ugly. As involvement and identification were found to be strongly connected, it can be insinuated that in the case of the morally ambiguous characters correlation of attractiveness and identification is different than in case of purely good (Hoffner, 1996), and purely bad (Konij and Horn, 2005) characters, and evokes more differentiations.

Another expectation in this study was that perceiving character as successful will positively affect the identification with him (H2.3). Thus, as Bandura (1986), and Hoffner and Cantor (1991) explored, people want to be like the successful characters. However, the outcome of present study does not support this statement. In general, success was found not to have any impact on the identification with a character. The explanation for it can be that protagonists in both of the groups were in a difficult position as both had grown up without a family. Although the character in experimental group achieved material success, her emotional success would be much more difficult to define. Moreover, success of character in this study was also determined by fulfilling the revenge successfully. Thus the main goal of both characters was a revenge on other people. Additionally, in conditional group the main

character is a prisoner. Therefore, taking into account that protagonists in this research were morally ambiguous and their goals were not purely good, obtaining success by character could not only be difficult to define, but also could be perceived as something negative.

5.3. Predictors for *Justified violence*

The third set of hypotheses examined the impact of different factors on the perception of justified violence.

Previous research has shown that one of the main reasons for justifying morally ambiguous characters and their actions is identification with a character (Janicke & Raney, 2011). As Bandura (2001) described, it happens through psychological matching processes, by which individual alter his/her thoughts and attitudes in order to match behaviors and attitudes of other persons. That being the case, it was predicted that greater identification will have a positive impact on justifying the behavior of a character (H3.1). As expected, the findings revealed that viewers who identified with protagonist were more likely to justify his behavior. However, obtaining justified violence differed significantly between groups. Thus, when taking into account only conditional group, identification with the protagonist did not have a significant impact on justified violence. The explanation for it can be that, as the t-test indicated, watching *Revenge* TV series resulted in higher identification levels with the character as well as greater justification of his behavior than of the character in the *Wentworth* series. Additionally, because protagonist in conditional group is a prisoner, the process of identification could be obstructed. Thus, as Hoffner and Cantor (1991) explain, one of the main components of identification is perceived similarity, and perceived similarity is essential when evoking positive attitudes towards a character. Tsay and Krakowiak (2011) also reflect on similarity as a crucial factor that automatically influence perception of justified violence. Therefore, in the conditional group although identification was obtained in general, it is possible that perceived similarity was the absent component of this identification. Given the fact that protagonist was a prisoner such explanation seems conceivable. Moreover, Konijn and Hoorn (2005) also reflect on the similarity of situations, which might bring viewers closer to a character. It can be therefore suggested that comparing oneself to a prisoner is more difficult, as prison directly evokes pejorative thoughts. What is more, justifying the behavior of someone who was judged by a court might be more complex.

Another assumption was that involvement with the character will positively contribute to justifying his behavior by a viewer (H3.2). Thus, it has been already explored that high

levels of involvement can switch the opinion about immoral behaviors and can lead to less critical thinking (Green & Brock, 2000). However, results in this paper support previous findings only partially, as in general there was no relation between involvement and justified violence. The possible explanation for this finding can be that in the case of serial narratives involvement is formed through a long period of time and because of it, judgments about characters form and alter throughout the weeks (Tamborini et al., 2010). Given the fact that in the present experiment participants were exposed to only a few minutes of the series and that not all information was provided, motivations and character's behavior could be misunderstood. As it was mentioned earlier, understanding of a character's behavior is an important component of involvement (Vorderer et al., 1996). Yet in experimental group it was found that attention allocation was the only involvement's dimension with positive impact on justified violence. It means that the more the viewer drew the attention to the clip, the more he/she justified the behavior of the character. It is possible that in an experimental group, certain details in content or context could decide for justifying the character's behavior. In conditional group participants were exposed to different content and context, therefore these details that played an important role in experimental group, were absent.

Next assumptions were that perceived attractiveness and success of protagonist will be positively correlated with justifying his behavior (H3.3; H3.4). In the previous research it was discussed that with regards to antihero narratives, viewers form their attitudes toward character based on the positive components of this character through moral disengagement cues (Newby-Clark, 2004). The cues are identified as moderators that help to hinder negative components, and enhance positive components of a character. Therefore, it was expected that positive traits of a character, attractiveness and success, will lead to increased favorability of the character, and thus will have an impact on justification of his behavior. However, the outcome of this study determined that neither perceived attractiveness nor success of a character does not affect justified violence. The explanation for it can be that moral disengagement can be obtained not only through character itself, but also through the action or the outcomes of this action (Bandura, 2002). As Bandura explains, the importance of these aspects vary depending on the context. It is possible therefore, that in the stimulus material, action and motivation had greater significance on ratings towards justified violence than the character itself.

5.4. *Moral judgment*

Below findings relate directly to the viewer's moral judgment of a character. This last set of hypothesis relates to *moral foundations, character's attributes and character's behavior variables* representing *moral judgment.*

5.4.1. *Moral disengagement* as predictor

Previous research demonstrated that the value preferences of the observer (Bandura, 2001) and propensity for moral disengagement (Bandura, 2012, Bandura et al., 1996) are crucial factors that influence moral judgment of the viewer. As Bandura et al. (1996) explain, individuals with greater tendency to morally disengage are more willing for moral justification of certain actions. It has been also found that individuals' tendency to morally disengage predict their acceptance of the character's immoral behavior (Bandura, 2001; Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2013). In line with those findings, the expectations were that the tendency to morally disengage will influence the attitudes toward morally ambiguous character and his behavior (H4.1).

Regarding moral foundations it was found that tendencies to morally disengage predict changes in moral foundations (H4.1a). The more the viewer is prone to morally disengage, the more he/she reports that his/her moral foundations were not violated by the character's behavior.

Furthermore, the outcome indicated that tendency to morally disengage does influence perception of character's attributes, but only in experimental group (H4.1b partially confirmed). The possible explanation for differences between conditions is that in conditional group the main character was a prisoner, and for this reason viewer followed the narrative schema for a villain, and not morally ambiguous character. Therefore, although he/she was prone to morally disengage, he/she evaluated the character's attributes as negative. Another possible explanation is that the viewers in the experimental group experienced higher levels of identification and justified the behavior of a character more than in a conditional group. Moreover character in experimental group was perceived as more attractive. Therefore, it is suggested that in experimental group tendency for moral disengagement influenced judgment of the character's attributes also due to other influential factors that occurred to have a stronger persuasive value, namely identification, attractiveness, and justified violence. As viewers in experimental group justified the character's behavior more, experienced higher identification, and perceived attractiveness,

80

they were also able to shift their attitudes toward character's attributes based on their own personal values. Thus, as Krakowiak and Tsay (2011) found, "individuals who are prone to morally disengage in their everyday lives are also more likely to excuse the immoral actions of a morally ambiguous protagonist" (p. 16). Alternative explanation for this finding is that in the experimental group the video could be perceived as less realistic, therefore viewers did not consider the realness of the consequences of character's actions. These suggestion was also proposed in Krakowiak & Tsay (2011) study. It can also be a case that perceived harmful outcome was stronger in the conditional group, as characters in this stimulus material were in a vulnerable position. That was not the case in experimental group, as in the stimulus material characters who were harmed by protagonist live in propensity (in contrast to prisoners). It is therefore suggested that in addition to characteristics of the wrong-doer, characteristics of harmed characters should be also taken into account (as it was proposed by Bandura, 1991). Another possible explanation is that items did not measure every eventual moral justification that could be further employed while watching. Furthermore, viewer's moral standards which are not necessarily based on tendency to morally disengage could interfere this process (Raney & Bryant, 2002).

However, results also demonstrated that tendency to morally disengage does not influence the judgment of the character's behavior in both of the groups (≠H4.1c). It is possible that when the character's immoral actions are in accordance with viewer's own beliefs, he/she identifies with this character or perceives this character as similar, and therefore evaluation of the character's personality is more positive. Thus because viewers perceive themselves as good people, they evaluate characters also positively. It is not a case regarding immoral actions itself, as viewer might be aware that these actions are not moral (yet these actions do not determine if someone is good or bad). It is possible that outcomes of these actions contributed to more negative evaluations of character's behavior (in both of the groups), and that motivation of these actions contributed to more positive evaluations of the character's attributes (in experimental group). Thus, viewers' judgments might vary, depending on which factor one consider (subconsciously or consciously) as relevant (Bandura, 1991). Moreover, as Bandura argues, there are multiple circumstances that influence judgment of actions, and they depend on reasoning from a number of different moral standards. It has to be therefore emphasized that there are multiple personal moral standards of the viewer that were not considered in this research, but they could affect the results.

5.4.2. *Identification* as predictor

It was previously explored that being exposed to perspectives of a character and identifying with him/her can result in attitude change (Cohen, 2001). Author also suggests that greater identification can lead to increased enjoyment, and therefore possibly greater effect on attitude change. Moreover, Tsay and Krakowiak (2011) found that identification with characters results in weaker moral standards used for the judgment. In consistency with those findings it was expected that greater identification will influence moral judgment of the character (H4.2).

Concerning moral foundations present study explored that identification with the character did not lead to changes in moral foundations of a viewer in both conditions (≠H4.2a). Possible explanation for this finding is that the exposure to stimulus material was too short, and therefore the viewer did not feel that the character violated or upheld his/her own moral standards. It is also possible that viewers have a boundary for rating the goodness of characters who behave immoral (Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2013), and they perhaps will not exceed this boundary regardless of the acceptance of these immoral actions or character's attributes.

Regarding character's attributes, it was found that identification with a character does impact the evaluation of character's attributes, but only under some other conditions (H4.2b partially confirmed). Similarly, results also demonstrated that identification does influence the judgment of character's behavior, but differences among groups were revealed (H4.2c partially confirmed). Thus, such correlation was found only in experimental group.

Possible explanation is that identification with characters can have a persuasive effect only when assuming that those viewers who identify with characters are unable to produce criticisms and counterarguments (Igartua, 2010). It was observed that low counterarguments with identified character lead to higher persuasion effect, and high level of counterarguments with identified character has a lower persuasive effect. Therefore, it is possible that in the conditional group the story was more complex and evoked more counterarguments and criticism than the story in the experimental group. Thus, it can be more difficult for the viewer to identify with a character who is a prisoner. Another possible explanation is that identification with a morally ambiguous character might be enhanced by the viewer's parasocial interactions with this character (Tian & Hoffner, 2010). Accordingly, it is also possible that other factors which enhance identification may account for this relationship. Similar explanation is that in the experimental group the identification level was higher than

in the conditional group, and accordingly viewers felt more empathy for the character. Tsay and Krakowiak (2011) explored that empathy is essential in evoking strong emotional responses and therefore inducing greater impact. Hence, possibly, identification as a whole should be rather divided into several different dimensions measured separately (like in the case of involvement). It might be the case that these several separate dimensions, such as perceived similarity and empathy, could be more accurate measures instead of identification. One more possible explanation is the negativity effect, which propose that when creating impressions of media characters, viewers attach more weight to the negative attributes of the characters which leads to lower identification than it would be with liked or neutral characters (Janicke, 2013). Possible is that in experimental group viewers liked character better.

Furthermore, these results maintain the idea that moral evaluations of characters are multidimensional (Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2013), therefore character's morality and perception of the character's behavior morality are interpreted by viewer independently. What is more, one morally ambiguous character might be perceived to have positive as well as negative values, while other morally ambiguous character can have high positive ratings and low negative ratings (Krakowiak & Oliver, 2012). In both of the groups different patterns of behaviors were presented, therefore moral judgments were assessed differently.

5.4.3. *Involvement* as predictor

According to previous investigations, involvement is strongly related to the character's attributes, thus when the involvement is lower, the character attributes are perceived more negatively (Konijn and Hoorn, 2005). It was demonstrated that involvement serves as a persuasive principle because of its possibility to hinder critical capacity (Igartua, 2010). Moreover, it was discovered that involvement increases emotional responses which results in higher persuasion effect (Felt, 2011). In line with these findings it was expected that involvement with the character will positively affect moral judgment of this character (H4.3). However, the outcome of this study only partially confirmed what was previously established in the literature.

Regarding moral foundations, it was predicted that involvement with the character will result in upholding of a moral foundations by the viewer (H4.3a). This expectation is supported by results of this study, but only partially. Thus, only one dimension of involvement (suspension of disbelief) had an impact on the moral foundations of the viewer,

and only in the experimental group. This dimension refers to the degree of objective evaluation of the situation presented in the clip (e.g., possible errors). It is possible that in conditional group the scenes were perceived as more real, and therefore suspension of disbelief did not have an impact on the moral foundations. Because in the experimental group, presented situation seemed to be less real, the viewer did not feel that the character violated his/her moral standards. This line of reasoning supports Konijn and Hoorn's (2005) findings that perceived realism influences how harmful actions are evaluated.

Concerning character's attributes, it was expected that involvement with the character will lead to more positive assessments of the character's morality (H4.3b). This expectation was not confirmed by the outcome of this paper and in both of the groups involvement with the characters did not result in a more positive evaluation of the character's values. The possible explanation for it can be that like in the case of justified violence, viewers did not understood the character and his motivations due to the short exposure to the stimulus material (Tamborini et al., 2010). Moreover, as Tamborni et al. explain, viewers need to create a relation with the character in order to be transported. Because relation with the character could not be formed during the short exposure, character's attributes were not evaluated more positively. Therefore, the evaluation of character's attributes was not influenced by the involvement level.

In connection with character's behavior it was anticipated that involvement with the character would positively affect the perception of the character's behavior (H4.3c). However, findings in this study only partially confirm this expectation. Thus, only one dimension of involvement (suspension of disbelief) had a positive impact on the perception of the character's behavior, and only in the experimental group. One possible explanation is that there are not only few types of involvement facilitated by various features, but also different forms of resistance might prevent viewer from being affected (Moyer-Guse, 2008). Moreover, scholar suggests that there is a possibility that viewers may become involved with the character who does not match his/hers existing attitudes, and even if involvement is achieved, the process of resistance interrupts in the change of these attitudes. It is therefore possible that due to other factors (such as attractiveness and justified violence), the process of resistance was weaker in the experimental group, and stronger in the conditional group.

Furthermore, the overall low relationship between involvement and moral judgment can be explained by the concept of "the antithesis of persuasion" (Knowles & Linn, 2004, p. 3). It is described as a resistance in a reaction against perceived pressure for change. Additionally psychological reactance theory suggests that individuals have a need for

84

freedom and to choose their own attitudes (Brehm & Brehm, 1981). In the light of above, some messages fail in producing changes in attitudes or behaviors. In his study on involvement in entertainment content, Moyer-Guse (2008) suggested that entertainment messages are using a gentle form of persuasion which can lead to this kind of resistance. Another possible explanation is the theory that in the case of a serial drama, greater show exposure is needed in order to form less critical attitudes towards characters (Tamborini et al., 2010). This can be the case especially when regarding morally ambiguous characters, who over time are judged as moral (Tamborini et al., 2010). There is also one more congruent explanation that during 'watching' there are two levels of involvement that influence reception (Vorderer et al., 1996, Vorderer at al., 2004). It is possible that viewers, during short exposure were entangled only in the first level of involvement which affected the results of this study.

5.4.4. *Justified violence* as predictor

In previous research it has been established that schemas for a hero and antihero differ. Regarding an antihero, viewers cannot simply rely on the schema to form their attitudes towards the character (Raney, 2003, 2004). As Janicke (2013) discovered, in the case of an antihero narrative, viewers first create a moral justification based on the narrative, and based on this justification they are then able to create a moral judgment and acceptance of the character. Also Tsay and Krakowiak (2011) examined that in order to perceive immoral action as right, viewers have to justify such action. In line with these findings it was expected that the more viewer will justify the character's immoral behavior, the more positively the overall moral judgment of this character will be evaluated (H4.4).

With regards to moral foundations, it was predicted that higher rates for justified violence will result in upholding the moral foundations of the viewer (H4.4a). As expected, outputs of this study revealed that justified violence was positively correlated with moral foundations of the viewer. The more viewers of both groups justified the protagonist's behavior, the more they were able to uphold their moral foundations. Concerning character's attributes, it was expected that the more the viewer will justify the character's behavior, the more positive will be evaluation in regards to this character's attributes (H4.4b). In line with expectations and previous research it was found that justification of a character's actions leads to more positive perception of character's morality.

With reference to a character's behavior it was expected that the more the viewer will justify a character's actions, the more he/she will accept his immoral behavior (H4.4c). In

consistency with previous findings, results of this research support this expectation. In both of the groups, justified violence was a strong predictor for the viewer acceptance of a character's behavior.

5.4.5. *Enjoyment* as predictor

In the literature it was discussed that while watching drama programs, emotional reactions toward character are essential for the enjoyment. According to Zillmann (2000) viewers play a role of moral monitors who make judgments about character's behavior while watching. Enjoyment was proved to be a significant factor while creating dispositions towards character, and his/her judgment. As Raney (2003) explains, when a character is liked, and therefore enjoyment is obtained, the viewer is willing to accept the character's negative actions. It was therefore expected that when enjoyment is greater, the viewer will make more positive moral judgments of the character (H4.5).

Concerning moral foundations, it was expected that the higher enjoyment obtained, the more moral foundations will be upheld by the viewer (H4.5a). Regarding the character's attributes it was expected that the greater the enjoyment, the more positive will be the evaluation of the character's morality (H4.5b). With regards to the character's behavior it was expected that the greater enjoyment obtained, the more the viewer will accept the behavior of a character (H4.5c). In opposition to the previous literature and predictions, greater enjoyment level did not lead to more positive moral judgments of a character.

One possible explanation is that regarding televised drama, enjoyment should not be perceived as a hedonic pleasure, but rather as an emotional reaction (Igartua, 2010). It is conceivable that instead of hedonic pleasure, the extent to which content evoked an emotional reaction predicts changes in judgments. Another possible explanation can be that in the crime drama justice sequences can vary by the means, motivations, and immoral acts committed, therefore various sequences are evaluated differently (Raney & Bryant, 2002). As authors explain, it is possible that one sequence is evaluated as more enjoyable than another due to justification of immoral acts. Thus, some acts might seem more justifiable than others. Therefore, the enjoyment of a drama presenting immoral acts performed by protagonist is complex and depends on various sequences and the character's evaluations in each of these sequences (Raney & Bryant, 2002).

Alternative, but similar explanation is the existence of so-called "cognitive component" in the entertainment process (Raney & Bryant, 2002). It means that the judgment of character and judgment of the justice might be influenced or by affective

processing or by cognitive processing. It is possible that in the case of morally ambiguous characters cognitive processing is stronger. One more possible explanation is the self-determination theory (Tamborni et al., 2010). Meaning, that enjoyment should be conceptualized as the satisfaction derived from autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Another distinction was proposed by Oliver (2010) who recognizes hedonic pleasure and feelings of personal expressiveness as two separate processes. In general, difficulties with conceptualizing media enjoyment pose an impression that enjoyment of morally ambiguous presentations can be even more complex.

5.4.6. *Attractiveness* as predictor

Previous studies indicated that physically attractive individuals are accredited with positive values (Dion et al., 1972), and that they are judged as "better" than less attractive characters (Hoffner & Cantor, 1985; Sparks & Cantor, 1986). It was therefore expected that perceived attractiveness of a character will lead to a more positive moral judgment of this character (H4.6).

Regarding moral foundations it was expected that when the viewer perceives a character as physically attractive, his/hers moral foundations will remain upheld (H4.6a). The outcome indicated that upholding moral foundations depends on perceived attractiveness of a character, but only under some other conditions, thus only in the experimental group moral foundations were uphold due to perceived attractiveness (H4.6a partially confirmed). The reasoning for this could be the fluctuations in the estimation of character's different traits, thus viewers might perceived some of the domains positively, and other negatively. Hence, Newby-Clark (2004) explains that regarding antiheroes, viewers form their attitude based on positive components of a character due to moral disengagement cues. Such cues help to hinder negative components and enhance positive values. Therefore it might be the case that in the experimental group these disengagement cues were evaluated differently. It can be also explained that different dimensions are significant when judging different characters, which is in line with Alexander's (1980) proposal (Hoffner & Cantor, 1991). Scholars explain that it was explored that when using different sample of characters, physical attractiveness influenced evaluations of this characters in some roles more than in others.

Relating to a character's attributes it was predicted that those viewers who will perceive character as more physically attractive, will evaluate character's nonmaterial attributes more positively (H4.6b). In accordance with expectations, this study revealed that

viewers form their perceptions of a character's moral attributes based on perceived attractiveness. In general, perceived physical attractiveness leads to more positive evaluations of a character. This study therefore confirms previous finding that physical attractiveness predicts positive evaluation of character's personality (Bazzini et al., 2010; Eagly et al., 1991).

In regards to a character's behavior it was expected that the perception of a character's attractiveness will increase acceptance of the character's immoral actions. However, the outcome does not confirm the predictions. In both of the groups perceived attractiveness had no impact on the judgment of immoral actions of a character. It can be explained by Eagly et al.'s (1991) finding that attractiveness has an impact on perceiving social and intellectual competence, but no impact on believes towards purity of this person. As it was previously discussed, morally ambiguous characters have good and bad qualities, and the viewer is aware of this (Janicke, 2013; Krakowiak & Oliver, 2012). It can be therefore concluded that although based on a character's attractiveness viewers evaluate positive judgments of this character's personality (as a good), they are not willing to change their attitudes towards his behavior based on perceived attractiveness. Evaluation of the character's attributes operates therefore differently than evaluation of the character's behavior. Furthermore, evaluations of the character's behavior may be more rigid than that of a character's attributes (Krakowiak & Tsay-Vogel, 2013). In general, the suggestion that moral judgment is a multidimensional construct is supported once more.

5.4.7. *Success* as predictor

Previous studies indicated that people want to be like successful character even if this character behaves immorally (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1963). Moreover, it has been shown that individuals are more willing to adopt the behavior of successful characters (Bandura, 1977, Zillmann & Cantor 1977). Therefore, it was expected that perceived successfulness of the character will lead to more positive moral judgment of this character (H4.7).

Regarding moral foundations, it was predicted that when viewers perceive a character as successful, their moral foundations will remain upheld (H4.7a). In line with the previous research, this study explored that this hypothesis can be to some extent confirmed. Thus, differences among groups were found. In the experimental group viewers who perceived a character as successful were more likely to uphold their moral foundations. Yet in the conditional group that was not a case. The explanation for it can be that watching a prisoner can be automatically perceived as watching unsuccessful person, and even if this character is

perceived as successful, prisoners are stereotyped to violate moral standards. Additionally as Hoffner and Cantor (1991) explain, manner of dress communicate information about social status of a person. Thus, wearing prisoner's outfit directly gives a message about unsuccessfulness of this character and about violating moral standards by this character. The manner of dressing can be automatically associated with a villain schema, as it was examined that viewers define villains as dirty and scruffy looking (Hoffner & Cantor, 1991). It is also possible that attractiveness of a character in the experimental group also contributed to perceived successfulness, as beautiful people are automatically accredited with positive values (Dion et al., 1972). According to scholars, people assign more successful life outcomes to the physically attractive individuals.

Concerning character's attributes it was expected that when viewers perceive character as successful, they will evaluate this character's attributes more positively (H4.7b). Interestingly, the results of this thesis indicates that on the contrary with perceiving attractiveness, being successful does not lead to more positive assessments of character's moral attributes.

In connection with a character's behavior it was expected that when the viewer will perceive character as successful, they will be more likely to accept his behavior (H4.7c). However, the outcome does not support this prediction. In both of the groups perceived successfulness of a character did not result in acceptance of his behavior.

The possible explanation for the outcome of perceived successfulness's role in a character's attributes evaluation, and character's behavior judgment is that success in this research was defined not only in the terms of welfare, but also in succeeding in achieving a character's goals. On contrary to typical heroes, goals of morally ambiguous characters are bad or not purely good, and therefore being successful cannot be associated with positive personality traits of the character and with acceptance of immoral behavior.

5.5.   Implicit attitudes towards self-justice

In the study it was expected that viewers subconsciously change their attitude towards morally ambiguous behavior due to various influential factors, and these factors also facilitate judgments about moral and immoral actions. Firstly, it was predicted that viewers of both groups will be affected by stimulus material, and therefore response latencies will be faster in round 2 than in round 3, and the quantity of errors will be higher in round 2 than in round 3. Secondly, it was expected that viewers in the experimental group will obtain higher scores for response latencies and quantity of errors than viewers in the conditional group.

The results of this study indicated that both of the groups did not differ in response latencies, as well as the quantity of errors, therefore it can be concluded that both stimulus materials had the same impact on the perception of morality by viewers.

As expected, quantity of errors in round 2 was higher than quantity of errors in round 3, which means that perception of moral and immoral actions was influenced by the stimulus materials. Thus, participants were confused weather certain actions should be perceived as crime, wrong action or good action. The possible explanation as to why the numbers of errors did not differ among groups is that other influential factors can be more important than attractiveness or successfulness of a character. Janicke (2013) examined how participants rated a hero and an antihero actions, and she did not find differences among perceptions of both when the context was introduced. Therefore scholar suggest that making moral judgments depends on the context. Accordingly, it can be thus explained that it was the context of the story (or various influential factors) that influenced the perception of morality in general. This is in line with Bleumke and Fiedler (2009) suggestion that "performance on the IAT depends on the stimulus context" (p. 7).

Nonetheless, regarding response latencies, viewers of both groups needed more time for evaluations in round 2 than in round 3, which in contrast with the quantity of errors would indicate that there was no change in perception of morality after being exposed to stimulus material. When compared to previous studies which were based on the speed responses of participants, similar findings were discovered (Janicke, 2013). Although there were differences in obtaining acceptability of certain actions among heroes and antiheroes, response speeds between heroes and antiheroes did not differ. As the author explains, it could be that clearly moral and immoral actions should be examined, and not morally complex ones. Regarding present studies, there were three different types of actions: crime, positive action and negative action. Perhaps, while incorporating only positive and only negative actions in the test, different speed reactions could be obtained. Moreover, in the previous research it was examined that judgments can vary in moral valence as well as in automaticity (Greene et al., 2004). Another possible explanation is that the human mind is flexible and uses specific cues in order to strategically facilitate the speed tasks (Bleumke & Fiese, 2008). For instance, the viewer can use his/her cultural knowledge while answering, and therefore he/she knows which answers are expected to be proper. Alternative explanation is that morally ambiguous characters might require rational thinking and therefore longer processing time in general (Eden et al., 2014). However, there is also an evidence that viewers exposed to the *Revenge* series were influenced more than those

watching the *Wentworth* series, thus in conditional group quantity of errors was lower and did not differ significantly between round 2 and 3, as it was in the case of experimental group.

Having discussed the most important findings, in the next section limitations of the present study are indicated. In the following chapter conclusions from this study are drawn along with suggestions for future research that derive from the limitations of this research.

5.6. Limitations of the study

Understanding of morally ambiguous characters is complex and this study prompts as many answers as questions. Therefore, these study was revealed to have some limitations. First and foremost, in the conditional group viewers were exposed to the protagonist who is a prisoner. Therefore, although the characters of both stimulus materials carry many similarities, there is a serious concern that seeing a prisoner would evoke a stereotyped schema. It is not clear whether responses were more influenced by perceived unattractiveness of this character or by the fact that she is a prisoner.

Furthermore, there are some further factors which were not considered in this research, but there is a possibility that they would affect the results. Namely perceived similarity, motivations, and outcome of immoral actions. Moreover, in this study enjoyment was measured only as a hedonic pleasure. It is possible that enjoyment would be rated differently when using measures of overall emotional response to the content. It is suggested, therefore, that identification and enjoyment are multidimensional constructs and, like in the case of involvement, each of them should be divided into fewer sections and evaluated differently.

Additionally, control for intuitive or deliberate thinking was not employed in this study, and according to Bartels (2008) these can significantly influence the viewer's responses. It is possible that rating for response latencies was influenced by viewers with high deliberate thinking style who respond faster regardless of their perception of morality.

Another limitation relates to the sample that was used in this study. Nowadays, there are some voices that undergraduates do not represent average population, as they are thought to be "weird" (Eden et al., 2014). It should be also emphasized that two sampling methods were employed and because of it, sample is random only to some extent. Moreover, experiments were performed in a few different places, therefore is it possible that responses were affected by these different surroundings. Additionally, exposure to the stimulus material is considered to be too short, and therefore longitudinal studies would be useful, as viewers in real life are exposed to morally ambiguous characters in TV series over time.

One more significant limitation of this study is that research about morality in television should not be limited to studying the characters and the content, but it is also important to consider various contexts of the message. In the light of above, in the future, scholars should investigate more thoroughly how responses to characters might be correlated or contradicted when taking into account numerous different contexts, and how these different contexts influence viewers' attitudes towards morally ambiguous behaviors.

6. Summary

In general, findings from the present research enhance the understanding of the factors that influence viewer's attitudes towards morally ambiguous characters. In particular, it contributes to the existing literature by indicating the role of numerous different factors, including both characteristics of the viewer, as well as characteristics of the character. Motivated by the social cognitive theory, affective disposition theory and theory of moral disengagement, this thesis sheds light on the processes influencing moral judgment, namely: tendency to morally disengage, identification, involvement, enjoyment, perceived justified violence, perceived attractiveness, and perceived success. Additionally, it was also demonstrated how these factors might influence the viewer's attitudes indirectly, serving as moderators. Another contribution is that attitude towards morality was measured by three different measurements, which measured how characters and their behavior upheld or violated moral standards of the viewer, how he/she perceived morality of the character, and how he/she perceived morality of character's behavior. One of the most interesting findings is that the attitude of the viewer towards morality of a character can be different than his/her attitude towards morality of his/her behavior. Furthermore, along with explicit measurements, this research incorporated the implicit measurement towards self-justice, which indicated whether morally ambiguous narratives can influence overall perceptions of morality (not towards character and his/her behavior). Combination of implicit forms of assessment and traditional explicit measures of the viewer's perception of the characters give an insight into how the content of a television series is processed. Given the fact that it is the first study that employs so many different variables at once, it also gives an initial idea on the importance of different factors when they are compared together.

Regarding enjoyment, the results of this study support the previous findings that greater enjoyment of morally ambiguous narratives can be obtained through identification. It is also indicated that involvement to some extent contributes to the enjoyment, however it is proposed that involvement is a multidimensional construct, and importance of its different dimensions vary depending on some conditions. Thus, only domain specific interest was found to have an impact on increased enjoyment, and differences between two groups of participants occurred. Unexpectedly, it was also determined that justified violence does not contribute to the enjoyment level. Future research should therefore examine what factors interfere the relation between justified violence and enjoyment. Moreover, in the future persuasive role of enjoyment should be examined in terms of emotional response to the

content, and not hedonic pleasure. Possibly, it should be also compared how both of this approaches are evaluated. Moreover, in contradiction with previous literature it was found that attractiveness does not have a significant impact on enjoyment. Interestingly, it was observed however that perceived successfulness of a character has an impact on the enjoyment levels, but only under some further conditions. It is suggested that different context influence success differently, but further research is needed to confirm this suggestion. Furthermore, it was observed that enjoyment levels do not influence the moral judgment, which contradicts with previous research. It is important to consider that enjoyment is a multidimensional construct, and in this study enjoyment was measured based on three items only. Perhaps future research would integrate more structured measurements.

Regarding identification, the outcome of this study partially confirms the previous findings that greater involvement leads to greater identification with a character. However, under different conditions, different involvement dimensions were revealed to have a persuasive effect on identification. Additionally, some of the involvement dimensions did not consolidate this relation. Moreover, the present study is in opposition with previous findings that perceived attractiveness and success have an impact on identification with a character. Moreover, results indicate that identification with a character does not influence moral foundations of the viewer. However, moral judgment was found to be, to some extent, influenced by identification. Thus greater identification can result in the acceptance of a character's behavior, as well as in more positive evaluation of the character's attributes, but only under some other conditions, which could not be clearly defined in this paper. Therefore, future research would focus on the processes or contexts that interfere with relations between identification and moral judgment. Moreover, in the future identification should be examined by means of several different dimensions, such as similarity and empathy.

Regarding justified violence, outcome of this study is in line with previous findings that those viewers who identify with a character tend to justify his/her behavior more. However, it was further explored that it might also depend on the context, and that not always the greater identification results in excusing the character's behavior. What is more, present research determined that only one involvement's dimension (attention allocation) leads to greater justification of a character's behavior, and only under some additional conditions. Additionally, the findings of this study violated previous investigations, and indicated that neither perceived attractiveness nor success of a character does not affect justified violence. It is proposed that motivations and outcomes of immoral actions were of

greater importance while justifying character's behavior, but future research should verify this suggestion.

Following, it was also found that amongst all of the predictors, justified violence has the greatest impact on the overall moral judgment. Thus, all of moral judgment models were found to be influenced. In consistency with previous findings it was found that the more the viewer justifies the behavior of a character, the less he/she violates his/her moral foundations. Moreover, the more he/she justifies a character's behavior the more positively he/she evaluates a character's attributes, as well as the character's behavior.

 Regarding involvement, the outcome of this study confirms previous research only partially. Thus, only one of the involvement's dimensions was found to have impact on the moral foundations and acceptance of character's behavior. Specifically, if the viewer is critically evaluating the content, he/she is more willing to accept a character's behavior as well as to report that the character did not violate his/her moral foundations. Future research might determine which of the involvement's dimensions influence moral judgment over a long period of time, and possibly compare if there are differences in the persuasive ability of involvement after exposure to one episode, and after exposure to several episodes of a TV Series.

Regarding perceived attractiveness, the findings revealed that upholding or violating moral foundations of the viewer does depend on attractiveness of a character, but only under some other conditions. Future investigations might determine which exact conditions should be taken into account, by incorporating numerous different characters in the experiment. Furthermore, in line with previous research it was found that perceived attractiveness leads to more positive perception of a character. However, greater acceptance of the character's behavior is not achieved through attractiveness of the character. It suggests that attractiveness indeed is associated with positive values, yet judgments of immoral behavior are evaluated differently.

Concerning perceived successfulness, results of this study are to some extent in line with previous investigations and indicate that viewers who perceive character as successful are more likely to uphold their moral foundations. Nevertheless, it was explored that there are further processes that might influence this relation. It is proposed that perceived attractiveness, or manner of dress could lead to such fluctuations. However, in the future examinations are needed in order to examine what factors play a role in these processes. Surprisingly, the findings also revealed that perceived success does not have an impact on a character's attributes and evaluations, as well as a character's behavior acceptance. It is

possible that in both of the conditions the character's success was also determined by performing the act of revenge successfully, and this evoked more negative responses. Therefore, future research should examine this relation under different conditions and contexts.

Regarding tendency to morally disengage, the outcome of this research is partly in line with previous findings as it was observed that tendency to morally disengage to some extent does influence the moral judgment. It was thus revealed that those who are prone to morally disengage are less likely to feel that protagonist violated their moral foundations. Moreover, present study indicated that tendencies to morally disengage can lead to more positive evaluations of character's attributes, but only under certain conditions. It is possible that perceived attractiveness in the experimental group could enhanced this mechanism, however further investigations are required to confirm this proposition. Moreover, because tendency to morally disengage was found not to affect the acceptance of the character's behavior, in the future it should be considered whether tendency to morally disengage would lead to acceptance of immoral actions within participants of different ages. Thus, in this study only young people, and mostly students participated.

Overall, it was determined that being exposed to morally ambiguous characters who perform the act of revenge has an impact on the attitude toward perception of morality and justice in general. However, it can be concluded that the overall perception of morality is not affected by perceived attractiveness and success, thus in both of the groups, experimental and conditional, automatic/intuitive responses were evaluated similarly.

References

Amit, E., & Greene, J. D. (2012, June). You see, the ends don't justify the means: Visual imagery and moral judgment. *Psychological Science, 23*(8), 861– 868. doi:10.1177/0956797611434965

Babbie, E. (2008). *The Basics of Social Research* (4th edition). Boston: Cengage Learning.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. New York: General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Ed.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development: Vol. 1* (pp. 45-103). New York: Psychology Press.

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*(3), 193-209. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory of mass communications. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (Ed.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (2nd edition, pp. 121-153). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bandura, A. (2004). The role of selective moral disengagement in terrorism and counter terrorism. In F. M. Moghaddam & A. J. Marsella (Ed.), *Understanding terrorism: Psychosocial roots, consequences, and interventions* (pp. 121–150). Washington: American Psychological Association.

Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of perceived self-efficacy revisited. *Journal of Management*, *38*(1), 9-44. doi:10.1177/0149206311410606

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*(2), 364-374. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.364

Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli, C., & Regalia, C. (2001). Sociocognitive self-regulatory mechanisms governing transgressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*(1), 125–135. doi:10.1O37//O022-3514.80.1.125

Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, A. A. (1963). Vicarious reinforcement and imitative learning. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*(6), 601-607. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0045550

Barkhuus, L. (2009, April). Television on the internet: new practices, new viewers. In *CHI'09 extended abstracts on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 2479-2488). Boston: ACM.

Bartels, D. M. (2008). Principled moral sentiment and the flexibility of moral judgment and decision making. *Cognition*, *108*(2), 381-417. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2008.03.001

Bazzini, D., Curtin, L., Joslin, S., Regan, S., & Martz, D. (2010). Do animated Disney characters portray and promote the beauty–goodness stereotype? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40*(10), 2687–2709. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00676.x

Becker, A. E. (2004). Television, disordered eating, and young women in Fiji: Negotiating body image and identity during rapid social change. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, *28*(4), 533-559. doi:10.1007/s11013-004-1067-5

Berndt, T. J., & Berndt, E. G. (1975). Children's use of motives and intentionality in person perception and moral judgment. *Child Development*, *46*(4), 904-912. doi:10.2307/1128396

Bilandzic, H. (2006). The perception of distance in the cultivation process: A theoretical consideration of the relationship between television content, processing experience, and perceived distance. *Communication Theory*, *16*(3), 333–55. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00273.x

Bleumke, M., & Friese, M. (2008). Reliability and validity of the Single-Target IAT (ST-IAT): Assessing automatic affect towards multiple attitude objects. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*(6), 977–997. doi:10.1002/ejsp.487

Buckingham, D. (1993). *Reading Audiences: Young People and the Media*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Busselle, R., & Bilandzic, H. (2008). Fictionality and perceived realism in experiencing stories: A model of narrative comprehension and engagement. *Communication Theory*, *18*(2), 255-280. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2008.00322.x

Busselle, R., & Bilandzic, H. (2009). Measuring narrative engagement. *Media Psychology, 12*(4), 321-347. doi:10.1080/15213260903287259

Bradshaw, L. (2013). Showtime's 'female problem': Cancer, quality and motherhood. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *13*(2), 160-177. doi:10.1177/1469540513480169

Brehm, S. S., & Brehm, J. W. (1981). Persuasion and attitude change. In S. S. Brehm & J. W. Brehm (Ed.), *Psychological reactance. A theory of freedom and control* (pp. 121-150). Waltham: Academic Press.

Bryant, J., & Zillmann D. (1991). *Responding to the screen: Reception and reaction processes*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods* (3rd edition). United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Cacioppo, J. T., & Berntson, G. G. (1994, May). Relationship between attitudes and evaluative space: A critical review, with emphasis on the separability of positive and negative substrates. *Psychological Bulletin*, *115*(3), 401–423. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.115.3.401

Cohen, J. (1999). Favorite characters of teenage viewers of Israeli serials. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *43*(3), 327–345. doi:10.1080/08838159909364495

Cohen, J. (2001). Defining identification: A theoretical look at the identification of audiences with media characters. *Mass Communication & Society*, *4*(3), 245–264. http://doi.org/10.1207/S15327825MCS0403

Collins, W. A., & Zimmermann, S. A. (1975). Convergent and divergent social cues: Effects of televised aggression on children. *Communication Research*, *2*(4), 331-346. doi:10.1177/009365027500200401

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1976). The design and conduct of quasi-experiments and true experiments in field settings. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 223-326). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Coyne, S. M., Padilla-Walker, L.M., & Howard, E. (2013). Emerging in a digital world: A decade review of media use, effects, and gratifications in emerging adulthood. *Emerging Adulthood*, *1*(2), 125-137. doi:10.1177/2167696813479782

Dant, T. (2005, September). *Consuming morality: television and postmodern ethics*. Paper presented to Sociology of Consumption Network at the European Sociological Association Conference, Torun, Poland. Retrieved from http://sifo.no/files/Dant.pdf

Detert, J. R., Treviño, L. K., & Schweitzer, V. L. (2008). Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: A study of antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(2), 374-391. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.374

Dion, K. K. (1972). Physical attractiveness and evaluation of children's transgressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24*(2), 207-213. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0033372

Dion, K. K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *24(3)*, 285-290. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.110.1.109

Druckman, J. N. (2003). The power of television images: The first Kennedy-Nixon debate revisited. *Journal of Politics*, *65*(2). 559–571. doi:10.1111/1468-2508.t01-1-00015

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Ealy, S. D. (2005, March). Corruption and innocence in Robert Penn Warren's fiction. *Modern Age*, *47*(2), 139-147. Retrieved from http://www.mmisi.org/ma/47_02/ealy.pdf

Eden, A. Grizzard, M., & Lewis, R. J. (2011). Disposition development in drama: the role of moral, immoral and ambiguously moral characters. *International Journal of Arts and Technology*, *4*(1), 33-47. doi:10.1504/IJART.2011.037768

Eden, A., Tamborini, R., Grizzard, M., Lewis, R., Weber, R., & Prabhu, S. (2014). Repeated exposure to narrative entertainment and the salience of moral intuitions. *Journal of Communication*, *64*(3), 501–520. http://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12098

Elkamel, F. (1995). The use of television series in health education. *Health Education Research*, *10*(2), 225-232. doi:10.1093/her/10.2.225

Eyal, K., & Kunkel, D. (2008). The effects of sex in television drama shows on emerging adults' sexual attitudes and moral judgments. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 52*(2), 161-181. http://doi.org/10.1080/08838150801991757

Felt, L. (2011). *"Almost as necessary as bread": Why we need narrative and what makes it work* (manuscript). Retrieved from http://www.laurelfelt.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Narrative-Murphy.LaurelFelt.Quals_.May2011.pdf

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, *7*(2), 117-140. doi:10.1177/001872675400700202

Fransson, N., & Ask, K. (2010). A cognitive-representational account of intuitive moral judgment: Effects of typicality and accessibility. *The Open Psychology Journal*, *3*, 67-75. doi:10.2174/1874350101003010067

Gentile, D. A. (2003). *Media violence and children: A complete guide for parents and professionals* (2nd edition). Westport: Praeger.

Gerbner, G. (1998). Cultivation analysis: An overview. *Mass Communication & Society*, *1*(3/4), 175–194. doi:10.1080/15205436.1998.9677855

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., Signorielli, N., & Shanaham, J. (2002). Growing up with television: cultivation perspective. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (Ed.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, (pp. 43-67). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gilbert, N. (2008). *Researching social life* (3rd edition). United Kingdom: Sage Publications Ltd.

Giles, D. (2003). *Media Psychology*. United Kingdom: Routledge.

Green, M. C., & Brock, T. C. (2000). The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(5), 701-721. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.701

Green, M. C., & Brock, T. C. (2002). In the mind's eye: Imagery and transportation into narrative worlds. In M. C. Green, J. J. Strange & T. C. Brock (Ed.) *Narrative impact: Social and cognitive foundations* (pp. 315-341). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Green, M. C., Brock, T. C., & Kaufman, G. F. (2004). Understanding media enjoyment: The role of transportation into narrative worlds. *Communication Theory*, *14*(4), 311–327. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2004.tb00317.x

Greene, J. D., Nystrom, L. E., Engell, A. D., Darley, J. M., & Cohen, J. D. (2004). The neural bases of cognitive conflict and control in moral judgment. *Neuron*, *44*(2), 389-400. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2004.09.027

Greene, J. D., Sommerville, R. B., Nystrom, L. E., Darley, J. M., & Cohen, J. D. (2001, September). An fMRI investigation of emotional engagement in moral judgment. *Science*, *293*(5537), 2105-2108. doi:10.1126/science.1062872

Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, *108*(4), 814-834. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.108.4.814

Haidt, J., & Björklund, F. (2008). Social intuitionists answer six questions about moral psychology. In W. Sinnott-Armstrong (Ed.), *Moral psychology: Vol. 2. The cognitive science of morality: Intuition and diversity* (pp. 1–31). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize. *Social Justice Research*, *20*(1), 98-116. doi:10.1007/s11211-007-0034-z

Harris, G. (2012, August). A return to form? Postmasculinist television drama and tragic heroes in the wake of The Sopranos. *New Review of Film and Television Studies,* *10*(4), 443-463. doi:10.1080/17400309.2012.708272

Hartmann, T., & Vorderer, P. (2010). It's okay to shoot a character: Moral disengagement in violent video games. *Journal of Communication*, *60*(1), 94-119. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2009.01459.x

Hefner, D., Rothmund, T., Klimmt, C., & Gollwitzer, M. (2011). Implicit measures and media effects research: Challenges and opportunities. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 5(3), 181-202. doi:10.1080/19312458.2011.597006

Hoffner, C. (1996). Children's wishful identification and parasocial interaction with favorite television characters. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *40*(3), 389–402. doi:10.1080/08838159609364360

Hoffner, C., & Buchanan, M. (2005). Young adults' wishful identification with television characters: The role of perceived similarity and character attributes. *Media Psychology*, *7*(4), 325–351. http://doi.org/10.1207/S1532785XMEP0704_2

Hoffner, C., & Cantor, J. (1985). Developmental differences in responses to a television character's appearance and behavior. *Developmental Psychology*, *21*(6), 1065-1074. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.21.6.1065

Hoffner, C., & Cantor, J. (1991). Perceiving and responding to media characters. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Ed.), *Responding to the screen: Reception and reaction processes* (pp. 63-101). United Kingdom: Routledge.

Hoolbrook, A. L, Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Telephone versus face-to-face interviewing of national probability samples of national probability samples with long questionnaires comparisons of respondent satisficing and social desirability response bias. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *67*(1), 9–125. doi:10.1086/346010

Igartua, J. J. (2010). Identification with characters and narrative persuasion through fictional feature films. *Communications*, *35*(4), 347–373. doi:10.1515/COMM.2010.019

Janicke, S. H. (2013). *Moral schemas in crime dramas: The matter of context for the activation of an antihero schema and its impact on moral judgment making* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7803&context=etd

Janicke, S. H., & Raney, A. A. (2011, May). *Exploring how we enjoy antihero narratives: A comparison of fans and nonfans of 24*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Boston, MA. Retrieved from http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p490690_index.html

Janicke, S. H., & Raney, A. A. (2014, May). *How moral schemas impact our liking and moral acceptance of antiheroes*. Paper presented at the meeting of International Communication Association, Seattle, WA. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/5739267/How_Moral_Schemas_Impact_Our_Liking_and_Moral_Acceptance_of_Antiheroes

Kirk, R. E. (2013). *Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences* (4th edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Klimmt, Ch., & Vorderer, P. (2003, August). Media Psychology "is not yet there": Introducing theories on media entertainment to the presence debate. *Presence*, *12*(4)*, 346–359. doi:10.1162/105474603322391596

Knowles, E. S., & Linn, J. A. (2004b). The importance of resistance to persuasion. In E. S. Knowles & J. A. Linn (Ed.), *Resistance and persuasion* (pp. 3–11). New York: Psychology Press.

Konijn E. A., & Hoorn, J. F. (2005). Some like bad: Testing a model for perceiving and experiencing fictional characters. *Media Psychology*, *7*(2), 107–144. doi:10.1207/S1532785XMEP0702_1

Krakowiak, K. M., & Oliver, M. B. (2012). When good characters do bad things: Examining the effect of moral ambiguity on enjoyment. *Journal of Communication, 62*(1), 117 - 135. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01618.x

Krakowiak, K. M., & Tsay, M. (2011). The role of moral disengagement in the enjoyment of real and fictional characters. *International Journal of Arts and Technology*, *4*(1), 90-101. doi:10.1504/IJART.2011.037772

Krakowiak, K. M., & Tsay-Vogel, M. (2013). What makes characters' bad behaviors acceptable? The effects of character motivation and outcome on perceptions, character liking, and moral disengagement. *Mass Communication and Society*, *16*(2), 179-199. doi:10.1080/15205436.2012.690926

Krakowiak, K. M., & Tsay-Vogel, M. (2014). The dual role of morally ambiguous characters: Examining the effect of morality salience on narrative responses. *Human Communication Research, 41*(3)*, 390–411. doi:10.1111/hcre.12050

Krijnen, T. (2011). Engaging the moral imagination by watching television: Different modes of moral reflection. *Journal of Audience & Reception Studies*, *8*(2), 52-73. Retrieved from http://www.participations.org/Volume%208/Issue%202/contents.htm

Leifer, A. D., & Roberts, D. F. (1972). Children's responses to television violence. In E. A. Rubinstein & G. A. Comstock (Eds.), *Television and social behavior: Vol. 2* (pp. 43–180). Washington: Government Printing Office.

Lemish, D. (1998). Girls can wrestle too: Gender differences in the consumption of a television wrestling series. *Sex Roles*, *38*(9-10), 833-849. doi:10.1023/A:1018829332270

Lewis, R. J., Tamborini, R., & Weber, R. (2014). Testing a dual-process model of media enjoyment and appreciation. *Journal of Communication, 64*(3), 397–416. doi:10.1111/jcom.12101

Liss, M. B., Reinhardt, L. C., & Fredriksen, S. (1983). TV heroes: The impact of rhetoric and deeds. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *4*(2), 175–187. doi:10.1016/0193-3973(83)90005-9

Livingstone, S. M. (1992). The resourceful reader: Interpreting television characters and narratives. *Communication Yearbook*, *1*(15), 58-90. Retrieved from http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/1002/1/RESOURCEFULREADER.pdf

Lockwood, P., & Kunda, Z. (1997). Superstars and me: Predicting the impact of role models on the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*(1), 91–103. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.91

Malach, M. (2008) 'Oz'. In G. R. Edgerton & J. P. Jones (Ed.), *The essential HBO reader* (pp. 52-61). Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Mares, M. L., & Cantor, J. (1992). Elderly viewers' responses to televised portrayals of old age empathy and mood management versus social comparison. *Communication Research*, *19*(4), 459-478. doi:10.1177/009365092019004004

McAlister, A. L., Bandura, A., Morrison, T. C., & Gussendorf, J. (2006). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in support of military force: The impact of 9/11. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *25*(2), 141-165. doi:10.1521/jscp.2006.25.2.141

Moyer-Gusé, E. (2008). Toward a theory of entertainment persuasion: Explaining the persuasive effects of entertainment education messages. *Communication Theory*, *18*(3)*, 407-425. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2008.00328.x

Murphy, C. (2012). *Sex sells: An analysis of sexual content on prime time TV over the past 50 years* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://www.carroll.edu/library/thesisarchive/murphyc_2012final.pdf

Murphy, S., Frank, L., Moran, M., & Woodley, P. (2011). Involved, transported, or emotional? Exploring the determinants of change in knowledge, attitudes, and behavior in entertainment education. *Journal of Communication, 61*(3), 407–431. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01554.x

Nabi, R. L., & Krcmar, M. (2004). Conceptualizing media enjoyment as attitude: Implications for mass media effects research. *Communication Theory*, *14*(4), 88-310. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2004.tb00316.x

Nadler, J., McDonnell, M. H., & Mary-Hunter. (2011). Moral character, motive, and the psychology of blame. *Cornell Law Review, 97*(2), 255-304. Retrieved from http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/clr/vol97/iss2/3

Newby-Clark, I. R. (2004). Getting ready for the bad times: Self-esteem and anticipatory coping. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *34*(3), 309-316. doi:10.1002/ejsp.199

Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating Humanity: a classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, M. (2001). *Upheavals of thought: The intelligence of emotions*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Oliver, M. B. (2010). Appreciation as audience response: Exploring entertainment gratifications beyond hedonism. *Human Communication Research, 36*(1)*,* 53–81. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2009.01368.x

Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (4th edition). United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Education.

Raney, A. A. (2003). Disposition-based theories of enjoyment. In J. Bryant, D. Roskos-Ewoldsen & J. Cantor (Ed.), *Communication and emotion: Essays in honor of Dolf Zillmann* (pp. 61– 84). United Kingdom: Routledge.

Raney, A. A. (2004). Expanding disposition theory: Reconsidering character liking, moral evaluations, and enjoyment. *Communication Theory*, *14*(4)*,* 348–369. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2004.tb00319.x

Raney, A. A. (2005). Punishing media criminals and moral judgment: The impact on enjoyment. *Media Psychology*, *7*(2), 145–163. doi:10.1207/S1532785XMEP0702_2

Raney, A.A., & Bryant, J. (2002). Moral judgment and crime drama: An integrated theory of enjoyment. *Journal of Communication, 52*(2), 402–415. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2002.tb02552.x

Raney, A. A., Schmid, H., Niemann, J., & Ellensohn, M. (2009, May). *Testing affective disposition theory: A comparison of the enjoyment of hero and antihero narratives*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago. Retrieved from http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p300171_index.html

Reiss, S., & Wiltz, J. (2004). Why people watch reality TV. *Media Psychology*, *6*(4), 363–378. doi:10.1207/s1532785xmep0604_3

Richman, W. L., Kiesler, S., Weisband, S., & Drasgow, F. (1999). A meta-analytic study of social desirability distortion in computer-administered questionnaires, traditional

questionnaires, and interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(5), 754-775. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.5.754

Rieger, D., Wulf, T., Kneer, J., Frischlich, L., & Bente, G. (2014, October). The winner takes it all: The effect of in-game success and need satisfaction on mood repair and enjoyment. *Computers in Human Behavior, 39,* 281–286. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.07.037

Rivadeneyra, R., & Ward, L. M. (2005). From Ally McBeal to Sabado Gigante: Contributions of television viewing to the gender role attitudes of Latino adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *20*(4), 453–75. doi:10.1177/0743558405274871

Scarborough, R. C., & McCoy, Ch. A. (2002). Moral reactions to reality TV: Television viewers' endogenous and exogenous loci of morality. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *0*(0), 1–28. doi:10.1177/1469540514521078

Segrin, Ch., & Nabi, R. L. (2002). Does television viewing cultivate unrealistic expectations about marriage? *Journal of Communication, 52*(2), 247-263. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2002.tb02543.x

Selnow, G. W. (1990). Values in prime time television. *Journal of Communication*, *40*(2), 64-74. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1990.tb02262.x

Shafer, D. M., & Raney, A. A. (2012). Exploring how we enjoy antihero narratives. *Journal of Communication*, *62*(6), 1028–1046. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01682.x

Signorielli, N. (2001). Television's gender role images and contribution to stereotyping. In D. G. Singer & J. L. Singer (Ed.), *Handbook of children and the media* (pp. 341–358). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Silverstone, R. (2007). *Media and morality: On the rise of the Mediapolis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Slade, C. (2002). *The real thing: Doing philosophy with media*. New York: Peter Lang.

Sparks, G. G., & Cantor, J. (1986). Developmental differences in fright responses to a television program depicting a character transformation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *30*(3), 309-323. doi:10.1080/08838158609386626

Summers, A., & Millers, M. K. (2014). From damsels in distress to sexy superheroes. How the portrayal of sexism in video game magazines has changed in the last twenty years. *Feminist Media Studies*, *14*(6), 1028-1040. doi:10.1080/14680777.2014.882371

Tal-Or, N., & Cohen, J. (2010). Understanding audience involvement: Conceptualizing and manipulating identification and transportation. *Poetics*, *38*(4), 402–418. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2010.05.004

Tamborini, R., Bowman, N. D., Eden, A., Gizzard, M., & Organ, A. (2010). Defining media enjoyment as the satisfaction of intrinsic needs. *Journal of Communication, 60*(4), 758-777. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01513.x

Tamborini, R., Weber, R., Eden, A., Bowman, N. D., & Grizzard, M. (2010). Repeated exposure to daytime soap opera and shifts in moral judgment toward social convention. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *54*(4), 621–640. doi:10.1080/08838151.2010.519806

Tewksbury, R. (2009). Qualitative versus quantitative methods: Understanding why qualitative methods are superior for criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology*, *1*(1), 38-58. Retrieved from http://www.jtpcrim.org/January_Articles/Qualitative_Vs_Quantitave_Richard_Tewksbury.pdf

Thorburn, D. (2008). The Sopranos. In G. Edgerton & J. Jones (Ed.), *The essential HBO reader* (pp. 61-70). Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Tian, Q., & Hoffner, C. A. (2010). Parasocial interaction with liked, neutral, and disliked characters on a popular TV series. *Mass Communication and Society*, *13*(3), 250-269. doi:10.1080/15205430903296051

Tsay, M., & Krakowiak, K. M. (2011). The impact of perceived character similarity and identification on moral disengagement. *International Journal of Arts and Technology, 4*(1), 102-110. doi:10.1504/IJART.2011.037773

Usoof-Thowfeek, R., Janoff-Bulman, R., & Tavernini, J. (2011). Moral judgments and the role of social harm: Differences in automatic versus controlled processing. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*(1), 1-6. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.07.016

Vorderer, P. (1992). *Watching television as action: Reception of TV movies from the perspective of motivational psychology*. Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Vorderer, P., Wirth, W., Gouveia, F. R., Biocca, F., Saari, T., Jäncke, L., … Jäncke, P. (2004). MEC Spatial Presence Questionnaire (MEC-SPQ). *Short Documentation and Instructions for Application. Report to the European Community, Project Presence: MEC (IST-2001-37661).* Retrieved from http://academic.csuohio.edu/kneuendorf/frames/MECFull.pdf

Vorderer, P., Wulff, H. J., & Friedrichsen, M. (1996). *Suspense: Conceptualizations, theoretical analyses, and empirical explorations*. United Kingdom: Routledge.

Vossen, H. G. M., Piotrowski, J. T., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2015). Media use and effects in childhood. In J. F. Nussbaum (Ed.), *The handbook of lifespan communication* (pp. 93-112). New York: Peter Lang.

Ward, M. (2002). Does television exposure affect emerging adults' attitudes and assumptions about sexual relationships? Correlational and experimental confirmation. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31*(1), 1-15. doi:10.1023/A:1014068031532

Ward, L. M., & Carlson, C. (2013). Modeling meanness: Associations between reality TV consumption, perceived realism, and adolescents' social aggression. *Media Psychology*, *16*(4), 371-389. doi:10.1080/15213269.2013.832627

Wittenbrink, B., Judd, Ch. M., & Park, B. (1997). Evidence for racial prejudice at the implicit level and its relationship with questionnaire measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*(2), 262-274. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.2.262

Zillmann, D. (1988). Mood management: Using entertainment to full advantage. In L. Donohew, H. E. Sypher & E. T. Higgins (Ed.), *Communication, social cognition, and affect* (pp. 147– 171). New York: Psychology Press.

Zillmann, D. (2000). Basal morality in drama appreciation. In I. Bondebjerg (Ed.), *Moving images, culture, and the mind* (pp. 53-64). United Kingdom: University of Luton Press.

Zillmann, D., & Bryant, J. (1985). Affect, mood, and emotion as determinants of selective exposure. In D. Zillmann & J. Bryant (Ed.), *Selective exposure to communication* (pp. 157–190). United Kingdom: Routledge.

Zillmann, D., & Cantor, J. R. (1977). Affective responses to the emotions of a protagonist. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *13*(2), 155–165. doi:10.1016/S0022-1031(77)80008-5

Zillmann, D., & Knobloch, S. (2001). Emotional reactions to narratives. *Poetics*, *29*(3), 189–206. doi:10.1016/S0304-422X(01)00042-0

Appendix A

Appendix B

Appendix C

Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
It is alright to fight to protect your friends. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
It's ok to steal to take care of your family's needs. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
It's ok to attack someone who threatens your family. (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
It is alright to lie to keep your friends out of trouble. (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Sharing test questions is just a way of helping your friends. (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Talking about people behind their backs is just part of the game. (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Looking at a friend's homework without permission is just	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

"borrowing it." (7)					
It is not bad to "get high" once in a while. (8)	○	○	○	○	○
Damaging some property is no big deal when you consider that others are beating up people. (9)	○	○	○	○	○
Stealing some money is not too serious compared to those who steal a lot of money. (10)	○	○	○	○	○
Not working very hard in school is really no big deal when you consider that other people are probably cheating. (11)	○	○	○	○	○
Compared to other illegal things people do, taking some things from a store without paying for them is not very serious. (12)	○	○	○	○	○

If people are living under bad conditions, they cannot be blamed for behaving aggressively. (13)	○	○	○	○	○
If the professor doesn't discipline cheaters, students should not be blamed for cheating. (14)	○	○	○	○	○
If someone is pressured into doing something, they shouldn't be blamed for it. (15)	○	○	○	○	○
People cannot be blamed for misbehaving if their friends pressured them to do it. (16)	○	○	○	○	○
A member of a group or team should not be blamed for the trouble the team caused. (17)	○	○	○	○	○
A student who only suggests breaking the rules should	○	○	○	○	○

not be blamed if other students go ahead and do it. (18)					
If a group decides together to do something harmful, it is unfair to blame any one member of the group for it. (19)	○	○	○	○	○
You can't blame a person who plays only a small part in the harm caused by a group. (20)	○	○	○	○	○
It is ok to tell small lies because they don't really do any harm. (21)	○	○	○	○	○
People don't mind being teased because it shows interest in them. (22)	○	○	○	○	○
Teasing someone does not really hurt them. (23)	○	○	○	○	○
Insults don't really hurt	○	○	○	○	○

anyone. (24)					
If students misbehave in class, it's their teacher's fault. (25)	○	○	○	○	○
If someone leaves something lying around, it's their own fault if it gets stolen. (26)	○	○	○	○	○
People who are mistreated have usually done things to deserve it. (27)	○	○	○	○	○
People are not at fault for misbehaving at work if their managers mistreat them. (28)	○	○	○	○	○
Some people deserve to be treated like animals. (29)	○	○	○	○	○
It is ok to treat badly someone who behaved like a "worm." (30)	○	○	○	○	○
Someone who is obnoxious does not deserve to be treated like a human being.	○	○	○	○	○

(31)

Some people have to be treated roughly because they lack feelings that can be hurt. (32)	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix D

Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Note: Amanda and Emily is the same person. Amanda changed her name into Emily, so that she could hide her real identity.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat Disagree (3)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)	Somewhat Agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly Agree (7)
While viewing the clip, I felt as if I was part of the action. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
While viewing the clip, I forgot myself and was fully absorbed. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I was able to understand the events in the clip in a manner similar to that in which Emily understood them. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

I think I have a good understanding of Emily. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I tend to understand the reasons why Emily does what she does. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
While viewing the clip I could feel the emotions that Emily portrayed. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
During viewing, I felt I could really get inside Emily's head. (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
At key moments in the clip, I felt I knew exactly what Emily was going through. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
While viewing the clip, I wanted Emily to succeed in achieving her goals. (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
When Emily succeeded I felt joy, but when she failed, I was	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

sad. (10)

I imagined how I would act if I found myself in the place of Emily. (11)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I tried to see things from the point of view of Emily. (12)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix E

Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I directed my attention to the clip. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
I had the feeling that I was in the middle of the action rather that merely observing. (2)	○	○	○	○	○
I felt like I could jump into the action. (3)	○	○	○	○	○
I thought about just how much I know about the things in the clip. (4)	○	○	○	○	○

I thoroughly considered what the things in the clip had to do with one another. (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The clip activated my thinking. (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I thought intensely about the meaning of the situations presented in the clip. (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I imagined precisely what it must be like to further explore the world presented in the clip. (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I directed my attention to possible errors or contradictions in the clip. (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I did not really pay attention to the existence of errors in the clip. (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I wondered whether the situation could really	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

exist like this. (11)

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I took a critical viewpoint of the situation in the clip. (12)	○	○	○	○	○
I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip. (13)	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix F

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I enjoyed the clip I watched very much. (1)	○	○	○	○	○
If this TV series will be screened on TV I will watch it. (2)	○	○	○	○	○
This is a TV series that I can enjoy. (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix G

	Disagree (1)	Agree (2)
The actions of Emily were appropriate to the situation. (1)	○	○
All things considered, the actions of Emily were acceptable. (2)	○	○
The actions of Emily were morally right. (3)	○	○
The actions of Emily were good. (4)	○	○
The actions of Emily were morally right in this situation. (5)	○	○
The actions of Emily were acceptable. (6)	○	○
The actions of Emily were justified. (7)	○	○

Appendix H

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Emily is a successful person. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Emily achieved her goals. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Emily did not get what she wanted. (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Emily is physically attractive to me. (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Emily is physically unattractive to me. (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Emily is good-looking. (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Emily is respected by others. (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Emily has lots of friends. (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Emily is well liked by others. (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Emily is not liked by others. (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Appendix I

	Completely Violated (1)	Violated (2)	Somewhat Violated (3)	Neither Violated nor Upheld (4)	Somewhat Upheld (5)	Upheld (6)	Completely Upheld (7)
Purity (1)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Inflicting Harm (2)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Fairness (3)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Group Loyalty (4)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Respect for authority (5)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Appendix J

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Emily is friendly. (1)	O	O	O	O	O
Emily is agreeable. (2)	O	O	O	O	O
Emily is devoted. (3)	O	O	O	O	O
Emily is trustworthy. (4)	O	O	O	O	O
Emily is evil. (5)	O	O	O	O	O

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Emily is a bad person. (6)	O	O	O	O	O
Emily is dishonest. (7)	O	O	O	O	O

Appendix K

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Emily was morally justified in her actions. (1)	O	O	O	O	O
I consider Emily's actions as unethical. (2)	O	O	O	O	O
I believe that in general Emily is an ethical person. (3)	O	O	O	O	O
It was all right for Emily to take a revenge. (4)	O	O	O	O	O

Appendix L

This task requires that you classify items as quickly as you can while making as few mistakes as possible.

The following is a list of category labels and the items that belong to each of those categories. You will be presented with a set of words to classify into groups.

RIGHT ACTION : Justice, Court, Sentence, Penalty, Charge

WRONG ACTION: Revenge, Vengeance, Payback, Retalitation, Reprisal

To classify a word as RIGHT ACTION, press the 'right shift' key.
To classify a word as WRONG ACTION, press the 'left shift' key.

Two labels at the top will tell you which words go with each key.

Press Enter to begin.

Appendix M

This time, you will see the same words
as in the trial before
but also see words of the category CRIME.

CRIME: Murder, Robbery, Rape, Deception, and Fraud.

Please press the 'right shift' button
if CRIME words or RIGHT ACTIONS occur.

Please press the 'left shift' button
if WRONG ACTIONS occur.

Appendix N

This time you will see words of the same
three categories RIGHT ACTION, WRONG
ACTION, and CRIME.

Please press the 'right shift' button
if WRONG ACTION or CRIME words occur.

PLEASE press the 'left shift' button
if RIGHT ACTION words occur.

Appendix O

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in a research about attitudes towards morally ambiguous behavior. This experiment is managed for the Master Thesis purposes at Erasmus University Rotterdam. The time needed to complete the questionnaire will take approximately 40 minutes. Your participation is voluntary and you can choose to stop responding at any time during the survey.

Should you have any questions, please contact: master.survey2015@gmail.com

Please indicate if you understood these terms:

❍ Yes (1)

❍ No (2)

Appendix P

What is your gender?
❍ Male (1)
❍ Female (2)
❍ Other (3)

What is your age?

What is your nationality?

What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, highest degree received.

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
							Mean Differenc e	Std. Error Differenc e	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)			Lower	Upper
Bandura	Equal variances assumed	1.361	.247	-1.896	70	.062	-.17953	.09469	-.36838	.00933
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.907	68.566	.061	-.17953	.09416	-.36739	.00834
Identification	Equal variances assumed	4.400	.040	-2.457	70	.016	-.54492	.22176	-.98721	-.10263
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.484	63.119	.016	-.54492	.21938	-.98331	-.10653
Enjoyment	Equal variances assumed	.152	.698	-4.688	70	.000	-1.13900	.24296	-1.62356	-.65443
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.705	69.665	.000	-1.13900	.24210	-1.62189	-.65610
Attractiveness	Equal variances assumed	19.604	.000	-7.155	70	.000	-1.24041	.17337	-1.58619	-.89463
	Equal variances not assumed			-7.034	49.231	.000	-1.24041	.17634	-1.59475	-.88608
Success	Equal variances assumed	.132	.718	-6.515	70	.000	-.87777	.13474	-1.14649	-.60905
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.472	64.660	.000	-.87777	.13562	-1.14865	-.60689
Justified_Violenc e	Equal variances assumed	5.179	.026	-3.130	70	.003	-.21180	.06767	-.34676	-.07685
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.152	67.503	.002	-.21180	.06720	-.34591	-.07770
Tamborini	Equal variances assumed	1.453	.232	-1.871	70	.066	-.40641	.21725	-.83970	.02688
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.886	66.219	.064	-.40641	.21546	-.83657	.02375
Character_Attrib utes	Equal variances assumed	.137	.712	-3.188	70	.002	-.42912	.13460	-.69757	-.16068

		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.191	69.961	.002	-.42912	.13447	-.69732	-.16092
Perception_of_character	Equal variances assumed	6.011	.017	-3.459	70	.001	-.59151	.17101	-.93257	-.25044
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.506	59.294	.001	-.59151	.16873	-.92911	-.25391
spatial_presence	Equal variances assumed	2.845	.096	-2.442	70	.017	-.91042	.37279	-1.65392	-.16693
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.426	64.493	.018	-.91042	.37529	-1.66004	-.16081
higher_cog	Equal variances assumed	1.700	.197	-2.244	69	.028	-1.74086	.77577	-3.28848	-.19323
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.280	63.486	.026	-1.74086	.76341	-3.26618	-.21553
suspension	Equal variances assumed	.042	.838	-.567	69	.573	-.25952	.45780	-1.17281	.65377
	Equal variances not assumed			-.565	65.657	.574	-.25952	.45910	-1.17623	.65718
Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	Equal variances assumed	1.846	.179	-.997	69	.322	-.165	.165	-.494	.165
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.010	65.819	.316	-.165	.163	-.490	.161
Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	Equal variances assumed	.375	.543	-2.821	70	.006	-.771	.273	-1.315	-.226
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.830	69.829	.006	-.771	.272	-1.314	-.227

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
					Change Statistics				
1	,878a	,771	,741	,60008	,771	25,264	8	60	,000
2	,886b	,784	,747	,59230	,013	1,793	2	58	,176

a. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Condition, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Identification, higher_involvement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Condition, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Identification, higher_involvement, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	,195	,629		,311	,757
	Identification	,411	,122	,325	3,379	,001
	Justified_Violence	-,743	,313	-,185	-2,374	,021
	Condition	,692	,163	,296	4,251	,000
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,014	,032	-,033	-,450	,654
	higher_involvement	,038	,036	,107	1,065	,291
	spatial_presence	-,057	,053	-,074	-1,062	,292
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,550	,090	,564	6,095	,000
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	-,092	,132	-,054	-,698	,488
2	(Constant)	-,365	,697		-,523	,603
	Identification	,404	,120	,320	3,358	,001
	Justified_Violence	-,833	,318	-,208	-2,622	,011

Condition	,447	,216	,191	2,075	,042
suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,001	,032	,001	,018	,986
higher_involvement	,041	,036	,113	1,120	,267
spatial_presence	-,042	,053	-,055	-,785	,436
Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,555	,089	,569	6,209	,000
Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	-,174	,140	-,103	-1,247	,217
Attractiveness	,011	,111	,009	,102	,919
Success	,267	,155	,162	1,716	,092

a. Dependent Variable: Enjoyment

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,866ᵃ	,750	,688	,61709	,750	12,006	7	28	,000
2	,903ᵇ	,815	,751	,55047	,065	4,594	2	26	,020

a. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Justified_Violence, higher_involvement, Identification

b. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Justified_Violence, higher_involvement, Identification, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,297	,996		,298	,768
	Identification	,556	,199	,540	2,797	,009
	Justified_Violence	-,670	,571	-,188	-1,174	,250
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,032	,054	,077	,591	,559
	higher_involvement	,075	,053	,254	1,404	,171
	spatial_presence	,071	,127	,076	,561	,580
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,414	,133	,462	3,112	,004
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	-,513	,270	-,365	-1,897	,068
2	(Constant)	-,661	1,631		-,405	,689
	Identification	,508	,183	,493	2,782	,010
	Justified_Violence	-,616	,510	-,173	-1,209	,238
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,087	,052	,208	1,667	,108
	higher_involvement	,029	,052	,098	,549	,588
	spatial_presence	,064	,126	,068	,505	,618
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,480	,122	,534	3,928	,001
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	-,577	,242	-,410	-2,381	,025
	Attractiveness	-,204	,249	-,087	-,819	,420
	Success	,615	,233	,284	2,638	,014

a. Dependent Variable: Enjoyment

131

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,867[a]	,752	,683	,55281	,752	10,849	7	25	,000
2	,883[b]	,780	,694	,54339	,028	1,437	2	23	,258

a. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Justified_Violence, spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Identification, higher_involvement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Justified_Violence, spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Identification, higher_involvement, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-1,317	1,292		-1,019	,318
	Identification	,288	,192	,204	1,502	,146
	Justified_Violence	-,351	,473	-,085	-,741	,466
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,021	,042	-,058	-,501	,621
	higher_involvement	,066	,059	,166	1,116	,275
	spatial_presence	-,099	,067	-,179	-1,488	,149
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,663	,128	,731	5,166	,000
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,179	,181	,107	,988	,333
2	(Constant)	,057	1,618		,035	,972
	Identification	,339	,196	,239	1,731	,097

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Justified_Violence	-,668	,509	-,161	-1,313	,202
suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,023	,043	-,065	-,545	,591
higher_involvement	-,020	,084	-,051	-,241	,812
spatial_presence	-,095	,066	-,171	-1,443	,162
Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,678	,127	,748	5,359	,000
Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,279	,202	,167	1,384	,180
Attractiveness	,294	,174	,286	1,695	,104
Success	-,412	,316	-,272	-1,301	,206

a. Dependent Variable: Enjoyment

Model Summary

			Adjusted R	Std. Error of	Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Square	the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,738ᵃ	,545	,501	,65967	,545	12,359	6	62	,000
2	,740ᵇ	,548	,488	,66823	,003	,211	2	60	,811

a. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Condition, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., higher_involvement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Condition, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., higher_involvement, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficientsᵃ

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1,901	,606		3,135	,003
	Condition	,099	,171	,054	,583	,562

133

		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,052	,034	-,151	-1,498	,139
	higher_involvement	,083	,038	,290	2,203	,031
	spatial_presence	-,004	,057	-,007	-,079	,938
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,388	,084	,502	4,596	,000
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,171	,140	,128	1,222	,226
2	(Constant)	1,701	,740		2,299	,025
	Condition	,023	,243	,012	,094	,925
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,046	,036	-,134	-1,269	,209
	higher_involvement	,085	,039	,298	2,205	,031
	spatial_presence	,001	,059	,001	,014	,989
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,388	,086	,502	4,504	,000
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,132	,154	,099	,857	,395
	Attractiveness	-,023	,123	-,024	-,189	,851
	Success	,113	,174	,087	,646	,521

a. Dependent Variable: Identification

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
					Change Statistics				
1	,801[a]	,641	,581	,69405	,641	10,720	5	30	,000
2	,819[b]	,671	,589	,68784	,030	1,272	2	28	,296

134

a. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., higher_involvement
b. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., higher_involvement, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2,040	,873		2,336	,026
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,110	,056	-,272	-1,967	,059
	higher_involvement	,062	,057	,218	1,082	,288
	spatial_presence	,063	,115	,070	,550	,586
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,474	,119	,544	3,977	,000
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,286	,253	,209	1,128	,268
2	(Constant)	-,742	1,950		-,380	,706
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,079	,062	-,194	-1,273	,214
	higher_involvement	,020	,064	,071	,318	,753
	spatial_presence	,160	,132	,176	1,212	,236
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,480	,120	,551	4,011	,000

Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,240	,253	,175	,945	,353
Attractiveness	,402	,301	,177	1,334	,193
Success	,320	,285	,152	1,123	,271

a. Dependent Variable: Identification

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,680[a]	,462	,363	,55407	,462	4,645	5	27	,003
2	,706[b]	,499	,359	,55587	,037	,913	2	25	,414

a. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, higher_involvement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, higher_involvement, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,181	1,062		1,112	,276
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,021	,041	,081	,495	,624
	higher_involvement	,145	,050	,517	2,923	,007
	spatial_presence	-,077	,064	-,199	-1,204	,239
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,197	,111	,307	1,771	,088

		B	Std. Error		t	Sig.
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,083	,181	,070	,457	,651
2	(Constant)	-,090	1,421		-,063	,950
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,034	,043	,132	,785	,440
	higher_involvement	,207	,069	,737	2,991	,006
	spatial_presence	-,079	,065	-,203	-1,226	,232
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,176	,114	,274	1,541	,136
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	-,049	,206	-,042	-,239	,813
	Attractiveness	-,126	,163	-,174	-,775	,445
	Success	,404	,308	,377	1,311	,202

a. Dependent Variable: Identification

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,611a	,373	,302	,24540	,373	5,195	7	61	,000
2	,638b	,407	,317	,24270	,034	1,681	2	59	,195

a. Predictors: (Constant), Condition, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Identification, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., higher_involvement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Condition, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Identification, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., higher_involvement, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,662	,243		2,725	,008
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,005	,013	,044	,366	,716
	higher_involvement	-,020	,015	-,220	-1,358	,179
	spatial_presence	-,037	,021	-,192	-1,727	,089
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,050	,036	,206	1,379	,173
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,083	,053	,196	1,568	,122
	Identification	,120	,047	,383	2,549	,013
	Condition	,154	,064	,263	2,416	,019
2	(Constant)	,423	,280		1,507	,137
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,008	,013	,074	,595	,554
	higher_involvement	-,022	,015	-,243	-1,495	,140
	spatial_presence	-,029	,021	-,154	-1,366	,177
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,045	,036	,184	1,239	,220
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,073	,056	,173	1,293	,201
	Identification	,118	,047	,375	2,515	,015
	Condition	,050	,088	,085	,564	,575
	Attractiveness	,065	,045	,212	1,452	,152
	Success	,029	,064	,071	,460	,647

a. Dependent Variable: Justified_Violence

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,807a	,651	,579	,20061	,651	9,018	6	29	,000
2	,807b	,652	,548	,20775	,001	,021	2	27	,979

a. Predictors: (Constant), Identification, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., higher_involvement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Identification, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., higher_involvement, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,927	,274		3,378	,002
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,022	,017	-,186	-1,262	,217
	higher_involvement	-,019	,017	-,234	-1,136	,265
	spatial_presence	-,130	,033	-,498	-3,888	,001
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	-,041	,043	-,165	-,973	,338
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,249	,075	,632	3,327	,002
	Identification	,201	,053	,698	3,810	,001
2	(Constant)	,901	,591		1,525	,139
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,023	,019	-,194	-1,181	,248
	higher_involvement	-,019	,019	-,227	-,965	,343
	spatial_presence	-,128	,041	-,489	-3,133	,004

Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	-,042	,045	-,168	-,931	,360
Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,250	,078	,634	3,212	,003
Identification	,200	,057	,695	3,511	,002
Attractiveness	,013	,094	,020	,138	,891
Success	-,010	,088	-,016	-,112	,911

a. Dependent Variable: Justified_Violence

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
					Change Statistics				
1	,492[a]	,243	,068	,22905	,243	1,387	6	26	,257
2	,606[b]	,368	,157	,21783	,125	2,374	2	24	,115

a. Predictors: (Constant), Identification, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., higher_involvement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Identification, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., higher_involvement, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,488	,449		3,314	,003
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,011	,017	,122	,618	,542
	higher_involvement	-,035	,024	-,362	-1,475	,152
	spatial_presence	-,019	,027	-,143	-,700	,490
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,110	,049	,501	2,258	,033
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	-,010	,075	-,024	-,128	,899
	Identification	-,001	,080	-,002	-,009	,993
2	(Constant)	1,628	,557		2,923	,007
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,012	,017	,136	,698	,492
	higher_involvement	-,055	,032	-,573	-1,741	,095
	spatial_presence	-,015	,026	-,115	-,590	,561
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,096	,047	,440	2,061	,050
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,010	,081	,024	,119	,906
	Identification	,007	,078	,019	,085	,933
	Attractiveness	,126	,065	,508	1,951	,063
	Success	-,107	,125	-,291	-,854	,402

a. Dependent Variable: Justified_Violence

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,591^a	,349	,237	,77533	,349	3,113	10	58	,003
2	,636^b	,405	,277	,75463	,056	2,613	2	56	,082

a. Predictors: (Constant), Condition, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Bandura, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Enjoyment, higher_involvement, Identification, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Condition, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Bandura, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Enjoyment, higher_involvement, Identification, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-,239	1,012		-,236	,814
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,054	,041	,167	1,311	,195
	higher_involvement	,020	,047	,074	,425	,673
	spatial_presence	-,007	,070	-,013	-,107	,915
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	-,072	,150	-,099	-,482	,631
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,107	,171	,084	,625	,534
	Identification	-,115	,182	-,121	-,634	,528
	Justified_Violence	1,061	,476	,351	2,226	,030
	Enjoyment	,190	,169	,252	1,129	,264
	Bandura	,544	,272	,255	1,999	,050
	Condition	-,110	,241	-,062	-,455	,651
2	(Constant)	-1,046	1,051		-,995	,324
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,076	,041	,235	1,842	,071
	higher_involvement	,028	,047	,102	,593	,556
	spatial_presence	,010	,068	,017	,147	,883
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	-,016	,149	-,022	-,107	,915
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	-,033	,180	-,026	-,181	,857
	Identification	-,094	,177	-,099	-,529	,599
	Justified_Violence	,873	,474	,289	1,841	,071

Enjoyment	,100	,169	,133	,594	,555
Bandura	,517	,266	,243	1,944	,057
Condition	-,430	,285	-,244	-1,509	,137
Attractiveness	,014	,142	,015	,099	,922
Success	,425	,203	,344	2,095	,041

a. Dependent Variable: Tamborini

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,606a	,368	,149	,92024	,368	1,679	9	26	,145
2	,784b	,614	,437	,74837	,246	7,657	2	24	,003

a. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, higher_involvement, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Enjoyment, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Identification

b. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, higher_involvement, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Enjoyment, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Identification, Success, Attractiveness

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-,314	1,685		-,186	,854
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,038	,083	,100	,457	,652
	higher_involvement	-,037	,083	-,140	-,446	,659
	spatial_presence	-,118	,192	-,140	-,613	,545
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	-,153	,239	-,189	-,643	,526
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,595	,438	,468	1,358	,186
	Identification	,009	,368	,010	,024	,981
	Justified_Violence	,550	1,165	,170	,472	,641
	Enjoyment	,203	,284	,225	,715	,481
	Bandura	,619	,520	,276	1,191	,244
2	(Constant)	-3,713	2,236		-1,660	,110
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,175	,076	,463	2,292	,031
	higher_involvement	-,108	,071	-,407	-1,512	,144
	spatial_presence	-,015	,184	-,018	-,083	,935
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,202	,216	,249	,938	,358
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,179	,372	,141	,481	,635
	Identification	,117	,333	,125	,350	,729
	Justified_Violence	,448	1,011	,139	,443	,662
	Enjoyment	-,306	,271	-,338	-1,129	,270

145

Bandura	,518	,485	,231	1,069	,296
Attractiveness	-,077	,391	-,036	-,196	,846
Success	1,374	,363	,702	3,788	,001

a. Dependent Variable: Tamborini

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
					Change Statistics				
1	,604[a]	,365	,116	,66081	,365	1,468	9	23	,218
2	,705[b]	,497	,234	,61544	,132	2,758	2	21	,086

a. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Justified_Violence, spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Identification, higher_involvement, Enjoyment

b. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Justified_Violence, spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Identification, higher_involvement, Enjoyment, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2,223	1,972		1,127	,271
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,037	,051	,142	,718	,480
	higher_involvement	,030	,073	,104	,407	,688
	spatial_presence	-,043	,084	-,108	-,512	,614
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	-,063	,222	-,097	-,285	,778

146

		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	-,219	,221	-,182	-,989	,333
	Identification	-,300	,251	-,296	-1,195	,244
	Justified_Violence	,764	,574	,258	1,332	,196
	Enjoyment	,360	,241	,503	1,496	,148
	Bandura	,449	,358	,235	1,255	,222
2	(Constant)	3,385	2,106		1,607	,123
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,043	,049	,169	,881	,388
	higher_involvement	-,050	,095	-,174	-,523	,606
	spatial_presence	-,058	,078	-,146	-,738	,469
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,063	,216	,098	,294	,772
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	-,129	,238	-,107	-,540	,595
	Identification	-,230	,247	-,228	-,933	,361
	Justified_Violence	,130	,599	,044	,218	,830
	Enjoyment	,196	,238	,274	,825	,418
	Bandura	,436	,334	,228	1,304	,206
	Attractiveness	,440	,209	,597	2,108	,047
	Success	-,368	,372	-,339	-,989	,334

a. Dependent Variable: Tamborini

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,598ᵃ	,358	,247	,51567	,358	3,230	10	58	,002
2	,682ᵇ	,465	,350	,47892	,107	5,621	2	56	,006

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1,474	,673		2,191	,032
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,005	,028	,021	,167	,868
	higher_involvement	-,061	,031	-,334	-1,926	,059
	spatial_presence	,031	,046	,079	,659	,512
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,081	,100	,166	,815	,419
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,090	,114	,105	,790	,433
	Identification	,022	,121	,035	,186	,853
	Justified_Violence	,664	,317	,328	2,096	,040
	Enjoyment	-,007	,112	-,014	-,063	,950
	Bandura	,269	,181	,189	1,488	,142
	Condition	,217	,160	,183	1,351	,182
2	(Constant)	,925	,667		1,386	,171
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,013	,026	,059	,487	,628
	higher_involvement	-,072	,030	-,396	-2,418	,019
	spatial_presence	,045	,043	,117	1,038	,304

148

Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,087	,094	,177	,923	,360
Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,091	,114	,106	,795	,430
Identification	,046	,113	,073	,412	,682
Justified_Violence	,478	,301	,236	1,587	,118
Enjoyment	-,044	,107	-,088	-,413	,681
Bandura	,215	,169	,151	1,272	,209
Condition	-,075	,181	-,064	-,417	,678
Attractiveness	,273	,090	,439	3,019	,004
Success	,035	,129	,043	,275	,784

a. Dependent Variable: Character_Attributes

Model Summary

					Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,754[a]	,568	,419	,41883	,568	3,803	9	26	,004
2	,762[b]	,581	,388	,42969	,012	,351	2	24	,708

a. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, higher_involvement, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Enjoyment, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Identification

b. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, higher_involvement, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Enjoyment, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Identification, Success, Attractiveness

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,681	,767		2,191	,038
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,031	,038	,151	,833	,413
	higher_involvement	-,130	,038	-,890	-3,428	,002
	spatial_presence	-,168	,087	-,361	-1,918	,066
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,145	,109	,325	1,338	,192
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,328	,199	,469	1,645	,112
	Identification	,373	,168	,728	2,223	,035
	Justified_Violence	-,397	,530	-,223	-,749	,460
	Enjoyment	-,101	,129	-,203	-,780	,443
	Bandura	,643	,237	,521	2,720	,011
2	(Constant)	1,551	1,284		1,208	,239
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,046	,044	,220	1,045	,306
	higher_involvement	-,136	,041	-,931	-3,314	,003
	spatial_presence	-,172	,106	-,370	-1,624	,117
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,190	,124	,426	1,537	,137
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,284	,214	,406	1,328	,197
	Identification	,409	,191	,799	2,140	,043
	Justified_Violence	-,469	,581	-,264	-,807	,427

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Enjoyment	-,168	,155	-,339	-1,084	,289
Bandura	,672	,278	,544	2,413	,024
Attractiveness	-,075	,225	-,065	-,334	,741
Success	,143	,208	,132	,685	,500

a. Dependent Variable: Character_Attributes

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,489[a]	,239	-,059	,58975	,239	,802	9	23	,619
2	,660[b]	,436	,140	,53141	,197	3,664	2	21	,043

a. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Justified_Violence, spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Identification, higher_involvement, Enjoyment

b. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Justified_Violence, spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Identification, higher_involvement, Enjoyment, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,892	1,760		1,075	,294
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,024	,046	-,112	-,516	,611
	higher_involvement	-,024	,065	-,104	-,373	,713
	spatial_presence	,088	,075	,274	1,183	,249
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	-,057	,198	-,107	-,286	,777

	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,095	,197	,097	,484	,633
	Identification	-,151	,224	-,183	-,675	,506
	Justified_Violence	,988	,512	,409	1,930	,066
	Enjoyment	,135	,215	,231	,628	,536
	Bandura	,025	,319	,016	,079	,938
2	(Constant)	1,763	1,818		,970	,343
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,002	,043	-,010	-,047	,963
	higher_involvement	-,021	,082	-,090	-,254	,802
	spatial_presence	,073	,068	,225	1,073	,295
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,011	,186	,021	,059	,953
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,032	,205	,033	,156	,878
	Identification	-,184	,213	-,222	-,861	,399
	Justified_Violence	,486	,517	,201	,940	,358
	Enjoyment	,043	,205	,073	,207	,838
	Bandura	-,018	,289	-,012	-,064	,950
	Attractiveness	,259	,180	,431	1,437	,166
	Success	,104	,321	,117	,323	,750

a. Dependent Variable: Character_Attributes

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,864[a]	,747	,703	,42230	,747	17,108	10	58	,000
2	,881[b]	,777	,729	,40358	,030	3,752	2	56	,030

a. Predictors: (Constant), Condition, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Bandura, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Enjoyment, higher_involvement, Identification, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Condition, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Bandura, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Enjoyment, higher_involvement, Identification, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-1,408	,551		-2,555	,013
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,004	,023	,013	,161	,873
	higher_involvement	-,001	,026	-,004	-,033	,974
	spatial_presence	,010	,038	,020	,259	,796
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,062	,082	,096	,754	,454
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,142	,093	,127	1,522	,133
	Identification	,200	,099	,241	2,020	,048
	Justified_Violence	1,499	,260	,568	5,777	,000
	Enjoyment	-,081	,092	-,123	-,884	,380
	Bandura	,269	,148	,145	1,813	,075
	Condition	,172	,131	,112	1,313	,194
2	(Constant)	-1,894	,562		-3,369	,001

	Coefficient B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,013	,022	,047	,602	,549
higher_involvement	-,005	,025	-,020	-,193	,847
spatial_presence	,022	,037	,043	,594	,555
Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,079	,080	,122	,988	,327
Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,108	,096	,097	1,120	,268
Identification	,218	,095	,262	2,295	,025
Justified_Violence	1,356	,254	,514	5,346	,000
Enjoyment	-,123	,090	-,187	-1,360	,179
Bandura	,234	,142	,126	1,642	,106
Condition	-,059	,152	-,038	-,388	,700
Attractiveness	,146	,076	,180	1,918	,060
Success	,123	,108	,114	1,135	,261

a. Dependent Variable: Perception_of_character

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,934a	,873	,829	,36180	,873	19,870	9	26	,000
2	,943b	,890	,839	,35103	,017	1,811	2	24	,185

a. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, higher_involvement, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Enjoyment, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Identification

b. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, higher_involvement, spatial_presence, Justified_Violence, Enjoyment, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Identification, Success, Attractiveness

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-1,587	,663		-2,395	,024
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,052	,033	,159	1,613	,119
	higher_involvement	-,028	,033	-,118	-,841	,408
	spatial_presence	-,123	,076	-,167	-1,634	,114
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,044	,094	,062	,471	,641
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,155	,172	,139	,903	,375
	Identification	,443	,145	,543	3,061	,005
	Justified_Violence	1,246	,458	,440	2,722	,011
	Enjoyment	-,162	,112	-,205	-1,450	,159
	Bandura	,416	,204	,212	2,037	,052
2	(Constant)	-3,133	1,049		-2,987	,006
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	,078	,036	,237	2,188	,039
	higher_involvement	-,047	,033	-,203	-1,409	,172
	spatial_presence	-,044	,087	-,060	-,513	,613
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,081	,101	,114	,800	,431
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,078	,175	,070	,449	,657
	Identification	,363	,156	,445	2,322	,029
	Justified_Violence	1,470	,474	,519	3,099	,005
	Enjoyment	-,202	,127	-,255	-1,594	,124

Bandura	,242	,227	,123	1,063	,298
Attractiveness	,253	,184	,136	1,376	,181
Success	,266	,170	,155	1,565	,131

a. Dependent Variable: Perception_of_character

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,722[a]	,521	,334	,40279	,521	2,783	9	23	,023
2	,790[b]	,624	,428	,37341	,103	2,880	2	21	,078

a. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Justified_Violence, spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Identification, higher_involvement, Enjoyment

b. Predictors: (Constant), Bandura, Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip., Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip., Justified_Violence, spatial_presence, suspension_disbeliefcorrect, Identification, higher_involvement, Enjoyment, Attractiveness, Success

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,382	1,202		1,150	,262
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,039	,031	-,216	-1,256	,222
	higher_involvement	-,050	,044	-,249	-1,120	,274
	spatial_presence	,079	,051	,285	1,550	,135
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,069	,135	,152	,512	,614
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,112	,135	,133	,835	,412

	Identification	,039	,153	,054	,252	,803
	Justified_Violence	1,173	,350	,564	3,353	,003
	Enjoyment	,083	,147	,165	,565	,578
	Bandura	-,152	,218	-,113	-,697	,493
2	(Constant)	,712	1,278		,557	,583
	suspension_disbeliefcorrect	-,021	,030	-,118	-,714	,483
	higher_involvement	-,009	,058	-,046	-,160	,874
	spatial_presence	,071	,047	,255	1,488	,152
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I am generally interested in the topic presented in the clip.	,075	,131	,166	,576	,570
	Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:-I directed my attention to the clip.	,009	,144	,010	,060	,953
	Identification	-,026	,150	-,036	-,171	,866
	Justified_Violence	,982	,364	,472	2,702	,013
	Enjoyment	,070	,144	,139	,485	,633
	Bandura	-,188	,203	-,140	-,928	,364
	Attractiveness	,045	,127	,088	,358	,724
	Success	,274	,226	,359	1,212	,239

a. Dependent Variable: Perception_of_character

Group Statistics

	Condition	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
rt_round2	Wentworth	35	1320,82213464696200	669,793625164011000	113,215786419480220
	Revenge	34	1293,13083164300160	458,755601329596600	78,675936554226650
rt_round3	Wentworth	35	1046,43877081867250	357,517527941516850	60,431491975958856
	Revenge	34	1180,63089925625380	594,072154126672700	101,882533905286790

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
rt_round2	Equal variances assumed	,644	,425	,200	67	,842	27,69130300396045 6	138,6031912359593 40	-248,96182 45975264 00	304,34443 06054473 00
	Equal variances not assumed			,201	60,283	,841	27,69130300396045 6	137,8684782220579 20	-248,06010 36775343 00	303,44270 96854552 00
rt_round3	Equal variances assumed	,604	,440	-1,141	67	,258	-134,19212 84375812 30	117,6436589290290 70	-369,00985 44579803 00	100,62559 75828178 50
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,133	53,837	,262	-134,19212 84375812 30	118,4568104306472 20	-371,70018 05886029 60	103,31592 37134404 70

Group Statistics

	Condition	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
errors_round2	Wentworth	35	5,09	3,807	,643
	Revenge	34	5,38	4,459	,765
errors_round3	Wentworth	35	2,71	2,308	,390
	Revenge	34	3,50	2,465	,423

Independent Samples Test

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
errors_round2	Equal variances assumed	,099	,754	-,298	67	,767	-,297	,997	-2,287	1,694
	Equal variances not assumed			-,297	64,765	,768	-,297	,999	-2,293	1,699
errors_round3	Equal variances assumed	,192	,663	-1,367	67	,176	-,786	,575	-1,933	,361
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,366	66,401	,177	-,786	,575	-1,934	,363

Paired Samples Test

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | | | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| | | | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
		Mean			Lower	Upper	t	df	
Pair 1	rt_round2 - rt_round3	274,383363828289500	605,478682993321200	102,344577015844800	66,394159129420130	482,372568527158800	2,681	34	,011
Pair 2	errors_round2 - errors_round3	2,371	4,023	,680	,990	3,753	3,488	34	,001

Paired Samples Test

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | | | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| | | | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
		Mean			Lower	Upper	t	df	
Pair 1	rt_round2 - rt_round3	112,499932386747790	352,062424569427000	60,378207695497960	-10,340454802301707	235,340319575797280	1,863	33	,071
Pair 2	errors_round2 - errors_round3	1,882	3,707	,636	,589	3,176	2,961	33	,006