only employees who refrain from exhibiting friendliness in the workplace. (Notice how this situation should lead Joe to behave in a relatively unfriendly manner.) Finally, after receiving this information, participants were asked to decide whether Joe is a friendly person by nature.

Figure 4.1 presents some of the results from this investigation, and the data show evidence of both discounting and augmenting. Discounting is evident when we compare the control condition with the “boss encourages friendliness” condition. When the situation provided a plausible explanation for Joe’s amity, participants are less sure he really is a friendly person. Augmenting is apparent when we compare the control condition with the “boss discourages friendliness” condition. Because Joe’s friendliness is just the opposite of what one would expect, participants are even more certain that he is a genuinely friendly person.

Discounting and augmenting principles play an important role in people’s lives. Far more than you may now realize, you rely on them to determine why people do what they do. You even use these principles to explain your own actions. So keep these principles in mind, because we will have occasion to refer to them throughout the text.

C. Correspondence Bias

Early research in attribution theory depicted people as rational, naive scientists who diligently strive to uncover the true reasons why people behave as they do. As research in this area progressed, it became apparent that people were not as studious as the naive scientist metaphor implies (Nisbett & Ross, 1980; L. Ross, 1977). A study by E. E. Jones and Harris (1967) provided the first hint that this was true. In this study, participants were shown an essay allegedly written by another student. In one condition, the essay supported Fidel Castro’s recent takeover of Cuba (pro-Castro essay); in the other condition, the essay opposed Castro’s recent takeover of Cuba (anti-Castro