

Victim Self-Evaluations and Belief in a Just World

by

Trevor Markesteyn

A thesis
presented to the University of Manitoba
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Psychology

Winnipeg, Manitoba

(c) Trevor Markesteyn, 1986

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-33915-2

VICTIM SELF-EVALUATIONS AND BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD

BY

TREVOR MARKESTEYN

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1986

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis.

I authorize the University of Manitoba to lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Trevor Markesteyn

I further authorize the University of Manitoba to reproduce this thesis by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Trevor Markesteyn

The University of Manitoba requires the signatures of all persons using or photocopying this thesis. Please sign below, and give address and date.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee; Dr. Fredrick Marcuse, my senior advisor, Dr. Lawrence Breen, and Dr. Rick Linden. For their advise, constructive criticism and helpful suggestions, I am grateful.

Special gratitude goes to Freddie Marcuse who's scholarly dedication and acumen were the guiding light that put it all into perspective. His door was always open and his friendship over the past three years I shall always value.

I would also like to thank a number of my fellow graduate students for their helpful comments, suggestions, and friendship. All the best in the future.

Finally, my deepest thanks goes to my family. Their support and faith in my abilities have always been invaluable.

Abstract

A review of crisis theory and "just world" research reveals that victims of misfortune may experience some degree of guilt, shame, or self-hatred following their victimization (Bard, 1980; Bard & Ellison, 1974; Burgess & Holmstrom, 1979; Rubin & Peplau, 1973; Comer & Laird, 1975). Recency of victimization, nature of offence, attribution style employed (Janoff-Bulman, 1979), and degree of belief in a "just world" (Lerner & Simmons, 1966; Rubin & Peplau, 1973) were tested as variables which may delimit victim self-derogation. The administration of a questionnaire to 327 University of Manitoba Introductory Psychology students parent population provided a sample of 99 subjects who indicated having been victimized within six months of participation. Subject victims were asked to identify themselves as such on the questionnaire only after they had completed self evaluation assessment measures. Results indicate that, as a group, victims do not differ significantly from nonvictims on the variables tested. Victims who obtained low scores on the Just World Scale (Rubin & Peplau, 1975) experienced the same degree of self-derogation as those victims whose scores reflected a strong belief in a just world. Recency of victimization (from 1 week to six months) is not correlated with self-derogation. Individuals react differently when victims of the same

crime. Results indicate that the seriousness of the crime is not necessarily a correlate of victim self-derogation. While subjects who scored higher on the Just World Scale and reported positive self-evaluations more strongly utilize a behavioral rather than characterological self-blame style, this distinction may be misleading. Variables in victimization and the role of law enforcement agencies were discussed.

Introduction

The victim of crime is often described as not having received due societal concern. In recent years, this has resulted in the development of research, planning and services designed to deal with their needs. The recent provincial legislature throne speech (May 9th, 1986) is indicative. The consequences of a crime on a victim are dependent on a number of factors. These include the type and severity of the crime, the victim's age and physical condition, the reaction of family and friends, subsequent involvement of the victim with the criminal justice system, and the effect of the crime on the victim's mental health (Weiler & Desgagne, 1984). It is this latter point that will be the focus of this research.

Typically, concern for crime victims has focused on material loss and physical damage (ie. loss of property, loss of income, or losses sustained due to medical expenses). Less understood, however, are the psychological and social costs associated with crime victimization - such losses are far less tangible. Only recently has society been increasingly willing to acknowledge that among the most grievous and long lasting injuries of victimization can be those at the level of feeling and behavior (Bard, 1980).

The Influence of Crisis Theory

In examining the psychological effects of victimization on the individual, crisis theory has been popularly employed as the theoretical premise upon which to build. In the psychological context, a crisis is a subjective reaction to a stressful life event. "It is a turning point in one's life, one from which the individual can emerge either psychologically damaged and less well able to cope, or strengthened, with skills that facilitate future coping" (Ellison & Buckhout, 1981, p.52).

Modern crisis theory has its origins in the work of Lindemann (1944) with victims and families of victims of the Coconut Grove fire (a nightclub). This work has been expanded and elaborated on greatly by Caplan (1964) and others to cover reactions to a variety of situations that involve important changes in a person's life.

Basically three different kinds of crisis can be identified. Developmental crises (Erikson, 1963) are those that occur in the normal course of growth, for example the stage of adolescence or the recently popularized midlife crisis (Sheehy, 1976). Secondly recognizable are the crises that can arise from stressful living conditions (ie. a stressful occupation, domestic problems, etc.). Thirdly, are crises resulting from accidental stressors which are sudden, arbitrary and unpredictable. This last one, in

particular, is acknowledged as the crisis of crime victimization.

Variables that are popularly considered in determining the magnitude of the crisis reaction include the extent to which it was life threatening, how long the stressor was present, the extent to which the community and significant others in the victim's life were able to give support, the victim's prior experience with coping, and his or her personality style and strengths. (Erikson, 1976; Caplan, 1964; Ellison & Buckhout, 1981).

Most crimes, whether against person or property, will precipitate a crisis reaction in the victim. Most victims feel a loss of control over their environment. The crisis that follows a Breaking & Entering, for example, may well be a result of an intrusion into an extension of the self - the home, into which the perpetrator has physically intruded without invitation. This act breaches the individual's feeling of security and victims often describe feelings of being dirtied and violated (Ellison & Buckhout, 1981). Pope (1977) reports that over half of all residential burglaries result in some damage to property and it is not uncommon to find that the perpetrator has defecated or urinated, masturbated into the linens or wantonly destroyed property (Bard & Ellison, 1974).

Most victims undergo a crisis reaction which tends to

occur in stages (Bard & Ellison, 1974; Burgess and Holmstrom, 1974; Sutherland and Scherl, 1970; Ellison & Buckhout, 1981). More specifically, Bard (1980) has identified the stages; impact, recoil, and reorganization.

Immediately following the crime and lasting for hours or days the victim experiences an acute crisis or stage of impact (Bard, 1980) which is characterized initially by denial ... "This couldn't be happening to me", and is followed by disruption because of shock. The individual's coping mechanisms no longer are adequate; he or she feels out of control, numb and disoriented. A feeling of helplessness may follow. The individual may revert emotionally to a dependent, almost childlike stage of development where the need for direction and support from others is essential. This temporary disability reflects the victim's need for help in ordering and gaining control of a world that has suddenly become chaotic. Guilt reaction, sometimes interocepted, sometimes projected onto others (family members or police) may also be experienced - such responses characteristic of the stage of impact are natural, not abnormal or idiosyncratic.

Shortly after the crime most victims usually enter the second stage of crisis; i.e. recoil (Bard, 1980). It is during this period that the individual may slip into a sense of false recovery by denying the impact of the event. The

process of recovery has started but it does not proceed in a straight line. Typically a secondary crisis reaction, a sort of "flashback", will occur in which some of the symptoms of the acute phase, particularly phobias and disturbances in eating and sleeping, return. This secondary crisis may last for hours, or days, and then will be followed by another "quiet" period. Often these periods alternate for months with the recovery periods becoming longer with time and the adequate support of society, family and friends. During recoil, the work of putting the violation into perspective takes place. The victim begins to reassemble reality, vulnerability, and loss and once more achieve integration and intactness - there has been the beginning of reorganization.

The final phase of the crisis reaction is reorganization (Bard, 1980). Fear and anger diminish to almost negligible levels and the individual's emotional energy is now appropriately invested in constructive pursuits. The more serious the violation, generally, the longer it will take the individual to come to grips with their victimization. A sexual assault or an attempted homicide naturally will take much longer and will be a more intense struggle than a purse-snatching or a pick-pocketing.

The Just World Hypothesis

Most researchers agree that victims will, at some point during their crisis reaction suffer from guilt, shame or self-hatred (Bard & Ellison, 1974; Burgess & Holmstrom, 1974; Sutherland & Scherl, 1970; Bard, 1980; Burgess & Holmstrom, 1979; Ellison & Buckhout, 1981). These feelings are generally accepted as being functional in the sense that they result from the victim's need to explain what has happened. The question raised, however, is: Why is it functional to blame oneself and suffer the guilt, shame and self-derogation of victimization? One theory, while not originally postulated to account directly for a victim's "self"-derogation, sheds light on the answer. It has been advanced by Lerner (Lerner, 1965, 1970, 1971, 1977; Lerner & Simmons, 1966; Lerner, Miller & Holmes, 1976; Lerner & Miller, 1978). He proposed that individuals have a need to believe that their environment is a just and orderly place where people usually get what they deserve. This, stated succinctly, has been labeled the "just world hypothesis" and has been empirically tested to show that groups or individuals confronted with an injustice will be motivated to restore justice - a social homeostasis.

The method whereby society accomplishes this is to compensate the victim. Compensation is generally achieved by punishing the perpetrator for his act of injustice and,

if possible, having the victim's possessions returned, thus restoring the balance. Observers though, when unable to compensate the victim, in order to maintain their view of justice will tend to take the position that the victim deserves to suffer (Lerner, 1970). By persuading ourselves that victims can deserve their fate as a consequence of engaging in bad acts we are maintaining our conviction that we live in a "just world". Without this attribution individuals would have to accept the unsettling prospect that they could suffer unjustly.

In the words of Lerner and Miller (1978):

The belief that the world is just enables the individual to confront his physical and social environment as though they were stable and orderly. Without such a belief it would be difficult for the individual to commit himself to the pursuit of long-range goals or even to the socially regulated behavior of day-to-day life. Since the belief that the world is just serves such an important adaptive function for the individual, people are very reluctant to give up this belief, and they can be greatly troubled if they encounter evidence that suggests that the world is not really just or orderly after all (pp. 1030-1031).

The majority of research on the "just world hypothesis"

has addressed the question of whether observers blame the victims of misfortunes for their fate, but virtually no research has examined the question of whether victims blame themselves for their fates (Lerner & Miller, 1978). That victims suffer from feelings of guilt, shame and self-derogation at some stage of their crisis formation perhaps can be explained utilizing the aforementioned "just world" theory.

Early research, as cited by Ellison and Buckhout (1981), has noted the tendency of people to blame the victims of misfortunes for their own fates. The authors point out that the orientation of victim-as-culprit is seen in the work on victim precipitation by Von Hentig, Wolfgang, and Abrahamson in homicide, and Amir in forcible rape. Using the theoretical framework of psychoanalytic theory, most of these researchers conclude that human behavior is purposive and that victims are motivated by masochism and even desires to commit suicide.

Ellison and Buckhout (1981) report that Wolfgang defines victim precipitated homicide and aggravated assault as situations in which the victim was the first in the encounter to use physical force or initiate insults against an individual who responds in turn. Amir views a "bad reputation", drinking with the offender, using vulgar language, and/or wearing "suggestive" clothing as

precipitative behavior in rape cases. In the case of robbery, there may be a careless flaunting of money in public places or burglary victims may "tempt" perpetrators by leaving their homes open. To quote a crime prevention advertisement, victims of auto theft "help a good boy go bad" by leaving their cars unlocked or running. Similarly, rigid proctoring of an exam is said to be a challenge to cheat! This, of course, in all cases may represent nothing but rationalization.

The tendency to blame the victim is not limited to victims of crime. Myrdal (1962) explains that we often justify the treatment of Blacks and other oppressed and disadvantaged groups by claiming that they somehow deserve their fate. Jews have been held responsible for their persecution by the Nazis before and during World War II (Hallie, 1971), the poor have been viewed as contributing to their own fate by being lazy or morally inferior (Ryan, 1971), physical disability is evidence of moral defect (Goffman, 1963) and even natural catastrophes may be misconstrued as punishment for sin (Rosenman, 1956) - albeit usually by a deity. Fritz Heider (1958) wrote: "The relationship between wickedness and punishment is so strong, that given one of these conditions the other is frequently assumed" (p.235).

Research in this area first received empirical validation

in the mid 1960's. In one such study Walster (1966) reported that the more damage that resulted from an automobile accident, the more subjects attributed the responsibility for that accident on the individual who was driving.

The prototype for later experiments on the "just world hypothesis" was conducted by Lerner and Simmons (1966). In this experiment, female subjects watched a fellow student on videotape react to apparently painful shocks. The subjects were lead to believe that they were participating in a human learning experiment and that the victim was receiving shocks as punishment for her errors. There were three conditions. In one condition the subjects were given the opportunity to restore justice and compensate the victim by voting to reassign her to a reward condition where she would receive money rather than shocks. As would be expected, most subjects took this opportunity to compensate the victim. In a second condition the victims could not be compensated and the subjects were informed that the shocks would continue. The third condition had the subjects believe that the victim had allowed herself to be talked into being shocked for their (the observers) sake and for the sake of the experimenter.

When later asked to evaluate the victim, substantial

differences emerged between the three conditions. In the first condition where the victim was compensated by the subject they (the subjects) rated the victim favourably. However, in the second, uncompensated, condition, in which the injustice was continued and presumably greater, victims were not rated as favourably and this tendency to derogate was even more markedly pronounced in the third condition. It appeared that "the sight of an innocent person suffering without the possibility of reward or compensation motivated people to bring about a more appropriate fit between her fate and her character" (Lerner & Miller, 1978, p.1032). This finding has been replicated a number of times with diverse populations (Simmons & Pilavin, 1972; Sorrentino & Hardy, 1974).

Walster's (1966) early work, cited previously, and other "just world" research has also tended to demonstrate a positive correlation between seriousness of the harm that befell a victim and the amount of blame attributed to him or her. For college students, at least, the more serious the calamity, the greater the amount of blame that will be attributed to the victim (Lerner, 1965; Rubin & Peplau, 1975; Jones & Aronson, 1973; Landy & Aronson, 1969).

Limitations to Derogation

There are, however, delimiting conditions under which people may not derogate a victim. The subjects in the first experimental condition participating in the Lerner and Simmons (1966) experiment clearly demonstrated that when individuals are given the opportunity to restore justice through compensation, derogation may not occur. It also appears that when people perceive the victim as being responsible for his or her own fate, there will be little need to derogate, presumably because an injustice has not occurred.

Jones & Aronson (1973) conducted research in this area. A married woman, a virgin, and a divorcee were depicted as having been raped. Subjects were asked to first rate the attractiveness of the three and then to assess how responsible they perceived them as being for the event. As expected by some, the virgin and the married woman were perceived as being more respectable but they were also seen as being personally more responsible than the divorcee.

Presumably, the knowledge that innocent, highly respectable females can be raped was particularly threatening to the subjects' belief that the world is just, and to avoid the threat posed by this type of admission, it was necessary to find fault with the actions of the victim. Thus, the subjects appear to

have tried to convince themselves that the victim was really not innocent and that she must have contributed, at least in some small but significant way, to her fate (Lerner & Miller, 1978, p.1035).

A third delimiting condition to the derogation effect is that observers will often choose to find fault with the victim's actions by exaggerating his or her behavioral responsibility rather than derogate their character if they are highly attractive or enjoy high status.

Fourth, it appears that in situations where the norm of "justified self interest" prevails, no derogation will ensue (Lerner, 1974). Stated simply, where two or more people, with equally legitimate claims, desire the same outcome, it is pursuing one's justified self interest to do what one can within the rules to obtain that outcome. In a Lerner and Lichtman (1968) experiment two undergraduate women learned that one of them would have to receive electric shocks, while the other would not. One of them was given the choice of the condition she preferred. This was done via a table of random numbers. The vast majority of these women chose the desirable condition for themselves, ascribed responsibility to themselves for their own fortunate fate and the other person's suffering, and yet showed few signs of guilt. According to Lerner (1974), their actions were accounted for by the justice of legitimate competition.

Similarly, researchers in this area (Lerner & Matthews, 1967; Lerner & Lichtman, 1968) propose that in situations in which perpetrator (P's) behaviour is clearly causally linked to victim (V's) undeserved suffering, P is motivated to avoid the self-perception of being a harm doer and to find a way of disowning responsibility for the action. An effective means of externalizing the blame is to establish, if one can, that the basis of the behaviour that caused the harm was normatively appropriate. Although P did action X and intended to do so, any reasonable person would be expected to do X under the circumstances (Lerner & Miller, 1978).

Of particular interest is a study conducted by Aderman, Brehm, & Katz (1974). Following a similar paradigm as Lerner & Simmons (1966), they presented evidence of a further delimiting condition of the "just world" derogation effect. Utilizing three experimental conditions, these researchers varied the instructional set that was given to the subjects who viewed the tape of the suffering victim. Subjects in the first two conditions were given the same instructions as those in the Lerner & Simmons (1966) experiment and simply told to "watch" the subject being shocked. As would be expected the experimenters discovered derogation effects when these subjects were later asked to evaluate the victims. In a third condition, where subjects

were told to "imagine yourself" in her place, no derogation occurred. The authors accounted for this effect stating that the lack of derogation occurred because subjects empathized with the victim.

Chaikin & Darley (1973) have a different interpretation. They postulated that the subjects in the "imagine yourself" condition were not necessarily empathizing with the victim but rather felt that they too might actually have to suffer. Their concern was not so much with the victim as with their own fate which they perceived might be similar.

Fate similarity and its relation to the "just world hypothesis" has been investigated by several researchers. Lerner and Matthews (1967) suggest that identification with a victim is an important determinant of whether a person responds to a victim with compassion or rejection. Their emphasis is on situational, not personal, similarity. "Identification with a victim requires the perception of the same common fate and not the perception of similar attributes" (p.324). They conclude that if observers identify with the victim they are likely to respond with sympathy and understanding rather than derogation.

Chaikin's and Darley's (1973) data support these findings. They had subjects witness an injustice and led them to believe that they were in some risk of being harmed or being a harm doer themselves in the next situation.

Those who anticipated that they might be next in the perpetrator's position were more likely to blame everything and everyone except the harm doer and resorted to derogating the victim when the outcome was severe. However, those subjects who were led to believe that they might be in the victim's position next increased their blame on the perpetrator and did not reject the victim when the consequences were severe.

Sorrentino and Boutilier (1974) had subjects observe a peer (victim) receive painful electric shocks as punishment for making errors in a serial learning task. Individuals who anticipated a similar fate were significantly less likely to devalue the victim than those who did not anticipate a similar fate.

Self-Blame and Attribution Style

It is evident from the literature on "just world" research that the vast majority of work done in this area is concerned with whether observers blame victims for their own fates. Few researchers have investigated whether the victims themselves will experience self-derogation in an effort to maintain the position "I get what I deserve". Crisis theory proposes that individuals who are the victims of misfortune will experience some degree of self-derogation. Although sparse, "just world" research empirically supports this hypothesis.

Beck (1967) has noted that many depressed people aggravate their psychological condition by blaming themselves for their fate. Kubler-Ross (1969) cited the case of a businessman who, when hospitalized for Hodgkin's disease, blamed himself. "His account was totally unrealistic, yet he insisted that he, and only he, caused 'this weakness'" (p.54) by eating improperly. Lerner & Miller (1978) state: "On the one level this process seems functional, since the need to satisfy one's belief that events are just and orderly is satisfied by blaming one's misfortune either on one's character or one's actions" (p.1043). Chodoff et al. (1964) note that this in turn brings feelings of relief and the reduction of anxiety. They described the feelings of parents with terminally ill children and reported that these couples often blame themselves for their children's fate. For the parents, however, this "self-blame can serve the defensive purpose of denying the intolerable conclusion that no one is responsible" (p.747).

Bulman and Wortman (1977) confirm this finding. Interviews with paraplegic victims of accidents and ratings from social workers and nurses were assessed to determine the ways in which each victim made sense of their fate. Results showed that the victims who blamed themselves for the accident were subsequently better adjusted. It is no

surprise that since these individuals were attempting to find some acceptable meaning and purpose as to what happened to them, those who scored higher on the Belief in a Just World Scale (Rubin & Peplau, 1975), reported themselves to be happier than the other victims did.

The apparent fact that blaming oneself is either adaptive or maladaptive was accounted for by Janoff-Bulman (1979). She postulated that there are two types of self-blame, "one representing an adaptive, control-oriented response, the other a maladaptive, self-deprecating response" (p.1799). They differ in the focus of blame. In order for self-blame to be adaptive it must focus on the person's behavior and is therefore labelled "behavioral" self-blame. The maladaptive style focuses on the person's character and is thus labelled "characterological" self-blame. Distinctions between the two are based partly on the individual's perception of control. In the behavioral self-blame situation the person perceives that the outcome is controllable, but when characterological self-blame is employed (resulting in self-derogation), the outcome appears to be uncontrollable. Similarly persons employing a characterological self-blame strategy have an external locus of control and are concerned with "personal deservingness for past outcomes" (p.1798). Behavioral self-blame is characteristic of individuals who are concerned with avoiding negative outcomes in the future.

Thus, as Janoff-Bulman (1979) reports, the paralyzed victims in the Bulman and Wortman (1977) study were apt to blame themselves but self-blame was more likely to be of a behavioral nature based in "a general belief in future control (e.g., I'll be able to improve my physical condition through physical therapy), rather than a more specific belief in the future avoidability of their own paralysis, which was medically regarded as irreversible in all cases" (p.1800).

Janoff-Bulman (1979) states: "This behavioral-characterological distinction parallels findings in the area of just world theory" (p.1799). It would appear that the paraplegic victims in the Bulman and Wortman study whose scores indicated a high belief in a "just world" were more likely to be engaging in behavioral self-blame which may account for their self-reported claims of being happier. It would be interesting to study whether the relationship between high belief in a "just world", behavioral self-blame and subsequent good coping is one that exists in situations other than that investigated by Bulman and Wortman.

Lefcourt (1982) and Seligman (1975) would probably agree with Lerner and Miller (1978) that "blaming yourself for your condition may often cause you to resign yourself to it rather than attempt to change it" (p.1043). Depending on the attribution style, some may find it therapeutic, but

many do not and continue to suffer the consequences of victimization. Other research investigating self-derogation confirms that victims suffer as a result of their misfortune. Rubin and Peplau (1973) found that receiving a high (ie. safe) number in a lottery draft resulted in individuals experiencing an increase in self-esteem, whereas drawing a low number resulted in just the opposite.

Comer and Laird (1975) assigned subjects the unpleasant task of having to eat a worm. They discovered that 12 of the 15 participants would then complete this aversive task even when given the opportunity to perform a neutral weight discrimination one instead. Replicating earlier findings showing that individuals often choose to suffer as a consequence of having expected to suffer (Aronson, Carlsmith, and Darley, 1963; Foxman and Radtke; 1970) they suggested that "much of the apparent stoicism of the world's victims may be due to their reconstruction of their views of themselves and the world, so that their sufferings are seen as either not so bad or no more than appropriate for people such as themselves" (pp.100-101). Results indicated that these individuals offered lower evaluations of themselves on a self-evaluation questionnaire than did subjects in a control group. Once again we see that individuals will alter their conceptual system in order to justify their belief that the world is an orderly and fair place to live.

Subjects Without a "Just World Belief"

Researchers have found that not all individuals have a high belief in a "just world". In the Lerner and Simmons (1966) experiment discussed earlier, over one third of the subjects did not derogate the victim at all. The fact that there are individual differences may be relevant to the "just world effect" and this was discussed by Lerner and Miller (1978) who report that Zuckerman, Gerbasi, Kravitz, and Wheeler, in an experimental design similar to that used by Lerner and Simmons (1966), found that individuals who scored low in their belief in a "just world" were also significantly more likely to give a favourable evaluation of the victim than were individuals with high scores.

Rubin and Peplau (1973) also found that not everyone will derogate the victims of misfortune. Subjects who had obtained low scores on the Belief in a Just World Scale expressed greater sympathy, greater liking, and less resentment towards individuals who were "losers" (e.g. people who were about to be drafted) in the 1971 United States Selective Service Draft Lottery than towards those who were winners. Since the subjects themselves were also in the lottery and many were victimized by it, it is hardly surprising, considering the fate similarity, that those scoring high on the Belief in a Just World Scale reacted at least as favourably to winners as losers. They did, however, resent losers more than winners.

Hypotheses

The first hypothesis was that victims of crime would have lower self-evaluations than nonvictims.

The second hypothesis was that victim and nonvictim Belief in a Just World Scale scores would not differ.

Thirdly it was hypothesized that victims who obtained lower scores on the Belief in a Just World Scale would not undergo the same degree of self-derogation as victims whose scores reflected a stronger belief in a "just world".

The fourth hypothesis was that the more recent the victimization the higher the self-derogation the victim would experience.

Fifthly, it was hypothesized that the more serious the nature of the crime (determined by the experimenter) the greater the self-derogation the victim would experience.

The sixth hypothesis was that individuals who both score high on the Just World Scale and report positive self-evaluations engage in a behavioral self-blame attribution style rather than one of characterological self-blame as shown by scores on the Janoff-Bulman (1979).

Method

Design

Aspects of the victimization experience (e.g. assault, break and enter), if one occurred, were employed as independent variables. The dependent variables included aspects of the subject's psychological and physiological well-being and the coping styles they exercised. Causal processes from observations in natural settings were also inferred.

Subjects

Three hundred twenty seven individuals of both sexes initially were used. They were University of Manitoba undergraduate students enrolled in Introduction to Psychology. Ninety nine students (30.3%) identified themselves as victims of a crime within the last six months. From the sample remaining ($n = 228$) a control group ($n = 99$) was randomly selected. Subjects (control and experimental) ranged in age from 17 to 35 with a mean age of 19.4. Seventy eight (39.4%) were male and 120 (60.6%) were female. Sex, age, marital status, employment status, type of residence, and personal income level of the two groups of subjects are shown in Table 1. No significant differences were present between the groups.

Insert Table 1 About Here

Measures

Subjects were required to complete a questionnaire (see Appendix A) which included the following measures:

1) The Adjective Check List (ACL; Gough & Heilburn, 1972) was administered to obtain a measure of subject self-evaluation. The ACL is comprised of 300 adjectives. Subjects were requested to put a check beside each adjective they considered self-descriptive (see Appendix A; Part A). While the Check List has 24 scales, for the purposes of the present experiment subjects were scored only for the following: defensiveness, total number of adjectives checked, self-confidence, exhibitionism, succorance, abasement, and counselling readiness. These scales, in particular, were selected because it was believed a priori that they would provide a measure of self-evaluation relevant for this project. Test-retest reliability of these scales over a ten-week interval of time vary from a low of .50 for succorance to a high of .87 on the exhibition scale, with a mean of .71 and standard deviation of .12. Inter-group reliability of ten judges on five cases using all 24 scales were as follows: .70, .63, .61, .75, .61.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Victim and Nonvictim Subjects

	Victims*	Nonvictims*	
Variables	Frequency(%)	Frequency(%)	Chi Square**
Sex			.085
Male	40(40.4)	38(38.4)	
Female	59(59.6)	61(61.6)	
Age			2.15
17-18	57(57.6)	52(52.5)	
19-20	24(24.2)	33(33.3)	
21-over	18(18.2)	14(14.1)	
Marital Status			.521
Single	96(96.9)	94(94.9)	
Other	3(3.0)	5(5.0)	
Employment Status			.182
Employed	51(51.5)	48(48.5)	
Unemployed	48(48.5)	51(51.5)	

(table continues)

Table 1 continued

	Victims*	Nonvictims*	
Variables	Frequency(%)	Frequency(%)	Chi Square**
Residence			2.21
University Housing	7(7.1)	6(6.1)	
Single Family Dwelling	61(61.6)	57(57.6)	
Duplex	11(11.1)	9(9.1)	
Apartment(detached)	15(15.1)	23(23.2)	
Other	5(5.0)	4(4.0)	
Annual Personal Income Level			
Not Employed	39(39.4)	46(46.5)	
Under \$10,000	52(52.5)	43(43.4)	
10,000 to 19,999	4(4.0)	5(5.1)	
20,000 and above	3(3.0)	1(1.0)	
Don't Know	1(1.0)	4(4.0)	

* n = 99

** in no case was the Chi Square significant

Regarding test validity, it was found that the rank order of needs as assessed by the ACL correlated $+ .60$ with the ranking given by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. For a complete discussion of test validity and, in particular, the validity of the scales selected, the reader is referred to the Adjective Check List Manual (Gough & Heilburn, 1972, pp. 16-18).

2) The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL; Derogatis, Lipman, Rickles, Uhlenhuth, Covi, 1974) provides a self-report of the number and intensity of symptoms experienced by the subjects. The HSCL comprises 58 items which measure five dimensions of symptoms - somatization, obsessive-compulsive, interpersonal sensitivity, anxiety and depression, through ratings on a four-point scale (see Appendix A; Part B). Internal consistency for each of the dimensions range from $.84$ to $.87$ and test-retest reliabilities over a one week period range from $.75$ to $.84$. Interrater reliability ranges from $.64$ for depression to $.80$ for interpersonal sensitivity. Obsessive-compulsivity was excluded (a priori) as a measure of subject self-evaluation because it was not considered a pertinent measure.

3) Subjects then completed the Belief in a Just World Scale (Rubin & Peplau, 1975). This scale was designed as a measure of an individual's belief that their environment is

a just and orderly place where people usually receive what they deserve. The respondent is asked to indicate his or her degree of agreement or disagreement, on a six-point continuum, to 20 statements. A high internal consistency (coefficient alpha equal to .85) suggests the scale is tapping an underlying general belief that can be viewed as a single attitudinal continuum. Construct validity, as reported by Rubin and Peplau, appears to be adequate as does the scale's face validity (see appendix A; Part C).

4) Attribution style was assessed by using the scenarios employed by Janoff-Bulman (1979). All subjects were asked to read four scenarios and to imagine that the various situations described had actually been experienced by them (see Appendix A; Part D). Responses to five questions following each scenario assess locus of blame (self, other people, world, and chance), characterological self-blame, behavioral self-blame, deservingness, and avoidability. Reliability for "self" and "other people" attributions range from .50 to .60. The other measures, except avoidability, have reliabilities between .62 and .74. Because the reliability of the avoidability item fails to reach .50 it was not included.

Additional information about the subjects was collected in Part E of the questionnaire (see Appendix A). Part F was designed to gather information concerning the nature of the

victimization, perceptions of how others reacted to the crime, law enforcement officer response, etc.' All participants were requested to answer these questions, whether victim or nonvictim (see 'Procedure').

An open-ended section was included at the end of the questionnaire which gave all subjects the opportunity to express any comments they had (see Appendix A; Part G).

Procedure

Subjects were administered a questionnaire (see Appendix A). which was divided into parts A through G. All subjects completed parts A through E unaware they were participating in a study of victim self evaluations - the experimental sign-up booklets which were circulated to students were entitled 'Student Self-Evaluations' and all subjects were "run" within a three day period to minimize inter-student experimental sophistication.

Part F of the questionnaire contained questions pertaining to the nature of the victimization. It was completed by victims of crime who identified themselves as such by simply writing the letter "X" on the lower portion of the page. A crime was defined as "a violation against person or property". Non-victim subjects were requested to respond to the questions as they believed an actual victim would. The non-victims were asked to imagine a fictitious

scenario in which they were the victims of a crime and complete the sections which followed accordingly. This procedure was intended to protect victim anonymity inasmuch as all subjects would now complete the questionnaire in relatively similar periods of time (40 minutes) and thus avoid the situation in which nonvictims could be identified by the shorter time interval they required.

The questionnaire was administered to groups of approximately 50 students at a sitting. In a cover statement students were assured that all information provided by them would remain completely anonymous (see Appendix A). They were instructed to remain seated until the last person had finished answering the questions. At that time the experiment was fully explained and questions answered. Subjects were told that they could obtain research results upon request.

Results

Inter-Group Analyses

Comparison between victims and nonvictims on self-derogation and Just World Belief.

A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to compare the victims with the nonvictims on measures of self-evaluation, "just world" belief, income level, mobility, perception of health, fear of victimization, and attribution style. Data from 198 subjects, 99 victims and 99 nonvictims were included in the analysis. Nineteen subjects had missing data on one or more variables. In order that these observations be included in the MANOVA, values were assigned according to the following guideline: if a subject's quantitative score was missing he/she received the mean score of the other subjects in that group.

Eleven variables were combined to comprise a separate measure of self-evaluation in subsequent analyses; seven ACL scores including: defensiveness, total number of adjectives checked, self-confidence, exhibitionism, succorance, abasement, and counselling-readiness, and four HSCL scores: somatization, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, and anxiety.

While there was no significant main effect between

groups, $F(23, 174) = 1.24$, $p = .22$, univariate F-tests indicated significant differences between the groups on three discrete items. First, victimized subjects reported significantly greater distress arising from perceptions of bodily dysfunction such as cardiovascular, gastrointestinal, respiratory complaints, headaches, pain, and discomforts in musculature (all were symptoms of somatization) than did nonvictims, $F(1, 197) = 5.60$, $p < .05$. Second, results also indicated that victims were significantly more self-confident than the control group, $F(1, 197) = 6.42$, $p < .05$, and third, that they behave in such a way as to elicit the immediate attention of others (indicative of exhibitionism), $F(1, 197) = 5.26$, $p < .05$.

Contrary to the first hypothesis victims did not report significantly lower overall self-evaluations than the control group. In addition, no differences were found between the groups in their zeal and drive as measured by the number of items checked on the Adjective Checklist. Defensiveness, succorance, abasement, and counselling-readiness scores, also revealed no significant differences between victims and nonvictims. The groups were statistically similar in their attribution of blame (to self, other people, the environment, chance, character, behavior, and deservingness). No significant differences between the groups were found on the Hopkins Symptom

Checklist measures of interpersonal sensitivity, depression, and anxiety. Their income levels, permanence of residency, perceptions of their own health and the degree to which they fear becoming a victim of crime in their neighbourhoods also did not differ significantly. The group means and nonsignificant univariate F 's are reported in Appendix B.

The second hypothesis was sustained. Victim and nonvictim Just World scores did not significantly differ, $F(1, 197) = .10$, $p = .76$, $> .05$.

Intra-Group Analyses: Victims

Relationship between Just World Belief and self-derogation.

Victims ($n = 99$) reported a mean individual score on the Just World Scale of 3.63 indicating a slight tendency to accept the notion that the world is a just place. An analysis of variance was conducted comparing the self-evaluations of victims who reported a low belief in a just world (scored less than or equal to 3.50 on the Just World Scale, $n = 45$), and subjects who scored high on the scale (above 3.50, $n = 53$). The results were nonsignificant, $F(1, 98) = .37$, $p = .55$, i.e. $> .05$. Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to examine the relationship between victim belief in a just world and self-evaluation. The results, as shown in Table 2(a), indicate that the

scores on the HSCL which measure somatization, interpersonal sensitivity, and depression are significantly negatively correlated with subject Just World Scale scores. Self-evaluation, as an independent measure, was not related to belief in a just world. The third (directional) hypothesis was thus not supported by the data.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Relationship between recency of victimization and self-derogation.

Victims were assigned to three groups according to how recently they were victimized. An analysis of variance was conducted comparing the self-evaluations of victims who reported being victimized within one month ($n = 28$) with those victimized one to three months ($n = 38$) and as well those three to six months previously ($n = 25$). Results revealed no significant differences between the three groups, $F(1, 84) = .27$, $p = .76$, $> .05$.

Ninety three victims for whom data were complete were included in a correlational analysis of the relationship between the elapsed time of victimization and self-evaluation. Results reveal that no significant correlation exists between recency of victimization, ranging from one to twenty six weeks prior to experimental participation and

Table 2

Correlations Between Self-Evaluation Variables and (a)
Belief in a Just World and (b) Recency of Victimization

Self-Evaluation Variables	(a) Belief in a Just World	(b) Recency of Victimization
Number of Adjectives Checked	.09	-.18
Defensiveness	.16	.05
Self Confidence	-.05	.00
Exhibitionism	-.12	-.14
Succorance	.02	-.05
Abasement	.08	.02
Counselling Readiness	-.09	.02
Somatization	-.20*	.02
Interpersonal Sensitivity	-.21*	.09
Depression	-.28**	.14
Anxiety	-.19	.11
Self Evaluation (overall)	-.05	.10

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

test measures of self-evaluation, $r^2 = .10$, $p = .35$ (see Table 2(b)). In sum, contrary to the fourth hypothesis, the present findings do not indicate that the more recent the victimization the higher the victim self-derogation.

Relationship between crime seriousness and self-derogation.

The questionnaire included thirteen different types of crime. An "other" category was also included. Subjects who made multiple responses (checked off more than one crime) were assigned by the experimenter into one crime type category - generally the least serious of those selected. The various crimes and their frequency of occurrence are presented in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 About Here

The twelve crimes which victims reported having occurred were ranked and grouped according to degree of seriousness. Three groups were decided upon. Offences of a summary (least serious) nature, namely vandalism, traffic accidents, and theft under two hundred dollars comprised the first group ($n = 48$). Offences of a more serious nature which can be considered violations to one's person (break-enter and theft (under and over \$200.00), break and enter, and theft over two hundred dollars) made up the second group ($n = 25$). The most serious crimes (i.e. those most life-threatening)

Table 3

Types of Victimization and Frequency of Occurrence

Crime Categories	Frequency*	Percent
Traffic Accident	16	16.2
Theft under \$200.00	25	25.3
Vandalism	7	7.1
Theft over \$200.00	11	11.1
Break & Enter	4	4.0
Break & Enter & Theft	10	10.1
Utter (serious) Threats	4	4.0
Pursesnatch	1	1.0
Robbery (strongarm)	7	7.1
A.C.B.H.**	4	4.0
Common Assault	2	2.0
Sexual Assault	8	8.1

* \underline{n} = 99

** Assault Causing Bodily Harm

were the ones in which the victim and perpetrator had direct contact, ($n = 26$). This last category included the following offences: assault causing bodily harm (A.C.B.H.), common assault, robbery (strongarm), uttering serious threats, and sexual assault.

An analysis of variance was conducted which, contrary to the fifth hypothesis, revealed no significant differences between victim self-evaluations dependent on the seriousness of the offence, $F(2, 98) = 1.17$, $p = 3.1$, $> .05$. Ranked victim self evaluation score means for each crime are reported in Appendix C. Seriousness of offence and self evaluation are also not significantly correlated (Pearson correlation coefficient = $.11$, $p = .27$).

Relationship between attribution style and self-derogation.

A sign-test comparing the behavioral and characterological self-blame strategies of victims who possess a strong belief in a just world (median split at 3.65) and obtained a high self-evaluation score (median split at 360.3) was conducted. Results indicated that victims attribute self-blame to their behavior significantly more than to their character when the conditions specified above occur ($p < .05$), supporting the original hypothesis. However, univariate F-tests from a multivariate analysis of variance with victim self evaluation and Just World scores as independent variables

and the two self-blame strategies as dependent variables revealed that victims make both behavioral and characterological attributions significantly more if they have low rather than high self evaluations and this occurs across Just World scores, [(d.v. - behavioral, $F(1, 98) = 4.95, p < .05$)(d.v. - characterological, $F(1, 98) = 18.33, p < .0001$)].

Predictors of victim self-evaluation

Twenty eight variables were originally considered as factors which could have an influence on victim self-evaluations. Following a test for multicollinearity a stepwise backward multiple regression was conducted on the 11 remaining variables. Three distinct outliers, accounting for 6.1% of the total variance, were dropped from the final analysis. Results reveal that blaming other people, characterological attribution style, and victim gender are reliable predictors of victim self-evaluations, $F(3, 95) = 13.94, p = .0001$, accounting for 31.3% of the variance in scores.

The Victimization Experience - Observations

Self-reported reactions. Victims were asked to report how they felt as a result of their victimization. Referring to Table 4 it is apparent that anger was the most common

Insert Table 4 About Here

reaction. Other than anger, in decreasing frequency, victims reported that they were surprised, fearful, had cried or felt upset, were nervous, confused, and had experienced pain, sickness, and nausea.

Fate similarity. Subjects were asked to what extent they feared becoming a victim of crime in their area of the city. It was thought that perceived fate similarity may be a delimiting condition to self-derogation. Their answers were recorded on a four-point scale ranging from not at all on the lower end of the continuum to a great deal on the other. A "don't know" option was also available. Results are reported in Table 5. The mean score for victims

Insert Table 5 About Here

(\bar{M} = 2.57) is not significantly different than that of nonvictims (\bar{M} = 2.49) on fear of victimization (see Between Group Analysis). Results also reveal that there is no significant correlation between fear of victimization and self-evaluation scores (Pearson correlation coefficient = .10, p = .30).

Table 4

Self-Reported Reactions to Victimization

Victims*		
Type of Reaction	Frequency**	Percent
Not Upset	6	6.1
Anger/Outrage	67	67.7
Fear	33	33.3
Pain	10	10.1
Surprise	46	46.5
Confusion	23	23.2
Sick/Nauseous	9	9.1
Nervous	24	24.2
Crying/Upset	29	29.3
Don't Know/No Response	7	7.1
Other	7	7.1

* \underline{n} = 99

** Inasmuch as subjects could check more than one item -
the sum is greater than 99

Table 5

Self-Reported Degree of Fear of Becoming a Victim of Crime

Measures	Victims		Nonvictims	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
None / Not at All	10	10.1	10	10.1
Very Little	36	36.4	33	33.3
Somewhat	35	35.4	39	39.4
A Great Deal	15	15.1	8	8.1
Don't Know	3	3.0	2	2.0
Missing Data	0	0.0	7	7.1
Total	99	100%	99	100%

Discussion

The results indicate that, contrary to the hypotheses, victims and nonvictims have statistically similar self-evaluations. Furthermore victim self-evaluations do not significantly vary dependent on degree of belief in a "just world", recency of victimization, or seriousness of the crime. The data do support the hypothesis that victims who report both high Just World Scale Scores and positive self-evaluations are more likely to engage in behavioral rather than characterological self-blame. The hypothesis that victims and nonvictims possess relatively similar "just world" belief was sustained.

It is postulated the the experimental procedure may account, in part, for these results. Prior researchers of victimization have, for the most part, elected to engage in active solicitation of subjects and more often than not, subjects have been aware that they would be asked questions directly pertaining to their misfortune. Random selection, subject sophistication, and demand characteristics have not tended to receive due consideration, instead being sidelined by experimenter enthusiasm for a large university population.

In light of these criticisms, an effort was made in the present experiment to minimize these methodological oversights. However, it is recognized that the desire for

experimentally rigorous procedures may have been offset by the use of a student population for subjects - generalizability may be limited.

The impact that the design has had on the results is apparent if one compares subject self-evaluation scores before they became aware of the purpose of the questionnaire and the reactions victims reported having had experienced. The self-evaluation scores, in general, did not differ between victims and nonvictims and yet victims, when asked to reflect back on the experience, reported that they became emotional and had reactions indicative of self-derogation. It appears that when asked to reflect on their misfortune victims have a tendency to inflate the impact of the event.

The unusually high self-evaluation scores obtained by victims may also be explained by crisis theory. It has been suggested that victims pass through a variety of stages on the way to recovery (Bard, 1980). It is therefore plausible that the initial reaction of the subjects to their misfortune may have been traumatic but that at the time they participated in the study, they had sufficiently recovered from their trauma and were functioning relatively normally. Analysis revealed, however, that this is not the case. A significant difference in victim self-evaluations dependent on recency of victimization was not found. Of course there remains the possibility that full recovery was complete by

the end of one month - the cut-off time for the first and second time periods used in the analysis. Taylor et al. (1983) would concur inasmuch as they propose that relatively few people feel the effects of victimization for very long. Still, one cannot discount research presenting evidence to suggest emotional distress can last as long as twenty or more years after the victimization as in the case of incest (Wortman, 1983). The kind of crime and the individual who underwent the ordeal in addition to duration is important.

Belief in a "just world" did not prove to be a significant factor delimiting victim self-evaluations. Lerner and Miller's (1978) contention that the tendency of victims to accept the notion that the world is a just and orderly place should lead to low self-evaluations was not corroborated. Moreover, fate similarity could not account for this effect.

The results did support the hypothesis that behavioral attributions were made significantly more than characterological if both high BJW scores and self-evaluations were reported. However, a closer examination of the data revealed that it was self-blame, in general, which was the influential factor. Victims reported low self-evaluations if they make internal attributions (characterological or behavioral) and this occurred across Just World Scale scores. While behavioral self-blame proved

to be more beneficial to victim coping than its characterological counterpart, it appears that self-blame as an independent attribution style is detrimental and the distinction between its two components is not as meaningful as others have contended (Janoff-Bulman, 1979).

This is not surprising if one considers Meyer and Taylor's (1985) recent finding that behavioral and characterological self-blame were related to negative coping among their sample of rape victims. They concur, behavioral self-blame is not particularly adaptive and blaming oneself in general is detrimental. Similar results have been found by Miller and Porter (1983) and Gold (1984). Research on battered women, child abuse and later functioning revealed that attributions for negative events are made to both character and behavior. They suggest that these self-blame styles become blurred when we examine traumatic recurring events such as domestic violence and child abuse. The present research goes further and suggests that these findings may be generalizable to victims of a wider variety of crimes.

It is noteworthy that the results indicate gender, blaming other people, and characterological self-blame as being the three best predictor variables of victim self-evaluation. This finding does not diminish the impact of the previous finding that self-blame is the influential

factor as these three variables account for only 31.3% of the total variance in self-evaluation scores. Furthermore, self-blame was not included as a variable in the regression analysis because of its high intercorrelation with other variables.

The tendency of regression coefficients to change with different samples and numbers of independent variables has been well documented (Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973). Several replication studies utilizing a larger population of victims, perhaps three times the size of the present sample, with the inclusion of self-blame as a predictor variable, would be desirable to unravel the implications of the current multiple regression analysis results.

Everstine and Everstine (1983) reported that psychological trauma following victimization is associated with five factors; physical injury incurred, coping ability arising from past experiences, fear of being killed during the crime, knowledge of the offender's identity, and the location of the offence. On the other hand, Bard and Sangrey (1979) identified the following variables to be important predictors of victim well-being; degree of violation of self (crime seriousness), the capacity to deal with stress resulting from past experiences, and the availability and effectiveness of support systems. Both studies were similar in their finding that the ability to

cope based on past experiences is a crucial component of victim rehabilitation. An example given by Bard and Sangrey was that of a rape victim whose husband had died a year before the rape. The woman remarked that this incident had tempered the effects of the rape because the death had been an even greater crisis. We can assume she had learned from her prior crisis how to effectively deal with the more recent trauma. The results of the present study are similar in that they indicate that attribution strategies are important predictors of victim coping. This is not to imply that attributions styles are derived solely from past experiences. However, as Weiner (1985) states in a review of antecedents of goal expectancies and their relation to attributions, ".... all theorists would agree that past reinforcement history does play some important role" (p.555). Whether victims make attributions to their character, other people, or themselves in general, attributional strategies should be a primary consideration if we wish to have a greater understanding of victim self-derogation.

Univariate F-tests revealed that victims differ from the control group on three separate items; somatization, exhibitionism, and self-confidence. Caution should be exercised when interpreting this finding as the multivariate F was nonsignificant. The significantly higher self-

confidence and outgoingness of victims has not been reported in other research. Victimized subjects also reported a marked degree of distress arising from physiological complaints. It could be argued that this finding is attributable to error or peculiar to the population sampled. However, as a guide to future research it is plausible that, at least on a physiological level, victims were still experiencing dysfunction. Perhaps a type of reaction formation occurs whereby victims do not outwardly convey derogation effects but, in fact are overcompensating for a marked physiological, less apparent, reaction to their misfortune. It is possible that only when directly queried about their victimization will victims drop the mask of being "in control". Prior research has shown that when one confronts a victim and asks her/him how they are doing, and that person is aware that the purpose is to gather information on their well being, victims will report low self-evaluations.

The finding that increasing crime seriousness was not related to lower victim self-evaluations can be attributed to what amounts to individual differences in that there are varied interpretations of what constitutes a "crime" - what may be a terrorizing for one person may merely give another person a mild shock.

Concluding Comments

In 1979 Bard and Sangrey reported that many victims complained that the police officers showed little interest in what they had just experienced. Symonds (1975) also noted the seeming indifference law enforcement officers have towards a victim's plight. The informal observational results of the present study and Woytowich's research findings (1986) do not concur with this earlier work and are perhaps a reflection of the changing attitudes of police forces with respect to victims. Waller (1985) has noted that because the police are the agency first and most often contacted by victims of crime, they are pivotal. The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police has devoted at least two annual conferences to discuss ways the police can better respond to problems of victims and has established a committee to encourage such changes. In the city of Winnipeg these efforts may be having an effect. The current research findings reveal that victims' opinions on the manner of the police and how the police treated them are more positive than have been previously reported by Bard and Sangrey (1979) and Symonds (1975). While improvements may have been made, many more are necessary. As Zlotnick (1979) accurately points out, a victim who is calmer, more relaxed, and has received help overcoming the immediate effects of his/her trauma is better able to furnish descriptions of the

suspected perpetrator and provide more accurate accounts of their victimization. Training programs that ensure police officers are sensitive to the needs of victims and provide information and knowledge about the existing local services and programs available to victims can only be of benefit to all concerned (Waller, 1985).²

While the questionnaire used in this research yielded interesting results, it must be kept in mind that the sample of subjects was from a university undergraduate population and this presents some difficulties which have been previously addressed. Furthermore, it is recognized that this research is exploratory and improvement in the phrasing of some of the questions can always be made. Larger cell sizes across all crime categories resulting in a larger overall sample of crime victims would be beneficial if a replication study were to be conducted.

Finally it is also suggested that the study of Type A behavior patterns be incorporated into the design of future experiments in this area. Findings demonstrate that in experimentally induced failure situations Type A's initially try vigorously to regain control and failing that will give up (Rhodewalt & Davidson, 1983). This may have important implications in victimology research (Rhodewalt, 1984).

References

- Aderman, D., Brehm, S., & Katz, L.B. (1974). Empathic observation of an innocent victim: The just world revisited. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 342-347.
- Aronson, E., Carlsmith, J.M., & Darley, J.M. (1963). The effects of expectancy on volunteering for an unpleasant experience. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66, 220-224.
- Bard, M. (1980). The psychological impact of personal crime. In Emilio C. Viano (ed.), Victim/Witness Programs: Human Services in the 80's. Washington D.C.: Visage Press Inc.
- Bard, M. & Ellison, K.W. (1974). Crisis intervention & investigation of forcible rape. The Police Chief, May, 68-74.
- Bard, M. & Sangrey, D. (1979). Crime Victim's Book. New York: Basic Books.
- Barkas, J.L. (1978). Victims. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Beck, A.T. (1967). Depression: Clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bulman, R.J., & Wortman, C.B.. (1977). Attributions of blame and coping in the "real world": Severe accident victims and their lot. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 351-363.

- Burgess, A.W., & Holmstrom, L.L. (1974). Rape: victims of crisis. Bowie, Md.: Robert J. Brady Co..
- Burgess, A., & Holmstrom, L. (1979). Rape: sexual disruption and recovery. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 49 (4), 648-657.
- Caplan, G. (1964). Principles of Preventive Psychiatry. New York: Basic Books.
- Chaikin, A.L., & Darley, J.M. (1973). Victim or perpetrator: Defensive attribution of responsibility and the need for order and justice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25, 268-275.
- Chodoff, P., Friedman, S.B., & Hamburg, D.A. (1964). Stress, defenses and coping behavior: Observations in parents of children with malignant diseases. American Journal of Psychiatry, 120, 743-749.
- Comer, R., & Laird, J.D. (1975). Choosing to suffer as a consequence of expecting to suffer: Why do people do it? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 92-101.
- Derogatis, L., Lipman, R., Rickels, K., Uhlenhuth, E. & Covi, L. (1974). The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL): a self-report symptom inventory. Behavioral Science, 19, 1-15.
- Ellison, K.W., & Buckhout, R. (1981). Psychology and Criminal Justice New York: Harper & Row.

- Erikson, E.H. (1963). Childhood and Society: (2nd Ed.). New York: Norton.
- Erikson, K.T. (1976). Everything in Its Path: destruction of community in the Buffalo Creek flood. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Everstine, D. & Everstine, L. (1983). People in Crises: Strategic, Therapeutic Interventions. New York: Brunner / Mazel Inc.
- Foxman, J., & Radtke, R.C. (1970). Negative expectancy and the choice of an aversive task. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15, 253-257.
- Gibson, L., Linden, R., & Johnson, S. (1980). A situational theory of rape. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 22(1), 51-65.
- Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Gold, E. (1984). Long-term effects of sexual victimization in childhood: An attributional approach. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Manitoba.
- Gough, G.H., & Heilburn, A.B. Jr. (1972). The Adjective Check List Manual. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Hallie, P.O. (1971). Justification and rebellion. In N. Sanford and C. Comstock (Eds.), Sanctions for Evil. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Heider, F. (1958). The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1979). Characterological versus behavioral self-blame: inquires into depression and rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1798-1809.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. & Frieze, I.H. (1983). A theoretical perspective for understanding reactions to victimization. Journal of Social Issues, 39(2), 1-17.
- Jones, C., & Aronson, E. (1973). Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of respectability of the victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26 (3), 415-419.
- Kerlinger, F., & Pedhazur, E.J. (1973). Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kubler-Ross, E. (1969). On Death and Dying. New York: Macmillan.
- Landy, D., & Aronson, E. (1969). The influence of the character of the criminal and his victim on the decisions of simulated jurors. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 5, 141-152.
- Lefcourt, H. (1982). Locus of Control: current trends in theory and research (2nd Ed.) Hillside, N.J.: Erlbaum Associates.

- Lerner, M.J. (1965). Evaluation of performance as a function of performer's reward and attractiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 355-360.
- Lerner, M.J. (1970). The desire for justice and reactions to victims. In J. Macaulay & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), Altruism and Helping Behavior: social psychological studies of some antecedents and consequences. New York: Academic Press.
- Lerner, M.J. (1971). Justice, guilt, and vertical perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 20, 127-135.
- Lerner, M.J. (1974). Social Psychology of Justice and interpersonal attraction. In T. Huston (Ed.), Foundations of Interpersonal Attraction. New York: Academic Press.
- Lerner, M.J. (1977). The justice motive: some hypotheses as to its origins and forms. Journal of Personality, 45, 1-52.
- Lerner, M.J., & Lichtman, R.R. (1968). Effects of perceived norms on attitudes and altruistic behavior toward a dependent order. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9, 226-232..
- Lerner, M.J., & Matthews, G. (1967). Reactions to suffering of others under conditions of indirect responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 319-325.

- Lerner, M.J., & Miller, D.T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. Psychological Bulletin, 85 (5), 1030-1051.
- Lerner, M.J., Miller, D.T., & Holmes, J.G. (1976). Deserving and the emergence of forms of justice. In Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol.9). New York: Academic Press.
- Lerner, M.J., & Simmons, C.H. (1966). The observer's reaction to the "innocent victim": Compassion or rejection? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 203-210.
- Lindemann, E. (1944). Symptomatology and management of acute grief. American Journal of Psychiatry, 101, 141-148.
- Meyer, C.D. & Taylor, S.E. (1985). Adjustment to rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, (in press).
- Miller, D.T. & Porter, C.A. (1983). Self-Blame in victims of violence. Journal of Social Issues, 39, 139-152.
- Myrdal, G. (1962). An American Dilemma: The Negro problem and modern democracy. New York: Harper & Row.
- Pope, C.E. (1977). Crime-Specific Analysis: An Empirical Examination of Burglary Offense and Offender Characteristics, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice (LEAA),NILE/CJ.

- Rhodewalt, F. (1984). Self involvement, self attribution, and the Type A behavior pattern. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 662-670.
- Rhodewalt, F. & Davidson, J. (1983). Reactance and the coronary prone behavior pattern: The role of self attribution in responses to reduced behavioral freedom. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 220-228.
- Rosenman, S. (1956). The paradox of guilt in disaster victim populations. Psychiatric Quarterly Supplement, 30, 181-221.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, A. (1973). Belief in a just world and reaction to another's lot: A study of participants in the national draft lottery. Journal of Social Issues, 29 (4), 73-93.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, A. (1975). Who believes in a just world? Journal of Social Issues, 31 (3), 65-89.
- Ryan, W. (1971). Blaming the victim. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Seligman, M.E.P. (1975). Helplessness: on depression, development, and death. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.
- Sheehy, G. (1976). Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Simmons, C.W., & Pilavin, J.A. (1972). The effect of deception on reactions to a victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 21, 56-60.

- Sorrentino, R.M., & Boutilier, R.G. (1974). Evaluation of a victim as a function of fate similarity/dissimilarity. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 10, 84-93.
- Sorrentino, R.M., & Hardy, J. (1974). Religiousness and derogation of an innocent victim. Journal of Personality, 42, 372-382.
- Symonds, M. (1975). Victims of violence: Psychological effects and after effects. American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 35, 19-26.
- Sutherland, S., & Scherl, D. (1970). Patterns of response among rape victims. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 40, 503-511.
- Taylor, S.E., Wood, J.V. & Lichtman, R.R. (1983). It could be worse: Selective evaluation as a response to victimization. Journal of Social Issues, 39(2), 19-40.
- Waller, I. (1985). Stress after crime: Its nature and care. Background paper presented at the Crime Victims' Trauma Conference, Ottawa.
- Walster, E. (1966). Assignment of responsibility for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 73-79.
- Weiler, D., & Desgagne, J. (1984). Victims and Witnesses of Crime in Canada. Ottawa: Department of Justice (Minister of Supply and Services).

- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of motivation and emotion. Psychological Review, 92(4), 548-573.
- Wortman, C.B. (1983). Coping with victimization: conclusions and implications for future research. Journal of Social Issues, 39, 195-221.
- Woytowich, S.A. (1986). Victims of Robbery: a report on a Winnipeg Survey. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Simon Fraser University.
- Zlotnick, J. (1979). Victimology and crisis intervention training with police. Crisis Intervention, 10(1), 2-17.

Footnotes

- 1 Some of the data gathered in Part E of the questionnaire was intended for uses other than in this thesis.
- 2 The trend towards concern for crime victims is reflected in a recent announcement by the Manitoba Attorney General that a surtax be levied in lower courts in order to finance a monetary victim compensation program (Winnipeg Free Press, July, 1986)

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

Dear Participant:

We would like you to fill out this questionnaire. The research is being conducted as an investigation of student self-evaluations. Read the instructions preceding each part carefully and answer the questions truthfully to the best of your knowledge. Feel free not to fill out any particular questions which you may want to skip. Remember, do not ask for the help of others. It is important that only you complete the questionnaire. In addition, please proceed through the questionnaire one page at a time in numerical order. Do not jump back and forth from one section to another. As indicated, any information provided by you will remain completely anonymous.

Thank you for your cooperation.

PART A

DIRECTIONS: This section contains a list of adjectives. Please read them quickly and put an X on the line beside each one you would consider to be self-descriptive. Do not worry about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Work quickly and do not spend too much time on any one adjective. Try to be frank, and check those adjectives which describe you as you really are, not as you would like to be.

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1) absent-minded _____ | 2) active _____ | 3) adaptable _____ |
| 4) adventurous _____ | 5) affected _____ | 6) affectionate _____ |
| 7) aggressive _____ | 8) alert _____ | 9) aloof _____ |
| 10) ambitious _____ | 11) anxious _____ | 12) apathetic _____ |
| 13) appreciative _____ | 14) argumentative _____ | 15) arrogant _____ |
| 16) artistic _____ | 17) assertive _____ | 18) attractive _____ |
| 19) autocratic _____ | 20) awkward _____ | 21) bitter _____ |
| 22) blustery _____ | 23) boastful _____ | 24) bossy _____ |
| 25) calm _____ | 26) capable _____ | 27) careless _____ |
| 28) cautious _____ | 29) changeable _____ | 30) charming _____ |
| 31) cheerful _____ | 32) civilized _____ | 33) clear-thinking _____ |
| 34) clever _____ | 35) coarse _____ | 36) cold _____ |
| 37) commonplace _____ | 38) complaining _____ | 39) complicated _____ |
| 40) conceited _____ | 41) confident _____ | 42) confused _____ |
| 43) conscientious _____ | 44) conservative _____ | 45) considerate _____ |
| 46) contented _____ | 47) conventional _____ | 48) cool _____ |
| 49) cooperative _____ | 50) courageous _____ | 51) cowardly _____ |
| 52) cruel _____ | 53) curious _____ | 54) cynical _____ |
| 55) daring _____ | 56) deceitful _____ | 57) defensive _____ |
| 58) deliberate _____ | 59) demanding _____ | 60) dependable _____ |

- | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 61) dependent ____ | 62) despondent ____ | 63) determined ____ |
| 64) dignified ____ | 65) discreet ____ | 66) disorderly ____ |
| 67) dissatisfied ____ | 68) distractable ____ | 69) distrustful ____ |
| 70) dominant ____ | 71) dreamy ____ | 72) dull ____ |
| 73) easy going ____ | 74) effeminate ____ | 75) efficient ____ |
| 76) egotistical ____ | 77) emotional ____ | 78) energetic ____ |
| 79) enterprising ____ | 80) enthusiastic ____ | 81) evasive ____ |
| 82) excitable ____ | 83) fair-minded ____ | 84) fault-finding ____ |
| 85) fearful ____ | 86) feminine ____ | 87) fickle ____ |
| 88) flirtatious ____ | 89) foolish ____ | 90) forceful ____ |
| 91) foresighted ____ | 92) forgetful ____ | 93) forgiving ____ |
| 94) formal ____ | 95) frank ____ | 96) friendly ____ |
| 97) frivolous ____ | 98) fussy ____ | 99) generous ____ |
| 100) gentle ____ | 101) gloomy ____ | 102) good-looking ____ |
| 103) good-natured ____ | 104) greedy ____ | 105) handsome ____ |
| 106) hard-headed ____ | 107) hard-hearted ____ | 108) hasty ____ |
| 109) headstrong ____ | 110) healthy ____ | 111) helpful ____ |
| 112) high-strung ____ | 113) honest ____ | 114) hostile ____ |
| 115) humorous ____ | 116) hurried ____ | 117) idealistic ____ |
| 118) imaginative ____ | 119) immature ____ | 120) impatient ____ |
| 121) impulsive ____ | 122) independent ____ | 123) indifferent ____ |
| 124) individualistic ____ | 125) industrious ____ | 126) infantile ____ |
| 127) informal ____ | 128) ingenious ____ | 129) inhibited ____ |
| 130) initiative ____ | 131) insightful ____ | 132) intelligent ____ |
| 133) interests narrow ____ | 134) interests wide ____ | 135) intolerant ____ |
| 136) inventive ____ | 137) irresponsible ____ | 138) irritable ____ |

- | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 139) jolly ____ | 140) kind ____ | 141) lazy ____ |
| 142) leisurely ____ | 143) logical ____ | 144) loud ____ |
| 145) loyal ____ | 146) mannerly ____ | 147) masculine ____ |
| 148) mature ____ | 149) meek ____ | 150) methodical ____ |
| 151) mild ____ | 152) mischievous ____ | 153) moderate ____ |
| 154) modest ____ | 155) moody ____ | 156) nagging ____ |
| 157) natural ____ | 158) nervous ____ | 159) noisy ____ |
| 160) obliging ____ | 161) obnoxious ____ | 162) opinionated ____ |
| 163) opportunistic ____ | 164) optimistic ____ | 165) organized ____ |
| 166) original ____ | 167) outgoing ____ | 168) outspoken ____ |
| 169) painstaking ____ | 170) patient ____ | 171) peaceable ____ |
| 172) peculiar ____ | 173) persevering ____ | 174) persistent ____ |
| 175) pessimistic ____ | 176) planful ____ | 177) pleasant ____ |
| 178) pleasure-seeking ____ | 179) poised ____ | 180) polished ____ |
| 181) practical ____ | 182) praising ____ | 183) precise ____ |
| 184) prejudiced ____ | 185) preoccupied ____ | 186) progressive ____ |
| 187) prudish ____ | 188) quarrelsome ____ | 189) unusual ____ |
| 190) quick ____ | 191) quiet ____ | 192) quitting ____ |
| 193) rational ____ | 194) rattlebrained ____ | 195) realistic ____ |
| 196) reasonable ____ | 197) rebellious ____ | 198) reckless ____ |
| 199) reflective ____ | 200) relaxed ____ | 201) reliable ____ |
| 202) resentful ____ | 203) reserved ____ | 204) resourceful ____ |
| 205) responsible ____ | 206) restless ____ | 207) retiring ____ |
| 208) rigid ____ | 209) robust ____ | 210) rude ____ |
| 211) sarcastic ____ | 212) self-centered ____ | 213) self-confident ____ |
| 214) self-controlled ____ | 215) self-denying ____ | 216) self-pitying ____ |

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 217) self-punishing ____ | 218) self-seeking ____ | 219) selfish ____ |
| 220) sensitive ____ | 221) sentimental ____ | 222) serious ____ |
| 223) severe ____ | 224) sexy ____ | 225) shallow ____ |
| 226) sharp-witted ____ | 227) shiftless ____ | 228) show-off ____ |
| 229) shrewd ____ | 230) shy ____ | 231) silent ____ |
| 232) simple ____ | 233) sincere ____ | 234) slipshod ____ |
| 235) slow ____ | 236) sly ____ | 237) smug ____ |
| 238) snobbish ____ | 239) sociable ____ | 240) soft-hearted ____ |
| 241) sophisticated ____ | 242) spendthrift ____ | 243) spineless ____ |
| 244) spontaneous ____ | 245) spunky ____ | 246) stable ____ |
| 247) steady ____ | 248) stern ____ | 249) stingy ____ |
| 250) stolid ____ | 251) strong ____ | 252) stubborn ____ |
| 253) submissive ____ | 254) suggestible ____ | 255) sulky ____ |
| 256) superstitious ____ | 257) suspicious ____ | 258) sympathetic ____ |
| 259) tactful ____ | 260) tactless ____ | 261) talkative ____ |
| 262) temperamental ____ | 263) tense ____ | 264) thankless ____ |
| 265) thorough ____ | 266) thoughtful ____ | 267) thrifty ____ |
| 268) timid ____ | 269) tolerant ____ | 270) touchy ____ |
| 271) tough ____ | 272) trusting ____ | 273) unaffected ____ |
| 274) unambitious ____ | 275) unassuming ____ | 276) unconventional ____ |
| 277) undependable ____ | 278) understanding ____ | 279) unemotional ____ |
| 280) unexcitable ____ | 281) unfriendly ____ | 282) uninhibited ____ |
| 283) unintelligent ____ | 284) unkind ____ | 285) unrealistic ____ |
| 286) unscrupulous ____ | 287) unselfish ____ | 288) unstable ____ |
| 289) vindictive ____ | 290) versatile ____ | 291) warm ____ |
| 292) wary ____ | 293) weak ____ | 294) whinny ____ |

295) wholesome _____

296) wise _____

297) withdrawn _____

298) witty _____

299) worrying _____

300) zany _____

PART B

Below is a list of problems and complaints that people sometimes have. Read each one carefully, and select the response that best describes HOW MUCH DISCOMFORT THAT PROBLEM HAS CAUSED YOU DURING THE PAST WEEK INCLUDING TODAY. Circle the appropriate number to the right of the problem using the code below. Do not skip any items.

- 1 = not at all
2 = a little bit
3 = quite a bit
4 = extreme

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Headaches..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Nervousness or shakiness inside..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Repeated unpleasant thoughts that won't leave your mind..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Faintness or dizziness..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Loss of sexual interest or pleasure..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Feeling critical of others..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Bad dreams..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Difficulty speaking when you are excited..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Trouble remembering things..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. Worried about sloppiness or carelessness..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. Feeling easily annoyed or irritated..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. Pains in the heart or chest..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. Itching..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. Feeling low in energy or slowed down..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. Thoughts of ending your life..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. Sweating..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17. Trembling..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18. Feeling confused..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

19. Poor appetite.....	1	2	3	4
20. Crying easily.....	1	2	3	4
21. Feeling shy or uneasy with the opposite sex.....	1	2	3	4
22. Feelings of being trapped or caught.....	1	2	3	4
23. Suddenly scared for no reason.....	1	2	3	4
24. Temper outbursts that you could not control.....	1	2	3	4
25. Constipation.....	1	2	3	4
26. Blaming yourself for things.....	1	2	3	4
27. Pains in lower back.....	1	2	3	4
28. Feeling blocked in getting things done.....	1	2	3	4
29. Feeling lonely.....	1	2	3	4
30. Feeling blue.....	1	2	3	4
31. Worrying too much about things.....	1	2	3	4
32. Feeling no interest in things.....	1	2	3	4
33. Feeling fearful.....	1	2	3	4
34. Your feelings being easily hurt.....	1	2	3	4
35. Having to ask others what you should do.....	1	2	3	4
36. Feeling that others do not understand you or are unsympathetic.....	1	2	3	4
37. Feeling that others are unfriendly or dislike you.....	1	2	3	4
38. Having to do things very slowly to insure correctness.....	1	2	3	4
39. Heart pounding or racing.....	1	2	3	4
40. Nausea or upset stomach.....	1	2	3	4
41. Feeling inferior to others.....	1	2	3	4
42. Soreness of your muscles.....	1	2	3	4
43. Loose bowel movements.....	1	2	3	4

44. Trouble falling asleep or staying asleep.....	1	2	3	4
45. Having to check and double check what you are doing.....	1	2	3	4
46. Difficulty making decisions.....	1	2	3	4
47. Wanting to be alone.....	1	2	3	4
48. Trouble getting your breath.....	1	2	3	4
49. Hot or cold spells.....	1	2	3	4
50. Having to avoid certain things, places, or activities because they frighten you.....	1	2	3	4
51. Your mind going blank.....	1	2	3	4
52. Numbness or tingling in parts of your body.....	1	2	3	4
53. A lump in your throat.....	1	2	3	4
54. Feeling hopeless about the future.....	1	2	3	4
55. Trouble concentrating.....	1	2	3	4
56. Feeling weak in parts of your body.....	1	2	3	4
57. Feeling tense or keyed up.....	1	2	3	4
58. Heavy feeling in your arms or legs.....	1	2	3	4

--- Continue to Next Section ---

PART C

Below is a list of statements. Read each one separately and indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with that statement in the space provided.

1. I've found that a person rarely deserves the reputation he has.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
2. Basically, the world is a just place.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
3. People who get "lucky breaks" have usually earned their good fortune.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
4. Careful drivers are just as likely to get hurt in traffic accidents as careless ones.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
5. It is a common occurrence for a guilty person to get off free in Canadian courts.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
6. Students almost always deserve the grades they receive in school.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
7. Men who keep in shape have little chance of suffering a heart attack.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
8. The political candidate who sticks up for his principles rarely gets elected.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
9. It is rare for an innocent man to be wrongly sent to jail.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
10. In professional sports, many fouls and infractions never get called by the referee.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree

11. By and large, people deserve what they get.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
12. When parents punish their children, it is almost always for good reasons.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
13. Good deeds often go unnoticed and unrewarded.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
14. Although evil men may hold political power for awhile, in the general course of history good wins out.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
15. In almost any business or profession, people who do their job well rise to the top.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
16. Canadian parents tend to overlook the things most to be admired in their children.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
17. It is often impossible for a person to receive a fair trial in Canada.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
18. People who meet with misfortune have often brought it on themselves.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
19. Crime doesn't pay.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree
20. Many people suffer through absolutely no fault of their own.
agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 disagree

--- continue to next section ---

PART D

Please read each of the following four scenarios and imagine that the situation described actually happened to you, then answer the four questions that follow each situation.

1. You are driving to the store with a friend of yours in the passenger seat. It is wintertime and although it hasn't snowed in almost two weeks, the sides of the street are still piled high with snow from previous storms. You get to an intersection which has no stop sign on either corner. Because of the snow it is hard to see around the corner, so you look up and down the street and then step on the accelerator. As you get to the middle of the intersection, you see another car heading straight for your car. It's too late; you can't stop. Your car is hit and your friend is badly hurt.

		not at							complete
		all							ly
a) Given what happened, how much do you blame:									
yourself.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
other people.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
the environment (the impersonal world)...	0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
chance.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
b) Given what happened, how do you blame yourself for being the kind of person who gets in an accident?.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
c) Given what happened, how much do you blame yourself for your driving behavior?.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
d) How much do you think you deserved what happened?.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
2. You meet a new "friend" at a party, and you think the two of you hit it off fairly well. You spend much of the evening talking to each other. When you leave you tell yourself you would like to stay in touch with this person, although you make no definite plans to do so. A week later there is a show in town; your parents have two tickets but can't make it, so they give them to you. You call your new "friend" who seems happy to hear from you, but who claims that she/he is busy the night of the show. You express your regrets and go off to the show with another friend. The next day you find out that your new "friend" really did not have prior plans as claimed. You can't help but wonder why he/she didn't want to go with you to the show.

- | | | not at | | | | | complete |
|--|---|--------|---|---|---|---|----------|
| | | all | | | | | ly |
| a) Given what happened, how much do you blame: | | | | | | | |
| yourself.....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| other people.....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| the environment (the impersonal world)....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| chance.....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| b) Given what happened, how much do you blame yourself for being the kind of person who has invitations turned down?....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| c) Given what happened, how much do you blame yourself for how you acted when you first met the person?.....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| d) How much do you think you deserved what happened?.....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| 3. Your roommate is out and her/his boyfriend/girlfriend calls. He/She leaves a message as to his/her whereabouts and asks you to have your roommate call him/her when she/he gets in. It is urgent that she/he call as soon as possible. Although there is a lot of commotion on both ends of the phone, you get the number down and give your roommate the message. She/He tries to get through, but the line is busy; when she/he finally does get through, she/he finds that the number you gave is the wrong number. There is no other way for your roommate to get in touch with her/his boyfriend/girlfriend. | | | | | | | |
| a) Given what happened, how much do you blame: | | | | | | | |
| yourself.....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| other people.....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| the environment (the impersonal world)....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| chance.....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| b) Given what happened, how much do you blame yourself for being the kind of person who causes inconveniences for others?.....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| c) Given what happened, how much do you blame yourself for how you acted when taking down the telephone number?.....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| d) How much do you think you deserved what happened?.....0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |

4. You are involved in an intense love relationship that lasts about two years. Your relationship has "normal" ups and downs, but you still care very much about this person. Out of the blue, it seems, your boyfriend/girlfriend leaves you and immediately becomes involved with another person. You are alone and miss him/her terribly because, despite the problems, you still love him/her very much.

	not at		complete-			
	all		ly			
a) Given what happened, how much do you blame:						
yourself.....0	1	2	3	4	5	6
other people.....0	1	2	3	4	5	6
the environment (the impersonal world)....0	1	2	3	4	5	6
chance.....0	1	2	3	4	5	6
b) Given what happened, how much do you blame yourself for being the kind of person who is rejected in relationships?...0	1	2	3	4	5	6
c) Given what happened, how much do you blame yourself for how you acted with your boyfriend/girlfriend?.....0	1	2	3	4	5	6
d) How much do you think you deserved what happened?.....0	1	2	3	4	5	6

--- Continue to Next Section ---

PART E

Please answer the following questions.

- 1) Age: _____
- 2) Sex (circle one): male / female
- 3) Present marital status (circle one answer number):
 - 1) single
 - 2) married
 - 3) separated or divorced
 - 4) widowed
 - 5) common law
- 4) How many people (if any) do you presently live with: _____
 Indicate your relationship with that/those person(s):
 - a) relative(s) (specify) _____
 - b) boarder
 - c) roommate
 - d) house guest
- 5) Are you currently employed (full-time or part-time) while attending University:

YES / NO
- 6) If YES what is your present occupation and if you have a spouse and he/she is working their occupation:
 self: _____ spouse: _____
- 7) What is your annual income and your spouse's annual income (if applicable) before taxes:

self	spouse	
0	0	not employed
1	1	less than \$10,000
2	2	\$10,000 to \$19,999
3	3	\$20,000 to \$29,999
4	4	\$30,000 to \$39,999
5	5	\$40,000 to \$49,999
6	6	\$50,000 and over
7	7	don't know
- 8) How would you describe your present physical health:

a) very poor b) poor c) fair d) good e) very good
- 9) In what type of building do you reside (circle one answer

number):

- 1) University Residence
- 2) single family dwelling
- 3) duplex
- 4) apartment (detached, above business, garage
other house, etc.)
- 5) apartment complex
- 6) condominium
- 7) other (please specify) _____

10) How long have you lived at your present address: _____

PART F

At this point we would like you to think carefully about the following question:

Have you been the victim of a crime sometime within the last six months?

By a "crime" we mean a violation against person or property. You may not have necessarily reported the crime to the police or told anyone else that you were a victim. If you think that the answer to the question above is YES then write the letter 'X' on the bottom right hand corner of this page and proceed with this section answering the questions truthfully to the best of your knowledge. The information you will be providing will be used to help mental health and social researchers gain valuable insights into victim response to crime. Once again we remind you that the information provided by you will remain in the strictest confidence and your identity will be anonymous.

If your answer is NO we would like you to respond to the questions which follow as you perceive an actual crime victim would do. Imagine a fictitious scenario in which you were the victim of a crime and complete this section accordingly.

If you have been the victim of more than one crime within the last six months think back to the crime which you now consider to have had the more/most grievous effect upon you, write the letter 'Y' on the bottom left hand corner of this page and proceed to answer the questions which follow in this section. Please remain seated and quiet until the last person has completed the questionnaire.

- 11) What was the nature of the crime (if applicable you may check off more than one):

☐ Theft under \$200.00
☐ Theft over \$200.00
☐ Fraud
☐ Traffic Accident
☐ Pursesnatch
☐ Break and Enter
☐ Common Assault
☐ Robbery
☐ Assault Causing Bodily Harm
☐ Arson
☐ Abduction
☐ Sexual Assault
☐ Attempt Murder
☐ Other (specify) _____

- 12) Did you live at your present address when you were a victim of crime:

YES / NO

- 13) If NO where did you reside: _____

- 14) How long ago were you the victim of a crime (in weeks): _____

- 15) Were you the primary victim or were others also victimized and if so how many and what was their relationship to you:

a) primary b) others (list) _____

- 16) Did you suffer any personal physical injury: YES / NO

a) If YES: what was the nature of the injury: _____

b) Did you receive any medical attention: YES / NO

c) What was the nature of the treatment: _____

d) Did you try to protect yourself: YES / NO

e) If YES: what measures did you take: _____

f) If YES: were your efforts successful:

YES / NO

17) if any articles were stolen or damaged as a result of the incident what was their approximate value:

- 1 under \$200.00
- 2 \$200.00 to \$299.99
- 3 \$300.00 to \$599.99
- 4 \$600.00 to \$999.99
- 5 \$1,000.00 to \$1,999.99
- 6 \$2,000.00 to \$4,999.99
- 7 \$5,000.00 to \$9,999.99
- 8 \$10,000.00 to \$19,999.99
- 9 over \$20,000.00

18) Did your insurance company cover you against what happened:

a) No b) partly c) fully d) don't know

19) Did you receive any assistance from Crime Injuries Compensation:

YES / NO

20) If you were working when the crime occurred and were injured as a result did you collect Workman's Compensation:

YES / NO

21) If articles were stolen have some or all of them been recovered:

a) some b) all c) none

22) Did you contact the police: YES / NO

23) Has anyone, to the best of your knowledge, been arrested in connection with the offence:

YES / NO

a) If YES: did you know the accused: YES / NO

b) If YES: what was their relationship to you: _____

c) On the scale below how would you describe your feelings towards that/those individual(s) before you were victimized:

Hatred 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Love

d) On the scale below how would you describe your present feelings toward that/those individual(s):

Hatred 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Love

- 24) If someone was arrested were you or will you be required to testify against that/those individual(s) in court:

YES / NO

- 25) If you have appeared in court as a witness how would you describe the experience (not the outcome):

extremely upsetting/
unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very rewarding/
favourable

- 26) Have you been the victim of a crime more than once in your lifetime other than in the last six months:

YES / NO

- a) if "yes", how many times: _____

- b) What was the nature of the offence(s): _____

- b) How many times have you not reported a crime to the police:

- c) What was the major reason for not reporting the incident(s):

- 27) Have you ever committed a crime against another person or property for which you have been charged at some time in your life;

YES / NO

- a) If YES: how many times have you been charged:

- b) What was the nature of the offence(s): _____

- 28) To what extent do you fear becoming a victim of crime in your area of the city?

- a) none
- b) very little
- c) somewhat
- d) a great deal
- e) don't know

- 29) We are interested in your perception of how others reacted to your victimization (that is, if you told anyone). Please tick off any number of responses listed below and indicate in the space provided whose reaction (e.g. mother, friend, priest) you are referring to. A reaction may have been experienced by more than one individual. ex: X disgust: mother, brother

_____ anger: _____
 _____ surprise: _____
 _____ disinterest: _____
 _____ confusion: _____
 _____ nervous: _____
 _____ joy: _____
 _____ upset: _____
 _____ overly concerned: _____
 _____ disgust: _____
 _____ vengeful: _____
 _____ guilt: _____
 _____ concern: _____
 _____ distrusting: _____
 _____ unbelieving: _____
 _____ uncaring: _____
 _____ other (specify): _____
 _____ other (specify): _____

- 30) People tell us a lot of different things about how they feel when they are victims of a crime. Would you please tell us how you feel as a result of what happened to you: (you may circle any number of letter answers)

a) not upset/ not bothered	g) sick/ nauseous
b) anger/ outrage	h) nervous
c) fear	i) crying/ upset
d) pain	j) other (specify) _____
e) surprise	
f) confusion	k) don't know

- 31) If you reported the incident to the police, upon their arrival did you receive any help from them in dealing with these feelings

YES / NO

- 32) Did the police officers who came to your home tell you about the Victim Services program:

YES / NO

- 33) Did the police officers give you any advice on crime prevention:

YES / NO

34) How would you rate the following aspects of the investigation on the scale shown below:

- 1 - very disappointing
- 2 - a little disappointing
- 3 - as expected
- 4 - a little better than expected
- 5 - much better than expected

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) The manner of the police officers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b) The advice given on crime prevention | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c) The information given about what was happening and what was going to happen | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d) The thoroughness of the investigation as far as you could tell | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

35) If you were to be a victim of crime again, which of the following would you like to see from the police: (rank them from 1 (would most like to see) to 5 (is not as important))

- | | |
|---|-------|
| a) provide more information | _____ |
| b) provide more advice on crime prevention | _____ |
| c) conduct a more thorough investigation | _____ |
| d) have a better manner | _____ |
| e) provide more information about Victim Services | _____ |

36) Overall, how satisfied are you with the way the Police conducted their investigation:

- a) very satisfied
- b) fairly satisfied
- c) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- d) fairly dissatisfied
- e) very dissatisfied

37) Overall, how satisfied are you with the way the Police treated you as a person:

- a) very satisfied
- b) fairly satisfied
- c) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- d) fairly dissatisfied
- e) very dissatisfied

38) Thinking of the police in general, can you tell us whether you

- 1 - Strongly agree
- 2 - Agree
- 3 - Neither agree not disagree
- 4 - Disagree
- 5 - Strongly Disagree

- with the following statements:

a) "The Police are not as helpful to people like me as they are to others"

1 2 3 4 5

b) "It is not the job of the police to comfort the victims of crime"

1 2 3 4 5

c) "The police catch as many criminals as can be expected"

1 2 3 4 5

PART G

At this point we would like to give you the opportunity to include any remarks you may have concerning your recent victimization that you feel may be important. In general terms remark on any adverse effects you may have felt as a result of your misfortune that this questionnaire failed to address. Also if you have any other comments please feel free to express them. If you do not have enough space you may write on the back of this page. Once again thank you for your cooperation and time spent filling out the questionnaire. If you have any questions, we would be happy to answer them for you.

APPENDIX B

Nonsignificant Univariate F's

Means and Nonsignificant Univariate F's from Multivariate Analysis of Variance between Victims and Nonvictims (N=198)

Variables	Means		
	Victims	Nonvictims	F(1, 197)
Self-Evaluation (overall)	357.6	364.8	1.77
ACL Measures			
No. of Adjectives Checked	44.2	42.8	0.48
Defensiveness	45.9	46.6	0.26
Succorance	51.3	49.3	2.13
Abasement	45.3	47.3	2.41
Counselling Readiness	51.2	51.9	0.23
HSCL Measures			
Interpersonal Sensitivity	1.91	1.79	1.99
Depression	1.85	1.72	2.57
Anxiety	1.70	1.59	2.29
Attribution Style			
Self Blame	3.37	3.17	1.77
Other People	3.05	2.84	1.76
The Environment	2.29	2.16	0.60
Chance	1.96	1.97	0.00
Characterological	2.65	2.35	2.73
Behavioral	2.98	2.74	1.89

Appendix B continued

Means			
Variables	Victims	Nonvictims	F(1, 197)
Attribution Style			
Deservingness	1.63	1.58	0.11
Personal Income Level	0.72	0.58	1.58
Mobility (in months)	93.7	86.2	0.39
Perception of Health	4.02	4.16	1.68
Fear of Victimization	2.57	2.49	0.47
Belief in a Just World	3.63	3.65	0.10

APPENDIX C

Victim Self-Evaluation Means

Ranked Mean Victim Self-Evaluation Scores* by Crime

Crime Category**	Frequency	Mean
Vandalism	7	340.82
Traffic Accident	16	350.67
Theft Over \$200.00	11	350.71
Assault Causing Bodily Harm	4	353.35
Sexual Assault	8	354.05
Theft Under \$200.00	25	356.71
Robbery (strongarm)	7	356.82
Break & Enter & Theft	10	357.42
Break and Enter	4	383.16
Utter (serious) Threats	4	397.71

Standard Deviation = 33.8

* Mean scores and self-evaluation are inversely related

** Pursesnatch and Common Assault were excluded because of the appreciably small sample sizes