

Table 3.1 Analysis of non-common effects after observed selection of University X

<i>Features of University X (chosen)</i>	<i>Features of University Y (not chosen)</i>	<i>Are features common or non-common?</i>	<i>Implication about intention</i>
Comfortable accommodation	Comfortable accommodation	Common	None
Sports facilities	Sports facilities	Common	None
Good reputation	Good reputation	Common	None
Friends applying	Friends applying	Common	None
Urban location	Rural location	Non-common	University X chosen because candidate wanted to live in an urban location

Table 3.2 Four patterns of consensus, consistency and distinctiveness information, and their perceived implications (after Kelley, 1967)

Consensus (<i>across persons</i>)	Consistency (<i>across situations</i>)	Distinctiveness (<i>across objects</i>)	Attribution
Low (No one else says that attribution theory is boring)	High (Hermione says attribution theory is boring in many different contexts)	Low (Hermione says that lots of things are boring)	Person attribution Effect covaries with person: something about Hermione causes her to say that attribution theory is boring
Low (No one else says that attribution theory is boring)	Low (Hermione only says attribution theory is boring in front of Ron)	High (Hermione doesn't say that other things are boring)	Context attribution Effect covaries with situation: something about the presence of Ron causes Hermione to say that attribution theory is boring
High (Everyone else says attribution theory is boring)	High (Hermione says attribution theory is boring in many different contexts)	High (Hermione doesn't say that other things are boring)	Entity attribution Effect covaries with object: something about attribution theory makes Hermione say that it is boring
Low (No one else says that attribution theory is boring)	High (Hermione says attribution theory is boring in many different contexts)	High (Hermione doesn't say that other things are boring)	Person–entity interaction Effect covaries with Hermione together with attribution theory: something about their combination causes her to say attribution theory is boring

Table 3.3 Possible causes of success and failure (after Weiner, 1979, 1985)

	<i>Internal</i>		<i>External</i>	
	<i>Stable</i>	<i>Unstable</i>	<i>Stable</i>	<i>Unstable</i>
<i>Controllable</i>	Mastery (e.g., knowledge, skill)	Effort	Enduring situational and social resources (e.g., contacts, wealth)	Temporarily available situational and social resources (e.g., advice, assistance)
<i>Uncontrollable</i>	Aptitude (e.g., intelligence, coordination)	Energy	Task ease or difficulty	Luck/chance

Table 3.4 Possible causes of romantic rejection (from Abramson et al., 1978)

	<i>Internal</i>		<i>External</i>	
	<i>Stable</i>	<i>Unstable</i>	<i>Stable</i>	<i>Unstable</i>
<i>Global</i>	I'm unattractive to men	My conversation sometimes bores men	Men are overly competitive with intelligent women	Men get into rejecting moods
<i>Specific</i>	I'm unattractive to him	My conversation sometimes bores him	He's overly competitive with intelligent women	He was in a rejecting mood