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Abstract

Individuals’ perceptions and attitudes towards authority figures are determined by the nature of their interactions with this group of individuals (Chow, 2012). Studies have indicated that the way people feel about authority figures like the police is associated with the way we feel about other authority figures such as teachers and parents (Brandt, 2000). In saying that, police officers, as authority figures, also work as law enforcers for the criminal justice system. In doing so, these individuals act on behalf of this institution. So, do the effects of negative interactions with police officers parallel those of institutional betrayal? Institutional betrayal is when an institution fails to adequately respond or provide support in response to trauma that is perpetrated upon an individual who is dependent on that institution (Smith & Freyd, 2014). This study hopes to understand how experiencing institutional betrayal at the hands of powerful organizations (and the people working for these power institutes) can ultimately impact perceptions towards authority in general. Two screening tools, the Trauma History Questionnaire (THQ) and Institutional Betrayal Questionnaire (IBQ), along with the Just World Scale (JWS) and General Attitudes towards Institutional Authority Scale (GAIAS) were used to determine individuals' perceptions and attitudes towards authority in the context of institutional betrayal. The results of the study suggested that experiencing institutional betrayal did not play a significant role in altering individuals’ perceptions and attitudes towards authority.
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Understanding the Impact of Institutional Betrayal on Individuals’ Perceptions of Authority

When someone experiences a trauma or negative event, the institution responsible for that person’s well-being can often play an important role in how that trauma is experienced (Smith & Freyd, 2014). Understanding the scope and impact of institutional involvement in traumatic events requires a willingness to examine the ways in which these trusted institutions can often directly or indirectly foster abuse (Smith & Freyd, 2014). When looking at an institution’s actions as potential explanations for the variation in reactions to the traumatic experience, Smith and Freyd (2014) found that the way in which an institution handles the situation can have the potential to either worsen or mitigate any posttraumatic outcomes. Institutes who were found to be active and supportive in response to an individual’s trauma actually served as a source for support and healing (Smith & Freyd, 2014). However, there are instances where that institution can react in an unsupportive way. In these situations, individuals can experience worsened post-traumatic outcomes (Smith & Freyd, 2014) and may also develop severe symptoms of anxiety, depression, and other interpersonal complications. These symptoms could even lead to the diagnosis of a mental illness such as borderline personality disorder, among other things (Smith & Freyd, 2013). This non-supportive response can be understood by examining the framework of institutional betrayal.

**Institutional Betrayal**

Institutional betrayal arises when wrongdoings are perpetrated by an institution upon an individual who is dependent on that institute (Smith & Freyd, 2014). Additionally, this can include the failure to prevent or respond supportively to wrongdoings by individuals who represent the institution, such as the police working on behalf of the criminal justice system (Smith & Freyd, 2014). Importantly, these institutions can be conceptualized as a larger
organization or social system such as a university or school, the criminal justice and healthcare system, or one’s personal workplace. As previously mentioned, these institutions can also be embodied by individuals working in those systems such as professors, police officers, doctors, or employers, respectively. As a result of people’s dependence on them, these kinds of institutions can often hold a place of authority over many individuals. Moreover, institutional betrayal can be further perpetrated by an institute’s lack of seriousness in responding to complaints of harassment, as well as their tolerance and lenience in holding those responsible accountable for their actions (Smith & Freyd, 2014). Whether this fracture in a relationship is felt between a patient and a doctor, a student and a professor, or an employee and their employer, the outcomes are the same; the dependent individuals could develop adverse symptoms as a result of institutional betrayal.

**Institutional Betrayal and Trust**

Studies on Betrayal Trauma Theory indicate that abuse perpetrated by someone with whom you have a close relationship with is more harmful than the abuse perpetrated by strangers (Smith & Freyd, 2014). This is because of the unexpected violation of trust and dependency in the relationship (Smith & Freyd, 2014). Often, institutional betrayal is experienced at the hands of these powerful institutions or individuals, which is why the violation of trust and dependency is so impactful. Unfortunately, this can often inhibit the victims from obtaining the compensation or necessary remedies required. Despite not always having a close and affectionate relationship with police, other authority figures, or institutions, we hypothesized in the current study that the form of trust and dependency people have in these institutes often mimics that of a close relationship. Hence, we believed that trauma suffered at the hands of these trusted relationships would significantly alter people’s perceptions and attitudes towards them.
Perceptions Towards Authority

In order to consider the potential effects of institutional betrayal on individuals’ perceptions towards authority, understanding the mechanisms of how perceptions towards authority are formed and changed is important. There are many identified factors that can contribute to how one’s perceptions of authority can change. Studies have found that people’s attitudes towards police are shaped by the type (i.e., negative versus positive) of interaction they experience, as well as the frequency of these interactions (Chow, 2012; Tyler, 2004). To illustrate, in one study, youth and adolescents held the least favourable attitudes toward police compared to any other age demographics because of the tendency to have more negative interactions with police than any other age group (Chow, 2012). Similar results have been reported by Brandt and Markus (2000), who found that adolescents who reported having bad experiences with police in the past year held significantly worse perceptions of police compared to their peers. Not only were negative interactions found to adversely impact youth and adolescent perceptions of police, but these experiences also served as reflections of this group’s diminished sense of trust in government institutions (Friedman, Lurigio, Greenleaf, & Albertson, 2004). Such findings have been replicated with adult populations whereby individuals who felt that they were being treated fairly and respectfully by the police experienced an increased sense of value and social identity (White, Mulvey, & Dario, 2016). Ultimately, this led to a stronger sense of connection for these individuals towards the authority figure and the social institution they represented (White et al., 2016).

Research also suggests that our perceptions of authority can change even without direct interactions with institutions or individuals who represent those institutions. Ren, Cao, Lovrich, and Gaffney (2005), for example, highlighted the link between fear of crime or prior experiences
of victimization as also being factors that lead to negative attitudes and perceptions of police. This relationship demonstrated that even experiences that lack direct interactions with police and authority may inadvertently serve as precipitants to worsen one’s perceptions towards these groups. These findings of how the public perceive police are relevant in considering the impact of institutional betrayal on perceptions of authority because they illustrate how external variables—rather than just personality factors—can influence one’s overall perception of authority. Given that people’s attitudes towards police are positively correlated with attitudes towards other sources of authority such as parents, teachers, and the law (Brandt, 2000), a negative experience with a police officer may lead to an overall diminish in attitudes and perceptions of authority in general.

**Trust and Perceptions Towards Authority**

One variable that has been found to impact the formation of individuals’ attitudes towards institutes and authority was trust (Jackson, 2018). Individuals who trusted the police were increasingly more likely to cooperate with them because they viewed the police as being more legitimate (Jackson, 2018). Moreover, people’s trust of the police also served as predeterminants of how police officers would act in the future (Jackson, 2018; Jackson & Gau, 2016). The maintenance of trust and legitimacy in police was fostered by the fair and respectful treatment by authority figures, as well as open communication and respect (Jackson, 2018). Overall, having trust in the police increased people’s likelihood to cooperate with the institution police represent by being more willing to report emergency and non-emergency situations, as well as cooperate in court proceedings (Chow, 2012; White et al., 2016). However, individuals who perceived unfairness or bias in police and the criminal justice system were more likely to justify their engagement in unlawful behaviours (Chow, 2012; Tyler, 2004).
Institutional Betrayal and Perceptions Towards Authority

Current research has addressed the harm that can arise from institutional betrayal (Smith & Freyd, 2014). Studies have also identified the relationships between trust and perceptions towards authority (Jackson, 2018). However, the research lacks breadth in understanding the connections between institutional betrayal and perceptions towards authority. The purpose of the current study was to attain a more concrete understanding of how individuals’ perceptions of authority can change in response to experiences of institutional betrayal. Thus, the goal was to understand to what degree, if at all, attitudes and perceptions towards authority varied between individuals who have experienced institutional betrayal and those who have not. As previously outlined, the research suggests that individuals who have experienced institutional betrayal are more prone to developing or experiencing stronger symptoms of mood disorders such as anxiety or depression (Smith & Freyd, 2013). Additionally, it was noted that people’s positive and negative interactions influenced their levels of trust in institutes, which further shaped people’s positive and negative expectations of how police officers would act in the future (Jackson, 2018). Since institutional trust was a strong predictor of perceptions of authority, examining the effect of institutional mistrust on individual’s perceptions towards the police and general authority was the next step.

In developing this study, several questions were considered. Fundamentally, how does institutional betrayal play a role in an individual's perceptions and attitudes towards authority? Does the perpetration of institutional betrayal alter individuals’ established perceptions towards authority figures, or are people simply more prone to adopting certain attitudes without wavering in their perceptions of authority? How do individuals’ attitudes or beliefs differ among their counterparts who have not experienced institutional betrayal? Given the current span of the
literature, it was reasonably hypothesized that negative interactions in which institutional betrayal has been perpetrated would increase individuals’ likelihood of holding unfavourable perceptions and attitudes towards authority.

**Hypothesized Outcome**

It has been found that individuals who more frequently come into contact with police and have negative interactions, often manifest worse attitudes than their counterparts who less frequently interacted with police officers (Shafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003). As an example, adolescents, because of their prevalence and often negative interactions they experience with officers, tend to have more negative attitudes about police in general (Shafer, et al., 2003). Since, it was already established that individual’s attitudes towards the police are correlated with their attitudes towards other authority figures (Brandt, 2000), we hypothesized that a similar finding would arise in this study. Individuals who have experienced institutional betrayal, and have in turn adopted negative attitudes towards authority, were predicted to consequently exhibit more negative attitudes towards other forms of authority. Congruently, it was hypothesized that those individuals who had a past history of trauma and had experienced institutional betrayal would be wearier of and more likely to hold prejudicial attitudes towards authority and authority figures.

**Methods**

**Participants**

The participants for this research were recruited from the University of Regina’s Psychology Participant Pool and given one percent credit for participation. A priori power analysis (i.e., G-Power) was conducted to identify that a sample size of 150 was required to detect a low-moderate effect size, if present (see Appendix G). In the end, 290 participants were
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recruited, but only data from 215 participants ($M = 22.23$ years; $SD = 6.05$; range 17 to 58; 158 female; 53 male; 4 others) were included in the analyses. The remaining participants not accounted for in our analyses were deemed ineligible because they failed to answer one of several attention control questions. Also, participants who answered the entire survey in under ten minutes were similarly deemed to be unreliable and removed from the final sample size because of the assumption that they would not be able to read and answer all questions accurately. Additionally, all participants who did not complete the survey (e.g., not answering the last section) had their data removed from the subsequent analyses.

Measures

**Demographics Questionnaire.** A demographics questionnaire was used to collect participant data relating to their gender, age, ethnicity, gender, and current occupation. Additionally, the demographic questionnaire collected information regarding participants’ frequency of interactions with members of authority. The purpose of these questions was to gauge whether or not the participant frequently interacted with authority figures and what the nature of those interactions would be (see Appendix B). Note, this data was not included in the final analyses.

**Trauma History Questionnaire (THQ).** Following the demographics questionnaire, participants would complete the THQ (Hooper, Stockton, Krupnick, & Green, 2011) which is a twenty-four-item questionnaire designed to record participant’s history of trauma (see Appendix C). The THQ asks the participant about their history with traumatic events related to crime, general disaster, traumatic physical or sexual experiences and other more general traumatic events. The questionnaire divided the questions into the appropriate category of traumatic event and asked the participant to identify if they had ever experienced the particular event by
answering “yes” or “no”. Furthermore, if participants responded to a question with “yes”, they were prompted to identify the frequency of the particular event, as well as their approximate age(s) at the time of the incident. Despite being designed to be used in conjunction with an interview, the THQ is typically used alone as a screening tool (Hooper, et al., 2011). The THQ followed recommended guidelines in addressing a wide range of traumatic events without being too specific or intrusive. Additionally, it has been documented to be a valid tool for screening trauma (Hooper et al., 2011). Moreover, the THQ has time and again demonstrated strong reliability in test-retest studies, where a majority of the items meet a Cohen’s kappa coefficient of .70 or greater (Hooper et al., 2011).

The purpose behind asking participants about their trauma history was so that we could identify which participants could potentially have experienced institutional betrayal in response to their traumatic event. Hence, it served as one of two screening tools for identifying participants who experienced institutional betrayal (see below for the second screening tool). If institutional betrayal is present, having asked this information about the trauma would essentially provide insight into the nature of the negative event that precipitated the institutional betrayal. Note, the purpose of the study was to identify how institutional betrayal as a response to a traumatic event—not the traumatic event itself—would alter individuals’ perceptions and attitudes of authority.

**Institutional Betrayal Questionnaire (IBQ).** The IBQ (Smith & Freyd, 2013) is a ten-item questionnaire that quantifies individuals’ lived experience with institutional betrayal. This questionnaire asked the individual about the response from the institute that perpetrated the trauma (identified using the THQ described above). As an example, if an individual had a negative altercation at a university and campus security was involved, the IBQ would ask the
The present study modified items eight through ten of the original IBQ to make it more general and, therefore, more generalizable and applicable to the study (see Appendix D). The original questions asked the individual if they felt that the institutional betrayal they experienced stemmed from discrimination against their sexual orientation. Such items were adapted to be more inclusive, such as: “creating an environment in which you felt discriminated against due to your status as a member of a minority group”. If the participant did not self-identify as a member of a minority group or felt that these questions were irrelevant to their situation, they were given the option to answer “N” for no or “NA” for not applicable.

**General Attitudes Towards Institutional Authority Questionnaire (GAIAS).** The GAIAS (Rigby & Rump, 1979) is a 128-item scale that aims to identify individuals’ attitudes towards the military, police, teachers, and the law (see Appendix F). The GAIAS has also been found to have high reliability, as well as strong concurrent validity (1979). As such, the current study used the GAIAS as a way to measure individuals’ attitudes towards authority. To make the scale more applicable and relevant to the present study, sections related to measuring attitudes towards the military were removed. It is important to note that the current study was conducted in Canada, where exposure to, and interactions with military are not as prominent as in the
United States, where the scale was originally developed. As such, measuring these particular perceptions was outside the scope of the study. After removing items, the scale was left with fifty items. Before analyzing the data, questions 96.3, 96.4, 96.5, 96.10, 96.12, 96.13, 96.14, 96.20, 96.21 on the police-specific GAIAS, and questions 97.2, 97.5, 97.6, 97.11, 97.13, 97.16, 98.2, 98.5, 98.7, 98.8, 98.9, 98.10, 98.12, 98.16 on the general GAIAS were reverse coded as specified by Rigby & Rump (1979).

Two composite scores were then drawn from both GAIAS. All questions relating to police authority were compiled to form one composite score regarding attitudes toward police. The reason for creating this individual score is because of the frequency and nature of interaction individuals tend to have with police enforcement. All other questions addressing the law and teachers formed a separate score for individuals’ attitudes towards general authority.

**Just World Scale (JWS).** The JWS (Lipkus, 1991) is a 14-item scale designed to measure participants’ belief in a just world (BJW) (see Appendix E). Essentially, BJW is an individual’s attitude towards the concept of fairness with respect to others and one’s self. By introducing the JWS, the participant’s attitudes about fairness were able to be assessed, which served to identify whether their perceptions and attitudes towards authority were a result of institutional betrayal, rather than a product of general attitudes about the world. The JWS has been found to yield a unitary construct of attitudes about fairness towards oneself, as well as others (Lipkus, 1991), where it can account for potential confounds in age or gender, but also demonstrates a strong level of internal consistency (Libkus, 1991).

**Procedure**

Participants were asked to complete the study’s survey component online using a secure Qualtrics link. The online survey commenced with a demographic’s questionnaire. Participants
were then asked about their history of trauma and experiences of institutional betrayal using the THQ and IBQ. If participants answered “yes” to any of the questions on the THQ, they would be identified as having some form of past traumatic experience and would go on to complete the IBQ. The IBQ aimed to quantify the experience of trauma by asking the participant about the involvement and response of the institute in the traumatic event. If participants answered “yes” to at least one of the questions on the IBQ, they were deemed to have some degree of exposure to institutional betrayal. If participants answered “no” to all questions on the THQ, they would not answer any questions from the IBQ and would instead be redirected to complete the JWS, as well as both the police specific and general GAIAS.

Perceptions and attitudes towards authority were compared between individuals who reported experiencing institutional betrayal and those that did not experience this form of betrayal. Participants’ perceptions and attitudes towards authority were analyzed from their responses to the JWS and GAIAS. After completing the survey (regardless of how they answered or whether they completed it) participants were granted a one percent bonus mark towards any undergraduate 100 or 200 level psychology course of their choosing as a compensation credit for their participation in this study.

**Coding**

Upon concluding the data collection component of this study, participants’ data was downloaded into a Microsoft Excel file. Here, the data was reorganized and coded in order to prepare an export file for SPSS. Depending on their answers to the THQ and IB, participants would be classified into no trauma or trauma, as well as institutional betrayal or no institutional betrayal. Also, composite scores were created for the JWS, as well as the police and general GAIAS. Before doing this, all reverse coded questions were modified; participants answers were
then summed and averaged. This gave us one composite score indicative of the participants belief in a just world and their attitudes towards authority. The cleaned Excel file was then exported into SPSS in order to properly and efficiently conduct our analyses.

Results

Methodology

To disseminate the effects of institutional betrayal on individuals’ perceptions of authority a hierarchical multiple regression was used with institutional betrayal as the independent variable; the dependent variables were participants’ perceptions towards police and general authority—derived from the GAIAS as individual composite scores. Both dependent variables were looked at as individual mean scores representative of the participants’ perceptions. A moderation analysis was also conducted in order to examine the relationship between institutional betrayal (IVPredictor) and perceptions of both police (DV) and general authority (DV), and whether this relationship was moderated by an individual’s belief in a just world (IVModerator). The moderation analysis found the interaction between institutional betrayal, perceptions of authority, and belief in a just world to not be statistically significant. Moreover, multicollinearity analyses were conducted simultaneously with the hierarchical multiple regressions and the results were indicative of a weak linear correlation between JWS_Mean and IBQ in our regression model, $VIF = 1.032$. However, our analyses still accounted for belief in a just world’s minor interference on institutional betrayal and perceptions of authority, so for this reason a hierarchical multiple regression was used. Additionally, our regression model allowed us to determine if a past experience of institutional betrayal could predict an individual’s perceptions of police as well as perceptions of authority in general.
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T-tests

Before running the regression, two independent samples t-tests were conducted in order to determine the mean difference in responses of attitudes towards police and general authority between participants who reported institutional betrayal and those who did not. Participants who did experience institutional betrayal reported significantly different scores on their perceptions of police compared to those who had not experienced it, \( t(213) = 2.372, p = .019 \). Moreover, in looking at perceptions towards general authority, participants who experienced institutional betrayal also report significantly different results when compared to participants who did not experience institutional betrayal, \( t(213) = 2.158, p = .032 \). Both of these results are reported in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively. In summary, participants who experience institutional betrayal, compared to participants who did not, reported significantly different perceptions of both police authority and general authority.

Table 1
Independent Samples Test for GAIAS_Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIAS_Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Independent Samples Test for GAIAS_General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIAS_General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.171</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Regressions

Institutional betrayal and perceptions of police authority

To follow, two hierarchical multiple regressions were utilized in order to include the personality variable of belief in a just world (BJW), in addition to the independent variable of IBQ. The results of the regression analysis looking at the impact of institutional betrayal on perception of police authority did not find a significant prediction between institutional betrayal and perceptions of police authority, \( \beta = -0.097, t(214) = -1.511, p < .132 \) with a model fit of \( R^2 = .149, F(1, 213) = 18.499, p < .000 \). These results are reported in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sif. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.45654</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>34.506</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.45517</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>2.283</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), JWS_Mean,
b. Predictors: (Constant), JWS_Mean, IBQ

Table 4

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JWS_Mean</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.424</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JWS_Mean</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBQ</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: GAIAS_Police
Institutional betrayal and perception of general authority

Similar findings were made when looking at the relationship between institutional betrayal and perceptions of general authority. The regression model did not predict a significant relationship between institutional betrayal on perceptions of general authority, $\beta = -0.097$, $t(214) = -1.457, p < .147$, with an overall model fit of $R^2 = .097, F(1, 213) = 11.441, p < .000$. These results are reported in Table 5 and Table 6.

Table 5

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sif. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.36770</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>20.652</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.36674</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>2.122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), JWS_Mean,
b. Predictors: (Constant), JWS_Mean, IBQ

Table 6

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JWS_Mean</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.113</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JWS_Mean</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBQ</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: GAIAS_General
Conclusively, both regressions models indicated that participants’ belief in a just world (JWS_Mean) was statistically significant with their perceptions of both police and general authority, $\beta = .189, t(214) = 5.531, p < .000$ and $\beta = .117, t(214) = 4.336, p < .000$ respectively. These results can be found in Table 4 and Table 6.

**Discussion**

The present study looked at the complex relationship between experiencing trauma, institutional betrayal, and the way individuals perceive authority. The results of the study did not support the original hypothesis that institutional betrayal could significantly change people’s perceptions and attitudes towards authority. Regardless, the results still provided insight into the extent of the effects of institutional betrayal and trauma. For starters, participants who experienced institutional betrayal, compared to participants who did not, reported significantly different perceptions of both police authority and general authority. However, despite having very negative memories and experiences with members of authority, those individuals in our study that had experienced institutional betrayal did not seem to display a significantly worse perception towards authority. The results also indicate that institutional betrayal led to a difference in participants’ responses regarding their attitudes towards authority; but the regression demonstrated that institutional betrayal was not predictive of significantly worse attitudes towards authority. Essentially, our findings suggest that, regardless of having endured trauma and betrayal, individuals are not likely to adopt significantly worse perceptions towards authority.

Over 90% of our sample reported at least one “yes” on the THQ. This means that 194 out of 215 participants had, at one point in their lives, experienced a potentially traumatic event. Out of these participants, more than half ($N = 114$) reported experiencing some degree of institutional
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betrayal. These finding are not only worrying, but they allude to the importance of having proper policies in place in order to address traumas that can be suffered in the school or workplace, or other environments where authority is present. It is important to keep in mind that this sample was comprised entirely of university students who were mostly young adults. Implementing proper policies and protocols can provide support and be a means of addressing any wrong doings or trauma that has been endured by individuals (Cooper, Masi, Dababnah, Aratani, & Knitzer, 2007). Given that one’s perception towards authority does not significantly change in wake of institutional betrayal, it is important to address and attempt to prevent such occurrences, so that individuals are not subject to these injustices.

It appears that individuals, in the presence of an authority figure, will maintain a more positive perception of them, regardless of their experiences. To some, this may be concerning because of the amount of power most authority figures already have over a majority of people. This study focused on police authority specifically, while also looking at general perceptions of authority. Given the differences between the scores on police authority and general authority, it could be argued that the perception of authority is an umbrella that encompasses many individuals working for many different institutes. It may also be the case that authority stems from an institution rather than the individual representing that institution. These are all additional variables the present study did not consider; with this in mind, it would be unwise to ultimately conclude that institutional betrayal does not impact perceptions of authority.

The results of the study, while not expected, served to illustrate how complex human interactions and perception can be. Moreover, these results veer away from what the current literature which suggest that perceptions of authority, regardless of the type of experience, are well established and potentially unwavering in their nature.
Limitations and Future Directions

Limitations

The current study is not free of potential limitations regarding the sample of participants, as well as the design of the experiment. For starters, the mean age of the participants was fairly young ($M = 22.23$, $SD = 6.05$). It could be reasoned that many individuals by that age have not fully developed a perception of authority through their lack of interactions with many different authoritative bodies in the real world. Additionally, the present study was not balanced in terms of gender and is therefore not representative of the greater population: 158 (73.5%) participants identified as female; 53 (24.6%) participants identified as male; 4 (1.9%) participants identified as other. Studies have found gender to be a factor that causes a difference in people’s perception of certain negative events (Marks, & Nelson, 1993), so it is not implausible to assume that gender may influence overall perceptions of authority after experiencing institutional betrayal. Regardless, a more gender-balanced sample would make these results more generalizable to the greater community.

In regard to the design of this experiment, many participants who experienced institutional betrayal provided detailed accounts of their experiences and feelings. For the sake of simplicity, this study only looked at their quantitative responses. An analysis of the qualitative responses could provide greater insight into the depth of the trauma and institutional betrayal experienced by the individual. This could then be analyzed to interpret and potentially categorize individuals according to the severity or type of trauma and institutional betrayal experienced.
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Future Directions

Given the findings of this research study, future research could consider looking at such cognitive phenomena like the halo effect on perceptions of authority. The halo effect is the phenomenon where a general evaluation of someone or something is influenced by the perception or evaluation of a specific or individual attribute of another person or thing (Nisbett, & Wilson, 1977). Given that institutional betrayal does not significantly worsen perceptions towards authority, it would be interesting to consider how the halo effect could alternatively reduce or change people’s subconscious sense of betrayal and trauma. For example, if people’s overall perceptions of police or another authority figure influenced their overall perceptions of authority. Future studies could consider if prior positive perceptions, impressions or even personal relationships have an impact on an individual’s perception of authority, and how that preconceived positive perception can interfere, inhibit, or affect the change in future perceptions.

Potential Implications

Theoretical Implications

In regard to theoretical implications, this study gave us a better understanding of how, and to what degree, traumatic situations and institutional betrayal can impact people’s cognitive processes in relation to the world around them; particularly in regard to how it impacts their behaviour towards authority figures and authority in general.

Practical Implications

Finally, in suggesting the practical implications of this study, we know that people’s perceptions of the world are shaped by their lived experiences (Chow, 2012). We can conclude that an individual’s behavior does not always stem from attributable character flaws like
impatience or hostility, but rather are a culmination of what they have learned to feel and express. Further researching the impact of institutional betrayal on individuals who experienced trauma provided insight into the degree of influence these experiences have on shaping people’s overall outlook on authority. This study could potentially inform learning and training for professionals involved in trauma-informed care and treatment. As an example, clinical psychologists, who actively deliver intervention and treatment, could benefit from an enhanced understanding of the impact that environmental precipitants and factors like institutional betrayal have on an individual's traumatic experience. Additionally, individuals who hold responsibilities of being first responders in high-risk situations like emergency medical service (EMS) officers could benefit from a gained insight into traumatic situations and appropriate responses. Finally, to address the implications present in a real-life situation, it has been found that increasing the positive experience that community members have with their local police ultimately serves to improve the image of the police in that community; thus, helping decrease residents’ fear of crime and conversely increase their positive outlook on police and authority. Promoting a positive relationship between the public and police is fundamental as it promotes collaboration between these two groups, which in turn serves to prevent crime, enhance community safety, and improve overall quality of life (Chow, 2012). Research that aims to better understand the complexity of trauma and variables like institutional betrayal, regardless of the findings, can always serve to better inform researchers and other professionals in relevant fields, as well as contribute to the limited, but growing body of literature.

**Conclusion**

To summarize, this research project has shed light on the impact of trauma and subsequent institutional betrayal on an individual’s perception of authority. The purpose of the
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current study was to attempt to understand how individuals’ perceptions of authority can change in response to experiences of institutional betrayal. We hoped to understand to what degree, if at all, these individuals’ attitudes and perceptions towards authority would vary as a result of institutional betrayal. The present study contributes to the limited body of research currently available on institutional betrayal and hoped to aid the growth of the existing body of literature available on perceptions of authority and impact of trauma on perceptions. The results of this study serve to illustrate the complexity behind the effects of trauma and institutional betrayal on perception. Finally, the results suggest that institutional betrayal does not play a significant role in changing individuals’ perceptions and attitudes towards authority; this could be because individuals are simply more prone to adopting certain attitudes without actually wavering in their perceptions of authority. Regardless, it is clear that more work focusing on trauma and institutional betrayal is needed in order to fully understand the extent of how these variables relate to perceptions of authority.
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Appendix A: Consent Form

Project Title: Understanding the Impact of Institutional Betrayal on Attitudes Towards Authority

REB Approval: This project was approved by the Research Ethics Board, University of Regina on (January 14th, 2020).

Researcher(s): Emilio Filomeno (Psychology Honours Student), filomene@uregina.ca

Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Kaila Bruer, Assistant Professor, 306-206-2104, kaila.bruer@uregina.ca.

Purpose of the Research: The purpose of this study is to explore the impact of institutional betrayal on individuals’ perceptions of authority. The goal is to better comprehend the complex relationship between individuals and authority figures.

Procedures: Participants will be asked to respond to a questionnaire that will screen for trauma. Next, participants will complete the Institutional Betrayal Questionnaire. This questionnaire will identify the presence of institutional betrayal in participants with past experiences of trauma. Once identified, participants will be prompted to answer questions regarding their attitudes towards authority—including police enforcement, the law, general authority and beliefs in a just world. The task is expected to take participants 30-45 minutes.

Potential Risks: It is possible that asking participants about past trauma may create negative feelings. If you are negatively impacted by this, please contact University of Regina Counselling Services at 251 Riddell Centre or by calling 306-525-5333.

Potential Benefits: Your participation in this project helps us learn about the impact of trauma and institutional betrayal on individuals’ perceptions and attitudes towards authority.

Compensation: If you choose to participate in this study, you will receive 1 course credit regardless of your performance on the tasks.

Confidentiality: If you agree to participate, we will maintain the strictest standards of confidentiality as required by the law. Your name will not be associated with the data collected in the study. Information you provide to us will be confidential and we will identify your information by a participant number only, and all personal information will be stored in a secure file on a computer at the University of Regina. The only individuals who will know your identity will be the research assistants who run the study and the principal investigator. Any information obtained from this study will be kept confidential and only group results will be reported. Please do not put your name or other identifying information in the questionnaire. These group results are intended to be published in academic journals, published in theses, presented at conferences, and shared with granting agencies who funded or supported the research.
Storage of Data: The consent form will be completed online and will be safely stored in an electronic file that is password protected for a period of 7 years. After this period, all electronic records will be permanently deleted. Our co-investigators will also have access to the data collected from this study up until the data is no longer usable.

Right to Withdraw: It is important to note that you are under no obligation to participate. If at any time you decide to discontinue participation in the study (even if you have already signed this form), you may withdraw without penalty. Any withdrawal will not affect your academic status, and/or access to, or continuation of, services provided by the University. Should you decide to withdraw, the only action required on your part is to close the internet browser window where the questionnaire is open. If you withdraw prior to end of the experiment, your data will not be used in the final results and will be destroyed, if desired. After this time, the researcher will not be able to identify your responses and it may not be possible to withdraw your data. If you do not want to participate in research, some course instructors offer alternative methods to acquire course credit. We encourage you to speak with your course instructor.

Follow-up: To obtain summary results from the study, please email the principal investigator (filomene@uregina.ca or kaila.bruer@uregina.ca).

Questions or Concerns: This project has been approved on ethical grounds by the U of R Research Ethics Board on (01/14/2020). Any questions regarding your rights as a participant may be addressed to the committee at (306-585-4775 or research.ethics@uregina.ca). Questions about this research may also be directed to the principal investigator, Emilio Filomeno (306-550-5034, filomene@uregina.ca), or Dr. Kaila Bruer (306-337-3227; kaila.bruer@uregina.ca) in the Psychology Department at the University of Regina.

Consent: By completing and submitting the questionnaire, your free and informed consent is implied and indicates that you understand the above conditions of participation in this study. A copy of this Consent Form can be printed for your records by going to file>print.

Your participation is very helpful to us and it is important to us that you are comfortable with participating. By clicking "Yes, I consent to participate," you are acknowledging that you have read this consent form and agree to participate. If you decide not to participate, select "No, I do not consent to participate."

☐ Yes, I consent to Participate

☐ No, I do not consent to participate

Name of Participant:

Date:
Appendix B: Demographics Questionnaire

1. Your gender: ______________________
2. Your Birthday: _____________________
3. Is English your first language? Yes: _______ No: __________
   a. If not, how many years have you been speaking English? _________
4. Ethnicity (optional): Please indicate which ethnic group you would consider yourself to belong to:
   a. White (e.g., European)
   b. Aboriginal (e.g., First Nations, Métis, Inuit)
   c. Black (e.g. African, African American, African Canadian, Caribbean)
   d. East Asian (e.g. Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Polynesian)
   e. South Asian (e.g. Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, Bangladeshi)
   f. Southeast Asian (e.g. Burmese, Cambodian, Filipino, Laotian, Malaysian, Thai, Vietnamese)
   g. West Asian (e.g. Arabian, Armenian, Iranian, Israeli, Lebanese, Palestinian, Syrian, Turkish)
   h. Latin American (e.g. Mexican, Indigenous Central and South American)
   i. Mixed origin, please specify: ___________________________________
5. Nationality (please check one)
   a. Canadian citizen: _________
   b. Permanent resident: _________
   c. Student Visa: __________
   d. Other (please specify): __________
6. Are you currently a student? Yes: _______ No: __________
7. What is your current occupation (other than student, if applicable)? __________
8. In the past 1 year, how many interactions would you say you have had with law enforcement/police (please choose only one):
   a. 12+ times per year _________
   b. 8-12 times per year _________
   c. 4-7 times per year _________
   d. 1 – 3 times per year _________
   e. None _________
9. In the past 1 year, how many interactions would you say you have had with Campus Security (please choose only one):
   a. 12+ times per year _________
   b. 8-12 times per year _________
   c. 4-7 times per year _________
   d. 1 – 3 times per year _________
   e. None _________
10. In the past 1 year, how many interactions would you say you have had with Doctors, Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) Officers, (please choose only one):
    a. 12+ times per year _________
    b. 8-12 times per year _________
    c. 4-7 times per year _________
    d. 1 – 3 times per year _________
    e. None _________
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Appendix C: Trauma History Questionnaire (THQ)

The following is a series of questions about serious or traumatic life events. These types of events actually occur with some regularity, although we would like to believe they are rare, and they affect how people feel about, react to, and/or think about things subsequently. Knowing about the occurrence of such events, and reactions to them, will help us to develop programs for prevention, education, and other services. The questionnaire is divided into questions covering crime experiences, general disaster and trauma questions, and questions about physical and sexual experiences. For each event, please indicate (circle) whether it happened and, if it did, the number of times and your approximate age when it happened (give your best guess if you are not sure). Also note the nature of your relationship to the person involved and the specific nature of the event, if appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime-Related Events</th>
<th>Circle one</th>
<th>If you circled yes, please indicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times</td>
<td>Approximate age(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Has anyone ever tried to take something directly from you by using force or the threat of force, such as a stick-up or mugging?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Has anyone ever attempted to rob you or actually robbed you (i.e., stolen your personal belongings)?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Has anyone ever attempted to or succeeded in breaking into your home when you were not there?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Has anyone ever attempted to or succeed in breaking into your home while you were there?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Disaster and Trauma</th>
<th>Circle one</th>
<th>If you circled yes, please indicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times</td>
<td>Approximate age(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Have you ever had a serious accident at work, in a car, or somewhere else? (If yes, please specify below)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Have you ever experienced a natural disaster such as a tornado, hurricane, flood or major earthquake, etc. Where you felt you or your loved ones were in danger of death or injury? <em>(If yes, please specify below)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Have you ever experienced a “man-made” disaster such as a train crash, building collapse, bank robbery, fire, etc., where you felt you or your loved ones were in danger of death or injury? <em>(If yes, please specify below)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Have you ever been exposed to dangerous chemicals or radioactivity that might threaten your health?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Have you ever been in any other situation in which you were seriously injured? <em>(If yes, please specify below)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Have you ever been in any other situation in which you feared you might be killed or seriously injured? <em>(If yes, please specify below)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Have you ever seen someone seriously injured or killed? <em>(If yes, please specify who below)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Have you ever seen dead bodies (other than at a funeral) or had to handle dead bodies for any reason? <em>(If yes, please specify below)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td>Have you ever had a close friend or family member murdered, or killed by a drunk driver? <em>(If yes, please specify relationship [e.g., mother, grandson, etc.] below)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td>Have you ever had a spouse, romantic partner, or child die? <em>(If yes, please specify relationship below)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
<td>Have you ever had a serious or life-threatening illness? <em>(If yes, please specify below)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong></td>
<td>Have you ever received news of a serious injury, life-threatening illness, or unexpected death of someone close to you? <em>(If yes, please indicate below)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong></td>
<td>Have you ever had to engage in combat while in military service in an official or unofficial war zone? <em>(If yes, please indicate where below)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical and Sexual Experiences**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circle one</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>If you circled yes, please indicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate age(s) and frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Has anyone ever made you have intercourse or oral or anal sex against your will? (If yes, please indicate nature of relationship with person [e.g., stranger, friend, relative, parent, sibling] below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Has anyone ever touched private parts of your body, or made you touch theirs, under force or threat? (If yes, please indicate nature of relationship with person [e.g., stranger, friend, relative, parent, sibling] below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other than incidents mentioned in Questions 18 and 19, have there been any other situations in which another person tried to force you to have an unwanted sexual contact?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Has anyone, including family members or friends, ever attacked you with a gun, knife, or some other weapon?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Has anyone, including family members or friends, ever attacked you without a weapon and seriously injured you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Has anyone in your family ever beaten, spanked, or pushed you hard enough to cause injury?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Have you experienced any other extraordinarily stressful situation or event that is not covered above? (If yes, please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Institutional Betrayal Questionnaire (IBQ)

1. Not taking proactive steps to prevent this type of experience.
2. Creating an environment in which this type of experience seemed common or like no big deal?
3. Creating an environment in which this experience seemed more likely to occur?
4. Making it difficult to report the experience?
5. Responding inadequately to the experience, if reported
6. Covering up the experience?
7. Punishing you in some way for this experience (loss of privileges, status, etc.)
8. Creating an environment in which you felt discriminated against due to your status as a visible minority? *
9. Responding differently to the situation based on your status as a visible minority? *
10. Expressing a biased or negative attitude toward you and/or the situation based on your status as a visible minority? *
Appendix E: Just World Scale (JWS)

The following questions pertain to fairness. In this first set of questions we are interested in your perceptions of fairness with respect to OTHERS. Please mark your level of agreement using the 7-point scale shown below.

1. I feel that people generally earn the rewards and punishments that they get in this world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. People usually receive the outcomes that they deserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. People generally deserve the things that they are accorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. I feel that people usually receive the outcomes that they are due.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. People usually use fair procedures in dealing with others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. I feel that people generally use methods that are fair in their evaluations of others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Regardless of the specific outcomes they receive, people are subjected to fair procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. People are generally subjected to processes that are fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
In this next set of questions, we are interested in your perceptions of fairness with respect to YOURSELF. Please mark your level of agreement using the 7-point scale shown below.

9. I feel that I generally earn the rewards and punishments that I get in this world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-Slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-Slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. I usually receive the outcomes that I deserve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-Slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-Slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. People generally deserve the things that they are accorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-Slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-Slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. I generally deserve the things that I am accorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-Slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-Slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. I feel that I usually receive the outcomes that I am due.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-Slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-Slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. People usually use fair procedures in dealing with me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-Slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-Slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. I feel that people generally use methods that are fair in their evaluations of me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-Slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-Slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. Regardless of the specific outcomes I receive, I am subject to fair procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-Slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 neutral</th>
<th>5-Slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. I am generally subjected to process that are fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-disagree</th>
<th>3-Slightly disagree</th>
<th>4 Neutral</th>
<th>5-Slightly agree</th>
<th>6-agree</th>
<th>7-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Appendix F: General Attitudes Towards Institutional Authority Scale (GAIAS)

All Items were scored from 1 to 5

(A) The Police Scale

1. The police will only use lawful means to combat crime
2. The police do a good job of stopping crime
3. The police spend most of their time going after people who commit petty crimes and ignore most of the bad things going on
4. The police are more likely to use physical force against minorities than non-minorities
5. The police are more likely to use physical force against members of aboriginal descent
6. Police always respond promptly when called
7. Police officers are always fair
8. Officers are usually courteous
9. The police let power go to their head
10. The police in Canada are pretty trustworthy
11. The police are lazy
12. The police are generally quite impartial and unfair in the way they carry out the law
13. The police like to bully people
14. The good work of the police ought to be better recognized
15. The police have a hard job
16. The police abide by the laws they enforce
17. The police have the public's good at heart
18. The police help the weaker members of society
19. The Police are unnecessarily violent in handling the people they dislike
20. Encounters with the police always go wrong

(B) General Authority

1. The law is superior to individual codes of conduct
2. We would be better off without any laws at all
3. A person should obey the law no matter how much it interferes with personal ambitions
4. It is difficult to break the law and maintain a positive image of one’s self
5. The law is a nuisance
6. A person who reports minor law infractions is a “snitch”
7. All laws should be strictly obeyed simply because they are the law
8. The law is the embodiment of justice and equality
9. The law must take its course, regardless of how individuals may suffer
10. A person should obey only those laws that appear reasonable
11. Everyone in a society is subject to the law equally
12. Laws benefit only a small group of people
13. The law benefits the masses of society
14. It is alright for a person to break the law if they don’t get caught
15. On the whole, judges are honest
16. The law punishes the bad and protects the good
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17. When an individual disagrees with the law they should not have to obey it
18. Personal circumstances should never be considered as an excuse for law-breaking
19. Normally, a teacher provides a model of exemplary behaviour for their students to follow.
20. A teacher’s primary concern is to make students obey rigid and ridiculous rules
21. Teachers are genuinely concerned with the needs of individual children
22. Teachers rarely display the professional competence that is expected of them
23. Teachers far too frequently try to instill opinions and values which students should not have forced upon them.
24. An important motive among teachers is the desire to dominate people who seem weaker than themselves
25. The happiness and emotional welfare of the individual student is usually of little or no concern to the average teacher.
26. A teacher is a somewhat ridiculous figure, posing as an authority on the important things in life, when in fact, they are often ignorant and immature themselves.
27. Teachers are usually ready to take quite seriously whatever it is that students feel in earnest about
28. Teachers freely acknowledge and respect the rights of students
29. It is reasonable to say that, as a rule, teachers work in the best interest of their students.
30. Teachers do not respect the individual personalities of the students.
Appendix G: G-Score Power Analysis

critical $F = 3.9059$

$\beta$ $\alpha$