

## References

- Magnusson, D., & Endler, N. S. (1977). Interactional psychology: Present status and future prospects. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), *Personality at the crossroads* (pp. 3-36). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Mischel, W. (1968). *Personality and assessment*. New York: Wiley.
- Mischel, W., & Peake, P. K. (1982). Beyond déjà vu in the search for cross-situational consistency. *Psychological Review*, 89, 730-755.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-453.
- Zuckerman, M., Koestner, R., DeBoy, T., Garcia, T., Maresca, B. C., & Sartoris, J. M. (1988). To predict some of the people some of the time: A reexamination of the moderator variable approach in personality theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1006-1019.

- No. 17 Oswald, M. (1989). Attribution of responsibility, penalty, and amount of damages. [Schadenshöhe, Strafe und Verantwortungsattribution.] *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie*, 20, 200-210. <50 Ref.>
- M. Oswald, Kriminologisches Forschungsinstitut Niedersachsen e.V., Leisewitzstr. 41, D-3000 Hannover 1, Germany.

So far, theories of attribution have only unsatisfactorily integrated assumptions from equity theory. However, an analysis comprising both theories seems necessary to deal with attribution of moral responsibility in cases of damage. According to Heider (1958) and Piaget (1973), the amount of damage is relevant only at a low level of development of moral judgment. On higher levels, only intentions and reasonable excuses of the offender should influence moral judgment but not the amount of damage which often depends on random influences.

However, not only do results of experimental studies and observations in every day life show that theories describe more often the normative desired behavior than actual adult behavior. In the Federal Republic of Germany, penalty is premised to depend on the amount of guilt of the offender. But the sentencing practice of criminal courts shows that both the occurrence as well as the amount of damage do have a considerable influence upon penalty assessment. Often, there is but insufficient elaboration (or none at all) on how far the occurrence or nonoccurrence of damage, or its actual amount were caused by random conditions, and thus do not justify any conclusion about the intentions of the offender and about the circumstances of the crime.

Equity theory assumes that both the observer and the person concerned feel a need to see the occurred damage compensated (retributive justice). In many situations, this causes a serious conflict: From a normative point of view, the damage has to be compensated by the offender to the extent that he or she can be held responsible. However, if a critical consideration leads to the assumption of reduced responsibility of the offender, some part of the damage has to remain uncompensated, unless the victim or a third party could be held responsible, simultaneously. Of course, this conflict becomes more difficult the

larger the damage that concurred, and it seems to be solved too easily when in favor of the need of retribution the whole responsibility is attributed to the offender. If, in other words, the attribution of responsibility increases with an increasing amount of damage, this means that persons restrict their criteria for attribution, or cease to test them (cf. Rule & Ferguson, 1984).

What can we do to avoid an overexaggerated and uncritical attribution of responsibility? The following point of view seems important: In common penal law, a retribution of damage occurs only in the form of "reconciliation" of the victim by doing harm to the offender. The victim's claim against the offender, as a civil case, also often goes without success because there is no money to be had from the offender. Some newer approaches try to reform this scheme of punishment. Among these are several models of offender-victim reconciliation which aim at a positive compensation of the damage. "Positive" means, in this respect, that the offender actively contributes to the compensation of damage, to the benefit of the victim. In many cases, this form of reconciliation may be more adequate than only doing harm to the offender. Furthermore, the aim is to have both offender and victim elaborate the performance and the background of the crime, so that it would be difficult to attribute responsibility only to the offender. (The same holds, of course, for neutralizing techniques applied by the offender.) Finally, the victim may learn to cope better with possible problems induced by his or her victimization, like, for example, anxiety, by elaborating on the process of the crime and the person of the offender, so that the damage perceived decreases, and consequently also the need of reconciliation (Utne & Kidd, 1980). According to these considerations, we assume that in case of an offender-victim reconciliation conflicts are solved less to the expense of the offender than in the conventional system of penalty.

## References

- Rule, B. G., & Ferguson, T. J. (1984). The relations among attribution, moral evaluation, anger, and aggression in children and adults. In A. Mummendey (Ed.), *Social psychology of aggression*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Utne, M. K., & Kidd, R. F. (1980). Equity and attribution. In G. Mikula (Ed.), *Gerechtigkeit und soziale Interaktion*. Bern: Huber.

- No. 18 Stern, E. (1989). The influence of the self-recording of behavior on attitude-behavior relationship. [Auswirkungender Verhaltens-Selbstprotokollierung auf die Einstellungs-Verhaltens-Konsistenz.] *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie*, 20, 220-229. <27 Ref., 5 Tab.>

E. Stern, Max-Planck-Institut für psychologische Forschung, Leopoldstr. 24, D-8000 München 40, Germany.

Recent research has shown that the correlation between attitude and behavior depends on whether personal experience with the attitude object is salient

when the attitude is expressed (Fazio, 1987). In line with these results one can conclude that *behavioral self-recording* changes the subjects' attitude towards the recorded behavior after the behavior-frequency information becomes known. This results in an increase in the correlation between behavior frequency and subjects' attitude toward the recorded behavior. The first study addresses the question whether behavioral self-recording changes the frequency of behavior (reactivity). Thirty-six psychology undergraduate students recorded the frequency of reading professional literature for three weeks using a time-sampling procedure; the procedure involved the use of small electronic instruments that served as a data carrier and as an alarm clock. Before and after the self-recording phase the attitude toward reading professional literature was measured with a rating scale. The amount of induced self-focused attention was varied in two experimental conditions: Either the subjects only recorded their reading behavior (recording condition *RC*), or in addition to this they were asked to state on a rating scale how much they liked to read the literature (affective evaluation condition, *AEC*). The persons were assigned randomly to one of the two conditions. Our expectation was that under both conditions attitude and behavior frequency would change and that these effects would be stronger under *AEC* than under *RC*.

Under both conditions there was a substantial correlation (.45 under *AEC*, .52 under *RC*) between the attitude measured prior to self-recording and self-recorded reading frequency. However, under *RC* the attitude towards reading professional literature was not affected by self-recording. Moreover, contrary to our assumption, in the *AEC* administered after the self-recording phase, reading frequency and the attitude towards reading professional literature no longer correlated. A further analysis showed that the correlation between aggregated affective evaluations and the attitude measured after the self-recording phase was .78. When subjects expressed their attitude towards reading professional literature after the self-recording phase, they took into account the affective evaluation they had stated together with the behavior recording.

The data are in line with results from Millar and Tesser (1986), who found for *consumatory behavior* that affective evaluation of behavior increased the correlation between attitude and behavior but decreased in case of *instrumental behavior*. Reading professional literature is an instrumental behavior. In cases where cognitive evaluation was required, the effect was the opposite.

To test this, we conducted an additional study, with 40 psychology students. This time, the frequency of reading professional literature was recorded by daily telephone interviews. Half the students gave affective evaluation, the other half gave logical reasons for reading this special literature (cognitive evaluation). In the affective evaluation condition, the results of the first study were replicated exactly. Under the condition of cognitive evaluation, the correlation between reading frequency and the attitude towards reading was not affected.

The data show that the reason for a correlation between attitude and behavior can be lack of information. If no other information is available, information about behavior frequency is considered. However, if affective information is available, it will be considered when an attitude is expressed, regardless of whether it corresponds to the frequency of behavior.

### References

- Fazio, R. H. (1987). Self-perception theory: A current perspective. In M. Zanna, J. Olson & P. Herman (Eds.), *Social influence: The Ontario Symposium* (Vol.5, pp. 129-149). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Millar, M. G., & Tesser, A. (1986). Effects of affective and cognitive focus on the attitude-behavior relation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 270-276.

### Clinical Psychology

- No. 19 Krausz, M., & Sorgenfrei, T. (1991). Therapeutic use of neuroleptics. [Der therapeutische Umgang mit Neuroleptika.] *Psychiatrische Praxis*, 18, 9-13. <56 Ref.>

M. Krausz, Psychiatrische Universitätsklinik Hamburg, Martinistr. 52, D-2000 Hamburg 20, Germany.

The problems of subjective acceptance and reaction by patients to the effects of neuroleptics have received less attention than the "objective" aspects, even though effects and side effects of neuroleptics can be differentiated by patients during acute illness as well as during remission.

The literature points to the significance of the patient's attitude to and assessment of pharmacotherapeutic measures with the framework of research on concept of disease and compliance. Studies on the compliance of outpatient neuroleptic treatment found that between 25-63% of the patients did not at all or not regularly take the prescribed medication (Blackwell, 1976; Krausz, 1987; Van Putten, 1974). The noncompliance alone does not explain the higher rate of relapse among schizophrenics (Schooler & Hogarty, 1987).

Noncompliance is often an expression of evasion of a therapeutic confrontation between physician and patient and correlates with the patient's discontent with the therapy (Krausz, 1987). Four underlying processes for the development of this form of reaction have been discussed:

1. The relationship to the psychosis: The psychosis seems to give a "trip-like gratification" as well next to the various negative aspects. The subjective feeling of insufficiency of the self-potential can lead to a psychotic impulse defense and conflict avoidance (Wulff, 1972; Brenner & Böker, 1986). A subjective self-overestimation leads to a rejection of the prescribed medication (Van Putten, 1976).