

THE MEDIATING ROLE OF JUSTICE PERCEPTION ON THE RELATIONSHIP  
BETWEEN REVENGE BEHAVIOR AND BASIC PSYCHOLOGICAL NEED  
SATISFACTION

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES OF  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

BARIŞ ŞAHİN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

JULY 2019



Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Tülin GENÇÖZ

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. Canan SÜMER

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is full adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. Bengi ÖNER-ÖZKAN

Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Prof. Dr. Özlem BOZO ÖZEN

(METU, PSY) \_\_\_\_\_

Prof. Dr. Bengi ÖNER-ÖZKAN

(METU, PSY) \_\_\_\_\_

Prof. Dr. Ayşen GÜRE

(Ankara Uni., PSİ) \_\_\_\_\_



**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

**Name, Last Name:** Barış Şahin

**Signature:**

## **ABSTRACT**

### **THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF JUSTICE PERCEPTION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REVENGE BEHAVIOR AND BASIC PSYCHOLOGICAL NEED SATISFACTION**

Şahin, Barış

M.S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan

July 2019, 97 pages

The present two studies aim to understand the role of justice perception on the relationship between revenge and basic psychological needs satisfaction. Previous studies have shown that when people are treated unjustly, their basic psychological needs showed frustration. In the first study, this proposition is tested with people's own experiences where they were victimized. Three hundred participants (195 females) completed the measurements of positive and negative affect, basic psychological needs satisfaction, vitality and satisfaction with life. The results were found lacking the desired differences for psychological needs satisfaction between

injustice, negative affect and control groups. Further in the literature, it was mainly accepted that the acts of revenge proceed acts of injustice. The reason behind this pattern was explained as people's desire to restore justice. Proceeding in line with the previous findings that suggested justice increases needs satisfaction, the effect of revenge behavior on needs satisfaction through the increase in perceived justice was investigated in the second study. In an experimental design 47 participants (27 females) received negative feedback about their writing abilities, then were presented with the opportunity to take revenge. Procedural and distributive justice perceptions, positive and negative affect and basic needs satisfaction were assessed before and after the revenge manipulation. Participants reported higher satisfaction for their psychological needs, positive affect and perceptions of distributive justice, after the revenge opportunity. However, revenge behavior failed to predict any of the changes in the mentioned variables. Implications of the findings were discussed and several alterations for future research were proposed.

**Keywords:** Revenge, Basic Psychological Needs, Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice, Experimental Design

## ÖZ

### İNTİKAM DAVRANIŞLARI İLE TEMEL PSİKOLOJİK İHTİYAÇLAR İLİŞKİSİNE ADALET ALGISININ ARACI ROLÜ

Şahin, Barış

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan

Temmuz 2019, 97 sayfa

Yapılan bu iki çalışma, adalet algısının; intikam ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar ilişkisindeki rolünü anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Geçmişteki çalışmalar insanların temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarının, adaletsizliğe uğradıklarında tatmin olmadıklarını göstermiştir. İlk çalışmada bu önerme, katılımcıların mağdur konumuna düştükleri kendi hayatlarından bir deneyimleriyle test edilmiştir. 300 katılımcı (195 kadın) pozitif ve negatif duygu, temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar, öznel zindelik ve yaşam doyumu ölçeklerini tamamlamışlardır. Sonuçlar, adaletsizlik, negatif kontrol ve kontrol grupları için temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar arasındaki istenilen farkları ortaya koymamışlardır. İlaveten ilgili kaynaklarda, intikam eylemlerinin adaletsizlik



eylemlerini takip ettiđi çođunlukla kabul edilmektedir. Bu yapının arkasındaki neden, insanların bir saldırı sonucu zarar görmüş adaletin onarılmasına duydukları istek olarak açıklanmaktadır. İkinci çalışmada, adaletin temel ihtiyaçların tatminini artırdığına dair geçmiş bulgulardan da yola çıkarak, intikam davranışlarının temel ihtiyaçların tatmini üzerindeki etkisi, yükselen adalet algısı üzerinden incelenmiştir. Deneysel bir çalışma olan ikinci çalışmada, 47 katılımcı (27 kadın) yazım yeteneklerine dair negatif bir geri bildirim almış, sonrasında kendilerine intikam alma fırsatı sunulmuştur. Katılımcılarda prosedürel ve dağıtımsal adalet algısı, pozitif ve negatif duygu ile temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar, intikam güdümlemesinden önce ve sonra ölçülmüştür. Katılımcılar kendilerine intikam alma fırsatı sunulduktan sonra; temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarının tatmininde, pozitif duygularında ve dağıtımsal adalet algılarında yükselme bildirmişlerdir. Bunun yanında intikam davranışları, bahsedilen değişkenleri yordamakta başarısız olmuştur. Bulgulardan yapılabilecek çıkarımlar tartışılmış ve gelecekteki çalışmalar için çeşitli değişiklikler önerilmiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** İntikam, Temel Psikolojik İhtiyaçlar, Prosedürel Adalet, Dağıtımdal Adalet, Deneysel Desen

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to start my series of expressing gratitude by mentioning TÜBİTAK Directorate of Science Fellowships and Grant Programmes for their valuable support during my graduate level studies.

Nominees accept that they are going to work under a supervisor when they are applying to a master's program. If they are changing schools between bachelor's and master's degree like I did, they can only hope that their supervisor happens to be a kind person, since they usually don't know the new academic stuff. I was highly fortunate to have not one but two incredibly supportive and easy to work with supervisors. First I would like to thank, Assoc. Prof. Ahmet Uysal for trusting in me and accepting me as a master thesis student when I first applied to METU. You were the reason I felt attached to my subject and earned the necessary tools to conduct a research. Years from now, I will still be talking about how great of an experience to be your student. Second I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan for accepting me as a thesis student, when I was left without one. When I was working with you, I felt like I am capable of doing anything work-related. You were supportive and encouraging, and it was always a great pleasure to have a talk with you about non-work related subjects. You are the nicest person I have met in Academy.

This thesis would have been much worse, if the valuable feedbacks from Prof Dr. Özlem Bozo-Özen and Prof. Dr. Ayşen Güre did not exist. Thank you for helping me decorate my thesis in a way that I could not have imagined without you.

My dearest friends and colleagues Hazal Öztekin, Elis Güngör, Zeynep Şaklar and Özde Koçak, you made this fun and easy. The whole process would have been unbearable without you. If I am talking positively about student life at METU in the

future, that is because of you. Thank you for always being there for me. Best people ever. 10/10 would recommend.

My next thank you goes to one of the wisest and coolest person I know, Ilgım Ardıç. You comforted me when I stressed out. You are the address that I visited when I needed a good advice. Knowing that I have you close to me has always been empowering. I am grateful to have a friend like you throughout my bachelor and master's degrees.

Before this thesis I was the only one in my family without a master's degree. Şehnaz Uysal and Sezai Şahin, I am so proud of and thankful to be your son. Your support is always priceless. I hope I will continue honoring you in the future, since you have always been sources to be honored for me.

Most importantly I would like to thank Sara Hurşidi for always complementing me. Without you not only this thesis, but all of my three years in this university would have been incomplete. This thesis falls second to being with you, in the list of my achievements for master's degree. You were my best friend, my partner in humor, my reason to carry on. If I was allowed to, I would have written you as a co-author for my thesis. Still you have your name written on every phase of this experience. If every word and every punctuation mark was a "thank you" in this thesis, they would not be able to express my gratitude for having you as my partner. You are my favorite person and I love you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	x
LIST OF TABLES .....	xiii
CHAPTER	
1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. General Discussion.....	1
1.2. Revenge .....	3
1.3 Revenge and Justice .....	7
1.4. Basic Psychological Needs.....	11
1.5. Current Study.....	15
2.METHOD.....	18
2.1 Study 1.....	18
2.1.1 Participants.....	18
2.1.2. Measurements.....	18
2.1.2.1. Manipulation Check .....	18
2.1.2.3. Basic Psychological Needs .....	19
2.1.2.4. Demographics .....	20
2.1.3. Procedure.....	20

2.2. Study 2 .....	21
2.2.1. Participants .....	21
2.2.2. Measurements .....	22
2.2.2.1 Injustice .....	22
2.2.2.2. Affect .....	22
2.2.2.3. Basic Psychological Needs .....	23
2.2.2.4. Demographics.....	23
2.2.3. Procedure.....	23
3.RESULTS.....	27
3.1 Study 1 .....	27
3.1.1 Data Screening.....	27
3.1.2 Manipulation Check.....	27
3.1.3 Between Groups Comparisons.....	28
3.1.4 Bivariate Correlations .....	28
3.1.5 Hypothesis Testing.....	29
3.2 Study 2 .....	31
3.2.1 Data Screening.....	31
3.2.2. Manipulation Check .....	31
3.2.3 Bivariate Correlation.....	32
3.2.4. Pre and Post Manipulation Comparison.....	34
3.2.5 Hypothesis Testing.....	34
4.DISCUSSION.....	36
4.1. Study 1 .....	36
4.2. Study 2 .....	38
4.3. General Discussion, Limitations and Future Research.....	40

REFERENCES.....	45
-----------------	----

## APPENDICES

Appendix A. Approval of METU Human Subjects Ethics Committee .....	51
Appendix B. Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule .....	53
Appendix C. Needs Satisfaction Needs Frustration Scale .....	55
Appendix D. Satisfaction with Life/ Vitality Scale .....	57
Appendix E. Justice Perception Sub-Scales .....	58
Appendix F. Demographic Information.....	59
Appendix G. Essay Writing Options for Study 2 .....	60
Appendix H. Bogus Essay Presented to Participants in Study 2 .....	62
Appendix I. Informed Consent Form for Study 1.....	63
Appendix J. Debriefing Form for Study 1.....	64
Appendix K. Announcement Text.....	65
Appendix L. Informed Consent Form for Study 2 .....	66
Appendix M. Debriefing Form for Study 2.....	67
Appendix N. Türkçe Özet/Turkish Summary .....	68
Appendix O. Tez İzin Formu/Thesis Permission Form.....	81

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 3. 1Bivariate Correlations and Reliability Values for Study One Variables ...	30
Table 3. 2Bivariate Correlations of Control and Justice Perception Variables.....	32
Table 3. 3Bivariate Correlations and Reliability Values for Study Two Variables...	33

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1. General Discussion**

Recall that one event that kept you awake for a night. The event that made you feel like crying even though you usually define yourself as emotionally stable. The event that you felt vulnerable and incompetent. This looks traumatizing though the event you recalled is just any event with the element of injustice in it. It might be someone cutting in line in front of you in the traffic, it might be getting scolded heavily by your superior for others' fault. It might even be an actual trauma but let's stick with something mild. Have you forgiven the person? Are you satisfied with the actual outcome? Have you done something to compensate your negative feelings? Why and why not? These are the main questions when we are talking about injustice and the acts following them. Throughout this thesis we will try to investigate the perception of injustice and acts of vengeance with their links to other psychological concepts like well-being and satisfaction.

If you have a general concept of "justice" in your mind, you must have observed something "unjust". Even if this event has not occurred to you personally, you might have heard it from a complaining friend, read it on the news, or anything else fails you should easily detect the injustice on your favorite TV series. The term is a relatively frequent in our daily lives. About the ways to act upon after such events, on the other hand, people have different approaches. Most people would advise you to forgive and forget. That way would be deemed as safer, more



humane and would decrease the risk of further retribution. When people put it into words that way, forgiveness seems the most logical option for responding to injustice. Then why do people fail to act in that way? Why those events come to people's minds easily? Why do people enjoy giving others what they deserve? Why does Batman exist? You might have your answers for those. Science has several contradicting ones.

As a main reason for any behavior, the first thing that comes to mind is happiness. We as human beings strive happiness throughout our lives. At least it would be fine to argue that it is far easier to report a degree of relevance to any kind of positive emotion if not happiness per se. Therefore, it should be predictable to see mood and emotions as the main outcome variables for revenge in the literature (e.g., Bushman, Baumeister, & Phillips, 2001; Carlsmith, Wilson, & Gilbert, 2008). Bushman and his colleagues (2001) mainly argued that people seek revenge to improve their emotional state. They have measured anger responses as the outcome of revenge behavior and found out that people acted out less in response to an offense, when they believe that their mood have been frozen. On the contrary, Carlsmith and colleagues (2008) presented that people ruminate after they took revenge and this condition harms their well-being in the long run. They measured mood with statements like "please, positive, irritated". As it can be observed here in terms of mood as the outcome of revenge, researchers fail to agree upon a single prediction. Gollwitzer and Bushman (2012) further went on to re-test vengeance as a mood regulator. When they used a similar design with Bushman and colleagues' study (2001) in which the participants were lead to believe their mood has improved automatically, the revenge behavior has not shown any statistical difference. They argued that if people were made to focus on their affective state explicitly they attribute the change in their mood to revenge. Thereupon, it would be controversial to assume that people take revenge to feel better.

Another frequent encounter as an alternative reason for revenge is satisfaction (e.g., Gollwitzer, Mader, & Schmitt, 2011; Gromet, Okimoto, Wenzell, & Darley,

2012). In the former article (Gollwitzer et al., 2011) the participants reported their satisfaction on statements such as “I feel satisfied”. In first the three studies people who exacted revenge reported higher levels of satisfaction compared to people who did not. The second study lacked a revenge condition. In the third study, satisfaction ratings from revenge and no-revenge grouped differed only if the participant received a message about offender’s understanding of their punishment. The results of this study somehow contradicting to infer that revenge is satisfying since it is found to be conditional. In the study by Gromet and colleagues (2012), it has been observed that people punished the offenders less severely when they have the perception that the victim was satisfied with the outcome. In this study, the punishers are a third party who acted like judges. One of the main argument here was that the jurors were made to take the perspective of the victim. So, one can argue that since the people are already in the position of a victim when they are acting out of vengeance personally, they should be seeking revenge for satisfaction too. Although it might seem convincing, the results only suggested that people punish third parties in the sake of victim’s satisfaction. Once more literature provided partial answers for the main question, what makes people exact revenge on others.

One of the main aims of this study is to answer the questions above and find the motive behind vengeful behavior. To achieve this the study investigates the relationship between revenge, justice perception and basic needs satisfaction. As you go through this chapter you will first be presented with what the past research on revenge tells us about the nature of the behavior. Then you will find the explanation of the justice component in revenge. At last, the literature on Basic Psychological Needs Theory will be reviewed and the reason why the theory should be noticed in revenge research will be explained.

## **1.2. Revenge**

Before starting to investigate the reasons behind people’s eagerness to exact revenge, it is important to clear the meaning behind the word revenge. Revenge as

a word has an array of meanings and much more concepts that are related to or used as synonymous with the word. This makes it hard for the researchers to agree upon a single definition for the concept. The most concise and, in terms of Turkish meaning, the most direct definition of revenge was made as “action taken in response to a perceived harm or wrongdoing by another person that is intended to inflict harm, damage, discomfort or injury to the party judged responsible” (Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001, p. 53). This will be the basic definition that the thesis will refer to when it mentions revenge. Moreover, it would be deficient to use the word revenge without mentioning its related concepts since this definition lack several concepts itself. Therefore, people should also consider the meanings that will be mentioned below.

In the literature, revenge was sometimes defined as punishment (Carlsmith, Wilson, & Gilbert, 2008; Gollwitzer & Bushman, 2012). The main argument came from the fact that punishment has a similar definition with revenge for lay people and to be able to observe revenge behaviorally, one may observe punishment. These are in fact good points for a) it brings out the knowledge that revenge is not only a behavior and b) we must consider lay people when we are defining concepts. Revenge, as the most concepts in psychology, has affective, behavioral and cognitive aspects. When we are referring to behavioral aspect of revenge, it would not be erroneous to use punishment interchangeably. Another study by Orth (2003) defined revenge as taking the victim’s perspective on deciding on a punishment. Meaning that punishment is greater than revenge since punishment can be done by third parties. This emphasizes the subjective nature of revenge and its relation with punishment. If one were to consider this proposition, one would infer that people who were put in a position of a victim may quickly demonstrate their revenge as in the form of a punishment. This punishment can be executed by the victim him/herself or by someone else. The important point here is that when the punisher is a third party, the punishment is no longer an act of revenge. This might be the main distinction between the two concepts when either of them is referred to further in the thesis.

Another frequently encountered word in the revenge literature is the word anger and aggression (e.g., Bies & Tripp, 1996; Bushman et al., 2001; Denzler, Förster, & Liberman, 2009; Liang, Brown, Lian, Hanig, Ferris, & Keeping, 2018). Both terms are not free floating emotions per se. As in the punishment, anger and aggression are both directed to a significant source, a source of injustice, untrustworthiness, abusive authority or insult. The initial act that triggered an aggressive or angry response might also be an act of aggression but that would not be enough for us to call the act vengeful. So, another component of revenge is highlighted here, reciprocity. For one to take revenge, one should aggress against someone who previously done wrong to that person. Otherwise it is plain violence. One can argue that acts of revenge can also be violent. That would be one good point however that does not make revenge and violence equals. Revenge and violence are complex terms that can have overlaps in certain cases. This is why someone has to draw their lines clear when someone uses any other word in place of revenge. In their article Elshout and her colleagues addressed a similar issue in detail (Elshout, Nelissen, & van Beest, 2014). They have presented that the anger driven responses has a slim difference from vengeful responses. Both responses have that interpersonal aspect to them though revenge is ahead on self-focus. The study found that offenses that led to a vengeful response has more potential to harm one's self construct (infidelity) while anger driven responses follows offenses like arguing which are less relevant to one's self. Building on this, people who act vengefully also elicit behaviors that induce self-threat to the wrongdoer more commonly compared to people who act out of anger. This stresses the reciprocal nature of revenge even more. Even though anger driven responses are also reciprocal, vengeful responses seems to consider intrapersonal and interpersonal facets of an offense jointly, and try to evoke similar disturbances in the self-concept of the perpetrator. Further findings suggest that people who acted out of revenge compared to anger, reported feeling self-conscious emotions (e.g., humiliation, shame) more. These findings here should be considered important since they once more emphasize the self-relevance of revenge and lay ground to affective part of revenge concept.

Retaliation is another word to encounter in revenge literature (Liang et al., 2018; Funches, Markley, & Davis, 2009). This is the result of definitions of both revenge and retaliation involving a degree of returning harm. Actually Liang and her colleagues used the definition of revenge that we used in this article to define retaliation although in the original article it is used to define revenge. (Liang et al., 2018). The question for us to answer here is, is it necessary to distinguish between these two concepts when they are used in one another's place in daily life, and in literature. Sometimes revenge has been distinguished from retaliation (Grobbink, Derksen, & Marle, 2015). It has been argued that retaliation is a quicker and logical response to a wrongdoing, compared to revenge which is defined as more personal, emotional and long-term. They have argued that since the revenge involves more complex emotions and more internalized, it has a more personal value and one might take their time to act vengefully. While acting out of revenge one might get over emotional and disregard logic in their actions. Retaliation, on the other hand, is stated as returning what has been suffered hence a more logical response, calling it "regulated revenge". The importance of this distinction was evaluating the behavior while acknowledging the emotions. A recent review on revenge defined revenge as "motivated retaliation" (Jackson, Choi, & Gelfand, 2019). Once more revenge and retaliation can be observed being used as a component of the one another. For this reason, though the difference was presented, the two concepts were referred to as "revenge" throughout this thesis.

Before moving onto its relation with the concerned variables, it would be attentive and explanatory to list the characteristics of revenge. A study was made to understand what people usually refer to when they mention the word revenge (Elshout, Nelissen, & van Beest, 2015). They wanted to elaborate what is more to the nature of vengeance than just returning harm. It was explained that the reason behind using lay people's definitions of revenge as them having better coverage of the whole concept. Researcher often try to use brief definitions to be more accurate on what they measure. Although this is advantageous for the sake of science, it is clearly fortifying to consider facets that have been left out of the definition, but

highly related to the term itself. In the study (Elshout et al., 2015) the authors presented sixty-nine features of vengeance, thirty-six of them were named central and thirty-three of them were named peripheral features according to subjects. The words that are perceived as the most central for revenge were grouped under vindictive feelings and anger. Moving on the third most frequent group, people reported “returning the harm” while defining revenge. As emphasized before revenge has a central affective aspect the people report more frequently than its widely used definition, that should not be ignored. “Personal” and “Deliberate” were also central components stressing the self-relevant feature of revenge and suggesting that people consciously and willingly take revenge. These were considered as the main characteristics of the revenge by the writer of this thesis. Several other features of revenge that was detected by Elshout and her colleagues will further be referred throughout the thesis.

### **1.3 Revenge and Justice**

Going back to the original aim of discovering the motivation behind the revenge behavior, one of the key concepts that is encountered is the term justice. In the study where Elshout and colleagues try to set a prototype for revenge, “justice” was one of the central features and seventh most frequently expressed word for the subjects (Elshout, Nelissen, & van Beest, 2015). Another one was taking the law into your own hands, which was about being the jury for the justice of the situation. People usually think of justice when they are thinking of revenge. As it is stated multiple times, revenge is taken when someone is harmed by another. Someone might argue that people reciprocate the harm to the original harm doer since it is the fair thing to do. This does not have to be the case all the time. People might have other motives than fairness as it was stated in the literature multiple times.

One of the articulated motives other than justice for revenge is the deterrence of harm (McCullough, Kurzban, & Tabak, 2013). They have argued in their chapter that defining revenge as returning harm or getting even, makes the revenge

behavior non-functional. They believe that for an action be functional it must benefit the mechanism of that same action when it is executed. When someone gets even with someone, they gave that person the opportunity to get even with them once more, named as counter-revenge. Therefore, this might not be a functional motive for people to exact revenge. According to the authors, it might be the idea of changing people's incentives on doing harm might be a more functional explanation for revenge. When people exact revenge and return the harm, the original harm doer will develop the understanding that by continuing this kind of behavior they increase the chance of them getting harmed too. This might end up deterring them from engaging in the same behavior in the future. They further support their claim by presenting another way of changing incentives as withholding benefits, namely economical ones. If one withholds benefits from the perpetrator, he/she does not return the harm directly but engage in some kind of revenge. Hence by doing this people still might change the incentives of the wrongdoer. This is assumed as more functional since the receiver of the behavior (revenge) likewise evolve their response. The main problem here with this explanation is that they mostly consider economical outcomes. People do not have to delve into incentives when they are socially interacting. Revenge is presented as having a central emotional side to it and when people are experiencing those emotions, future incentives might look peripheral. Though it might be helpful to specify the motive of revenge as deterring future harm for economical behavior, for general social behavior it lacks the personal factors.

Second alternative for justice as a motive for revenge was suggested as rehabilitation of the wrongdoer (Darley & Pittman, 2003). Supporters of this motive also take the definition of revenge as returning the harm. In their article they stated that people punish the harm doers to make them understand what they have caused. They want the perpetrator to be in the position of the victim and learn. The main motive here is to change the attitudes of the perpetrator rather than their incentives. The lesson taught here is that the pain of the revenge exceeds the pleasure of initial harm for the wrongdoer. This should be considered a strong

alternative for justice as the motive for revenge. In another study by Gollwitzer and colleagues (2011) found results that can be argued as supporters for rehabilitation as the motive of revenge. They have presented two hypotheses on what satisfies the victims when they take revenge, comparative suffering hypothesis suggest that victims are satisfied with revenge because they bring their levels of suffering to a similar level with the offender; understanding hypothesis states that revenge is about delivering a message to the offender. They have measured satisfaction after revenge behavior, which was a punishment, and compared the groups with one of them getting even with the offender, and the second one getting even and receiving a note with connotations that the offender understood why they have been treated like that. In two out of three studies, the understanding hypothesis occurred to be confirmed. This does not necessarily mean that the main motive of revenge is to teach a lesson to the wrongdoer. It might suggest that seeing the wrongdoer learned something and could change their attitudes adds an extra amount of satisfaction for the revenge taker. Also it can be declared that the lesson given to the offender here is a lesson about justice leaving justice as the original motive for revenge. Or it might be a way of rationalizing the revenge behavior since it is viewed as inherently wrong by the society (Osgood, 2017).

As it was stated earlier the motive that the people often articulated for revenge was justice. Correspondingly this statement has more supportive arguments in the literature compared to deterring harm. (Osgood, 2017). As presented by Osgood revenge is usually preceded by an act of injustice. Yoshimura (2007) observed 15 types of behavior that was reported as initiators of revenge. All of them involved some perceived injustice. In their study, Bies and Tripp (1996) identified common beliefs from the subjects when they were providing a reason for revenge as “doing the right thing” and “doing justice”. These further show that when we talk about revenge we are talking about injustice. Injustice can be eliminated by restoring the justice or at least having the sense of justice after everything is said and done. One of the alternatives to achieve this to exact revenge. More supporting arguments



were rendered by a study about reactions to injustice (Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2006). The researchers asked some employees to rate their perceptions of procedural justice (which they discussed as fairness and consistency of the organization) on a hypothetical scenario, then asked them how the people in the scenario should have acted. They observed that when the procedural justice was perceived to be lower, people suggested revenge as the appropriate behavior more. These results might be the indicators that people in their organizations try to restore the justice in their own terms by taking revenge. Although it would be hasty to call restoring justice as the main motive for revenge, it is apparent that justice and revenge are related constructs. In fact, in the literature, revenge has been referred to as retributive justice. (Vidmar, 2002). In this article the author explains retributive justice as an outcome of retributive impulses. These impulses come from the initial loss of balance in justice and social norms. It has been argued that when people observe a rule or norm violation, they elaborate the incident in perspective to their self. If they believe that the violation harmed their self-construct they engage in anger. Hence, to steam off this emotion and balance the disturbed cognition, one exacts punishment on the violator. When the term is observed from this standpoint it might seem as a more collective concept rather than a personal one. Since the article itself is about law, the communal part of revenge has been emphasized here. Yet, when we recognize the usage of the term by Wenzel and his colleagues, we might understand the personal part of retributive justice (Wenzel, Okimoto, Feather, & Platow, 2008). The retributive justice here has been presented as a motive on revenge with the alternative of restorative justice as the motive for compensation. Assuming that someone has the motivation to restore justice by equalizing the harms received and make the offender suffer the same injustice, it can be inferred that the person's motive on taking the revenge was retributive justice. Nonetheless the motivation was to bring justice to the incident by making the offender understand and agree with the values he/she has violated to begin with, it can be argued that the motive for revenge was restorative justice. As it can be seen in both cases, injustice appears to be an antecedent. If one acts out of personal accounts in response to injustice it is about revenge and

retributive justice, while one is minding community values they seek compensation and have restorative justice as their motive. This is one of the main reasons why the personal nature of the revenge behavior has been emphasized more compared to the communal part in this thesis. In addition to this, it was suggested that the unfair treatment should be perceived as intentional for a victim to take revenge (Darley & Pittman, 2003; Okimoto & Wenzell, 2010). When the act was perceived as involuntary, compensation was demanded. Once again justice seems to be the motive behind revenge behavior given that the injustice has been taken personally by the victim. When all of these information was considered it was presumed in this study that revenge behavior requires an injustice and people take revenge to restore their perception of justice. Furthermore, this presumption alone is not sufficient to explain the revenge behavior itself. Whereas previous studies tried to present mood and emotions as the outcome of revenge behavior, in this study it has been proposed that an alternative outcome should be more fundamentally structured within the human psychology. Hence the basic psychological needs satisfaction was decided to be the determinant of the achieved outcome of justice restoration by exacting revenge.

#### **1.4. Basic Psychological Needs**

Basic psychological needs have been conceptualized by Deci and Ryan (2000) as a part of their broad Self Determination Theory (SDT). In SDT, it has been proposed that people do not solely act upon their physiological needs. Three innate psychological needs; need for autonomy, need for competence, and need for relatedness has been proposed. The thing that makes these basic psychological needs different from physiological needs is that their aim is personal growth, vitality and integration rather than survival. It is further stated that these psychological needs do not arise from deprivation of some source. One does not seek for autonomy when one realizes that the level of autonomy in their system has reached to a critical level. These needs are deemed necessary components of personal growth and well-being and they have to be satisfied for a person to function properly. Therefore, people feel that these needs are not satisfied when

they observe that they do not function properly or environmental factors does not allow them to continue their personal growth. Another way of identifying basic needs is to seek for the conditions that allow positive psychological consequences related to need satisfaction. When people appreciate those conditions they seek to get involved with those, not because they try to satisfy their needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness. Since people are growth oriented they feel that these conditions create the most adaptive environment for them to be effective, connected and coherent. It is proposed in this thesis that revenge can be named under the behaviors that simply satisfies one's basic psychological needs, consequently leading to people's persistence on engaging in revenge behavior repeatedly.

Autonomy can be defined in terms of self-determination as self-governance (Ryan & Deci, 2006). This suggests that autonomy is achieved when people regulate their lives by their inner impulses and interests. It can be easily mixed with independence. Autonomy in fact involves independence but as argued by Van Petegem and his colleagues (Van Petegem, Beyers, Vansteenkiste, & Soenens, 2012) the positive consequences assigned to autonomy such as social functioning can be observed when it is defined as self-endorsed vs. controlled compared to when it is defined as independence vs. dependence. Likewise, one can choose to be dependent in a situation, and if one believes this choice was self-endorsed, one can satisfy their need for autonomy while being dependent.

Competence can be defined as control and self-efficacy (Deci & Ryan, 2000). People try to control and be effective in their environment. The need for competence is satisfied for people to the degree that people feels they have the ability and the understanding of their surroundings to manipulate, function through or direct them. One example of competence supportive activity is providing structure. Structure is the clear explanation of what is expected from someone and what are some effective ways to satisfy these expectations (Jang, Reeve, & Deci, 2010). When structure is provided people's control over the task increases. This leads to increased levels of self-efficacy and perceived competence whereas it

lowers the helplessness behavior. Another effective way of manipulating competence is providing feedback. Positive feedback that directly mentions effectance satisfies the need for competence whereas negative feedback on ineffectance thwarts it (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Relatedness can be defined as reciprocal love and care for others, a need of connectedness (Vansteenkiste, Niemiec, & Soenens, 2010). We as human beings need to interact with others. If an activity prevents us from getting the needed social interactions, we try to avoid that activity. The degrees of relatedness can be altered by acting warm and caring and providing unconditional love.

The relationship between justice and psychological needs satisfaction has been examined previously in work environment contexts (Olafsen, Halvari, Forest, & Deci, 2015; Aryee, Walumbwa, Mondejar, & Chu, 2013). In both of the studies the researchers practiced questionnaires as their primary measurement tool. In the study by Aryee and colleagues (2013) the justice in the work environment has been measured by using a 6-item overall justice scale while the need satisfaction was measured by 12 items, 4 for each need. They found out that as the employees perceive higher levels of overall justice in their organization, their psychological needs tend to be satisfied. Olafsen and colleagues (2015) found a similar result, using a different measure for justice in work place. They applied Procedural and Distributive Justice scales (Colquitt, 2001). Colquitt (2001) explains procedural justice as the perceived fairness of the processes used to arrive at the outcome and the person's influence on this outcome. Distributive justice though explained as the perceived fairness of outcomes related to their contribution. The researchers observed that basic psychological needs satisfaction was related to procedural justice, while the distributive justice was unrelated. The authors explained this finding as distributive justice being about the actual pay received by the employees. Monetary gains proposed as an extrinsic motivation, hence it has been argued that it fails to satisfy basic psychological needs, which are often related to intrinsic motivation (Deci, Koestnerr, & Ryan, 1999). As both studies presented, people feel that their needs are satisfied and they can continue their personal

growth when they perceive a way of justice in their life. Thus it should be justified to conclude that seeking acts that restore justice might be by virtue of satisfying basic psychological needs.

While basic psychological needs are a novelty in revenge literature, this is not the first time someone proposed needs as the possible outcome variables for injustice and revenge. The needs that has been thwarted by unfair treatment has been proposed as status and power (Shnabel & Nadler, 2008). Moving on, the authors provided the perspective of the perpetrator and they suggested that the act of injustice damages the offenders social acceptance. During the aftermath of the unjust treatment, both parties strive to satisfy those needs that have been frustrated. They used their findings to provide valuable information on reconciliation process, as people should acknowledge the victim's recovery of power, while the offender should be provided with increase in their moral standing. Although the findings served nothing regarding revenge behavior, an alternative for reconciliation might be argued as taking revenge and another theory can be built upon existing propositions. Developing on the same theory, Pemberton and colleagues (Pemberton, Aarten, & Mulder, 2017) proposed agency and communion as the primary needs that have been affected by injustice-revenge process. They named these need as the Big Two of victimization by crime. Agency has several definitions most of them related to competence, instrumentality, individual striving, power and independent self-construal, whereas communion has been linked to social relatedness, morality, warmth, expressiveness and interdependent self-construal. As it has been argued by the authors when a person has been treated unfairly and put in a position of a victim, they lose the sense of power and competence and experience inferiority. Likewise, the sense of unity and trust would be harmed for the victim, seeing that nobody has stood for them while they suffered. The authors carry on to provide suggestions about how revenge can restore those values. Previously explained concepts retributive and restorative justice once more shows up. Retributive justice which is about taking the law into one's hands and applying punishment on the offender is mostly related to agency

need. Besides if the priority is the values of the victim to be restored, the term restorative justice is referred. Providing restorative justice can satisfy the communion need, if the victim feels that the offender and/or third parties sympathize with the victim and acknowledge that they are understood and connected. One solution to satisfy both needs as proposed by the authors was to providing an option to a victim on what should be the punishment for the offender, as a third party whom provides concern and understanding. The researchers end their valuable suggestions with the assertion that although procedural justice and the Big Two are highly related structures, literature fail to provide adequate exploration of the connection between them. Taking this lack of connection and previously mentioned framework of revenge regarding justice, present studies has been formed.

### **1.5. Current Study**

To be able serve a well-grounded answer for why do people keep on taking revenge, the reviews of the concepts revenge, justice and basic needs satisfaction has been provided. Though some of the connections between the concepts has already been investigated, a collective and detailed investigation of the three concepts seems to be lacking. In the present studies the ultimate aim would be combining these three concepts, hence combining the literatures.

Before providing the hypotheses, it would be safe to repeat the sole presumption that this study has, which is revenge requires an act of injustice. The connection of the three concepts starts from previously mentioned link between injustice and needs satisfaction.

H1: The acts of injustice will be detrimental for basic psychological need satisfaction.

H1a: The acts of injustice will be detrimental for autonomy satisfaction

H1b: The acts of injustice will be detrimental for competence satisfaction

H1c: The acts of injustice will be detrimental for relatedness satisfaction

Moving on to the revenge as the centerpiece of the study, the most vocalized motive for revenge as restoring justice has been accepted for the present studies.

H2: Taking revenge will increase perceived procedural and distributive justice.

Previously in the literature the relationship between revenge and basic psychological needs has not been presented. Yet the previously explained need for agency and need for communion could be perceived as counterparts of the three psychological needs. Agency seems to be containing features of both autonomy and competence since it is about power and individual existence. Onward it is reasonable to expect one to lose a sense of control over their decisions, when an offender force some kind of suffering upon them. Thus it can be argued that the frustration of autonomy can be repaired by giving the right to decide for the victim on how to rearrange the suffering between them and the perpetrator. For the sake of competence, the definition of the lost power (Foster & Rusbult, 1999) or perceived control (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994) after the unfair treatment seems similar with the definition of competence in self-determination theory since both involves control over environment. After an act of revenge, a victim might perceive improvement in their competence since they would observe that they have the required tools to have the desired effect on the outcome of an offense directed at them. Moving on to the need for relatedness, it is basically the same concept with communion. Although the acknowledgment of the comprehension of the suffered harm and values by a third party would satisfy the need for relatedness, the negative effect of initial injustice is anticipated to hinder the observation of this satisfaction after the revenge is executed. Contrary to the literature, the three basic psychological needs appear to be satisfied collectively. Therefore, as revenge would satisfy the needs of autonomy and competence, it should satisfy the need for relatedness indirectly.

H3: Taking revenge should satisfy basic psychological needs.

H4: The increase in perceived procedural and distributive justice will mediate the relationship between revenge and basic psychological need satisfaction.

To be able to test these four hypotheses two studies were conducted. In the first study H1 was tested. As presented earlier there are several findings supporting the first hypothesis. Mentioned findings were observed in an organizational context and by using questionnaires. The aim of the first study is to find out whether a similar finding can be observed with real life experiences of injustice as reported by the participants. This method of observing perceived unfairness has been previously operated (e.g., McCulough, Fincham & Tsang, 2003; Liang et al., 2018). In the second study hypotheses 2,3 and 4 were tested in an experimental design. Injustice manipulation in the second study has been done by giving negative feedback on a writing task. The reasons behind using this method were that it is known for a negative feedback to frustrate the need for competence (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Burgers, Eden, Engelenburg, & Buningh, 2015), and providing negative feedback has been practiced as injustice inducer in revenge related studies before (e.g. Gollwitzer et al., 2011; Zdaniuk & Bobocel, 2012). Assessment of revenge behavior has been directly taken from the study by Okimoto and Wenzel (2010) as victims' assignment of the degree of unpleasantness and duration of a second task for the offender.

Besides the main hypotheses variables assessing mood and well-being was used in both studies to check and rule out possible alternates for revenge motives. Self-esteem was also measured to control for possible link between revenge and self-esteem boost as previously observed (Baumeister, Smart, & Boden, 1996; Zdaniuk & Bobocel, 2012).



## **CHAPTER 2**

### **METHOD**

#### **2.1 Study 1**

##### **2.1.1 Participants**

Participants were students from Middle East Technical University. Participants were recruited online in return of course credits. Final sample consisted of 300 participants. 195 of them were females, 103 males and 2 of them identified themselves as other. Mean age for the participants was 21.71 and the age range was between 18 and 42.

##### **2.1.2. Measurements**

###### **2.1.2.1. Manipulation Check**

After the participants assigned to their manipulation groups and finished writing a previous life experience they were asked a single question as “Please rate the positivity and negativity of the event you have mentioned on the 7-point scale below”. Second manipulation check item was hidden in Positive Affect Negative Affect Scale as an extra item which is shown as “victimized”. Third manipulation check was presented as an item while assessing basic psychological needs as “I feel like I was victimized”.

### **2.1.2.2. Affect**

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) was used to assess participants' mood. Participants were asked to rate the degree of experiencing 21 emotions; 10 measuring positive affect (e.g., enthusiastic, determined) and 10 measuring negative affect (e.g., hostile, nervous) and 1 item to assess injustice (victimized), on a five point Likert Scale, 1 standing for Not at All, 5 standing for Extremely.

Turkish adaptation of the scale was done by Gençöz (2000) and was proven statistically reliable and consistent. The internal consistency for subscales of negative affect (NA) and positive affect (PA) have been observed as .86 and .83 correspondingly. Test re-test reliability numbers were reported as NA = .40 and PA= .54.

We further assessed participants' well-being with Vitality Scale (Ryan & Frederick, 1997). Participants responded to six item (e.g., "I have energy and spirit.") about how much they believe it is true for them on a seven point Likert Scale 1 standing for not at all true, 7 standing for very true. Reliability analysis revealed the Cronbach alpha for the scale as .934.

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWL) (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) was also used. Five items (e.g., "In most ways my life is close to my ideal") assessed participants' overall satisfaction with their lives. SWL items were presented with the items of Vitality Scale; they used the same formatting. Reliability analysis results showed that the scale had a Cronbach alpha of .870.

### **2.1.2.3. Basic Psychological Needs**

Basic Need Satisfaction - Need Frustration Scale (BSFS) (Chen et al., 2015) was adapted to continuous tense to collect participants' present time reactions to items. The questionnaire consists of 21 statements assessing participants' autonomy (e.g., "People I interact with tend to take my feelings into consideration"), competence

(e.g., "Often, I do not feel very competent") and relatedness (e.g., "I consider the people I interact with to be my friends") satisfactions. Participants were asked to rate their agreement with these statements on a seven point Likert Scale. 1 standing for not at all true, 7 standing for very true.

Further six items (e.g., "I frequently feel there are novelties for me") were affiliated to assess novelty, a fourth need proposed by Gonzalez-Cutre and colleagues (Gonzalez-Cutre, Sicilia, Sierra, Ferriz, & Hagger, 2016), and an item to check whether the participant felt victimized ("I feel like I was victimized").

The translation of the scales into Turkish was done by four translators. Translation was done independently. The team came together to agree upon the best translated items to form the new translation.

Confirmatory factor analysis revealed that, the data did not fit the proposed model for three sub-dimensions (S-B  $\chi^2$  (249) = 562.501,  $p < .001$ ), however comparative fit index and root mean-square error of approximation estimates revealed an acceptable fit for the model (CFI = .90, RMSEA = .065, CI = [.058, .072], RHO = .94) according to Hair et al. (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 2010) and Kline (2005) in their respective books. The reliability values (Cronbach alpha) for three sub-dimensions were .876 for autonomy, .921 for competence and .868 for relatedness.

#### **2.1.2.4. Demographics**

Participants' age and gender were the only demographics that have been recorded. For gender there were three options (male, female, other).

#### **2.1.3. Procedure**

Data collection commenced after Middle East Technical University, Human Participants Ethic Committee has approved the procedure and the items that has been used in the study. All participants have completed the study online. They

have been directed to the study website from University database that the participants gain course credit from. They were first presented with the consent form. Participants were informed about their rights to end the study whenever they feel like it and anonymity of their responses. After their agreement to participate, participants have been randomly assigned to one of the three conditions; injustice condition, negative control condition and control condition. In all conditions participants were asked to write a personal experience of theirs as a small paragraph. In the injustice condition they were asked to write an experience where they have been treated unjustly and felt victimized. In negative control condition they have been asked to write an experience where the consequences were undesired for them and that they feel responsible for. In control condition participants were asked to write an experience where they have interacted with other people. When the writing part finished the participants were presented with the questionnaires. First they answered the manipulation check question than proceeded to complete PANAS, BPNS, self-esteem scale, vitality and satisfaction with life scales. After that they have provided their age and sex. At the end of the questionnaires participants were presented with the debriefed about the purpose of the study and were provided with the e-mail address of the researcher if they have any questions regarding the study.

## **2.2. Study 2**

After the first study failed to produce anticipated results, the researcher wanted to observe the effects of injustice on psychological needs with a more controlled study. Thus second study used experimental design in which injustice forced on the participants and observed participants' justice perception with a scale, compared to single item assessment in the first study.

### **2.2.1. Participants**

Participants were students from Middle East Technical University. Participants were recruited online in return of course credits (63) or volunteered (7) to

participate in the study. From 70 individual responses 23 was removed. Twenty-three participants, whose data were removed, understood the deceptive nature of the study. Final sample consisted of 47 (27 females) participants. Mean age for the participants was 21.29 and the age range was between 19 and 30.

## **2.2.2. Measurements**

### **2.2.2.1 Injustice**

To be able to assess whether the participants perceived injustice we used two subscales of Organizational Justice Scale (Colquitt, 2001) which were Procedural and Distributive Justice Scales since they were more relevant in the context of giving and receiving feedbacks, were used. There were seven items assessing procedural justice (e.g., “Have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures?”) and four assessing distributive justice (e.g., “Does your (outcome) reflect the effort you have put into your work?”). Participants were instructed to reflect their opinion about the essay writing process using the seven point Likert scale, 1 standing for very little and 7 is for to a great extent.

Confirmatory factor analysis revealed that, the data fit the model for the two subscales ( $\chi^2 (43) = 36.752$ ,  $p = .73$ ,  $CFI = 1.0$ ,  $RMSEA < .001$ ,  $CI = [.000, .074]$ ,  $RHO = .84$ ). Reliability values for the sub-scales can be found in Table 3.3.

The Turkish version of the scale used the word “earnings” instead of the original “outcome”. For the relevancy, the word “outcome” was used.

### **2.2.2.2. Affect**

PANAS as used in the first study repeated in the second study with only a minor change. The additional manipulation check item “victimized” has been replaced with “treated unjustly” since it has been assumed, following the results of the first study, that people might be reluctant to report that they were victimized since the

word for “victimized” in Turkish is same with “victim” and the connotation of the word in Turkish is less favorable.

### **2.2.2.3. Basic Psychological Needs**

Basic Need Satisfaction - Need Frustration Scale once more was used. Reliability values for all three sub-dimensions in second study can be found in Table 3.3.

Manipulation item remained the same since “I feel like I was victimized” does not have the similar negative connotation.

### **2.2.2.4. Demographics**

Participants’ age and gender were the only demographics that have been recorded. For gender there were three options (male, female, other).

### **2.2.3. Procedure**

Data collection commenced after Middle East Technical University, Human Participants Ethic Committee has approved the procedure and the items that has been used in the study. Participants received course credit for their participation in the study and signed up online for the study. In the sign up page, they were informed about the flow of the study which will require them to write an essay, evaluate another one and reflect their visual preferences on a series of photographs. They were invited to a waiting room setting where they have been greeted by the researcher. The researcher told them that there will be another participant participating simultaneously. The second participant here was a confederate. Following the arrival of the actual participants, the confederate was informed. When the confederate arrived at the waiting to room researcher told them to wait in the room while the researcher explains the study to the actual participant since they arrived earlier. Confederates were also informed that they will complete the study in a different room all in the presence of the actual participant.

Participants were welcomed to the experiment room where the study page was already opened on a computer displaying the consent form. Participants were informed according to script that they were asked to write an essay about 200-250 words on one of the topics that will be presented to them. They were encouraged to pick a topic that they have confidence on writing about. They have also been told that the word limit is not that strict, it has been set to ensure participants does not use the whole hour on writing the essay since there are two steps of the study, and directed them not to deduct other participants score if they have exceeded the word limit of 250. The essay they receive to grade at the end of this step was 237 words long. They were asked to knock the door of the experiment room whenever they finish writing so that the researcher can collect the written essay. They were also informed that if the researcher is with the other participant he would not hear the knocking sound, so if the researcher does not come to collect 1 minute after they knocked, they were asked to open the door of the experiment room and hold it so that the researcher can see them when he is back from talking with the other participant. Unlike the made up scenario, experimenter always responded on time. After providing this information, researcher leaves the room explaining that he will repeat the same process with the other participant in a different room. From that point confederate left the waiting room and researcher conducted the whole process alone.

Participants have chosen from seven (Cinema, Psychology, Literature, Politics, Technology, Football and Music) categories to write an essay. They always received an essay on music. When they finished their essay they knocked on the door to inform the researcher. After the participants knocked the door, researcher collected their essay and told them the other participant was not finished yet. They were asked to wait a bit till the other participant also finishes. After this the researcher waited for exactly 4 minutes and returned with the essay of the other participant which was prepared a night before the experiment. Researcher asked them to evaluate the essay of the other participant and told them that the grade they assigned to the other participant will affect the pictures that the other participant

will rate in the second part of the study. They were also encouraged to write a couple sentences long feedback with the grade if they feel like it. When they finish the grading similar knocking process was instructed. After they have graded the paper they immediately receive their essay back with a grade of 2 out of 10 and a feedback “Being this much incompetent at [their chosen topic] they should not have bothered writing an essay. I did not bother reading it.” Participants were given a fake code, namely as a code corresponding to their grade, to proceed in the study. Participants proceeded to complete Procedural and Distributive Justice Scale, PANAS and BPNS all in order. After completing the questionnaires, they were updated that the second part of the study is about to begin and they will be projecting their usual preferences. Participants were presented with 40 Cleaning Product pictures. Every picture has the question “Would you recommend this product to a friend?” beneath them. This part of the study acted as a filler task. At the end of the 40 pictures participants were instructed by the questionnaire to report to the researcher as they will give them a second code to proceed.

After the participant reported, researcher entered the study room. Told the participant that he was sorry that he read the participant’s essay and he felt that their essay does not deserve 2 out of 10 and there is an injustice caused by the other participant. They were informed that it is impossible for the researcher to take the credit back from the other participant since they have also been in the room for the required time. Instead they were given an opportunity to select overtly the category and the number of pictures that the other participant will choose from. After their choice the researcher will look from the table and give the other participant the corresponding code. Researcher also assured that he has the participant’s code and it won’t change according to their choices. They were presented with six categories (vacation resorts, fashion designs, grocery products, cleaning products, insects and skin diseases) and six numbers (15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40). The categories and number of pictures were directly integrated from a previous study assessing revenge (Okimoto & Wenzel, 2010) They were informed that these were the original categories that might have been assigned to them, and



their category should be amongst these categories too. After the choice, the researcher gave them a code to proceed. After they have entered the code the researcher explained the following question where it is asked “if you had a choice, which category would you like to choose your 40 pictures from?” with the same 6 categories, to avoid confusion with their previous choice. Then left the room to give the other participant their last code.

After they have selected their preference for the category for themselves the participants completed the same questionnaires they have completed previously to observe post manipulation difference. After they have completed the questionnaires they have been asked their age and gender. They were asked to report to the researcher. After they reported they have been debriefed about the study. Participants who showed signs of, or outwardly expressed understanding the deceptive nature of the study were branded as “turnover”. Participants (2) who displayed intense emotional responses after the study have been provided with verbal consolation, and were referred to METU Psychological Counselling and Guidance Center.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESULTS

#### 3.1 Study 1

##### 3.1.1 Data Screening

The final registered data after the data collection phase ended, belonged to 413 students. Of the 413 participant 100 failed to complete the essay writing phase of the study. thirteen participants failed to respond to the required questionnaires. Thus, after removing 113 invalid responses, the major analyses were conducted on 300 remaining responses.

Of the 300 hundred valid responses, 100 belonged to each of the three conditions as in injustice, negative control, and control conditions.

##### 3.1.2 Manipulation Check

An analysis of variance showed that the perception of positivity of the event differed significantly between the three groups,  $F(2,297) = 44.672, p < .001$ . Supplementary post-hoc analysis using Tukey's HSD demonstrated that people who wrote about an event involving injustice ( $M = 2.10, SD = 1.259$ ) and people who wrote an event involving negative consequences ( $M = 2.35, SD = 1.184$ ) reported lower levels of positivity on the mentioned event compared to people who have written about a social interaction ( $M = 3.81, SD = 1.656$ ),  $p < .001$ .

Perception of victimization was assessed by two variables. Ratings of the word “victimized” (VC1) was significantly affected by the group type,  $F(2,297) = 22.367, p < .001$ . Tukey’s post hoc test displayed that negative control group ( $M = 3.60, SD = 1.949$ ) had significantly higher ratings for “victimized” compared to control group ( $M = 2.55, SD = 1.749$ ),  $p < .001$ ; injustice group ( $M = 4.35, SD = 2.027$ ) had significantly higher ratings compared to negative control group,  $p = .16$ . The group affect was significant for the ratings of second item “I feel like I was victimized” (VC2),  $F(2,297) = 4.707, p = .01$ . Tukey’s post hoc test revealed that only the injustice group ( $M = 3.83, SD = 1.970$ ) rated the item significantly higher compared to control group ( $M = 3.01, SD = 1.784$ ),  $p = .007$ .

### **3.1.3 Between Groups Comparisons**

Multiple one-way ANOVA analyses was conducted to examine the effect of priming injustice on basic psychological needs satisfaction, positive and negative affect, vitality and satisfaction with life. Of the three basic psychological needs, only the need of relatedness found to be significantly affected by the type of injustice priming,  $F(2, 297) = 3.489, p = .032$ . Tukey’s post-hoc tests revealed that participants in the injustice group ( $M = 5.501, SD = 1.05$ ) had significantly higher scores of relatedness compared to participants in negative control group ( $M = 5.112, SD = 1.219$ ),  $p = .035$ . Further, the effect of the type of the essay written was significant for Negative Affect(NA),  $F(2,297) = 4.601, p = .011$ . Post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the only significant difference between groups for NA was between negative control ( $M = 3.319, SD = 1.306$ ) and control group ( $M = 2.818, SD = 1.06$ ),  $p = .008$ . The results of analyses of variance did not show any effect of injustice priming on neither vitality or satisfaction with life.

### **3.1.4 Bivariate Correlations**

Correlation analyses were run to check whether the results support the literature. Pearson Correlation coefficients used to determine correlations between variables.

As can be seen in Table 3.1 the results revealed that the positivity of the event that the participants wrote about, negatively correlated with the two victimization check variables. For both of the items VC1( $r = -.293, p < .001$ ) and VC2 ( $r = -.145, p = .012$ ), the correlations were significant. VC1 significantly correlated with autonomy ( $r = -.259, p < .001$ ), competence ( $r = -.190, p = .001$ ) and relatedness ( $r = -.299, p < .001$ ). VC2 showed a similar tendency as the correlations with autonomy ( $r = -.416, p < .001$ ), competence ( $r = -.300, p < .001$ ) and relatedness ( $r = -.299, p < .0001$ ) were all significant.

### **3.1.5 Hypothesis Testing**

Main outcome and predictor variables for the study were all rated on a seven point Likert scale by the participants. Overall the participants were generally content with their need for autonomy ( $M = 4.159, SD = 1.185$ ), satisfied with their needs for competence ( $M = 4.519, SD = 1.338$ ) and relatedness ( $M = 5.267, SD = 1.110$ ). The comparison between injustice, negative control, and control group using one-way ANOVA demonstrated that, the difference between groups for autonomy,  $F(2,297) = 1.934, p = .146$ ; and competence,  $F(2,297) = 1.424, p = .242$ ; were not significant. Therefore, the lack of difference between injustice primed and control groups prevented the confirmation of injustice being harmful for basic psychological needs satisfaction(H1).

**Table 3. 1 Bivariate Correlations and Reliability Values for Study One Variables**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.ManCheck	(-)							
2.VC1	-.293**	(-)						
3.VC2	-.145*	.605**	(-)					
4.Aut	.070	-.259**	-.416**	(.873)				
5.Com	.062	-.190**	-.300**	.640**	(.921)			
6.Rel	.032	-.165**	-.299**	.413**	.366**	(.868)		
7.PA	.140*	-.182**	-.169**	.360**	.396**	.228**	(.880)	
8.NA	-.273**	.566**	.469**	-.469**	-.428**	-.364**	-.263**	(.858)

Note 1. Numbers in the parenthesis indicate the reliability scores of each questionnaire. Note 2. ManCheck:

Manipulation Check VC: Victimization Control Aut: Autonomy, Com: Competence Rel: Relatedness PA: Positive

Affect NA: Negative Affect Note 3. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Additional multivariate linear regression analysis using standardized scores was run to control whether the control variable assessing participants' perception of feeling victimized (VC2) predicted satisfaction for autonomy, competence and relatedness satisfaction. The model was significant for all three variables of autonomy,  $F(1,298) = 62.255$ ,  $p < .001$ , with a partial eta squared of .173; competence,  $F(1,298) = 29.447$ ,  $p < .001$ , with a partial eta squared of .090; and relatedness,  $F(1,298) = 29.223$ ,  $p < .001$ , with a partial eta squared of .089. VC2 negatively predicted autonomy satisfaction,  $B = -.416$ ,  $SE = 0.53$ , 95% CI [-519, -.312]; competence satisfaction,  $B = -.300$ ,  $SE = 0.55$ , 95% CI [-.409, -.191]; and relatedness satisfaction  $B = -.299$ ,  $SE = 0.55$ , 95% CI [-.408, -.190]. After controlling for positive and negative affect, the prediction of autonomy satisfaction,  $B = -.237$ ,  $SE = 0.54$ , 95% CI [-.344, -.130]; and relatedness satisfaction,  $B = -.157$ ,  $SE = 0.60$ , 95% CI [-.275, -.039], remained significant. The prediction of competence satisfaction was not significant,  $B = -.110$ ,  $SE = 0.56$ , 95% CI [-.220, .000],  $p = .051$ .

## **3.2 Study 2**

### **3.2.1 Data Screening**

After the data collection ended, final registered scores belonged to 70 participants. A dummy variable called "suspect" was created. During the data collection phase, those who were labeled as a "turnover" were coded as 1 in the suspect variable. After removing participants who had suspects about the original aim of the study, remaining 47 participants formed the final sample of the study.

### **3.2.2. Manipulation Check**

Compared to the first study, injustice has been measured via standardized sub-scales. Two additional variables have been used similar to Study 1, to provide alternatives and reinforce the existing sub-scales, as "treated unjustly" (IC1) and "I feel like I was victimized" (IC2); both rated on 7-point scales. After the application of unfair treatment to the subjects, they reported relatively high levels

of being treated unjustly ( $M = 5.36$ ,  $SD = 1.737$ ), and relatively low levels of feeling victimized ( $M = 3.02$ ,  $SD = 1.882$ ). When the measurements were applied after the participants were given the opportunity to take revenge, both IC1 ( $M = 2.91$ ,  $SD = 1.863$ ) and IC2 ( $M = 2.83$ ,  $SD = 1.749$ ) were rated relatively low. As can be seen in the table both variables failed to correlate with existing procedural and distributive justice scales, before and after the opportunity to take revenge. (Table 3.2)

**Table 3. 2** *Bivariate Correlations of Control and Justice Perception Variables*

	1	2	3	4
1.IC1	(-)	.763**	-.189	-.048
2.IC2	.071	(-)	-.131	-.104
3.ProJus	.010	-.103	(-)	.503**
4.DisJus	-.088	.196	.486**	(-)

*Note 1. Below the diagonal the correlations belong to pre-manipulation and above the diagonal correlations belong to post-manipulation measures. Note 2. IC: Injustice Control ProJus: Procedural Justice DisJus: Distributive Justice Note 3. \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$*

### 3.2.3 Bivariate Correlation

The correlations between variables were estimated by using Pearson's correlation coefficient. As seen in Table 3.3, psychological need satisfaction was not significantly correlated with procedural justice ( $r = .265$ ,  $.214$ ,  $.187$  for autonomy, competence and relatedness respectively,  $ps > .070$ ) and distributive justice ( $r = -.120$ ,  $-.137$ ,  $-.048$  for autonomy, competence and relatedness respectively,  $ps > .36$ ) when measured before revenge opportunity, and after revenge opportunity (procedural justice  $r = .187$ ,  $.076$ ,  $.190$  for autonomy, competence and relatedness respectively,  $ps > .20$ ; distributive justice  $r = -.170$ ,  $-.143$ ,  $.060$  for autonomy, competence and relatedness respectively,  $ps > .25$ ).

**Table 3. 3 Bivariate Correlations and Reliability Values for Study Two Variables**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Pre-Manipulation Measures</b>							
1.Autonomy	(.918)						
2.Competence	.798**	(.919)					
3.Relatedness	.707**	.684**	(.882)				
4.Positive Affect	.494**	.535**	.424**	(.870)			
5.Negative Affect	-.446**	-.516**	-.483**	-.397**	(.824)		
6.Procedural Justice	.265	.214	.187	.074	-.275	(.717)	
7.Distributive Justice	-.120	-.137	-.048	-.204	.032	.486**	(.864)
<b>Post-Manipulation Measures</b>							
1.Autonomy	(.928)						
2.Competence	.829**	(.953)					
3.Relatedness	.555**	.540**	(.935)				
4.Positive Affect	.395**	.505**	.363*	(.936)			
5.Negative Affect	-.390**	-.549**	-.373**	-.373**	(.906)		
6.Procedural Justice	.187	.076	.190	.235	-.344*	(.784)	
7.Distributive Justice	-.170	-.143	.060	-.021	-.086	.503**	(.943)

*Note 1. Numbers in the parenthesis indicate the reliability scores of each questionnaire. Note 2. \*p<.05; \*\*p<.01*



### 3.2.4. Pre and Post Manipulation Comparison

The comparison of the responses to study variables have been performed by a Paired Sample T-Test Analysis. The results revealed that compared to what they have reported before the revenge opportunity, people reported significantly increased values for autonomy ( $MD = 0.252$ ,  $SD = 0.556$ ,  $t(46) = 3.11$ ,  $p = .003$ ), competence ( $MD = 0.207$ ,  $SD = 0.555$ ,  $t(46) = 2.56$ ,  $p = .014$ ), relatedness ( $MD = 0.175$ ,  $SD = 0.323$ ,  $t(46) = 3.725$ ,  $p = .001$ ), positive affect ( $MD = 0.234$ ,  $SD = 0.666$ ,  $t(46) = 2.409$ ,  $p = .02$ ) and perceptions of distributive justice ( $MD = 0.478$ ,  $SD = 1.527$ ,  $t(46) = 2.148$ ,  $p = .037$ ) when they were able to take revenge. Participants also demonstrated significant decrease in negative affect after the revenge manipulation ( $M = 2.389$ ,  $SD = 1.272$ ) compared to before revenge manipulation ( $M = 2.897$ ,  $SD = 1.136$ ),  $t(46) = -4.009$ ,  $p < .0001$ . The difference between perceptions of procedural justice before ( $M = 4.462$ ,  $SD = 1.074$ ) and after ( $M = 4.386$ ,  $SD = 1.263$ ) revenge opportunity was not significant,  $t(46) = 0.52$ ,  $p = .605$ .

### 3.2.5 Hypothesis Testing

The revenge scores for participants were measured by the difference between what they have preferred for themselves and what they have assigned to the person who have treated them unfairly, for the alleged visual perception task. The categories for the visual perception tasks (vacation resorts, fashion designs, grocery products, cleaning products, insects and skin diseases) were coded from 1 to 6 as previously done by Okimoto and Wenzel (2010). Category that the participant preferred for themselves were subtracted from the category they assigned to the offender. Therefore, every participant was assigned a revenge variable ranging from 5 to minus 5. Overall participants had high levels of revenge ( $M = 2.489$ ,  $SD = 2.394$ ,  $Mdn = 3$ ).

To test whether revenge behavior predicted increase in perceived procedural and distributive justice(H2) a multivariate regression analysis using general linear

model with standardized scores has been conducted. Standardization of the variables was done by mean centering. The increase in perceived justice subscales, participant's response to the items before the manipulation has been subtracted from their responses after the manipulation. The model was not significant for both distributive justice ( $F(1,45) = 0.612, p = .43$  with a partial eta squared of .013) and procedural justice ( $F(1,46) = 0.002, p = .964$  with a partial eta squared of .001) difference. Hence, the analyses failed to confirm H2.

To test whether revenge predicted the satisfaction of basic psychological needs (H3) a multivariate regression analysis using general linear model with standardized scores has been conducted. Standardization of the variables was done by mean centering. Similar process as perceptions of justice has been applied to calculate the increase in needs satisfaction. Overall, the model was not significant for differences in autonomy ( $F(1,46) = 0.921, p = .342$  with a partial eta squared of .020), competence ( $F(1,46) = 1.137, p = .292$  with a partial eta squared of .25) and relatedness ( $F(1,46) = 0.253, p = .617$  with a partial eta squared of .006) satisfaction. H3 was not supported.

In the last step a series of mediation analyses conducted using Process model (Hayes, 2017) with 5000 bootstrapping samples to test the relationship between basic needs satisfaction change and revenge behavior, through justice perception change (H4). All of the analyses failed to produce statistically significant results for indirect effects of revenge on autonomy,  $B = -.000, SE = 0.006, 95\% CI [-.014, .013]$ ; competence,  $B = .000, SE = 0.005, 95\% CI [-.033, .105]$ ; and relatedness satisfaction,  $B = .000, SE = 0.005, 95\% CI [-.010, .014]$  via procedural justice and via distributive justice ( $B = -.003, -.001, .005$  for autonomy, competence and relatedness respectively, all 95% CI involved 0). H4 was not supported.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **DISCUSSION**

#### **4.1. Study 1**

The main aim of the first study was to investigate whether people feel their basic psychological needs frustrated when they have been treated unjustly and put in the position of a victim. The link between basic psychological needs and injustice have been studied in organizational studies before (Olafsen et al., 2015; Aryee et al., 2013). In study 1, two manipulations were applied; the justice manipulation has been pursued by priming injustice for injustice group and negative affect without injustice was manipulated for negative control group. As mentioned earlier in this thesis, people persist on doing same actions as they felt those actions to be supportive of their self-actualization. In the first study, it was aimed to capture people's everyday actions that they felt as remarkable, since they chose to write about it, and evaluated their basic needs satisfaction in response to those actions. The main hypothesis was that when people thought about their past experiences in which they were put in a position of a victim, they would report higher levels of frustration for their basic psychological needs (H1). The results failed to support the hypothesis as the differences between three groups (injustice, negative control, and control) for basic needs satisfaction was not significant except the need for relatedness. The results showed, unlike what was expected in line with the previous research, that people who wrote about an event in which they were victimized had higher scores for relatedness compared to people who wrote about

an event in which they suffered unwanted consequences and believed that they were responsible for that. This might be an indicator of insufficiency of the instructions given to the participants, before they wrote about their experiences. People were asked about an event in which they were victimized and treated unjustly. One possible explanation for people having higher relatedness ratings is that they might have wrote about an event where they were victimized and got immediately comforted by their close friends. The results about negative affect only being significantly different between negative control and control groups arguably supported this explanation. It was expected for injustice group scores to be significantly different from control group in terms of negative effect too, but being comforted by a friend might have increased the participant's mood. The instructions should have expressed explicitly that the event the injustice group reported, must have involved an act of injustice in which the offender was not punished and the victim was not socially supported following the event. This might have further underlined the effect of injustice on basic needs satisfaction since both punishment and consolation were found to be satisfactory for the victim (Gromet & Darley, 2009; Gromet et al., 2012). Second explanation for the inability of confirming H1 might be that negative control group participants' might have written about an event in which they have suffered injustice, even though the instructions directed them to write about something undesirable that they had been personally responsible. The item "I feel like I was victimized", which was a control variable for victimization, failed to differ among injustice/victimization group and negative control group. The connotation of the phrase in Turkish language (Mağdur olmuş hissediyorum) was expected to prevent it from being expressed for an event where someone took responsibility for their actions resulted in undesirable outcomes. In addition to this, the other victimization control variable "victimized" showed difference between the two groups. It seemed like participants failed to report they were "victimized" since it had much negative connotations than just being treated unjustly. When one considered the possibility of people writing an event where they felt they were victimized and take responsibility for the outcome, as in "I deserve this outcome since I chose to be

victimized by this particular person”, measuring it as an additional control variable might have solved this issue. Researchers failed to predict the prevalence of these kind of events being written by the participants. Moreover, significant negative prediction by victimization check variable on the three basic psychological needs confirmed the previous research (Olafsen et al., 2015; Aryee et al., 2013) on injustice being detrimental for autonomy, competence and relatedness. Even after controlling for positive and negative affect, feelings of being victimized predicted autonomy and relatedness frustration. Therefore, it can be proposed here that setting the outcome variables as basic psychological needs for injustice and related concepts has the potential to produce meaningful results in a study with clear-cut instructions for the participants. Future research on this matter would benefit from treating these self-critic explanations as recommendations.

#### **4.2. Study 2**

When the responses in the first study lacked precision about the nature of injustice suffered by the participants, second study was designed in a way that the same unfair act was forced on every participant in an experimental design. As argued before, it was presumed by the researchers that the acts of revenge emerged following the acts of injustice. Although every individual was forced to suffer injustice, taking revenge was designed as optional. After stabilizing the act of injustice, the participants were given the opportunity to take revenge. Every single participant was assigned a continuous revenge score. People who decided not to take revenge or forgive the offender had a revenge score of either zero or below. The main aim of the study was to investigate whether taking revenge would increase procedural and distributive justice perceptions (H2), and basic psychological needs satisfaction directly (H3), or indirectly by increasing justice perceptions (H4). The results did not produce any supportive outcome for any of the hypotheses. Nonetheless, several promising results were found. To begin with, participants significantly felt better after they were given the opportunity to exact revenge on the offender, regardless of taking or not taking revenge. Furthermore, revenge scores lacked significance in predicting positive or negative affect.

Therefore, it can be argued that this difference in mood could have derived from an unmeasured variable, or the measurement of revenge behavior was not suitable to detect the effect of revenge on mood. Same argument can be made for needs satisfaction since participants reported higher levels of autonomy, competence and relatedness ratings after the revenge opportunity for an injustice. For justice perception variables, participants did not report different results for procedural justice between pre and post manipulation measurement. For distributive justice on the contrary, people perceived the process as more fair following the opportunity to take revenge has emerged. This finding can be deemed as unexpected, when one considers the fact that procedural justice dealt with how the whole process was handled and how much influence did the participants had over the outcome whereas, distributive justice dealt with how much did the outcome explain participant's effort (Colquitt, 2001). Due to the nature of the design, participants had higher control over the outcome of the offender after the revenge manipulation (procedural justice), although their personal score (outcome) did not change at all (distributive justice). It can be argued here that the participants felt comforted by the researcher who told them that their score should have been higher before they presented them the revenge conditions. The injustice manipulation was not merely a negative feedback that deteriorated the need for competence, but it had a social aspect in which the incompetency of the participant was known by a third party: researcher. Participant's might have put more emphasis on the social aspect of the injustice therefore reported higher perceptions of distributive justice. As opposed to the findings of the second study, in an experimental design where the justice perceptions were measured implicitly (Liang et al., 2018), retaliation behavior predicted lower levels of perceived injustice. Building onto these findings, none of the justice perception variables correlated with nor predicted mood and needs satisfaction variables, both pre and post manipulation measurements, challenged the existing literature on the mentioned variables (Olafsen et al., 2015; Aryee et al., 2013). Observing the desired relationships between revenge and justice in a previous experimental research by Liang et al. (2018) and between justice and needs satisfaction in non-experimental designs by Olafsen et al. (2015), lead us to

argue that the sub-scales of Procedural and Distributive Justice were not suitable to use in an experimental design to measure justice perceptions.

### **4.3. General Discussion, Limitations and Future Research**

When someone is talking about revenge, they usually talk about more than just the act of revenge. Emotions regarding revenge, harm that is suffered, forgiveness that feels like a distant alternative and most importantly the concept of injustice all comes to play when someone mentions revenge. As mentioned in the review by Jackson et al. (2019), for a long part of the history, psychologists investigated revenge as a one dimensional phenomenon where someone reacts to conflict or disturbance. It was until recently people decided that revenge has more sophisticated components attached to it and can be functional in everyday life. Due to this, it is not surprising to observe that in the literature of basic psychological needs theory, the concept of revenge has been overlooked. In the literature, basic psychological needs often found to be related to positive concepts such as well-being (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010), creativity (Ryan & Deci, 2006), performance (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004) in multiple context including sports (Vansteenkiste, Mouratidis, Van Riet, & Lens, 2014), health (Uysal, Ascigil, & Turunc, 2017) and education (Benita, Roth, & Deci, 2014). It has been argued that people's psychological needs are satisfied when they feel they are becoming more functional in their lives. There is no reason for anybody to feel dysfunctional after taking revenge, or vengeance being detrimental to one's self-actualization. This thesis had the privilege to investigate the relationship between basic psychological needs and a relatively darker concept in revenge. As the results have shown people reported their needs of autonomy and relatedness to be satisfied after they have been presented with the opportunity to exact vengeance, even after controlled for their mood. Although the revenge was not found to directly predict needs satisfaction, these results were in the desired direction: psychological needs satisfaction had something to do with revenge. One possible explanation of this increase would be that people might feel content by having the opportunity to take revenge, and not necessarily taking it. It has been argued in a past research by

Lillie and Strelan (2016) that chronically powerless people felt upset, angry and dissatisfied with justice environment when they fantasized about taking revenge. Being chronically powerless can be described as abstaining in an event involving power dynamics. So, when people were not able to take revenge and want to take it, they feel worse. What has been offered to the participants in our research was the power to take revenge. This alone might be sufficient for victims to feel more autonomous and competent since it satisfies the need of agency (Pemberton et al., 2017), and the feeling of being understood by the researcher as he/she offers them the chance of retribution, might satisfy the need for relatedness. This explanation was of course built on the assumption that people wanted to take revenge after they were treated unfairly. Assessing revenge intentions during the study is anticipated to be harmful for the deceptive nature of the study. For this assumption, future research would benefit considering assessing revenge intentions implicitly. They might go on further and implicitly assess the revenge behavior itself. This approach might also eliminate the effect of culture since Turkey is more of a collectivistic culture. Making another suffer for one's psychological well-being can be deemed socially unacceptable, making the participants withdraw from exacting revenge even though they desire the restoration of justice.

Another issue that needs attention for the revenge behavior is victims' compensation. As presented by Wenzel et al. (2008) two types of justice motivation gets activated when someone is treated unjustly, retributive and restorative justice. While the retributive justice is concerned with bringing a balance to suffered damage for both parties, restorative justice is concerned with victim's needs and values. In our research, the retributive justice motive was determined as the central motive. There are several reasons for that. To begin with, people gain full satisfaction over a retaliatory behavior, if the behavior responds to what has been damaged in the first place (Gromet & Darley, 2009). In their article Gromet and Darley (2009) argued that people wanted to punish the offender regarding the initial harm. If the offender harmed a communal value, people act on restorative justice motives thus, they suggest compensation as the punishment. If



the offense is more of a personal attack, people seem to evaluate a retributive justice motive as more valid. From this point forth, when a researcher wants to investigate the underlying psychological mechanisms for compensation of the victim, he or she has to design a research with an injustice manipulation on community and values. This requirement raises questions about ethicality. For this thesis, an attack on participants' values as injustice induction was neglected as an option. A personal attack on competence was elaborated as ethically applicable, and verbally repairable. Thus, the participants were expected to act on retributive justice motives. Even though their retributive justice motives were alerted, participants were compensated by the researcher as they were told that their grade should not be that low. Participant's self-observation was balanced by a feedback from a third party. This can be interpreted as justice restoration for the participants as argued by Pemberton et al. (2017). As justice restoration was presumed to be the main motive behind revenge behavior in this thesis, this partial satisfaction of restorative justice motive might have removed the inclination towards taking revenge conceptualized by the authors. Future studies might use a different design that does not require researcher to comfort the participants after they were treated with injustice.

There is a fundamental issue that needs attention, in terms of affecting our results. It is possible to argue that the zeitgeist is not suitable for conducting experimental designs. 23 of the 70 (33%) initial participants' understanding the deceptive nature of our study is supportive of this argument. Building onto this it is viable to propose that people assume that they are getting fooled in some way when they are participating in an experiment. First thing that can be done to eliminate this effect is waiting for the right zeitgeist to exercise experimental studies. A more constructive but a harder way is to create a bogus variable that cannot be easily detected by the participants. The participants accept the aim we present them for the study as a cover story. By leading them to detect this fake third variable as the main aim for the study, it is possible to satisfy the participants' desire to identify the original research question and conceal our main study variables.

When the issue at hand is revenge, one should draw their borders on what one plans to observe. In this thesis, the decision to use a personal attack on competence for injustice manipulation was made after considering it would be easier this way to observe the harmful effects of injustice in Turkish culture. It was estimated that people would take serious offense after receiving negative feedback on their personal abilities. The research variables were not measured before and after the injustice manipulation. The reason behind this was to eliminate the possibility of survey fatigue. Future studies might want to embed another step where justice perceptions and basic psychological needs are assessed before and after injustice manipulation. This would enable them to check statistically whether psychological need satisfaction is affected by injustice. Moving on, the acts of revenge can differ in terms of their recency to offense. As the saying “revenge is a dish best served cold”, people might want to take their time before they act on their vindictive feelings. In the study by Elshout et al. (2015) “planned/well considered” was rated by the participants as a central feature of revenge while “unplanned/impulsive” was observed to be a peripheral feature. In this thesis, unplanned nature of revenge behavior was highlighted, after all it would be hard to observe and measure revenge behavior in a planned fashion with more variables coming into the picture. If one plans to observe the revenge behavior as a “cold dish”, it is definitely encouraged for the future studies though it is anticipated to have multiple confounding variables. Referring to the same article by Elshout et al. (2015) people rated “social relationships” as a central feature of revenge. “Social relationships” feature consisted of the terms such as family, friends, revenge on ex; and was the eight most frequently mentioned component for revenge. Hence, this can imply that people usually decided to take revenge on people that they have known for a while. In our design the confederate that treated the participants unfairly, was a stranger to the participants. This detail might have affected the results of the study. Future studies on this matter might benefit from investigating the consequences, when the offender is known by the participant before the experiment. Last but not least, the revenge behavior is observed on a simple performance evaluation game in this thesis. All of the findings should be viewed in

the context of this innocent design. It would be viciously inattentive to spread what has been found about revenge and needs satisfaction to a general revenge concept, since revenge includes more sensitive subjects like revenge killing. Future qualitative research might focus on addressing more sensitive subjects to check whether the things that have been proposed in this thesis apply to those subjects similarly. Until those suggested research was done, the findings that are observed in this thesis should be treated cautiously.

## REFERENCES

- Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2007). "Getting even or moving on? Power, procedural justice, and types of offense as predictors of revenge, forgiveness, reconciliation, and avoidance in organizations": Correction to Aquino, Tripp, and Bies (2006). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 80–80. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.80
- Aryee, S., Walumbwa, F. O., Mondejar, R., & Chu, C. W. (2013). Accounting for the Influence of Overall Justice on Job Performance: Integrating Self-Determination and Social Exchange Theories. *Journal of Management Studies*, 52(2), 231-252. doi:10.1111/joms.12067
- Baard, P. P., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Intrinsic Need Satisfaction: A Motivational Basis of Performance and Well-Being in Two Work Settings<sup>1</sup>. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(10), 2045-2068. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02690.x
- Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Does High Self-Esteem Cause Aggression? *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. doi:10.1037/e499912006-008
- Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994). Guilt: An interpersonal approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(2), 243-267. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.115.2.243
- Benita, M., Roth, G., & Deci, E. L. (2014). When are mastery goals more adaptive? It depends on experiences of autonomy support and autonomy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 106(1), 258-267. doi:10.1037/a0034007
- Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (n.d.). Beyond Distrust: “Getting Even” and the Need for Revenge. *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, 246-260. doi:10.4135/9781452243610.n12
- Burgers, C., Eden, A., Van Engelenburg, M. D., & Buningh, S. (2015). How feedback boosts motivation and play in a brain-training game. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48, 94-103. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.038

- Bushman, B. J., Baumeister, R. F., & Phillips, C. M. (2001). Do people aggress to improve their mood? Catharsis beliefs, affect regulation opportunity, and aggressive responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*(1), 17-32. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.81.1.17
- Carlsmith, K. M., Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2008). The paradoxical consequences of revenge. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*(6), 1316-1324. doi:10.1037/a0012165
- Chen, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Beyers, W., Boone, L., Deci, E. L., Van der Kaap-Deeder, J., ... Verstuyf, J. (2014). Basic psychological need satisfaction, need frustration, and need strength across four cultures. *Motivation and Emotion*, *39*(2), 216-236. doi:10.1007/s11031-014-9450-1
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 386-400. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386
- Darley, J. M., & Pittman, T. S. (2003). The Psychology of Compensatory and Retributive Justice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *7*(4), 324-336. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0704\_05
- Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *125*(6), 627-668. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.125.6.627
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "What" and "Why" of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227-268. doi:10.1207/s15327965pli1104\_01
- Denzler, M., Förster, J., & Liberman, N. (2009). How goal-fulfillment decreases aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*(1), 90-100. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2008.08.021
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *49*, 71-75.
- Elshout, M., Nelissen, R. M., & Van Beest, I. (2014). Vengeance is self-focused: Comparing vengeful to anger-driven responses. *Cognition and Emotion*, *29*(7), 1239-1255. doi:10.1080/02699931.2014.976181

- ELSHOUT, M., NELISSEN, R. M., & VAN BEEST, I. (2015). A prototype analysis of vengeance. *Personal Relationships*, 22(3), 502-523. doi:10.1111/pere.12092
- Foster, C. A., & Rusbult, C. E. (1999). Injustice and Powerseeking. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(7), 834-849. doi:10.1177/0146167299025007006
- Funches, V., Markley, M., & Davis, L. (2009). Reprisal, retribution and requital: Investigating customer retaliation. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(2), 231-238. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.030
- Gençöz, T. (2000). Pozitif ve Negatif Duygu Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(46), 19-26.
- Gollwitzer, M., & Bushman, B. J. (2011). Do Victims of Injustice Punish to Improve Their Mood? *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(5), 572-580. doi:10.1177/1948550611430552
- Gollwitzer, M., Meder, M., & Schmitt, M. (2010). What gives victims satisfaction when they seek revenge? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 41(3), 364-374. doi:10.1002/ejsp.782
- González-Cutre, D., Sicilia, Á., Sierra, A. C., Ferriz, R., & Hagger, M. S. (2016). Understanding the need for novelty from the perspective of self-determination theory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 102, 159-169. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.036
- Grobbink, L. H., Derksen, J. J., & Van Marle, H. J. (2014). Revenge: An Analysis of Its Psychological Underpinnings. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(8), 892-907. doi:10.1177/0306624x13519963
- Gromet, D. M., & Darley, J. M. (2009). Punishment and Beyond: Achieving Justice Through the Satisfaction of Multiple Goals. *Law & Society Review*, 43(1), 1-38. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5893.2009.00365.x
- Gromet, D. M., Okimoto, T. G., Wenzel, M., & Darley, J. M. (2012). A victim-centered approach to justice? Victim satisfaction effects on third-party punishments. *Law and Human Behavior*, 36(5), 375-389. doi:10.1037/h0093922

- Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., & Black, W. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective, Seventh Edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall.
- Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis, Second Edition: A Regression-Based Approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Publications.
- Jackson, J. C., Choi, V. K., & Gelfand, M. J. (2019). Revenge: A Multilevel Review and Synthesis. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *70*(1), 319-345. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-103305
- Jang, H., Reeve, J., & Deci, E. L. (2010). Teacher Instructional Style Rating Sheets. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. doi:10.1037/t03536-000
- Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling, Fourth Edition*. New York, NY: Guilford Publications.
- Liang, L. H., Brown, D. J., Lian, H., Hanig, S., Ferris, D. L., & Keeping, L. M. (2018). Righting a wrong: Retaliation on a voodoo doll symbolizing an abusive supervisor restores justice. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *29*(4), 443-456. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.01.004
- Lillie, M., & Strelan, P. (2016). Careful what you wish for: Fantasizing about revenge increases justice dissatisfaction in the chronically powerless. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *94*, 290-294. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.01.048
- McCullough, M. E., Fincham, F. D., & Tsang, J. (2003). Forgiveness, forbearance, and time: The temporal unfolding of transgression-related interpersonal motivations. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *84*(3), 540-557. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.84.3.540
- McCullough, M. E., Kurzban, R., & Tabak, B. A. (2013). Cognitive systems for revenge and forgiveness. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *36*(1), 1-15. doi:10.1017/s0140525x11002160
- Okimoto, T. G., & Wenzel, M. (2010). The Other Side of Perspective Taking. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *2*(4), 373-378. doi:10.1177/1948550610393032
- Okimoto, T. G., & Wenzel, M. (2010). The Other Side of Perspective Taking. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *2*(4), 373-378. doi:10.1177/1948550610393032

- Olafsen, A. H., Halvari, H., Forest, J., & Deci, E. L. (2015). Show them the money? The role of pay, managerial need support, and justice in a self-determination theory model of intrinsic work motivation. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *56*(4), 447-457. doi:10.1111/sjop.12211
- Orth, U. (2003). Punishment goals of crime victims. *Law and Human Behavior*, *27*(2), 173-186. doi:10.1023/a:1022547213760
- Osgood, J. M. (2017). Is revenge about retributive justice, deterring harm, or both? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *11*(1), e12296. doi:10.1111/spc3.12296
- Pemberton, A., Aarten, P. G., & Mulder, E. (2017). Beyond retribution, restoration and procedural justice: The Big Two of communion and agency in victims' perspectives on justice. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *23*(7), 682-698. doi:10.1080/1068316x.2017.1298760
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Self-Regulation and the Problem of Human Autonomy: Does Psychology Need Choice, Self-Determination, and Will? *Journal of Personality*, *74*(6), 1557-1586. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00420.x
- Ryan, R. M., & Frederick, C. (1997). On Energy, Personality, and Health: Subjective Vitality as a Dynamic Reflection of Well-Being. *Journal of Personality*, *65*(3), 529-565. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1997.tb00326.x
- Shnabel, N., & Nadler, A. (2008). A needs-based model of reconciliation: Satisfying the differential emotional needs of victim and perpetrator as a key to promoting reconciliation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*(1), 116-132. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.1.116
- Uysal, A., Ascigil, E., & Turunc, G. (2016). Spousal autonomy support, need satisfaction, and well-being in individuals with chronic pain: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *40*(2), 281-292. doi:10.1007/s10865-016-9783-1
- Van Petegem, S., Beyers, W., Vansteenkiste, M., & Soenens, B. (2012). On the association between adolescent autonomy and psychosocial functioning: Examining decisional independence from a self-determination theory perspective. *Developmental Psychology*, *48*(1), 76-88. doi:10.1037/a0025307
- Vansteenkiste, M., Mouratidis, A., Van Riet, T., & Lens, W. (2014). Examining Correlates of Game-to-Game Variation in Volleyball Players' Achievement Goal Pursuit and Underlying Autonomous and Controlling Reasons.



*Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 36(2), 131-145.  
doi:10.1123/jsep.2012-0271

Vansteenkiste, M., Niemiec, C. P., & Soenens, B. (2010). The development of the five mini-theories of self-determination theory: an historical overview, emerging trends, and future directions. *Advances in Motivation and Achievement*, 105-165. doi:10.1108/s0749-7423(2010)000016a007

Vidmar, N. J. (2001). Retributive Justice: Its Social Context. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.293782

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Positive and Negative Affect Schedule. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. doi:10.1037/t03592-000

Wenzell, M., Okimoto, T. G., Feather, N. T., & Platow, M. J. (2008). Retributive and Restorative Justice. *Law Hum Behav*, 32(5), 375-389.  
doi:10.1007/s10979-007-9116-6

Yoshimura, S. (2007). Goals and emotional outcomes of revenge activities in interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24(1), 87-98. doi:10.1177/0265407507072592

Zdaniuk, A., & Bobocel, D. R. (2012). Vertical individualism and injustice: The self-restorative function of revenge. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(5), 640-651. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1874

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A. Approval of METU Human Subjects Ethics Committee

UYSULANALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ  
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER



DUNLUPINAR BULVARI 06060  
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TÜRKİYE  
T: +90 312 230 22 90  
F: +90 312 230 79 99  
usm@metu.edu.tr  
www.usm.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620B16 /583

15 ARALIK 2017

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İli: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Doç. Dr. Ahmet UYSAL;

Danışmanlığını yaptığımız yüksek lisans öğrencisi Barış ŞAHİN'in "Mağduriyet sürecinde temel ihtiyaç doyumu" başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay 2017-SOS-170 protokol numarası ile 15.12.2017-30.08.2018 tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL  
Üye

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN  
Başkan V

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR  
Üye

Doç. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI  
Üye

Doç. Dr. Zana ÇITAK  
Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Fınar KAYGAN  
Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK  
Üye



DUMALUPINAR BULVARI 06061  
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TÜRKİYE  
Tel: 0312 290 22 01  
Faks: 0312 290 22 02  
e-posta: iletisim@metu.edu.tr  
www.usam.metu.edu.tr

08 KASIM 2018

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (IAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Prof.Dr. Bengi Öner ÖZKAN

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız yüksek lisans öğrencisi Banış ŞAHİN'in "İntikam Davranışının Temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarla ilişkisinin Adalet Algısı Üzerinden Değerlendirilmesi" başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay 2018-SOS-177 protokol numarası ile 08.11.2018 - 31.08.2019 tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN

Başkan V

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL

Üye

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR

Üye

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KORDAKÇI

Üye

Doç. Dr. Zana ÇITAK

Üye

Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK

Üye

Doç. Dr. Üyesi Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

## Appendix B. Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule

Lütfen aşağıda verilen her ifadeyi dikkatlice okuyup, bu ifadelerin ŞU ANKI DUYGULARINIZI ne oranda yansıttığını 7 puanlık ölçek üzerinden değerlendiriniz (1 = Hiç Yansıtmıyor, 7 = Tamamen Yansıtıyor)

1.Hiç Yansıtmıyor

4.Ne Yansıtıyor Ne Yansıtmıyor

7.Tamamen Yansıtıyor

1. İlgili
2. Tedirgin
3. Sıkıntılı
4. Uyanık
5. Heyecanlı
6. Utanmış
7. Mutsuz
8. İlhamlı
9. Güçlü
10. Sinirli
11. Suçlu
12. Kararlı
13. Ürkmüş

<b>14. Dikkatli</b>
<b>15. Düşmanca</b>
<b>16. Asabi</b>
<b>17. Hevesli</b>
<b>18. Aktif</b>
<b>19. Gururlu</b>
<b>20. Korkmuş</b>
<b>21. Adaletsizliğe Uğramış</b>

## Appendix C. Needs Satisfaction Needs Frustration Scale

Lütfen aşağıda verilen her ifadeyi dikkatlice okuyup, bu ifadelerin "şu andaki" duygu ve düşüncelerinizi ne oranda yansıttığını 7 puanlık ölçek üzerinden değerlendiriniz (1 = Hiç katılmıyorum, 7 = Tamamen katılıyorum)

1.Hiç Yansıtmıyor

4.Ne Yansıtıyor Ne Yansıtmıyor

7.Tamamen Yansıtıyor

1	Üstlendiğim şeylerde bir seçim ve özgürlük duygusu hissediyorum.
2	Bir şeyleri iyi yapabileceğime dair kendime güveniyorum.
3	Bir şeyleri iyi yapıp yapamayacağıma dair ciddi şüphelerim var.
4	Önemsediğim ve beni önemseyen insanlarla aramda bir bağ olduğunu hissediyorum.
5	Günlük aktivitelerim bir dizi zorunluluk gibi geliyor.
6	Birlikte zaman geçirdiğim insanlarla sıcaklık hissediyorum.
7	Var olan ilişkilerimin yüzeysel olduğunu hissediyorum.
8	<b>Şu anda</b> kararlarımın gerçekten istediğim şeyleri yansıttığını hissediyorum.
9	Yapmayı seçmeyeceğim birçok şeyi yapmaya zorlandığımı hissediyorum.
10	Yaptığım şeylerde yeterli hissediyorum.
11	Çoğu performansıyla ilgili hayal kırıklığı hissediyorum.
12	Seçimlerimin gerçekte kim olduğumu yansıttığını hissediyorum.
13	Birçok şeyi yapma konusunda baskı altında hissediyorum.

14	Benim için önemli olan insanlara kendimi yakın hissediyorum.
15	<b>Şu anda</b> birlikte zaman geçirdiğim insanların benden hoşlanmadığına dair bir izlenimim var.
16	Hedeflerime ulaşma konusunda kendimi yetkin hissediyorum.
17	Gerçekten ilgimi çeken şeyleri yaptığımı hissediyorum.
18	Zor işleri başarıyla tamamlayabileceğimi hissediyorum.
19	Hayatımda yeni şeyler yaptığımı hissediyorum.
20	Hayatımda benim için yenilikler olduğunu hissediyorum.
21	Yeteneklerim konusunda güvensiz hissediyorum.
22	<b>Şu anda</b> hayatımda yeni heyecanlar hissediyorum.
23	Hayatımda yeni durumların ortaya çıktığını düşünüyorum.
24	Hayatımda yenilikler yapma fırsatına sahibim.
25	Benim için önemli olan insanların bana karşı soğuk ve mesafeli olduğunu hissediyorum.
26	Yaptığım hatalardan dolayı kendimi bir başarısızlık örneği olarak görüyorum.
27	Ait olmak istediğim gruptan dışlanmış hissediyorum.
28	Kendimi mağdur olmuş hissediyorum
29	Önemsediğim insanların da beni önemsedini hissediyorum.
30	Yaptığım çoğu şeyi "yapmak zorundaymışım" gibi hissediyorum.
31	Hayatımda sık sık yeni şeyler keşfettiğimi düşünüyorum.

## Appendix D. Satisfaction with Life/ Vitality Scale

Lütfen aşağıda verilen her ifadeyi dikkatlice okuyup, bu ifadelerin "şu andaki" duygu ve düşüncelerinizi ne oranda yansıttığını 7 puanlık ölçek üzerinden değerlendiriniz (1 = Hiç katılmıyorum, 7 = Tamamen katılıyorum)

1.Hiç Yansıtmıyor

4.Ne Yansıtıyor Ne Yansıtmıyor

7.Tamamen Yansıtıyor

1	Kendimi capcanlı ve hayat dolu hissediyorum.
2	Bazen o kadar hayat dolu hissediyorum ki içim içime sığmıyor.
3	Enerjim ve şevkim var; moralim iyi.
4	Her yeni günü dört gözle bekliyorum.
5	Kendimi neredeyse her zaman atık ve uyanık hissediyorum.
6	Kendimi zinde hissediyorum.
7	Pek çok açıdan ideallerime yakın bir yaşamım var.
8	Yaşam koşullarım mükemmeldir.
9	Yaşamım beni tatmin ediyor.
10	Şimdiye kadar, yaşamda istediğim önemli şeyleri elde ettim.
11	Hayatımı bir daha yaşama şansım olsaydı, hemen hemen hiçbir şeyi değiştirmezdim.



## Appendix E. Justice Perception Sub-Scales

Yazı yazma süreci ve değerlendirilmesi hakkındaki görüşlerinizi, lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyup 7 puanlık ölçek üzerinden değerlendiriniz. (1 = Çok az, 7 = Büyük Ölçüde)

1. Çok Az

4. Kısmen

7. Büyük Ölçüde

1	Fikirlerinizi ve duygularınızı bu süreç esnasında ifade edebildiniz mi?
2	Bu süreç esnasında elde edilen sonuçlar üzerinde etkiniz var mıydı?
3	Bu süreç tutarlı bir şekilde uygulandı mı?
4	Bu süreç önyargılardan uzak uygulandı mı?
5	Bu süreç doğru ve tutarlı bilgilere mi dayandırılmıştır?
6	Süreç sonucu ulaşılan noktanın düzeltilmesini talep edebildiniz mi?
7	Bu süreç etik ve ahlaki standartlara uygun muydu?
8	Elde ettiğiniz sonuçlar süreçteki çabanızı yansıttı mı?
9	Elde ettiğiniz sonuçlar tamamladığınız işe uygun muydu?
10	Elde ettiğiniz sonuçlar çalışmaya yaptığınız katkıyı yansıtır mı?
11	Elde ettiğiniz sonuçlar göstermiş olduğunuz performansa uygun muydu?

## Appendix F. Demographic Information

Yaşınız: ...

Cinsiyetiniz:

Erkek

Kadın

Diğer

## Appendix G. Essay Writing Options for Study 2

Lütfen aşağıdaki başlıklardan kendinize en çok güvendiğinizi seçiniz. Sizden bu konuda bir deneme yazmanız istenecektir. Seçiminizi yaptıktan sonra lütfen araştırmacıdan size bir kâğıt getirmesini rica ediniz. Yazınız bittikten sonra kâğıt sizden alınacak ve bir başka katılımcı tarafından değerlendirmeye tabi tutulacaktır. Bu sırada sizden de bahsedilen katılımcının denemesini puanlamanız istenecektir. Yazı yazmadaki performansınıza göre ikinci kısımdaki göreviniz şekillenecektir.

1. Sinema En sevdiğiniz yönetmeni (yerli veya yabancı) ve nedenini, yönetmenin sanatında sevdiğiniz yanlarına değinerek anlatınız. Lütfen yazınızın 300 kelimeyi geçmemesine çabalayınız.
2. Psikoloji Psikolojinin alanları içinden (sosyal, klinik vb.) en sevdiğiniz ve nedenini, alanın güçlü olduğuna inandığınız yönlerine değinerek anlatınız. Lütfen yazınızın 300 kelimeyi geçmemesine çabalayınız.
3. Edebiyat En sevdiğiniz yazarı (yerli veya yabancı) ve nedenini, yazarın sanatında sevdiğiniz yanlarına değinerek anlatınız. Lütfen yazınızın 300 kelimeyi geçmemesine çabalayınız.
4. Siyaset Kendinize en yakın gördüğünüz siyasi akımı (sosyalizm, liberalizm vb.) ve nedenini, bu akımın güçlü olduğuna inandığınız yönlerine değinerek anlatınız. Lütfen yazınızın 300 kelimeyi geçmemesine çabalayınız.
5. Teknoloji Yapay zekâ hakkındaki karşıt görüşlerden (avantaj mı, tehlike mi?) kendinize en yakın gördüğünüzü ve nedenini, teknik bilgilere değinerek anlatınız. Lütfen yazınızın 300 kelimeyi geçmemesine çabalayınız.
6. Futbol Desteklediğiniz futbol takımını (yerli veya yabancı) ve nedenini, takımınızın futbol anlayışına değinerek anlatınız. Lütfen yazınızın 300 kelimeyi geçmemesine çabalayınız.

7. Mzk İyi derecede aldıđımız mzk aletini(min. 2 senelik deneyim) ve neden bu mzk aletini setiđinizi, teknik bilgilere deđinerek anlatınız. Ltfen yazınızın 300 kelimeyi gememesine abalayınız.

## Appendix H. Bogus Essay Presented to Participants in Study 2

9-10 yaşlarında nereden geldiğini şu an anımsamadığım aşırı müzik dinleme dürtümü ağabeyimin arşivi sayesinde doyurmaya başlamıştım. Bir gün odasının önünden geçerken içeriden gelen ilahi güzellikte bir şarkı duyduğumu hatırlıyorum. Master of Puppets, 12 yaşında beni gitar çalmaya teşvik eden şarkıdır.

Her ne kadar Master of Puppets'a âşık olsam da önce Nothing Else Matters çalmam gerektiğini söylediler. Bense Akdeniz Akşamları çalarak çıtayı oldukça düşük tuttum. Derslerdeki tembel yapımın elbette gitar çalışmaya da etkisi olacaktı. Ancak bir farklılık vardı. Derslerdeki gibi “ileride ne işime yarayacak?” sorusunu burada sormuyordum. Sadece tellere vurup ses bile çıkarsam, o an işime yarıyordu. İyi hissettiriyordu. Böylece gitar çalmak için mükemmel olmaya gerek olmadığını anladım.

Bu şekilde bir süre alaylı olarak devam ettiğim gitar çalma işini bir sonraki aşamaya taşımam gerekiyordu. Çünkü ulvi amacım Master of Puppets çalmaktı. Önce tablaları okumayı öğrendim. Sonradan kendimi sınırlandırmayacağım dizileri (gamları) öğrenmeye başladım. Sanırım birçok gitarist için gamları öğrenmek gitar çalmaya başladığı noktadır. Gamlar sayesinde gitarı elinize aldığınızda ne çalayım diye düşünmeden çalarsınız. Gamlar belirli notaları belirli bir şekilde dizince ortaya çıkan bir ses grubu anlamına geliyor. “Güzel” gitar çalabilmek benim için buydu.

Ses çıkarmak var olduğunu hissetmekle ilgili sanırım. İşitsel insanlar bu şekilde gerçekliğe ulaşıyor olabilirler. Sahne ışığı potansiyeli de bir sanat galerisine göre daha kolay. Ergenlikte yaşadığım bu hisler evrildi ve müziği sevme noktasına geldi bugün. Sanırım bu his, beni gitar çalmaya başlatan değil de devam ettiren his olabilir. Bu arada Master of Puppets çalabildim sonunda. Solosu hariç ☺



## Appendix I. Informed Consent Form for Study 1

### GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU

Katılımcı olacağınız bu çalışma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü bünyesinde yüksek lisans bitirme tezi kapsamında yapılmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacı, adalet ve mağduriyet kavramları üzerinden öznel mutluluğun temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarla ilişkisini incelemektir. Bu çalışmaya katılım tamamen gönüllülük üzerinedir. Katılımlar anonim olacaktır. Toplanan tüm bilgiler elektronik ortamda saklı tutulacak ve bu bilgilere sadece adı belirtilen araştırmacılar ulaşabilecektir.

Bu çalışmada sizden kişisel bir deneyiminizi kısa bir pasaj şeklinde yazmanız ve birkaç kısa ölçek doldurmanız istenecektir. Bu çalışmada kullanılacak olan ölçek ve soruların herhangi bir rahatsızlık yaratması öngörülmemektedir. Ancak katılımcı olarak, çalışmanın herhangi bir aşamasında bir rahatsızlık hissederseniz, hiçbir neden belirtmeksizin araştırmadan özgürce ayrılma hakkına sahipsiniz.

Eğer araştırma veya katılımınızla ilgili sorularınız olursa lütfen araştırmacı Barış Şahin'e (baris.sahin.c@gmail.com) ya da danışmanı Doç. Dr. Ahmet Uysal'a ([uahmet@metu.edu.tr](mailto:uahmet@metu.edu.tr)) ulaşmaktan çekinmeyiniz.

Çalışmaya olan katılımınızdan dolayı çok teşekkür ederiz.

## Appendix J. Debriefing Form for Study 1

### BİLGİLENDİRME FORMU

Bu çalışma, adalet ve mağduriyet kavramları üzerinden öznel mutluluğun temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarla ilişkisini incelemektedir. Araştırmalara göre insanlar adaletsiz bir tutuma maruz kalıp mağdur konumuna düştüklerinde öznel mutlulukları azalmaktadır. Temel Psikolojik İhtiyaçlar teorisine göre bireylerin üç temel ihtiyacının (özerklik, yeterlik, ilişki) tatmini, öznel mutluluklarında belirleyici bir değişkendir. Katılımcı olduğunuz çalışma bu ihtiyaçların tatminini, mağduriyet ve öznel mutluluk arasındaki ilişkiyi açıklamada kullanacaktır.

Araştırma ile ilgili herhangi bir sorunuz olursa, araştırmacı Barış Şahin'e (baris.sahin.c@gmail.com) ya da danışmanı Doç. Dr. Ahmet Uysal'a ([uahmet@metu.edu.tr](mailto:uahmet@metu.edu.tr)) ulaşmaktan çekinmeyiniz.



## Appendix K. Announcement Text

### DUYURU METNİ

Bu çalışma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü bünyesinde yüksek lisans bitirme tezi kapsamında yapılmaktadır. Katılım tamamen gönüllülük üzerinedir ve katılımcılardan kimlik bilgi talep edilmemektedir. Toplamda 45 dakika sürecektir. Bu araştırmada, katılımcılardan var olan konular arasından seçecekleri bir konu hakkında bir deneme yazmaları, bir denemeyi puanlamaları ve birkaç resim değerlendirmeleri istenecektir. Katılımcılar değerlendirecekleri resim türleri ve sayısı, katılımcıların deneme yazmadaki performanslarına göre değişiklik gösterecektir. Bu araştırmada kullanılacak olan ölçek, soru veya resimlerin herhangi bir rahatsızlık yaratması öngörülmemektedir. Ancak katılımcı olarak, soruları yanıtlarken bir rahatsızlık hissederseniz, araştırmadan özgürce ayrılma hakkına sahiptir. Eğer araştırma veya katılımınızla ilgili sorularınız olursa lütfen araştırmacı Barış Şahin'e (baris.sahin.c@gmail.com) ya da danışmanı Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner Özkan'a (bengi@metu.edu.tr) ulaşmaktan çekinmeyiniz.

## Appendix L. Informed Consent Form for Study 2

### GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU

Katılımcı olacağınız bu çalışma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü bünyesinde yüksek lisans bitirme tezi kapsamında yapılmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacı, bilişsel süreçlerin ve performans değerlendirmesinin, görsel tercihler üzerindeki etkisini incelemektir. Bu çalışmaya katılım tamamen gönüllülük üzerinedir. Verileriniz hiçbir şekilde kişisel bilgilerinizle eşleştirilmeyecektir. Toplanan bilgiler elektronik ortamda, yazılı belgeler ise kilitli bir dolapta saklı tutulacak ve bu bilgilere sadece adı belirtilen araştırmacılar ulaşabilecektir.

Bu çalışma iki kısımdan oluşmaktadır. Birinci kısımda sizden seçtiğiniz bir konu hakkında 300 kelimelik bir deneme yazmanız, bir denemeyi puanlamanız ve birkaç ölçek doldurmanız istenecektir. İkinci kısımda ise karşınıza çıkacak görseller hakkında tercihte bulunmanız ve birkaç ölçek doldurmanız istenecektir. İkinci kısımdaki göreviniz birinci kısımdaki performansınıza göre değişiklik gösterecektir. Bu araştırmada kullanılacak olan ölçek ve soruların herhangi bir rahatsızlık yaratması öngörülmemektedir. Ancak katılımcı olarak, çalışmanın herhangi bir aşamasında bir rahatsızlık hissederseniz, hiçbir neden belirtmeksizin araştırmadan özgürce ayrılma hakkına sahipsiniz.

Eğer araştırma veya katılımınızla ilgili sorularınız olursa lütfen araştırmacı Barış Şahin'e (baris.sahin.c@gmail.com) ya da danışmanı Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner Özkan'a (bengi@metu.edu.tr) ulaşmaktan çekinmeyiniz.

Çalışmaya olan katılımınızdan dolayı çok teşekkür ederiz.

## Appendix M. Debriefing Form for Study 2

### BİLGİLENDİRME FORMU

Bu çalışma en genel anlamıyla intikam motivasyonunu araştırmaktadır. Bununla beraber adaletsizliğe maruz kalma ve intikam davranışının psikolojik iyilik hali ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar ile ilgisini incelemektedir. Araştırmalara göre insanlar adaletsiz bir tutuma maruz kalıp mağdur konumuna düştüklerinde öznel mutlulukları azalmaktadır. Öte yandan intikam ve öznel mutluluk arasındaki ilişki hakkındaki bulunan sonuçlar çelişkilidir. Katılımcı olduğunuz çalışma intikam davranışları ve öznel mutluluk arasındaki ilişkiyi açıklamada kullanacaktır.

Yazmış olduğunuz deneme öznel bir denemeye tabi tutulmamıştır. Denemenize otomatik olarak puan verilmiştir. Aldığınız düşük puana karşılık gelen kod da çalışmaya devam etmenizi sağlayan tek koddur. Yani ikinci kısımdaki göreviniz performansınızdan bağımsızdır ve sabittir. Aldığınız düşük puan, sadece sizde bir adaletsizlik duygusu uyandırmak için verilmiştir. Kâğıdınız üzerine yazılmış geri bildirim araştırmacı tarafından, siz önceden hazırlamış olduğumuz denemeyi değerlendirirken, el ile yazılmıştır ve her katılımcı için sabittir. Birinci kısımdaki aldığınız puan hiçbir şekilde sizin yazma yeterliliğinize karşılık gelmemektedir. Yine de kendinizi yetersiz hissettiyseniz ve bu durumdan hali hazırda rahatsız olmaya devam ediyorsanız içten özrümüzü kabul etmenizi rica ederiz. Bu rahatsızlık nedeniyle eğer verilerinizin çalışmamızda kullanılmasını istemiyorsanız lütfen araştırmacıya bunu belirtiniz.

İkinci kısmın sonunda sizden karşı tarafın değerlendireceği resimlerin kategorisini ve resim sayısını sorduk. Karşı taraf hiçbir resim değerlendirmemiştir. Bu sorulara verdiğiniz cevaplar sizin intikam alıp almadığınızı ve analizler yapılırken hangi grupta olacağınızı belirlemede kullanılacaktır.

Araştırma ile ilgili herhangi bir sorunuz olursa, araştırmacı Barış Şahin'e (baris.sahin.c@gmail.com) ya da danışmanı Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner Özkan'a (bengi@metu.edu.tr) ulaşmaktan çekinmeyiniz.

Katılımınız için çok teşekkür ederiz.

## Appendix N. Türkçe Özet/Turkish Summary

### İNTİKAM DAVRANIŞLARI İLE TEMEL PSİKOLOJİK İHTİYAÇLAR İLİŞKİSİNE ADALET ALGISININ ARACI ROLÜ

Eğer bir adalet duygusuna sahipseniz, hayatınız bir döneminde adaletsizliği ayırt etmişsinizdir. Bireysel olarak sizin başınıza gelmiş olmasa da bir arkadaşınızdan duymak, haberlerde veya sevdiğiniz televizyon dizisinde adaletsizliği görmek herkes için yüksek ihtimale sahiptir. Hayatınızda sıkça karşınıza çıkan bu terime karşı nasıl davranılacağına ise herkesin farklı bir yaklaşımı vardır. Çoğu insan size affedip unutmanızı tavsiye edecektir. Bu daha insancıl ve gelecekte oluşabilecek intikamlar zincirini engelleyecek bir davranış olarak sunulacaktır. Böyle düşünüldüğünde affetmenin en mantıklı tepki olduğu konusunda herkes hemfikir olmalıdır. Öyleyse neden insanlar başkalarına hak ettiklerini vermek konusunda bu kadar istekliler? Neden yıllar önce yaşadığımız bir haksızlığı bile bugün dahi hatırlayabiliyorsunuz? Neden Hint destanı Mahabbarata, Shakespeare'den Hamlet ve modern çizgi romanların en popülerlerinden olan Batman; farklı yüzyıllarda, farklı kültürlerce, aynı konuyu işlemiş? Okuyacağınız çalışmaların ana amaçlarından biri de bu soruları cevaplandırıp, intikam içeren davranışların arkasındaki motifi bulmaktır.

Geçmişteki çalışmalarda intikam davranışlarının nedeni olarak duygular (Bushman, Baumeister & Phillips, 2001; Carlsmith, Wilson & Gilbert, 2008), ve kişisel tatmin (Gollwitzer, Mader & Schmitt, 2011; Gromet, Okimoto, Wenzell & Darley, 2012) önerilmiştir. Bu tez için yapılan çalışmalarda ise, intikamın

arkasındaki motifin ruh hali ve tatminden çok, temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar olduđu ortaya atılarak; intikam, adalet algıları ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar arasındaki ilişki incelenmiştir.

### **İntikam**

İntikam kelimesinin herkes için farklı bir tanımı olabilir. Bu yüzden intikam için bir işevuruk tanım yapılmalıdır. Bu tezde kullanılan intikam tanımı, başka biri tarafından verilen zarara tepki olarak; zarar ya da rahatsızlık verme amacıyla yapılan eylemler olarak yapılmıştır (Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001, p. 53). Bu tanım fazlaca geniş olup, intikamın karşılıklı olma ve başkası tarafından verilmiş zarardan kaynaklanma doğasını belirttiği için yeterli görülmüştür. Yine de intikam deyince dikkate alınması gereken birkaç kavram daha vardır. Bunların başında cezalandırma gelmektedir. Cezalandırma, meslekten olmayan insanların intikam tanımıdır (Carlsmith, Wilson, & Gilbert, 2008; Gollwitzer & Bushman, 2012). Cezalandırma, intikamın davranışsal gösteriminin bir kısmını oluşturmakla birlikte, bu kavramlar aynı şeyi ifade etmez. İntikam, cezalandırma yaparken mağdurun bakış açısında olma olarak tanımlanabilir (Orth, 2003). Yani cezalandırmayla karşılaştırıldığında intikam, daha öznel bir tepki olarak sunulabilir.

Konuyla ilgili kaynaklarda, intikam yerine kullanılan kavramlardan ikisi de kızgınlık ve saldırganlıktır (e.g., Bies & Tripp, 1996; Bushman et al., 2001; Denzler, Förster, & Liberman, 2009; Liang, Brown, Lian, Hanig, Ferris, & Keeping, 2018). Kızgınlık ve saldırganlık, intikam için merkezdeki elemanlar olsalar da duygu belirten kavramlardır. Ama intikamın duygusal tarafının yanında bilişsel ve davranışsal tarafları da vardır. İntikam bu duyguları içeriyor olsa da, kızgınlık ve saldırganlıktan çok daha fazlasıdır. Kızgınlık ve saldırganlığa kıyasla intikam, bir kişiye ya da kuruma yönlendirilmiştir. Bu duygularla yapılmış bir eylemin intikam kapsamına girmesi için, bu eylemin öznesine karşı en başta gerçekleşmiş bir zarar olması gerekmektedir. İyi çalışmadığı için kızdığımız bilgisayarınızdan intikam almış olmazsınız.

İntikam literatüründe en sık karşılanabilecek kavramlardan biri de öçtür (Liang et al., 2018; Funches, Markley, & Davis, 2009). Öç ve intikam birbirleri yerine kullanılabilir iki kavramdır. Eğer bir ayırım sunulması gerekiyorsa, öç intikamın düzenlenmiş hali olarak tartışılabilir (Grobbink, Derksen, & Marle, 2015). Öç, bir zarara karşı verilmiş daha hızlı ve mantıksal tepkilerdir. İntikam ise daha çok içselleştirilmiş, kişisel önemi daha fazla olan ve daha uzun zamanda verilmiş tepkiler olarak sunulmuştur.

İntikamın birden çok merkezi ve çevresel özellikleri saptanmıştır (Elshout, Nelissen, & van Beest, 2015). Bu tezde kabul edilmiş olan özellikler ise intikamın bir zararın iade edilmesi özelliği, kişisel özellik ve kasti olma özelliğidir. Bir kişinin intikam alması için başta bir zarar görmüş olması gerekmektedir. İntikam birey için kişisel önemi olan konularda, kişisel eylemler üzerinden alınmaktadır ve intikam kasti olarak yapılan bir eylemdir.

### **İntikam ve Adalet**

İntikam üzerine yapılmış çalışmalarda, intikam davranışlarının nedeni olarak en sık önerilen konu adaletin tekrar sağlanmasıdır (Osgood, 2017). Kişiler bir kişi tarafından yapılmış adaletsizlik sonucunda bozulmuş dengeyi tekrar başlangıçtaki konumuna getirmek için intikam alırlar. Bu amaçla alınmış intikamlar için, cezalandırıcı ve onarıcı adalet olmak üzere iki adet adalet güdüsü önerilmiştir (Wenzel, Okimoto, Feather, & Platow, 2008). Cezalandırıcı adalet, görülen zararların eşitlenmesiyle adaleti tekrar kazanmayı amaçlar. Suçlunun cezalandırılmasını istemek bunun en büyük örneğidir. Onarıcı adaletse, mağdurun zarar görmüş değerlerini onararak adaleti sağlamayı amaçlar. Mağdurun zararının suçluca telafi edilmesi ya da tazminat talebi, onarıcı adalet güdüsüyle alınmış intikam kapsamındadır. Hangi güdüyle yapılmış olursa olsun intikam davranışları, adaletsizlik davranışlarını takip etmektedir.

### **Temel Psikolojik İhtiyaçlar**

Üç temel psikolojik ihtiyaç, Deci ve Ryan (2000) tarafından Öz Belirleme Kuramı (ÖBK) altında tanımlanmıştır. Özerklik ihtiyacı, öz belirleme çerçevesinde öz-

yönetim olarak tanımlanır (Ryan & Deci, 2006). Bu önermeye göre özerklik, kişilerin hayatlarını içsel dürtü ve ilgilerine göre düzenlemeleriyle ulaşılabilir. Yeterlik ihtiyacı, kontrol ve öz-etkinlik olarak tanımlanmıştır (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Bireyler çevrelerini algılama ve değiştirme gücünü kendilerinde görürlerse, yeterlik ihtiyaçları tatmin olur. İlişkili olma ihtiyacı ise karşılıklı sevgi gösterme ve bağlantılı olma ihtiyacı olarak tanımlanır (Vansteenkiste, Niemiec, & Soenens, 2010). ÖBK'ya göre bireyler, bu ihtiyaçlarını tatmin etmek için bir arayış içinde değillerdir. Bireysel gelişimin ve yetişmenin amaçlandığı temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarda, birey kendini daha canlı ve bütünlük içinde hissettiği davranışları tekrarlamak güdüsüne sahiptir. Bir davranış temel psikolojik ihtiyaçları tatmin ediyorsa, o davranışın devamlılığı üzerinde ısrarcı olunur.

Literatürde adalet ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar arasındaki ilişki, örgütsel bir çalışma içinde incelenmiştir (Olafsen, Halvari, Forest, & Deci, 2015). Bu çalışmada iki tür adalet algısından bahsedilmiştir; işlemsel adalet ve dağıtımsal adalet. İşlemsel adalet, sürecin adilliği ve kişinin süreç sonucu elde edilen kazanımlar üzerinde etkisinin, kişi tarafından algılanma şekli olarak açıklanmıştır. İşlemsel adaletse süreç sonucu elde edilen kazanımların, kişinin bu sürece katkılarını ne oranda yansıttığının, kişi tarafından algısı olarak belirtilmiştir. Yapılan bu çalışmada her iki adalet algısındaki yükselmenin, temel psikolojik ihtiyaçların tatmini üzerindeki etkisi gözlemlenmiştir.

Adaletsizlik ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar arasındaki ilişkiyle ilgili bulgular olmasına rağmen, intikam ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar arasındaki ilişki henüz incelenmemiştir. İntikam ve ihtiyaçlar üzerine yazılmış en yakın kaynak Pemberton ve meslektaşlarına aittir (Pemberton, Aarten, & Mulder, 2017), Büyük İkili olarak adlandırılmış eylemlilik ve paylaşım ihtiyaçlarının, intikam davranışları tarafından tatmin edildiğini sunmuşlardır. Eylemlilik ihtiyacı; yeterlik, yararlılık, bireysel uğraş ve güç gibi kelimelerce tanımlanmaktadır. Paylaşım ihtiyacı ise sosyal yakınlık, etik, sıcaklık ve anlamlılık kelimeleriyle tanımlanmıştır. İddia edilebileceği üzere, eylemlilik ihtiyacı, özerklik ve yeterlik ihtiyaçlarının birleşimi, paylaşım ihtiyacı ise ilişkili olma ihtiyacının neredeyse

birebir aynısıdır. Bu yüzden benzer bir ilişkinin intikam davranışları ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar arasında da bulunması çok olası görülmüştür. Bu bilgilerden yola çıkarak dört hipotez kurulmuştur.

### **Hipotezler**

H1: Adaletsizlik içeren eylemler temel psikolojik ihtiyaçların tatmini açısından zararlı olacaktır.

H1a: Adaletsizlik içeren eylemler özerklik ihtiyacının tatmini açısından zararlı olacaktır.

H1b: Adaletsizlik içeren eylemler yeterlik ihtiyacının tatmini açısından zararlı olacaktır.

H1c: Adaletsizlik içeren eylemler ilişkili olma ihtiyacının tatmini açısından zararlı olacaktır.

H2: İntikam almak, işlemsel ve dağıtımsal adalet algılarının yükselmesine neden olacaktır.

H3: İntikam almak, temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarının tatmin edilmesini sağlayacaktır.

H4: İşlemsel ve dağıtımsal adalet algılarındaki yükselme, intikam davranışları ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçların tatmini arasındaki ilişkide aracı rol üstlenecektir.

### **Çalışma 1**

#### **Katılımcılar**

Birinci çalışmada 300 katılımcı (195 kadın), hepsi ODTÜ öğrencileri olmak üzere, internet üzerinden ilişkisel çalışmamıza katılmıştır. Katılımcıların yaşı 18 ve 42 arasında değişim göstermiştir ve ortalama yaş 21.71'tir. Katılımcılar SONA sistemi olarak adlandırılan bir platform üzerinden çalışmaya davet edilmişlerdir. Çalışmayı başarıyla tamamlayan katılımcılara psikoloji derslerinde fazladan puan olarak kullanılmak üzere 2 puan verilmiştir.



## **Ölçümler**

Katılımcılardan geçmişte yaşadıkları bir deneyimi yazmaları istenmiştir. Bu deneyimi yazdıktan ve o anki duyguları ön-hazırlamaya tâbi tutulduktan sonra katılımcıların ruh halleri Pozitif Duygu Negatif Duygu Ölçeği (Gençöz, 200), Öznel Zindelik Ölçeği (Ryan & Frederick, 1997), ve Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeği (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985) ölçüm araçlarıyla, temel psikolojik ihtiyaçları ise Temel İhtiyaçlar Tatmini ve Hüsranı Ölçeği (Chen et al.,2015) kullanılarak ölçülmüştür. Katılımcılar atandıkları gruba göre farklı türde deneyimlerini yazmışlardır. Adaletsizlik grubundaki katılımcılardan, geçmişlerinde yaşadıkları adaletsizliğe uğradıklarını ve mağdur konumuna düşürüldükleri bir deneyimlerini aktarmaları istenmiştir. Negatif kontrol grubundaki katılımcılardan geçmişte yaşadıkları, istemedikleri şekilde sonuçlanan ama sonuçların sorumluluğunu kabul ettikleri bir deneyimi aktarmaları istenmiştir. Bunun nedeni bu gruptaki katılımcıların mağduriyet hissettikleri bir anıyı yazmalarını engellerken, negatif duygularını sabit tutmak olarak açıklanmıştır. Kontrol grubundaki katılımcılardan ise geçmişte birileriyle sosyal bir etkileşim içine girdikleri bir anılarından bahsetmeleri istenmiştir. Gruplar arasındaki farklar incelenmiştir.

## **Bulgular ve Kısa Tartışma**

İki adet değişimleme kontrolü değişkeni (“Mağdur”(DK1) ve “Mağdur olmuş hissediyorum”(DK2)) katılımcılar tarafından 7 dereceli Likert ölçeği üzerinde değerlendirilmiştir. Adaletsizlik grubundaki katılımcılar DK1 için, diğer gruplara kıyasla anlamlı bir biçimde daha yüksek sonuçlar rapor etmiştir. DK2 için, adaletsizlik grubundaki katılımcıların skoru sadece kontrol grubundan anlamlı bir biçimde farklılık göstermiştir. Bunun nedeni negatif kontrol grubundaki bazı katılımcıların, yönergeler onları aksine zorlasa da mağdur konumuna düştükleri bir anılarından bahsetmeleri olabileceği önerilmiştir. Bu durum çalışma gruplarının belirgin bir şekilde birbirinden ayrılmasını engeller niteliktedir.

İki deęişkenli iliřki incelemeleri, iki deęişimleme kontrolü deęişkeninin de temel psikolojik ihtiyaçların tatminiyle negatif ilgileřim göstermiřtir. Tez içinde önerildięi gibi, kiřiler adaletsizlięe maruz kaldıkları ve maędur konumuna düřtüklerinde tüm temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarının tatmininde bir azalma gözlemlenmiřtir. Bu bulgular birinci hipotez doęrultusundadır (H1).

Gruplar arası kıyaslamalarda birinci hipotezde önerilenin aksine, üç temel psikolojik ihtiyaç arasından sadece iliřkili olma ihtiyacı gruplar arasında anlamlı bir fark göstermiřtir. Beklenenin aksine, adaletsizlik grubundaki katılımcılar, negatif kontrol grubundaki katılımcılara kıyasla daha yüksek seviyelerde iliřkili olma ihtiyacı tatmini rapor etmiřlerdir. Bunun nedeni adaletsizlik grubundaki katılımcılara verilen yönergede, bahsettikleri maęduriyet ieren deneyimlerinin arkadaşları tarafından avutuldukları ya da suçlu tarafından suçun telafi edildięi bir olayı iermemesi gerektięini açık bir řekilde belirtmemesi olabilir. Kiřiler eęer böyle bir deneyimden bahsettilerse, iliřkili olma ihtiyaçlarının yüksek olması tahmin edilebilecek bir sonuçtur. Adaletsizlik grubundaki katılımcıların, kontrol grubundaki katılımcılara kıyasla anlamlı bir řekilde yüksek negatif duygu puanlarına sahip olmamaları da bu önermeyi destekler niteliktedir. Aynı řekilde bu durum da alıřma gruplarının belirgin bir řekilde birbirinden ayrılmasını engelleyen bir unsurdur.

Regresyon analizleri, DK2'nin bütün temel psikolojik ihtiyaçların tatminini yordadıęını ortaya koymuřtur. Bu bulgu birinci hipotezi destekler niteliktedir. alıřma gruplarının kesin bir řekilde birbirlerinden ayrılmasını saęlayacak düzenlemelerden sonra bu alıřma, gruplar arası farkların anlamlı ıktıęı sonuçlar üretme potansiyeline sahiptir.

## **alıřma 2**

### **Katılımcılar**

İlk alıřmada adaletsizlik ölçümü istendięi řekilde yapılamadıęından, ikinci alıřma için bu deęişken üzerinde daha fazla kontrolün olduęu deneysel bir alıřma tasarlanmıřtır. Bu alıřmada adaletsizlik katılımcılara deneysel olarak ve

her birine aynı şekilde uygulanmıştır. Yetmiş katılımcı (7 gönüllü) bu çalışmaya, SONA sisteminden ders puanı karşılığında laboratuvar ortamında katılmıştır. Yirmi üç katılımcının yanıtları, çalışmanın aldatıcı doğasını anlamaları üzerine çalışmaya dahil edilmemiştir. Kalan 47 katılımcının (27 kadın) yaşları 19 ve 30 arasında değişmiş olup ortalama yaş 21.29 olarak bulunmuştur.

## **Ölçümler**

İkinci çalışmada da birinci çalışmada olduğu gibi ruh hali için Pozitif Duygu Negatif Duygu Ölçeği, temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar içinse Temel İhtiyaçlar Tatmini ve Hüsrani Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Adalet algılarının ölçümü içinse Örgütsel Adalet Ölçeğinin (Colquitt, 2001) İşlemsel Adalet ve Dağıtımsal Adalet alt ölçekleri kullanılmıştır.

Katılımcılar çalışmaya internet üzerinden kayıt yaptırmışlardır. Kayıt sayfasında, katılımcıların tam puan alabilmeleri için bir deneme yazmaları, başka birinin denemesini puanlandırmaları ve görsel tercihlerini bir seri fotoğraf üzerinden belirtmelerigerektiği bilgileri sunulmuştur. Katılımcılar laboratuvar ortamına geldiklerinde çalışmacı tarafından, aynı anda başka bir katılımcının daha çalışmaya katılacağı hakkında bilgilendirilmişlerdir. Bahsedilen ikinci katılımcı bir anlaşmalı katılımcıdır. Anlaşmalı katılımcı da bekleme alanına geldikten sonra iki katılımcıya da farklı odalarda çalışmaya alınacakları bildirilmiştir.

Deney odasında katılımcıya bilgisayar üzerinden sürecin nasıl devam edileceği anlatılmış, onay formu gösterilmiş ve kendilerine boş bir kâğıt ve tükenmez bir kalem verilmiştir. Katılımcıdan bu kâğıt üzerine birazdan karşılıklarına çıkacak kategoriler arasından kendilerine en çok güvendikleri bir kategoriyi seçip, 200 - 250 kelimelik bir deneme yazmaları istenmiştir. Kendilerine kelime sınırının çok katı olmadığı, eğer diğer katılımcının denemesi 250 kelimeyi geçerse bu diğer katılımcının puanını kırmaları için bir neden olmaması hakkında uyarılmışlardır. Katılımcıların yazma aşaması sonrası ellerine geçen ve anlaşmalı katılımcı tarafından yazıldığını düşündükleri deneme 237 kelime uzunluğundadır.

Katılımcıdan yazma işlemi bitince deney odasının kapısını çalarak araştırmacıyı uyarması istenmiştir.

Katılımcı deneme yazmak için yedi konudan birini seçmiştir (Sinema, Psikoloji, Edebiyat, Siyaset, Teknoloji, Futbol ve Müzik). Katılımcılar her seferinde müzik hakkında, bir gece önceden çalışmacı tarafından yazılmış aynı denemeyi almışlardır. Yazma işlemi bitince katılımcıya, diğer katılımcının henüz yazma işlemini bitirmemiş olduğu ve biraz beklemesi gerektiği belirtilmiştir. Tam olarak 4 dakika sonra katılımcıya, anlaşmalı katılımcı tarafından yazıldığı iddia edilen deneme getirilmiştir. Katılımcıdan bu denemeyi puanlandırması ve verdikleri puanın diğer katılımcının çalışmanın ikinci aşamasındaki seçeceği resim türünü değiştireceği belirtilmiştir. Eğer isterlerse birkaç cümlelik bir geri bildirim de yazabilecekleri söylenmiştir. Katılımcı puanlamasını tamamlayınca kendi denemesini puanlanmış bir şekilde geri almıştır. On üzerinden iki puan aldıkları denemede bir de not görmüşlerdir ([seçtikleri konu] konusunda bu kadar yetersizken keşke yazmaya uğraşmasaymış. Ben okumaya uğraşmadım.). Katılımcıya çalışmada devam edebilmesi için, aldığı puana denk gelen sahte bir kod verilmiştir. Bu kısım çalışmanın adaletsizlik manipülasyonunu oluşturmaktadır. Devamında adalet algısı, ruh hali ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçları ölçen araçları bu sırayla doldurmuşlardır. Anketlerin bitmesinin ardından katılımcı bilgisayar tarafından ikinci aşamaya başlamak üzere oldukları hakkında bilgilendirilmiştir. İkinci aşamada 40 adet temizlik ürünü resmi üzerinden görsel tercihlerini yansıtmaları istenmiştir. Her bir resim “Bu ürünü bir arkadaşınıza önerir miydiniz?” sorusuyla sunulmuştur. Çalışmanın bu kısmı deney sonuçlarına katılmamış, ölçekleri doldurma zamanları arasındaki farkı artırmak için konulmuştur. Bu aşamanın bitimince bilgisayar katılımcıdan ikinci bir kod istemiştir.

Bu kısımda çalışmacı deney odasına girerek, katılımcının denemesini okuduğu için üzgün olduğunu belirtmiş ve denemelerinin on üzerinden ikiyi hak etmediğini, diğer katılımcının haksız bir tavır sergilediğini söylemiştir. Böyle bir durumda yapabilecekleri tek şeyin, katılımcının, anlaşmalı katılımcıya ait ikinci görevdeki

resim türlerini ve sayısını direkt olarak belirleme hakkına sahip olması olarak belirtmiştir. Katılımcıya kendi kodlarının bu seçimlerinden asla etkilenmeyeceği garantisi verilmiştir. Karşı taraf için seçim yapabilecekleri altı kategori sunulmuştur; tatil köyleri, moda tasarımları, market ürünleri, temizlik ürünleri, böcekler ve deri hastalıkları. Değerlendirecekleri resim sayısı da 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 olarak sunulmuştur. Bu kategoriler ve sayılar daha önceki benzer bir çalışmadan direkt olarak alınmıştır (Okimoto & Wenzel, 2010). Bu kısım çalışmanın intikam manipülasyonunu oluşturmaktadır. Ardından katılımcıya eğer seçme şansları olsaydı, bu altı kategoriden kendileri için hangisini seçecekleri sorulmuştur. Katılımcıların intikam puanları bu iki cevabın farkı alınarak hesaplanmıştır. Bu seçimin ardından katılımcı, manipülasyon öncesi ve sonrası karşılaştırma için, daha önce doldurmuş olduğu ölçekleri bir defa daha doldurmuştur.

### **Bulgular ve Kısa Tartışma**

İkinci çalışma için yapılan iki değişkenli ilişki incelemeleri, beklenilen aksine adalet algısı değişkenleriyle, temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar arasında bir ilişki ortaya koymamıştır. Bunun nedeni işlemsel adalet ve dağıtımsal adalet ölçeklerinin deneysel bir araştırma için uygun olmaması olabilir. Konuyla ilgili bu ölçekleri kullanmamış bir deneysel desende (Liang et al., 2018), öç almanın, adaletsizlik algılarındaki düşüşü yordadığı bulunmuştur. Deneysel olmayan ve işlemsel adalet ve dağıtımsal adalet ölçeklerini kullanan başka bir çalışmada (Olafsen et al., 2015) ise, işlemsel adaletin temel psikolojik ihtiyaçları yordadığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Bahsedilen bulguların bu çalışmada tekrarlanmamış olması, bu önermeyi destekler niteliktedir.

Manipülasyon öncesi ve sonrası deney değişkenlerinin kıyaslanması incelemeleri, katılımcıların intikam fırsatından önceye kıyasla, kendilerine intikam fırsatı verildikten sonra özerklik, yeterlik ve ilişkili olma ihtiyaçlarının tatmini ile pozitif duygularında ve dağıtımsal adalet algılarında anlamlı bir artış, negatif duygularında anlamlı bir azalış rapor etmişlerdir. Bu bulgular araştırmanın üçüncü hipotezini(H3) destekler niteliktedir. Kişiler intikam şansını elde ettiklerinde,

temel psikolojik ihtiyaçları tatmin olmuştur. Bununla birlikte iki adalet algısı değişkeninden sadece dağıtımsal adalet algısının yükselmiş olması dikkat çekici bir noktadır. Dağıtımsal adalet, kişilerin elde ettikleri sonuçların kendi çabalarını ne kadar yansıttığıyla ilgilidir. Oysa bu çalışmada kişiler sonuçlarında bir değişiklik olmamıştır. İntikam manipülasyonunun öncesinde ve sonrasında puanları on üzerinden iki olarak kalmıştır. Bununla beraber ikinci çalışmanın adaletsizlik manipülasyonunun sosyal bir yanı vardır. Puanlara göre devam etme kodunu sağlayan çalışmacı, katılımcının on üzerinden iki almış olduğuna şahit olmuş, katılımcının yetersizliğini de görmüştür. İntikam manipülasyonu sırasında, çalışmacı katılımcının daha fazla puan alması gerektiğine inandığını söyleyerek bu durumu değiştirmiştir. Yani intikam fırsatından sonra değişen tek sonuç, sosyal sonuçtur. Dağıtımsal adalet algısının yükselmesi bu şekilde açıklanabilir.

Çeşitli regresyon ölçümleri, intikam davranışlarının adalet algısı değişkenlerini ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçları yordamakta yetersiz kaldığını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bu durum ikinci (H2) ve üçüncü (H3) hipotezleri çürütür niteliktedir. Dördüncü hipotezin (H4) denenmesi de anlamlı sonuçlar ortaya koymamıştır. Adalet algısı değişkenleri, intikam davranışları ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar arasındaki ilişkide aracı rol üstlenmemiştir. Bunun açıklaması, intikam fırsatından sonra temel psikolojik ihtiyaçların yükselmesine neden olan ölçülmemiş bir değişkenin varlığı ya da intikam davranışlarının ölçülmesindeki araçların yetersizliği üzerinden yapılabilir.

### **Genel Tartışma**

İnsanlar adaletsizliğe uğradıklarında seçim şanslarının kendileri yerine başkaları tarafından yapıldığını, çevrelerinde olan değişimler üzerindeki kontrollerinin azaldığını ve insanlar tarafından sevgi ve ilgi görmediklerini hissedebilirler. Bu durum onların temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarının tatminini engeller. İntikam davranışlarının, adaleti tekrar sağlama etkisi göz önünde bulundurarak, bu ihtiyaçlar önündeki engelleri kaldıracağı kabul edilmiştir. Ancak sonuçlar bu yönde değildir. İntikam manipülasyonundan sonra insanların temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarının tatminindeki artış ve dağıtımsal adalet algılarındaki yükselişin

nedeni intikamla açıklanamamıştır. Bu konuyla ilgili getirilebilecek en temelli tartışma, insanların kendileriyle ilgili kaybettikleri kendini gerçekleştirmeyle ilgili duyguların geri kazanımı, intikam olanağına sahip olmakla açıklanabilir. İnsanların kendilerini tekrar çevrelerinin kontrolünde hissetmeleri ve kendi kararlarını veriyormuş hislerinin tekrar kazanımı için karşı tarafa aynı zararı verme olanağını ellerinde bulundurmuş olmak yetmiş olabilir. Temel psikolojik ihtiyaçların doyumu için intikam almak şart değildir fakat intikam alma seçiminin mağdura verilmesi bu kişinin kendini daha iyi hissetmesini sağlamıştır. İntikam davranışı Türkiye gibi toplumcu kültürlerde, kendi psikolojik iyi halin için başkalarına zarar verme olarak algılanacağından sosyal olarak kabul gören bir davranış olmayabilir. Bununla beraber adaleti tekrar sağlama isteği, toplumun devamlılığı için gereklidir ve intikam fırsatı bunu sağlamak için yeterlidir. Kişilerin intikam davranışlarının, temel psikolojik ihtiyaçları üzerine direkt ve dolaylı etkisinin bulunamamasının birincil sebebi bu olabilir.

Bununla birlikte deneysel çalışmaların, günümüz genel görüşüyle pek uyum içinde olmadığını söylemek mümkündür. Katılan 70 katılımcının 23'ü (%33) çalışmanın aldatici doğasını fark etmiştir. Bu tartışmaya açık bir şekilde yüksek bir orandır. Buradan yola çıkarak, katılımcıların deneysel bir çalışmaya katılırken, bir şekilde kandırılıyor olduklarını var saydıkları öne sürülebilir. Bu durumu değiştirmek için yapılabilecek ilk şey deneysel çalışmaların zamanının tekrar gelmesini beklemek olabilir. Daha yapıcı ama uygulaması zor olan yol ise insanlara kolaylıkla anlayamayacakları, asıl çalışmayla hiçbir ilgisi olmayan üçüncü bir değişken koymak olabilir. Çünkü katılımcılar onlara sunduğumuz araştırma konusunun, asıl amacı gizleyen bir hikâye olduğunu kabul ederek çalışmalarını tamamlamaktadırlar. Onların içindeki çalışmanın asıl amacını bulma isteğini bu sahte üçüncü değişkeni bulmalarını sağlayarak doyurabilir, asıl asıl amacımızın gizliliğini koruyabiliriz.

Çalışmanın sonuçlarını etkilemiş olabilecek bir diğer etmense, çalışmacının intikam fırsatını sunarken katılımcılara aldıkları puanın bu kadar az olmaması gerektiğini söylemesi olabilir. Bu cümle katılımcılar için bir çeşit telafi yöntemi olarak görülmüş olabilir. Sonuç olarak onarıcı adalet güduları üzerinden, adaletin

belli bir oranda sağlandığını düşünmüş ve karşı tarafı cezalandırmamış olabilirler. Çalışmamızda cezalandırıcı adalet güdülerini ölçtüğümüz için sonuçların bu değişkenden etkilenmiş olma olasılığı oldukça yüksektir. Gelecekte yapılacak çalışmalar katılımcıların herhangi bir şekilde telafi edilmesini engellemekten fayda sağlayacaktır.

İntikam için bir başka önemli faktör ise sosyal ilişkilerdir. Elshout ve meslektaşlarının (2015) çalışmasına göre, sosyal ilişkiler intikamın merkezi özelliklerindedir. Sosyal ilişkiler başlığı altında aile, arkadaşlar, eski sevgiliden intikam gibi sözcükler gruplandırılmıştır. İnsanlar genelde tanıdıkları insanlardan intikam almaya meyillidirler. İkinci çalışmada ise anlaşmalı katılımcı, asıl katılımcı için bir yabancıdır. Katılımcılar önceden tanımadıkları ve belki bir daha asla karşılaşmayacakları birinden intikam almayı tercih etmemiş olabilirler. Gelecekteki çalışmalar, tanınmayan biri ve tanınan birine karşı intikam davranışları arasındaki farkı inceleyebilirler.

Bir diğer önemli unsur ise, intikama neden olan adaletsiz eylem üzerinden geçen süredir. “İntikam soğuk yenen bir yemektir” sözünün varlığı, insanların intikam almadan önce belli bir zaman geçmesini ve planlama yapmayı dileyebileceklerinin göstergesidir. İkinci çalışmada adaletsizlikten hemen sonra intikam alma fırsatı sunulmuştur. Bu da sonuçların istenilen yönde çıkmasını engellemiş bir unsur olarak tartışılabilir. Adaletsizlik ve intikam arasındaki süreyi deneysel bir çalışmada uzatmak, başka değişkenlerin dâhil olmasına neden olabileceğinden bu yol tercih edilmemiştir. Bu olası değişkenleri kontrol edebileceğine inanan araştırmacılar, intikamı uzun süreli bir davranış olarak incelemeleri konusunda desteklenmektedir.

Son olarak intikam davranışı ikinci çalışmada basit bir performans değerlendirmesi oyunu içerisinde gözlemlenmiştir. Çalışmaya ait bütün bulgular bu masum desen bağlamında değerlendirilmelidir. İntikam ve temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar arasındaki bu bulguları, genel intikam kavramına genellemek son derece dikkatsizce bir davranış olacaktır. Çünkü intikam her ne kadar günlük hayatın içindeki bunun gibi küçük anlaşmazlıklarda karşımıza çıksa da, töre cinayetleri de intikam kavramının



içinde yer almaktadır. Gelecekteki nitel çalışmalar bu gibi hassas konular üzerinde durabilirler. Bahsedilen düzeltmeler yapılarak uygulanacak gelecekteki çalışmalara kadar, elde ettiğimiz bulgular dikkatli bir şekilde, umut verici olarak irdelenmelidir.

## Appendix O. Tez İzin Formu/Thesis Permission Form

### TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

#### ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

#### YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Şahin

Adı / Name : Barış

Bölümü / Department : Psikoloji

**TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English)** : The Mediating Role of Justice Perception on the Relationship Between Revenge Behavior and Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction

**TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE:** Yüksek Lisans / Master

Doktora / PhD

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır.** / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.

2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years.** \*

3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months.** \*

\* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.  
A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature .....

Tarih / Date