

1-1-1972

Reactions of advantaged and disadvantaged to a situation of inequity.

Nuran Hortacsu
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation

Hortacsu, Nuran, "Reactions of advantaged and disadvantaged to a situation of inequity." (1972). *Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014*. 1632.
<https://doi.org/10.7275/z008-nt95> https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/1632

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

312066013573331

REACTIONS OF ADVANTAGED AND DISADVANTAGED
TO A SITUATION OF INEQUITY

A dissertation Presented

By

Nuran Hortacsu

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

June 1972
(month) (year)

Major Subject Psychology

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements are extended to Dr. Stephen Reisman and Dr. Ivan Steiner for their help and guidance during the writing and the conception of the study. I am also grateful to Drs. Barbara and Castellano Turner for their help and enthusiasm in my research.

My thanks to Robert Bringle for his help during the analysis of the data and also to Michael Carroll, William DeLamarter and Manfred Rotermund for their help during the videotaping and other stages of the study. Special thanks to George I. Whitehead, III, for his support in spite of the fact that his support was extended under no hindsight fait accompli conditions.

I also acknowledge Michael Costa, Paul Dansereau, Paul Lane, Ed Wagner and especially Jeff Maienza for their cooperation and patience during the making of the videotape movie.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	ii
LIST OF TABLES.	iv
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
II. METHOD.	16
Subjects.	16
Procedure	17
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.	24
Manipulation Checks	31
Reactions to Injustice.	47
Relationship Among Alternative Ways of Dealing With Injustice.	65
Differences In Perception Of The Experimental Situations Between Subjects Taking Teacher's And Student's Point Of View.	77
IV. CONCLUSION.	82
REFERENCES.	88
APPENDIX A.	90
APPENDIX B.	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of Manipulation Checks	27
2. Main and Interaction Effects on Manipulation Checks from 4 Way Analysis	28
3. Main and Interaction Effects on Manipulation Checks from 3 Way Analysis Using Data from Subjects Taking Student's Point of View	29
4. Main and Interaction Effects on Manipulation Checks from 3 Way Analysis Using Data from Subjects Taking Teacher's Point of View	30
5. Significant Main and Interaction Effects on Various Measures from 4 Way Analysis of Variance	35
6. Significant Main and Interaction Effects on Various Dependent Measures from 3 Way Analysis Using Data from Subjects Taking Student's Point of View	41
7. Significant Main and Interaction Effects on Various Dependent Measures from 3 Way Analysis Using Data from Subjects Taking Teacher's Point of View	43
8. Frequency distribution of Subjects' Scores on Perceived Justice	49
9. Internal Analysis on Data from Subjects Taking Students' Point of View with Independent Variables High and Low Perceived Injustice and Questionnaire Order	51
10. Perceived Justice and Questionnaire Order Interaction on the Amount of Money the Student Thinks the Teacher Would Have Given Himself	58
11. Internal Analysis on Data from Subjects Taking Teacher's Point of View with Independent Variables High and Low Perceived Injustice and Questionnaire Order	60

Table		Page
12.	Frequency Distribution of Subject's Scores on Amount of Exploitation	69
13.	Questionnaire Order Effects	70
14.	Internal Analysis on Data from Subjects Taking Student's Point of View with Independent Variables High, Medium and Low Exploitation and Questionnaire Order	71
15.	Internal Analysis on Data from Subjects Taking Teacher's Point of View with Independent Variables High and Low Exploitation and Questionnaire Order	75
16.	Significant Effects Due to Point of View Taken	78

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to predict the reactions of people who are justified or unjustified in occupying advantaged roles in a situation of inequity. Study was made up of two parallel experiments, one using subjects watching a videotape movie of the unjust situation from the point of view of the advantaged and the other, from the point of view of the disadvantaged. The design of the study was a 2 x 2 x 2 design with the independent variables justified-unjustified advantaged, justified-unjustified disadvantaged and questionnaire order. The dependent variables were 1) evaluation of other, 2) justification, 3) minimization, and 4) compensation/exploitation. The variable of advantaged-disadvantaged was manipulated by the high or low status and outcome teacher and student roles in the situation and justification was manipulated by high or low performance on a pretest relevant to role occupation which was consistent or not consistent with the role occupied. Questionnaire order varied answering compensation/exploitation measure before or after the other measures.

It was predicted that our four experimental situations, JA-JDA, JA-UJDA, UJA-JD, UJA-UJDA would lead to different degrees of feelings of injustice, anger and guilt, which, in turn would lead to differential use of the four responses to injustice. Analysis of data showed that our four experimental situations did not lead to different degrees of perceived injustice, guilt

or anger. Since the use of dependent measures were assumed to be mediated by these variables no attempt was made at interpreting the few significant effects obtained from analysis of data according to manipulations.

Two internal analyses based on perceived injustice were conducted, one using data from subjects taking the point of view of the student and the other using data from subjects taking the point of view of the teacher. Results of the internal analyses showed that those subjects taking the point of view of the student exploited and derogated more and justified and minimized less in high than low perceived injustice condition. For subjects taking the point of view of the teacher there was more compensation, less justification and less derogation in the perceived injustice than the perceived justice condition.

Two internal analyses based on amount of exploitation engaged in were conducted using data from subjects taking the point of view of the student and subjects taking the point of view of the teacher. This was done in order to look at the relationship between different modes of resolving dissonance aroused by the injustice of the situation. It was found that high exploiting students used more derogation and less justification than low exploiting students and that high exploiting teachers used more derogation and more justification than low exploiting teachers. It was also found that subjects taking the point of view of the teacher compensated more if the opportunity to compensate was presented before than after the opportunity to derogate or justify. Another finding was that those taking the point of view

of the advantaged justified the situation more than those taking the point of view of the disadvantaged.

The results are discussed in a dissonance theory framework and it is concluded that people in a situation of inequity respond in ways which most effectively reduce their dissonance and cause them the least financial costs.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to understand and predict the reactions of people who are justified or unjustified in occupying advantaged or disadvantaged roles in relation to each other in a situation where inequity exists. The task here will be the analysis of the use of alternate responses to inequity by people occupying different roles. A dissonance theory framework will be used in attacking the problem. One would expect that people who benefit and people who suffer from the inequity might react differently to each other and to the situation. Another general expectation is of the use of several possible responses to the situation of inequity rather than just one. It is expected that the simultaneous use of two or more responses might increase dissonance for people occupying the advantaged role but the use of the same two responses might not lead to increased dissonance for people occupying the disadvantaged role. In the context of the experiment, we want to look at the reactions of justified and unjustified teachers and their students to each other. The justification variable will be manipulated by having one's score on training ability test (high or low) consistent or inconsistent with one's role status (teacher or student) in the experimental situation. A teacher who scores high on a training ability test will be considered to be occupying his position with justification

while a teacher who scores low on the test will be said to have no justification for occupying the teacher role. Inversely, the occupation of the student position will be justified for a low scoring student and unjustified for a high scoring student.

In approaching this problem, evidence from three types of studies will be considered. The first group of studies to be reviewed are those done by Lerner, which deal with the reactions of an observer to the suffering of an "innocent" victim. In these studies the observer has very little or no responsibility for the pain endured by the victim. The main dependent variable of Lerner studies is the evaluation of the victim by the observer.

A second group of studies involve subjects who harm a confederate during the experiment (Berscheid and Walster, 1967; Brock and Buss, 1962, 1964; Carlsmith and Gross, 1969; Freedman and Wallington, 1967; Glass, 1964; Jones and Davis, 1960). The dependent variables of this second group of studies are 1) compliance to a request by the victim or another person (Berscheid and Walster, 1967; Carlsmith and Gross, 1969; Freedman and Wallington, 1967); 2) evaluation of the victim (Brock and Buss, 1962, 1964; Glass, 1964; Jones and Davis, 1960); 3) judgment of the amount of pain inflicted (Brock and Buss, 1962, 1964); 4) justification of aggression (Brock and Buss, 1964; Glass, 1964); 5) compensation to the victim (Berscheid and Walster, 1967).

The studies in the two above groups deal with the reactions of the advantaged to the disadvantaged. The predictions and explanations of the above studies are mainly derived from dissonance

formulations. Lerner's explanation of his results (derogation of the innocent victim) is that people like to believe that they are living in a just world where saints are rewarded and sinners are punished. In a situation where they are faced with the suffering of an innocent victim, people tend to rearrange the facts of the situation in such a way as to maintain the idea of a just world. In other words, subjects in Lerner's experiments reason that since people who deserve punishment suffer; the victim is obviously suffering, the victim must deserve punishment, i.e., the victim must be a low valued person. In the harm-doer studies, the idea of having harmed another person for a little more justification than the fact that it was required (or recommended) by a psychology experiment is assumed to be dissonant with most people's self concept of being a just, decent person. Thus, these studies are concerned with responses made by subjects experiencing different degrees of dissonance.

Two studies are representative of the third group of studies concerned with the problem at hand. The first study is by Thibaut. Thibaut (1960) randomly assigned one group of boys to play the more interesting part of a game (throw beanbags) and the other group to play the less interesting part (hold the target for the beanbags and retrieve beanbags). The experimenter observed a lot of hostility directed at the group performing the more interesting task by the group performing the dull task. The advantaged group did nothing to return the hostility of the disadvantaged group probably because they felt that they were unjustly holding the interesting job and that the others had a right to feel hostile.

A second study (Stephenson and White, 1970) used privilege-deprivation and justification-no justification as the independent variables. They looked at the cheating behavior of boys occupying one of the four positions in a group (justly privileged, unjustly privileged, justly deprived, unjustly deprived). The experiment involved 10-year old boys racing miniature cars. The 2 privileged boys raced the cars while the 2 deprived boys picked them up as they came off the track. Justice and injustice were manipulated by giving the boys a test before they started playing with the cars and assigning them to roles of racing and picking up the cars on the basis of their test performance. After a short practice session, however, the experimenter told the boys that there had been a mistake in scoring the test and that one of the racers (unjustly privileged) really had a low score while one of the pickers (unjustly deprived) really had a high score on the test. After the racing period was over the boys were asked about their enjoyment of the task and also were given an opportunity to cheat on a different task in order to win a prize.

The results showed a significant main effect of privilege vs. deprivation in enjoyment of the situation. No significant differences were found in the amount of guilt between justly and unjustly privileged groups, nor were the unjustly deprived boys significantly more "angry" than justly deprived when "anger" was measured by answers to questions. However, the experimenters observed signs of embarrassment and being upset in unjustly privileged and unjustly deprived boys. The cheating scores showed no main effect of privileged vs. deprived groups. It was found

that the justly privileged cheated more than the justly deprived and that the unjustly privileged cheated slightly less than the unjustly deprived. One interesting finding was that the subjects in high cheating groups believed that they performed well on the test used to assign them to high or low privileged groups while low cheating subjects rated themselves low on the test.

The proposed study is an attempt at predicting several dissonance reducing responses made by teachers and their students when the occupation of the two roles are either justified or unjustified. The teaching situation with teacher and student roles is chosen for the experiment because of the advantage and disadvantage associated both with the pay and the status of the two roles and also because of the fact that performance on a previous test can quite clearly show whether the occupation of the roles is justified or not. Also, the teacher-student situation is generally familiar to most experimental subjects at least in a general way.

All but one (Brock and Buss, 1964) of the harm-doer studies concern situations where subjects are arbitrarily assigned to the harm-doer role by the experimenter and do what they are told with no choice in selecting or changing their roles. Arbitrary assignment by the experimenter is very much like being assigned by chance. The person's qualifications have no bearing on how assignment is made. The victim also occupies his role by an arbitrary decision of the experimenter. By manipulating the variable of justification and no justification for role occupation we are trying to examine at the influence of different types

of advantaged-disadvantaged relationships on the reactions of both advantaged or disadvantaged to each other. The second contribution of the proposed study to earlier research is the examination of the reactions of the disadvantaged to the situation. The harm-doer studies have shown no interest in the victim's reactions and have used him only as a stimulus person of the situation. We think that their reactions to the four experimental situations (justified advantaged-justified disadvantaged, unjustified advantaged-justified disadvantaged, justified advantaged-unjustified disadvantaged, unjustified advantaged-unjustified disadvantaged) is an important part of the advantaged-disadvantaged relationship and should be investigated.

In the Stephenson and White (1970) study, an equity hypothesis was used to predict the amount of cheating subjects in each experimental condition would engage in. Similar reasoning is useful in assessing the degree of inequity (dissonance) experienced by the advantaged teachers and disadvantaged students in the four experimental conditions suggested in the present study. According to the distributive justice rule, people expect the outcomes they get from an experiment to correspond to the resources they put into the situation. The degree of satisfaction with the situation is determined by the correspondence between inputs one invests and the outputs one gets. In other words, people want to reap as much as they sow. The degree of satisfaction with the situation is also, theoretically determined by comparing the ratio of one's own inputs to outputs with

those of others. Most people are more or less satisfied if they get the same ratio of inputs to outputs as others with whom they compare themselves. Dissatisfaction with one's outcomes arises when one sees that one's payoff ratio is less than those of comparison others. It is important to note that in most situations it is the equality or inequality of one's payoff ratio to that of others, as well as the net payoff, which determines the degree of satisfaction with one's outcomes, i.e., satisfaction is a function of the product of net payoffs and relative payoff ratio.

If we think of being satisfied with one's outcomes as rewarding and being dissatisfied as frustrating or punishing, we can begin to predict the feelings of a person towards others whose net payoff ratios are greater or less than one's own. In operational terms being advantaged vs. disadvantaged is defined by enjoying high or low net payoffs. Justly disadvantaged are those whose inputs and absolute payoffs are both low, unjustly disadvantaged are those whose inputs are high, but whose net payoffs are low. Justly advantaged individuals contribute much and enjoy high outcomes, while those who are unjustly advantaged contribute little but enjoy high outcomes.

From this point on we will be concerned with making predictions about equity-restoring responses of advantaged and disadvantaged in the proposed experimental situation. Reactions of the advantaged will be considered first, primarily because the work on harm-doers bears on the predictions for the advantaged.

In the following discussion we will assume that some degree of dissonance in the advantaged is present because of the fact that they derive higher outcomes from a situation than a fellow subject. Equity principles will be applied to infer the degree of dissonance experienced in different conditions. In the four experimental conditions suggested above, discrepancy between payoff ratios of teacher and student is greatest in UJA-UJDA and least in JA-JDA. As was explained in the discussion of equity principles, the above is true because of the fact that in UJA-UJDA the teacher invests least and gets the best possible outcomes in the situation while the exact opposite is true for the student. On the other hand, in JA-JDA condition both people in the situation get from the experience outcomes appropriate with their inputs (i.e., the more able person gets to be the teacher while the less able gets to be the student). Following from the above analysis, most and least dissonance should be experienced in conditions UJA-UJDA and JA-JDA respectively. Conditions UJA-JDA and JA-UJDA are similar with respect to discrepancy of payoff ratios. It might be suggested that more dissonance will be experienced in UJA-JDA condition because the teacher will know that he is not worthy of the position he is occupying. There is some evidence from Brock and Buss (1964) that subjects occupying the trainer position and who shock their student feel more guilt and estimate the injury they inflicted to be less if they have no justification for holding their position than if they are told that they are assigned to the trainer role on the basis of a screening test

measuring their aptitude for training.

In most situations there are several ways of reducing inequity or dissonance. The teachers in the above experimental situations are likely to have several ways of relieving their dissonance; namely: 1) justifying their role; 2) minimizing the student's disadvantage; 3) derogating the student; 4) compensating the student; 5) derogating themselves. Elaine Walster (1969) offers the following pertinent hypotheses concerning the conditions under which harm-doer (advantaged teacher in this case) may be expected to use one equity restoring technique rather than another.

"Hypothesis III: Other things being equal, the more adequate a harm-doer perceives an available equity-restoring technique to be, the greater the probability that he will choose to restore equity by utilizing this technique.

The "adequacy" of a technique is defined as the extent to which use of that technique will exactly restore equity to the relationship. (p. 187)

Corollary III-B: The more adequate a harm-doer perceives available justifications to be, the greater the probability that he will choose to restore equity by utilizing this technique.

1) Justifications should be more credible (adequate), and thus more readily used, when they require little distortion of reality than when they require a great deal of reality distortion. (p. 181)

2) Justifications which involve distortion of the victim's characteristics should be more credible and thus more readily used, the less contact the harm-doer has had (or anticipates having) with the victim. (p. 189)

Hypothesis IV: Other things being equal, the harm-doer will use that technique which will yield the highest overall O/I ratio in the harm-doer-victim relationship.

Derivation IV-1: If all three techniques are available and equally adequate, self punishment will be least preferred of the three responses. (p. 190)

Hypothesis V: The harm-doer will tend not to use the justification technique in concert with compensation and self punishment techniques.

Corollary V-A: In cases in which both compensation and justification techniques are available, but are inadequate, only one technique will be used; they will not be used in concert to reduce distress. (p. 191)"

In the proposed study subjects will watch a video tape movie of a learning situation where the teacher and the student are either justified or unjustified in occupying their roles. The subjects will be instructed to identify with either the teacher or the student in the movie. At the end of the videotape movie both the teacher and the student will receive questionnaires. The subjects watching the movie will also be given questionnaires and will be instructed to respond as if they were in the place of the person they identified with. In addition to manipulation checks concerning the justification for occupation of the roles and questions about felt guilt and annoyance, four kinds of responses to inequity will be tapped in the questionnaire, namely 1) evaluation of the other person in the situation; 2) minimization of the injustice of the situation; 3) justification of the situation; and 4) compensation/exploitation, i.e., actually restoring justice.

Since all these responses are responses to injustice, it is expected that the extent to which each is used should be related to the use of others. The relationships among the use of

different responses to injustice is not necessarily the same for those occupying the advantaged and disadvantaged roles. For those occupying the advantaged role, exploitation of the disadvantaged and justification of the situation should be positively related since justifying the injustice paves the way to further injustice, i.e., exploitation. For those occupying the disadvantaged role, justification of injustice and exploitation of the advantaged should be negatively related, since supporting the injustice by justifying it should reduce felt injustice and make restoring justice by exploitation of the advantaged less necessary. For both advantaged and disadvantaged, exploitation and devaluation of the other should be positively related since exploiting a liked other should be a dissonance producing response in itself.

Four dissonance reducing responses by advantaged teachers are being measured in this study: 1) evaluation of the student; 2) judgment of the importance of the money lost by the student; 3) teacher's justification for his role; and, 4) compensation.

Evaluation (derogation) of the student

In general we would expect JDA to be derogated more than UJDA since the evidence available to the teacher supports that response. In Walster's (1969) words, there is less distortion of reality in derogating a JDA than an UJDA. Also, it is easier for a JA to derogate a JDA than it is for an UJA since the JA knows that he is superior and he will feel more justified in derogating a low scoring person. On the other hand, UJDA should be derogated more by UJA than JA because of the greater dissonance

to be relieved by the UJA. Derogating might be least costly and most convenient way of relieving dissonance in UJA-UJDA condition since because of the large amount of inequity experienced the alternate technique of compensation might not be seen as adequate. In summary, two main effects (J-UJA and J-UJDA) and an interaction effect are predicted with the following ordering in terms of decreasing use of derogation: $JA-JDA > UJA-JDA > UJA-UJDA > JA-UJDA$.

Judgment of the importance of the money lost by the student

Minimization of the loss endured by the student is a dissonance reducing mechanism and its use does not conflict with use of any other alternate response, i.e., minimization when used simultaneously with another mechanism does not lead to more dissonance. Thus the use of minimization should be a function of the amount of dissonance experienced. As a result, greatest and least amount of minimization should occur in conditions UJA-UJDA and JA-JDA with intermediate amounts in the remaining conditions.

Justification

The JA would be expected to use justification more in general than UJA since this way of reducing dissonance is more in accordance with reality in the former case. More justification is also likely to be used in JDA and UJDA since most people would be more willing to see injustice directed at those who are of lower ability, who presumably deserve punishment, than toward those of higher ability. Thus, on this measure main effects of both J-UJA and J-UJDA are expected.

Compensation

The amount of compensation should be inversely related to the amount of derogation in a condition since when both responses are used, dissonance may be increased rather than decreased.

(If a person deserves his ill fortune there is no need to compensate him.) It is also likely not to occur when the experienced inequity is very high, since subjects might feel that the amount of compensation they offer may not be adequate. Thus, conditions JA-UJDA and UJA-JDA would lead to more compensations than conditions JA-JDA and UJA-UJDA since the former lead to intermediate amounts of dissonance. Condition JA-UJDA might lead to greatest compensation since UJDA deserves more compensation and less derogation than JDA. Least compensation is expected in JA-JDA, since least inequity is experienced in this condition. Thus, in terms of the use of compensation the rank ordering will be the following: JA-UJDA > UJA-JDA > UJA-UJDA > JA-JDA.

Making predictions about the reactions of the DA to the experimental situation has been relatively straightforward. Since the DA should feel little responsibility for the existence or perpetuation of the inequitious situation, the use of several inequity reducing responses should be a direct function of the amount of inequity experienced. As was discussed above, most inequity should be felt in UJA-UJDA condition because of the large discrepancy between the input and output ratios of the student and teacher in the situation. In that situation the

student should feel that he got a bad deal and that the person who really deserved to get little money did nothing to help him gain all the money he could possibly gain. Least inequity should occur in JA-JDA condition because although the student gets little money, he previous performance on the screening test justifies the little amount he gets. Some inequity should be felt in JA-UJDA and UJA-JDA conditions because of the fact that the discrepancy between payoff ratios of teacher and student favor the teacher. The four alternate equity restoring responses available to the student in the proposed experimental situations were: 1) evaluation (derogation) of the teacher; 2) judgment of the importance of the money lost by the student; 3) justification for the behavior of the teacher; 4) demanding compensation from the teacher. It is expected that the use of justification will be negatively correlated with demands for compensation and derogation of the teacher since simultaneous use of justification with any of the other two measures is likely to create dissonance rather than alleviate inequity. Predictions concerning the relative amounts of the four alternate responses likely to be used by disadvantaged ones.

Evaluation (derogation) of teacher

Amount of derogation should be greater for UJA than JA since such an evaluation is consonant with reality. Amount of derogation should also be a direct function of amount of inequity experienced. Thus, the following rank ordering should occur in amount of teacher derogation engaged in by students: UJA-UJDA > UJA-JDA > JA-UJDA > JA-JDA.

Judgment of the importance of the money lost by the student

If the experiment were run with students who really lost money which was of significant importance to them the importance of the money lost would be hard to distort. If the amount of money lost were not of significant importance, the judged importance of the money lost should follow the following rank ordering: $UJA-UJDA > UJA-JDA > JA-UJDA > JA-JDA$.

Justification of the behavior of the teacher

A main effect of justification vs. no justification of teacher is expected since JA has shown that he deserves his advantageous position by his previous performance on a screening test. Parallelling the use of derogation, use of justification should be an inverse function of amount of inequity. Hence, the following descending order is predicted: $JA-JDA > JA-UJDA > UJA-JDA > UJA-UJDA$.

Compensation demanded from the teacher

To the student, the most advantageous way of restoring equity should be asking for compensation. We expected demanding compensation to be a popular response among students. Compensation demanded should be a direct function of the inequity experienced. Hence, the following ascending order is predicted: $JA-JDA > JA-UJDA > UJA-JDA > UJA-UJDA$.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

The study was conceived of as 2 parallel experiments, one looking at the situation from the point of view of the advantaged and the other looking at the situation from the point of view of the disadvantaged. The design of each experiment was a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ design with the following independent variables: Justified-unjustified advantaged (teacher), Justified-unjustified disadvantaged (student) and Questionnaire order (answering the question about the division of extra \$3 provided by the experimenter before or after other dependent measures). The dependent measures were: 1) evaluation of the student by the teacher or evaluation of the teacher by the student; 2) degree of justification of the situation; 3) degree minimization of the injustice; 4) compensation offered to the student by the teacher or compensation demanded by the student from the teacher.

Subjects

Subjects in the experiment were 249 male students from various psychology courses at the University of Massachusetts. Subjects were encouraged but not required to sign up for psychology experiments in order to gain extra points to be added to their course grade. One hundred and thirty one subjects were randomly assigned to the point of view of the student and one hundred and eighteen

subjects were assigned to the point of view of the teacher.

Procedure

Subjects were run in groups of 1-14. They were seated in a small room containing a TV screen. Subjects were given a questionnaire with either the name "Stan" or "Bruce" on it and were instructed to try to imagine that they were going through the same experience as either Stan or Bruce in the movie. They were told that the movie was about a psychology experiment and that the two subjects in the movie were participating in the experiment because they were told that they could make some money during the experiment. Subjects were told that the subjects in the movie would get a questionnaire at the end of the movie and that they would also get the identical questionnaire and should answer it as if they had undergone the experience of either Stan or Bruce. The experimenter then turned on the TV and let the subjects watch the movie. Subjects watched one of the four versions of the experimental movie, which had the following scenerio:

Experimenter: Hello, I am Jeff

Subject 1: I am Bruce

Subject 2: I am Stan

Experimenter: Let me explain what we are going to be doing here.

On this poster is printed the name of a common object, apple.

(Experimenter displays poster which has name "apple" at top and five seven-step semantic scales below; fast-slow, old-young, hard-soft, red-black edible-inedible.)

If you were asked to rate "apple" on each of these scales, perhaps you could do it. But some of the scales aren't appropriate. It isn't very meaningful to say an apple is fast or slow, or that it is old or young. If you were trying to tell someone what an apple is like, you'd probably emphasize the edible-inedible dimension and the red-black dimension. That is the way it is whenever we try to describe or explain something to someone else -- we need to identify the thing on the dimensions that really matter. Half of the job of describing something is picking the right dimension.

In this study we are trying to determine how well one person can teach another to select the important dimensions, the ones that are most descriptive of certain concepts. One of you will be the teacher and one will be a student. I'll display posters like this, each with a different concept and different dimensions. The student will tell the teacher which of the 5 dimensions he thinks is most descriptive of the concept, and the teacher will evaluate the student's responses by telling whether he is right or wrong on each trial. In order that the teacher will have some basis for judgment I'll give him a sheet of paper on which we are reporting how frequently students in the past have selected each dimension. The fact that a particular dimension has been regarded as most important by lots of other students doesn't necessarily mean it is best, but it is, at least, presumptive evidence. The teacher will have to make a judgment each time as to whether or not the student is right or wrong.

Our earlier research has suggested that some people are better teachers than others--some people seem to be better at deciding whether a particular response is a good one or not and also by dispensing rewards in such a way as to improve their student's performance on a task. Of course whether a student can improve his performance on a task or not is partly determined by his own ability and sensitivity to the cues of his teacher. What I am trying to say is that teaching and being taught is a two-way business. It takes good teachers and good students to improve the student's performance. In this study we are trying to match you people to the teacher-student roles so that the person who shows higher ability in teaching and understanding the task to be performed becomes the teacher and the other person becomes the student. To test this teaching ability we want you to take the Thurnstone Abstract Thinking Ability test. I want you both to take it. The one who scores higher will be the teacher and the other will be the student. Bob will you give these people the tests?

(Bob appears briefly and hands each student a mimeo form. The picture blacks out and then resumes with Bob collecting the papers. The experimenter resumes talking.)

It will take him only a couple of minutes to score the papers. In the meantime, let me explain what is going on here some more. You must be wondering why I did not mention anything about the money you were told you could be earning in this experiment. It goes like this: you will each be earning money according to the efforts and abilities you put into this task and also on the

progress you make at the task. Most people would agree that the teacher carries more of the burden of responsibility. After all not only is he the more able of the two but he is also going to be devising a strategy to improve the performance of the student. He might or might not be successful in improving the student's performance but at least he is spending the effort. The teacher will get 20¢ for each trial. At the end of every five trials I will pay the teacher 1 dollar. The student will be rewarded for his correct answers by the teacher. The teacher will have an additional 3 dollars at his disposal for rewarding the student for his correct responses. This money is not his to keep. He should use it as a means of teaching the student. It is up to the teacher how much he should give the student for each correct answer. He should use his judgment in determining the amount but he should try to give the money in such amounts that he can spread the money along the 15 trials of the experiment. Money given to the student is a source of information about the quality of his answers as well as a reward for performing well. If the teacher does not use up all of the 3 dollars available as rewards to the student the remainder will be returned to me. What I mean is the teacher will not get more money if he gives little to the student. The student should always try to give the best answer and should pay close attention to the way the teacher responds to his answers. He should try to figure out what the teacher is trying to tell him by giving or withholding rewards. Students can often improve their performance as they go along if they figure out

the strategy the teacher is following. Sometimes they learn not only that the teacher thinks certain kinds of answers are wrong but also that certain other kinds are right.

The teacher should check the sheets I'll give him to see what other people have generally regarded as best answers. But he must use his own judgment too, and he need not necessarily be bound by the decisions others have made. The teacher should try to dispense rewards in a way that will improve the performance of his student on later posters.

(Bob enters and hands the experimenter the results of the "thinking ability test")

Experimenter: Bruce, you scored high on the test, so, you will be the teacher. Stan, you will be the student. (to Bruce, giving him \$3) in change. Here is the money you will use to reward Stan, and here are sheets which show how other students in the past have responded to the concepts. Are there any questions (pause) O.K., then we will begin.

(Experimenter goes through 5 posters, student gets 2 quarters. At this point Bob enters in all but the justified teacher-justified student condition)

Justified teacher-justified student condition

Experimenter: Let me interrupt for a minute. Some people find that they make better teachers if they go through the same experience as their students. (to Bruce) Would you like to exchange roles with your student for a while?

Bruce: No, I think I am O.K. as I am.

Experimenter: O.K. then, Let's go on.

Justified teacher-unjustified student condition

Experimenter: It seems there was a mistake in scoring of the tests. Stan, you scored pretty high. Actually either of you could have been the teacher.

By the way, some people find that they make better teachers if they go through the same experience as their students. (to Bruce) Would you like to exchange roles with your student for a while?

Bruce: No, I am O.K. as I am.

Experimenter: O.K. then. Let's go on.

Unjustified teacher-justified student condition

Experimenter: It seems there was a mistake in scoring of the tests. Bruce, you scored pretty low. Actually either of you could have been the student.

By the way, some people find that they make better teachers if they go through the same experience as their students. (to Bruce) Would you like to exchange roles with your student for a while?

Bruce: No, I think I am O.K. as I am.

Experimenter: O.K. then. Let's go on.

Unjustified teacher-unjustified student condition

Experimenter: It seems there was a mistake in scoring of the tests. Stan, you scored pretty high and Bruce, you scored pretty low. You really should have been in each other's roles.

By the way, some people find that they make better teachers if they go through the same experience as their students. (to Bruce) Would you like to exchange roles with your student for a while?

Bruce: No, I think I am O.K. as I am.

Experimenter: O.K. then. Let's go on.

(Subjects go on for 10 more trials. Stan gets rewarded 3 more times.)

Experimenter: O.K. Now we would like you to answer some questions.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to study the reactions of advantaged and disadvantaged to different degrees of injustice. Following an equity line of theorizing the degrees of injustice were defined by the difference between the payoff ratios (the ratio of one's inputs to outputs in a situation) of the two subjects in the situation. It was assumed that injustice would lead to uncomfortable feelings of guilt or that subjects anger in the people occupying the advantaged and the disadvantaged roles would seek to resolve these feelings in one of the following two ways: 1) actually restoring justice by offering or asking for compensation, or 2) rationalizing the injustice away by justification, minimization or devaluation of the other. It was also assumed that there would be systematic relationships among the use of different responses to injustice such that feelings of dissonance due to injustice would be reduced most effectively when several responses to injustice were available. Thus, findings will be discussed in three major sections:

A) degree to which each of the available responses is used at different degrees of injustice by the advantaged and the disadvantaged; B) the relationships among the use of different

responses; and C) differences in reactions to the unjust situations between subjects taking the point of view of the advantaged and those taking the point of view of the disadvantaged. Although we will discuss our results in these three sections we believe that a dissonance theory explanation is the dominant theme over all sections in that all three sections suggest answers to the question of how dissonance is most effectively reduced in different circumstances by people occupying different roles.

In the experimental situation, the expected responses to injustice were: 1) evaluative reactions to the other person in the situation; 2) justification of the unjust situation; 3) minimization of the injustice; and, 4) exploitation/compensation. Manipulation of different degrees of injustice was attempted by giving the subjects a pretest which presumably tested their ability for the experimental task. Subjects were assigned to the high status, high outcome teacher and low status, low outcome student roles either in a way consistent with their test performance (i.e., high scorers become teachers and low scorers become students) or in a way inconsistent with their test performance (i.e., high scorers become student and low scorers become teacher). When performance on pretest and status were congruent (high score-high status) the subject was said to occupy the role with justification, when performance and status were not congruent, (high score-low status, low score-high status) the subject was said to occupy the role with no justification.

It was expected that the situation where status and performance of the two people were congruent (justified advantaged-justified disadvantaged) would lead to least feelings of injustice and the one where the status and performance of the two people were incongruent (unjustified advantaged-unjustified disadvantaged) would lead to greatest feelings of injustice. The other two conditions, where the status and ability of only one of the participants was incongruent were to lead to intermediate feelings of injustice.

There were two possible ways of looking at the study. One way is to look at the design as a $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ design with point of view, just-unjust teacher, just-unjust student and questionnaire order as four independent variables. The second way of thinking about the study is to consider it two parallel $2 \times 2 \times 2$ studies, one where the observer takes the point of view of the advantaged and the other where the observer takes the point of view of the disadvantaged. The second way of conceptualizing the study might be more correct since some of the dependent measures are worded somewhat differently for subjects playing the role of the teacher and that of the student. The first way of conceptualizing the study however, is useful in that it gives one an idea of the differences in perception of the situation which may be due to the point of view taken while observing the event.

Manipulation checks based on both ways of analyzing the data will be reported below and summarized in Tables 1-4. Our first step in analyzing the data is to see if the performance of the

TABLE 1

Summary of Manipulation Checks		
<u>Dependent measure</u>	<u>Type of analysis</u>	
<u>Manipulation checks</u>	<u>2 x 2 x 2 x 2</u>	<u>2 x 2 x 2 (teacher)</u>
Performance of teacher on pretest	JT (4.22), UJT (5.19) JT better (.001)	JT (3.18), UJT (3.91) JT better (.03)
Performance of student on pretest	JS (5.16), UJS (4.70) JS worse (.02).	No significant effect
Qualification of teacher	No significance	No significance
Deservingness of student of his role	JS (4.62), UJS (4.05) JS deserves more (.05) Main effect mainly due to J-UJ teacher, J-UJ student interaction which shows UJS rated less deserving in UJT-UJS condition, same in other three conditions	Student deserves role more when teacher is justified than when teacher is not justified. JT)5.39), UJT(4.47)

TABLE 3

Main and Interaction Effects on Manipulation Checks from 3 Way Analysis Using Data from Subjects Taking Student's Point of View

<u>Dependent measure</u>	<u>Independent Measures</u>		<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>
Performance of student on relevant pretest (< # better performance)	Justified student	Unjustified student	.04	4.33
	5.77	5.99		
Performance of student on relevant pretest (< # better performance)	Justified student	Unjustified student	.05	3.95
	4.27	5.14		
	Justified teacher			
Performance of teacher on relevant pretest (< # better performance)	Unjustified teacher		.001	11.03
	4.27	3.97		
	Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher		
Student's deservingness of his role (> # more deserved)	5.30	6.43	.05	4.06
	Justified student	Unjustified student		
	3.91	3.16		

TABLE 4

Main and Interaction Effects on Manipulation Checks from 3 Way analysis Using Data from Subjects Taking Teacher's Point of View

<u>Dependent Measure</u>	<u>Independent Measures</u>		<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>
Performance of teacher on relevant pretest (< # better performance)	Justified teacher	3.18		
	Unjustified teacher	3.91	.03	4.74
Student's deservingness of his role (> # more deserved)	Justified Teacher	5.39		
	Unjustified teacher	4.47	.04	4.37
Student's deservingness of his role	Justified teacher	5.14		
	Unjustified teacher	5.05	.04	4.00
Perceived annoyance of student (< # more annoyed)	Justified student			
	Unjustified student	5.64		
	Justified teacher	2.56		
	Unjustified teacher	3.51	.01	6.59
	Justified student	4.03		
	Unjustified student			

high and low status people on the thinking ability test, scores on which supposedly determined role assignment, were remembered by subjects as reported in the movie. Another check of the manipulations was the degree to which each of the subjects the movie deserved the role he occupied. Secondly, we want to see if the different situations led to different degrees of feelings of injustice.

Manipulation Checks

Two questions in the questionnaire were concerned with the perceived performance of the participants on the screening test used to assign the subjects to their high and low status roles. Two other questions asked whether the occupation of the roles was justified or not. We will consider these four questions to be our primary manipulation checks. There were also two questions which were concerned with the degree of injustice in the situation, as well as one about the annoyance of the student and one about the guilt of the teacher. Since the hypotheses were that different degrees of injustice, guilt and anger would be aroused in the different experimental situations leading to different degrees of injustice reducing responses, it was expected that the four experimental situations would be rated differentially on these four items of injustice, guilt and annoyance.

Four way analysis

Of the four primary manipulation checks concerning performance on the screening test and justification of the role occupation, three gave results in the expected direction (Table 2)

when the data were analyzed by a $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ design. The justified teacher was said to have performed better than the unjustified teacher ($p > .001$, $F = 17.12$), the justified student was said to have performed worse than the unjustified student ($p > .02$, $F = 5.37$), and the justified student was seen to have deserved the role of the student more than the unjustified student ($p > .05$, $F = 3.96$). This last main effect, however was a function of perception of the student as much less deserving in the unjustified teacher-unjustified student condition than the other three conditions. That is, only when the high or low status role and relevant ability for occupying the role were incongruent for both the participants was the student seen as not deserving his role. There were no interaction effects between the point of view taken in viewing the movie and perception of the manipulations. The teacher was not perceived to be more qualified to teach the student in the justified than the unjustified teacher condition. There were no significant main or interaction effects on measures of guilt, annoyance and injustice.

Three way analysis

As mentioned above, this study can be conceptualized as two parallel studies, one, looking at different degrees of injustice from the point of view of the person benefiting from the injustice and the other, looking at different degrees of injustice from the point of view of the person suffering from the injustice. In the following two sections we will look at the manipulation checks from the analysis of the data by these three way analysis designs where the independent variables are justified-unjustified teacher,

justified-unjustified student, and questionnaire order.

a) Three way analysis with data from subjects taking student's point of view.

When an analysis of variance was computed on only the data from the subjects taking the student's point of view, the manipulation checks fared worse than they did with the four way analysis (Table 3). The justified student was seen to have deserved the role of the student more than the unjustified student ($p > .05$, $F = 4.06$). The justified student was also perceived to have performed worse on the screening test relevant to role assignment than the unjustified student ($p > .04$, $F = 4.33$) but this main effect was a function of the perception of the unjustified student to be better in the UJT-UJS condition than all the other three conditions, which did not differ greatly from each other (Table 3). The teacher was seen to have performed better when he was justified than when not justified ($p > .001$, $F = 11.03$). There were no significant effects on perception of the performance of the teacher on the screening pretest or the perception of the qualification of the teacher for the role.

Three way analysis with data from subjects taking the teacher's point of view.

Analysis of variance computed with data from subjects taking the point of view of the teacher showed that the teacher was perceived to have performed significantly better ($p > .03$, $F = 4.74$) when his role was justified than when it was unjustified. Also, the student was seen as more deserving of the student role when

teacher was justified than unjustified ($p > .04$, $F = 4.37$); but the interaction effect ($p > .04$, $F = 4.00$) of justified-unjustified teacher and justified-unjustified student showed that the student was seen as most deserving of the student role in justified teacher-unjustified student condition rather than the predicted justified teacher-justified student condition. As can be seen from Table 4, there were no significant effects on the perceived performance of the student on the pretest used for his role. On the measure of perceived annoyingness of the situation to the student, the subjects taking the point of view of the teacher rated JT-JS situation to be most annoying and JT-UJS to be least annoying. UJT-UJS and UJT-JS were ranked second and third ($p > .01$, $F = 6.99$). No significant effects were found on measures of felt guilt and perceived injustice.

In the above study there were four experimental conditions: JT-JS, JT-UJS, UJT-JS, UJT-UJS. It was expected that the four experimental manipulations would lead to differing degrees of felt injustice, least injustice being felt in JT-JS and most in the UJT-UJS conditions. Manipulations were not successful in leading to perceptions of our experimental situations resulting in differential feelings of felt injustice in the four experimental conditions. In deriving the hypotheses we had assumed that feelings of injustice, together with guilt or annoyance, would mediate the use of the four ways of reacting to injustice that were measured; namely, evaluative reactions to the other person in the situation, justification of the unjust situation,

TABLE 5

Significant Main and Interaction Effects on Various Measures from 4 Way Analysis of Variance

A) <u>Dependent measures concerning evaluative responses</u>					p	F
1) Average semantic differential response ($>$ # more positive)						
	Teacher's point of view		Student's point of view			
	Justified student	Unjustified student	Justified student	Unjustified student		
Justified teacher	6.90	6.57	9.24	10.53	.04	4.57
Unjustified teacher	7.01	7.30	10.04	9.84		
2) Sociable (1) -- Unsociable (15)						
	Teacher's point of view		Student's point of view			
	Justified	Unjustified	Justified	Unjustified		
Justified teacher	8.60	7.70	11.05	11.75	.04	4.30
Unjustified teacher	8.55	9.05	11.70	10.85		
3) Wise (1) -- Foolish (15)						
	Teacher's point of view		Student's point of view			
	Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher	Justified student	Unjustified student		
			7.82	9.15	.03	4.80
			8.90	8.72		

TABLE 5 (continued)

4) Good (1) -- Bad (15)	Compensation last	Compensation first	p	F
Teacher's point of view	8.27	7.60	.02	5.64
Student's point of view	10.92	12.00		
5) Altruistic (1) -- Egotistic (15)	Justified Student	Unjustified student		
Teacher's point of view	7.40	6.65	.02	5.57
Student's point of view	10.72	11.62		
6) Kind (1) -- Cruel (15)	Justified student	Unjustified student		
Teacher's point of view	6.70	5.82	.01	6.71
Student's point of view	9.55	10.35		
7) Severe (1) -- Lenient (15)	Justified student	Unjustified student		
Teacher's point of view	8.75	10.12	.05	4.01
Student's point of view	5.17	5.10		
8) Liking for other (< # greater liking)	Justified student	Unjustified student		
Teacher's point of view	4.60	4.17	.01	6.40
Student's point of view	6.32	6.87		

TABLE 5 (continued)

B) Dependent measures concerning justification

1) Student's deservingness of his role (> # more deserved)		Teacher's point of view		Student's point of view		p	F
		Compensation last	Compensation first	Compensation last	Compensation first		
Justified teacher		5.70	5.07	3.12	3.95	.03	4.78
Unjustified teacher		4.19	4.74	3.70	3.35		
2) Teacher's qualification for his role (> # more qualified)							
		Compensation last		Compensation first			
		Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher	Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher		
Justified student		3.31	3.50	3.11	3.50	.03	4.77
Unjustified student		3.20	3.85	3.60	2.70		

TABLE 5 (continued)

3) Teacher's qualification for his role (#.more qualified)		Teacher's point of view		Student's point of view		D	F
Justified teacher	Justified student	Co. last	Co. first	Co. last	Co. first	.001	10.34
		4.33	3.33	3.87	4.87		
Unjustified teacher	Unjustified student	3.55	5.11	5.34	3.18		
	Justified student	2.29	2.93	2.53	2.31		
	Unjustified student	1.86	1.89	2.23	2.24		

TABLE 5 (continued)

4) Performance of teacher on relevant pretest (< # better performance)					
		Teacher's point of view		Student's point of view	
		Co. last	Co. first	Co. last	Co. first
Justified teacher	Justified student	3.13	2.92	5.94	4.60
	Unjustified student	4.00	2.67	5.12	5.44
Unjustified teacher	Justified student	4.25	3.33	6.14	6.22
	Unjustified student	3.08	4.91	6.82	6.82
					.004 8.42

TABLE 5 (continued)

5) The amount the person thinks the other person would have given himself if he were to divide up the extra \$3.

\bar{p} \bar{F}
.05 4.00

Justified teacher 154¢ Unjustified teacher 142¢

Teacher's point of view
Justified student Unjustified student

Justified teacher

152¢ 136¢ 159¢ 171¢ .05 4.02

Unjustified teacher

130¢ 132¢ 165¢ 143¢

6) Difficulty of task (> # more difficult)

Justified student 5.83 Unjustified student 5.30

.03 4.81

TABLE 6

Significant Main and Interaction Effects on Various Dependent Measures from 3 Way Analysis
Using Data from Subjects Taking Student's Point of View

A) <u>Dependent measures concerning evaluative responses to other</u>				
1) Average semantic differential response (> # more positive)				
Justified student	Justified Teacher 9.35	Unjustified Teacher 10.05	p .03	F 4.82
Unjustified student	10.54	9.84		
2) Wise (1) -- Foolish (15)				
Justified student	Justified Teacher 7.70	Unjustified Teacher 9.69	.02	5.87
Unjustified student	9.92	9.36		
3) Altruistic (1) -- Egotistic (15)				
	Justified student 10.68	Unjustified student 11.71	.03	4.88
4) Kind (1) -- Cruel (15)	9.50	10.37	.03	4.76
5) Liking for other person (> # more liking)				
	6.28	6.86	.04	4.28

TABLE 6 (continued)

<u>B) Dependent measure concerning justification</u>			
1) How hard did the student try? (< # try harder)	Justified Student	Unjustified Student	
	3.70	2.92	
C) Liking for person subject identifies with (> # more liking)	Justified Teacher	Unjustified Teacher	
	3.72	4.47	
			p
			.02
			F
			5.46
			p
			.001
			F
			7.30

TABLE 7

Significant Main and Interaction Effects on Various Dependent Measures from 3 Way Analysis
Using Data from Subjects Taking Teacher's Point of View

<u>A) Dependent measures concerning evaluative responses to other</u>				
	Justified Teacher	Unjustified Teacher	p	F
1) Sociable (1) -- Unsociable (15)				
Compensation last	7.45	9.50	.02	5.68
Compensation first	8.85	8.20		
2) Altruistic (1) -- Egotistic (15)				
Compensation last	6.75	7.90	.05	4.00
Compensation first	7.05	6.35		
3) Sociable (1) -- Unsociable (15)				
Compensation last	7.85	9.40	.01	6.65
Compensation first	9.05	7.60		
4) Severe (1) -- Lenient (15)				
	8.83	10.13	.02	5.89

TABLE 7 (continued)

5) Altruistic (1) -- Egotistic (15)		Compensation last		Compensation first		p	F
		Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher	Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher		
Justified student		6.20	8.60	8.40	8.60	.008	7.30
Unjustified student		7.60	10.40	7.50	7.70		
B) <u>Dependent measures concerning justification</u>							
1) Constraints on teacher in giving out rewards (no constraints (1) -- constrained (9))							
		Compensation last		Compensation first			
		Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher	Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher		
Justified student		4.20	3.50	4.50	5.20	.031	4.76
Unjustified student		4.50	4.80	6.30	3.50		
2) Amount the teacher thinks the student would have given himself if he were to divide up the extra \$3.							
		Compensation last		Compensation first			
		Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher	Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher		
Justified student		132¢	135¢	176¢	127¢	.01	6.90
Unjustified student		138¢	114¢	132¢	150¢		

TABLE 7 (continued)

3) Student's ability for the experimental task (able (1) -- unable (9))			
Justified student	Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher	$\frac{p}{.004}$ $\frac{F}{8.45}$
	6.15	5.75	
Unjustified student	5.20	6.50	
C) Liking for person subject identifies with (< # more liking)			
Justified student	Justified teacher	Unjustified teacher	$\frac{p}{.02}$ $\frac{F}{5.90}$
	6.35	6.00	
Unjustified student	5.75	7.05	

minimization of injustice, exploitation, or compensation. As can be seen from Tables 1-4, our manipulations had very little effect on these dependent measures. Tables 5-7 report significant main and interaction effects on the analysis of data recording to four and three way analysis of the data. These significant effects are few in number and unpredictable. Since differing degrees of felt injustice do not seem to have mediated the significant results some other aspect of the situation must have been responsible for the few significant effects shown. Hence, testing our hypotheses would not be reasonable since the obtained results seem to be mediated by some variables other than the level of felt injustice. Tables 5-7 report the significant effects concerning just-unjust teacher and just-unjust student variables, i.e., main and interaction effects with other variables. The only significant effects we will try to deal with from the four and three way analyses will be the main effects caused by the point of view taken and the questionnaire order since these variables were common to all four of our experimental situations. That is, manipulation of injustice were identical for subjects taking either point of view. These results will be considered at a later section since they are not central to the main hypotheses of the study.

In trying to discuss further results concerning injustice effects we will group them in three sections: 1) reactions to injustice; i.e., the extent to which different responses are used in the experimental conditions; 2) relationships among

the use of alternate responses (this section will be concerned with the effects concerning the order in which compensation/exploitation question and the evaluation and justification questions are answered and the interaction of the questionnaire order with the other variables); and 3) the differences in perception of the situation due to the viewpoint taken by the subjects.

1) Reactions to Injustice

Our predictions were concerned with 4 kinds of responses to injustice: 1) evaluation of the other; 2) justification of the situation or self; 3) minimization of injustice; 4) compensation/exploitation. Evaluation of the other is measured by 8 evaluative semantic differential scales and the five attraction to other questions on the questionnaire; a) perception of student's performance on learning task during the experiment; b) teacher's ability in teaching the student; c) perception of constraints on the teacher's freedom in dispensing rewards. Perceptions of the teacher's qualifications for the role and the student's deservingness of the role can also be seen as dependent measures of justification. Minimization of the injustice done will be measured on the basis of ascribing little or great importance to the amount of money that was possible to be made during the experiment. Dependent measures for compensation/exploitation are the amount of money given to the other in dividing the extra \$3 provided by the experimenter and the difference between the amount given to the other and the amount perceived as the amount

the other would have given himself if he were dividing the money.

Reactions to injustice (internal analysis results)

As can be seen from the above section not many dependent measures gave significant results on the 3 and 4 way analyses of variance reported above. In view of the fact that the experimental manipulations did not lead to different degrees of perceived injustice, the lack of significant effects on the dependent measures is not surprising. Since feelings of injustice were assumed to mediate other responses to the situation, the failure of differential induction of perceived injustice probably explains the lack of significant effects on the measures of evaluation, justification, minimization and compensation/exploitation.

In order to see whether the predicted relationship between perceived injustice and the above four responses actually existed subjects were divided on the degree of perceived injustice. About half of the subjects taking the teacher's and student's point of view scored the situations as 9 on a 9 point just-unjust scale. Because of the nature of the distribution, all subjects checking 9 were put in the perceived injustice condition and all the rest of the subjects were put in the perceived justice condition (see Table 8). Two 2 x 2 (perceived justice-injustice, questionnaire order) analyses of variance were performed, one using the data from subjects taking the point of view of the student, and the other using the data from subjects taking the point of

TABLE 8

Frequency distribution of Subjects' Scores on Perceived Justice
 (Do you think people in the experimental situation got what they
 deserved? Yes (1)-- No (9))

Subjects taking student's point of view		Subjects taking teacher's point of view	
Scale value	Frequency	Scale value	Frequency
1	5	1	4
2	3	2	4
3	7	3	5
4	3	4	1
5	7	5	9
6	5	6	9
7	24	7	17
8	17	8	11
9	60	9	58

view of the teacher. The evaluation of the hypotheses stated in the introduction will be based on the results of the internal analyses based on high and low degrees of perceived injustice. Since the original hypotheses were based on four degrees of injustice and we have only two degrees of perceived injustice from the internal analysis of the data, for the sake of our hypotheses only, we will assume that our high and low perceived injustice conditions correspond to the most and least unjust conditions stated in our hypotheses, i.e., UJT-UJS and JT-JS. This is not to say that the perceived injustice condition in the internal analysis is equal to the UJT-UJS, and the perceived justice condition is equal to JT-JS, but only to substitute the two conditions for the high and low injustice situations assumed in our hypotheses. In effect, by dealing with high and low perceived injustice only we are losing the opportunity to look at the effects of different kinds of status-performance inconsistencies (i.e., high status-low performance--low status-low performance vs. high status-high performance--low status-high performance) on reactions to injustice. But, since the main purpose of the study is to deal with reactions to injustice and since the different kinds of status-performance inconsistencies were used to create different degrees of injustice the primary goal of the study will still be served by evaluating our hypotheses on the results from the internal analysis of the data with only two degrees of injustice. First, let us look at the results from the subjects taking the point of view of the student (Table 9).

TABLE 9

Internal Analysis on Data from Subjects Taking Student's Point of View with Independent Variables High and Low Perceived Injustice and Questionnaire Order

A) Dependent measures concerning evaluation of other

	<u>Just</u>	<u>Unjust</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>
1) Attraction question # 1 (9=+, 1= -)	3.90	2.90	.001	12.92
2) Attraction question # 2 (9= +, 1= -)	3.05	2.60	.07	3.33
3) Attraction question # 3 (9= -, 1= +)	6.60	7.20	.033	4.63
4) Attraction question # 4 (9= -, 1= +)	4.85	4.45	.017	5.88
5) Good (1)--Bad (15)	10.95	12.15	.002	9.96
6) Altruistic (1)-- Egotistic (15)	10.65	11.95	.006	7.85
7) Sociable (1) -- Unsociable (15)	10.80	12.25	.001	12.92
8) Kind (1)--Cruel (15)	9.5	10.65	.003	9.49
9) Attracting (1)-- Repelling (15)	10.6	11.6	.013	6.39
10) Innocent (1)-- Guilty (15)	9.15	10.25	.04	4.31
11) Wise (1)--Foolish (15)	8.75	9.75	.059	3.64
12) Average semantic differential evaluative score	9.50	10.50	.002	10.31
13) Hard (1)--Soft (15)	5.55	4.60	.072	3.30
14) Severe (1)--Lenient(15)	5.70	4.35	.003	9.14

TABLE 9 (continued)

	<u>Just</u>	<u>Unjust</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>
15) Effectiveness of teacher- competent (1)--incompetent (9)	7.45	8.35	.002	10.41
16) Generosity of teacher generous (1)--stingy (9)	6.55	7.20	.044	4.13
B) <u>Dependent measures concerning justification</u>				
1) Teacher's qualification for his role(< # more qualified)	2.55	2.05	.06	3.57
2) Attitude toward experiment (> # more pro)	4.10	3.25	.037	4.43
3) Guilt that should be felt by teacher (< # more guilt)	5.85	7.05	.003	9.00
4) Annoyance felt by student (< # more annoyance)	3.60	2.80	.03	4.65
C) <u>Minimization measure</u>				
Importance of money to be made (< # more important)	5.45	4.40	.026	5.05
D) <u>Exploitation measures</u>				
1) Amount given by student to teacher	88¢	63¢	.004	8.83
2) Difference between what student thinks teacher would give himself and what student gives teacher	71¢	97¢	.026	5.07
E) <u>Justice measures</u>				
1) How just was the situation? just (1)--unjust (9)	6.05	7.04	.001	11.52
2) Did people get what they deserved? Yes(1)--No(9)	5.85	9.00	.001	115.61
3) How comfortable were you watching the movie (< # more comfortable)	4.60	5.45	.04	4.18

Reactions to injustice of subjects taking the point of view of the disadvantaged student

Significant effects were found on the amount of guilt that should be felt by the teacher ($p > .003$, $F = 9.00$) and annoyance felt by the student ($p > .03$, $F = 4.65$). The subjects taking the point of view of the student thought the teacher should feel greater guilt and the student greater annoyance, in the unjust than the just condition. The remaining results will be discussed in four sections:

1) Derogation of the other: The assumption underlying the predictions about the devaluation of the teacher was that devaluation should be a direct function of inequity experienced, i.e., I suffered in this situation while the other person enjoyed himself and did nothing to help me; therefore I dislike him. As can be seen from Table 9, the results show that derogation was indeed a popular response to injustice for those taking the point of view of the disadvantaged. The teacher was evaluated more negatively in perceived injustice than the perceived justice condition on 1) 7 out of 8 semantic differential scales, 2) 4 out of 5 attraction to other questions. The teacher was also rated as more stingy ($p > .04$, $F = 4.13$), less competent ($p > .002$, $F = 10.41$), less qualified to be the teacher ($p > .06$, $F = 3.57$), harder ($p > .072$, $F = 3.30$) and more severe ($p > .003$, $F = 9.14$) in the unjust condition. The popularity of the devaluation response is reasonable if we consider the fact that the subjects in the experiment knew that they could never

meet the person playing the role of the teacher and therefore never get their evaluations of him disconfirmed by finding out that he was really a nice person. They also had little reason to feel guilty for devaluating a fellow student since the fellow student was, to say the least, instrumental in giving another student an unfair deal. Thus, devaluation was an "easy" response for those taking the role of the disadvantaged student. It did not necessitate any cognitive effort, such as distorting reality, nor did it conflict with subject's perceptions of himself as a fair person.

2) Justification: It was predicted that the subjects taking the point of view of the disadvantaged student would justify the behavior of the teacher more if they perceived little injustice than if they perceived a great deal of injustice. Our results support this prediction (Table 9). Competence of the teacher ($p > .002$, $F = 10.41$) in teaching the student and his qualification for the role ($p > .06$, $F = 3.57$) were seen to be lower in the unjust than the just condition. The student also had a more negative attitude toward the experimental situation in the unjust than the just condition ($p > .037$, $F = 4.43$). Thus, our results seem to support our predictions of negative relationship between amount of justification of the situation and the amount of perceived injustice. After all, if a situation is unjust there should be more things wrong with it than if it is just. It would have been inconsistent for our subjects to say, on the one hand, that the teacher was qualified and competent and that

they enjoyed themselves and , on the other hand, to say that the situation was unjust. The reverse would also be dissonance producing, i.e., a just situation where they got less money than a person who dispensed the rewards to them and was not even deserving of his reward-giving position. In real life terms, other things being equal, those who support the status quo are more likely to perceive a situation as just than those who do not.

3) Minimization: We predicted that the importance of the money in question would be judged to be most important when the injustice experienced was greatest and least when the experienced was least. In other words, if an issue is not worth talking about, one cannot feel too much injustice about it. Of course, people can feel anger or injustice over issues which involve little monetary gains and losses but do involve some important principles. But, in general, people seem to be more extreme in their judgment of events involving high than low costs or outcomes. Since minimization of the injustice is another way of justifying the injustice it was predicted to be negatively related to the perceived injustice of the situation. The results support this predicted relationship. The importance of money to be made in the experimental situation was seen to be greater in the perceived unjust than the perceived just condition ($p > .026$, $F = 5.05$). Thus, the more unjust the disadvantaged perceived the situation to be, the more important they judged the issue on which the injustice was done.

4) Compensation demanded from the teacher: Demanding compensation from one teacher by the disadvantaged was the most advantageous way of dealing with the injustice for the disadvantaged party in the situation. This response would both alleviate feelings of injustice by asserting oneself and asking for what one thinks one deserves, and would also provide monetary profits for the person asking for the compensation. Since asking for compensation would provide both hedonic and cognitive satisfaction for the disadvantaged asker, we expected this response to be used to a large extent by the disadvantaged. It was also expected that people who experience greater injustice would ask for greater amounts of compensation than those experiencing lesser degree of injustice. In equity theory terms, the difference between the perceived payoff ratios of the advantaged and the disadvantaged was greater for those in the perceived injustice condition than the perceived justice condition. Therefore, to balance the ratios, a greater amount has to be added to the outcome of the disadvantaged (or subtracted from the outcome of the advantaged). Our results support our prediction of greater demand for compensation in the perceived injustice than the perceived justice condition. Money given to the teacher was less in the unjust than in the just condition ($p > .004$, $F = 8.83$). Also the difference between the amounts of the student though the teacher would give himself and that the student gave the teacher (what you want and what you get) was greater in the unjust than the just condition ($p > .026$, $F = 5.07$). These

two measures show that greater exploitation of the advantaged by the disadvantaged occurred in the unjust than the just condition as predicted.

Thus, in the case of the subjects taking the point of view of the disadvantaged, our predictions about the relative use of devaluation, demanding compensation, justification and minimization responses in high and low perceived injustice conditions seem to be confirmed. Those in high perceived injustice condition devaluated the cause (or at least the instrument) of injustice, asked to be compensated and did not justify the situation. Also, by asking for more compensation, those perceiving a high degree of injustice were remedying the injustice in the most direct way, i.e., getting rid of it. Subjects in the low perceived injustice condition supported the status quo more and did not attempt to change the division of outcomes of the situation as much as those feeling a high degree of injustice. Thus, other things being equal, those who perceived the injustice tried to change it, while those who perceived it as less tried to live with it. Translated into dissonance terms, high dissonance led to change, while low dissonance did not lead to change.

Aside from the main effects due to injustice, there was one significant justice by questionnaire order interaction effect in the 2×2 internal analysis using data from subjects taking the student's point of view. The dependent measure on which the interaction effect occurred was the amount of money the student thought the teacher would give himself if he were to divide up

TABLE 10

Perceived Justice and Questionnaire Order Interaction on the Amount of Money the Student Thinks the Teacher Would Have Given Himself

	Just	Unjust
Exploitation last	143¢	169¢
Exploitation first	177¢	151¢

$p < .007$, $F = 7.47$

TABLE 11

Internal Analysis on Data from Subjects Taking Teacher's Point of View with Independent Variables High and Low Perceived Injustice and Questionnaire Order

A) Dependent measures concerning evaluation of other

	<u>Just</u>	<u>Unjust</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>
1) Altruistic(1)-Egotistic(15)	7.85	6.05	.001	16.13
2) Kind (1)-Cruel(15)	6.80	5.90	.04	4.07
3) Honest(1)-Dishonest(15)	8.50	7.70	.03	4.81
4) Innocent(1)-Guilty(15)	5.95	4.85	.03	4.81
5) Average semantic differential evaluative score	6.50	5.30	.06	3.62

B) Justification measures

1) Performance of student on relevant pretest (< # better)	5.75	5.15	.08	3.05
2) Student's ability for experimental task (< # more able)	5.50	6.15	.026	5.07
3) Guilt felt by teacher (> # more guilt)	3.80	4.75	.04	4.20
4) Subject's liking for teacher in the movie (< # more liking)	5.90	6.55	.036	4.49

C) Compensation measures

Amount given to student by teacher	83¢	106¢	.02	5.78
------------------------------------	-----	------	-----	------

D) Justice measures

1) How just was the situation? just (1)--unjust (9)	5.20	7.15	.001	25.74
2) Did people get what they deserved? Yes(1)--No(9)	5.65	9.00	.001	133.01
Did you feel what the teacher in the movie was feeling? Yes(1)-No(9)	5.20	6.05	.05	3.82

the extra \$3 among the participants in the experiment ($p > .007$, $F = 7.97$). As Table 10 shows, subjects who felt that the situation was relatively just thought the teacher would take less for himself if they answered the evaluation, justification and minimization measures before than if they answered these questions after the question about how much did they think the teacher would take for himself. The reverse was true for subjects who felt the situation was unjust; i.e., they thought the teacher to be more greedy if they answered the evaluation, justification and minimization questions before than after answering the question about how much money did they think the teacher would take for himself. This interaction is hard to interpret since it was the only one in the analysis and no parallel interaction effects were found in measures of justification, minimization, devaluation and compensation/exploitation.

Reactions to injustice of subjects taking the point of view of the advantaged teacher

Analysis of variance performed on data from subjects taking the teacher's point of view gave results similar to those obtained from subjects taking the point of view of the student, but significant effects were fewer in number (see Table 11). The fewer number of significant results could be partially due to the fact that the subjects taking the point of view of the teacher identified to a lesser degree with the teacher in the movie and therefore were less involved in the whole situation than were the subjects taking the point of view of the student (Table 16). In

the internal analysis of data from subjects taking the point of view of the teacher, a significant effect of injustice was found on the amount of felt guilt but not on perceived annoyance of the student. Now let us group the results in four sections.

1) Derogation of the other: In predicting the degree of derogation of the disadvantaged by the advantaged we hypothesize that more derogation would take place in JA-JDA than UJA-UJDA, i.e., more derogation in the just than in the unjust condition. Although the Lerner (1969) and harm-doer studies would suggest that more derogation would take place in the more unjust condition, the nature of our experimental manipulation gave realistic evidence that the justified student actually did perform worse than the unjustified student, a fact which the high injustice experiencing teacher had to distort if he were to evaluate the other negatively. Our results show that the student was evaluated more positively in the unjust than the just condition on 5 out of 8 semantic differential scales. Also, the performance of the student on the task relevant pretest was seen to be better in the unjust than in the just condition ($p > .08$, $F = 3.05$). Although our results seem to support our predictions and seem to imply that perception of the performance of the student on the pretest and the overall evaluation of the student as a person were positively related, the devaluation of the "innocent victim" might still occur in situations where a great deal of guilt is felt by the advantaged. The guilt felt by the subjects taking the point of view of the teacher in our situation was moderately

low (4.75 on 9 point "not at all" (1) - "a great deal" (9) scale). It may be that admitting the injustice of the situation might have had an influence on the positive evaluation of the other, e.g., if the other person were a negatively evaluated person he would have deserved the low outcomes he got out of the situation and there would have been no cause for injustice. In other words, verbalizing the injustice of the situation might have had an influence on the positive evaluation of the other. One possibility is that at high levels of guilt the advantaged would not admit to the injustice of the situation and devalue the victim, i.e., the "no good person" got what he deserved, so there was no injustice for me to be responsible for. The implication here is a curvilinear relationship between felt guilt and evaluation of the other with compensatory rise in evaluation for low degrees of felt guilt and defensive devaluation and justification of the situation at high levels of guilt. This, however is only speculation at this point since we do not have any data on the devaluation of the victim at high levels of felt guilt in this study.

2) Justification: It was predicted that more justification would be engaged in at greater levels of injustice. Our results give some support for this prediction. The student was seen as less able at performing the learning task in the experimental situation in the unjust than the just condition ($p > .026$, $F = 5.07$). Perceiving the student as having less ability in dealing with the experimental task might have been seen as justification for

the little money earned by the student during the experiment. Admitting the injustice and still offering justification for it is not a dissonance producing response for the advantaged, although it is for the disadvantaged, as we discussed above. By offering justification for the situation, the advantaged is in a way getting rid of some of the responsibility for being the cause or the instrument of injustice. In a way he is saying that although he let a fellow student get less money than himself in a situation, he could not have given the other person more money since the other person was not doing much to earn it. Thus, by offering justification for the situation the advantaged is moving the locus of the cause of the injustice from himself to external situational factors.

3) Minimization: It was predicted that more minimization of the injustice done to the student would take place in the unjust than the just condition. No difference between the conditions was found. In view of the fact that minimization of the injustice is a type of justification of the injustice, the lack of difference among the conditions on this measure was not surprising since justification was seen on only one of several questions that allowed for it to take place. It seems that justification was not a popular response for the subjects taking the point of view of the advantaged in our situation. The relatively small amount of justification used by the advantaged in our situation can be somewhat explained by the small but significant ($-.40, p .01$) correlation between the amount of felt guilt and

assuming responsibility for giving as much or as little in rewards to the student found in the high injustice condition on the data from subjects taking the point of view of the teacher. No correlation between guilt and responsibility was found for those subjects in the low injustice condition. Thus, denial of responsibility for the student's low monetary gain might have been used instead of justification by subjects taking the point of view of the advantaged in the perceived injustice condition.

4) Compensation: We predicted that least compensation would be offered in the most just condition and that the offering of compensation would be negatively related to amount of derogation of the other. Our results show that more compensation was given in the perceived injustice than the perceived justice condition to the disadvantaged by the advantaged ($p > .02$, $F = 5.78$). In view of the fact that the amount of guilt felt by subjects taking the point of view of the teacher was relatively low (4.20 on 9 point "not at all" (1), "a great deal" (9) scale), this positive relationship between degree of perceived injustice and amount of compensation is not surprising. If felt guilt were high, however, we might have found that less compensation was engaged in with great deal of felt injustice. As Elaine Walster says (1970), if people feel a lot of guilt and also feel that the amount of compensation they can offer would not be enough to relieve them of these feelings of guilt, they are more likely to offer no compensation and derogate their victim than offer an insufficient amount of compensation and still retain their guilt.

The implication here is that amount of compensation offered to the disadvantaged by the advantaged has a curvilinear relationship with the degree of felt guilt. We would expect a positive relationship between the amount of compensation offered and felt guilt at lower levels of felt guilt and a negative relationship at greater levels of felt guilt. Again, as in the case of derogation of the other, our study seems to have created low or intermediate amounts of felt guilt, thus giving us a positive relationship between perceived injustice and compensation offered.

Relationship Among Alternative Ways of Dealing With Injustice

The responses to injustice in which we are interested in this study are of two kinds. The first kind actually remedies injustice done by offering or taking compensation, thus making the distribution of the available outcomes in the situation more equal. The second kind of response to injustice does not actually decrease the amount of injustice in the situation but enables people to live with the situation by reinterpreting or reevaluating the situation or by letting out frustration. The responses included in this second class are evaluation of the other, justification of the situation and minimization of the injustice of the situation. The degree to which each kind of response is used might depend on the relative use of other responses as well as the temporal availability of the response. First let us look at the temporal availability of the two kinds of responses.

Effects due to the availability of compensation/exploitation first or last to people taking the point of view of the advantaged or the disadvantaged

It is reasonable that those responses that are made available to the subjects first will be used first and relieve some of the felt injustice, thus leaving less injustice to be reduced by the remaining responses. The temporal order in which the compensation/exploitation responses are made available should make the most difference in the use of other responses since the use of the former actually restores justice and makes the use of other injustice (dissonance) reducing responses unnecessary. In the case of the advantaged, this is the response which is most costly, and is therefore most likely to reduce dissonance. Thus, if an advantaged person is presented with an opportunity to compensate before he is faced with the other possible responses he is more likely to compensate than he is after having reduced his dissonance in less costly ways. For the disadvantaged, asking for compensation is not costly but he may ask for more if he has not justified the injustice first and thus gotten rid of some of his annoyance with the situation.

The data support the above predictions. As can be seen from Table 13 whether opportunity for compensation was available to the subjects first or last had an effect on the amount given to the other person out of the extra \$3 to be divided among the participants in the experiment. In general subjects gave other more if they answered the compensation question first. This was true for 4 way analysis of data with subjects taking both the

teacher's and the student's point of view, ($p > .01$, $F = 6.50$) for 3 way analysis of data from subjects taking the teacher's point of view ($p > .02$, $F = 5.39$) and for internal analysis on injustice based on data from subjects taking the teacher's point of view ($p > .055$, $F = 3.77$). Subjects taking the point of view of the student, on the other hand, did not exploit more when they answered the exploitation question first. This last failure of questionnaire order effect may however be due to the fact that subjects taking the point of view of the student gave very little above the minimum possible amount to the teacher (overall they gave 77¢ while the minimum possible amount that could be given was 50¢).

A 3 way analysis based on data from subjects taking the point of view of the student showed a few significant effects of questionnaire order. When subjects answered exploitation first they rated the teacher as more bad, more wise and less eagerly sought after by their friends. If we interpret the meaning of "wise" in a "cunning" sense, we might say that after exploitation the disadvantaged tends to devalue the person he exploited more than before exploitation. This result seems reasonable especially if we consider the predicted (and found) positive relationship between exploitation and devaluation of the other. Exploiting someone one does not like should lead to far less dissonance than exploiting someone one likes.

No main effects of questionnaire order were found on internal analysis on injustice based on subjects taking the student's point of view. With data based on subjects taking teacher's

point of view, however, there was one significant effect. When subjects had an opportunity to compensate first, the student was rated as more able at learning the experimental task than when they had the opportunity last ($p > .029$, $F = 4.89$). This result, again, is explainable in dissonance terms. During the experiment the student was rewarded by the teacher for learning the experimental task. Since the subjects got a constant amount (125¢) during the experiment those subjects taking the point of view of the teacher who compensated first (and therefore more) must have provided a reason for their greater compensation. The most obvious reason for giving the student money was the one offered in the experiment, i.e., performance at the task. Thus, those subjects who gave more money also rated the student in the experiment as more deserving of this money. Judging the student as doing a poor job at what he was being paid for and giving him more compensation would have been dissonance producing in itself.

Internal analysis on degree of exploitation engaged in

Since offering or demanding compensation was the only way of actually restoring justice, an internal analysis based on the degree of exploitation/compensation was conducted. In order to look at the relationship between exploitation/compensation and other reactions to injustice the subjects were divided on the amount of exploitation they engaged in. Two analyses of variance were conducted with the dependent variables of degree of exploitation and questionnaire order; one using the data from subjects taking the point of view of the teacher and the other using the

TABLE 12

Frequency Distribution of Subject's Scores on Amount of Exploitation (positive score means giving other less than he is perceived to give himself; i.e., exploitation, negative score is giving other more than he is perceived to give himself; i.e., compensation)

Subjects taking student's point of view		Subjects taking teacher's point of view	
Difference	Frequency	Difference	Frequency
200¢	20	200¢	9
150¢	0	150¢	0
100¢	76	100¢	37
50¢	2	50¢	0
0¢	29	0¢	65
-50¢	0	-50¢	0
-100¢	4	-100¢	7

TABLE 13
Questionnaire Order Effects

(4 way analysis) Amount given to other	Compensation last	Compensation first	p	F
	76¢	93¢	.01	6.50
(3 way analysis) Teacher's point of view Amount given to other	81¢	106¢	.02	5.39
Internal analysis on justice Teacher's point of view Amount given to other	85¢	103¢	.055	3.77
Internal analysis on justice Teacher's point of view Ability of student for learning experimental task (1) able-(9) unable	6.15	5.50	.029	4.89

TABLE 14

Internal Analysis on Data from Subjects Taking Student's Point of View with Independent Variables High, Medium and Low Exploitation and Questionnaire Order

A) Dependent measures concerning evaluation of other

	<u>High</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>
1) Attraction question #1 (1 = -, 9 = +)	2.50	3.45	4.15	.003	6.22
2) Attraction question # 2 (1 = -, 9 = +)	2.30	2.65	3.60	.002	6.50
3) Attraction question #3 (1 = +, 9 = -)	7.75	7.15	5.80	.001	16.13
4) Attraction question #4 (1 = +, 9 = -)	7.60	7.15	5.80	.001	12.17
5) Attraction question #5 (1 = -, 9 = +)	3.75	4.65	5.10	.038	3.34
1=like, 9=dislike	7.65	6.70	5.75	.001	8.78
7) Good (1)--Bad (15)	13.20	11.35	10.80	.003	6.14
8) Altruistic (1)-- Egotistic (15)	11.70	11.55	10.20	.031	3.57
9) Sociable (1)-- Unsociable (15)	12.75	11.35	10.35	.001	7.45
10) Kind(1)--Cruel(15)	10.80	10.20	8.95	.004	5.82
11) Attracting(1)-- Repelling (15)	12.05	11.10	10.05	.011	4.65
12) Wise(1)--Foolish(15)	11.40	8.90	8.50	.002	6.41
13) Average semantic differential evaluative score	11.05	10.12	9.05	.001	9.66
14) Hard(1)--Soft(15)	3.45	5.05	6.40	.003	5.94

TABLE 14 (continued)

	<u>High</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>
15) Severe(1)-Lenient(15)	3.65	5.00	6.55	.001	8.46
16) Generous (1) -- Stingy (9)	7.35	7.25	5.85	.001	9.66
B) <u>Dependent measures concerning justification</u>					
1) Teacher's qualification for his role (< # more qualified)	1.45	2.30	2.60	.017	4.23
2) How hard did student try (< # tried harder)	2.35	3.25	3.75	.038	3.35
3) Attitude toward experiment (> # more pro)	3.10	3.30	4.80	.001	6.78
4) Annoyance (< # more annoyed)	2.00	3.15	3.95	.006	5.38
5) Guilt (< # more guilt)	7.80	6.55	5.15	.001	9.63
6) Amount student thinks teacher would give himself	200¢	170¢	119¢	.001	21.80
C) <u>Dependent measures concerning exploitation</u>					
1) Amount given by student to teacher	16¢	79¢	108¢	.001	50.79
2) Difference between what student thinks teacher would give himself and what student gives teacher	184¢	92¢	9¢	.001	100.66

data from subjects taking the point of view of the student. The dependent measure used for dividing the subjects into different levels of exploitation was the difference between what the subject gave the other person and what he thought the other person would have given himself. As seen in Table 12 subjects taking the teacher's point of view and those taking the student's point of view had different frequency distributions on this measure. Thus, it was necessary to divide subjects taking the teacher's point of view into two groups and those taking the student's point of view into three groups.

Internal analysis on degree of exploitation engaged from data from subjects taking the student's point of view.

Exploitation and evaluative response to other

We had said in our introduction that there should be positive relationships between exploitation and devaluation of other since exploitation of a liked other is a dissonance producing response in itself. It can be seen from Table 13 that subjects engaging in greater degree of exploitation evaluated the other more negatively on 8 semantic differential scales as well as the total semantic differential measure ($p > .003$, $F = 6.14$), 5 attraction measures and liked the other less at a gut level ($p > .001$, $F = 8.78$). High exploiters also rated the other to be harder ($p > .003$, $F = 5.94$), more severe ($p > .001$, $F = 8.46$) and less generous ($p > .001$, $F = 5.85$). Thus, the predicted positive relationship between exploitation and derogation was found.

Exploitation and justification of the situation

High exploiters thought the teacher to be less qualified ($p > .017$, $F = 4.23$) to teach them and thought the teacher should feel more guilt ($p > .001$, $F = 9.63$) than low exploiters. Attitude towards taking part in the experiment also was more negative among high exploiters than low exploiters ($p > .001$, $F = 6.78$). They also felt more annoyed ($p > .006$, $F = 5.38$). These results show that those subjects who tried to change the distribution of outcomes in the situation by exploiting the advantaged and thus restoring justice justified the status quo less than those who tried to change the distribution of outcomes less. In other words, those who cognitively supported the unjust situation did less to change it in an active sense and vice versa. Thus, people acted consistently with their cognitions of the situation and/or changed their cognitions to suit their actions.

Exploitation and minimization

It was predicted that exploitation of the advantaged and minimization of injustice done would be negatively related for subjects taking the point of view of the disadvantaged student. No significant effects of degree of exploitation on minimization of the injustice in the situation was found.

Internal analysis on degree of exploitation engaged in from data from subjects taking the point of view of the teacher

As can be seen from Table 15 there were fewer significant effects of degree of exploitation when analysis of variance was performed using data from subjects taking the point of view of the teacher.

TABLE 15

Internal Analysis on Data from Subjects Taking Teacher's Point of View with Independent Variables High and Low Exploitation and Questionnaire Order

A) Dependent measures concerning evaluation of other

	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>
1) Average semantic differential evaluative score	7.35	6.60	.059	3.63
2) Wise(1)--Foolish (15)	8.95	7.65	.015	6.11

B) Dependent measures concerning justification

1) Guilt (< # more guilt)	3.40	4.75	.004	8.64
2) Difficulty of task (≥ # more difficult)	5.20	6.15	.02	5.53
3) Amount teacher thinks student would give himself	170¢	114¢	.001	63.60

C) Dependent measures concerning exploitation

1) Amount given by teacher to student	56¢	120¢	.001	61.16
2) Difference between what teacher thinks student would give himself and what teacher gives student	119¢	-5¢	.001	448.85

TABLE 16

Significant Effects Due to Point of View Taken (4 Way Analysis)

A) <u>Evaluative measures</u>	<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>
1) Attraction question #1 (1 = -, 9 = +)	4.61	3.48	.001	26.30
2) Attraction question #2 (1 = -, 9 = +)	3.78	2.53	.001	19.98
3) Attraction question #3 (1 = +, 9 = -)	5.03	6.81	.001	30.34
4) Attraction question #4 (1 = +, 9 = -)	5.42	6.86	.001	43.26
5) Attraction question #5 (1 = -, 9 = +)	3.22	4.63	.001	15.93
6) 1 = like, 9 = dislike	4.38	6.66	.001	109.94
7) Good (1)--Bad (15)	7.93	11.45	.001	98.08
8) Altruistic(1)--Egotistic (15)	7.02	11.18	.001	153.71
9) Sociable (1)--Unsociable (15)	8.47	11.35	.001	69.60
10) Kind(1)--Cruel(15)	6.26	9.95	.001	141.13
11) Attracting(1)--Repelling(15)	8.20	10.87	.001	71.39
12) Honest(1)--Dishonest(15)	5.46	8.91	.001	70.65
13) Innocent(1)--Guilty(15)	5.91	9.53	.001	81.80
14) Wise(1)--Foolish(15)	8.20	9.10	.02	5.30
16) Average semantic differential evaluative score	6.91	9.91	.001	152.06
17) Hard(1)--Soft(15)	8.16	5.11	.001	56.90
18) Severe(1)--Lenient(15)	8.36	5.13	.001	143.87
19) Brave(1)--Cowardly(15)	8.08	8.85	.04	4.25

TABLE 16 (continued)

20) Average semantic differential potency score	7.96	6.36	.001	27.23
B) <u>Justification measures</u>				
1) Teacher's qualification for his role (> # more qualified)	4.19	2.29	.001	58.49
2) Deservingness of student (> # more deserving)	4.92	3.53	.001	28.95
3) Performance of teacher on pretest (< # better performance)	3.53	5.88	.001	99.72
4) Performance of student on pretest (< # better performance)	5.41	4.45	.001	21.11
5) How hard did the student try? (> # tried harder)	5.76	5.51	.001	53.82
6) Guilt of teacher (> # more guilt)	4.20	6.30	.001	46.77
7) Amount other gives other	137¢	159¢	.001	12.36
C) <u>Exploitation measures</u>				
1) Self gives other	92¢	77¢	.03	5.01
2) Difference between what other wants and gets	46¢	81¢	.001	15.20
D) <u>Identification measures</u>				
1) Identification measures #1	5.80	3.91	.001	48.97
2) Identification measures #2	5.45	3.61	.001	53.30
3) Identification measures #3	5.63	3.81	.001	48.95

Exploitation and evaluative responses to other

As for the disadvantaged, it was predicted that there would be a positive relationship between derogation of the other and exploitation when the subjects were taking the point of view of the advantaged. Our results show that this was the case. High exploiters rated the student more negatively on average semantic differential score ($p > .059$, $F = 3.63$) and also as more foolish ($p > .015$, $F = 6.11$). Thus, people behaved in a consistent fashion and gave a bad deal to people they did not like and a better one to those they liked better.

Exploitation and justification of the situation

It was predicted that for the advantaged there would be a positive relationship between exploitation and justification of the injustice of the situation. The simultaneous use of these two responses is consistent in that exploiting the disadvantaged (or compensating little) is a way of perpetuating the unjust situation and justification of the situation is giving rationale for perpetuating the injustice. Our results show that high exploiters rated the task for which the student got rewarded to be easier ($p > .02$, $F = 5.53$) than low exploiters. The easiness of the task might have been a rationale for not compensating the student who got relatively little rewards for the task. The student got little money out of the situation but he did not put in much effort anyway, so I do not have to compensate him.

Exploitation and minimization

It was predicted that high exploiters would minimize the im-

portance of the money involved more than low exploiters. The dependent variable of minimization was the question "concerning the amount of money that was possible to be got from the experiment" (1)-"I could have used it quite a bit", (9)-"did not matter to me". Our results show that high exploiters said that the money that could be earned in the experiment was more important than the low exploiters said it was. This unexpected result can be explained if we assume that the subjects taking the point of view of the teacher interpreted the question as the importance of the money to the teacher himself rather than to the student. In that case if the high exploiting teachers thought money was more important they might have exploited more thus incurring less costs to themselves ($p > .057$, $F = 3.69$), i.e., they did not give up money that was important to them.

When internal analysis was made on data based on subjects taking the student's point of view, divided on degree of exploitation, subjects answering the exploitation question first rated the teacher as more sought after as a friend, wiser but less good.

Differences In Perception Of The Experimental Situations Between Subjects Taking Teacher's And Student's Point Of View

Table 16 shows the main effects of point of view from a 4 way analysis of data. It shows that the advantaged felt less guilt than the disadvantaged thought they should have felt ($p > .001$, $F = 46.77$). It must be noted here that the question about guilt was phrased somewhat differently for the two kinds of subjects. For subjects taking the teacher's point of view

it was phrased as "how much guilt did you feel", for subjects taking the student's point of view it read: "Do you think the teacher should feel any guilt over receiving more money than you did in the experiment?". The remaining questions which could be used as justification of the situation, however, were phrased similarly for subjects taking both the student's and the teacher's point of view. On these 5 questions subjects taking the teacher's point of view thought that the teacher was more qualified to be the teacher ($p > .001$, $F = 58.49$) and that the student deserved to be the student more than did the subjects taking the student's point of view ($p > .001$, $F = 28.95$). Also the advantaged thought the disadvantaged would like to give himself less money if he were to divide up the extra \$3 than the disadvantaged thought the advantaged would give himself ($p > .001$, $F = 12.36$). The ratings of performance on the pretest relevant to teacher-student roles were higher for teacher and lower for student by subjects taking the teacher's point of view than by subjects taking the student's point of view ($p > .001$, $F = 99.72$) ($p > .001$, $F = 21.11$). Another significant difference due to point of view taken was the perception of student as trying harder at the experimental task by subjects taking the teacher's point of view than by subjects taking student's point of view ($p > .001$, $F = 53.82$). All the above differences due to point of view with the possible exception of the last seem to indicate that subjects taking the teacher's point of view seemed to justify the situation more than did the subjects taking the student's point of view. This finding is not

surprising in view of the fact that justification and compensation are negatively related for the advantaged and that justification is far less costly than compensation for the advantaged.

On the whole the subjects taking the point of view of the student liked the teacher less than the subjects taking the point of view of the teacher liked the student in the movie. This difference, however, might be due to the different actors playing the roles of the student and the teacher in the movie. This guess is somewhat supported by the finding that the subjects taking the point of view of the teacher liked the teacher less than the subjects taking the point of view of the student liked the student. The subjects taking the point of view of the teacher also reported having identified with the teacher in the movie to a lesser extent than the subjects taking the point of view of the student did with the student in the movie. This difference in the degree of identification might have been due to characteristics of the actors playing the roles as well as the fact that the subjects were in actuality students themselves.

C H A P T E R I V

CONCLUSION

In summary, it can be said that the results of the study show that people who benefit or suffer from injustice in a situation make use of several cognitive or conative responses to injustice in a way which most effectively reduced dissonance caused by the unjust situation. In responding to the unjust situation in our experiment, subjects could reduce dissonance in one of two possible ways: 1) they could divide the extra \$3 provided by the experimenter in a way that actually reduces the difference between the payoff ratios of the advantaged and the disadvantaged; 2) they could reduce the difference between the payoff ratios by cognitively decreasing the inputs of the disadvantaged (e.g., he did not try hard, deserved his role) and increasing the inputs of the advantaged (i.e., he had high qualifications for the role). Viewed in another way the first kind of response can be seen as changing the actual situation and the second kind as keeping the actual situation and reinterpreting it in one's mind to reduce the dissonance caused by the injustice. Therefore, one would expect the two kinds of responses to be related. We must note here that changing the distribution of outcomes in the situation means monetary gain (exploitation) for the disadvantaged and loss (compensation) to the advantaged.

In the case of the advantaged, change producing compensation decreases the difference between the payoff ratios of the advantaged and the disadvantaged as does the inequity maintaining response of justification. Since one cannot both change and maintain a situation, compensation and justification should be negatively related. Our data confirmed this prediction. In the case of the disadvantaged, the change producing response of exploitation decreases the difference between payoff ratios of the advantaged and the disadvantaged and so does change avoiding response of justification. Again, since one cannot both change and maintain the same situation the use of exploitation and justification are negatively related. Our data supported this prediction.

Devaluation of the other when used by the advantaged would cognitively decrease the difference between the payoff ratios of the two people in the situation by decreasing the inputs of the disadvantaged. Thus, devaluation of the disadvantaged would make it less necessary to change the actual situation by giving compensation to the disadvantaged. So, we expected and found a negative relationship between compensation and devaluation of the disadvantaged. In the case of the disadvantaged, devaluation of the other would increase the difference between the payoff ratios of the two people in the situation by decreasing the inputs of the advantaged and thus would encourage a change in the situation resulting in the increase of the outcomes of the disadvantaged (i.e., exploitation of the advantaged). In line with this reasoning our results show a positive relationship between devaluation and exploitation of the advantaged by the disadvantaged. Another

reason for the positive relationship between devaluation and exploitation (or negative relationship between devaluation and compensation) is the consistency of helping someone one likes and harming someone one dislikes.

The difference between the reactions of the advantaged and the disadvantaged to the same unjust situation can be explained by the fact that making actual changes in the difference between payoff ratios of the advantaged and the disadvantaged in the situation is profitable (in terms of money) to the disadvantaged while making cognitive changes is profitable for the disadvantaged. Thus, we see that subjects taking the point of view of the teacher tend to justify the situation more than those taking the point of view of the student.

It is difficult to draw parallels between the present study and other studies mentioned in the introduction. One reason for this difficulty is the fact that only two (Stephenson and White, 1970, and Thibaut, 1960) of the studies reviewed in the introduction deal with the reactions of people in the disadvantaged position. The second, and theoretically more important, reason is the fact that none of the studies measure all of the four responses to injustice made available to subjects in this study. (Derogation, justification, minimization, and compensation). This point is especially important since the use of the four different modes of reducing inequity are expected (and found by the results of this study) to be related and the unavailability

of one or more of the responses is expected to make an important difference in the use of the other responses that are available to the subjects. The availability of the compensation/exploitation response is especially important in the way the other responses are used since this response actually restores the inequity in the situation. Most of the studies mentioned in the introduction provide the subjects either with justification, minimization, derogation (Brock and Buss, 1962, 1964; Glass, 1964; Lerner, 1966) or compensation (Freedman and Bless, 1967; Berscheid and Walster, 1967). As we have seen, whether compensation/exploitation is made available to subjects first or last has an effect on the extent to which these equity restoring responses are engaged in. The studies using compensation (or compliance to a request following harm-doing) make compensation the first available response and therefore enable their subjects to make more use of that response in resolving their dissonance than if the existing dissonance were resolved by other responses such as justification, minimization and derogation.

In terms of the independent variables of interest the present study is closest to Stephenson and White (1970) study in which the variables of interest were justified-unjustified privilege and deprivation. However, the way the experimental situations are conceptualized are somewhat different in the two studies. In trying to predict the reactions of the privileged and deprived to the situation, this study took into consideration the justification (or lack of it) for the occupation of both roles in the

situation. In other words, the present study predicted a justified privileged (or deprived) person to react to the situation differently depending on whether the other person in the situation occupied his role with or without justification. Thus, the present experimental situation was conceptualized as a 2 x 2 design with justified-unjustified privileged and justified-unjustified deprived as the independent variables jointly determining the degree of perceived injustice. Stephenson and White (1970) seem to have analyzed their four experimental conditions as 4 different conditions and made their comparisons between justified privileged and justified deprived and between unjustified privileged and unjustified deprived. This seems to indicate that the variable Stephenson and White considered important was whether or not a person's own role was justified or not regardless of whether or not the other person's role was justified or not. Thus, their justified privileged condition contains both the justified privileged-justified deprived and justified privileged-unjustified deprived condition of the present study. This difference in analyzing the results of the two studies makes comparison of the two studies difficult aside from the fact that their situation allowed the deprived to exploit (the experimenter not the privileged) but did not allow the privileged to compensate the deprived.

One problem with the present kind of study is the fact that the question asking about the perceived injustice can be conceptualized both as a manipulation check or a measure of justification.

When a subject rates a situation which according to manipulations should have been an unjust situation as just, one of two things can be true: 1) experimental manipulations might not have been effective; 2) the subject might have been defensively denying the injustice of the situation. This problem is hard to circumvent in a study of this sort. It is possible that those subjects who verbalize the injustice and those who do not, react to the situation differently. This, in part, might explain the clear-cut and consistent findings when subjects were divided into two groups of high and low perceived injustice and inconsistent and unexplainable results when data were analyzed according to experimental manipulation.

References

- Berscheid, E., and Walster, E. "When does a harm-doer compensate a victim?" JPSP., 1967, 6, 435-440.
- Brock, T.C. and Buss, A.H. "Dissonance, aggression, and evaluation of pain." JASP., 1962, 65, 197-202.
- Brock, T.C. and Buss, A.H. "Effects of justification for aggression in communication with the victim on post-aggression dissonance." JASP., 1964, 63, 403-412.
- Carlsmith, J.M. and Gross, A. "Some effects of guilt on compliance." JPSP., 1969, 11, 232-239.
- Davis, K.E. and Jones, E.E. "Changes in interpersonal perception as a means of reducing cognitive dissonance." JASP., 1960, 61, 402-410.
- Freedman, J.L., Wallington, S.A., and Bless, E. "Compliance without pressure: The effect of guilt." JPSP., 1967, 7, 117-124.
- Glass, D.C. "Changes in liking as a means of reducing cognitive discrepancies between self-esteem and aggression." JP., 1964, 32, 520-549.
- Homans, H.C. Social behaviour: Its elementary forms. New York: Hartcourt, Barace and World, 1961.
- Lerner, M.J. and Simmons, C.H. "Observer's reactions to the 'innocent victim': Compassion or rejection?". JPSP., 1966, 4, 203-210.

- Macaulay, J. and Berkowitz, L. (Eds.) Altruism and helping behaviour: social psychological studies of some antecedents and consequences. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Stephenson, G.M. and White, J.R. "Privilege, deprivation and children's moral behaviour: An experimental clarification of the role of investments, JESP, 1970, 6, 167-176.
- Thibaut, J. "An experimental study of the cohesiveness of under-privileged groups." Human Relations, 1950, 3, 351-378.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE TAKEN BY SUBJECTS TAKING THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE
STUDENT

This is a study investigating people's reactions to others in a situation where they identify with one of the participants in the situation rather than try to be an impartial observer. You will see a movie of a psychology experiment. In this study one of the subjects plays the role of the teacher in a concept learning study and the other subject plays the role of the student. The names of the subjects are Bruce and Stan. You are to identify with (Stan). Try to put yourself in that person's shoes. Once the movie starts try to imagine that you are (Stan). You are doing what he is doing and feeling and experiencing whatever he is feeling and experiencing. You may or may not agree with the actions of the person you are identifying with. In any case be that person rather than being a cool observer and judge the actions in an objective way.

Please answer the following questions

How easy did you find identifying with Stan?

very easy:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: very difficult

Do you think you were feeling what Stan was feeling during the experiment?

very much so :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: not at all

Do you think you were experiencing what Stan was experiencing during the experiment?

very much so :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: not at all

How much money did the teacher get during the concept description task in the videotape?_____. How much money did the student get during the concept description task in the videotape?_____.

How just did you think the experimental situation was?

very just :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: very unjust

Do you think people in the experimental situation got what they deserved?

yes :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: no

How comfortable did you feel watching the movie?

very comfortable :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: very uncomfortable

On the basis of their performance on the Thurnstone Abstract Thinking Ability test who do you think deserved to be the teacher _____, the student_____?

At a gut level, how do you feel about Bruce?

like him a lot :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: dislike him very much

(Compensation/exploitation questions)

In this study we are fortunate to be supported by a grant, so we have some extra money to give to the subjects who take part in the experiment. We have 3.00 dollars to divide between the two of you. We do not want to be the judge of how much to give to each person. Since you were the student you know how much effort you spent in trying to improve your performance. You may also have an idea of how much effort the teacher spent in trying to teach you. We want you, the student, to be the judge of how the money should be divided between the two of you. Please look at the alternatives below and insert one of them in this space_____. Also indicate which of the alternatives do you think your teacher would have chosen if he had the chance to determine the division of the money _____.

- a) 1.50 for teacher, 1.50 for student
- b) 2.50 for teacher, 0.50 for student
- c) 0.50 for teacher, 2.50 for student

(Evaluation questions)

This is the questionnaire given to Stan in the experiment. Please answer the questions imagining you are Stan.

As the student in this situation we would like to know your reactions to your teacher. Please answer the following questions based on the impression you formed of your teacher.

1) How would people in general react to this person after a brief acquaintance, in terms of getting to know him better?

would prefer not to become further acquainted :__::__: would be intensely interested

2) How easily would this person fit in with your friends?

very easily :__::__: very difficult

3) Some people are able to gain admiration and respect from others very easily and other people are not. How easily can this person gain admiration from others?

very easily :__::__: very difficult

4) Some people are able to gain affection and liking from others very easily and other people are not. How easily can this person gain affection from others?

very easily :__::__: very difficult

5) From the impression this person gives, how likely is he to be able to get the things he wants out of life?

will have to struggle for what he wants :__::__: the things he wants will come very naturally and easily

Now please rate your teacher on the following adjective scales

good	:__:	bad
altruistic	:__:	egotistic
sociable	:__:	unsociable
kind	:__:	cruel
attracting	:__:	repelling
honest	:__:	dishonest
innocent	:__:	guilty
wise	:__:	foolish
hard	:__:	soft
strong	:__:	weak
severe	:__:	lenient
brave	:__:	cowardly

(Justification, minimization questions)

This is the questionnaire given to Stan at the end of 15 trials. Please answer the questions imagining you are Stan and only with reference to what happened up until the end of 15 trials.

1) To what extent did you think the teacher was qualified to teach you in this experiment?

very slight :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: very great

2) How effective did you think the teacher was in trying to improve your performance?

very competent :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: very incompetent

3) To what extent did you think you deserved the role of the student?

very slight :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: very great

4) Estimate your performance on the "Abstract thinking ability test" relative to your peers. I think I performed at the level of

highest 10% :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: lowest 10%

5) Estimate the teacher's performance on the "Abstract thinking ability test". I think he performed at the level of

highest 10% :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: lowest 10%

6) In this experiment, to what extent did you think the teacher could have given you all of the 3 dollars if he wanted, regardless of your performance on the task?

could have given me:	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	could not given me
all the money if he		all the money even
wanted to		if he wanted to

7) Concerning feelings about not receiving as much money as the teacher did in the experiment, I feel

very annoyed :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: not at all annoyed

8) Do you think the teacher should feel any guilt over receiving more money than you did in the experiment?

not at all :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: great amount

At a gut level, how do you feel about Stan?

like him a lot :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: dislike him very much

As a university student, how much injustice have you experienced?

a great amount :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: none at all

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE TAKEN BY SUBJECTS TAKING THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE
TEACHER

This is a study investigating people's reactions to others in a situation where they identify with one of the participants in the situation rather than try to be an impartial observer. You will see a movie of a psychology experiment. In this study one of the subjects plays the role of the teacher in a concept learning study and the other subject plays the role of the student. The names of the subjects are Bruce and Stan. You are to identify with (Bruce). Try to put yourself in that person's shoes. Once the movie starts try to imagine that you are (Bruce). You are doing what he is doing and feeling and experiencing whatever he is feeling and experiencing. You may or may not agree with the actions of the person you are identifying with. In any case be that person rather than being a cool observer and judge the actions in an objective way.

Please answer the following questions

How easy did you find identifying with Bruce?

very easy :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: very difficult

Do you think you were feeling what Bruce was feeling during the experiment?

very much so :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: not at all

Do you think you were experiencing what Bruce was experiencing during the experiment?

very much so :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: not at all

How much money did the teacher get during the concept description task in the videotape?_____. How much money did the student get during the concept description task in the videotape?_____.

How just did you think the experimental situation was?

very just :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: very unjust

Do you think people in the experimental situation got what they deserved?

yes :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: no

How comfortable did you feel watching the movie?

very comfortable :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: very uncomfortable

On the basis of their performance on the Thurnstone Abstract Thinking Ability test who do you think deserved to be the teacher _____, the student _____?

At a gut level, how do you feel about Stan?

like him a lot :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: dislike him very much

(Compensation/exploitation questions)

In this study we are fortunate to be supported by a grant so we have some extra money to give to subjects who take part in the experiment. We have 3.00 dollars to divide between the two of you. We do not want to be the judge of how much to give each person. Since you were the teacher you know how much effort you spent in trying to teach the student. You may also have an idea of how much effort your student was making in trying to improve his performance. We want you, the teacher, to be the judge of how the money should be divided between the two of you. Please look at the alternatives below and insert one of them in this space _____. Also indicate which of the alternatives you think your student would have chosen if he had a chance to determine the division of the money_____.

- a) 1.50 for teacher, 1.50 for student
- b) 2.50 for teacher, 0.50 for student
- c) 0.50 for teacher, 2.50 for student

(Evaluation questions)

This is the questionnaire given to Bruce in the experiment. Please answer the questions imagining you are Bruce.

As the teacher in this situation we would like to know your reactions to your student. Please answer the following questions based on the impression you formed of your student.

1) How would people in general react to this person after a brief acquaintance, in terms of getting to know him better?

would prefer not :__::__: would be intensely
to become further interested
acquainted

2) How easily would this person fit in with your friends?

probably not easily :__::__: would be eagerly
sought out

3) Some people are able to gain admiration and respect from others very easily and other people are not. How easily can this person gain admiration from others?

very easily :__::__: very difficult

4) Some people are able to gain affection and liking from others very easily and other people are not. How easily can this person gain affection from others?

very easily :__::__: very difficult

5) From the impression this person gives, how likely is he to be able to get the things he wants out of life?

will have to :__::__: the things he wants will
struggle for come naturally and easily
what he wants

At a gut level, how do you feel about Bruce?

like him a lot :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : dislike him very much

As a university student, how much injustice have you experienced?

a great amount : : : : : : : : : none at all

