Defensive Attribution and Its Relationship with False Consensus for Criminal Inmates in Prisons

Nagham Hadi Hussein[1] and Nabil Noir Dakheel[2]

Abstract

The present study set out to do the following: (1) determine whether or not moral crime perpetrators engage in defensive attribution; (2) determine whether or not such perpetrators engage in false consensus; (3) determine whether or not such perpetrators engage in defensive attribution and false consensus; and (4) determine the relative contribution of false consensus to defensive attribution among such perpetrators. The research goals could not have been accomplished without instruments to gauge defensive attribution and false consensus. The researcher had to construct a tool to measure defensive attribution after scouring the existing literature and failing to come up with suitable instruments; the original instrument, which was based on Shaver's theory of defensive attribution (1970), contained 33 elements. The validity and reliability psychometric qualities were extracted, and the scale was then consisted of 28 items with four choices. In addition, the researcher developed a tool to assess false consensus using the model proposed by Ross & et al. (1977) as a basis. This tool comprises After its psychometric features were extracted, it was reduced from 24 items to 18 items with two response possibilities. The current study's population included offenders convicted of moral crimes while incarcerated in Babylon Governorate in the year 2023. The researcher used a random sampling technique to choose a sample of four hundred inmates from the governorate. Findings indicated that research participants exhibited high levels of defensive attribution and false consensus. Additionally, the study found a positive association between defensive attribution and consensus, which was statistically significant. Perpetrators of moral crimes often engage in defensive attribution, which is exacerbated by the prevalence of false consensus among these criminals.

Keywords: *Defensive Attribution, False Consensus, Criminals, Prison Inmates*

CHAPTER ONE (GENERAL FRAMEWORK OF THE RESEARCH)

Firstly: Research Problem

It is important to understand that one of the realities and, unfortunately, constant processes occurring in communities of people is crime. Abdullah and Mustafa have noted from their observation as stated in Abdullah and Mustafa (2020, p. 143), that crime is inevitable in any region where people are found to be assembled. It has occurred in all ages, starting from the times of the Neolithic, and ending with the present postmodern epoch, and in all cultures existing in the world. It has been constructed from all that has been learned and known and can differ within a given population overtime. Al-Jourani et al. (2023, p. 261) observed that the number, type and rate of crime, including moral crime has not remained constant among the developed and developing nations due to social and political changes, economic progress, and technology.

Signs of the behavior which violates all publicly recognized legal acts and moral standards, every action violating the cultural pattern of the society which shapes our daily conduct and outlook is a moral crime. When it comes to "moral crime" thus, it is a phrase qualm. Due to the fact that moral crime is a violation of the set values, traditions, and customs in the society, it has been deemed as one of the most disastrous social vices that put society's unity at risk. This is because moral crime is an attack on the individual together with his money and honor which is according to Al-Jourani et al. , 2023, p. 265It becomes a risk to endanger the lives of individual, group, and the society, and it also becomes a risk that puts the stability and security of individuals, groups, and the society in focus according to Abdullah and Mustafa, 2020, p. 143.

Specifically as a consequence of decades of crises the worsening of social problems, deterioration of control systems and a host of other factors have lead to what appears to be a clear escalations of behaviours that are

---

[1] Al-Qadisiyah University, College of Arts, Iraq, E-mail: Nagham.hadi@qu.edu.iq

[2] Al-Qadisiyah University, College of Arts, Iraq, E-mail: Nabeell1980hh@gmail.com

deviant or immoral in the context of the collective conscience of Iraqi society (Abdullah and Mustafa, 2020: 144).

indicating that moral crimes as mentioned by Al-Jourani et al. (2023)are some of the most heinous and dreadful types of immoral crimes as per page 265. This is so because they are actions of the kind that lead to insulting of modesty, honor and honor which they generate. Consequently, people who are involved in moral wrongdoings may attempt to provide an alibi that would justify their behaviors, or shift the buck to someone or something else. It is done in a bid to provide a workaround as a way of explaining their behavior and general accountability that they may harbor. Moral crime offenders can easily put on a mask of victim mentality and claim that certain realities in life or pressure from negative vices or environments, societal pressures or tough economic conditions pushed them to the edge. In doing so, the goals, among them include trying to avoid bearing responsibility for actions one took by attributing blame to other influential factors (Shaver, 1985, p. 247). This is a situation that may even come to pass. Some people find it hard to believe that such a situation may even arise. This is one of the defence strategies that individuals opt to adopt so as to guard themselves from negative emotions like shyness or embarrassment. This is referred to as defensive attribution and the reason given is a feeling of inadequacy (Baumeister & Newman, 1994, page 676).

By using defensive attribution, periphery criminals can maintain their self-esteem and reduce feelings of guilt for their misdeeds. In other words, when a person is exposed to situations that are difficult to deal with or when they have negative feelings such as blame and guilt, they resort to defensive attributions with the hope of defending ones self esteem, overcoming negative emotions, blame and guilt. According to Larson and Chastain (1990, page 393), they are able to feel confidence in themselves if only they shift their attention away from the negative feeling and give reasons for doing what they are doing. This is mainly done in a way that the criminal should be relaxed, comfortable and should not feel shy in supporting immoral actions and in fact be in a position to commit moral crimes and this according to Jackson & et al. (1999, P362) For this reason, people tend to overemphasise or be defensive towards aspects within them that they need to embrace change and failing to take appropriate tracks that do not suit them in life.

Shooting defensive attributes in the field of psychology, it can be justified by numerous methods for denying or shifting the blame. Such coping mechanisms include denying that the situation has an impact on one's life, denying that problem exists, denying the ability to change the situation, and denying personal responsibility for the problem. With regards to outcomes, the two approaches differ in that their use holds other individuals wholly responsible in entailment, although attribution does not necessarily involve holding any other means responsible. They could delegate and attribute the fault to other individuals or to the group or portions of the group to which they belong or they may prefer to blame the entire group or culture or norms of the society to which they belong. For this reason, they want to agree that even if they had carried out the misdeeds, it was not due to their initiative but because of the laws, culture, or values of the community to which they belong. This is done with the purpose of reducing the level of attributed personal responsibility to a minimum. The commitment resulted from the responsibility that follows being an individual, and a feeling of self-confidence and backing of what they achieve (Staub, 1989, p.302). Ross et al . (1977) introduced the phrase known as 'false consensus' and employed it in an attempt to describe a situation whereby individuals considered their behavioural decisions and evaluations as being much more popular than other potential options. Ross and others pointed out, on page 280 that, paternality means that people who engage in a specific behavior or those people who feel that they have certain rights expect other members of their group that this specific behavior of theirs is engaged in more regularly while the rest of the people who are involved in various other behaviors and those who are on the opposite toward this specific rights and privileges don't hold this opinion.

It should be pointed out that the false consensus refers to a situation where one mistakenly believes that all is well with the actions s/he is taking irrespective of whether or not those actions are correct or incorrect. This perception leads to the promotion of the individual's continued participation in these behaviors if they are pathological and unbecoming (Pierce & Gilpin, 2002, P241). Buunk and Gibbons (2007) further noted that false consensus may lead to false recovery and most importantly failure of people to grow and change. Moreover, it may hinder an individual from pursuing some efforts to make a change to himself and acquire

better character and skills both in the personal and career aspects of life because the person may rely on the perceived appreciation instead of a genuine growth (Buunk & Gibbons, 2007, p. 309). It is also possible for false consensus to lead to a decreased ability to reason and to be willing to accept the assumption of one's own view and behavior as the standard that is uncontaminated with the allowance of criticism (Ross & et al., 1977, page 283). In addition, the distortion of facts is also likely to occur in certain situations, which can aggravate the existing situation. Prentice and Miller also note other effects of false consensus on the social behavior and decision-making (1993; 243). This is because it maybe tends to lower the level of cooperation and constructive discussions within the society. The individual perceives oneself as being in agreement with others as he categorizes them as being 'similar,' 'same,' or 'agree,' though there are actually diverse opinions in society. For example, false consensus may bring about over-estimations of personal perspectives and down play of views' heterogeneity. This is because there is a feeling that most people will not disagree with him most of the times. It is then possible to experience intolerance or disrespect for different points of view, as well as ignoring various opinions or excluding them at all (Turner & Pratkanis, 1998, p. 219).

Further, erroneous consensus can aggravate conflicts with other peoples, lead to more problems in communication and problem solving, and may hinder people from realizing and handling real conflict of interest situations. If indeed people become convinced that others who belong to their social group are similar to them in their beliefs, this may lead to an increase in social division and animosity (Ross and John, 1977 283). In this respect, those persons, who develop certain moral crimes, feel they are assisted by their respective social groups as the existence of those behaviors and opinions is widely spread, thus encouraging those people to practice moral crimes (Jackson & et al. , 1999, P362). This is because the false consensus affects how people view the world and in how they judge events as well as situations which in the end results in social decisions as well as solutions being made without a certain regard to possible effects.

In addition to the above, the problem of the current research arises through the following question:

• Is there a correlation between defensive attribution and false consensus among prison inmates who commit moral crimes?

Second: The Importance of Research

Human behavior has determinants and controls that work to direct it and justify its results, so he is responsible for them and attributes them to his interests, abilities, and effort if the result of the behavior is positive, or he is dependent and evades his responsibility if they are wrong or negative, attributing them to luck, fate, and difficult external circumstances (Ben Tariyah and Ben Tariyah , 2021, p. 3), that is, when individuals fail or commit mistakes, they may resort to blaming external circumstances in an attempt to overcome the negative feelings and traumas they face in life by justifying their behaviors (Larson & Chastain, 1990, P392), and Schiffer believes Shaver (1970)) that individuals resort to attributing blame for their mistakes to external circumstances for two reasons: In an effort to avoid negative emotions and other related problems: This is because it is an effective strategy of distancing from reality and positively twisting events getActivity "In an effort to avoid experiencing a misfortune that may befall the individual; or to simply avoid blame: This is because, this creates a way of running away from reality and hence framing circumstances in a positive light, whether they are real or not (Shaver, 1970 p156).

Aydin (2004, p. 55) affirmed that, ordinarily, defensive attribution influences all aspects of people's interaction and their behavior within the framework of social relations, as the practical orientations of people for being in the society (Taylor & Brown, 1988, p. 193). It must be of great help psychologically as one can have that sort of a thought process. From the behaviourism perspective, Taylor and Brown's (1988, p. 193) account enables us to acknowledge the objectively rooted factors that support the change for their attitudes and the way we perceive their behavior.

The defensive attribution is actually the attempt that people undertake, to some extent, to find reasons so as to deny or minimize the existence of bad occurrences in one's life. Unlike, personal responsibility where an individual takes full blame for whatever they do, this attribution is likely to blame it on other people of circumstances (Baumeister and Newman, 1994, P676). In any circumstance that involves prejudice, an

unfavorable treatment of other people, a tragedy or a dispute over a contentious topic which some people consider hostile, people will use defensive attribution. This is also true to immoral behaviors. In an effort to keep these focuses off of themselves, their criminal activities, or feelings of anger or guilt, their blame attributions target other people, situations, or cultural processes where they are not responsible parties (Larson and Chastain, 1990 p392). This helps them to have something to celebrate on and become emotionally and psychologically relieved. This is in harmony with the study conducted by Gisli (1984) which aimed at identifying how the criminals employ the theory of defensive attribution to justify their conduct based on sexual characters and other personality aspects. By evaluating the data collected, the researchers provided a detailed description of three types of defensive attribution that criminals use to justify criminal acts. One of them is known as external attribution which tend to put the blame on societal aspects. One is the mental attribute (e. g. Technique (the ability to link the crime to mental disorder/ impaired impulse control/ abnormal perception and the punitive aspect (the aspect of guilt). g. These and other related based emotions (e. g. issues of embarrassment, regret; or retribution) are discussed in Gisli (1984, p. 6). Following the lines of Simone and et al (2003), the current authors argued that violent offenders employ defensive attribution when justifying their criminal activities through victim or societal blame, p. From the study conducted by al (1999), he discovered that sexual offenders process and act in procedural and post-procedural ways that are inherently disavowing of the predatory characteristics of the acts committed and exonerating the victims and other societal influences (Stephen & et. al, 1999, p. 22). Similar findings were confirming Omar & et al. (2023 , and in an attempt to justify their heinous actions, criminals will always blame social and economic factors as observed by Omar&et. al, 2023, p. 5).

The defensive attribution is actually the attempt that people undertake, to some extent, to find reasons so as to deny or minimize the existence of bad occurrences in one's life. Unlike, personal responsibility where an individual takes full blame for whatever they do, this attribution is likely to blame it on other people of circumstances (Baumeister and Newman, 1994, P676). In any circumstance that involves prejudice, an unfavorable treatment of other people, a tragedy or a dispute over a contentious topic which some people consider hostile, people will use defensive attribution. This is also true to immoral behaviors. In an effort to keep these focuses off of themselves, their criminal activities, or feelings of anger or guilt, their blame attributions target other people, situations, or cultural processes where they are not responsible parties (Larson and Chastain, 1990 p392). This helps them to have something to celebrate on and become emotionally and psychologically relieved. This is in harmony with the study conducted by Gisli (1984) which aimed at identifying how the criminals employ the theory of defensive attribution to justify their conduct based on sexual characters and other personality aspects. By evaluating the data collected, the researchers provided a detailed description of three types of defensive attribution that criminals use to justify criminal acts. One of them is known as external attribution which tend to put the blame on societal aspects. One is the mental attribute (e. g. Technique (the ability to link the crime to mental disorder/ impaired impulse control/ abnormal perception and the punitive aspect (the aspect of guilt). g. These and other related based emotions (e. g. issues of embarrassment, regret; or retribution) are discussed in Gisli (1984, p. 6). Following the lines of Simone and et al (2003), the current authors argued that violent offenders employ defensive attribution when justifying their criminal activities through victim or societal blame, p. From the study conducted by al (1999), he discovered that sexual offenders process and act in procedural and post-procedural ways that are inherently disavowing of the predatory characteristics of the acts committed and exonerating the victims and other societal influences (Stephen & et. al, 1999, p. 22). Similar findings were confirming Omar & et al. (2023 , and in an attempt to justify their heinous actions, criminals will always blame social and economic factors as observed by Omar&et. al, 2023, p. 5).

Thus, the false consensus is crucial in the practice of this ideology since it serves as motivation to improve one's self. Due to this the people are always have this tendency of stereotyping other people they take it that everyone is just like them even though this may not be true. People also start to feel that the way they have been thinking, the kind of things they believe in or the manner in which they behave is right and that other people would also be similar to them. In fact through these aforesaid things, they get all their thoughts, assessments and plans supported as confirmed by Edward, 1995, page 32. These scenarios explain the probability that individuals fight

for validation from others and thus lead to wrongful consensuses. According to the need to identify with the prototype of the in-group and to deny the significance of other belief s and opinions, it can be assumed that over - estimation of similarity and under –estimation of out – group people stem from the need for belonging (Cialdini and Goldstein 2004, p 591) In turn, people can be wrong in evaluating It should thus be noted that a human being has few contacts and experience

Some examples are as follows; group decisions, politics, commercial advertisement, social pressure are among of the many areas where false consensus is rather rampant. It can be used individually or by a group to guide the people in one direction or for getting them to act voluntarily (Stone, 1994, P116). Thus, two reasons exist to consider that erroneous consensus can affect conduct: this call for an understanding of the fact that perception of standards control behaviors among human beings. Attitudes can operate as motivators; for instance, the research done by Shah and Breckler (2008) showed that risk-taking behaviour is higher for those who believed that the activities in question are popular or that, wearing a seat belt or not smoking, would be more prevalent if many others also wore a seat belt or refrained from smoking. In various schools of thought in psychological thinking, normativity is outlined in a clear manner as one of the primary reasons behind behavior. For instance, Behaviorally speaking, Festinger (1954) in social-comparison theory postulated that when people discover that others are thinking and behaving in a certain way with regard to the perceived status, the former will also be thinking and behaving in a similar manner. This means that the behaviour of a part, whether this continued the execution of the habit or altered, may have been caused by a belief that other participants in the same group are also involved in the execution of the same act (Suls & et. al, 1988, p67). This revealed that the subjects that gave the highest false consensus estimates of smoking prevalence were the ones inclined most towards smoking as stated in the study made by Botvin (1992) which confirms that false consensus is used in changing behavior (Botvin, 1992, p. 296). Besides the empirical study conducted by Sherman et al (1983) that provides evidence of the relationship between CIs and the false consensus, there has been the study conducted by Tan (2008), which links CIs to criminality; Such acts are acts of defiance against the law by the individual to do as he wants without being held back by legal restraints (Tan 2008, This freedom might lead to the overemphasis on some practices, Rather the aim should be to ensure such actions look normal and natural that people do not withdraw from doing them; the more so since everybody else I know is doing it, and unlike the act of riding a sleigh with eight tiny reindeer, I may enter into it myself if all indications are that no serious outcomes shall follow it, (Pedersen, 1995, p. 26).

Based on this, one might conclude that, as long as individuals are continuing to commit moral crimes, they employ defensive attribution as a way of rationalization of the actions taken, and as a means of finding ways and means with which to avoid the sense of moral shame. It's the false consensus: Moral support for the moral sins that one commits or pleasures at the thought of such. This is something that they get from people like them who encourage them to continue making the self-destructing decision. Therefore, in developing the psychological background of the circumstances that provide grounds for criminal operations, it makes sense to draw attention to how the principles of defensive attribution intertwine with the false consensus effect in people involved in moral crimes.

Accordingly, the researcher believes that the theoretical and applied importance of the current research appears in the following:

•This research is significant because it tackles a serious issue—moral crimes—and because these crimes have far-reaching negative consequences, both for families and for society as a whole. After all, moral crimes are among the most dangerous crimes because of the damage they do to society's safety and stability.

•Dealing with a particularly dangerous sample—those responsible for moral crimes—raises the importance of the current research because of the profound influence this sample has on society.

•Although defensive attribution and its relationships to other variables have been the subject of much research in the West, the researcher is unaware of any such studies conducted in an Arab or local context; thus, his research has the potential to add new theoretical material to the existing body of knowledge in these areas.

•This study tackled a major issue in social psychology—the concept of false consensus—which has far-reaching implications for people's daily lives and the choices they make.

•As far as the researcher is aware, this is one of the first studies to examine the connection between defensive attribution and false consensus in an Arab context, specifically looking at the local environment. This is a new scientific resource for Arab and local libraries that bridges these ideas.

• The measurement methods developed for this study add to the existing body of knowledge in the scientific community and will be useful for future studies in this area.

Third: Research objectives

1. Offenders who commit moral offenses often resort to defensive attribution.
2. The deceitful agreement among those who commit immoral acts.
3. A connection between the use of defensive attribution and the false belief held by those who commit moral crimes.

4. The extent to which criminals who commit moral offenses rely on defensive attribution and false consensus.

Fourthly: Search Limits

This study only includes inmates from Babylon Governorate (2023) who are convicted of a crime.

Fifth: Definition of Terms

Defensive Attribution: Defined by

1. McGuire (1961) McGuire: "The person has been previously exposed to arguments that support his basic beliefs" (McGuire, 1961, p185).

2."A protective mechanism against negative feelings and thoughts in which individuals deny or minimize the consequences of their responsibility in failure events, by using justifications to support their behavior, by blaming others, events, and things to alleviate the fault of themselves or those who do it." This behavior helps individuals maintain a positive self-image (Shaver, 1970, p. 23).

To paint a full picture, Shaver's (1970) definition contained crucial information regarding defensive attribution that were only partially touched upon in earlier definitions. When it came to defensive attribution, no other definition covered it as thoroughly as Shaver's (1970).

Respondents' aggregate scores on the defensive attribution scale developed for this research represent the procedural definition of defensive attribution.

False Consensus: known by Everyone who

1. "A pervasive cognitive bias in social inferences, which refers to people's tendency to view their behavioral choices, judgments, opinions, and beliefs as relatively common to others and appropriate to existing circumstances" (Ross & et.al, 1977). (Ross & et.al, 1977, p.280).
2. Dawes (1989): "An attributional type of cognitive bias in which people tend to overestimate how normal and typical their opinions, beliefs, preferences, values, and habits are relative to the opinions of others" (Dawes, 1989, P1).

   The operational definition of false consensus is represented by the total score that the respondent obtains on the false consensus scale prepared in the current study.

CHAPTER TWO (THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK)

Theories That Explained Defensive Attribution

First: The Theory of Control in the Inner World by Julian Rutter (1954)

One of the main goals of the theory of control in the inner world is to explain how people's expectations and actions are shaped by their subjective beliefs about how much power they have over their immediate environment. The individual's conviction in his power to influence the results of his activities also informs his behavior and expectations. Central to the theory is the idea of internal control, which This view holds that each individual can influence the course of his or her own life by virtue of the choices and actions that he or she makes (Rotter, 1954, P284).

It is possible for people to have different levels of internal control and external control, according to Rotter's idea. People who are very self-reliant think that their actions determine their fate and that they may influence their destinies. People with a strong sense of external control, on the other hand, think they can influence their own fate and that their actions will determine the outcome. They attribute their lack of agency to the belief that their lives are dictated by external factors like chance or fate (Lefcourt, 1982, P201).

Defensive attribution, in which people see the actions of others or themselves in a negative light, is a central concept in Rotter's theory. Those who lack self-control are more likely to blame outside forces, such chance or circumstance, when they encounter unsavory conduct or setbacks. Poorly controlled individuals may, for instance, blame external reasons like the exam's difficulty or their own bad luck when they don't do well on a crucial exam. Bear in mind that defensive attribution can be utilized to explain one's own behavior in addition to other people's (Weiner, 1985, P98).

According to Rotter's view, defensive attribution helps people feel competent and maintain their sense of self-integrity. People can keep their confidence and sense of competence by blaming outside forces when things go wrong (Bandura, 1977, P356).

In psychology and psychotherapy, it is crucial to apply the notion of internal control and comprehend defensive attribution. To better handle life's demands and difficulties and to increase one's capacity for internal control, it is helpful to get an understanding of how one's beliefs impact one's capacity to do so. An integral aspect is defensive attribution as well. According to Skinner and Zimmer-Gembeck (2007), it helps to understand how individuals behave in bad situations, drawing on Router's theory (p. 119).

Second: Self-Defense Theory by Richard E. Nisbett and Lionel Tiger (1972)

In order to better comprehend human behavior in fields as diverse as social psychology, cognitive science, and social explanation, Richard and Lionel put out the self-defense theory. This theory provides some insight into why people have a tendency to rationalize their acts and assign meaning to other people's behaviors in ways that boost their sense of self-worth and shield them from emotions of helplessness or failure. Every year, the theory gives us a better picture of what makes people's interpretations of events meaningful and significant (Weiner, 1985, P548).

Human behavior and the reasons people offer for good or bad outcomes can be better understood through the lens of self-advocacy theory, which offers a holistic and practical perspective. Many important psychological and social phenomena, including selective animosity, social discrimination, and interpersonal interactions, are better understood as a result. Additionally, it lays the groundwork for future studies in sociology, social psychology, and interpersonal connections (Hewstone & et.al, 2008, P111)

Theory of self-defense seeks to shed light on attribution by situating it within the framework of social and cognitive interpretation. One of the main tenets of self-defense theory is that people have a tendency to find meaning in events in a way that reinforces their positive self-image and provides an excuse for their own behavior. An individual's tendency to transfer responsibility when confronted with unfavorable circumstances or failure is common. We attribute these occurrences to random chance or other exogenous, ephemeral sources.

When things go well, nevertheless, people tend to take credit for themselves and their ability rather than external variables like luck or chance (Nisbett & Ross, 1980, p197).

Theoretically, self-defense theory investigates a variety of topics, including how one's background information and expectations influence the attribution process and how cultural and social variables influence the prevalence and incidence of defensive attribution in various communities (Weiner, 1985, P548).

Theories That Explained the False Consensus

First: Leon Festinger's Social Comparison Theory (1954)

The goal of social comparison theory is to clarify how people gauge their own worth and status through comparing themselves to others. According to the hypothesis, people learn more about themselves and their social standings when they compare themselves to others to see how they fare in particular areas (Wood, 1989, P231). According to Festinger, social comparison theory estimates and gathers knowledge about individual achievement and failure through social comparison. The person uses himself as a benchmark, comparing himself to others who have his characteristics and accomplishments in a certain industry. Based on the outcomes of this comparison, the person extrapolates an assessment of himself and his social standing (Festinger, 1954, p117).

According to the social comparison theory, individuals are more likely to make comparisons with those they see as having comparable characteristics, skills, or social standing as themselves. Competence, attractiveness, intellect, professional competence, fame, fortune, social standing, and a host of other factors form the basis of a person's social comparison. On a societal level, it plays a significant role (Wills, 1981, P245).

The primary tenet of Leon Festinger's (1954) social comparison theory was that people learn more about themselves and their thoughts and attitudes when they compare them to others (Campbell, 1986:282). An individual's intrinsic motivation to form fair assessments of themselves is central to social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954:117). The drive to feel good about oneself and the demand for validation could be driving forces behind this. Using other individuals as sources of information is an extension of this approach. This is known as informational social influence, because it helps to establish social reality and directs behavior. Unfortunately, it's rather uncommon for people to misjudge the social norm and the true sentiments of others around them. Put simply, studies have demonstrated that our perceptions of others' social behavior are frequently mistaken. Biased processing and erroneous social perception can be better understood thanks to this discovery. One such example of an inaccurate claim is the false consensus. Social comparison can have significant psychological impacts, one of which is "false consensus," the idea that one's own self-esteem is lower than that of other people. A person's attempt to cope with low self-esteem may involve misrepresenting or exaggerating facts or beliefs, and it can This is accomplished by either shifting the comparison to include less successful people or by discounting the features to which he is being compared. For instance, a someone may strive to avoid feelings of regret and underappreciation related to their profession if they are employed in a particular field and experience underappreciation. If he meets with others he perceives as less accomplished than him in the same industry, he may have a negative impression of their work or accomplishments and find faults or mistakes in order to boost his own self-esteem (Suls & Wheeler, 2000, p178). What this means is that the person is trying to attain psychological harmony and defend his social status by relying on false consensus. The distortion of facts and failure to look realistically at what an individual has actually accomplished are the root causes of false consensus, which in turn can boost feelings of self-satisfaction and confidence (Taylor & Lobel, 1989, P569).

Achieving psychological adjustment and avoiding regret can be facilitated by social comparison, as discussed in social comparison theory and the concept of false consensus. However, it is important to approach these mechanisms with caution and strive for a balance between healthy self-esteem and genuine personal improvement (Buunk & Gibbons, 2007, p309).

Second: The Theory of Cognitive Conflict by Leon Festinger (1957)

People try to keep their beliefs, attitudes, and actions from being at odds with one other, according to the cognitive dissonance theory. According to the hypothesis, people experience cognitive duality and tension when their beliefs or attitudes are at odds with one another, and they try to alleviate this tension by modifying their views. For example, actions or seeking out data that backs up preexisting opinions. Individuals strive for harmony and agreement between their ideas and behaviors when they experience cognitive dualism, which is seen as an uncomfortable state according to the theory of cognitive dissonance. Three primary mechanisms are responsible for this:

1. Changing beliefs: When an individual faces cognitive duality, he may change his beliefs or perceptions to conform to current behavior. He may rely on new opinions or information to support contradictory beliefs or modify existing beliefs to reduce contradiction.
2. Behavior change: The individual can change his behavior to be compatible with current beliefs and thus reduce cognitive contradiction. He may take measures to change his behavior or avoid situations that lead to contradiction.
3. Searching for external confirmation: The individual can search for information or explanations that support current beliefs to reduce cognitive contradiction. He can resort to similar opinions to support his beliefs and relieve the tension resulting from the contradiction (Harmon, Jones & Mills, 1999, p219).

Cognitive dissonance theory holds that when there is no real consensus between beliefs and behavior, false consensus may occur by changing beliefs or behaviors based on social expectations or the needs of the surrounding community. False consensus depends on three main factors:

1. Appeal to the group: Individuals tend to change their beliefs or behavior to conform to the group to which they belong. The individual believes that adhering to the group's beliefs increases his belonging and acceptance by others.
2. The need for social harmony: The individual considers social harmony necessary to maintain positive social relationships and avoid conflict and rejection. So, he tends to change his beliefs or behavior to conform to the expectations of the group or society.
3. Denial anxiety: The individual considers the admission of internal or social contradiction a sign of weakness or personal fault. Therefore, he tends to change his beliefs or behavior to avoid recognizing the contradiction and maintain a positive self-image (Elliot & Devine, 1994, P390).

Festinger believes that cognitive dissonance and false consensus play an important role in understanding the formation and change of attitudes and shaping the behavior of individuals. Understanding cognitive dissonance helps us understand the motives and factors that influence our decisions and behavior, and can help us analyze internal tensions and contradictions and direct them toward positive change (Festinger, 1957). ,P154).

CHAPTER THREE (RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES)

First: The Research Community

The present study's sample population is based on the 3158 inmates incarcerated in Babil Governorate's penal institutions in 2023; of these, 2,181 are male inmates housed in Al-Hilla Central Prison for Men and 997 are female inmates housed in the Iraqi Correctional Department's Hilla Correctional Section.

Second: Research Sample

The researchers chose a sample of inmates from Babil Governorate's prisons for the year 2023. The men's sample came from the Central Correctional Department of the Hilla Central Prison, while the women's sample came from the Iraqi Correctional Department, which is located in Hilla.

Third: Search Tools

Achieving the research objectives required creating tools to measure defensive attribution and false consensus among criminals in prisons:

❖ **Defensive Attribution Scale**

The two researchers built a tool to measure defensive attribution based on Shaver's defensive attribution theory (1970). The following is a presentation of how to build the research tool:

Planning the Scale (Defining the Concept According to the Theory Adopted in the Study)

The two researchers looked at what Shaver (1970) said about defensive attribution in his theory. According to Shaver, defensive attribution is "a protective mechanism against negative feelings and thoughts in which individuals deny or minimize the consequences of their responsibility in failure events, by using justifications to support their behavior, by placing blame." When people do this, it helps them avoid feeling bad about themselves or others who do the same thing (Shaver, 1970, p. 74).

Develop And Draft the Scale Items

In addition to the ideas of the supervising professor and some professors who specialize in psychology, thirty items were formulated in their initial form for the defensive attribution scale. This was accomplished by informing the researchers of the adopted theoretical framework as well as some previous studies that dealt with the variable and in accordance with the stated theoretical framework.

Logical Analysis of the Items (Validity of the Scale Items)

Ebel rightfully noted that when it is required to prove that an objective is sufficiently valid to measure a trait for which the items are designed, it is desirable that a number of specialists state the validity of these items. On this basis, the items of the scale were presented to a sample of … arbitrators with focus to psychology (n=16) to get their perspective on the issue. Regards:

The validity of the items to measure what they were designed for.

-Suitability of answer alternatives.

-Performing what they deem appropriate (deletion, addition or modification) and adopting a percentage of (80%) or more of the arbitrators' opinions to accept or reject the paragraph.

Scale Correction

Taking into account the varying levels of education across the study community, the researchers came up with four possible possibilities for the scale items: highly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Four marks

are awarded to the respondent when he answers "strongly agree" to the positive items and "no" to the alternative. (I really agree.) You get one mark.

Statistical Analysis of the Defensive Attribution Scale Items

A - The two peripheral groups (external consistency):C Mata a dos grupos periféricos (coherentes externos):

To achieve this, the researchers followed the following steps:In the considerations to this end, the researchers adopted the following procedures:

1) The defensive attribution scale was employed by the researchers in this study through surveying sampled criminals in prisons in a scientific manner such that the number of participants in this particular study was 400.

2) I also indicate where it is needed to correct the form and evaluate the total score.

3) Category that involves: Analyzing the responses by ranking the scores from the least P to the highest score.

4) The process of identifying the percentage that would help in grouping of workers in to high performers as well as low performers. There is a distinction in the acceptable percentages in defining these two groups as according to Anastasi, the acceptable interval is 25% – 33%.

Although Eble pointed out that (27) % is the most appropriate percentage to define the two extreme groups, since, when applying this percentage, the sample size is maximal and the sample is as differentiated as possible from the sample (Source: Eble, 1972, p. 261).

Given that the raw number for this percentage is 27, the total questionnaires for each of the groups amounted to 108, and the total questionnaires that were subject to analysis equaled 216.

Independent-samples t-test was administered to look for a significant difference between the two groups on each defensive attribution scale item. At the 0. At 05 level of significance, the following item is considered to be distinctive for the reasons that the computed T-value of 3. 96. Using the variables, number of words (W), number of sentences (S), number of unique word (WU) and degree of freedom (Df), the study revealed that all the paragraphs are unique.

The Relationship of the Item Score to the Total Score of the Scale (Item Validity)

For this, the researchers regressed the score of each of the items in the defensive attribution scale on the total score of the sample of 400 filled questionnaires employing the Pearson correlation coefficient. It was also found that all correlation coefficient were statistically significant at $p < 0.01\%$ level. Here is the summary of the results that are presented in the table below which is also referred to as Table (1).

Table 1. The validity of the defensive attribution scale items using the method of relating the item score to the total score.

Correlation coefficient	Phrases	Correlation coefficient	phrases
0.639**	15	0.404**	1
0.288**	16	0.521**	2
0.430**	17	0.528**	3
0.370**	18	0.464**	4
0.647**	19	0.516**	5
0.494**	20	0.518**	6
0.505**	21	0.536**	7
0.567**	22	0.468**	8
0.456**	23	0.332**	9
0.639**	24	0.363**	10
0.476**	25	0.442**	11
0.430**	26	0.397**	12
0.508**	27	0.567**	13
0.647**	28	.0456**	14

With the outcome being statistically significant at a 0. 05 and the degrees of freedom 398, all the correlation coefficients were therefore concluded to be significant as compared to the critical standard coefficient of 0. 087. As reported in Table (1), all the coefficient values of the correlation scale are statistically significant.

Standard (Psychometric) Characteristics of the Defensive Attribution Scale

The researchers extracted the validity and reliability of the scale, as follows:

A - Honesty. Validity:

The validity of the defensive attribution scale is achieved through the following indicators:

Face Validity

The objective of judging the apparent validity of the defensive attribution scale was done with a test of forwarding the scale to the arbitrators and asking them for their sentiments about the validity of the scale items, instructions, and options.

Construct Validity

This type of validity of the defensive attribution scale was achieved through the following indicators:

•The two-party group method.

•The item score is related to the total scale score.

B - Reliability:

The Stability of the Defensive Attribution Scale Was Verified in Two Ways

Test-Retest (External Consistency)

To do this, the defensive attribution scale was filled in by 30 male and female offenders from Hilla (Babylon). Then, for the next two weeks, the scale was given to the participants again. The reliability coefficient was

established by calculating Pearson's 'r' correlation coefficient for two sets of scores obtained by the two methods. 4.51, which is within the acceptable range of 0.75, and ideal for research purposes.

Cronbach's alpha (internal consistency):

Table (2) shows the findings of the researchers' use of Cronbach's alpha to confirm the defensive attribution scale's stability following a random sample of 100.

Table 2. Cronbach's alpha reliability of the defensive attribution scale.

Reliability Statistics	
N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
28	0.780

The Scale in Its Final Form

The final version of the defensive attribution scale has 28 items, with a maximum score of 100 and a minimum score of 47, and an estimated mean of 70.

Statistical Indicators for the Defensive Attribution Scale

The researchers collected a variety of statistical indicators after administering the defensive attribution scale to the 400 research sample members. The distribution of the scores of the research sample members was modest, with values of skewness and kurtosis less than (1).

False Consensus Scale

The researchers built a tool to measure false consensus based on the model of Ross & et al (1977). The following is a presentation of how to build the research tool:

Planning The Scale (Defining the Concept and Fields According to the Theory Adopted in the Study)

The researchers relied on the Ross et al (1977) model.

Developing and Drafting the Scale Items

To prepare the items for the false consensus scale, the researchers did the following:

•Adopting the model of Ross & et al (1977) to formulate fields and paragraphs that fit the variable.

Based on this, (22) items were formulated in their initial form to measure false consensus.

Scale Correction

The researchers came up with twenty-two questions for the false consensus scale in its initial form. For the individual who is the subject of the investigation, these items represented two different options: yes and no. Choose the alternative that you believe applies to you, and then place a checkmark (√) beneath the alternative that you believe applies to your colleagues from the two alternatives that are presented in front of each paragraph (the point of view of others is in agreement with this point of view of mine, and the point of view of others contrasts with this point of view of mine).

Validity of the Scale Items

This objective was accomplished by presenting the scale in its initial form, which consisted of twenty-two items, to sixteen arbitrators who were experts in the field of psychology.

Clarity of the Scale's Paragraphs and Instructions

It was administered to a survey sample that consisted of thirty respondents in order to establish whether or not the instructions of the scale were clear and whether or not the criminal respondents understood the paragraphs

of the scale. The time required varied from seven to eleven minutes, and it was discovered that the paragraphs of the scale are understandable. There is no requirement for improvement or modification.

Statistical Analysis of the False Consensus Scale

In the process of assessing the items of the false consensus scale, two relevant techniques are the two-tailed groups method (external consistency) and the link of the item score to the total score of the scale. Additionally, exploratory factor analysis of the scale is utilized, as will be explained in the following manner:

The Two Peripheral Groups (External Consistency)

Following the application of the research instrument and the correction of the responses of the participants in the questionnaire on the scale that was distributed, this step in the procedure consists of drawing a random sample from the research community. In order to accomplish this, a sample of individuals was drawn randomly, which amounted to four hundred criminals from the city of Hilla (Babylon). In light of this, the researcher arranged the total scores in a descending order, beginning with the highest score and ending with the lowest score. In order to obtain two extreme groups, the researcher chose to select (27%) of the questionnaires that obtained the highest scores (108) and the questionnaires that obtained the lowest scores. In total, there were 108 questionnaires, and the group with the lowest results was referred to as the lowest group. When it comes to selecting the peripheral groups, the percentage of 27% is considered to be one of the best percentages. This is due to the fact that it may offer us with two groups that are characterized by the best size, which allows us to compare the scores of the respondents on each item of the scale. During the same moment, the greatest potential degree of differentiation.

The Relationship of the Item Grade to the Total Grade (Item Validity)

All correlation coefficients were found to be statistically significant at the level of significance (0.05), and the degree of freedom (398), when compared with the critical standard score of (0.087), except for paragraphs (4,9,13,14).

Exploratory Factor Analysis of the False Consensus Scale

The value of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olin test is (0.51) compared with (0.50) the cut-off score, which is higher than the cut-off score, which indicates that the size of the research sample is appropriate for factor analysis.

Honesty Validity

The researcher verified the validity of the false consensus scale through the following indicators:

Face Validity

The apparent validity of the false consensus scale was demonstrated when the arbitrators were asked to read through the false consensus scale, and provide their perceived validity on the scale's items, instructions, and on the alternatives.

Construct Validity

This type of validity for the false consensus scale was achieved through indicators represented by item analysis methods.

Reliability

Reliability indicators: The researchers extracted the reliability of the false consensus scale in two ways:

Internal Consistency (Kuder-Richardson (20)

Since the scale is two-alternative, the reliability of the false consensus scale was extracted using the Keuder-Richardson method (20), and the reliability coefficient reached (0.804). It has very good stability.

External Consistency (Test-Retest)

In the next step, the two researchers were therefore able to get dependability in the following manner from a sample of thirty individuals, as mentioned earlier: Utilizing the false consensus scale. This value was deemed as reliability coefficient of the false consensus scale since Cronbach shows that if the correlation coefficient between the first and second application is 0. The complete information on Cronbach coefficient calculation can be found in the works of Nunnally. This last statement may be considered as a sign of high test reliability if the number of items in the test is 70 or more. The pretest of the scale was used, in the second instance, after two weeks of the first administration of the scale with the same sample. Using the Pearson coefficient of variation to identify the type of connection between outcomes of the first and second application degree, it would appear that the reliability of the scale coefficient was equal to (0. 801), and this value was deemed to measure the stability of this type of link.

Table 3. Cronbach's alpha reliability of the false consensus scale.

Reliability Statistics	
N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
22	0.70

The Scale in Its Final Form

A total of eighteen items were included in the final version of the false consensus scale. These items were designed to determine how individuals who commit moral offenses react to two different answer options: The viewpoints of my colleagues are in agreement with this viewpoint of mine, and the viewpoints of my colleagues are in contrast to this viewpoint of mine. The first alternative, which states that the point of view of my colleagues is in agreement with this point of view of mine, is assigned a weight of one, which indicates the presence of false consensus. On the other hand, the second alternative, which states that the point of view of my colleagues differs with this point of view of mine, is assigned a weight of zero, which indicates that there is no false consensus. As a result, the hypothetical range for the maximum score that a respondent may obtain is (31), the lowest score that they can obtain is (25), and the hypothetical average score is (9).

CHAPTER FOUR (PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS)

The First Goal: Defensive Attribution Among Perpetrators of Moral Crimes

The defensive attribution scale was applied to the research sample, which consisted of four hundred individuals, so that the researcher could accomplish this objective. When this average is compared to the average that was anticipated, the findings showed that their average score on the scale reached 77.38 degrees, with a standard deviation of 12,022 degrees. Additionally, when this average is balanced with the average that was hypothesized, when Because the calculated T-value was higher than the tabulated T-value of (1.96), with a degree of freedom of 399 and a significance level of 0.05, it was determined that the difference was statistically significant and in favor of the arithmetic mean. This was determined by using the t-test for one sample. Table (4) illustrates this finding. The scale in question was seventy degrees.

Table 4. The t-test for the difference between the sample mean and the hypothesized mean for the defensive attribution scale.

Significance level	D.F	Tabular T-value	Calculated T-value	Hypothetical mean	standard deviation	SMA	the sample
significant	399	1,96	12,277	70	12,022	77,38	400

As suggested by the foregoing analysis, there is a strong tendency of defensive attribution in the research sample. Attributing controllability to the behaviour can be explained by Shaver's (1970) defensive attribution theory. Shaver also agrees with the argument that people have a tendency to look for reasons in other factors instead of possessing personal responsibility when one fails within a subject or when a certain difficulty or some undesirable event occurs. Maintaining Positive Self-Image enables the follower to avoid strengthening a negative/weak self-image; lowers the levels of frustration and tension brought about by failure and negative

occurrences; and may lead to improvement of the overall mood and satisfaction with the self. Therefore, it is advisable that everyone has to make sure that they maintain their self-image. Positive and they reject a negative self – image, and therefore, the high defensive attribution among prison inmates who commit moral crimes might be due to their need to protect their positive self-image from their own eyes and therefore stay away from a negative self-image so that they be able to reduce the frustration and tension resulting from failure and negative events in their lives. In an effort to boost the spirits, to feel at ease with the self, and in order not to feel guilty due to criminal offenses committed.

The researcher is of the opinion that this could be due to the fact that individuals who commit immoral acts while incarcerated have a tendency to place blame on external factors when they are confronted with failure or when they commit immoral acts. This behavior is connected to their desire to protect their positive self-image and avoid negative self-image in order to reduce feelings of stress and guilt. The perpetrators of moral crimes may also be afraid of the legal and societal repercussions that would result from their immoral conduct. As a result, they may view defensive attribution as a way to justify or mitigate the potential consequences of their actions. In addition to this, they could have a strong desire to preserve their reputation and present a favorable image to others at all times.

This is in accordance with the result of prior researches such as elucidated by Stephen & et. imilarly, this study also supported the study done by al (1999) as they both showed how the male sexual offenders are more inclined towards defensive attribution as compared to the female offenders. Raynor and his colleagues also noted that this approach can be seen in the study of Barbis (Raynor, 1999, p. Such that, the study by Barbis (2018, 52) pointed out that the occurrence of a sexual crime leads the perpetrator to blame the victim; while, the study conducted by Ndobie et al (2019) highlighted that defensive attribution increases among people. Findings of this paper supports the observation made Musa & et. al, 2019, P255 and a study. al (2019), who also corroborated it with the fact that Peoples (2009) also found a high level of defensive attribution among those individuals . G., 2019, p72), and the study of Simone & et. Porter (2003), which found that the criminals with behaviors to be violent individuals, they often employ defensive attribution to justify their criminality.

The second goal: the false consensus among perpetrators of moral crimes:

In order to achieve this objective, the researcher used the false consensus scale on the research sample which was made up of four hundred participants. With regards to the participants' score on the said scale, it was established that their average score was 28. This distribution of scores is 2 degrees with 1 as a standard deviation. 5365 degrees. Moreover, the average for this scale was computed with the help of… Taking into consideration the hypothetical scale, and its main characteristic – the degrees, the mean for the given scale was nine degrees. Thus it shall be seen that because the calculated t-value was higher than the tabulated t-value of 1. 96, the degree of freedom being 399 and the threshold of significance being 0. However, it was noted in the end of 05 that this difference was statistically significant and belonged to the arithmetic mean. This was as highlighted in table (5) as shown below, where it shows that this was the case.

Table 5. T-test of the difference between the sample mean and the hypothesized mean for the false consensus measure.

Significance level	D.F	Tabular T-value	Calculated T-value	Hypothetical mean	standard deviation	SMA	the sample
significant	399	1,96	249,915	9	1,5365	28,2	400

There is a significant degree of false consensus among those who commit moral crimes while incarcerated, as indicated by the conclusion that was presented earlier. In their hypothesis, Ross et al. (1977) indicated that individuals' knowledge of the perspectives of others is always biased towards the viewpoints they choose for themselves. This conclusion may be interpreted according to what Ross et al. (1977) explained in their argument. Some people have a tendency to exaggerate the popularity of their beliefs, opinions, and behaviors. They also believe that motivational processes are among the factors that contribute to the perception that an individual's judgments, responses, and behaviors enjoy a high degree of consensus. Furthermore, they believe that justifying and validating behaviors, particularly those that may be regarded as deviant, may be the most

important function that is served by motivational processes. The more deviant the conduct is, the greater the need for the individual to comprehend that the behavioral action is dominating, and at the same time, the larger the false consensus (overestimation) that one anticipates during the process of motivation. In situations where an individual perceives a threat to himself (such as failure, risk, or deviance), this can be reduced. experiencing a sense of threat as a result of overestimating the common opinion of one's actions or stance.

According to the researcher, this is because those who commit moral crimes often use the concept of false consensus to rationalize or absolve themselves of blame for their immoral or illegal actions. In other words, they convince themselves that any other person in their shoes could act similarly, even though this is obviously not the case. In reality.

This finding is in line with earlier research that has shown a high level of false consensus among individuals despite different samples. For example, studies by Botvin (1992), Sherman & et.al (1983), Bond & et.al (2019), Buunk & Gibbons (2007), and Tan (2019) have all reached similar conclusions.

The Third Goal: The Correlation Between Defensive Attribution and False Consensus Among Perpetrators of Moral Crimes

In order to accomplish this, we calculated the correlation coefficient between the total scores of the defensive attribution scale among the sample members and the false consensus among the offenders of moral crimes using the Pearson correlation coefficient. The findings demonstrated that those responsible for moral offenses are more likely to engage in defensive attribution and false consensus. The computed correlation value was 0.61, which is more than the tabular Pearson correlation coefficient value of 0.098 at the 0.05 level and 398 degrees of freedom (as shown in Table 6).

Table 6. The correlation between defensive attribution and false consensus.

Value	Indicator	Relationship variables
0,61	The value of the calculated correlation coefficient	
0,098	The value of the tabular correlation coefficient	Defensive attribution and false consensus
398	D.F	

The above finding suggests a positive and statistically significant relationship between false consensus and defensive attribution. In other words, the more widespread the false consensus, the more likely it is that criminals committing moral offenses will resort to defensive attribution. Shaver (1970) and Ross et al. (1977) provide an explanation for this finding by positing that individuals are motivated by false consensus or selfish, self-centered biases. These biases support and validate the individual's belief that their behaviors are justified. These responses are reasonable and suitable in response to environmental demands and also cover self-defense. Additionally, they hold the belief that an individual's behavior and thought processes are more influenced by a higher false consensus. People who think their peers will act in a certain way may act in a similar way themselves; this is because, when people overestimate the consensus, it makes certain actions seem more common and acceptable, which in turn supports them. This, in turn, reinforces their decisions and behaviors and gives them credit for them. Another possible benefit is that it improves the individual's sense of self-worth by making them feel like they're not in the worst situation compared to others. One such social support requirement is the need to feel safe in one's position, and one way to meet this need is to attribute one's position to others. Making distorted consensus estimations to suit certain requirements in our life can be driven by either conscious or unconscious motivations. Attributing these needs can help us avoid feeling guilty about failure, inappropriate behaviors, or unfavorable experiences, which can help us retain a positive self-image. Get over having a bad self-image.

The researcher believes that the reason for this could be due to individuals resorting to cognitive biases or using defensive mechanisms in the event of failure or negative events in order to defend the psychological system that the individual relies on to adapt to difficult events and potential threats. These mechanisms can be useful in reducing anxiety and stress. Psychological, but sometimes it can lead to ignoring personal responsibility. One of these mechanisms and biases is defensive attribution and false consensus.

The author of the study suggests that this could be due to the fact that when individuals face unpleasant results or setbacks, their psychological systems—which they employ to adapt to dangerous situations—are susceptible to cognitive biases and protective mechanisms. These approaches can help reduce worry and tension. Reasonable, yet it can occasionally lead to avoiding one's duties. Items such as defensive attribution and false consensus are examples of biases and defense mechanisms.

Consistent with prior research, this finding supports the idea that individuals seek validation for their behaviors and beliefs through false consensus. For example, Sherman et al. (1983) found that people seek validation from others when they act in a way that goes against social norms, and Suls et al. (1988) found that people overestimate the consensus around their harmful behaviors (like drug and alcohol use) because it makes them seem more common and acceptable, which in turn brings them social support.

Fourth Objective: The Relative Contribution of False Consensus to Defensive Attribution Among Perpetrators of Moral Crimes

To determine the extent to which false consensus contributes to defensive attribution among perpetrators of moral crimes, a simple regression analysis was conducted, and Table (7) shows this.

Table 7. Regression analysis of variance to identify the statistical significance of the contribution of false consensus to defensive attribution.

Sig	F	M.S	D.F	s.of.s	s.of.v
		138,039	1	138,039	Statistical regression
Not a sign	0,955	144,553	398	57532,201	Residual
			399	57670,24	Total

From the table above, it is clear that false consensus contributes to defensive attribution among perpetrators of moral crimes, as the F-value calculated for the regression analysis of variance was (8.667), which is higher than the tabular F-value of (3.84) at the level of (0.05) and the degree of freedom (398).

To determine the extent of the relative contribution of false consensus to defensive attribution, the Beta coefficient was extracted, and Table (8-9) shows this.

Table 8. Correlation coefficient, coefficient of determination and standard error.

The value of t for the fixed term	Fixed limit	Standard error	The coefficient of determination	Correlation coefficient
4,16	45,341	7,508	0,781	0,61

Table 9. Beta coefficient of relative contribution and its statistical significance.

Significance is at 0.05	T calculated	Standard error of relative contribution	Beta value	Independent variable
significant	2,944	0,311	0,916	false consensus

It is evident from the table above that defensive attribution is significantly impacted by false consensus. The beta value reached 0.916, which is statistically significant according to the calculated T-value index of 2.944 when compared to the tabulated T-value of 1.96 at the level of .05. So, the false consensus accounts for a small fraction of the shift in defensive attribution (0.146 percentage points), while other, non-study-related factors account for the balance (0.854 percentage points).

This insight is clarified by looking at Shaffer's theory of defensive attribution, which recognizes that people have various strategies for protecting themselves and keeping a positive self-image when confronted with adversity. One of these strategies is shifting the blame away from one's own internal causes and onto external factors. Dangerous, for example, people who engage in false consensus by thinking that other people share their bad actions. Defensive attribution also makes use of obvious outside factors. The person using this process is more likely to place the responsibility on outside forces, such as chance or events. One way in which the false consensus comes about is through the process of causal attribution. This is when people look outside themselves for support for their beliefs, leading them to believe that their actions are influenced by societal norms and standards.

Perpetrators of moral crimes may be influenced to think their immoral behavior is acceptable or justified by false consensus, according to the researcher. This is because they perceive social approval for their actions, which helps them justify themselves and overcome feelings of guilt or responsibility.

RECOMMENDATIONS

According to the research results, the researchers recommend the following:

1. Media institutions of all types must enhance the viewer's, listener's, and reader's awareness of the reality of defensive attribution and its negative impact on behavior.
2. Providing awareness and educational programs for individuals to understand how false consensus affects the justification of individuals' behaviors, and to enhance awareness of the importance of individual responsibility for one's actions.
3. Concerned state institutions must implement preventive and treatment programs concerned with the cognitive and psychological aspects of prison inmates.
4. Concerned state institutions must activate the role of counselors and psychological therapists in prisons.
5. Concerned authorities should hold awareness-raising seminars and training workshops to develop a sense of responsibility and not blame others when committing a mistake.
6. Separating the categories of prisoners according to the type of moral crime, such as separating crimes of assault against money from crimes of sexual assault, crimes of forgery, and so on, to reduce the false consensus between these categories.

PROPOSALS

According to the research results, the researchers recommend the following:

1. Conducting a study on defensive attribution and its relationship to biological, psychological, social and cultural factors.
2. Conducting a study that addresses the two research variables (defensive attribution and false consensus) and their relationship with other demographic variables that were not addressed in the current research (age - place of residence - profession - economic status.(
3. Studying the correlation between defensive attribution and other variables not addressed in current research, such as methods of dealing with psychological and social pressures, and personality types.
4. Conducting a study similar to the current study on other samples such as beggars, keffiyeh wearers, beauty clinic goers, and alcohol and drug addicts.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Haneen Hassan, and Mustafa, Adnan Yassin. (2020). Crimes that violate moral rules: a social field study in the city of Baghdad. Journal of the College of Education for Girls, Volume 31, Issue 4, 143-159.

Alicke, M. D. (1985). Global self-evaluation as determined by the desirability and controllability of trait adjectives. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49(6), 162-163.

Al-Jourani, Nibal, and Hamidat, Ramadan Muhammad Shehadeh. (2023). A sociological study of the social and economic factors that lead to women committing moral crimes. Tishreen University Journal for Scientific Research and Studies - Arts and Humanities Series, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 259-279.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 356.

Baumeister, R. F., & Newman, L. S. (1994). How stories make sense of personal experiences: Motives that shape autobiographical narratives. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20(6), 676-690.

Bayer, S. (2012): The lace-sheet-weavers—a long story (Araneae: Psechridae: Psechrus). Zootaxa 3379: 1–170.

Ben Taria, Afaf, Ben Taria, Sarah. (2021). Locus of control (internal/external) and its relationship to the meaning of life among a sample of high school students: A field study in some high schools in the city of Ouargla, unpublished master's thesis, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Kasdi Merbah University - Ouargla, Algeria, p. 7.

Bond, M., & Bedenlier, S. (2019a). Facilitating Student Engagement Through Educational Technology: Towards a Conceptual Framework. Journal of Interactive Media in Education, 2019(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.5334/jime.528.

Botvin G. J., Botvin E. M., Baker E., Dusenbury L., & Goldberg C. J. (1992): The false consensus effect: predicting adolescents' tobacco use from normative expectations. Psychol Rep. V70, pp171-178.

Buunk, B. P., & Gibbons, F. X. (Eds.). (2007). Social comparison: Theories, processes, and relationships. Psychology Press, 309-310.

Campbell, Rebecca, Emily Dworkin, and Giannina Cabral. 2009. "An ecological model of the impact of sexual assault on women's mental health." Trauma, Violence, and Abuse 10(3): 225-246.

Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. Annual Review of Psychology, 55, 591-621.

Dawes, R.M. (1989). Statistical Criteria for Establishing a Truly False Consensus. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 25(1), 1.

Edward, Largo (1995): The Role of Self in the False Consensus Effect, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Volume 31, Issue 1, January 1995, pp28-47.

Elliot, A. J., & Devine, P. G. (1994). On the motivational nature of cognitive dissonance: Dissonance as psychological discomfort. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67(3), 382-394.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 7(2), 117-140.

Festinger, L. (1957). A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford University Press, 153-155.

Festinger, L., Riecken, H. W., & Schachter, S. (1956). When Prophecy Fails: A Social and Psychological Study of a Modern Group that Predicted the Destruction of the World. University of Minnesota Press, 61.

Gisli, H. Gudjonsson (1984). Attribution of blame for criminal acts and its relationship with personality, Personality and Individual Differences, Volume 5, Issue 1, 1984, pp. 53-58.

Harmon-Jones, E., & Mills, J. (Eds.). (1999). Cognitive Dissonance: Progress on a Pivotal Theory in Social Psychology. American Psychological Association, 219-221.

Hewstone, M., Stroebe, W., & Jonas, K. (2008). Introduction to social psychology. John Wiley & Sons, 111-113.

Hye, Q. M. A., & Lau, W. Y. (2018). Does Financial and Trade liberalization Drive Private Investment in Pakistan?. Asian Journal of Economics and Empirical Research, 5(2), 112-120.

Jackson, C., Henriksen, L., & Dickinson, D. (1999). Alcohol-specific socialization, parenting behaviors and alcohol use by children. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 60(3), 362-367.

Jam, F. A., Haq, I. U., & Fatima, T. (2012). Phychological contract and job outcomes: Mediating role of affective commitment. Journal of Educational and Social Research, 2(4), 79-79.

Janis, I. L. (1982). Groupthink: Psychological studies of policy decisions and fiascoes (2nd ed.). Houghton Mifflin.

Larson, J. G., & Chastain, R. L. (1990). Self-esteem, defensiveness, and student perceptions of instructor credibility. Communication Education, 39(4), 392-400.

Lefcourt, H. M. (1982). Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research. Psychology Press, 201.

McGuire, M.C. (1961). The Yale group's studies of social influence. In C. I. Hovland & I. L. Janis (Eds.), Personality and Persuasibility (pp. 185). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Nisbett, R. E., & Ross, L. (1980). Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment. Prentice-Hall, 197-199.

Omar, García-Ponce & Isabel, Laterzo & Vivian, Bronsoler & Elisa, Lavore & Shahriar, Kibriya (2023). Who is to blame? Youth crime and attribution of responsibility in urban Mexico, Journal of Criminal Justice, Volume 86, May–June 2023, 102064.

Pedersen, J. Peggy.(1995): The False Consensus Effect in Estimates of Safe and Unsafe Sexual Practices. A THESIS submitted to Oregon State University. in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. pp1-148.

Pierce, J. P., & Gilpin, E. A. (2002). News media coverage of smoking and health is associated with changes in population rates of smoking cessation but not initiation. Tobacco Control, 11(3), 241-247.

Prentice, D. A., & Miller, D. T. (1993). Pluralistic ignorance and alcohol use on campus: Some consequences of misperceiving the social norm. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64(2), 243-256.

Ross, L., Greene, D., & House, P. (1977). The "false consensus effect": An egocentric bias in social perception and attribution processes. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 13(3), 279-301.

Rotter, J. B. (1954). Social learning and clinical psychology. Prentice-Hall, 284-286.

Shaver, K. (1970). Defensive attribution effects of severity and relevance on theresponsibility assigned for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 14, 101-113.

Shaver, K. G. (1985). The attribution of blame: Causality, responsibility, and blameworthiness. Springer.

Sherman, S. J., Presson, C. C., Chassin, L., Corty, E., & Olshaysky, R. (1983): The false consensus effect in estimates of smoking prevalence: Underlying mechanisms. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, V 9, No 2, pp197-207.

Simone, Fox & Erica, De Koning & Sharon, Leicht (2003). The relationship between attribution of blame for a violent act and EPQ-R sub-scales in male offenders with mental disorder, Personality and Individual Differences, Volume 34, Issue 8, June 2003, pp. 1467-1475.

Skinner, E. A., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2007). The development of coping. Annual review of psychology, 58, 119-144.

Staub, E. (1989). The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence. Cambridge University Press.

Stephen, Blumenthal & Gisli, Gudjonsson & Jan, Burns (1999). Cognitive distortions and blame attribution in sex offenders against adults and children, Child Abuse & Neglect, Volume 23, Issue 2, February 1999, pp 129-143.

Stone, J., Aronson, E., Crain, A. L., Winslow, M. P., & Fried, C. B. (1994). Inducing hypocrisy as a means of encouraging young adults to use condoms. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20(1), 116-128.

Suls, J. Wan, C. K., & Sanders, G. S. (1988): False consensus and false uniqueness in estimating the prevalence of health-protective behaviors. Journal of Applied Social Psychology. V18, No1, pp66-79.

Suls, J., & Wheeler, L. (2000). Handbook of social comparison: Theory and research. Springer Science & Business Media, 178.

Tan L, Grace RC (2008). Social desirability and sexual offenders: a review. Sex Abuse. 2008 Mar;20(1):61-87. doi: 10.1177/1079063208314820. PMID: 18420557.

Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. Psychological Bulletin, 103(2), 193-210.

Taylor, S. E., & Lobel, M. (1989). Social comparison activity under threat: Downward evaluation and upward contacts. Psychological Review, 96(4), 569-575.

Turner, M. E., & Pratkanis, A. R. (1998). A social identity maintenance model of groupthink. Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 73(2-3), 210-235.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. Psychological Review, 92(4), 548-573.

Wills, T. A. (1981). Downward comparison principles in social psychology. Psychological Bulletin, 90(2), 245-271.

Wood, J. V. (1989). Theory and research concerning social comparisons of personal attributes. Psychological Bulletin, 106(2), 231-248.

Zuckerman, M., & Miyake, K. (1993). The effect of defensive attribution on laboratory aggression in three cultures. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 24(4), 463-485.