

D378
W465d
1977

DEROGATION OF RAPE VICTIMS:
A JUST WORLD AND DEFENSIVE
ATTRIBUTION ANALYSIS

by

D. KENT WELSH

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
the Department of Psychology
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA

1977

Accepted by the Faculty of the Graduate School, The
University of Alabama, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
specializing in Clinical Psychology.

Dissertation Committee:

Dennis Runcie, Ph.D.

William Janzen, Ph.D.

Kenneth B. Melvin, Ph.D.

Henry C. Rickard, Ph.D.

Chairman

Stanley L. Brodsky, Ph.D.

Dept. Chairman

Raymond D. Fowler, Ph.D.

Dean, Graduate
School

Date April 25, 1977

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere gratitude is expressed to my chairperson, Dr. Stan Brodsky. He displayed incredible patience over the years and finally saw me through. I would also like to thank Drs. Bill Janzen, Ken Melvin, Charlie Rickard, and Dennis Runcie for serving on my committee.

I wish to express my appreciation to the faculty of the Psychology Department of Lamar University for their assistance in obtaining subjects for this series of studies.

My love and appreciation go to Cay Welsh who provided personal support throughout my endeavors and to Jerry and Rosemary Hart who tolerated me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Sociological Definition of Rape	3
The Just World Hypothesis	5
Similarity of Victim to Observer	6
Defensive Attribution	8
Attribution of Responsibility to Rape Victims	10
Comparison of J-W and DA Theories in Accounting for the Derogation of Rape Victims	13
Method (Experiment I)	15
Results (Experiment I)	17
Discussion (Experiment I)	19
Method (Experiment II)	21
Results (Experiment II)	22
Discussion (Experiment II)	24
Method (Experiment III)	26
Results (Experiment III)	28
Discussion (Experiment III)	29
II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	31
III. METHOD	34
Subjects	34
Procedure	35
Similarity	36
Stimulus materials	37
Dependent Measures	38
IV. RESULTS	40
Evaluation of the Rape Victim	44
Attribution of Responsibility for the Rape	44
V. DISCUSSION	53
VI. SUMMARY	58
REFERENCES	60

Appendix

A.	Analysis of Variance on Difference Scores of Lerner Scales - Victim (Experiment I)	65
B.	Analysis of Variance on Difference Scores of Lerner Scales - Assailant (Experiment I)	67
C.	Analysis of Variance on Character Attribution Ratings - Assailant (Experiment I)	69
D.	Analysis of Variance on Difference Scores of Lerner Scales - Victim (Experiment II)	71
E.	Analysis of Variance on Character Attribution Ratings - Victim (Experiment II)	73
F.	Analysis of Variance on Ratings of Definition of Rape Item (Experiment II)	75
G.	Analysis of Variance on Ratings of Feigned Resistance Item (Experiment II)	77
H.	Three-way Analysis of Variance on Difference Scores of Lerner Scales - Victim (Experiment III) .	79
I.	Two-way Analysis of Variance on Difference Scores of Lerner Scales - Victim (Experiment III) .	81
J.	Analysis of Variance on Behavioral Attribution Ratings (Experiment III)	83
K.	Analysis of Variance on Ratings of Attraction (Experiment III)	85
L.	Attitudes toward Women Scale	87
M.	Similarity Check Questionnaire	90
N.	Lerner Scales	92
O.	Attribution Questionnaire	94
P.	Raw Data	96

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Analysis of Variance on Difference Scores of Similarity Ratings	43
2.	Analysis of Variance on Difference Scores of Lerner Scales	45
3.	Analysis of Variance on Behavioral Attribution Ratings	46
4.	Analysis of Variance on Character Attribution Ratings	48
5.	Analysis of Variance on Attribution to Luck	49
6.	Analysis of Variance on Ratings of "Deserving" Item	50
7.	Analysis of Variance on Ratings of "Not Me" Item	52

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The crime of rape has received much more publicity over recent years than it did earlier in history; yet, rape remains one of the least understood forms of criminal behavior. Until Amir's (1967) analysis of the patterns of rape in the Philadelphia area during the early 1960's, little had been done to objectively examine even the incidence of rape. Although Amir's sampling techniques have been questioned (he used only cases reported to the police), his research nonetheless represents the first major objective study of rape.

One subject of study that has developed recently has been the victim of rape. This research interest in the victim rather than the rapist has come about partially from the applied problems for practitioners in medicine and mental health (Hayman, Lanza, & Noel, 1973). As women become more willing to report rape, they are demanding more attention and services from professionals. With a few notable exceptions, the professionals have not provided the appropriate services; therefore, rape victims and other interested parties have organized their own services and developed their own techniques (Horos, 1974). They have also begun challenging existing statutes concerning rape and are gradually having an impact on the social system, the service delivery system, and legal systems (Wood, 1973).

One of the problems in effecting change is the attitude of society toward victims of rape. In many cases, the victim of a rape is devalued by others for having been raped (Jones & Aronson, 1973). Frequently she is thought to have either allowed the rape to occur by not resisting enough or precipitated the rape by enticing the man into it (Goldner, 1972). The conclusion may or may not be based upon facts. These attitudes seem to pervade the culture from jokes "a woman with her skirt up can run faster than a man with his pants down" (Schwendinger & Schwendinger, 1974, p. 19) to conventional academic writing, "A woman's sexual need can lead to the unconscious desire for the aggressive act; the coercion serving to avoid guilt feelings which may arise against willing participation...Many victims are nothing more than aiders and abettors, if not offenders themselves, and should be examined psychiatrically along with the offender (Schultz, 1968, p. 138)." Other writers, although not as condemning as Schultz, implicitly place responsibility for rape upon the victim. For example, by warning a woman not to go out alone at night, Schiff (1972) implies that if a woman makes herself vulnerable then she is responsible for the consequences. Thus, at least a part of the responsibility for the crime is lifted from the attacker. Wood (1973) has noted that juries often consider the character and the behavior of the victim in deciding the guilt or innocence of the assailant. Even in a situation where extreme physical violence was directed toward the victim (her jaw broken in two places), her previous moral character was influential in one jury's decision for acquittal. "Rape is one of the few crimes where the victim often is as much on trial as the accused (Curtis, 1974, p. 601)." The prevalent attitude among many then, is that if

a woman is raped, she must have deserved it. This seems to occur even when few of the facts of the situation are known about a particular case. The proposed research will examine some of the variables affecting the evaluation of rape victims by other people and will present a theoretical framework from which to predict the level of evaluation and the assignment of responsibility for rape.

Sociological Definition of Rape

Arguing that laws reflect the prevalent attitudes of a society, Astor (1974) has traced the history of rape laws to British common law and considers modern rape laws as having evolved from the concept of women as the property of men. A rape was considered a crime against the man who owns the woman such as her father or husband. When the woman was raped, the property was sullied and therefore worthless. The last vestige of the property concept in rape law is the modern law that defines rape as "...sexual penetration of a woman by a man not her husband without the woman's consent (Weis & Borges, 1973, p. 71, emphasis added)."

If modern rape laws do reflect the values of today's society, the definition of rape by individuals within that society should parallel the laws. In an attempt to arrive at a socio-psychological definition of rape Klemmack and Klemmack (1976) obtained questionnaire data from 208 women. The respondents were presented with seven brief descriptions of interpersonal interactions that involved sexual relations without the woman's consent. The behavior of the victim and the aggressor were varied as well as the previous relationship between the victim and the aggressor. The respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they believed that "rape" had occurred.

An inverse correlation was found between the degree of previous relationship between the two people and the definition of rape. As the relationship between the man and woman increased, the number of people defining the situation as rape decreased. The better a woman knew a man, the more she was held responsible for having become vulnerable or for having not foreseen the consequences of her behavior. In addition to the questionnaire on the definition of rape, the Klemmacks also obtained data on the respondents' attitudes toward family life. Their measure was a ten item scale assessing the respondents' views toward the role of women in the family. The more non-traditionally oriented respondents tended to define rape more broadly, thereby holding the female less responsible for the event. By defining rape more narrowly, the more traditionally oriented women tended to hold the woman more responsible. If the more traditional woman herself was a victim of rape, it would be reasonable to expect that she would hold herself somewhat responsible and therefore would experience more intense guilt about the rape than would a less traditionally oriented woman.

The Klemmacks' research with this female sample supported the hypothesis that victims of rape are frequently held responsible for their misfortune, not only by others, but possibly by themselves as well. The study also identified at least one type of information which is utilized by the observer in assigning responsibility for the crime: the previous relationship between the victim and the aggressor. Furthermore, one of the characteristics of the observer that influences her interpretation of the situation is her traditional or non-traditional attitude toward the female role. The research

question still remains, however, of the extent to which victims of rape are devalued by others when the relationship between the victim and the aggressor is unknown.

The Just World Hypothesis

One theory from the psychological literature which may account for the phenomenon is Lerner's (1965, 1971, 1974) just-world (J-W) hypothesis. This theory which is derived from a cognitive dissonance model states that people have a need to believe that the world around them is inherently just and that they "earn" their rewards either by their behavior or their character. When behavioral cues are ambiguous and one cannot account for the misfortune of another by reference to these cues, a cognitive dissonance is formed. It is in the resolution of this dissonance that the J-W hypothesis is invoked and the victim of the misfortune is devalued; i.e., A) the world is just, B) I perceive that person's misfortune as unjust, C) injustice does not truly exist, thus, that person must deserve his misfortune. The dissonance is resolved by shifting one's evaluation of the person downward thereby making him deserving of his fate. Thus, the need for cognitive consonance is satisfied.

A typical J-W study (Lerner, 1971) involves presenting experimental subjects with a video-taped scene in which a person (supposedly another student) is receiving severe electric shock. The subjects are told that the victim's assignment to the punishment group rather than the reward group or a control group is by chance. Thus, she is an innocent victim. Following this explanation and the viewing of the video-tape, the experimental subjects are asked to rate the individual that they observed on a semantic differential type questionnaire

consisting of 15 highly evaluative bipolar scales (intelligent-unintelligent, likeable-unlikeable, uncooperative-cooperative, bossy-easygoing, immature-mature, imaginative-unimaginative, irresponsible-responsible, nervous-calm, patient-impatient, reasonable-unreasonable, rigid-flexible, courteous-rude, selfish-unselfish, warm-cold, sincere-insincere). In scoring, the more positive the rating, the higher the score and all fifteen of the scales are combined to give a total score. After rating the victim, the subjects are asked to rate the average college student on the same fifteen scales. The difference score between the rating of the average college student and the rating of the victim reflects the degree of derogation by the subject.

The factors influencing the J-W effects have been empirically demonstrated to include: genuineness of suffering (Lerner, 1971); lack of behavioral responsibility (Lerner & Matthews, 1967); degree of suffering (Stokols & Shopler, 1973); anticipation of continued suffering of the victim (Lerner & Simmons, 1966); and apparent weakness of the victim (Lerner & Lichtman, 1968). The type of misfortune befalling the victim has also been varied across a variety of conditions; men with high probability of induction numbers in the draft lottery (Rubin & Peplau, 1973), the loser of a chance zero-sum game (Lerner & Simmons, 1966) and victims of social ostracism resulting from an unwanted pregnancy (Stokols & Schopler, 1973).

Similarity of Victim to Observer

One of the basic assumptions of the J-W hypothesis is that people feel a need to be able to explain, predict, and to some extent, control the factors that influence their own lives. When one can perceive the world as just and assume that people earn their rewards (positive or

negative) one has achieved at least a minimal level of predictability about one's world. To observe that fate is capricious and that unpleasant consequences can happen to an innocent victim tends to be threatening to one's security. It would be reasonable to expect that this threat would be heightened as the similarity between the observer and the innocent victim increased (Novak & Lerner, 1968). The greater threat should lead to a greater rejection of the innocent victim. By devaluing the victim, one would be attempting to decrease the similarity between one's self and the victim, thus, regaining the security that unpleasant consequences only happen to deserving victims.

Lerner and Agar (1972) and Novak and Lerner (1968) manipulated attitudinal similarity between the victim and the subject. While their subjects assigned more positive attributes to the similar victim, they also indicated a stronger preference to interact with the dissimilar victim. In both studies, the rejection of the similar victim was interpreted as supporting the hypothesis that it is more threatening to perceive injustice happening to a similar victim than to a dissimilar victim.

Taking a different approach to the similarity variable, Sorrentino and Boutilier (1974) varied the fate similarity between the subject and the victim rather than attitudinal similarity. They led their subjects to believe that they too might be assigned to the shock-punishment experimental group and experience the same fate as the victim they observed. Their results indicated that immediate threat did not increase a need to devalue the victim. However, there was no measure of approach or avoidance of the victim.

The effects of the similarity of the victim to the subject on the

devaluation of the victim are still not clearly determined. First, the nature of the threat was vague in the first two studies (Lerner & Agar, 1972; Novak & Lerner, 1968). The victim was described as a heroin addict (Lerner & Agar, 1972) or as having been a mental patient (Novak & Lerner, 1968). In both of these cases, there is a degree of personal involvement on the part of the victims in their own misfortune. It would be unlikely that the subjects would consider themselves as potentially vulnerable to the same fate.

At the other extreme, the subjects in the Sorrentino and Boutilier (1974) study were faced with the imminent threat of receiving painful electric shock. This immediate threat may have been so arousing that there was interference with the subjects' attention to the dependent measures (four of the 21 subjects in the shock group attempted to leave the experimental session, but were convinced to remain until they finished the material containing the dependent measures).

The question then of how similarity between the victim and the observer affects the observer's evaluation of the victim has not yet been resolved within the J-W paradigm. Other researchers (Chaikin & Darley, 1973; Shaver, 1970) have approached the question from a different theoretical framework and have demonstrated more definitive results.

Defensive Attribution

While the J-W research has focused upon the evaluation of a victim by an observer, other researchers (Chaikin & Darley, 1973; McKillip & Posovac, 1975; Shaver, 1970; and Walster, 1966) have focused upon the assignment of responsibility for negative consequences. Walster (1966) demonstrated that people are more inclined to attribute responsibility to the actor instead of chance when the consequences of an accident are

more severe. Her reasoning was similar to Lerner's (1971) in that they both believed that attribution of an unpleasant consequence to chance would suggest that the same misfortune could befall the observer. "If we can categorize a serious accident as in some way the victim's fault, it is reassuring. We then simply need to reassure ourselves that we are a different kind of person from the victim, or that we would behave differently under similar circumstances, and we feel protected from catastrophe (Walster, 1966; p. 74)." It would follow then, that as similarity between victim and observer increases, so does personal threat and the need to attribute responsibility to the victim.

While this reasoning seems appealing, empirical support for it has been equivocal (Shaver, 1970; Walster, 1966) which led Shaver (1970) to propose an alternative hypothesis. He reasoned that attributing responsibility to the victim could be threatening because a person would not want to be held responsible by others if the accident should happen to him. Therefore, the person would tend to attribute responsibility to chance rather than to the similar victim in an effort to avoid blame himself. Greater empirical support has been demonstrated for this defensive attribution (DA) hypothesis (Chaikin & Darley, 1973; McKillip & Posovac, 1975; Shaver, 1970) than for the earlier position (Walster, 1966).

In perhaps the best demonstration of DA, Chaikin and Darley (1973) showed their subjects a video-tape of two people working on a task. The subjects were led to believe that they would be assuming the role of one or the other of the people on the tape. During the taped sequence, one of the people "accidentally" causes the other to experience either a mild or severe consequence. Those subjects who believed that they would be playing the role of the person causing the accident attributed less

responsibility for the accident to the person and indicated a greater liking for him than did the other group of subjects. Thus, at least for similarity of immediate fate, the DA theory seems to fit the data. Attitudinal similarity was manipulated by McKillip and Posovac (1975) and was also shown to result in less responsibility attributed to the similar victim.

Attribution of Responsibility to Rape Victims

A few studies have specifically examined the conditions under which responsibility is attributed to rape victims (Feldman-Summers & Lindner, 1976; Jones & Aronson, 1973; and Luginbuhl & Mullin, 1976). One of the variables that affects this attribution is the "respectability" of the victim. In examining this variable, the assumption was made that one's character (or respectability) and one's behavior could be considered separately. As had been demonstrated in the J-W literature, when a victim's behavior is held constant, the observer devalues the victim's character. Jones and Aronson (1973) reasoned that by manipulating character, the behavior would be differentially evaluated. That is, a person of "high respectability" (a virgin) will be held more behaviorally responsible for her unfortunate fate than a person of "low respectability" (a divorcee).

In the manipulation of this dimension, the respectability of the victim (virgin, married, or divorcee) was varied and the subjects were simply asked "How much do you consider the crime to be the victim's fault? (p. 417)." Responses were made by circling a number on a 21-point scale from -10 to +10 with -10 representing no fault attributed to the victim. The results were consistent with the predictions that more "fault" was attributed to the respectable victim. One weakness

in the methodology of this study is that although the term "fault" implies some behavioral component, it is also possible to assume that a characterological "fault" could be attributed to the victim. That is, the "respectability" of the victim was perceived as lower rather than her behavior being at "fault."

Feldman-Summers and Lindner (1976) expanded the range of the respectability variable by identifying five levels of respectability: married woman, single virgin, single non-virgin, divorcee, and prostitute. Two of their dependent variables were the degree of responsibility for the crime attributed to the victim and the rating of intensity of the psychological impact of the crime on the victim. In contrast to the Jones and Aronson (1973) results, the least respectable victim (the prostitute) was seen as most responsible for having precipitated the crime and also as being affected by it to a lesser degree than were the more respectable victims. It was only in this extreme case (the prostitute) that these particular measures tended to show a separation in terms of responsibility for the event and the impact of the rape. The women at the other four levels of respectability were not perceived as differentially responsible for the crime. Apparently, at least for this sample of subjects, the married woman and the divorcee are perceived as similar in their responsibility for their misfortune. Again, however, it is not possible to differentiate between behavioral and characterological "fault." While the respectability of the victim has been demonstrated to be a factor that some people consider when evaluating rape victims, it remains to be determined which "respectability" factors are relevant and which are not.

Luginbuhl and Mullin (1976) approached this question by exaggerating

the extremes of respectability (novice nun, student, or topless dancer) and asked their subjects to differentiate between different types of blame they assigned for the event. It was their contention that the victim may be seen as at fault because of her behavior or her character. They also asked their subjects to consider "chance" and an "overall" factor in their attribution of fault. The four dependent variables, then, were the subject's attribution of fault to: A) the victim's behavior, B) her character, C) chance, and D) overall blame.

These investigators further proposed that the similarity of the victim to the subject would affect the ratings of responsibility. Employing the DA conceptual framework it was reasoned that if an observer perceived a rape victim as similar to herself, she would tend to feel somewhat threatened that she could also be raped. It would be reasonable to believe that a victim would not want other people to blame her character if she were raped. Therefore, the observer would not be inclined to blame the character of the rape victim perceived as similar. The observer would tend to attribute blame to the victim's behavior and to chance. Thus, the age and academic status of the rape victim (20 year old part-time student or 31 year old non-student) was varied in an effort to assess the effects of similarity upon attribution of responsibility for the occurrence of a rape. Sex of subject was also controlled. The final design was a 2 (high and low similarity) x 3 (nun, student, dancer) x 2 (male, female) factorial.

Again, as in the Feldman-Summers and Lindner study (1976), the less respectable victim was seen as having more overall responsibility for her fate than the more respectable victim. As predicted, the character of the topless dancer was blamed more than the characters of

the nun and student. The more respectable victims were held more behaviorally responsible and attribution to chance was greater with the respectable victims. In general, males did not differentiate between the victim's character and her behavior as a cause for the rape. Females, on the other hand, attributed far greater responsibility to the victim's behavior regardless of her respectability or her similarity. In doing so they seem to be utilizing "defensive attribution" mechanisms to protect themselves from threat. However, the effects of the similarity variable were weak and were not clearly demonstrated. At least part of this difficulty can be attributed to the fact that only one of the six experimental conditions could be considered relevant. It is not likely that many women in the college population from which the sample was drawn were either nuns or topless dancers. Thus, the similarity effect was masked by the respectability manipulation. As yet, there has been no clear demonstration of the effects of the similarity variable upon attribution of responsibility for rape.

Comparison of J-W and DA Theories in Accounting for the Derogation of Rape Victims

The "respectability" of the rape victim has been demonstrated to be a factor in an observer's attribution of responsibility for the occurrence of the rape (Feldman-Summers & Lindner, 1976; Jones & Aronson, 1973; Lugenbuhl & Mullin, 1976). There remains, however, disparity in the literature as to the precise effect of the respectability variable. That is, Jones and Aronson (1973) found the more respectable victim was held more at fault while both Feldman-Summers and Lindner (1976) and Lugenbuhl and Mullin (1976) found greater responsibility attributed to the less respectable victim.

In an attempt to resolve this apparent inconsistency, a program of research was undertaken in which the respectability dimension was manipulated. An additional concern in the research was the efficiency with which the J-W and the DA theories account for the data. While both J-W and DA theories are concerned with how people view and evaluate others, one difference is in the methodology used to demonstrate them. The J-W studies (Lerner, 1971) utilize a series of semantic differential scales to measure an observer's overall evaluation of a victim. The DA studies (Shaver, 1970), on the other hand, ask for an assignment of responsibility for the event. In an effort to determine the relationship between the evaluation of the victim and attribution of responsibility for rape, both types of variables were measured.

Another factor that has been examined in the research on attribution of responsibility for the occurrence of rape is the impact of the crime upon the victim. Feldman-Summers and Lindner (1976) found that their subjects believed that rape would have less impact upon the least respectable victim (the prostitute). The impact of the rape upon the victim, however, has not been manipulated as an independent variable. In the present research, it was reasoned that the additional information about the victim's reaction to the rape would influence the subjects' evaluation of the victim and their attribution of responsibility. Specifically it was hypothesized that the more severe the impact of the crime, the less responsibility would be attributed to the victim and the less she would be devalued.

The third variable manipulated was the past behavior of the rapist. It was reasoned that if a man had committed other rapes, the present one would be consistent with his previous behaviors; thus, less responsibility

would be attributed to the present victim and the less she would be devalued.

Method (Experiment I)

Subjects. Forty eight students in an Introductory Psychology class served as subjects in this research. They all received course credit for their participation. Both men and women students were represented in approximately equal numbers ($n_{\text{male}} = 22$, $n_{\text{female}} = 26$).

Procedure. Rating sheets containing 15 semantic differential scales were distributed by the experimenter (intelligent-unintelligent; likeable-unlikeable; uncooperative-cooperative; bossy-easygoing; immature-mature; imaginative-unimaginative; irresponsible-responsible; nervous-calm; patient-impatient; reasonable-unreasonable; rigid-flexible; courteous-rude; selfish-unselfish; warm-cold; sincere-insincere). The scales were identical to those used by Lerner (1971, 1974) and have been demonstrated by him to be sensitive to the type of experimental manipulation performed in this study. The students were asked to evaluate the reference person named at the top of each rating sheet on all of the 15 scales. The three reference persons rated were a 20-year old white married female college student, a 20-year old white divorced female college student, and a 22-year old single male college student. The rating sheet for each reference person was distributed and gathered separately.

Following the collection of the last rating sheet, a packet of materials containing a brief description of a rape scene was distributed to the students. Included in the materials was a description of the victim and a description of the assailant. There were eight different protocols randomly distributed to the subjects with each subject receiving only one condition. The respectability of the victim was manipulated

by describing her as either married or divorced. Her reaction to the rape was manipulated by stating that:

"An examination confirmed that sexual relations had occurred and that there were no apparent physical injuries. However, she was treated for shock and remained hospitalized under psychiatric care for five days following the incident." (extreme reaction) or:

"An examination confirmed that sexual relations had occurred and since there were no apparent physical injuries, she was released in good condition. Follow-up contact by the police indicated that she experienced no further problems." (mild reaction)

The past history of the assailant was also varied. The single offense condition was described as "Upon questioning he admitted to having committed the rape, but stated that he had never attempted anything like that before." The multiple offenses condition was described as, "Upon questioning he admitted to having committed the rape and further admitted to having sexually assaulted at least twelve other women." The design of the experiment then was 2 (married vs. divorced) x 2 (extreme vs. mild reaction) x 2 (one vs. twelve assaults).

The students were instructed to read the materials and then to rate the victim and the assailant on the 15 semantic differential scales. These scales were included in the packet of materials. The dependent variable was derived by subtracting the rating of the victim from the rating of the appropriate reference person.

The students were also asked to indicate on a scale from 1 (not

at all) to 13 (extremely powerful cause) the extent to which they believed that each of the following factors could have contributed to the occurrence of the crime: the situation, the victim's behavior, the victim's character, the assailant's behavior, and the assailant's character.

Finally, the students were asked to indicate the length of the prison term the assailant should receive for committing the crime.

Results (Experiment I)

Three-way factorial analyses of variance were performed on each of the dependent variables (see Appendix A). A main effect for respectability of the victim was obtained for the rating of the victim on the Lerner scales ($F_{1,40} = 10.91$; $p < .005$). The more respectable victim was devalued (the higher the score, the greater the devaluation) to a greater extent than the less respectable victim (\bar{X} married victim = 2.90; \bar{X} divorced victim = -3.56). There were no other main effects, but there was a significant interaction between the reaction of the victim and the past history of the assailant ($F_{1,40} = 8.95$; $p < .005$). The greatest devaluation occurred when the victim demonstrated a mild reaction and the assailant was a single offender ($\bar{X} = 4.45$) while the least devaluation occurred when the victim demonstrated an extreme reaction and the assailant was a multiple offender ($\bar{X} = -4.83$). The means for the two conditions for the multiple offender fell between these extremes (\bar{X} mild reaction = -1.70; \bar{X} extreme reaction = 0.75). There was also a significant three way interaction ($F_{1,40} = 4.52$; $p < .05$) such that the greatest devaluation occurred when the victim was divorced and demonstrated the mild reaction and the assailant was a single offender. The least derogation occurred when the divorcee

demonstrated an extreme reaction and the assailant was a single offender. In general, the means for the married victim groups remained relatively stable (range 2.30 to 3.50) while the means for the divorced groups varied (range -10.10 to 5.30).

The analysis of the ratings of the assailant on the Lerner scales yielded one significant main effect (see Appendix B; $F_{1,40} = 6.35$; $p < .025$). The repeated offender was devalued to a greater extent (\bar{X} single offender = -9.96; \bar{X} multiple offender = 0.44). The interaction between the respectability of the victim and her reaction to the rape approached significance ($F_{1,40} = 3.08$; $p < .10$). The greatest devaluation of the assailant in this case occurred when the victim was divorced and exhibited an extreme reaction ($\bar{X} = -0.46$) while the next highest evaluation of him when she was married and exhibited a mild reaction ($\bar{X} = -1.75$). There were no other significant effects.

The analysis of the attribution of causality to the assailant's character yielded two significant main effects and one tendency toward a main effect (see Appendix C). The main effect for the victim's respectability indicated that the assailant's character was blamed more when the victim was divorced ($F_{1,40} = 5.64$; $p < .025$; \bar{X} married = 10.96; \bar{X} divorced = 11.96). The main effect for the victim's reaction indicated that greater causality was attributed to the assailant's character when the victim suffered more ($F_{1,40} = 4.29$; $p < .05$; \bar{X} mild reaction = 11.04; \bar{X} extreme reaction = 11.92). There was a tendency to blame the assailant's character more when he was a repeated offender ($F_{1,40} = 3.17$; $p < .10$; \bar{X} single offender = 11.09; \bar{X} multiple offender = 11.86). A tendency toward an interaction was obtained between the victim's respectability and her reaction ($F_{1,40} = 3.04$; $p < .10$) such that the assailant's

character was blamed less when the victim was married and suffered the least. Finally, there was a rather powerful three way interaction ($F_{1,40} = 53.25$; $p < .001$) such that there was less attribution of causality to the assailant's character when the victim was married and exhibited the mild reaction and the assailant was a one time offender. No other attributional measures reached significance.

Discussion (Experiment I)

The results generally support Lerner's (1971, 1974) J-W hypothesis and Jones and Aronson's (1973) extension of it. The more respectable victim was devalued more than was the less respectable victim. This effect was demonstrated with the only difference in the respectability of the victim being whether she was married or divorced. Earlier studies (Feldman-Summers & Lindner, 1976; Lugenbuhl & Mullin, 1976) had used more extreme differences in their manipulation of the respectability dimension. The present study, however, did not find reliable differences on the attributional measures as had the earlier researchers (neither of the other researchers included an attribution to the assailant's character or behavior). Therefore, perhaps the more extreme differences are necessary to produce a separation in the attributional measures on the respectability dimension.

The impact of the crime upon the victim was demonstrated to be a viable dimension in rape research. However, its effects seem to occur only relative to other dimensions. It may be that the impact dimension serves as further information upon which to evaluate the victim's participation in the rape. For example, if she is not particularly affected by the rape, she may have precipitated it. There may also be a sympathy effect for the victim who suffers the extreme reaction. In this particular

manipulation of the impact dimension, the description of the extreme impact may have carried the connotation that the victim was over reactive because she spent five days hospitalized under psychiatric care. In future research, this dimension should be "toned down" some to avoid such connotations.

One way of improving the precision of an experimental variable is to decrease the within variance by grouping the subjects along some other dimension. Since the attributional measures did not reach significance in the present study, it seems reasonable to examine the method and attempt to discover another dimension which will help decrease the within variance.

Shaver (1975) suggests that the attributional process may be influenced by the cognitive style of the attributor, therefore, a measure which will differentiate between groups along a cognitive style dimension should serve to provide the increase in precision. The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960) has been demonstrated to be a reliable instrument in assessing at least one aspect of cognitive style. Individuals who score toward the more dogmatic end of the range of the scale tend to utilize less information in making their causal attributions (Shaver, 1975). Therefore, it would be reasonable to expect that these individuals would tend to attribute greater responsibility to the more stable characteristics of an actor, his character. Specifically, they would attribute greater responsibility to the character of a rape victim than would less dogmatic individuals.

In the second study, the limits of the respectability dimension were exaggerated to determine if the attributional measures were only sensitive at the extremes of the respectability dimension. The impact of the crime

on the victim was restated to increase the verisimilitude of the dimension. The criminal background of the assailant was dropped and the cognitive style dimension was included to increase the precision of the attributional measures.

Method (Experiment II)

Subjects. Fifty-six students in an Introductory Psychology class served as subjects in this research. They all received course credit for their participation. Both men and women students were represented ($n_{\text{male}} = 21$; $n_{\text{female}} = 35$).

Procedure. The procedure for the present study was similar to the procedure in the previous study. However, the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960) was administered between the initial ratings of the reference individuals and the distribution of the experimental materials.

In the present study, the victim was described as either a 20-year old part-time student, part-time department store clerk (respectable) or as a 20-year old part-time student, part-time go-go dancer (unrespectable). Her reaction was described as:

"Even several weeks after the assault Joan had difficulty sleeping. She felt uncomfortable around other people, yet frightened when she was left alone. The assault seemed to have an extreme psychological effect on her." (extreme effect)

The mild effect was described as:

"Even several weeks after the assault Joan had no difficulty sleeping. She felt comfortable around other people and secure when she was left alone. The assault seemed to have a minimal psychological effect on her."

The subjects' causal attributions were assessed by asking the students to respond to specific questions along seven point Likert type scales. The questions asked were:

1. Did the assault occur because of something Joan did? (behavioral attribution)
2. Did the assault occur because of the type of person Joan is? (characterological attribution)
3. Did the assault occur because Joan was unlucky? (chance attribution)
4. Would you define the assault as rape?
5. How often does a woman say "no" to sexual relations when she really means "yes"?

Results (Experiment II)

The median value was computed on the Rokeach scores (median = 59) and each of the four experimental groups was split at the median to create a 2 (clerk vs. dancer) x 2 (mild vs. extreme impact) x 2 (high vs. low dogmatic) design. The number of subjects per cell ranged from 4 to 10.

Results of the analysis of variance performed on the Lerner scales yielded a main effect for the respectability of the victim ($F_{1,47} = 6.94$; $p < .025$) such that the more respectable victim was devalued more (\bar{X} respectable = 5.77; \bar{X} unrespectable = -0.76). There were no other main effects or interactions (see Appendix D).

On the attribution to the victim's character variable, all three independent variables produced main effects and one interaction resulted (see Appendix E). The character of the less respectable victim was faulted more ($F_{1,47} = 4.82$; $p < .05$; \bar{X} clerk = 2.43; \bar{X} dancer = 3.24), but her character was faulted to a greater degree when the victim

experienced the milder effect ($F_{1,47} = 4.13$; $p < .05$; \bar{X} mild = 3.19; \bar{X} extreme = 2.44). The more dogmatic students tended to fault the victim's character more than did the less dogmatic students ($F_{1,47} = 7.10$; $p < .01$; \bar{X} high dogmatic = 3.30; \bar{X} low dogmatic = 2.33). The respectability dimension interacted with the dogmatism dimension such that the more dogmatic students attributed far greater responsibility to the unrespectable victim ($F_{1,47} = 4.97$; $p < .025$; \bar{X} high dogmatic, unrespectable victim = 4.27; next highest cell mean is 2.63 for the high dogmatic, respectable victim group).

Although there were no significant effects in the attribution of responsibility to the victim's behavior or to chance, significant effects were obtained on the questions concerning definition of rape and consent. An interaction between dogmatism and respectability was obtained on the definition of rape question (see Appendix F; $F_{1,47} = 4.47$; $p < .05$). The more dogmatic students were more likely to define the situation as rape when the victim was unrespectable (\bar{X} respectable = 5.44; \bar{X} unrespectable = 6.64) while the less dogmatic students did not respond differentially to the respectability of the victim (\bar{X} respectable = 6.50; \bar{X} unrespectable = 6.00).

In responding to the question, "How often does a woman say "no" to sexual relations when she really means "yes"?", the more dogmatic students indicated that the situation occurred more frequently than did the less dogmatic students (see Appendix G; $F_{1,46} = 5.47$; $p < .025$; \bar{X} high dogmatic = 3.81; \bar{X} low dogmatic = 3.04). The students who read the material indicating that the impact on the victim was mild, rated the occurrence of feigned resistance higher than did the students who viewed the extreme material ($F_{1,46} = 7.07$; $p < .01$; \bar{X} mild impact = 3.88;

\bar{X} extreme impact = 3.00). There was also an interaction between dogmatism and impact ($F_{1,46} = 5.32; p < .025$) such that the item was rated highest by the more dogmatic, mild impact group ($\bar{X} = 4.22$) and lowest by the less dogmatic, extreme impact group ($\bar{X} = 2.17$).

Discussion (Experiment II)

The derogation on the Lerner Scales (Lerner, 1971) of the more respectable victim combined with the greater attribution of responsibility to the less respectable victim suggests that there are at least two operations occurring in an observer's evaluation of rape victims. The first operation applies to the less respectable victim. These women are thought deserving of their misfortune because of the "type of people" that they are. Sexual relations with relative strangers is not inconsistent with the observer's impression of the character of go-go dancers. Therefore, it is relatively easy for an observer to attribute responsibility to the character of the less respectable victim.

The observer also takes into consideration the reaction of the victim to the rape. When the victim appears to exhibit little concern for the incident, the observer may reason that she is of poor moral character and may have even precipitated the assault.

The second operation in the evaluation of the victim by the observer is related to both the J-W and DA hypotheses. Additional inspection of the data from the second study revealed that the males tended to rate the respectable and unrespectable victims similarly (\bar{X} respectable = 0.80; \bar{X} unrespectable = 3.10) while the females rated them quite differently (\bar{X} respectable = 10.00; \bar{X} unrespectable = -2.20). This respectable victim, a 20-year old part-time student, part-time department store clerk is similar to the women from which this sample is drawn.

Therefore, it could be assumed that it would be relatively easy for the women in the sample to identify somewhat with the victim. As the observer perceives the similarity between herself and the victim, she may also perceive herself as vulnerable to being raped. It would be reasonable to expect that imagining one's self as a potential rape victim would be threatening. To defend themselves against this threatening idea, the women change their perception of the victim. By devaluing her, they make the victim "not like" themselves, more deserving of her misfortune and, thereby, they reduce the personal threat. This supports the J-W hypothesis. They stop short however, of attributing responsibility to the victim because from a DA perspective, that too, would be threatening. A study in which the similarities between the subject and the victim were manipulated could determine whether the J-W or the DA hypothesis is more effective in accounting for the devaluation of rape victims by women.

Of further interest in the present study was the degree to which the cognitive style of the individuals, as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, affected their attribution of causality and their evaluation of the victim. It was reasoned that although the Rokeach had been demonstrated to be effective in separating groups along a cognitive style dimension, a scale which pertained particularly to attitudes toward women would be more relevant to research on rape.

The Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS) developed by Spence and Helmreich (1972) has been demonstrated to effectively assess how people view women. The original scale consisting of 55 items was standardized on a sample of 712 male and 768 female students at the University of Texas. A later shortened version containing 25 items was administered

to 241 female and 286 male students and was found to correlate .97 with the original scale (Spence, Helreich, & Stapp, 1973). On a sample of 20 individuals the AWS and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale were shown to be moderately correlated ($r = -.43$; $p < .05$; the negative value of r is the result of differences in scoring direction of the two instruments).

There has been no research demonstrating that rape victims are devalued vis-a-vis persons who experience other events. Therefore, a third variable, the type of event that occurred, was included in the present study. It was hypothesized that the rape victims would be devalued on the Lerner scales to a greater extent than would be persons who experienced events of neutral outcome.

Method (Experiment III)

Subjects. The subjects for this study were recruited from the women students enrolled in the Introductory Psychology classes at Lamar University during the summer of 1976. All 54 women who served as subjects received course credit for their participation in the study.

Procedure. The Attitudes toward Women Scale (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973) was administered to all the women in the psychology classes during the summer terms. The students were also asked to complete a "personal data sheet" which asked for name, age, birthdate, home town, high school attended, religion, living arrangements (with parents, in dormitory, etc.) and major. Completion of this form by the students was voluntary and all information obtained was maintained as confidential.

The women were asked to report to the classroom in groups of 15 to 20 and they were seated in alternate desks to prevent their observing each others' work. Both a male and female experimenter were present and alternated duties with different groups. When all scheduled subjects

arrived at a given experimental session, two sheets containing 15 highly evaluative bipolar scales (Lerner, 1971) were distributed and the women were asked to rate a 20-year old woman and a 33-year old woman on these scales. When they finished, the sheets were collected and the following instructions were read to them:

I am doing research on how people view other people and the events that happen to them. I am particularly interested in how people evaluate others who experience certain types of events. In the booklet I will give you, first you will find a "data face sheet" containing some information about a person. Look at this carefully. Next you will find a description of an event. Read it carefully and then turn to the next page which contains some questions about the person and the event. Answer all the questions based on your own thoughts and feelings about the person and the event. Are there any questions?

All questions were answered by repeating the appropriate section of the instructions. The booklets containing the experimental material were then distributed to the women.

Experimental conditions. Similarity. The degree of similarity between the subject and the victim was manipulated by varying the number of demographic variables that were the same for both of them. The information obtained from the subject on the "personal data sheet" completed in class was included on the "data face sheet" in each subject's booklet. For the similar victim the demographic information was identical to that of the subject except for the birthdate which was given as in the same month as the subject's. For the dissimilar

victim, the following information was given: age, 33; birthdate, September 19, 1942; home town, Evansville, Indiana; education, two years college; occupation, secretary; marital status, single; lives with roommate.

Type of event. The descriptions of the two types of events were identical except for the final sentence in the paragraph. In the neutral condition the subjects read, "...suddenly he ran up to her and asked for directions to a nearby address, thanked her and went on his way." The subjects who received the rape condition stimulus materials read, "...suddenly he ran up to her and forced her into a nearby van where he removed her clothing and sexually assaulted her."

Dependent measures. The questionnaires containing the dependent measures were included in the booklet distributed to the women. The women were asked to indicate the degree to which (on a 7 point scale) they believe the assault was caused by the victim's character, her behavior, or chance. They were also asked to rate the victim on the 15 bipolar scales used by Lerner (1971). The rating of the victim on these scales was subtracted from their rating of the appropriate reference person. The statistical analysis was performed on this derived score. A rating of attraction was computed by combining the responses on the following questions: "Does Joan seem to be someone you would like to know?" and "Does Joan seem similar to you?"

Results (Experiment III)

A three-way analysis of variance yielded a main effect for type of event ($F_{1,37} = 6.09$; $p < .05$) such that the rape victims were devalued vis-a-vis the non-victims (\bar{X} rape = 4.74; \bar{X} non-rape = -2.42; see Appendix H). There were no other main effects. The evaluation of the

non-victims, however, is of little theoretical importance and inclusion of these data in the analysis adds variance without adding information. Therefore, these data were excluded from further analysis. The analysis of variance performed on the remaining scores yielded a main effect for the cognitive style of the subject (see Appendix I; $F_{1,23} = 7.20$; $p < .05$). The more traditionally oriented women devalued the victim to a greater extent than the less traditionally oriented women (\bar{X} traditional = 11.86; \bar{X} non-traditional = 0.92). There were no other main effects or interactions on this variable.

Of the three separate analyses of variance performed on the attributional measures (behavior, character and chance) only one produced a significant result. The more traditionally oriented women attributed greater causality to the victim's behavior than did the less traditionally oriented women (see Appendix J; $F_{1,23} = 21.72$; $p < .001$; \bar{X} traditional = 5.00; \bar{X} non-traditional = 2.85).

The analysis of variance performed on the attraction rating yielded one strong main effect on the cognitive style dimension such that the less traditionally oriented women were more accepting of the victim than were the more traditionally oriented women (see Appendix K; $F_{1,23} = 14.62$; $p < .001$; \bar{X} traditional = 6.71; \bar{X} non-traditional = 9.23). There was also a mild tendency on the part of the women to reject the similar victim ($F_{1,23} = 3.38$; $p < .10$; \bar{X} similar = 7.25; \bar{X} dissimilar = 8.47).

Discussion (Experiment III)

Whereas it had been predicted that the perceived similarity between the subject and the victim would affect the subject's choice of the J-W model or the DA model to account for the occurrence of rape, the results of study three suggest that the cognitive style of the subject

(as measured by the AWS) is a more potent variable in affecting that choice. It is very likely, however, that the format in which the demographic information was presented did not make salient the similarity between the subject and the victim. Thus, there was not an adequate test of the similarity variable.

The women who scored in the lower range on the AWS hold conservative views of the role of women in society. Their performance in this particular study suggests that they view rape victims as behaviorally responsible for their misfortune. These traditional women also reject and devalue the rape victim. This pattern of behavior on the three measures suggests that the more traditional women are utilizing the J-W model to account for events in their environment. However, the lack of results on the similarity dimension temper this conclusion. Without the personal threat that the misfortune could befall the subject, there would be no need for her to reject and devalue the victim.

CHAPTER II

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It has been noted both in descriptive literature (Curtis, 1974; Weis & Borges, 1973; Wood, 1973) and in empirical literature (Feldman-Summers & Lindner, 1976; Jones & Aronson, 1973; Lugenbuhl & Mullin, 1976) that rape victims are frequently derogated by observers. The form of this derogation has varied and the researchers have relied upon either a just-world (J-W) or a defensive attribution (DA) analysis to account for their results.

The assumptions underlying the J-W hypothesis are that the world is just and that people earn their fate: "Good things happen to good people and bad things happen to bad people." The J-W hypothesis further suggests that the greater the similarity between the observer and the innocent victim of misfortune, the greater the threat to the observer. It is reasoned that the observation of a chance misfortune befalling a person similar to oneself makes salient the possibility that the same misfortune could befall the observer (Novak & Lerner, 1968). The possibility of being an innocent victim of a chance misfortune violates the J-W assumption that people deserve what they get. Consequently, the observer has the tendency to devalue the victim both to make him "not like" himself and to make him deserving of his fate.

In contrast to the J-W hypothesis the DA hypothesis (Shaver, 1970) suggests that devaluation of the victim similar to oneself is tantamount

to devaluing oneself. It was reasoned (Shaver, 1970) that the observer would not like others to derogate him if the misfortune befell him therefore, it would be less threatening to attribute the occurrence of the event to chance. Since the victim has no control over the chance event, he cannot be blamed for its occurrence.

While both theories indicate a need on the part of an observer to account for the occurrence of the event, they differ in the process utilized to explain the misfortune. It is apparent that these different theoretical positions predict different ways of accounting for an extreme event such as rape, particularly when the victim is similar to the observer. The J-W hypothesis would predict that the victim would be rejected, devalued and held behaviorally responsible for the rape. The DA hypothesis, on the other hand, would predict that the observer would tend to identify with the victim, not devalue her, and attribute the occurrence to chance. The three studies previously reported in the present paper suggest that the cognitive style of the individuals effects their use of the J-W or DA models to account for events. However, the effects of the similarity between the observer and the victim were not clearly demonstrated. The present research was designed to further demonstrate the relationship between cognitive style (as defined by scores on the AWS) and evaluation of rape victims who are similar to the subjects.

The specific hypothesis tested in the present research were:

1. Traditionally oriented women will admit less similarity between themselves and an attitudinally similar rape victim than will non-traditionally oriented women.
2. Traditionally oriented women will devalue an attitudinally similar

rape victim to a greater extent than will non-traditionally oriented women.

3. Traditionally oriented women will attribute greater responsibility for the rape to an attitudinally similar victim's behavior than will non-traditionally oriented women.
4. Traditionally oriented women will attribute greater responsibility for the rape to an attitudinally dissimilar victim's character than will non-traditionally oriented women.
5. Non-traditionally oriented women will attribute greater responsibility for the rape to an attitudinally similar victim's luck than will traditionally oriented women.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

The 120 female subjects used in this study were recruited from a pool of approximately 500 women taking Introductory Psychology at Lamar University during the fall semester of 1976 and the spring semester of 1977. The Attitudes toward Women Scale (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973) was administered to all 500 of the women in the subject pool during their regular class time (see Appendix L). The mean for the entire subject pool was 50.53 and the standard deviation was 10.41. The mean and standard deviation for the 120 women used in the study were 51.44 and 10.51 respectively. After the experimental data were collected, the subjects' scores on the AWS were ranked and divided into the highest, middle, and lowest one-third. The ranges (in raw score units) for the three groups were 72-57 (High), 56-48 (Mid), and 47-26 (Low). These groups defined the AWS dimension in the data analysis.

Half of the women at each AWS level were randomly assigned to the Similar experimental condition and half were assigned to the Dissimilar condition. There were six experimental protocols that were unusable for the present study. Five women failed to complete at least one portion of the task and one marked double responses on two parts of the experimental materials. These subjects were replaced by other volunteers from the same population until a total of 120 valid

experimental protocols were obtained. All subjects received course credit for their participation.

Procedure

The volunteers were asked to report to the experimental sessions in groups ranging in size from 6 to 15. Upon her arrival, each woman was asked to rate "an average college woman" on the 15 bipolar scales employed by Lerner (1971). After they completed the rating sheets, the papers were collected and the following instructions were read:

I am doing research on how individuals view other people and the events that happen to them. I am particularly interested in how people form judgments about the causes of events and how people evaluate others who experience certain types of events.

In an earlier study with a different group of women, I had the subjects answer a questionnaire and then write a short paragraph describing an event that happened to them that they thought was personal and important. I also obtained their permission to show these materials to other people.

The booklets I am going to give you contain the responses of some of the women who participated in the other study. Each of you will receive the materials produced by only one person. Please study these materials carefully and follow the instructions in the booklet. Do one page at a time and do not turn backward or forward in the booklet. Are there any questions? All questions were answered by repeating the appropriate section

of the instructions. The booklets containing the experimental materials were then distributed to the women.

Similarity. The similarity between the subject and the victim was manipulated according to a procedure developed by Byrne (1969) and utilized in previous J-W studies by Lerner and Agar (1972) and Novak and Lerner (1968). The procedure involved asking the subject to complete an attitude questionnaire, removing it, surreptitiously marking a second questionnaire either similar to or dissimilar from the subject's and then presenting the bogus questionnaire back to the subject while representing it as having come from another person.

The AWS had previously been administered to all of the women in the subject pool and those questionnaires were utilized as the basis for the similarity manipulation. When a woman volunteered to participate in the study, her AWS questionnaire was selected from among the others in the subject pool. A second AWS was then marked with 75% of the responses either identical to (Similar condition) or opposite from (Dissimilar condition) the subject's according to the procedure described by Byrne (1969). For example, on each of the 25 items on the AWS, the subject was instructed to respond by circling a letter from A to D to indicate the degree to which she agreed with a particular item. In the Dissimilar condition, when the subject marked A to a particular item, she received a bogus questionnaire marked D on the item. If she marked B, she received C on the stimulus material. A C response resulted in a B stimulus and a D response resulted in an A. Nineteen of the 25 items were randomly chosen and marked according to this system. The remaining items were marked the same as the subject's. For the Similar condition, 19 items were marked identically to the

subject's questionnaire and the remaining 6 were marked oppositely.

Stimulus materials. The first two pages of the experimental booklet were the bogus AWS utilized in the similarity manipulation. The third page was a brief questionnaire consisting of seven distractor items and one manipulation check (see Appendix M). The fourth page contained a hand written account of a sexual assault. This description was similar to the descriptions of rape scenes employed in earlier research (Feldman-Summers & Lindner, 1976; Jones & Aronson, 1973; Lugenbuhl & Mullin, 1976; studies I, II, III in the present report).

The description of the event was as follows:

I don't know if this is the type of thing you want or not but it was personal and important to me. One day last spring, I went to the shopping center to do some shopping. When I got finished, I started walking toward my car and this guy yelled something at me. I didn't understand what he said so I just went on. The next thing I knew, he ran up to me and grabbed me and pulled me into a van that was parked close by. When he got me in there, he made me have sexual relations with him. Afterward, he drove around for awhile then he let me out a few blocks from my house. As soon as I could I called the police and reported it but they haven't caught him yet.

On the fifth page of the booklet, the subjects were asked to "write a brief paragraph describing your impression of the person whose questionnaire and narrative you have read." When they had

completed their paragraph, they were asked to turn to the next page and rate "the person whose materials you read" on the 15 bipolar scales employed by Lerner (1971). The last page of the booklet contained the items assessing the subjects' attribution of causality for the rape.

Dependent Measures

The first dependent measure was the rating of the rape victim on the 15 bipolar scales developed by Lerner (1971, see Appendix N). An individual's responses (along a 7 point scale) on each of the 15 scales were summed to give a single evaluation rating. The overall rating of the victim was then subtracted from the overall rating of the reference person to give a comparison between the two persons (the higher the value, the greater the devaluation of the victim). In the present research, the ratings of "the person whose material you read" were subtracted from the ratings of "an average college woman" and the statistical analyses were performed on these derived values.

Lerner (1971) examined the direction of change of each of the 15 scales and demonstrated that the composite score is sensitive to the types of manipulations performed in the present research. A test-retest reliability coefficient was computed on the ratings of a 20-year old female college student" in a previous study. With a sample of 65, an r of .70 was obtained.

The attribution questionnaire consisted of six items to which the women were asked to respond on a seven point rating scale (see Appendix O). The first four items pertained directly to the hypotheses. The last two were included for heuristic purposes and no predictions were made about the subjects' responses to them. The six items on the attribution questionnaire were:

1. The event occurred because of something this person did.
2. The event occurred because of the type of person this individual is.
3. The event occurred because of this person's luck.
4. This person is similar to me.
5. Events like this happen to people who deserve them.
6. An event like this could not happen to me.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In the present research, similarity between the subject and the victim was manipulated as an independent variable and was measured as a dependent variable. As an independent variable, it was critical to the hypotheses being tested that the subjects believe that they were either similar to or dissimilar from the victim prior to receiving the information that she had been raped. In an effort to determine the success of this manipulation, the item "This person is similar to me" was included among several distractor items on a rating sheet administered immediately following the similarity manipulation materials. The subjects were asked to rate this item along a seven point scale from highly dissimilar to highly similar. Within the Similar group, eight subjects rated this item at less than the mid-point of the scale indicating that they viewed the stimulus person as dissimilar to themselves. However, 47 subjects rated the stimulus person as similar to themselves. Of the subjects in the Dissimilar group, eight rated the item at greater than the mid-point of the scale, indicating some similarity between themselves and the stimulus person. Fifty subjects rated the stimulus person as dissimilar. The data from the sixteen aberrant cases were included in the analyses in order to maintain the randomness of the samples. A t-test comparing the means of the Similar and Dissimilar groups on this item suggests that the initial similarity

manipulation was successful ($\bar{X}_{Sim} = 5.43$; $\bar{X}_{Dis} = 2.00$; $t = 7.15$; $df = 118$; $p < .001$).

A subjective assessment of the believability of the stimulus materials was obtained in the paragraph the subjects wrote describing the victim. There were only two women who explicitly indicated that they doubted the authenticity of the materials, however, there were an additional ten who acknowledged the similarity or dissimilarity between their own responses to the questionnaire and those of the supposed victim. The data from these twelve women were examined and it was concluded that their responses were within the limits of the other data and were included in the analyses. It is not known if other subjects doubted the materials, but did not indicate it.

While most of the paragraphs written by the subjects were supportive of the rape victim, some were condemning. One of the women in the Low AWS, Dissimilar group wrote, "She may have been dressed in revealing clothing... and may have invited being picked up." An even more extreme derogation of the victim came from a woman in the High AWS, Dissimilar group who wrote, "... she just let herself be used and then gets mildly upset about being pushed into the van. ... I don't like her. I can't stand her." A Low AWS, Similar group woman, however, reported, "I think this person is very nice and understanding. ... I know how she felt because the same thing happen (sic) to me ..."

The second objective assessment of perceived similarity between the subject and the victim was made following the subject's receiving the information that the person whose material she was reading was a rape victim. The form of the item was the same and it was again imbedded among several other items. The difference between the subjects' ratings

on the two assessments was computed as an index of their acceptance or rejection of the rape victim (Similarity rating one minus Similarity rating two; the greater the difference, the greater the rejection). The analysis of variance computed upon these difference scores is summarized in Table 1.

The main effect on the Similarity dimension again reflects the success of the manipulation of similarity as an independent variable ($F_{1,114} = 24.81$; $p < .001$). Since the Dissimilar group had initially rated the victim as rather unlike themselves, the information that the person had been raped did little to alter their perception of the victim (Prerape $\bar{X} = 2.00$; Post Rape $\bar{X} = 2.02$). The main effect on the AWS dimension ($F_{2,114} = 6.96$; $p < .005$) however, reflects the tendency for females with traditional views toward women to change their perception of the victim after they received the information that she had been raped. The Low AWS group differed from the Mid AWS and the High AWS groups ($t_{\text{Low-Mid}} = 2.62$; $df = 78$; $p < .01$; $t_{\text{Low-High}} = 3.61$; $df = 78$, $p < .01$)¹, but the Mid AWS and High AWS groups did not differ from each other ($t_{\text{Mid-High}} = .98$; $df = 78$; $p = ns$). The rather strong interaction effect ($F_{2,114} = 17.18$; $p < .005$) indicates the tendency on the part of the traditionally oriented women in the Similar group to reject the rape victim ($t_{\text{Sim/Low - Sim/Mid}} = 3.53$; $df = 38$; $p < .01$). This interaction offers direct support for hypothesis one which stated that traditionally oriented women would admit less similarity between themselves and attitudinally similar rape victims than would non-traditionally oriented women.

¹Tuckey's procedure was utilized to compare individual means following analysis of variance (Guilford, 1956).

TABLE 1
Analysis of Variance on
Difference Scores of Similarity Ratings

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
AWS (A)	40.42	2	20.21	6.96	<.005
Similarity (S)	72.08	1	72.08	24.81	<.001
A x S	34.35	2	17.18	5.91	<.005
Error	331.15	114	2.90		
Total	478.00	119			

Means for Difference Scores of Similarity Ratings

	Similar	Dissimilar	Combined
High AWS	0.40	-0.05	0.18
Mid AWS	1.15	-0.05	0.55
Low AWS	3.05	0.05	1.55
Combined	1.53	-0.02	0.76

Evaluation of the Rape Victim

The analysis of variance performed on the Lerner scales yielded two significant main effects and a significant interaction (see Table 2). The women in the Dissimilar group rated the rape victim an average of 10.8 points lower on the Lerner scales after they received the rape information. That information had a much milder effect upon the women in the Similar group. Their evaluation changed by an average of -0.43. This difference between the Similar and Dissimilar groups resulted in a significant main effect on the analysis of variance ($F_{1,114} = 53.71$; $p < .001$).

The main effects on the AWS variable ($F_{2,114} = 4.60$; $p < .025$) may be attributable to the rather large differences between means within the Similar group. The more traditionally oriented women within the Similar group decreased their evaluation of the victim ($\bar{X}_{Low} = 5.75$) while the mid and upper ranges of AWS scorers increased their evaluation of the victim ($\bar{X}_{Mid} = -2.95$; $\bar{X}_{High} = -4.10$; $t_{Low - Mid} = 3.28$, $df = 38$, $p < .01$; $t_{Low - High} = 3.71$, $df = 38$; $p < .01$; $t_{Mid - High} = .43$, $df = 38$, $p = ns$). Hypothesis two concerning devaluation of a similar rape victim by traditionally oriented women is thus supported.

Attribution of Responsibility for the Rape

The results of the analysis of variance performed on the behavioral attribution ratings are summarized in Table 3. The main effect for AWS level ($F_{2,114} = 3.48$; $p < .05$) indicates significant differences between groups in their attribution of responsibility to the behavior of the woman involved. Further examination of the means of the groups revealed that the Low AWS group attributed greater responsibility for the rape to the victim's behavior than did the High AWS

TABLE 2
Analysis of Variance on
Difference Scores of Lerner Scales

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
AWS (A)	648.32	2	324.16	4.60	<.025
Similarity (S)	3785.63	1	3785.63	53.71	<.001
A x S	560.62	2	280.31	3.98	<.025
Error	8035.40	114	70.49		
Total	13029.97	119			

Means for Difference Scores of Lerner Scales

	Similar	Dissimilar	Combined
High AWS	-4.10	9.65	2.78
Mid AWS	-2.95	11.85	4.45
Low AWS	5.75	10.90	8.33
Combined	-0.43	10.80	5.18

TABLE 3
Analysis of Variance on
Behavioral Attribution Ratings

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	p
AWS (A)	21.12	2	10.56	3.48	<.05
Similarity (S)	0.83	1	0.83	0.27	ns
A x S	10.12	2	5.06	1.66	ns
Error	346.35	114	3.04		
Total	378.42	119			

Means for Behavioral Attribution Ratings

	Similar	Dissimilar	Combined
High AWS	1.80	2.60	2.20
Mid AWS	2.90	2.40	2.65
Low AWS	3.40	3.05	3.23
Combined	2.70	2.68	2.69

group ($\underline{t} = 2.63$; $\underline{df} = 58$; $\underline{p} < .01$). The Low AWS group, however, did not differ from the Mid-range AWS group ($\underline{t} = 1.47$; $\underline{df} = 58$, $\underline{p} = ns$). The third hypothesis then, that traditionally oriented women would attribute greater responsibility for the rape to the similar victim's behavior was only partially supported. In fact, the traditionally oriented women attributed greater causality to behavior of the victim whether she was similar to themselves or not.

Table 4 summarizes the analysis of variance performed on the attribution of responsibility for the rape to the victim's character. Hypothesis four was only partially supported in that the AWS dimension was the only one to yield a main effect ($\underline{F}_{2,114} = 5.08$; $\underline{p} < .01$). Comparison of individual means revealed that the High AWS group and the Mid-range AWS group differed from the Low AWS group, but not from each other ($\underline{t}_{\text{High} - \text{Low}} = 3.09$, $\underline{df} = 38$, $\underline{p} < .01$; $\underline{t}_{\text{Mid} - \text{Low}} = 2.23$, $\underline{df} = 38$, $\underline{p} < .05$; $\underline{t}_{\text{High} - \text{Mid}} = .88$, $\underline{df} = 38$, $\underline{p} = ns$). Again, the traditionally oriented women reacted to the similar and dissimilar victim in about the same way.

As Table 5 reveals, there were no significant differences revealed in an analysis of variance performed on the attribution to the victim's luck and hypothesis five was not supported. The subjects' responses to the final two items on the attribution questionnaire, however, did result in one statistically significant result. The women in the Dissimilar group rated the rape victim more deserving of her fate than did the women in the Similar group ($\bar{X}_{\text{Sim}} = 1.38$, $\bar{X}_{\text{Dis}} = 2.08$). While this difference is statistically significant (see Table 6) the mean of the Similar group falls between "Strongly disagree" and "Moderately disagree" and the mean of the Dissimilar group falls at "Moderately disagree." Apparently then, neither group believes the victim truly "deserved" her fate.

TABLE 4
Analysis of Variance on
Character Attribution Ratings

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
AWS (A)	33.27	2	16.63	5.08	<.01
Similarity (S)	4.03	1	4.03	1.23	ns
A X S	0.87	2	0.43	0.13	ns
Error	373.00	114	3.27		
Total	411.17	119			

Means for Character Attribution Ratings

	Similar	Dissimilar	Combined
High AWS	2.25	2.85	2.55
Mid AWS	2.80	3.00	2.90
Low AWS	3.65	3.95	3.80
Combined	2.90	3.27	3.08

TABLE 5
Analysis of Variance on Attribution to Luck

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
AWS (A)	6.95	2	3.48	0.94	ns
Similarity	1.20	1	1.20	0.33	ns
A x S	1.85	2	0.93	0.25	ns
Error	420.80	114	3.69		
Total	430.80	119			

Means for Attribution to Luck

	Similar	Dissimilar	Combined
High AWS	3.50	3.15	3.33
Mid AWS	3.65	3.80	3.73
Low AWS	3.35	2.95	3.15
Combined	3.50	3.30	3.40

TABLE 6
 Analysis of Variance on
 Ratings of "Deserving" Item

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
AWS (A)	5.12	2	2.56	1.35	ns
Similarity (S)	14.70	1	14.70	7.74	<.005
A x S	1.25	2	0.63	0.33	
Error	216.40	114	1.90		
Total	237.47	119			

	Means for Ratings on "Deserving" Item		
	Similar	Dissimilar	Combined
High AWS	1.25	1.95	1.60
Mid AWS	1.35	1.80	1.58
Low AWS	1.55	2.50	2.03
Combined	1.38	2.08	1.73

The final item of the questionnaire, "An event like this could not happen to me", was not rated differentially by the different groups of subjects (see Table 7). The rather low combined mean (2.40) indicates that all groups rated it likely that they could be a victim of rape.

TABLE 7
 Analysis of Variance on
 Ratings of "Not Me" Item

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
AWS (A)	12.32	2	6.16	2.06	ns
Similarity	8.01	1	8.01	2.68	ns
A x S	0.22	2	0.11	0.04	ns
Error	340.45	114	2.99		
Total	361.00	119			

Means for Ratings on "Not Me" Item

	Similar	Dissimilar	Combined
High AWS	2.00	2.55	2.28
Mid AWS	1.90	2.30	2.10
Low AWS	2.55	3.15	2.85
Combined	2.15	2.67	2.40

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The major hypotheses of this study, which were derived from the Just World hypothesis (Lerner, 1971), were clearly supported. However, the data also revealed that the evaluation of victims of misfortune is not a unitary process, but rather it is a series of processes. When an individual observes an event, his or her first inclination is to attempt to determine causal factors inherent in the event itself and in the actors involved. If he or she is unable to find these causal factors, then the cognitive style of the observer determines the manner in which causal attributions are made.

Results of Experiment II in the present report indicated that when evaluating rape victims, the observer's first reaction was to make a superficial judgement as to the respectability of the victim. When she was judged to be unrespectable, then she presented no great threat to the observer. Her present behavior could be considered by the observer to be consistent with her assumed past behavior and thus there are data upon which the observer could base a causal attribution (Kelley, 1973). When this is not the case and the victim was judged "respectable", then her present behavior could not be utilized as a basis for an attribution.

A second dimension upon which an observer evaluates a rape victim is the degree of similarity between herself and the rape victim. If the observer determines that the victim is dissimilar from herself,

she is able to denigrate her on the basis that she is different. The observer is not particularly threatened by the misfortune befalling someone unlike herself. The knowledge that the person is a rape victim is further proof that the victim is unlike herself. This difference is an attribute inherent in the victim upon which the observer may base an evaluation and causal attribution.

When the victim is similar to the observer, however, there is a degree of threat experienced by the observer who believes that the world is a fair and just place to live (Lerner, 1974; Lerner & Agar, 1972; Lerner & Matthews, 1966; Novak & Lerner, 1968; Sorrentino & Boutilier, 1974). The ideas that fate is capricious and that misfortunes can befall innocent people make salient the idea that the same fate could befall the observer. This only seems to occur, however, when the threat is not specific and imminent, but yet is within the realm of possibilities. In earlier studies in which similarity between the subject and the victim was manipulated, the researchers utilized either extremely unlikely misfortunes (Lerner & Agar, 1972; Novak & Lerner, 1968) or a strong, specific, imminent threat (Sorrentino & Boutilier, 1974). Rape, on the other hand, is an omnipresent threat that women are warned against from childhood. While different women react differentially to this threat (Brownmiller, 1975), for most, it is not imminent at any given moment. Therefore, when the idea of rape is made salient to the subject, the threat is specific, within the realm of possibilities, but probably not so intense that it interferes with their attention to the task. The responses to the item "An event like this could not happen to me" demonstrate the salience of the threat to the women in the present study. However, the women at different levels

of AWS responded differentially to this threat in their evaluation of the rape victim.

Once the observer determines that there are no factors inherent in the event or the victim that render the victim deserving of her fate, the cognitive style of the individual determines the paradigm within which the observer evaluates the victim and attributes causality for the event. The J-W model is one theoretical paradigm which is utilized; however, the present study revealed that there are differences between individuals in their propensity to employ the J-W model to account for rape. One factor which affects this propensity is the attitude expressed by the individual toward the role of women in society. The more conservative women in the present study seemed to employ the J-W model, while those in the upper ranges of the AWS did not. As predicted, these traditionally oriented women admitted less similarity between themselves and the attitudinally similar victim. They devalued the victim to a greater degree on the Lerner scales and they attributed greater responsibility to the victim's behavior and her character than did the more liberal women in the study. Thus, the traditionally oriented women were able to defend themselves against the threatening idea of identifying themselves as potential rape victims by making the victim unlike themselves. They could then attribute the rape to a factor associated with the victim rather than to chance. This represents support for the hypotheses proposed by both Lerner (1971) and Walster (1966) that there is a greater need to attribute the cause of negative outcome events to the actors involved.

Combining these findings with those of Klemmack and Klemmack (1976) it would be reasonable to expect that the more traditional woman would potentially experience greater subjective discomfort if she became the

victim of a misfortune, particularly if it is a rape. Since she experiences a greater need to attribute causality for events to the actors involved rather than attributing the cause to chance factors, she would view her own misfortune as somehow justified and would likely experience a great deal of guilt because of it. The low AWS women have also been found to experience lower self-esteem and to be less "self-actualized" than their more liberal sisters (Hjelle & Butterfield, 1974). Further, their perception of others' misfortune as justifiable would make it more difficult for them to give emotional support to victims of misfortune.

The belief systems and life styles of the conservative women have implications for their satisfaction with themselves as women and as people. Birnbaum (1975) found that traditionally oriented women experienced a lower self-esteem during their middle years than did more career oriented women. The housewives described marriage as "restrictive, burdensome and demanding (p. 405)." However, they did not view marriage as a negative element in their lives. Rather, they viewed it as the role a woman must play. Thus, within the J-W paradigm they are earning what they deserve.

The finding that the low AWS women were more likely to employ the J-W model is also consistent with the data presented by Rubin and Peplau (1973). In a group of young men a significant correlation was found between belief in a just world and justification of discrimination against women, blacks, and poor people (as measured by questionnaires). Apparently those people who believe in a just world also believe in the maintenance of the status quo. When presented with an event, they attempt to account for it in the simplest way possible and frequently ignore extenuating factors. They are threatened by changes and

disruptions of expectations regarding events that occur in their environment (Shaver, 1975).

The information on how conservative women attribute causality can be useful to those who are in the position of choosing juries for rape cases and in screening volunteers for rape crisis centers. The results of these studies would suggest that rape crisis workers who hold traditional attitudes toward women would tend to devalue the clients that they perceive as similar to themselves. An active program of training and education would be appropriate to help these individuals be more effective in their work.

The present series of studies examined only one type of devaluation of rape victims. The issue of devaluation of rape victims by males was not addressed. It is likely that other mechanisms are operating for them. There may also be special characteristics of the event of rape that induce people to evaluate rape victims differently than victims of other types of misfortune. However, the present studies cannot make that distinction.

The J-W hypothesis was differentially supported within the present series of studies. Its utility as an explanatory construct was enhanced by the delineation of at least one subset of people who would be likely to employ it to account for events in their environment. The degree of similarity between the observer and the victim of misfortune was demonstrated to be an important variable in the use of the J-W hypothesis as was the cognitive style of the observer. However, further research is needed to determine other cognitive style variables that affect the use of the J-W model and other attributional and evaluative paradigms.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The present program of research was undertaken to investigate the derogation of rape victims by other people. Earlier research into the area of derogation of innocent victims of other types of misfortune suggested two alternative theories to account for the phenomenon. The Just World (J-W) hypothesis, which is derived from a cognitive dissonance model, suggests that people have a need to believe that the world around them is a fair and just place to live and that people earn their "just rewards." The observation of a misfortune befalling a seemingly innocent victim is dissonant with that belief; therefore, the observer shifts his evaluation of the victim downward to make the victim deserving of his misfortune. The contrasting Defensive Attribution (DA) theory suggests that the observer of a misfortune befalling an innocent victim would tend to attribute the occurrence of the misfortune to chance in order to avoid being held responsible if a similar misfortune befell him. In both theories, the similarity between the observer and the victim was considered critical to the functioning of the model.

A series of four experiments were conducted in which the variables affecting the evaluation of rape victims and the attribution of responsibility for the rape were refined. In the final study, attitudinal similarity between the observer and the victim was manipulated. The cognitive style of the observer was controlled by dividing the 120 female

undergraduates who served as subjects into three levels according to their scores on the Attitudes toward Women Scale. The subjects were presented with a written description of a rape incident and were asked to indicate the degree to which they believed the rape was attributable to the victim's behavior, her character, or chance.

The data from the four studies suggest that the observer goes through a series of steps in attributing causality and evaluating victims of misfortune. The observer first attempts to account for the event by attributing it to factors inherent in the event or the victim. If this cannot be done, then the cognitive style of the observer determines the manner in which the victim evaluated. The more conservative women in the study appeared to employ the J-W model when evaluating rape victims who were attitudinally similar to themselves. The more liberal women did not. There was no clear support for the DA theory in these particular studies.

REFERENCES

- Amir, M. Victim precipitated forcible rape. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1967, 58, 493-502.
- Astor, G. The Charge Is Rape. Chicago: Playboy Press, 1974.
- Birnbaum, J. A. Life patterns and self-esteem in gifted family oriented and career committed women. In S. H. Mednick, S. S. Tangri, & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Women and Achievement: Social and Motivational Analyses. Washington, D. C.: Hemisphere Publishing Corp., 1975, 396-419.
- Brownmiller, S. Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975.
- Byrne, D. Attitudes and attraction. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1969, 35-89.
- Chaiken, A. L., & Darley, J. M. Victim or perpetrator?: Defensive attribution of responsibility and the need for order and justice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 268-275.
- Curtis, L. A. Victim precipitation and violent crime. Social Problems, 1974, 21, 594-605.
- Feldman-Summers, S., & Lindner, K. Perceptions of victims and defendants in criminal assault cases. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 1976, 3, 135-150.
- Goldner, N. S. Rape as a heinous but understudied crime. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1972, 63, 402-407.

- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education.
New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Hayman, C. R., Lanza, C. O., & Noel, E. C. What to do for victims of rape. Resident and Staff Physician, 1973, 8, 29-30.
- Hjelle, L. A., & Butterfield, R. Self-actualization and women's attitudes toward their roles in contemporary society. The Journal of Psychology, 1974, 87, 225-230.
- Horos, C. V. Rape. New Canaan, Conn.: Tobey Press, 1974.
- Jones, C., & Aronson, E. Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of respectability of the victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 415-419.
- Kelley, H. H. The process of causal attribution. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 107-128.
- Klemmack, S. H., & Klemmack, D. L. The social definition of rape. In M. Walker & S. L. Brodsky (Eds.), Sexual Assault: The Victim and the Rapist. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Press, 1976.
- Lerner, M. J. Evaluation of performance as a function of performer's reward and attractiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 355-360.
- Lerner, M. J. Observer's evaluation of a victim: Justice, guilt and veridical perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 20, 127-135.
- Lerner, M. J. Social psychology of justice and interpersonal attraction. In T. Huston (Ed.), Foundations of Interpersonal Attraction. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

- Lerner, M. J., & Agar, E. The consequences of perceived similarity: Attraction and rejection, approach and avoidance. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1972, 6, 69-75.
- Lerner, M. J., & Lichtman, R. R. Effects of perceived norms on attitudes and altruistic behavior toward a dependent other. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 226-232.
- Lerner, M. J., & Matthews, G. Reaction to suffering of others under conditions of indirect responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 319-325.
- Lerner, M. J., & Simmons, C. H. Observer's reaction to the "innocent victim": Compassion or rejection? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 203-210.
- Lugenbuhl, J. E. R., & Mullin, C. J. Attribution of blame for a rape to the victim's character, behavior and to chance. Unpublished manuscript, North Carolina State University, 1976.
- McKillip, J., & Posovac, E. J. Judgments of responsibility for an accident. Journal of Personality, 1975, 43, 248-265.
- Novak, D. W., & Lerner, M. J. Rejection as a consequence of perceived similarity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 147-152.
- Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, A. Belief in a just world and reactions to another's lot: A study of participants in the national draft lottery. Journal of Social Issues, 1973, 29, 73-93.
- Schiff, A. F. Rape. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1972, 6, 76, 81, 82, & 84.

- Schultz, L. G. The victim-offender relationship. Crime and Delinquency, 1968, 14, 135-141.
- Schwendinger, J. R., & Schwendinger, H. Rape myths in legal, theoretical and everyday practice. Crime and Social Justice, 1974, 2, 18-26.
- Shaver, D. G. Defensive attribution: Effects of severity and relevance on the responsibility assigned for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14, 101-113.
- Shaver, K. G. An Introduction to Attribution Processes. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishing Co., 1975.
- Sorrentino, R. M., & Boutilier, R. G. Evaluation of a victim as a function of fate similarity/dissimilarity. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1974, 10, 84-93.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. The attitudes toward women scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1972, 2, 66. (Ms. No. 153).
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. A short version of the attitudes toward women scale (AWS). Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1973, 2, 219-220.
- Stokols, D., & Schopler, J. Reactions to victims under conditions of situational detachment: The effects of responsibility, severity, and expected future interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 199-209.
- Walster, E. Assignment of responsibility for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 73-79.
- Weis, K., & Borges, S. S. Victimology and rape: The case of the legitimate victim. Issues in Criminology, 1973, 8, 71-115.

Wood, P. L. The victim in a forcible rape case: A feminist view.

American Criminal Law Review, 1973, 2, 335-354.

APPENDIX A
Analysis of Variance on Difference Scores
of Lerner Scales - Victim
(Experiment I)

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
Respect. (R)	501.93	1	501.93	10.91	<.005
React (C)	120.34	1	120.34	2.61	ns
Offender (S)	0.20	1	0.20	<1.00	ns
R x C	96.40	1	96.40	2.10	ns
R x S	8.43	1	8.43	<1.00	ns
C x S	411.97	1	411.97	8.95	<.005
R x C x S	207.80	1	207.80	4.52	<.05
Error	1840.85	40	46.02		
Total	3187.92	47			

APPENDIX B
Analysis of Variance on Difference Scores
of Lerner Scales - Assailant
(Experiment I)

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
Respect. (R)	31.88	1	31.88	<1.00	ns
React (C)	0.00	1	0.00	<1.00	ns
Offender (S)	1294.80	1	1294.80	6.35	<.025
R x C	627.35	1	627.35	3.08	<.10
R x S	310.88	1	310.88	1.53	ns
C x S	484.97	1	484.97	2.38	ns
R x C x S	132.28	1	132.28	<1.00	ns
Error	8152.31	40	203.81		
Total	10769.92	47			

APPENDIX C
Analysis of Variance on
Character Attribution Ratings - Assailant
(Experiment I)

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
Respect. (R)	12.06	1	12.06	5.64	<.025
React (C)	9.19	1	9.19	4.29	<.05
Offender (S)	6.79	1	6.79	3.17	<.10
R x C	6.50	1	6.50	3.04	<.10
R x S	4.32	1	4.32	2.02	ns
C x S	1.21	1	1.21	0.57	ns
R x C x S	113.96	1	113.96	53.25	<.001
Error	85.77	40	2.14		
Total	239.98	47			

APPENDIX D

Analysis of Variance on Difference Scores
of Lerner Scales - Victim
(Experiment II)

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
Respect. (R)	710.03	1	710.03	6.94	<.025
React (C)	219.97	1	219.97	2.15	ns
Dogmatism (S)	146.30	1	146.30	1.43	ns
R x C	98.22	1	98.22	<1.00	ns
R x S	36.83	1	36.83	<1.00	ns
C x S	75.71	1	75.71	<1.00	ns
R x C x S	207.69	1	207.69	2.03	ns
Error	4808.57	47	102.31		
Total	6303.32	54			

APPENDIX E
Analysis of Variance on
Character Attribution Ratings - Victim
(Experiment II)

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
Respect (R)	8.87	1	8.87	4.82	<.05
React (C)	7.59	1	7.59	4.13	<.05
Dogmatism (S)	13.06	1	13.06	7.10	<.01
R x C	0.00	1	0.00	<1.00	ns
R x S	9.15	1	9.15	4.97	<.05
C x S	5.06	1	5.06	2.75	ns
R x C x S	4.47	1	4.47	2.43	ns
Error	86.60	47	1.84		
Total	134.80	54			

APPENDIX F
Analysis of Variance on
Ratings of Definition of Rape Item
(Experiment II)

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
Respect (R)	1.64	1	1.64	<1.00	ns
React (C)	1.39	1	1.39	<1.00	ns
Dogmatism (S)	1.45	1	1.45	<1.00	ns
R x C	5.26	1	5.26	2.64	ns
R x S	9.48	1	9.48	4.47	<.05
C x S	3.95	1	3.95	1.86	ns
R x C x S	0.00	1	0.00	<1.00	ns
Error	99.70	47	2.12		
Total	120.55	54			

APPENDIX G
Analysis of Variance on
Ratings of Feigned Resistance Item
(Experiment II)

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
Respect (R)	1.73	1	1.73	<1.00	ns
React (C)	10.40	1	10.40	7.07	<.01
Dogmatism (S)	8.04	1	8.04	5.47	<.025
R x C	3.15	1	3.15	2.14	ns
R x S	1.36	1	1.36	<1.00	ns
C x S	7.82	1	7.82	5.32	<.025
R x C x S	5.04	1	5.04	3.43	ns
Error	67.50	46	1.47		
Total	105.04	53*			

*One subject who had answered the other items did not answer this item

APPENDIX H

Three-way Analysis of Variance on
Difference Scores of Lerner Scales - Victim
(Experiment III)

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
Event (R)	608.01	1	608.01	6.09	<.05
AWS (C)	18.26	1	18.26	<1.00	ns
Similarity (S)	168.15	1	168.15	1.68	ns
R x C	4.96	1	4.96	<1.00	ns
R x S	347.74	1	347.74	3.48	ns
C x S	391.43	1	391.43	3.48	ns
R x C x S	848.74	1	848.74	8.51	<.01
Error	3691.44	37	99.76		
Total	6078.73	43			

APPENDIX I

Two-way Analysis of Variance on
Difference Scores of Lerner Scales - Victim
(Experiment III)

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
AWS (R)	805.88	1	805.88	7.20	<.05
Similarity (C)	11.85	1	11.85	<1.00	ns
R x C	65.08	1	65.08	<1.00	ns
Error	2576.02	23	112.00		
Total	3458.82	26			

APPENDIX J
Analysis of Variance on
Behavioral Attribution Ratings
(Experiment III)

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
AWS (R)	31.28	1	31.28	21.72	<.001
Similarity (C)	0.31	1	0.31	<1.00	ns
R x C	2.26	1	2.26	1.57	ns
Error	33.12	23	1.44		
Total	66.97	26			

APPENDIX K
Analysis of Variance on
Ratings of Attraction
(Experiment III)

Source	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	F	<u>p</u>
AWS (R)	42.69	1	42.69	14.62	<.001
Similarity (C)	9.87	1	9.87	3.38	ns
R x C	10.16	1	10.16	3.48	ns
Error	67.13	23	2.92		
Total	129.85	26			

Appendix L

Attitudes toward Women Scale

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the role of women in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feelings about each statement by indicating whether you (A) Agree strongly, (B) Agree mildly, (C) Disagree mildly, or (D) Disagree strongly. Please indicate your opinion by circling the letter in the left hand column which corresponds to the alternative which best describes your personal attitude. Please respond to every item.

(A) Agree strongly (B) Agree mildly (C) Disagree mildly
(D) Disagree strongly

- A B C D 1. Swearing and obscenity is more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.
- A B C D 2. Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.
- A B C D 3. Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.
- A B C D 4. Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.
- A B C D 5. Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.
- A B C D 6. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.
- A B C D 7. It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.
- A B C D 8. There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.
- A B C D 9. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.
- A B C D 10. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
- A B C D 11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.
- A B C D 12. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.
- A B C D 13. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.
- A B C D 14. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.

- A B C D 15. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.
- A B C D 16. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.
- A B C D 17. Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiances.
- A B C D 18. The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.
- A B C D 19. Women should be concerned with their duties of childrearing and house tending, rather than with desires for professional and business careers.
- A B C D 20. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.
- A B C D 21. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set by men.
- A B C D 22. On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contribution to economic production than are men.
- A B C D 23. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.
- A B C D 24. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.
- A B C D 25. The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.

Appendix M
Similarity Check Questionnaire

When people form impressions of other people, they make inferences about the attributes the other people possess. Some of these attributes may be positive and some may be negative.

On the items below, decide to what extent you agree with the statement as it pertains to the person whose questionnaire you just examined. Indicate the degree of your agreement with the item by placing a number from 1 to 7 in the blank to the left of the item number. Consider each item separately and answer them independently. Do not refer to the questionnaire for your answers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

- ___ 1. This person reacts appropriately to stress.
- ___ 2. This person would fit in with my circle of friends.
- ___ 3. This person has strong religious values.
- ___ 4. This person is likely to be successful in interpersonal relationships.
- ___ 5. This person probably came from a small family.
- ___ 6. This person is similar to me.
- ___ 7. This person is likely to be critical of her own performance.
- ___ 8. This person is somewhat idealistic.

Appendix N
Lerner Scales

Please indicate your rating of the person described above on each of the following pairs of adjectives by circling the appropriate number.

intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unintelligent
likable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unlikable
uncooperative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cooperative
bossy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	easygoing
immature	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	mature
imaginative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unimaginative
irresponsible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	responsible
nervous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	calm
patient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	impatient
reasonable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unreasonable
rigid	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	flexible
courteous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	rude
selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unselfish
warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	cold
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	insincere

Appendix 0
Attribution Questionnaire

When people make decisions about the cause of an event, they take various factors into account. Sometimes an event is caused primarily by a single factor, at other times an event is the result of the interaction of several factors.

On the items below, decide to what extent you agree with the statement and indicate your answer by placing the appropriate number in the blank to the left of the item number.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	agree nor	agree	agree	agree
			disagree			

- ___ 1. The event occurred because of something this person did.
- ___ 2. The event occurred because of the type of person this individual is.
- ___ 3. The event occurred because of this person's luck
- ___ 4. This person is similar to me.
- ___ 5. Events like this happen to people who deserve them.
- ___ 6. An event like this could not happen to me.

APPENDIX P

Raw Data

RAW DATA

GROUP: SIMILAR-HIGH AWS

Subject AWS	Difference Scores on ratings on:		Rating on Attribution to:		Ratings on Items:	
	Lerner Scales	Similarity Items	Behavior	Character	Deserve Fate	"Not Me"
01	7	3	1	5	6	2
02	-13	0	1	1	7	1
03	6	3	5	4	1	4
04	-20	-2	2	1	1	1
05	-1	0	1	1	4	1
06	-7	0	4	4	4	1
07	7	-2	1	4	4	1
08	3	1	4	2	2	4
09	1	-2	2	1	1	1
10	2	-2	2	2	1	4
11	-8	1	2	3	4	1
12	-2	0	1	4	4	6
13	-8	1	2	4	5	5
14	-3	-2	1	1	1	1
15	-6	-2	1	4	1	1
16	-2	-1	1	1	1	4
17	-1	-2	1	1	1	4
18	-27	3	1	2	1	1
19	2	1	1	1	1	1
20	-16	1	2	5	1	1

RAW DATA

GROUP: SIMILAR-MID AWS

Subject AWS	Difference Scores on Ratings on:		Rating on Attribution to:		Ratings on Items:	
	Lerner Scales	Similarity Items	Behavior	Character	Deserve Fate	"Not Me"
21	56	2	5	3	1	1
22	56	2	6	5	4	4
23	55	0	1	1	1	1
24	54	-1	2	3	1	1
25	53	-1	6	7	1	2
26	53	-2	1	1	1	1
27	53	-1	1	1	1	1
28	53	6	7	7	1	1
29	53	3	4	5	1	4
30	52	3	1	2	1	4
31	51	0	1	1	1	1
32	50	3	2	6	1	2
33	49	2	4	1	1	4
34	49	0	4	3	5	1
35	49	1	1	1	1	1
36	49	2	4	2	1	2
37	49	1	1	4	1	1
38	48	10	1	2	1	1
39	48	-6	2	7	1	1
40	48	3	7	1	1	4

RAW DATA

GROUP: SIMILAR-LOW AWS

Subject AWS	Difference Scores on Ratings on:		Rating on Attribution to:		Ratings on Items:	
	Lerner Scales	Similarity Items	Behavior	Character	Deserve	Fate "Not Me"
41	7	1	3	4	3	1
42	2	3	7	7	2	7
43	3	3	2	1	4	4
44	8	4	3	6	3	3
45	16	3	2	4	5	3
46	2	5	4	4	5	3
47	3	4	5	5	7	1
48	2	6	4	4	1	1
49	-1	5	4	6	1	1
50	0	3	5	1	1	1
51	16	4	1	3	1	1
52	25	1	5	6	1	2
53	8	2	2	4	4	2
54	0	6	4	1	1	4
55	-3	0	2	4	7	1
56	5	0	1	2	4	5
57	4	0	2	4	3	7
58	5	4	4	1	5	1
59	5	1	4	3	2	1
60	8	6	2	2	4	1
			5	1	1	4
			5	4	2	2
			2	4	2	1
			4	3	1	1
			2	2	2	1
			2	4	2	1
			4	1	2	1
			1	1	2	1
			2	4	2	5
			4	1	1	7
			1	4	1	1
			2	2	1	4
			4	4	4	2
			2	1	3	1
			1	1	5	7
			0	0	2	1
			0	0	2	1
			0	4	1	1
			4	1	1	1
			4	3	2	1
			2	2	4	1
			5	5	1	4
			8	2	2	2
			0	1	1	2
			16	4	4	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16	4	1	1
			25	6	1	1
			8	4	1	1
			0	1	1	1
			-3	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			4	6	4	1
			4	4	7	1
			0	1	1	1
			4	3	1	1
			5	1	1	1
			8	6	4	1
			0	1	1	1
			16			

RAW DATA

GROUP: DISSIMILAR-HIGH AWS

Subject AWS	Difference Scores on Ratings on:		Rating on Attribution To:		Ratings on Items:	
	Lerner Scales	Similarity Items	Behavior	Character	Deserve Fate	"Not Me"
61	72	-3	0	1	1	1
62	71	19	0	1	1	1
63	71	10	0	5	1	6
64	69	19	0	2	4	6
65	68	2	0	1	1	1
66	67	9	-3	1	1	4
67	66	0	0	1	6	1
68	66	14	0	1	4	1
69	66	12	0	1	2	3
70	64	6	0	1	1	1
71	64	14	1	2	1	1
72	63	8	0	6	1	2
73	62	12	0	4	1	1
74	62	6	0	2	1	4
75	61	3	1	4	4	4
76	60	19	0	4	2	2
77	59	15	0	4	6	4
78	58	2	0	3	4	1
79	58	13	1	5	3	5
80	58	13	-1	1	4	1
			0	3	1	5

RAW DATA

GROUP: DISSIMILAR-MID AWS

Subject AWS	Difference Scores on Ratings on: Lerner Scales	Similarity Items	Rating on Attribution to: Behavior	Character	Luck	Deserve Fate	Ratings on Items: "Not Me"
81	25	0	1	1	5	1	1
82	-1	1	1	1	4	1	2
83	27	0	1	4	4	1	1
84	16	0	2	2	6	1	2
85	0	-5	1	1	4	1	1
86	10	1	7	6	2	5	1
87	17	0	1	1	7	7	4
88	48	0	1	6	1	2	1
89	11	-2	1	1	7	2	2
90	2	-1	1	1	1	1	7
91	17	0	1	2	6	1	3
92	3	-1	1	1	1	1	1
93	13	-1	1	1	4	1	1
94	9	-6	2	5	1	3	3
95	-3	-1	5	5	1	4	1
96	2	0	5	1	5	1	2
97	8	0	3	4	4	1	7
98	1	1	2	4	4	1	1
99	13	0	6	2	4	1	2
100	19	-2	4	6	5	1	3

RAW DATA

GROUP: DISSIMILAR-LOW AWS

Subject AWS	Difference Scores on Ratings on:		Rating on Attribution to:		Ratings on Items:	
	Lerner Scales	Similarity Items	Behavior	Character Luck	Deserve Fate	"Not Me"
101	46	24	2	1	1	1
102	45	1	1	4	2	4
103	43	10	1	5	1	1
104	43	2	1	2	4	5
105	43	4	4	1	1	1
106	43	16	5	5	4	4
107	42	7	5	2	2	1
108	41	9	3	2	1	4
109	40	11	5	5	3	2
110	40	20	3	4	4	4
111	40	5	5	5	5	3
112	40	17	5	4	1	2
113	40	0	5	1	6	6
114	39	0	3	1	1	4
115	32	23	2	4	1	1
116	32	12	5	3	3	1
117	32	24	4	2	1	3
117	31	6	5	1	1	1
118	30	8	2	1	5	4
119	29	6	1	1	1	4
120	26	13	3	3	6	2
			1	4	1	5
						6