LaMar, Ansley Wilton

SOME DETERMINANTS OF ALTRUISM TOWARDS MEMBERS OF STIGMATIZED GROUPS

City University of New York Ph.D. 1980

SOME DETERMINANTS OF ALTRUISM TOWARDS MEMBERS OF STIGMATIZED GROUPS

By

Ansley W. LaMar

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York
1980

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology (Social-Personality) in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Sept 10, 1980
(Date)

Irwin Katz
Chairman of Examining Committee

September 10, 1980
(Date)

Martin L. Hoffman
Executive Officer

Irwin Katz

Florence Denmark

Anderson J. Franklin
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted at a northeastern urban public college to investigate the effects of belief in a just world (high vs. low); social support (weak vs. strong); and disability status of a child needing tutoring (physically handicapped vs. normal) on altruism. The relation between personal norm for helping and actual commitment to help was also examined. The Rubin & Peplau (1975, 1973) Belief in a Just World scale and an item designed to measure an individual's personal norm for helping was administered to two hundred and ten college students in various psychology classes by their instructors. Approximately one week later, a white female confederate attempted to recruit volunteer tutors from each of these classes by reading a prepared script. The disability status and social support manipulations were embedded in the script. In the Physically Handicapped condition, the subjects were told that the children who needed tutoring were " . . . handicapped kids of normal intelligence . . . kids who have muscular dystrophy, rheumatic heart disorder, and various physical deformities. They all need to use a wheelchair or crutches." There were no references made concerning the physical condition of the child in the Normal condition.

In the Weak Social Support condition the subjects were told that their college "is the only college in Hudson County where some students expressed enough interest to make it worthwhile to set up the (tutorial) program." In the Strong Social Support condition, the subjects were told that "students in Hudson County have expressed a lot of interest, so that several colleges in the area are participating in the program." Belief

in a just world was varied by determining the median score and considering those above the median as having a high belief in a just world and those below the median as having a low belief in a just world.

To measure altruism the confederate circulated a pledge form and asked the students to indicate how many hours they would be willing to volunteer as tutors. Analysis of the data indicated that (a) there was an interaction effect of belief in a just world and social support on the proportion of subjects who volunteered with the highest proportion volunteering in the Strong Social Support/Low Belief condition; (b) the amount of time volunteered was greatest in the Strong Social Support/Low Belief condition; (c) there was a nonsignificant tendency for more time to be volunteered to tutor the physically handicapped child than the normal child; (d) personal norm for helping was associated with the actual commitment to help; (e) belief in a just world was negatively correlated with helping in the Normal/Strong Social Support condition, and (f) belief in a just world was negatively correlated with helping in the Strong Social Support condition. The results are discussed with reference to relevant earlier studies. Suggestions are made for a subsequent study.

To

Oba and Zenya

My nephew and niece

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As I approach the end of my "career" as a graduate student, I would like to thank those individuals who helped me along the way. Especially those who helped me complete my dissertation.

I wish to especially thank Professor Irwin Katz, my friend, mentor, and academic advisor. His patience and freely given assistance helped make graduate school an important and meaningful experience for me.

I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee, Professor Florence Denmark and Professor Anderson J. Franklin. Professor Denmark was the person who told me I should apply to Graduate School of CUNY. Professor Franklin has shown me that rigorous scholarship and love of one's community can, indeed, go together.

I thank Professor Curtis Thomsen and my other colleagues in the Psychology Department of Jersey City State College. Their interest in my work and unselfish cooperation helped to make my work easier.

An especially warm and loving thank you goes to Ralph Ricci, Dan Roth and all my friends at group. Without their love and involvement, I would probably still be working on incompletes.

A true friend at the Graduate Center has been Mr. Dean K. Harrison. His constantly open office was always a place of reassurance and support.

Special thanks go to my dear sister, Maudeena C. LaMar, who unselfishly typed, retyped, and retyped my dissertation.

And finally a thank you to my confederates Joanne Brett, Heather Gilliard, and Judith DeTore. They were always there when I needed them.

God bless you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Statement of the Problem

Within the last decade social scientists have begun to concern themselves with prosocial behavior. Psychologists, for example, have isolated a myriad of situational and dispositional variables that influence the rate of helping a normal individual (see review by Krebs, 1970; for example). Unfortunately, however, there has been relatively little research on the determinants of altruism toward the physically handicapped. Furthermore, the investigations that have been conducted yielded inconsistent results. For example, some studies have found that visibly disabled help-seekers received less assistance from strangers than did their physically normal counterparts (e.g., Pomazal & Clore, 1973; Piliavin, Piliavin & Rodin, 1975); whereas other studies have reported more aid being given to handicapped than to normal help-seekers (e.g., Dobb & Ecker, 1970; Levitt & Kornhaber, 1977).

The apparent inconsistency of previous results on helping the handicapped seems to be due to the presence of different situational factors (e.g., the type of physical handicap) and the different measures of altruism used in the various experiments. Indeed, few attempts have been made to specify the factors that determine the strength of altruistic responses to disabled people. Based on a review of the literature on helping behavior and reactions toward the physically handicapped, two factors emerge that seemed to be of special relevance: (a) the level of social support for a given altruistic action, and (b) the strength of the potential helper's justice motive (need to believe in a just world). A third factor perhaps of somewhat less interest, was the strength of the potential helper's personal norm for engaging in a particular

altrusitic act. The purpose of the present research is to investigate the separate and combined effects of these variables on the willingness of nondisabled college students to aid disabled children. Before describing this research the background literature will be reviewed.

Reactions Towards Stigmatized People

General Reactions to the Physically Handicapped

To begin with, a study conducted by Richardson, Hastorf, Goodman & Dornsbuch (1961), which used children as subjects and another by Tringo (1970), which used teenagers and young adults, established the fact that normal people have a relatively stable preference order for people with different types of disabilities. Richardson et al., demonstrated that there is uniformity in elementary school children's preferences for people with different types of physical handicaps by presenting individual subjects with six pictures of a young child with various types of handicaps. The order of preference for these pictures was: first, nonhandicapped; second, wearing a leg brace; third, in a wheelchair; fourth, the left hand missing; fifth, a facial disfigurement; and sixth, obesity. Tringo presented his subjects with a list of twenty-one different disabilities, and used a modified version of the Bogardus (1923) social distance scale to determine the closest relationship they would be willing to have with a person with each particular disability. Analysis of the data revealed that the preference order amongst the groups, high school students, college students and college graduates, was remarkably stable. Because of studies conducted by Kleck and his associates (Kleck, 1966; Kleck, 1968; Kleck, Buck, Goller, London, Pfeiffer & Vukcevic 1968; Kleck, Ono & Hastorf, 1966), it can be assumed that the rank of each disability was influenced by the relative discomfort it aroused in the subject. Kleck (1966), for example, found that nondisabled people report

less emotional comfort when interacting with a physically disabled individual. Kleck, Buck, goller, London, Pfeiffer & Vukcevik (1968) went on to demonstrate, using a modified Levinger figure-placement task (Levinger & Gumner, 1967) as well as actual measures of interpersonal distance, that sigmatizing traits result in greater personal distance between the stigmatized and normal person. In the first study it was found that male college students placed a figure representing their "self" further from a figure representing a stigmatized person, e.g., Negroes, amputees, etc., than from affectively positive persons, e.g., good friend, liked professor, etc. In the second study, Kleck et al. observed that their subjects, white male psychology students, sat further away from a confederate who was said to be epileptic than they did from a normal confederate. Kleck et al. reasoned that the felt discomfort was translated into a tendency for the nonstigmatized person to utilize a greater interaction distance between himself and a stigmatized person than between himself and a normal person. Despite the outcome of these studies there is some evidence that nondisabled people also have positive or, at the least, sympathetic reactions toward the disabled.

Kleck (1968) and his associates (Kleck, Ono, & Hastorf, 1966) found that along with feelings of discomfort there is an ateempt by normal adults to respond in a friendly manner toward physically handicapped individuals. Normal adults when interviewed by either a nonhandicapped adult or a handicapped adult tended to evaluate the latter more favorably and exerted greater efforts to agree with his assumed opinions. These subjects, however, while appearing friendly revealed their discomfort by being more motorically inhibited when interacting with the handicapped interviewer.

Normal adults have conflicting reactions toward the physically

handicapped. They rate themselves as being relatively uncomfortable when interacting with a physically handicapped individual and reveal this discomfort by assuming greater interpersonal distances and by suppressing their natural physical activity. Yet they evaluate a disabled person more favorably than a nondisabled person and agree more with the opinions of a disabled person than with the opinions of a nondisabled person. The nonhandicapped individual's conflicted reactions to the physically handicapped person is further manifested in the studies which have investigated altruism toward the physically handicapped.

Altruism Toward the Physically Handicapped

The literature that concerns itself with the effects of physical stigma on altruism has many contradictory results. Doob & Ecker (1970) did a study to determine whether nonstigmatized people feel an approach-avoidance conflict when accosted by a stigmatized person requesting help. They had a female confederate with or without an eyepatch over her eye ask a sample of housewives to fill out a 79-item questionnaire and return it through the mail. Another group of housewives were asked to participate in a 15-20 minute interview. Analysis of the data revealed that in the interview condition the presence of an eyepatch did not influence the subject's willingness to help the confederate. It was found, however, that in the questionnaire condition the presence of an eyepatch elicited substantially more helping than its absence.

Levitt & Kornhaber (1977), in a replication of the Doob & Ecker (1970) study, varied the perceived permanence of the handicap and the sex of the subject and obtainedd similar results. In their study, a female confederate (a) was wearing a metal orthopedic brace and using crutches

(permanent handicap condition), (b) had a white cast on her leg and was using crutches (temporary handicap condition), or (c) appeared to be nondisabled. She approached male and female pedestrians on New York City streets and asked them for change. Both the permanent and temporary handicap conditions elicited more helping behavior than the normal condition. Baker & Reitz (1978) used the wrong number technique to determine whether subjects would be more inclined to help a normal or blind individual. The wrong number technique is an unobtrusive procedure in which the researcher telephones the subject and pretends that he accidentally called the wrong number with his last dime and needs the subject to call the correct number and deliver a message. The measure of helping is whether the subject makes the call. The results of the Baker & Reitz study revealed that a higher percentage of subjects helped the blind caller.

In the studies cited above, a physically handicapped person received more assistance than a nonhandicapped person. In the studies to be cited now, the nonhandicapped person was favored. Pomazal & Clore (1973) found, in one of their field experiments, that drivers were more willing to offer a ride to a nonhandicapped hitchhiker than to a hitchhiker who wore a white, 24-inch knee brace on his or her right leg and a white cloth sling on the left arm. Similarly, Samerotte & Harris (1976) looked at the effects of permanence of a handicap, locus of responsibility for an accident, and sex of the subject on helping. In the permanent handicap condition the confederate, a male, wore an eyepatch and had an unattractive facial scar; in the temporary handicap condition, the same confederate replaced the eyepatch and scar with a bandage around his forearm; and in the control condition, the confederate had neither an eyepatch

and scar nor bandage. The confederate dropped envelopes in a shopping center. The measure of altruism was the number of dropped envelopes people passing by helped the confederate pick up. Significantly more envelopes were picked up when the confederate's handicap was temporary than when his handicap was permanent or nonexistent. Pilavin, Piliavin & Rodin (1975) noticed that the presence or absence of a disfiguring facial birthmark influenced helping. Piliavin et al. had a white male confederate with or without a "port wine stain" birthmark on his left cheek and brown cane board a New York City subway train. A few seconds after the doors closed the confederate staggered several feet, collapsed and curled up on his right side. His left cheek, therefore, was clearly visible. The presence of the birthmark reduced helping.

Ungar (1979), in a very recent replication of the Doob & Ecker study cited above, noticed that when helping entails extra effort normal people are more inclined to help normal than handicapped people. Ungar's study took place on a Canadian subway platform and utilized 200 Canadian men and women as subjects. The procedure was as follows: a male confederate approached a female confederate, who was standing near the subject, and asked her which way the train was going. The female confederate then answered him incorrectly and walked away. The measure of helping was whether the subject corrected the misinformation. Stigma was manipulated by having the male confederate appear nonhandicapped or partially blind, a white medical eyepatch was affixed to one of his eyes. Effort, the other variable, was manipulated by having the misinformed confederate remain near the subject (low effort condition) or walk about 30 feet away (high effort condition). There was a signficiant interaction effect of handicap and effort on helping, with (a) the handicapped

confederate receiving significantly greater help in the low effort condition than he did in the high effort condition, and (b) the nonhandicapped person being helped more than the handicapped person in the high effort condition but not in the low effort condition.

Several studies failed to find any effects due to the characteristics of the help seekers. In the Doob & Ecker study, for example, the subjects were not affected by the characteristics of the help seeker in the interview condition. Likewise, Ungar noticed that both handicapped and nonhandicapped people were helped equally in the low effort condition. Pomazal & Clore (1973), in another field experiment had a handicapped or nonhandicapped confederate positioned alongside a highway with a 1965 Chevrolet that had its trunk up and a spare tire propped against its left rear. They found that drivers were as willing to stop and help a nonhandicapped person change a flat tire as they were a person wearing a leg brace and an arm sling. Lastly, Worthington (1974) noticed that people, in an airport lobby, spent as much time giving instructions to a man seated in a wheelchair, who had an opaque rubber tube inserted in his nostril, as they spent giving instructions to a man without the visible stigma. Incidentally, the subjects in the Worthington study stood further away from the physically handicapped person than the nonhandicapped person.

The foregoing review can be summarized as follows: 1) There is cultural uniformity among children of different races, socio-economic backgrounds and socio-geographic areas, and between teenagers and adults in their preference for people with various types of physical handicaps (Richardson et al., 1961; Tringo, 1970). 2) Nonhandicapped people report relatively strong feelings of emotional discomfort when interacting with

a physically handicapped individual (Kleck, 1955). 3) The nonhandicapped person translates his relatively strong feelings of emotional discomfort into greater interpersonal distances when interacting with a handicapped person (Kleck, 1966; Worthington, 1974). 4) Along with the feelings of discomfort the nonhandicapped person also feels sympathetic toward the handicapped person (Kleck, 1968; Kleck et al. 1966). 5) The literature on altruism toward the physically handicapped has many inconsistent results. And 6) each study operationalized stigma and measured altruism differently. The kinds of physical stigma differed in that some of the physical handicaps appeared to be permanent, e.g., a leg amputation and sitting in a wheelchair, whereas others appeared to be ambiguous as regards permanence, as shown, for example, by the wearing of an eyepatch. An important difference among the various measures of altruism was the amount of time the nonstigmatized prson would have to maintain contact with the physically handicapped person. Some measures of helping required little contact, e.g., giving change, whereas others required prolonged contact, e.g., giving a ride to a hitchhiker.

In addition, physically handicapped people were helped more than nonhandicapped people when: 1) the altruistic response required relatively little or no face-to-face contact (Barker & Reitz, 1978; Doob & Ecker, 1970; Levitt & Kornhaber, 1977) or 2) the physical handicap was perceived as being temporary (Samerotte & Harris, 1976). This trend is reversed when 1) the physical handicap is perceived as being permanent (Pomazel & Clore, 1973; Piliavin et al., 1975; Samerotte & Harris, 1976) or 2) the handicap was perceived as being temproary but the altruistic response required face-to-face contact and effort to initiate (Ungar, 1979).

Given this constellation of results one may conclude that the

inconsistencies in the research on altruism toward the physically handicapped are caused by different features of the contact situation producing in the nonhandicapped person varying tendencies toward approaching and avoiding the handicapped person. This approach-avoidance conflict seems to be caused by the simultaneous arousal of sympathy and discomfort; with sympathy producing helping and discomfort producing withdrawal. Perhaps whether a handicapped person is helped by a nonhandicapped person is determined by the relative strength of the latter's feelings of sympathy and discomfort.

It is also possible, however, that the nonhandicapped person's major concern when confronted by a help-seeking handicapped person is how he/she may most quickly and efficiently reduce the level of discomfort produced by the help-seeker's physical handicap and request for aid. If this is so, the inconsistencies in the literature on altruism toward the physically handicapped might be best understood by considering the cost to the benefactor for helping (e.g., strength of felt discomfort, time lost) and the cost to the benefactor for not helping (e.g., guilt).

Following this line of reasoning the following variables were selected for investigation: 1) the strength of the potential helper's need to believe in a just world, 2) the level of social support for a particular altruistic act, and 3) the potential helper's personal norm for engaging in a particular altruistic act.

These variables were picked because it has been demonstrated that they influence the amount and rate of altruistic behavior toward nonhandicapped people and seem to influence the benefactor's perception of cost to him/herself for helping and not helping a physically handicapped help-seeker. Addressing the latter point more specifically, it will

become clear that whether a normal individual behaves in an altruistic manner toward a handicapped individual is influenced by the way he/she is motivated to perceive justice, and a personal or group norm that he/she has decided to adhere to. The violation of either should cause the potential benefactor considerable discomfort.

Belief in a Just World

Heider (1958) deduced, from the general theoretical framework of balance theory that people have a tendency to assume that the consequences a person experiences are in some way an indication of his personal worth. He has written:

> The relationship between goodness and happiness, between wickedness and punishment is so strong, that given one of these conditions, the other is frequently assumed. Misfortune, sickness, accident are often taken as signs of badness and guilt. If O is unfortunate, then he has committed a sin (p. 235).

Lerner, on the basis of Heider's observation and the results of a series of studies that will be discussed later in this review, formulated the just world hypothesis. "The just world hypothesis is stated as follows: Individuals have a need to believe that they live in a world where people generally get what they deserve" (Lerner & Miller, 1978, p. 1030).

This proposition can also be found in the writings of Goffman (1963) and Ryan (1971). Goffman, in his thesis on stigma, noted that people are inclined to view another person's physical handicap as evidence of a moral defect--a just punishment for something he or his family did. Ryan, who was concerned with the treatment of oppressed and disadvantaged groups, provacatively illuminated the public's propensity towards blaming

the victim.

> The generic process of Blaming the Victim is applied to almost every American problem. The miserable health care of the poor is explained away on the grounds that the victim has poor motivation and lacks health information. The problems of slum housing are traced to the characteristics of tenants who are labeled as "Southern rural migrants" not yet "acculturated" to life in the big city. The "multiproblem" poor, it is claimed, suffer the psychological effects of impoverishment, the "culture of poverty," and the deviant value system of the lower classes; consequently, though unwittingly, they cause their own troubles. From such a viewpoint, the obvious fact that poverty is primarily an absence of money is easily overlooked or set aside (p. 5).

Belief in a just world and the attendant proclivity towards blaming the victim, while being irrational at times, does serve an adaptive function: it allows the individual to believe that his world is orderly and stable and that he will be rewarded or punished in a manner that is commensurate with the virtuousness of his behavior. Belief in a just world and blaming the victim are caused by the individual's needs to believe that he has some control over the events that affect his life.

Empirical support for the just world hypothesis comes from a series of studies conducted by Lerner and his associates. Lerner (1965) found that subjects rated a fortuitiously rewarded individual's performance more favorably than the performance of an individual who was not rewarded, even though the respective performances were equivalent. Apsler & Friedman (1975) replicated Lerner's study and found similar results. Lerner & Simmons (1966), in a study that served as a prototype for similar studies, demonstrated that observers tend to derogate individuals who are fortuitously made to suffer. Lerner & Simmons had a group of female

college students describe a peer who was "randomly" placed in the negative reinforcement condition of a learning experiment. After watching their colleague suffer, actually a videotaped performance, the subjects were told either: 1) that the experiment was half over and that they were to watch anothr session of equal length after they rated their colleague, 2) that a group vote would determine whether their colleague would be switched to a more favorable condition, or 3) that the experiment was over. In one other condition subjects heard their colleague reluctantly consent to be in the negative reinforcement condition of the learning experiment so that they, the subjects, would not be inconvenienced. Lerner & Simmons labeled the confederate in this condition the martyr. Analysis of the date revealed the following: 1) the martyr was devalued the most, 2) the subjects who were unable to stop the victim's suffering devalued the victim more than the subjects who thought the experiment was over, and 3) the subjects who had an affect on the victim's fate devalued the victim the least. Analysis of related data also revealed that when subjects were given control over the victim's fate they overwhelmingly chose to place the victim in a circumstance where she would be rewarded, instead of one where she would receive no compensation or continue suffering.

Several subsequent studies offer compatible results. Lerner (1971), in order to assess the effects of rewarding a victim on the subject's valuation of the victim used a modified version of the Lerner & Simmons paradigm. The subjects in one condition were led to believe that the victim would receive thirty dollars for participating in the experiment; the subjects in a second condition believed the victim would receive ten dollars; the subjects in a third condition were told that the victim

would not be compensated; and the subjects in a fourth condition were told that the victim was acting. The subjects derogated the confederate who did not receive any compensation and the one who received ten dollars as compensation significantly more than the confederate who received thirty dollars or the confederate they knew was acting. McDonald (1977) had his subjects read an account of a stabbing. In the account he varied the extent to which the victim would be perceived as being responsible for being stabbed. The subjects rejected the martyr more than the innocent victim or the deserving victim. The innocent victim, was not rejected more than the deserving victim. Stokols & Schopler (1973) had subjects read the medical file of a female "fellow student." In it they varied the extent to which the target person would be perceived as being responsible for an unwanted pregnancy, the severity of the consequences of the pregnancy, and whether the subject would meet the target person. Consistent with the just world hypothesis the results indicated that there was a tendency for the subjects to be least attracted to the victims who were not responsible for their fate or who suffered relatively severe consequences. Jones & Aronson (1973) varied the respectability of the victim and the severity of the crime (actual rape vs. an attempted rape). The dependent variable was the extent to which the subject was seen as being responsible for her fate. As predicted by the just world hypothesis, respectability of the victim was positively related with being blamed for being raped. Presumably, this finding emerged because the subjects could not maintain their belief in a just world by derogating the personality characteristics of the respectable victim. Therefore, they chose to maintain it by allowing themselves to believe that the victim's behavior, in some significant way, contributed to her fate.

Two studies, while further demonstrating the viability of the just world hypothesis, have found that they typically discovered derogation effects may be reduced by having the subjects empathize with the victim (Aderman, Brehm, & Katz, 1974) or identify with the victim (Chaikin & Darley, 1973). Aderman and his colleagues replicated the Lerner & Simmons (1966) study mentioned above, but varied the number of subjects who watched the victim shocked and the observational set of the subjects. Subjects were told either to 1) imagine that they were the victim, 2) watch the victim, or 3) " . . . observe the emotional state" of the victim (the Lerner & Simmons instructions). The subject derogated the victim least when she was given the empathy instructions and when she was alone. Chaikin & Darley (1973) had the subjects identify with either the worker or the supervisor in a task oriented dyad by telling them that they would be playing that role later on in the experiment. This can be considered identification through fate similarity. At the end of the task, the supervisor became the perpetrater of an accident by accidently destroying the finished product of the worker, who then became the victim. Chaikin & Darley also manipulated severity of the accident related consequences by telling the observers that the worker's payment was contingent on the supervisor's evaluation of the worker's work or the experimenter's evaluation of the worker's work. The worker in the latter condition could not redceive any payment because after the accident there would not be any work for the experimenter to evaluate. Analysis of the subsequent ratings of the supervisor and worker by the observers revealed that the future superviser who believed the consequences for the worker were severe derogated the worker the most. The future workers, however, saw the victim in a relatively favorable light.

Personality and behavioral correlates. Rubin & Peplau (1975, 1973) developed a scale to assess individual differences in the disposition to believe the world is a just place. They found that the scores were related to several personality variables and to the way their subjects perceived victims of misfortunes. Rubin & Peplau (1975) have reported that belief in a just world is positively associated with: 1) a 10-item version of the F-scale focusing on authoritarian submissiion; 2) lack of suspiciousness of a deceptive experimental manipulation; 3) trust as measured by Rotter's (1967) Interpersonal Trust Scale; 4) frequency of church and synagogue attendance; 5) a belief in an active God, 6) belief in the Protestant ethic, as measured by the Protestant Ethic Scale (Mirels & Garrett, 1971); 7) being internal, as measured by Rotter's (1966) I-F scale; 8) favorable attitudes towards Congress, the Supreme Court, the military, big business, and labor unions; 9) the tendency to derogate blacks; 10) the tendency to perceive men who received low priority draft numbers during the 1971 national draft lottery in a more favorable light than men who received high priority numbers; and 11) resistance to becoming politically active.

The effects of a belief in a just world on altruism. The results of the studies which investigated the relation between belief in a just world and helping behavior demonstrate rather consistently that when an individual witnesses a person being unjustly victimized, he/she maintains his/her belief in a just world by either derogating the victim or restoring justice to the victim. Restoration of justice usually takes the form of compensation or altruism. In one condition of the Lerner & Simmons (1968) experiment, mentioned above, subjects had the opportunity to restore justice by voting to reassign the victim to a reward condition in

which she would receive money rather than shocks. The results indicated that most subjects took this opportunity to compensate the victim. Kenrick, Reich & Cialdini (1976) used the Lerner & Simmons paradigm to test the hypothesis that victim derogation and compensation for the same victim are mutually exclusive processes. The findings did not confirm their assumption. The study was 2 X 2 factorial study, the independent variables were 1) whether the subjects observed the confederate being shocked and 2) whether the subject was asked to evaluate the confederate before or after recommending some amount of monetary compensation for the victim. The results indicated that perceived suffering caused greater victim derogation as well as greater victim compensation. Furthermore, subjects who were asked to recommend some amount of monetary compensation for the victim before being asked to evaluate the victim derogated the victim less than the subjects who were asked to rate the victim and then asked to recommend the amount of monetary compensation.

A study reported by Lincoln & Levinger (1972) demonstrated that witnessing a member of a stigmatized group being made to suffer unjustifiably also caused victim compensation or derogation. Lincoln & Levinger led their subjects to believe that a black was treated either neutrally or in an unjustifiably brutal manner by a white policeman and that their evaluations of the victim and the policeman might or might not have meaningful consequences for altering the victim's fate. The results revaled that : 1) the subjects tended to disvalue the characteristics of a victim of an unjustified attack; 2) the subjects in the unjustified attack/meaningful consequence condition tended to devalue the policeman more than the subjects in the no attack/meaningful consequence condition. Mills & Egger (1972), in a conceptually similar study, also

noted that the opportunity to help reduced victim derogation; however, victim derogation was reduced even if the help did not have any effect whatsoever. Subjects in this study were given the opportunity to reduce the victim's suffering and monitor the subsequent effects. In one condition, the victim's suffering appeared to decrease, in the other the victim's suffering appeared to stay the same. Surprisingly, both conditions resulted in less victim derogation. This study taken along with the others leads one to believe that the need for justice is reduced once the witness of unjustified suffering has engaged in some behavioral or cognitive process that has the potential of restoring justice, even though it does not.

A study by Miller (1977) causes some refinement of this conclusion. Miller assessed the effects of belief in a just world, number of victins, and whether the victim's condition was temporary or permanent on the subject's willingness to participate in extra experimenal sessions to help alleviate the victim's misfortune. Belief in a just world was measured by the Rubin & Peplau (1975) Belief in a Just World scale. Two signficiant effects force one to conclude that the effectiveness of the action is an important determinant of helping behavior. Miller found that high believers in a just world were more inclined to be altruistic when there was a limited number of victims, and when the victims' condition was temporary. If ineffective helping serves to reduce the need for justice as much as effective helping the level of altruism should not be different across high belief in a just world conditions. In other words, the high belief in a just world individual should have been as altruistic in the larger number of victims permanent misfortune condition as he/she was in the small number of victims temporary misfortune condition.

This was not the case in the Miller study; a situational cue, a high probability that all witnessed suffering would be alleviated, seemed to be the compelling factor. Reconsidering Mills & Egger's results in light of Miller's (1977) findings it is possible that subjects in the ineffectual help condition of the Mills & Egger study believed, despite the experimenters' attempts, that their help was effective. Only future experimentation will determine the correctness of this assumption.

Miller's study demonstrated that high need to believe in a just world can result in humanistically oriented helping behavior. A study by Zuckerman (1977), on the other hand, pointed to the fact that a high need to believe in a just world can result in helping behavior that is irrationally motivated and self-serving. Zuckerman reasoned that the high belief in a just world person would believe, rather naively, that the greater his positive inputs, e.g., prosocial behavior, the greater would be his outputs, i.e., rewards, even if the inputs and outputs are not related. To test this assumption Zuckerman looked at the level of belief in a just world, as measured by the belief in a just world scale (Rubin & Peplau, 1975), and the number of weeks before an exam, on the number of hours volunteered to read to a blind student. It was believed that high belief in a just world students would volunteer more time when the final exam was temporally proximate because they would believe that their grades would be positively affected by helping the blind student. The results confirmed the hypothesis.

In summary a belief in a just world emerges from our need to believe that the events that affect our lives are in some way reflective of the way we have lived our lives. We want to believe that we will get what we deserve and deserve what we get. In order to maintain this belief,

we either derogate the personality characteristics of an innocent victim, blame the innocent victim for the unjustifiable misfortune, or behave in a manner which would compensate the victim for suffering or alleviate the suffering. Whether the victim will be compensated for his/her suffering or denigrated is influenced by the strength of the potential benefactor's need to believe in a just world, whether the potential benefactor believes he/she will in some way benefit from intervening altruistically, and the probability of success of the proposed altruistic intervention. Whereas the person with a low need to believe in a just world does not seem to be influenced by potential personal rewards for being altruistic or the probability of the success of the proposed intervention, the person with a high need to believe in a just world behaves "altruistically" when he/she believes that he/she will be rewarded for his/her efforts or believes that the probability of success of the altruistic intervention is high.

Miller (1977), in effect, manipulated the probability of success of an altruistic act by varying the number of victims and whether the victim's misfortune was temporary or permanent. The high probability of success conditions were, of course, the limited victim and the temporary misfortune conditions. Given a specified number of victims the probability of success for an altruistic intervention can also be increased by increasing the number of people who are competently implementing the helping behavior. That is to say that the probability of success of an altruistic intervention also varies with the level of social support.

Social Support

It has been reliably demonstrated that the real or implied presence of others can either facilitate or inhibit the social behavior of an

individual (see, for example, Milgram, 1963, 1965). In this portion of the paper, the effects of social support on altruistic behavior will be examined.

Social Factors Which Facilitate Altruistic Behavior

The effects of helping models. Bandura & Walters (1963) have proposed that the observation of models affects behavior in two distinct ways: 1) by inducing the acquisition of long-term behavioral dispositions, and 2) by inducing the performance of imitative behavior (cited in Krebs, 1973). Only those studies which are concerned with stimulating the performance of imitative altrustic behavior will be considered here. Some attention will be paid to the characteristics of the model, less to the characteristics of the observer.

Rosenbaum & Blake (1955) demonstrated, in a field experiment, that subjects were more willing to volunteer a small portion of their free time to engage in an expriment whey they heard another person, the model, volunteer than when there was no model or the model refused. Rosenbaum (1956), in a subsequent experiment, manipulated the intensity of the request to participate in a brief psychological experiment and the response of the model to the request. There was a main effect due to both variables in the expected direction: high intensity requests and affirmative models produced the greatest amount of helping. Rosenhan & White (1967) offer some evidence to support Bandura & Walters' notion that observation of an altruistic model leads to the acquisiton of a disposition towards altruism. Eight and nine year old boys observed either an altruistic model or no model at all and were presented with an opportunity to donate money to a needy cause in the presence and absence of the model. The results indicated the following: 1) the adult model condition produced more helping than

the no model condition; 2) the children exposed to the model tended to donate more porportionately in the absence of the model than the children in the no model condition; 3) more children gave in the model's presence than in his absence; and 4) those who gave in his presence were more inclined to give in his absence.

Bryan & Test (1966) in a series of field experiments further demonstrated that the presence of an altruistic model tends to produce congruent altruistic behavior. In the first experiment they noted that motorists were more likely to stop and help a woman fix a flat tire if they drove past a model helping a confederate fix a flat tire. In the second and third experiments they found that shoppers were more likely to toss money in a Salvation Army kettle if a model had done so about 20 seconds earlier. Wagner & Wheeler (1969) looked at the effects of a generous, selfish, or no model; cost of helping; and strength of appeal on the amount of money donated by enlisted servicemen. Cost of helping was manipulated by telling the servicemen that if they agreed a twenty-five dollar donation would be taken out of their next paycheck or that five dollars would be taken out of each of their next five paychecks; strength of the appeal was manipulated by telling the servicemen that the money was being used to fly the family of a dying serviceman to his bedside or to build a servicemen's fund. There was a main effect due to the disposition of the model, with the generous model eliciting the most donations and the selfish model eliciting the least. Cost to the servicemen also influenced donating significantly, the servicemen were more inclined to donate when the money would be taken in installments. Surprisingly, the strength of the appeal did not influence helping.

Finally, Solomon & Grota (1976), in a study designed to determine

whether a helping model could inhibit helping behavior manipulated whether a helping model was present and the severity of the emergency. The guiding assumption was that the cost of helping would be the mediating variable. It was, therefore, expected that the presence of a model in a non-emergency (low effort) situation would serve to remind the observer that the behavior is socially desirable and that the presence of a model in an emergency situation, a high cost circumstance, would allow the observer to ascribe responsibility away from himself. The experiment consisted of a confederate either simply dropping some supplies or dropping some supplies and feigning stomach cramps; in half of the cases of each of the above conditions a second confederate helped the first one. As predicted, there was more helping in the model/low emergency condition than in the no model/low emergency condition and greater helping in the no model/high emergency condition than in the model/high emergency condition.

Perceived group standards. Bandura & Walters' (1963) assertion that the observation of models induces the performance of behavior that is congruent with the models' behavior, while receiving substantial empirical support, does not explain why the behavior is emitted. Krebs (1970) has suggested that the models make salient the appropriate behavioral alternatives and the social norms that are functioning in a particular context. The studies to be reviewed here support his contention.

Helson, Mouton & Blake (1958) theorized that social behavior is a function of:

> " . . . a) the stimuli defining the character of the expected response, b) contextual or background stimuli which may alter the effects of the defining stimuli, and c) residuals which represent beliefs, attitudes, and all other personal considerations in terms of which individuals differ from one another with respect to the situation calling for actions" (p. 3).

In a petition signing study designed to test the adequacy of the above generalization, Helson manipulated the attractiveness of an appeal, and the perception of whether a group of relevant others were in favor of the appeal. The results revealed that both the attractiveness of the appeal and the implied group norm had a sustantial effect on the petition signing behavior.

White (1975) demonstrated that social anchors dramatically influence a person's opinion judgment in the direction of the anchor--regardless of the extremeness of the anchor. In one field experiment White manipulated the amount of money a student thought each of a number of other students was willing to pay a semester for books and noted that the student's estimate shifted in the direction of what appeared to be the group standard. Similar results were found when he manipulated the number of hours a student thought other students were willing to tutor a student having academic difficulties.

Humanitarian Norms

The above review of the literature on social support for altruistic behavior led to the conclusions that the real or implied presence of others caused the actor to define the help-eliciting situation as one where helping behavior was either appropriate or inappropriate or allowed him, in some cases, to deny that he had any responsibility to help the person in need. It seems, then, that the presence of others activiated or deactivated the social and personal norms that elicit helping behavior. Berkowitz and his colleagues in a series of studies that have results that are difficult to interpret, have attempted to demonstrate that the norm of social responsibility produces helping behavior.

Of greater predictive and theoretical value is Schwartz's (1973) notion of personal norm. Research pertaining to both positions will be reviewed.

The Norm of Social Responsibility

"A normative analysis suggests that people act altruistically in particular situations because it is the proper thing to do" (Krebs, 1970, p. 294). To demonstrate this, Berkowitz and his associates conducted a series of experiments which used the same basic paradigm: subjects who were recruited for an experiment on supervisory ability were told that they would be working for a supervisor, whose pay was or was not highly dependent on the output of the worker. The subject/worker was required to construct a number of envelopes or boxes from instructions given to him by the supervisor. The dependent variable was the number of boxes or envelopes made by the worker. In all of the studies (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963; Daniels & Berkowitz, 1963; Berkowitz & Daniels, 1964; Berkowitz et al. 1964; Berkowtiz & Conner, 1966; Berkowitz, 1967) the output of the subject/worker was positively related to the level of dependency of the supervisor. Berkowitz accepts these results as support for the existence of a norm of social responsibility.

Berkowtiz's demonstrations of the norm of social responsibility, however, are inadequate conceptually. The existence of the norm is inferred from the behavior that it is supposed to explain. This type of circularity does not allow one to predict when a behavior will emerge and, therefore, does not explain the behavior. "The methods used to study social norms should be different from the operations used to establish their effects" (Krebs, 1970, p. 295). Schwartz's research on the predictive utility of personal norms satisfies this dictum.

Personal Norms

Schwartz (1973) defined a personal norm as the moral obligation that people hold for themselves concerning engaging in a particular behavior. In his consideration of the relationship between personal norms and altruism he went on to propose that "altruistic behavior is influenced by the intensity of moral (personal) obligation an individual feels to take specific helping actions" (Schwartz, 1977, p. 227). Schwartz has stated that the relationship between personal norms for any behavior and the enactment of that behavior is moderated by the actor's tendencies to become aware of the consequences of his behavior for others and to accept rationales for denying responsibility for the consequences of his behavior (see, for example, Schwartz, 1974; 1970; Schwartz & Clausen, 1970). However, only those studies which directly investigated the relationship between one's personal norm for engaging in altruistic behavior and altruistic behavior will be mentioned here.

A major problem with any normative analysis of behavior is the difficulties of determing the existence and intensity of a norm without using the behavior the norm is supposed to predict as evidence. Schwartz solved this problem by assuming that the existence and intensity of a personal norm can be measured by asking the person to indicate the extent to which he would feel obligated to engage in a particular behavior.

Allowing the assumption that the norm activation process can be instigated by asking a person how he feels he ought to behave in a given situation, Schwartz and others have consistently demonstrated that knowledge of an individual's personal norm for a given altruistic act is a reliable perdictor of that behavior. Remember, however, that the relationship between the personal norm for helping and actual help is deflated by the

extent to which a person is unaware of the consequences of his behavior for others and denies responsibility for the consequences that his behavior has for others.

Schwartz (1968) asked men who resided in a college dormitory how they ought to behave in nine hypothetical but realistic situations which involved considerateness, helpfulness, and reliability. A week later each member of the dormitory rated the members of his immediate peer group on the general traits of considerateness, helpfulness, and reliability. The observed correlation between the summary index of personal norms and of peer ratings of helpfulness and considerateness was low, but significant ($r = .25$, $p < .01$). When only the summary indexes of those students who were high in awareness of consequences and low in responsibility denial was taken into consideration, the correlation coefficient rose to .54. Schwartz & Tessler (1972) were able to predict, rather adequately, a person's intention to engage in a particular altruistic act, a heart donation upon death, from their knowledge of his: 1) personal norm concerning the act, 2) attitudes towards the act, and 3) social normative belief. Social normative belief was measured by asking the subject to indicate how obligated a person, in general, should feel about donated his heart. Personal norm emerged as the most powerful predictor of the behavioral intention. The support for the predictive utility of personal norm based on the results of this study is weakened by the fact that an intention is not an act and the possibility that a person's intentions include his felt obligation to engage in the act. Later studies, however, provide evidence that is more convincing. Zuckerman (1977) investigated the effects of students' personal norm for donating blood and their tendency to donate blood on actual blood donating behavior. The students' personal norm

for donating blood was measured by asking them to indicate how willing they would be to donate blood. A high willingness to donate blood and a high tendency to assume responsibility for donating blood were significiantly associated with donating blood two months after the measures were taken. Zuckerman et al. (1977) also demonstrated that high ascription of responsibility and a high willingness to donate blood is related to the probability that one will give blood and the actual donation of blood. It should be mentioned, however, that while the percentage of subjets who donated blood in the high ascription/high willingness cell was significant (34.1%), a sugstantially larger percentage of the subjects in that cell (63.9%) did not. Six other studies, cited by Schwartz (1977), have shown personal norm to be predictive of altruistic behavior; the correlations ranged from .24 to .59. Thusly, it would be reasonable to assume that Schwartz's (1977) method of measuring personal norm is both reliable and valid.

In general, the research on social support and humanitarian norms supports the contention that an individual behaves altruistically because either a group or personal norm indicates that it is appropriate and because violating either of these referents will cause the potential benefactor to experience considerable discomfort, e.g., guilt or some social sanction.

The literature reviewed above revealed that the amount of altruism is influenced by the physical characteristics of the needy individual, the requirements of the helping response, the preceived level of social support for the altruistic act, and the psychological disposition of the potential benefactor. More specifically, the studies cited empirically supported the following propositions:

1) People are more inclined to help a physically stigmatized person than a normal person when the helping response does not entail prolonged face-to-face contact (see, Doob & Ecker, 1970) and when the physical stigma is not permanent or the altruistic act does not take a grat deal of effort to initiate. Allowing people to determine the physical distance between themselves and the permanently physically stigmatized help requestor, however, eliminates the effects produced by prolonged interpersonal contact.

2) People are more inclined to be altrusitic if they have a tendency to believe the world is just and believe that their help would be instrumental in fully alleviating the suffering of an innocent victim or believe that their prosocial behavior would result in some personal reward.

3) People are more inclined to engage in an altruistic act when they believe a substantial number of their peers are engaging in a similar altruistic act.

4) People are more inclined to engage in a particular altruistic act when their felt obligation to engage in that act is relatively strong.

Given these empirical relationships and a needy individual who is either physically normal or suffers from a permanent, unattractive physical handicap, it is reasonable to assume that the following propositions would be true:

1) There will be greater willingness to help a normal individual than an individual with a permanent physical disability if helping entails close, sustained contact.

2) There will be greater willingness to help when the level of peer social support is high rather than low.

3) The feeling of obligation to help will be related to actual

helping.

Furthermore, if Katz's (1979) suggestion that the presence of a physically handicapped individual threatens the observer's belief in a just world is allowed, a theroetically provocative proposition emerges:

4) Willingness to help will be highest when the needy individual has a physical handicap, the level of peer social support is high, and the potential benefactor's belief in a just world is high; and lowest when the needy individual has a physical handicap, the level of social support low, and potential benefactor's belief in a just world low.

As a preliminary test of these propositions, a pilot study was conducted.

Pilot Study

Students at two colleges in New Jersey were solicited by a white female confederate in classrooms to volunteer to tutor elementary school children who were having learning difficulties. The children were described as either physically handicapped, i.e., suffering from cerebral palsy and partially paralyzed, or normal. The tutoring program was described as either strongly supported by students at several colleges (Strong Social Support) or as having had very little student response (Weak Social Support). At least thirty subjects were exposed to each combination of stigma and support conditions. Two weeks prior to the solicitation all subjects had filled out the Rubin & Peplau Just World Scale and a single-item measure, based on Schwartz's personal norm format, of personal feeling of obligation to tutor handicapped children.

Results

To ascertain the effects of the social support and stigma manipulations on number of hours volunteered, a 2 X 2 analysis of variance was done. To determine whether belief in a just world and personal norm were related to volunteering, within-treatment correlations were computed. Table 1 presents the cell means.

Table 1

Mean Number of Hours Pledged in Each Condition

	Disabled		Normal	
	M	N	M	N
High Support	1.53	60	2.58	30
Low Support	.65	39	.38	56

The analysis of variance revelaed that there was a main effect for support ($p < .01$) and a main effect for disability ($p. < .05$). That is, less time was pledged for disabled than normal children, and when social support was low rather than high.

Belief in a just world and personal norm were not significantly related to helping behavior in the Normal condition, but as Table 2 shows, there were significant relationships in the Handicapped condition. The data suggest that belief in a just world interacts with the handicap and support variables with regard to effects on helping.

Table 2

Product Moment Correlations for Handicap Condition Only

	Low Social Support		High Social Support	
	BJW	Help	BJW	HELP
PN	.10	.35*	.15	.39*
BJW		-.38*		.32*

*$\underline{P}$ < .05 (two-tailed)

Hypotheses

The above brief review of the relevant literature and the pilot study indicate that physical stigma, level of social support, the need to believe in a just world, and one's personal norm to tutor school children in need of such help influences the willingness of college students to volunteer as tutors. In light of this conclusion, a study was conducted that was essentially a full-scale replication of the pilot study. Students at a New Jersey college filled out the belief in a just world and personal norm scales; then about two weeks later, they were solicited in their classes by confederates posing as representatives of a student-faculty committee for a special program to tutor school children in need of such help. The children were described as either physically handicapped or normal.

The following hypotheses were tested:

1) There will be more commitment to tutor normal children than handicapped children.

2) There will be more commitment to tutor when the level of peer

social support is high rather than low.

3) The feeling of obligation to tutor will be predictive of actual commitment to tutor.

4) There will be a three-way interaction effect of handicap, social support, and belief in a just world, such that willingness to tutor will be highest in the Handicap/Strong Support/High Belief cell, and lowest in the Handicap/Weak Support/ High Belief cell. In general, high belief in a just world subjects will be more influenced by handicap and social support than will low belief in a just world subjects.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Overview

To test the preceding hypotheses it was necessary to 1) manipulate the characteristics of the person in need; 2) measure the potential benefactor's need to believe in a just world and personal norm for engaging in a particular act; 3) manipulate the perceived level of social support for a particular altruistic act; and 4) determine the measure of the dependent variable, atruism.

As stated earlier, White (1975) demonstrated that social anchors influenced the number of hours his subjects indicated that they would be willing to tutor a fellow student having academic difficulty and the pilot study revealed that the number of hours subjects were willing to tutor a student having academic difficulty was influenced by the phsyical characteristics of the needy student, and the level of social support. The measure of the dependent variable in the study was, therefore, the number of hours the subjects volunteered to tutor an elementary school child experiencing academic difficulties.

As far as manipulating the characteristics of the person in need, Kleck et al. (1968) demonstrated that pictorial figures representing either a normal or physically handicapped person, established through instruction, resulted in the subject assuming differential interpersonal distances. Furthermore, the pilot study revealed that being told that a needy person has a physical defect, i.e., cerebral palsy, and is partially paralyzed, influenced the subject's willingness to help that person. Using this notion, characteristics of th person in need, an elementary school child experiencing academic difficulties was manipulated by telling the subjects in the stigma condition that the children ". . . are

are handicapped . . . have conditions like muscular distrophy, rheumatic heart disorder . . . and need to use a wheelchair or crutches." Muscular dystrophy and rheumatic heart disorder were used instead of cerebral palsy and partial paralysis because it was felt that the latter group of physical handicaps could lead the subject to believe that the stimulus-person was also mentally retarded. There was no reference made concerning the physical condition of the child in the normal condition.

As far as manipulating the level of social support is concerned, Helson et al. (1958) noticed that the number of students thought to favor an appeal affected the compliance rate of their subjects. Based on this finding and the results of the pilot study, social support was manipulated by telling the subjects that their college was the only college in the country interested enough to participate in the tutorial program (Weak Social Support), or that several other colleges have expressed a lot of interest and are participating (Strong Social Support).

Belief in a just world was measured by using a Likert scale version of the Rubin & Peplau Belief in a Just World Scale and personal norm was measured (as suggested by Schwartz, 1977) by asking the subjects to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 4, the strength of his/her felt obligation to volunteer to tutor elementary school children who were having academic difficulties.

In summary of the above, the procedure for this experiment was as follows: first, the subject's level of need to believe in a just world and personal norm for tutoring were measured; at a later date the subject was asked to indicate how many hours he/she would be willing to volunteer to tutor either a handicapped or normal school child who was having academic difficulties. During the solicitation, the subjects were told that

only students at their college or students at several colleges were interested in tutoring the children.

Design

The experiment was a 2 X 2 X 2 factorial design. The independent variables were: 1) characteristics of the needy, normal versus physically handicapped; 2) level of social support, strong versus weak; and 3) strength of the subject's need to believe in a just world, high versus low. Personal norm for a particular altruistic behavior was considered a correlate of the dependent variable altruism.

Characteristics of the needy were manipulated by telling the subjects they would be tutoring handicapped children who had physical conditions that required them to use a wheelchair or cruthces (Physically Handicapped condition) or by making no reference to the physical condition of the child (Normal condition). Social support was manipulated by belling the subjects that students in Hudson County had expressed a lot of interest, so that several colleges in the area were participating in the program (Strong Social Support condition) or that their college was the only college in Hudson County where some students expressed enough interest to make it worthwhile to set up the program (Weak Social Support condition). The subjects' need to believe in a just world was measured by having them fill out Rubin & Peplau's (1975, 1973) Belief in a Just World Scale. The subjects' personal norm for tutoring school children having academic difficulties was masured by having the subjects respond to an item, fashioned after Schwartz (1977), which asked the subjects to indicate the level of obligation they felt to tutor an academically needy child. Altruism, the dependent variable, henceforth to be known as amount of time volunteered, was measured by having the subjects indicate on a pledge form

the number of hours between 0 and 15 they would be willing to donate to tutor a child having academic difficulties.

Subjects

Two hundred and ten college students in 21 psychology classes at an urban New Jersey public college served as subjects. Some of the psychology courses were primarily for psychology majors, but many of them were open to the general college population. One hundred and sixty-two of the subjects were female and forty-eight were male. Approximately seventy-two percent of the subjects were white, approximately eighteen percent were black, and approximately ten percent were unidentifiable.

Permission was obtained from the instructor to use class time for the experiment. Each class was randomly assigned to one of the eight experimental conditions. There were at least two classes in each cell. The number of subjects in each cell ranged from 19 to 33.

Confederates

Three white female students, ages 18, 19 and 22 served as confederates. Because of their role in the study, they were aware of the purpose of the study but not of the hypotheses. The confederates were trained for approximately two hours so that their modes of presentation were similar. They were also randomly assigned to treatment conditions.

Procedure

Instructors who volunteered to participate in the study administered to their classes the Rubin & Peplau (1975) Belief in a Just World Scale and the personal norm item, fashioned after Schwartz (1977). The instructors told the subjects that they were randomly selected to participate in a state wide survey. The instructor told the students to sign

their names on the questionnaire.

One week later one of the confederates came to the class and asked the instructor whether she could have 15 minutes of class time to recruit volunteers for a tutorial program. The instructor invariably said "yes" and stepped to the side of the room. The confederate introduced herself as a representative of a special student-faculty committee at Jersey City State College and read an appeal asking for students to volunteer to tutor children of normal intelligence who have weak academic backgrounds that can be corrected through tutoring. She then handed out a pledge form that instructed the student to: 1) indicate the number of hours that he/she would be willing to pledge as a volunteer during the next few weeks; 2) sign his/her name; 3) give his/her address and phone number and indicate the best time to reach him/her by phone.

While the pledge forms were being circulated the confederate said, "Please read these forms carefully and give all the necessary information. If you decide that you cannot volunteer any time for some reason, please put a 0 in the space provided and sign your name. The committee would like to keep a record of all the students I have spoken to. These pledge forms will be kept in strictest confidence. Only those people who are involved with this project will see these forms."

While the subjects were filling out the pledge form, the confederate took note and recorded the number of blacks and whites in the class.

After the confederate left the classroom, the instructor read a written debriefing script and circulated an attendance sheet. The debreifing script stressed the practical importance of the study and the necessity for the deception. The attendance seet enabled the experimenter

to identify subjects who were in more than one of the "target" classes during the solicitation.

Manipulation of Independent Variables

In the Physically Handicapped condition the classes were told the following about the children who need tutoring: "We are interested in handicapped kids of normal intelligence . . . kids who have muscular distrophy, rheumatic heart disorders, and various physical deformities. They all need to use a wheelchair or crutches." There were no references made concerning the physical condition of the child in the Normal condition.

In the Strong Social Support condition the subjects were told either that "Students in Hudson County have expressed a lot of interest, so that several colleges in the area are participating in the program." Subjects in the Weak Social Support condition were told that their college "is the only college in Hudson County where some students expressed enough interest to make it worthwhile to set up the program." Belief in a just world, being a personality variable, was varied by determining the median score and considering those above the median as high a high belief in a jut world and those below the median as having a low belief in a just world.

Materials that were used in this study, i.e., Belief in a Just World Scale, personal norm item, scripts, and debriefing statement can be found in the appendix.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Before analyzing the primary data several analyses of variances were conducted to determine: 1) whether mean personal norm scores of the treatment groups were similar, 2) whether the mean belief in a just world scores of the low belief in a just world groups were similar, 3) whether the mean belief in a just world scores of the high belief in a just world groups were similar, and 4) whether the three confederates had differential effects on the amount of time volunteered. The results of the analyses of variance indicated that: 1) there were no significant differences in the mean personal norm scores of the treatment groups, 2) there were no significant differences in the mean belief in a just world scores of the low belief in a just world groups, 3) there were no significant differences in the mean belief in a just world scores of the high belief in a just world groups, and 4) the confederates did not have differential effects on the amount of time volunteered. These results attest to the adequacy of the sampling procedure and eliminate confederate characteristics as an explanation for any significant effects.

Subsequently, three different statistical analyses were conducted on the primary data. Firstly, a log-linear analysis was conducted to determine whether the treatment conditions had any effect on the rate of volunteering. "The purpose of the analysis is to obtain a description of the relationships between the factors of

the table, either by forming a model for the data or be testing and ordering the importance of the interactions between the factors. The analysis is based on fitting a (hierarchical) log-linear model to the cell frequencies; that is, the logarithm of the expected cell frequency is written as an additive function of main effects and interactions in a manner similar to the usual analysis of variance model." (Brown, 1979, p. 297) Secondly, a 2 X 2 X 2 factorial analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether the treatment conditions had any effect on the amount of time volunteered; and lastly, a correlational analysis was conducted to determine whether the amount of time volunteered was significantly associated with the subject's personal norm or belief in a just world score. The correlations between the subject's belief in a just world score and the amount of time they volunteered were calculated so that a better understanding of the relation between belief in a just world and altruism could be obtained.

Analysis of Frequency Data

In order to determine the effects on the rate of volunteering of: 1) the disability status of the pupils to be tutored (handicapped vs. normal), 2) high vs. low belief in a just world, and 3) strong vs. weak social support, the data were dichotomized and a log-linear analysis for a three-way table was conducted on the dichotomized data. Bifurcation was based on whether the subjects did or did not volunteer any time. The proportions of the subjects volunteering as a function of the various treatment conditions are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Proportion of Subjects Volunteering by Experimental Condition

	Low BJW		High BJW	
	Weak Support	Strong Support	Weak Support	Strong Support
Disability Status	Prop. n	Prop. n	Prop. n	Prop. n
Normal	.233 30	.444 27	.368 19	.130 23
Handicapped	.269 26	.555 20	.394 33	.375 32

The results of the log-linear analysis used to analyze the dichotomous data is presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Summary of the Results of a Log-Linear Analysis of the Frequency of Volunteering Data

Effect	df	LR CHI SQ	P
BJW (A)	1	0.60	0.4404
Disability Status (B)	1	2.37	0.1237
Social Support (C)	1	0.94	0.3333
A x B	1	0.36	0.5505
A x C	1	7.60	0.0058
B x C	1	1.25	0.2643
A x B x C	1	0.62	0.4308

The log-linear analysis revealed that there was a significant interaction effect of belief in a just world and social support (LR CHI SQ = 7.60, df = 1, $p < .006$). Inspection of Table 3 reveals that frequency of volunteering was highest in the Strong Social Support/Low Belief in a Just World Condition.

Table 3

Proportion of Subjects Volunteering for the Interaction of Social Support and Belief in a Just World

	Belief in a Just World			
	Low		High	
Social Support	Prop.	n	Prop.	n
Weak	.250	56	.385	52
Strong	.489	47	.273	55

2 X 2 X 2 Factorial Analysis of Variance

Preliminary inspection of the amount of time volunteered revealed that the distribution of the data in each of the treatment conditions was extremely skewed and that the mean number of minutes volunteered in each condition was approximately proportional to the corresponding variance. In order to get the data to assume a normal distribution and justify the use of the usual parametric statistical tests the data were logarithmically transformed (see Winer, 1971). Table 4 displays the descriptive statistics for the untransformed data in the various experimental conditions (mean volunteering scores,

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Amount of Time
(in Minutes) Volunteered by Experimental Condition

Low BJW

	Weak Support						Strong Support					
Disability Status	Mean	SD	Mdn	Ku	Sk	N	Mean	SD	Mdn	Ku	Sk	N
Normal	96.39	198.94	.348	2.58	2.00	31	127.50	237.12	11.25	4.39	2.23	28
Handicapped	63.46	133.71	11.05	4.48	2.25	26	127.50	179.44	45.00	1.46	1.50	20

High BJW

	Weak Support						Strong Support					
	Mean	SD	Mdn	Ku	Sk	N	Mean	SD	Mdn	Ku	Sk	N
Normal	63.53	131.58	16.37	6.49	2.58	17	11.74	32.29	2.20	6.48	2.70	23
Handicapped	115.46	220.09	9.75	5.01	2.32	33	100.64	179.59	16.50	2.56	1.87	31

medians, standard deviations, indices of skewness (sk) and of kurtosis (Ku)). Tables 5, 6, and 7 display the results of statistical tests conducted on the logarithmically transformed data.

In order to determine the effects of disability status, belief in a just world, and social support 2 x 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance was conducted. The descriptive statistics (mean volunteering scores, standard deviations for the transformed data, and sample Ns for conditions) are presented in Table 5 and the results of the three-way factorial analysis of variance of the transformed data are summarized in Table 6.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for the Log Transformation of the Number of Minutes Volunteered by Experimental Condition

	Low BJW						High BJW					
	Weak Support			Strong Support			Weak Support			Strong Support		
Disability Status	X	SD	N	X	SD	N	X	SD	N	X	SD	N
Normal	.54	1.00	30	1.01	1.19	27	.787	1.08	19	.253	.67	23
Handicapped	.61	1.04	26	1.27	1.17	20	.905	1.17	33	.867	1.16	32

Table 6

Summary Table of the Three-Way Factorial Analysis of Variance of the Log Transformation of the Number of Minutes Volunteered

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	df	MEAN SQUARE	F	p
MAIN EFFECTS	4.556	3	1.5187	1.308	.273
BJW (A)	0.837	1	.8370	.731	.397
DISABILITY STATUS (B)	3.367	1	3.3670	2.900	.090
SOCIAL SUPPORT (C)	1.027	1	1.0270	.885	.348
2-WAY INTERACT	9.903	3	3.301	2.843	.039
A X B	0.643	1	.643	.554	.458
A X C	8.434	1	8.434	7.264	.008
B X C	1.288	1	1.288	1.109	.294
A X B X C	0.401	1	.401	.345	.558
EXPLAINED	14.860	7	2.1228	1.838	.084
RESIDUAL	234.533	202	1.1611		
TOTAL	249.393	209	1.19333		

The analysis of variance revealed that there was a nonsignificant tendency for the subjects to be affected by the disability status of the pupils: more time was volunteered to tutor the handicapped child than the normal child ($F = 2.90$, $df = 1$, $p < .10$).

There was also a significant interaction effect of belief in a just world and level of social support ($F = 7.264$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$). The cell means and cell standard deviations for this interaction are shown in Table 7. A post-hoc test, the t-test for differences among several means, indicated that the interaction effect emerged because the Strong Social Support/Low Belief in a Just World condition produced a greater amount of volunteering than the Weak Social Support/Low Belief

in a Just World condition ($t = 1.96$, $df = \infty$, $p < .05$) and the Strong Social Support/High Belief in a Just World condition ($t = 1.96$, $df = \infty$, $p < .05$).

Table 7

Cell Means, Standard Deviations and Ns for the Interaction of Social Support and Belief in a Just World on the Logarithm of the Number of Minutes Volunteered

	Belief in a Just World					
	Low			High		
Social Support	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N
Weak	.571	1.011	56	.862	1.126	52
Strong	1.097	1.170	47	.610	1.022	55

Correlational Analyses

Correlations between personal norm and the amount of time volunteered. In order to determine whether a subject's personal norm was predictive of the amount of time he/she was willing to volunteer as a tutor the within cell correlations between number of minutes volunteered and personal norm by condition were determined. In addition, the correlation between personal norm and the amount of time volunteered was determined when: 1) the High Belief in a Just World cells were combined, 2) the Low Belief in a Just World cells were combined, 3) the Strong Social Support cells were combined, 4) the Weak Social Support cells were combined, 5) the Physically Handicapped cells were combined, and 6) the Normal cells were combined.

A matrix of within cell correlations of personal norm with the amount of time volunteered by condition is presented in Table 8. There

Table 8

Within Cell Correlations Between Number of Minutes Volunteered and Personal Norm by Condition

	Low BJW				High BJW			
	Weak Support		Strong Support		Weak Support		Strong Support	
Disability Status	r	n	r	n	r	n	r	n
Normal	.2613	30	.6426*	27	.5790*	19	.4968*	23
Handicapped	.2663	25	.0717	20	.5463*	33	.4337*	32

*p < .01 (two-tailed)

are five significant correlations which range from r = +.4337 to r = +.6426. It should be noted that it was mainly in the High Belief in a Just World conditions that the correlations reach significance.

When only the subjects' level of belief in a just world was taken into consideration, the correlation between personal norm and the amount of volunteering in the Low Belief condition was .3291 (N = 102, p < .01). And .4866 (N = 107, p < .01) in the High Belief condition. The difference between these correlations was not significant.

Further analysis indicated that the strength of the association between personal norm and the amount of volunteering was not influenced by the disability status of the pupil or the level of social support. The correlation between personal norm and the amount of volunteering was .4564 (N = 100, p < .01) in the Normal condition, .3715 (N = 100, p < .01) in the Handicapped condition, .3957 (N = 102, p < .01) in the Strong Support condition, and .4341 (N = 108, p < .01) in the Weak Social Support condition. These correlations were not significantly different.

Correlations between belief in a just world and amount of time volunteered. When the cells were collapsed on belief in a just world, one significant correlation emerged: belief in a just world was negatively correlated with the amount of time volunteered in the Normal/Strong Social Support condition (r = .3646, N = 50, p < .01). The matrix of within condition correlations between belief in a just world and the amount of time volunteered are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Within Condition Correlations Between Belief in a Just World and Number of Minutes Volunteered for Various Social Support by Disability Status Conditions

	Disability Status of Pupil			
	Normal		Handicapped	
Social Support	r	n	r	n
Weak	.1177	49	.1343	59
Strong	-.3643*	50	.1475	52

*p < .01 (two-tailed)

Further analysis indicated that the strength and direction of the correlations between belief in a just world and the amount of time volunteered was influenced by the level of social support. The correlation between belief in a just world and the amount of time volunteered was .1359 ($N = 108$, $p < .15$) in the Weak Social Support condition and -.2190 ($N = 102$, $p < .05$) in the Strong Social Support condition. These correlations were significantly different ($Z = 2.5714$, $p < .01$).

Correlations between personal norm and belief in a just world. When the cells were collapsed on belief in a just world and the within cell correlations between personal norm and belief in a just world were obtained, a significant correlation emerged in the Normal/Weak Social Support condition. The correlations are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Within Condition Correlations Between Belief in a Just World and Personal Norms for Various Social Support by Disability Status Conditions

	Disability Status of Pupil					
	Normal			Handicapped		
Social Support						
	r	p	n	r	p	n
Weak	.4365	.001	50	.2007	.065	58
Strong	.1126	.218	50	.1577	.132	52

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Overview

The only hypotheses that were supported by the results of this study were the ones concerning the predictive utility of the personal norm item. Personal norm was positively related to the rate of volunteering and more closely related when the child in need of tutoring was physically normal. The strength of the association between personal norm and the rate of volunteering was also influenced by the level of social support and the strength of the subject's need to believe in a just world. Personal norm was more closely related to the rate of volunteering when the level of social support was weak rather than strong and when the subject's need to believe in a just world was high rather than low.

The other hypotheses were contradicted or not confirmed. In this study there was a nonsignificant main effect: the physically handicapped child elicited a higher rate of volunteering than the normal child. There was also a highly significant interaction effect: the low belief in a just world subjects were more influenced by the level of social support than the high belief in a just world subjects. The Low Belief/High Social Support condition produced the most helping and the Low Belief/ Low Social Support condition the least. In addition, belief in a just world was positively related to the rate of volunteering in the low social support condition and negatively related to the rate of volunteering in the high social support condition. Surprisingly, the level of

social support did not have a direct effect on the rate or volunteering and belief in a just world did not interact with the characteristics of the needy to affect the rate of volunteering.

Predictive Utility of Personal Norm

That personal norm was positively correlated with the rate of volunteering was not surprising. Theoretically, personal norm as operationalized in the study has characteristics that make it a superior predictor of behavior. It takes into account that behavior is determined by environmental as well as personality variables (Weissberg, 1965). When a subject responded to the personal norm item, he/she indicated his/her sense of moral obligation to behave altruistically (a dispositional variable) in a college setting (an environmental variable). The personal norm item is also highly specific. In this study, the subject was asked how he/she felt about responding to a particular target, a child experiencing academic difficulties; in a particular social context, a college; in a particular manner, as a tutor. Ajzen & Fishbein (1977) have argued and Herberlein & Black (1976) and others (see review by Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977), have demonstrated that highly specific measures of attitudes, intentions, etc., are better predictors of behavior than more general measures. Herberlein & Black found that a single item used to measure the respondents' felt obligation to purchase lead-free gasoline was a better predictor of the actual buying of lead-free gasoline, than the respondents' attitudes toward the environment, air pollution, or lead-free gasoline.

The personal norm item was a weaker predictor of willingness to tutor the handicapped child than the normal child because the target of the personal norm was not described as being handicapped. The

specificity of the personal norm item causes it to lose accuracy when it is used to predict behavior toward a target that is not similar to the target specified in the item. As the similarity between the behavior, target, and social context of the item and the actual behavior, target and social context lessens, the predictive power of personal norm decreases.

The fact that personal norm was more strongly associated with helping in the low social support condition than the high social support condition suggests a diffusion of responsibility effect (see Latane & Darley, 1970). The high social support condition apparently reduced the subject's sense of personal responsibility for alleviating the child's academic difficulties. In a conceptually relevant study, Schwartz (1970) noticed that potential bone marrow donors were more inclined to volunteer to donate bone marrow when they thought that they were one of a limited or uniquely qualified pool of donors. Schwartz (1973) later noted that personal norm for donating bone marrow as not related to volunteering to donate bone marrow in subjects who denied personal responsibility, but was a powerful predictor for those who had a high sense of personal responsibility. The strength of personal norm as predictor is weakened when the respondent believes others will share or take responsibility.

If a high belief in a just world score can be taken to mean that the high belief in a just world subject, more so than the low belief in a just world subject, believes that the probability of justice being served is very high, the theoretically interesting finding that personal norm was most strongly associated with helping in the high belief in a just world conditions can easily be explained. The high belief in a

just world subject is more inclined to honor his/her expressed moral obligation, i.e., personal norm, to be altruistic because he/she is more inclined to expect to be rewarded for adhering to it and punished for not. Zuckerman (1977), in a related study, which was summarized earlier, found that high belief in a just world students were more willing to tutor a blind student when their final exam was temporally proximate. Zuckerman concluded that these results emerged because the high belief in a just world students had the irrational belief or hope that they would receive a higher grade on their final exam because they did a "good deed."

The high belief in a just world individual perceives his/her world as being highly structured. He/she believes that behavior which conforms to his/her personal norm will be rewarded and behavior that does not will be punished. The high belief in a just world helper appears to be motivated by selfish concerns.

Belief in a Just World by Social Support Interaction

The finding that the Strong Social Support/low Belief in a Just World condition produced a significantly higher frequency and rate of volunteering than either the Weak Social Support/Low Belief in a Just World condition or the Strong Social Support/High Belief in a Just World condition is not in discordance with the framework from which the original, unsupported, hypothesis was derived. It was expected that high belief in a just world subjects as compared with subjects low on this belief, would be more affected by the level of social support, with their rate of volunteering positively related to the level of social support. Just the opposite was found: firstly, the low belief in a

just world subjects were more strongly influenced by the social support manipulation; and secondly, a post-hoc within-treatment correlation revealed that in the Weak Social Support condition strength of the subject's belief in a just world was positively related to the amount of volunteering. Most interestingly, strength of belief in a just world was negatively related to the rate of volunteering in the Strong Social Support condition. Contrary to expectations, the high belief in a just world subject was more willing to volunteer time when social support for the program was weak rather than strong. The reverse was found in the pilot study.

This finding perhaps emerged because the need to restore justice that was aroused in the high belief in a just world subject after hearing about the needy children was alleviated by hearing the high social support script. That is, the high belief in a just world subject may have believed, after hearing the high social support script, that justice would be restored by others. Previous studies lend support to this contention. For example, studies by Kenrick et al., Lincoln & Levinger, and Mills & Egger have shown that an individual's need to restore justice is reduced when the individual engages in an act that has the potentiality of restoring justice, even though he/she receives information that indicates that the act was ineffective (see Mills & Egger, 1972). It is conceivable, therefore, that information indicating that others are restoring justice will also reduce the subject's need to restore justice. The low social support script, on the other hand, was not effective in reducing the high belief in a just world subject's need to see justice served; therefore, he/she was, because of the existing need, impelled to behave altruistically.

While the high belief in a just world subjects seem to base their decision as to whether to behave altruistically on considerations of restoring justice the low belief in a just world subjects' decision seems to be guided by the behavior of relevant others. In this study, the low belief in a just world subject responded rather vigorously to the level of volunteering of his/her peers. This finding replicates the findings of a wide variety of studies (e.g., Bryan & Test, 1966; White, 1975) all of which demonstrated, using different measures of altruism, that an individual's rate of helping is positively associated with the rate of helping of relevant others. This phenomenon has been explained in several ways. The underlying feature of each of these explanations seems to center around the subject's concern about doing what is right in an arousing, somewhat ambiguous situation. The behavior of others, it has been argued (Krebs, 1970), makes salient the appropriate behavioral alternatives and legitimized a particular course of action. Unlike the high belief in a just world subject, the low belief in a just world subject appears to lack an internalized value system around which they make judgments concerning altruism. This conclusion is in line with the finding that high belief in a just world subjects tend to have an internal locus of control and that low belief in a just world subjects tend to have an external locus of control (see Rubin & Peplau, 1975).

The Main Effects Due to the Characteristics of the Needy

The finding that the physically handicapped child elicited a higher rate of volunteering than the physically normal child is surprising. Previous studies (see, for example, Pomazel & Clore, 1973) have

found that normal people are less altruistic toward physically handicapped people than toward physically normal people, when the physical handicap is perceived as being permanent and the altruistic response entails prolonged face-to-face contact. In this study, the opposite was found; the subjects were willing to spend more time with an individual who had a permanent physical handicap. The mean number of minutes volunteered to tutor the handicapped child was 101.18 and the mean of the number of minutes volunteered to tutor the normal child was 79.88.

This finding probably emerged because, in this study, the characteristics of the help-seeker were manipulated verbally rather than behaviorally, and, presumably, the verbal description of the physical handicap elicited a higher level of sympathy and/or a lower level of anxiety than the actual handicap would have. The subjects possibly would have felt more discomfort and therefore have been less altruistic if a handicapped child were present. The study by Doob & Ecker (1970) is relevant here. They found that normal individuals were relatively more inclined to help a handicapped person when the helping would not entail face-to-face contact than when it would entail such contact. In the interview situation of the study, 33.7% of the subjects complied in the eyepatch condition and 32.0% of the subjects complied in the no eyepatch condition. In the questionnaire condition, however, 69.2% of the subjects in the eyepatch condition complied, whereas only 40.0% of the subjects in the no eyepatch condition complied. Unfortunately, this perspective does not explain the results of the pilot study. In the pilot study, the verbal description of the physically handicapped help-seeker elicited less helping than the verbal description of the normal help-

seeker. This effect perhaps occurred because the verbal description of the physical handicap in the pilot study, cerebral palsy and partially paralyzed, elicited greater anxiety and/or less sympathy than the verbal description of the handicap in this study.

Belief in a Just World by Personal Correlation

The significant correlation between belief in a just world and personal norm in the Normal/Weak Social Support condition is an enigma which may be due to either: 1) the characteristics of the instructor who administered the belief in a just world scale and the personal norm item or 2) the personality disposition of the subjects who fell into that cell. The former suggestion seems most tenable. Unfortunately, however, there is no way to determine whether in fact this is the reason.

Alternative Explanations

When comparing the effects of the characteristics of the needy on altruism in this study with the results of previous studies one must take into consideration the fact that the subject pools are not comparable. This study used students taking psychology courses at an urban college, while the other studies tapped what conceivably would be a more heterogenous population. The contrary tendency (nonsignificant) then, for subjects in this study to prefer spending more time with the handicapped child than the normal child suggests that (a) the physical absence of the stigmatized individual may have had an influence on subjects' responses, or (b) that the sample of students in psychology courses was unique. This explanation is not as tenable as the one offered earlier because it does not account for the results of

the pilot study, which, like the earlier studies, indicated that the subjects spent more time with the normal child.

The lack of an interaction effect between belief in a just world and the disability status of the pupil is probably due to the weakness of the stigma manipulation, i.e., the oral description of the handicapped child instead of his/her actual presence. Consider the fact that the main effect due to the physical status of the pupil neither reached the usual level of significance nor was in the usual direction and that Lincoln & Levinger (1972) obtained results consistent with the belief in a just world hypothesis when they showed their subjects a video-tape of a member of a stigmatized group being abused. Unfortunately, they failed to manipulate the characteristics of the victim; therefore, no conclusive statement can be made about the way belief in a just world influences helping or compensation of a stigmatized victim.

Given the reliability of the effects of social support on volunteering, the lack of an interaction effect due to social support and belief in a just world in this study was probably due to the fact that low and high belief in a just world subjects were affected in opposite manners by the social support manipulation. This phenomenon may have led to the overall effect of social support being neutralized.

Finally, inasmuch as the phase of the experiment dealing with solicitation of volunteers lasted about a week, subjects already tested would have had time to communicate with others not yet tested. Hence, subject contamination cannot be ruled out as an alternative explanation of the results. Although subjects were asked not to discuss the study by their instructor, there is no guarantee that they

followed his/her instructions.

In summary, a replication of the present study might 1) use a more powerful manipulation of the characteristics of the needy individual; and 2) attempt to tap a more heterogenous population. The characteristics of the needy child can be manipulated by having a young child play the role of one of the children to be tutored while the confederate recited her solicitation. Or a photograph of one of the children to be tutored could be printed on the pledge form. The latter suggestion is preferred because it would allow randomization of the characteristics of the needy within each treatment group.

APPENDIX

Name _____

Age _____ Date _____

SOCIAL ATTITUDES

This questionnaire is being used in a national survey of college students' attitudes. Please answer the items as candidly as possible. Your replies will be regarded as condifidential. At a later date your instructor will give you feedback on the results of the survey.

We want your personal opinion on each statement. For each item indicate, in general, whether you agree or disagree with it by circling "Agree" or "Disagree." Then circle a number, 1, 2, or 3, to indicate how strongly you agree or disagree.

Agree	Disagree
1. Agree a little	1. Disagree a little
2. Agree on the whole	2. Disagree on the whole
3. Agree very much	3. Disagree very much

1. I've found that a person rarely deserves the reputation he or she has.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
2. Basically the world is a just place.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
3. People who get "lucky breaks" have usually earned their good fortune.	Agree	1 2 3
4. Careful drivers are just as likely to get hurt in traffic accidents as careless ones.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
5. It is a common occurrence for a guilty person to get off free in American courts.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
6. Students almost always deserve the grades they receive in school.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
7. Men or women who keep in shape have very little chance of suffering a heart attack.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
8. The political candidate who sticks up for his or her principles rarely gets elected.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
9. It is rare for an innocent person to be wrongly sent to jail.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3

(-over-)

10. In professional sports, many fouls and infractions never get called by the referee.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
11. By and large, people deserve what they get.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
12. When parents punish their children, it is almost always for good reasons.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
13. Good deeds often go unnoticed and unrewarded.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
14. Although evil people may hold political power for a while, in the general course of history good wins out.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
15. In almost any business or profession, people who do their job well rise to the top.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
16. American parents tend to overlook the things most to be admired in children.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
17. It is often impossible for a person to receive a fair trial in the USA.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
18. People who meet with misfortune have often brought it on themselves.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
19. Crime doesn't pay.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3
20. Many people suffer through absolutely no fault of their own.	Agree Disagree	1 2 3 1 2 3

PLEDGE FOR VOLUNTEER TUTORS

If you are willing to participate in the tutoring project, please indicate below how much time you can give. Also provide the additional information requested.

A representative will contact you by telephone early next term to arrange a time for the half-hour training session, where you will be shown how to use our simple tutoring method. At the end of this training session, your schedule of tutoring appointments will be arranged in accordance with your availability.

You may pledge any total number of hours from 1 to 15 (not counting the half-hour training session).

****

I wish to pledge a total of _____ hours as a volunteer tutor during the first month of the spring semester.

_____

(Your Signature)

PLEASE PRINT THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

Name _____

Address _____

_____

Telephone _____

Best time to be reached by telephone:

_____

PERSONAL NORM ITEM

For the next item check one of the alternatives given below the item.

If a special program was started at this college to tutor school children with learning difficulties I would feel a personal obligation to give a few hours of my time.

_____ would feel no obligation to do this

_____ would feel a slight obligation

_____ would feel somewhat more obligation

_____ would feel a strong obligation

Normal-Low Social Support

Hello, I represent a special student-faculty committee to help school children with learning problems. PAUSE We are interested in kids of normal intelligence who have weak academic skills that can be corrected through tutoring. These are kids who are failing in school even though they have the necessary interest and ability. They could easily be shown how to succeed. We are trying out a method for tutoring 4th and 5th graders in basic skills. We need volunteers who can give us a few hours of their time during the first month of the spring semester. The kids will be brought here by bus.

Volunteers will choose the subject they want to tutor in, and will be shown the method we are trying out. Each volunteer will work with a single school kid. You can commit yourself for as little as an hour and a half, at a time convenient for you.

You will recall that a few weeks ago you filled out an attitude questionnaire PAUSE that included an item on how you feel about tutoring children with learning problems. Jersey City State College is the only college in Hudson County where some students expressed enough interest to make it worthwhile to set up the program.

Handicapped-Low Social Support

Hello, I represent a special student-faculty committee to help physically handicapped children who have learning problems in school. PAUSE We are interested in handicapped kids of normal intelligence who have weak academic skills that can be corrected through tutoring. These are kids who have conditions like muscular dystrophy, rheumatic heart disorder, and various physical deformities. They all need to use a wheelchair or crutches. These children are failing in school even though they have the necessary interest and ability. They could easily be shown how to succeed. We are trying out a new method for tutoring 4th and 5th graders in basic skills. We need volunteers who can give us a few hours of their time during the first month of the spring semester. The kids will be brought here by bus.

Volunteers will choose the subjects they want to tutor in, and will work with a single school kid. You can commit yourself for as little as an hour and a half at a time convenient for you.

You will recall that a few weeks ago, you filled out an attitude questionnaire that included an item on how you feel about tutoring children with learning problems.

PAUSE Jersey City State College is the only college in Hudson County where some students expressed enough interest to make it worthwhile to set up the program.

Normal-High Social Support

Hello, I represent a special student-faculty committee to help school children with learning problems. We are interested in kids of normal intelligence who have weak academic skills that can be corrected through tutoring. These are kids who are failing in school even though they have the necessary interest and ability. They could easily be shown how to succeed. We are trying out a method for tutoring 4th and 5th graders in basic skills. We need volunteers who can give us a few hours of their time during the first month of the spring semester. The kids will be brought here by bus.

Volunteers will choose the subject they want to tutor in, and will be shown the method we are trying out. Each volunteer will work with a single school kid. You can commit yourself for as little as an hour and a half, at a time convenient for you.

You will recall that a few weeks ago you filled out an attitude questionnaire that included an item on how you feel about tutoring children with learning problems. Students Hudson County have expressed a lot of interest, so there are several colleges in the area that are participating in the program.

Handicapped-High Social Support

Hello, I represent a special student-faculty committee to help physically handicapped children who have learning problems in school. We are interested in handicapped kids of normal intelligence who have weak academic skills that can be corrected through tutoring. These are kids who have conditions like muscular dystrophy, rheumatic heart disorder, and various physical deformities. They all need to use a wheelchair or crutches. These children are failing in school even though they have the necessary interest and ability. They could easily be shown how to succeed. We are trying out a new method for tutoring 4th and 5th graders in basic skills. We need volunteers who can cige us a few hours of their time during the first month of the spring semester. The kids will be brought here by bus.

Volunteers will choose the subjects they want to tutor in, and will work with a single kid. You can commit yourself for as little as an hour and a half, at a time convenient for you.

You will recall that a few weeks ago you filled out an attitude questionnaire that included an item on how you feel about tutoring children with learning problems.

Students in Hudson County have expressed a lot of interest, so several colleges in the area are participating in the program.

Debriefing Script

It is important that you do not reveal, to anyone, what I'm about to tell you. This class was used in a study concerning helping behavior. A couple of weeks ago you filled out a questionnaire and last class some of you volunteered to tutor some children who you thought were having trouble in school. Both of these events were part of a study to determine what type of individual would help a person in need, in this case an academically handicapped child.

This type of study is important because it allows the psychologist to further understand why people respond to the needy. The results of this study may be useful in attempts to make people more sensitive to people less fortunate than they are.

Unfortunately, you had to be deceived. This was done to make sure you would give uninfluenced answers.

I am not responsible for this study, but I will answer your questions as well as I can. Any questions?

This study is still going on, so please keep what I have told you a secret. If you are exposed to any part of the experiment in your other classes please play "dumb". Take a pledge form, sign it and put a zero in the space provided for you to indicate the number of hours you are willing to volunteer to tutor.

REFERENCES

Aderman, D., & Berkowitz, L. Observational set, empathy, and helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14, 141-168.

Aderman, D., Brehm, S.S., & Katz, L.B. Empathic observation of an innocent victim: The just world revisited. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 242-247.

Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 85(5), 888-918.

Apsler, R. & Friedman, H. Chance outcomes and the just world: A comparison of observers and recipients. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 887-894.

Bandura, A. & Walters, R. Social Learning and Personality Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Baker, L.D. & Reitz, H.J. Altruism toward the blind: Effects of sex of helper and dependency of victim. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1978, 104, 12-28.

Benson, P.L., Karabenik, S.A. & Lerner, R.M. Pretty pleases: The effects of physical attractiveness, race, and sex on receiving help. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1976, 12(5), 409-415.

Berkowtiz, L. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (10 vols). New York: Academic Press.

Berkowitz, L. Social norms, feelings and other factors affecting helping behavior and altruism. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 1972, 6, 63-108.

Berkowitz, L. Dependency helpfulness with increased group size through lessening the effects of the needy individual's dependency. Journal of Personality, 1978, 46, 2, 299-310.

Berkowitz, L. Responsibility, reciprocity and social distance in helpgiving. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1968, 4, 46-63.

Berkowitz, L. & Daniels, L.R. Responsibility and dependency. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 429-437.

Berkowitz, L. & Daniels, L.R. Affecting the salience of the social responsibility norm: Effects of past help on the response to dependency relationships. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 275-281.

Berkowitz, L. & Connor, W.H. Success, failure and social responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 664-669.

Berkowitz, L., Klanderman, S.B., & Harris, R. Effects of experimenter awareness and sex of subject and experimenter on reactions to dependency relationship. Sociometry, 1964, 27(3), 327-337.

Bickman, L., & Kamzan, L. The effect of race and need on helping behavior. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 89, 73-77.

Blake, R.R., Berkowitz, H., Bellamy, R., & Mouton, J.S. Volunteering as an avoidance act. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 154-156.

Blake, R.R., Rosenbaum, M. & Duryea, R. Gift-giving as a function of group standards. Human Relations, 1955, 8, 61-73.

Bogardus, E.S. Social distance and its origins. Journal of Applied Sociology, 1925, 9, 216-226.

Brown, M. P3F Multiway Frequency Tables--The Log-Linear Model. In W.J. Dixon & M.B. Brown (Eds.), BMDP-79 Biomedical Computer Programs P-Series. Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1979.

Bryan, J.H. & Test, M.A. Models and helping: Naturalistic studies in aiding behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6(4), 400-407.

Chaikin, A.L., & Darley, J.M. Victim or perpetrator: Defensive attribution of responsibility and the need for order and justice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 268-275.

Cialdini, R.B., Kenrick, D.T., & Hoerig, J.H. Victim derogation in the Lerner paradigm: Just world or just justification? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 719-724.

Daniels, L.R. & Berkowtiz, L. Liking and response to dependency relationships. Human Relations, 1963, 16, 141-148.

Doob, A.N. & Ecker, B.P. Stigma and compliance. Journal of Personality, 1970, 14, 302-304.

Dixon, W.J. & M.G. Brown (Eds.). BMDP-79 Biomedical Computer Programs P-Series. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979.

Festinger, L.A. A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 1954, 7, 117-140.

Godfrey, B.W. & Lowe, C.A. Devaluation of innocent victims: An attirbution analysis within the just world paradigm. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 944-951.

Goffman, E. Stigma, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Goranson, R.E. & Berkowitz, L. Reciprocity and responsibility reactions to prior help. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 227-232.

Gruder, L.C., Romer, D., & Korth, B. Dependency and fault as determinants of helping. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1978, 14, 227, 235.

Heider, F. The Psychology of Inter-Personal Relations. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Helson, H., Mouton, J.S. & Blake, R.R. Petition signing as adjustment to situational and personality factors. Journal of Social Psychology, 1958, 48, 3-10.

Herberlein, T.A. & Black, J.S. Attitudinal specificity and the prediction of behavior in a field setting. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 474, 479.

Hornstein, H.A., Fisch, E., & Holms, M. Influence of a model's feelings about his behavior and his relevance as a comparison on other observers' behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 222-226.

Horowitz, I.A. Effect of choice and locus of dependence on helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 373, 378.

Jones, C. & Aronson, E. Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of respectability of the victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 415-419.

Katz, I. Some thoughts about the stigma notion. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. (In press)

Katz, I. & Glass, D.C. An Ambivalence Theory of Behavior Toward the Stigmatized. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.). The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1978.

Kenrick, D.T., Reich, J.W., & Cialdini, R.B. Justification and compensation: Rosier skies for the devalued victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 654-657.

Kleck, R. Physical stigma and nonverbal cues emitted in face-to-face interaction. Human Relations, 1968, 21, 19-28.

Kleck, R. Emotional arousal in interactions with stigmatized persons. Psychological Reports, 1966, 19, 1226.

Kleck, R., Buck, P.L., Goller, W.L., London, R.S., Pfeiffer, J.R., & Vukcevic, D.P. Effects of stigmatizing conditions on the use of personal space. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 111-118.

Kleck, R., Ono, H., & Hastarf, A.H. The effects of physical deviance upon face-to-face interaction. Human Relations, 1966, 19, 425-436.

Krebs, D.L. Altruism--An examination of the concept and a review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 4, 258-302.

Latane, B. & Dabbs, J.M. Sex, group size, and helping in three cities. Sociometry, 1975, 38(2), 180-194.

Latane, B. & Darley, J. The Unresponsive Bystander: Why Doesn't He Help? New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Lerner, M.J. Justice, guilt, and cerifical perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 20, 127-135.

Lerner, M.J. The justice motive: "Equity" and "parity" among children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 539-550.

Lerner, M.J. The justice motive: Some hypotheses as to its origins and forms. Journal of Personality, 1977, 45, 1-52.

Lerner, M.J. Evaluation of performance as a function of performer's reward and attractiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 355-360.

Lerner, M.J. The justice motive in social behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 1975, 31(3), 1-20.

Lerner, M.J. & Miller, D.T. Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. Psychological Bulletin, 1978, 85, 9, 1030-1051.

Lerner, M.J., Miller, D.T., & Holms, J.G. Deserving and the emergence of forms of justice. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 1976, 9, 134-160.

Lerner, M.J. & Simmons, C.H. The observer's reaction to the "innocent victim": Compassion or rejection? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 203-210.

Lerner, R.M. & Frank, P. Relation of race and sex to supermarket helping behavior. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1974, 94, 201-203.

Lerner, R., Solomon, H., & Brody, S. Helping behavior at a busstop. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 200.

Levinger, G. & Gunner, J. The interpersonal grid: 1. Felt and tape techniques for the measurement of social relationships. Psychonomic Science, 1967, 8(4), 173-174.

Levitt, L. & Kornhaber, R.C. Stigma and compliance: A re-examination. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1977, 103, 13-18.

Lincoln, A., & Levinger, G. Observers' evaluations of the victim and the attacker in an aggressive incident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 22, 202-210.

Long, G.T. & Lerner, M.J. Deserving. the "personal contract," and altruistic behavior by children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 551-556.

Macauley, J. & Berkowitz, L. (Eds.), Altruism and Helping Behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

McDonald, G.W. Innocent victim, deserved victim and martyr: Observers' reaction. Psychological Reports, 1977, 41(2), 511-514.

Milgram, S. Liberating effects of group pressure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1(2), 127-134.

Milgram, S. Behavioral study of obedience. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1963, 67(4), 371-378.

Miller, D.T. Altruism and the threat to a belief in a just world. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1977, 13, 1-13.

Mills, J. & Egger, R. Effect on derogation of a victim of choosing to reduce his distress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 23, 405-408.

Mirels, H.L. & Garrett, J.B. The Protestant Ethic as a personality variable. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 36, 40-44.

Piliavin, I.M., Piliavin, J.A. & Rodin, J. Costs, diffusion, and the stigmatized victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 429-438.

Pomazal, R.J. & Clore, G.L. Helping on the highway: The effects of dependency and sex. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1973, 3(2), 150-164.

Pomazal, R.J. & Jaccard, J.J. An informational approach to altruistic behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, V33(3), 317-326.

Richardson, S.A., Hastorf, A.H., Goodman, N., & Dornsbusch, S.M. Cultural uniformity in reaction to physical disabilities. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 241-247.

Rosenbaum, M. The effect of stimulus and background factors on the volunteering response. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 118-121.

Rosenbaum, M. & Blake, R.R. Volunteering as a function of field structure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 193-196.

Rosenhan, D. & White, G.M. Observation and rehearsal as determinants of prosocial behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1967, 5, 424, 431.

Rotter, J.B. A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. Journal of Personality, 1967, 35, 651-665.

Rubin, Z. & Peplau, L.A. Who believes in a just world? Journal of Social Issues, 1975, 31(3), 65-90.

Rubin, Z. & Peplau, A. Belief in a just world and reactions to another's lot: A study of participants in the national draft lottery. Journal of Social Issues, 1973, 29(4), 73-93.

Ryan, W. Blaming the Victim. New York: Pantheon, 1971.

Samerotte, G.C. & Harris, M.B. Some factors influencing helping: The effects of a handicap, responsibility and requesting help. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1976, 98, 39-45.

Schneider, K. Personality correlates of altruistic behavior under four experimental conditions. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1977, 102, 113-116.

Schwartz, S.H. Awareness of consequences and the influence of moral norms on interpersonal behavior. Sociometry, 1968, 31, 355-369.

Schwartz, S.H. Awareness of interpersonal consequences, responsibility denial and volunteering. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 57-63.

Schwartz, S.H. Elicitiation of moral obligation and self-sacrificing behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 283-293.

Schwartz, S.H. Normative explanations of helping behavior: A critique, proposal, and empirical test. Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology, 1973, 9, 349-364.

Schwartz, S.H. Words, deeds, and the perception of consequences and responsibility in action situations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 232-242.

Schwartz, S.H., & Ames, R. Positive and negative referent others as sources of influence. Sociometry, 1977, 40, 12-21.

Schwartz, S.H. & Clausen, G.T. Responsibility, norms, and helping in an emergency. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 16, 299-310.

Schwartz, S.H. & Tessler, R.C. A test of a model for reducing measured attitude-behavior discrepancies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 24, 225-236.

Simmons, C.H. & Lerner, M.J. Altriusm as a search for justice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 215-225.

Solomon, L.Z. & Grota, P. Imitation of a helpful model: The effect of level of emergency. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1976, 99, 29-35.

Stokols, D. & Schopler, J. Reactions to victims under conditions of situational detachment: The effects of responsibility, severity, and expressed future interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 199-209.

Thayer, S. Lend me your ears: Racial and sexual factors in helping the deaf. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 193, 28, 1, 8-11.

Tringo, J.L. The hierarchy of preference toward disability groups. Journal of Special Education, 1970, Sum., 4(3), 295-306.

Ungar, S. The effects of effort and stigma on helping. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1979, 107, 23-28.

Wagner, C. & Wheeler, L. Model, need and cost effects in helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 12, 111-116.

West, S.G., Whitney, G., & Schnedler, R. Helping a motorist in distress: The effects of sex, race, and neighborhood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31(4), 691-698.

White, G.M. Contextual determinants of opinion judgments: Field experimental probes of judgmental relativity boundary conditions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32(6), 1047-1954.

Winer, B.J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Wispe, L.G. & Freshly, H.B. Race, sex, and sympathetic helping behavior: The broken bag caper. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 17, 59-65.

Wispe, L. Positive forms of social behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 1-20.

Worthington, M.E. Personal space as a function of the stigma effect. Environment and Behavior, 1974, 6, 289-294.

Wright, B.A. Physical Disability--A Psychological Approach. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Wrightsman, L.S. Social Psychology. Monterey, California: 1977.

Zuckerman, M. Belief in a just world and altrusitic behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 972-976.

Zuckerman, M. & Reiss, H.T. Comparison of three models for predicting altrusitic behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36, 5, 498-510.

Zuckerman, M., Siegelbaum, H., & Williams, R. Predicting helping behavior: Willingness and ascription of responsibility. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1977, 7, 4, 295-299.