

Research Paper

## Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?

Shivangi Gupta<sup>1\*</sup>

### ABSTRACT

In this paper my study will analyze data collected from people in India. The purpose of this study is to see whether in India people believe in victim blaming in the case of an incident caused due to external causes or they try to compensate them. Just world belief plays a significant role in preserving people's view in justice. Many people who believe the society is just are also more inclined towards the principle of just world belief. In many studies psychologists have studied the effect of just world belief in western societies. In western culture people-power distance relation is not huge as compared to India and western culture is an individualistic society as compared to India. In India crime rate is more as compared to western culture which also plays an important role. In India people hold a strong belief in karma which is basically "people get what they deserve". Concept of karma is similar to just world belief. In India karma is one of the important factors which determines whether a person is more willing to contribute or blame the victim. The other factor which determines the willingness to help is income standard of the person. People who fall in upper class income status they are less willing to help and hold a stronger stand on victim blaming, whereas, people in middle class income group try to contribute more rather than victim blaming. People in middle class are more empathetic towards victims further they hold a strong view in karma and try to do well to others. According to me people belonging to middle class families try to donate more or find ways to help victims as compared to upper class people. As per the survey conducted, I will try to establish that "Indians when given an opportunity will compensate victims more and when asked to evaluate victim will derogate them and not compensate". Opportunity plays an important role when it comes to deciding whether to compensate or derogate. This is not dependent on different cultures or types of society.

**Keywords:** *Influenced, World Belief, Derogation of a Victim*

Just world theory is relatively a new concept in social psychology introduced by Lerner. Since the evolution of this theory there have been many papers published on it which justifies this theory in various fields of human activities. World is not free from any

<sup>1</sup>Psychologist & Lawyer, India

\*Corresponding Author

Received: May 14, 2021; Revision Received: July 20, 2021; Accepted: August 03, 2021

## **Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

form of injustice, people in their daily lives are witnesses of one unfortunate or another unfortunate event. Each individual has a different view on a particular event; few people will empathize with the victim and try to help them. On the other hand, few individuals will try to devalue those victims and blame them for unfortunate events.

As per Lerner just world theory is “people have this urge to believe and perceive that world is a just place” (Sutton R. a., 2013). The major component of this model is the belief of people get what they deserve and world is a just place (Hafer L. C., 2015). Just world belief has been also seen as positive illusion as it encourages people to see world as place of order, meaning and predictable (Lerner M. a., 1978). Belief in just world theory is the reason for forming impression, degrading victims, compensating victims and also for well-being of mental health. Further it helps people to believe that they have control over their lives and it also helps them in forming long term goals. People who have strong belief in just world theory are able to cope up with negative situations in an easier way and they experience lesser negative events as compared to people having less belief in just world (Janoff-Bulman, 1977).

People have different belief for themselves and for others. This is measured through just world belief for self and just world belief for others. Firstly, people perceive justice differently for themselves and for others that is what is fair for them can be unfair for others and vice-a-versa (Messick D. B., 1985). Secondly, whether the outcome is favourable/fair or not depends on who is receiving it (Messick D. a., 1983). Thirdly, humans use others to compare whether what they received is fair or not (Adams, 1965). World is divided into victims (sick, poor, old people) and non victims; and belief in just world helps to make sense of unfortunate events while decreasing the risk of entering in the world of victims (Lipkus M. I., 1996). Restoring faith in just world varies from helping/compensating victims to rationalizing psychologically a victim’s fate (Hafer L. C., 2005).

There are various reasons why people believe in just world theory. Firstly, it helps people to face vulnerabilities. As people do not want to be a part of violent happenings, hence, when they hear about such events, they try to rationalize it. Their understanding of crime would be through blaming the victim’s behaviour or by compensating for it. Secondly, it helps people in reducing their anxious feelings. As people believe that individuals are responsible for their unfortunate conditions, it restores their belief that world is just and in turn it reduces cognitive dissonance. Thirdly, it helps people to be more optimistic and control their unnecessary fears (Hafer L. C., 2015).

There are various theories that have explained the concept of just world and why people believe that the world is just. Lerner proposed the idea of personal contract in just world belief. According to this theory a child moves from the phase of pleasure principle to reality principle. In the phase of pleasure principle, a child looks for instant satisfaction due to which child indulge in activities as per their desire without thinking about long term consequences. For example, a child in this phase would go out and play without doing a particular task asked to finish for instant pleasure. In reality principle phase a child learns how to modify satisfaction so to gain or lose something which is reward or punishment. For example, a child would perform a certain activity in order to receive reward for it and avoid punishment; here the focus is on long term. When kids shift from pleasure phase to reality phase they form a type of contract with world known as personal contract. As per this

## **Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

contract children abide to follow moral constructs of world in exchange of receiving fair results or results that benefits them (Sutton R. a., 2013).

As per personal contract, a child learns how to abide by the principles of justice in order to receive favourable results. This contract is based on faith, where children learn that life will treat them fairly and this forms an integral principle of life. These principles then gives them confidence to live life with goals and in a reasonable manner. Through this way a child learns the concept of deservingness. Here child believes that by putting extra investments in world will give them better outcomes and what a person deserves is what he/she gets. With time a child learns long term investment method which leads to being more sensitive towards concept of deservingness (Hafer L. C., 2005).

Hence, we have been learning since our childhood that we get what we deserve; our whole life is based on the principle of deservingness. When we witness injustice around our faith is at stake that is just world belief is threatened. We are forced to save our belief this force leads to rationalizing of events on the basis of principle of deservingness. Further to maintain this commitment people believe in just world and when this commitment is challenged people are forced reduce this feeling of faith being challenged.

Group value model states that, humans care about justice not only because of the principle of deservingness but also because they need to maintain their social identity. The fairness of outcome validates their status in society. If humans get fair treatment, they think that they hold a higher position in society. This phenomenon encourages people to work hard in order to maintain their status in society and built confidence (Tyler, 1994). In a study conducted by Moorman et al, it was observed that people who believed that they are receiving results through fair process, they tend to perform extra work and work harder for their organization (Moorman, 1998). In this theory people focus more on procedural justice that is the process of getting an outcome rather than on distributive justice which is the actual outcome. Students use this theory to justify their grades that is whether they got fair grades or not (Sutton R. a., 2013). In a study conducted by Wilke et al, students at Leiden University where asked to participate in a task. In this task one group of students had chance to express themselves on how to distribute lottery tickets, and on the other hand, the second group had no chance to express their opinion. As per this study opportunity to express opinion played an important role as it helped students to compare that they got fair procedure and helped them to evaluate outcome. This led to greater satisfaction in students with a chance to express themselves (Van den Bos, 1997).

System Justification theory was suggested by Jost and Banaji, it stated that people are dependent on social system for earning and security which motivates them to justify social system (Jost, 1994).

Another theory that elaborates on justification of just world theory is immanent justice. This theory suggests that good and bad comes from our good and bad deeds. Hence if a person is suffering due to unfortunate event it is due to his/her bad deeds. It was established that not only children believe in this concept but elders more frequently used immanent justice to rationalize events (Raman, Evidence of more immanent justice responding in adults than children: A challenge to traditional developmental theories, 2004). In an experiment conducted by Raman and Winer, participants were presented with a conversation between two characters who were discussing about a serious illness contracted to a person named

## **Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

John. These characters also discussed about the character of John that was he is a liar and a thief. Further they added a statement that this illness is caused to both types of people good or bad, but such serious issues are caused more often to people who are deserving of unfortunate events. Participants were later asked to justify this conversation and 48% people justified this event through immanent justice (Raman, Children's and adults' understanding of illness: Evidence in support of a coexistence model., 2002).

In an experiment conducted by Callan et al (Callan M. S., 2010), a fake news was circulated through a newspaper to participants. In this news a person met with an accident and this news was followed by pictures of the scene. In this news a person who was a swimming coach died because of a tree fell onto this car. Participants reaction was manipulated by stating that victim was nice person and held a good image in society or the victim was not a good person and used to steal from his class. As we know there is no connection between victim's death and his morality. Still participants connected this accident to victim's deeds and blamed victim's death on victim's behaviour.

As per immanent justice theory people draw links between person's behaviour and misfortunate event happened to that person. This link is solely dependent on people's behaviour and is affected by the fact whether the unfortunate event is a random act or an act of nature. This act of justifying an event is not only for bad events but these links are also used to justify positive happenings in one's life, for example scoring top grades in university exam because of past good deeds. There is no physically reasonable justification for happening of an event to person's behaviour (Callan M. S., 2014).

Just world theory justifies the idea of immanent justice, this was illustrated by Jose in 1990. In this experiment Jose showed children variants of Piaget's orchard scenario where by behaviour of character was crossed by their deeds. Jose also showed casual connection between them. Responses were more inclined towards immanent justice in cases where the outcome was related to past behaviour (Jose, 1990). This study proved how people connect past behaviour with the principle of deservingness.

Just like two sides of a coin, just world theory is also a two-sided theory. On one side people use this to restore their faith in world by compensating a victim and on the other side people derogate victims for their misfortune. When an individual witness any unfortunate event their belief in just world is challenged. The intensity of challenge lies between whether the victim is a good person or a bad person. In order to save their belief people help or derogate/blame victims.

This idea was illustrated by Lerner and Simmons in one of their experiments where participants willingly helped victims when they were able to, on the other side they derogated victims in order to restore faith in just world (Lerner M. a., 1966). In this experiment victim got mild electric shocks when she was not able to answer correctly. Observers helped the victim when they had an opportunity to help and when they were informed that they cannot do anything to reduce victim's suffering, observers' attitude towards the victim was different and they devalued victim more. Further in another experiment on similar grounds observers were made to believe that victim is a good person and undeserving of these shocks. This scenario threatened belief in just world, in order to protect it observers were harsher on victims when it came to justification of the treatment (Lerner M. a., 1966).

## **Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

Just world belief not only encourages altruistic behaviour in people but it also encourages victim blaming. There are several techniques used by people to save their belief in just world. According to Lerner people try to save just world belief by three strategies, these are i) rational whereby people address an unfortunate event and rationalize it by compensating or derogating victims; ii) non-rational whereby people do not address an event by leaving in denial; and iii) protective whereby people create such views about world where one does not test belief in just world (Lerner M. , 1980). In non rational strategy people might also distort reality, outcome or meaning of the outcome which leads to victim blaming. In protective strategy people believe in ultimate justice and keep on believing in this, they believe that ultimately justice will prevail.

Psychological distancing is a way of defending just world belief. In this process people physically distance themselves from injustices of the society (Hafer L. C., 2015). Belief in just world is threatened majorly when a person is able to psychologically associate himself/herself from the victim. In such cases people believe that they share common world as the victim which leads to greater threat to just world belief (Lerner M. a., 1972). According to Rubel et al, people are motivated to distance themselves from victims of unfortunate events in order to maintain their just world belief in people (Hafer L. C., 2015). In a study by Hafer (Hafer C. , Investment in long-terms goals and commitment to just means drive the need to believe in a just world , 2000b), it was found that psychological distancing depends upon the degree to which a participant wants to disassociate themselves from the victim, for instance, participants reported low identification with victim and victim's situation. It was found that people who engage in high level of just world belief have high psychological distancing as well.

In another study by Hafer, participants were asked to watch a videotape story of a woman who suffered assault and was robbed while travelling to North America. In this study threat was manipulated by stating that offenders escaped the punishment and flew to different country or they have been arrested. Later on, before measuring psychological distancing participants were asked to finish stroop task. It was found that in the case where offenders were not caught there was greater justice word interference related to greater psychological distancing (Hafer C. , Do innocent vicitms threaten the belief in a just world? Evidence from modified Stroop task, 2000a).

According to Gaucher et al (Gaucher, 2010), people use compensatory realization of to save their belief in just world belief. This concept means that when a negative event takes place people associate positive reasons to it and when a negative event takes place people associate positive reason to it. This method helps people to think that on balance world is a just place. As per Rubel et al study, the main purpose of this form of strategy is to balance negative underserved event with positive events and positive events to negative ones (Hafer L. C., 2015). These are some common strategies used by people to defend just world belief. The most common of all strategies is victim derogation and compensation. There are several studies on how people decide between derogating and compensating.

People try to help victims due to several reasons, for instance people help others because they are in a good mood and they do not want to be brought down due to others suffering (Wengener, 1994). Helping a victim by compensation is also one of the ways of reducing distress caused by threat to just world belief. Compensation in just world belief means compensating in the form of monetary help (Haynes, 2006). Several studies have showed

## **Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

how belief in just world theory motivates altruistic behaviour in some cases (Begue, 2008). Believe in just world encourages people to help others in order to gain something from it. This encourages superstitious belief in people which persuades people to help more (Sutton R. a., 2013). In a study conducted by Zuckerman, students who scored higher on just world belief scale scored high on compensation scale as well (Zuckerman, 1975).

As per Begue et al “altruistic behaviour will occur to the extent that the desire for justice is elicited and in amounts which reflects the perceived discrepancy between a dependant person’s fate and fate he deserved” (Begue, 2008). The other way of dealing with injustice is to ignore the incident completely or to interpret incident in a way that it appears to be just which strengthens a person’s belief in just world belief (Reichle, 1998). In a study conducted by De Palma et al, participants were provided with an opportunity to help a person suffering from cancer and manipulated the reason for disease. It was found that when a person is not responsible for this incident, people who had stronger belief in just world helped more (De Palma, 1999).

One of the factors that determine how much a person would contribute in order to help depends on whether a person is contributing alone to the victim or if a person is helping through charity. If people asked to help in a case of huge problem like a disaster where number of victims are many, people tend to contribute less. The reason behind this is people think that they could hardly help or their contribution would not be effective that much. This discourages people from contributing less (Sutton R. a., 2013).

The other way to defend just world belief is to derogate victim. Generally, in the case of just world belief people derogate victim by blaming them for the incident even in the cases where it is remotely not even victim’s fault. As per personal contract theory, we learn that bad things happen to people because they are bad themselves. Due to this theory first thing that comes in one’s mind is that “a bad event happened because the victim is a bad person”. In cases like these we tend to ignore circumstantial evidence when it comes to rationalize events (Dawtry, 2018). Victim blaming is a method of derogating victims where the victim is held responsible for the consequences of unfortunate event (Kaplan, 2012). When any unfortunate incident takes place, victims are closely assessed. Things like victim’s profession, economic status or gender is taken into consideration. On the basis of these things people assess whether victim provoked that particular act and blame it on to victims when they can’t rationalize the act through any other way.

People tend to believe that the system they live in is just hence, people who are suffering deserve to suffer and it is due to victims reckless nature they suffer (Valor-Segura, 2011). Victim blaming is not only specific to certain unfortunate events. A negative reaction to victims is towards people from low poverty to the victims of sexual violence to people suffering from diseases. Various studies have proved stronger belief in just world leads to more derogation of victims (De Judicibus, 2001).

In an experiment conducted by Hafer (Hafer C. , Investment in long-terms goal and commitment to just means drive the need to believe in just world., 2000), participants were asked to watch a video of a girl who contracted HIV due to bad luck where condom broke. Before participants were shown the video they were asked to note down their long term goals. Participants were more prone to blaming victim and associate her with negative characteristics. This was due to people who have long term life goals they need to believe

## **Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

that the world is just. In order to reap long term goals people need to pay and sacrifice. Hence, this motivates people to rationalize unfortunate events. So, in cases where there is no other way of rationalizing people tend to derogate more.

In another study by Callan et al (Callan M. P., 2007), participants were asked to look at a photo of a woman and were told that they would have to recognize her later. Afterwards participants were informed that the woman has suffered greatly or not much due to fire at her house. Later on participants were presented with picture of the victim which was altered in a way to make the victim less attractive. When originality of picture was asked participants selected picture which was less attractive. This shows that people tend to evaluate others as less favourable than them. This is also a way of victim blaming that is less favourable treatment than self.

Mostly in the cases of people suffering from incurable disease it is patient's fault. People believe that a person who is responsible for his/her illness should also be the one paying it (Crawford, 1990). In a study by DePalma et al (De Palma, 1999), it was established that people tend to help patients only when they know that patients are not responsible for their own condition. Patients character and how a person perceives it plays a major role in determining whether people will compensate or derogate a patient.

Various studies in just world theory depicts that when people who are more inclined towards this theory, they hold more prejudice opinions about people from lower background, people who are unemployed (Reichle, 1998), old people (Lipkus I. a., 1993) and people who belong to poor class (Furnham A. a., 1984).

This paper has focussed on how Indians react when their belief in just world is threatened. To measure this belief in just world few variables are manipulated. We presented participants with evaluation first and then compensation and the other scenario was compensation first then evaluation. Generally, when people evaluate victims first, they tend to derogate more and compensate less. Further if people are given with an opportunity to help people tend to derogate less. Participants were presented with a particular unfortunate event which increases or decreases threat to just world belief; secondly, participants are presented with an incident where they enough opportunity to help the victim in order to maintain belief in just world. To study this effect it is necessary to manipulate certain variables.

According to Furnham, just world belief exist more in countries where society is unjust because it helps citizens to justify evident and many forms if injustices (Furnham A. , 1985b). This helps in reducing and preventing threats. As per this we can say that in India also people will believe more in just world hypothesis as compared to a country with less crimes or injustices. Just world beliefs can be formed both because of individual's perception and also because of societal norms. This means that few people are more inclined towards just world because of their personal experiences or because of including such belief in order to peruse society's own welfare (Furnham A. a., 1992). Further just world belief can also be formed in countries because of their culture for instance country's legal system, which religion is more prominent or society's distribution system functions.

In a study conducted by Furnham and Rajamanickam, it was found that in Indian participants scored higher on just and unjust scale and one of the reasons stated was

## **Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

conservative nature of people due to their religion in India. Further in countries where there is power-distance values like India, there people endorse more in just world belief (Furnham A. a., 1992). In Rubin and Peplau study it was established that men, younger people and people of lower status economically are more inclined towards just world belief (Rubin, 1975). This paper will take into consideration factors to further analyse whether in current study Indians when given an opportunity will compensate more or when not given an opportunity will derogate more.

In the current study we will evaluate the effect of evaluation on compensation and derogation. Our hypothesis is when people evaluate victims first, they tend to derogate them more and when people are given an opportunity to compensate first they tend to derogate less.

In current study we will analyse whether people had enough opportunity to help the victim or not, and if there was enough opportunity have they taken initiative to compensate victim. Secondly, as discussed earlier India is a country where religion is an integral part of society. In Hinduism (major religion in India), people believe more in karma which means people get what they deserve whether it is a positive or a negative outcome. Thirdly, our study involves victim suffering from cancer which will lead to death of the victim, would this encourage participants to help victim. Just world theory also influences death as belief in just world theory reduces the fear of death.

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### ***Participants***

A total of 119 participants participated in the mentioned study. These participants were approached by researcher herself through various social media applications in the city of New Delhi. Out of 119 participants only 88 number of participants filled survey till the end. Survey had questions for monetary compensation in form of INR and in form of GBP. Due to 1 British participant GBP part was removed from survey. Out of these 67 is number of women who participated and rest is male. The age range for this study varies from 18 to 45.

#### ***Procedure***

The study was done through online survey. Here participants were asked to fill a questionnaire which contained measure of socioeconomic demographics like age, gender, ethnicity and income status. All participants carried out the survey voluntarily and in the beginning of survey participants were explained the objective of this study. This survey was around 15-20 minutes long.

In the survey participants were presented with a medical hypothetical story about a man AJ who is 28 years old and works on daily wage basis. AJ suffers from a rare cancer where with time AJ will have difficulties in movement and would be relying on wheelchair in near future. He is sole earning member of his family. There is a treatment for this type of cancer which is high in cost and AJ alone cannot afford the cost. Hence AJ's family has to rely on other people to cover treatment finances.

#### ***Instruments***

The participants were asked to fill the 8-item Just World Beliefs Scale (Lipkus, Dalbert, & Siegler, 1996). The main purpose of this scale is to measure just world belief for self and for others. This scale has been used in several published studies to compute just world belief,

## **Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

this shows that the scale is reliable and valid. The reliability of this scale is  $\alpha=0.82$ , where  $0.9 > \alpha \geq 0.8$  is considered to be good. The questionnaire was explained in hindi to individuals who had difficulty in understanding questions.

### ***Measure***

#### ***Just World Belief***

I used 8 item scaled developed by Lipkus et al. Few questionnaire items are “I feel that the world treats people fairly”, “I feel that when people meet with misfortune, they have bought it on themselves”. Participants were asked to show the extent to which they agreed with each statement using 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 stands for strongly disagree and 7 stands for strongly agree

#### ***Derogation***

To measure derogation questions like "How negative to positive would you evaluate AJ as person compared to how negative to positive you would evaluate yourself as a person" was asked. These questions basically measured how participants see themselves with respect to AJ who was suffering for a disease which he is not responsible for. Participants had to indicate on the scale of 10-point Likert type where 0= "much more negative than me" and 10 = "much more positively than me. The reliability of this scale is  $\alpha= 0.715$ , where  $0.8 > \alpha \geq 0.7$  is considered to be acceptable.

#### ***Compensation***

To measure compensation participants were asked whether and how much would they be willing to donate money directly to AJ's family. The amount varied from 0 to 1000. Secondly, they were asked if there is charity for AJ would they be willing to contribute through charity and how much would they like to contribute. The amount varied from 0 to 1000. Lastly, they were asked would they be willing to spend a day helping in raising fund for AJ, this was measured on the scale of 0 to 10 where 10 stands for extremely likely and 0 stands for extremely unlikely. The reliability of this scale is  $\alpha= 0.65$ , where  $0.7 > \alpha \geq 0.6$  is considered to be questionable. If while testing reliability we remove time as a factor it will increase reliability to 0.69.

## **RESULTS**

The purpose of this research work was to investigate whether people will derogate victims more when they are given an opportunity to evaluate and then compensate or whether they will compensate more and derogate less. The study included 87 individuals, 35 of them where in compensate then evaluate group (first group), and 52 were in evaluate then compensate group (second group). These groups were estimated in two conditions – derogate and compensate. In derogate condition, the first group showed the average score of 6.638 with a standard deviation of 1.445 and the second group had a mean of 5.833 with a standard deviation of 1.655. In the compensate condition, the first group had an average of 6.704 with the standard deviation of 2.305, and the second group had an average of 7.692 with the standard deviation of 2.805.

A t-test for independent samples was used to examine the difference in the average scores of derogate and compensate conditions between two groups. The Levene's test for equality of variances revealed that the variances are approximately equal in derogate condition ( $F = 0.003$ ,  $p = 0.958$ ) and in compensate condition ( $F = 2.726$ ,  $p = 0.102$ ). The first t-test revealed a significant difference between first and second group average scores in derogate

## Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?

condition ( $t = 2.338$ ,  $p = 0.022$ ). However, the second t-test did not determine a statistically significant difference in the average scores between two groups in compensate condition ( $t = -1.745$ ,  $p = 0.085$ ). As indicated by descriptive statistics and test results, people who compensate then evaluate in derogate condition score significantly more than those who evaluate and then compensate. However, in compensate condition, both groups of people demonstrated similar scores.

The next part of the analysis was to determine strength, direction and significance of the association between scores in four groups: SSS\_1, BJW\_M, dero\_M and comp\_M. The following correlation matrix was calculated:

	SSS_1	BJW_M	dero_M	comp_M
SSS_1	1	-0.097	0.103	0.080
BJW_M	-0.097	1	-0.002	0.012
dero_M	0.103	-0.002	1	0.047
comp_M	0.08	0.012	0.047	1

\*- significant at 0.05

None of the above correlation coefficients were significant, because all p-values were greater than 0.05. This result suggested that the scores in all four groups were not correlated to each other, hence being independent.

The last table shows descriptive statistics for the scores in these four groups. For instance, in the SSS\_1 group, the minimum score was 2 and the maximum was 10, with an average of 6.76 and standard deviation of 1.561. In BJW\_M group, the minimum value was 1 and the maximum as 6.38, the mean value was 3.446 and the standard deviation is 1.021. In dero\_M group, the scores ranged from 1 to 9.67 with a mean of 6.157 and standard deviation of 1.615. Finally, in comp\_M group, the scores ranged from 1 to 11 with the mean of 7.288 and standard deviation of 2.644.

## DISCUSSION

The overall purpose of this study was to evaluate whether people in India compensate a victim or derogate. In this study we considered two conditions where participants were given a chance to evaluate first and then compensate; and in the other condition participants were asked to compensate first and then evaluate his condition. As per Lerner's experiment, discussed in literature review of paper when people are given an opportunity to compensate victims they derogate them less. Further there is evidence that establishes how people derogate victims more when they belong to lower status of society or are criminals. In a study conducted by Braman and Lambert it was found that mere stigma attached to a victim leads to more blaming responses (Braman. C. Amie, 2001).

In a study by DePalma et al (De Palma, 1999), it was ascertained that people were less inclined to help patients who were the reason behind their own illness and people who held more faith in just world belief tend to help more only when they knew illness caused to a patient was not because of patient's fault. In the current study AJ is a victim of a rare form of cancer and in no way responsible for the illness happened to him. In this study we found that when participants were given a chance to compensate first and then evaluate they compensated more. As predicted by Lerner and other psychologists when given a mere opportunity people tend to help victims. Even in this study mere opportunity to compensate first led to better evaluation of the victim.

## **Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

In a study by Haynes and Olson (Haynes, 2006), they worked on when people have either a chance to compensate or a chance to derogate then people who have higher just world belief chooses to compensate. Further they also found that people who held lower belief in just world tend to compensate less. This shows that mere chance of compensating/helping leads to a decision of derogation or compensation. As per Lerner and Miller (Lerner M. a., 1978), if any person has the capability to help a victim and this form of help is not affecting the person himself/herself in that case the help will most likely occur. Further they gave evidence which proved if a person believes that their help will be able to bring significant change in the fate of a victim then people are most likely to help victim. There numerable studies and evidences which have depicted the role of opportunity in each unfortunate event. A mere chance of helping a victim to save just world belief most likely leads to compensation than derogation. Hence, opportunity plays the major role when it comes to analysing compensation or derogation dynamics.

As per earlier studies it have been established that opportunity plays the most important role in determining compensation and derogation. On the other hand, when participants were asked to evaluate first and then compensate it was found that people still compensated better and had better evaluation for victim. This suggests that in this study we found an upcoming trend where people even when not having an opportunity to compensate they still derogate the victim lesser. Even though there was minimum significant difference between p values of both conditions still this could hint towards a new trend. There could be many reasons behind this new trend. One of it could be people evaluate victims better in order to have better evaluations for themselves. Personality of a person also determines how a person will evaluate others (Petersen, 2017) Further while filling a survey people try to look good on paper and they manipulate their answers accordingly and this plays a significant role when it comes to determining differences between the two conditions.

As per Lambert and Braman, the effect of belief in just world principle could also lead to fewer victim blaming (Braman. C. Amie, 2001). Lastly, culture plays an important role in determining belief in just world and how to defend it. Furnham in his various studies have discussed how differences in societies play a role in determining just world belief. Sinha's study brought into notice that people outside India believe Hinduism is deeply rooted in Indian culture and people blindly follow law of karma (Sinha, 1988). Karma means a person will get what he/she deserves. As per Cambridge dictionary karma means "a person's actions will influence his/her future". As per this, principle of karma is associated with both positive and negative outcome. Most of the people in India believe that if any unfortunate event has occurred in one's life it is due to their karma. On this basis of definition of karma we could say that karma and belief in just world both share the core principle of deservingness. The difference between western culture and Indian culture is of how we name the principle of deservingness.

Another interesting fact found in the current study was that there is no significant correlation between belief in just world, derogation and compensation. One of the reasons could be the cultural difference. There are many evidences on how just world belief operates in western culture and very few studies on just world belief in India. This study was solely based on Indian participants hence the evidence of cultural difference was higher in this study. In India people believe in karma more which means a person reaps what he/she sows. Most of Indian judgements are dependent on the concept of karma. Believing more in one concept than other western notion could be a reason for no correlation between the variables.

## **Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

There are several factors which determine belief in just world and how people choose to defend it. In India, when people are provided with mere opportunity, they tend to help a victim. Further there is a new trend discovered where even after evaluation compensation was better.

### **CONCLUSION**

In this paper I analysed how by manipulating two important variables of just world belief people choose between derogation and compensation. In this study when participants were asked to choose between compensation and derogation in the case of evaluation first or later, participants still evaluated victim better. This study showed how when given opportunity to compensate people choose to help the victim. People when think they have a power to change someone's fate they try to it. There are several other ways to protect just world belief and there are several theories behind why people believe in just world theory.

For future research one should examine more specifically how karma plays a role in determining compensation and derogation. Further research could also develop a way to measure karma just like how psychologists use 8 point just world belief measure to see how one's belief is determined in just world scale. Secondly, future research one could examine how this new trend where participants have evaluated victims better even in the case of evaluation first and then compensating has evolved. There could be a scale or measure developed to track this trend. Further why people are still motivated to evaluate better even when there is opportunity present in later phase.

Thirdly, future research could further work on how culture plays a role in determining belief in just world in India. There are numerous studies that focus on just world belief in western culture and these studies have illustrated well enough to come to a conclusion that in western culture belief in just world plays an important role in determining course of action that is derogation or compensation. In India there are limited study which points towards just world belief and how Indians work out in compensation-derogation dynamics. Future study could also determine on how karma and just world belief is related. To evaluate this researchers have to come up with a scale that could either involve questions based on prima facie similarities in both or whether these two words play a different role in an individual's life. Further if in India word "just world belief" is replaced by word "karma" would it still have the same impact as this study on people.

Lastly, this study was only conducted in India and people in India communicate in Hindi. This survey used English language for the purpose of communication. Would translating of survey from English to Hindi will create a difference in participant's opinion was not evaluated. Considering in India Hindi is most prominent language this could bring certain changes in the results which could be further evaluated in future research.

Therefore, on the basis on above study we could come on a conclusion that as predicted in previous studies mere chance of opportunity to help a victim plays an important role in understanding derogation-compensation dynamics. Further in India just world belief, derogation and compensation have no significant correlation, as compared to other countries where studies have provided evidence for significant correlation between just world, derogation and compensation.

## **REFERENCES**

- Adams, J. (1965). Inequity in social exchange . In L. Berkowitz, *Advances in experimental psychology* (pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Begue, L. C. (2008). Altruistic behavior and the bidimensional just world belief. *American Journal of Psychology*, 47-56.
- Braman. C. Amie, a. L. (2001). Punishing Individuals for Their Infirmities: Effects of Personal Responsibility, Just-World Beliefs, and In-Group/Out-Group Status. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1096-1109.
- Callan, M. P. (2007). The consequences of victim physical attractiveness on reactions to injustice: The role of observers' belief in a just world. *Social Justice Research* , 433-456.
- Callan, M. S. (2010). When deserving translates into causing: The effect of cognitive load on immanent justice reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1097-1100.
- Callan, M. S. (2014). Immanent justice reasoning: Theory, research, and current directions . *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 105-161.
- Crawford, R. (1990). Individual responsibility and health politics. In P. C. Kern, *The sociology of health and illness: Critical perspectives* (pp. 387-395). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Dawtry, J. R. (2018). Derogating Innocent Victims: The Effects of Relative Versus Absolute Character Judgments. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 186-199.
- De Judicibus, M. a. (2001). Blaming the target of sexual harassment: Impact of gender role, sexist attitudes, and work role. *Sex Roles*, 401-417.
- De Palma, M. M. (1999). Perceived patient responsibility and belief in a just world affect helping. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 131-137.
- Furnham, A. (1985b). Just world belief in an unjust society: A cross-cultural comparison. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 363-366.
- Furnham, A. a. (1984). Just world beliefs and attitudes towards the poor. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 265-269.
- Furnham, A. a. (1992). The Protestant Work Ethic and Just World Beliefs in Great Britain and India. *International Journal of Psychology*, 401-416.
- Gaucher, D. H. (2010). Compensatory rationalizations and the resolution of everyday undeserved outcomes. *Personality and Social Bulletin* , 109-118.
- Hafer, C. (2000). Investment in long-terms goal and commitment to just means drive the need to believe in just world. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1059-1073.
- Hafer, C. (2000a). Do innocent vicitms threaten the belief in a just world? Evidence from modified Stroop task. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 165-173.
- Hafer, C. (2000b). Investment in long-terms goals and commitment to just means drive the need to believe in a just world . *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1059-1073.
- Hafer, L. C. (2005). Experimental Research on Just World Theory: Problems, Developments, and Future Challenges . *American Psychological Association*, 128-167.
- Hafer, L. C. (2015). The Why and How of Defending Belief in a Just World. In a. Z. Olson M. James., *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 41-96). Burlington: Academic Press.
- Haynes, G. A. (2006). Coping With Threats to Just-World Beliefs: Derogate, Blame, or Help? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 664-682.

**Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

- Janoff-Bulman, R. a. (1977). Attributions of blame and coping in real world: Severe accident victims react to their lot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 351-363.
- Jose, P. (1990). Just-world reasoning in children's immanent justice judgments. *Child Development*, 1024-1033.
- Jost, J. a. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 1-27.
- Kaplan, H. (2012). Belief in a Just World, Religiosity and Victim Blaming. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, 397-409.
- Lerner, M. (1980). *The belief in just world: A fundamental delusion*. New York: NY: Plenum Press.
- Lerner, M. a. (1966). Observer's reaction to the "innocent victim"; Compassion or Rejection? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 203-210.
- Lerner, M. a. (1972). The consequences of perceived similarity: Attraction and rejection, approach and avoidance. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*, 69-75.
- Lerner, M. a. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. *Psychological Bulletin* , 1030-1051.
- Lipkus, I. a. (1993). The belief in a just world and perceptions of discrimination. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 465-474.
- Lipkus, M. I. (1996). The importance of distinguishing the Belief in Just World for Self Versus for Others: Implications for Psychological Well-Being. . *Society for Personality and Social Psychology*, 666-677.
- Lipkus, M., Dalbert, C., & Siegler, &. (1996). The Importance of Distinguishing the Belief in a Just World for Self Versus for Others: Implications for Psychological Well-Being. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 666-677.
- Messick, D. a. (1983). Fairness, preference, and fairness biases. In D. a. Messick, *Equity theory: Psychological and sociological perspectives* (pp. 61-94). New York: Praeger.
- Messick, D. B. (1985). Why we are fairer than others. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 480-500.
- Moorman, R. B. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour? *Academy of Management Journal*, 351-357.
- Petersen, N. (2017, May 5th). *Blog*. Retrieved from AllPsych: <https://blog.allpsych.com/personality-plays-a-role-in-how-people-evaluate-each-others-performance/>
- Raman, L. a. (2002). Children's and adults' understanding of illness: Evidence in support of a coexistence model. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 325-355.
- Raman, L. a. (2004). Evidence of more immanent justice responding in adults than children: A challenge to traditional developmental theories. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 255-274.
- Reichle, B. S. (1998). How do observers of victimization preserve their belief in a just world cognitively or actionally? In L. a. Montada, *Responses to victimization and belief in just world* (pp. 55-86). New York: Springer.
- Rubin, Z. a. (1975). Who believes in just world. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65-90.
- Sinha, D. (1988). Basic Indian values and behaviour dispositions in the context of national development. In D. a. Sinha, *Social Values and Development* (pp. 29-55). New Delhi: Sage .

**Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim?**

- Sutton, R. a. (2013). Altruism and Justice. In R. a. Sutton, *Social Psychology* (pp. 608-658). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sutton, R., & Douglas, K. (2013). Altruism and Justice. In R. Sutton, & K. Douglas, *Social Psychology* (pp. 608-658). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tyler, T. (1994). Psychological models of the justice motive: Antecedents of distributive and procedural justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 850-853.
- Valor-Segura, I. E. (2011). Attitude toward prostitution: is it an ideological issue? *The European Journal of Applied to Legal Context*, 159-176.
- Van den Bos, K. L. (1997). How do I judge my outcome when I do not know the outcome of others?The psychology of the fair process effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1034-1046.
- Wengener, D. a. (1994). Mood management across affective states: The hedonic contingency hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1034-1038.
- Zuckerman, M. (1975). Belief in a just world and altruistic behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 972-976.

**Acknowledgement**

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

**Conflict of Interest**

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

**How to cite this article:** Gupta S. (2021). Just World Belief: How People Are Influenced in India by The Concept of Just World Belief, Whether They Are More Inclined Towards Helping a Victim or Towards Derogation of a Victim? *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(3), 375-389. DIP:18.01.038.20210903, DOI:10.25215/0903.038