Article

Situational Victimization Cues Strengthen Implicit and Explicit Self-Victim Associations: An Experiment With College-Aged Adults

Nicole M. Sachs[1] iD **, Bonita M. Veysey**[2] **and Luis M. Rivera**[2]

Abstract

Contextually salient social identities are those that individuals may not think of often but that may be temporarily activated by relevant situational cues. We hypothesized that victim, one of many identities people may possess, is a contextually salient identity that operates both implicitly and explicitly. To test this hypothesis, the present research tests the effect of a situational victimization cue on implicit and explicit self-victim associations. We utilized an experiment with a 2 (Victimization salience: yes vs. no) × 2 (Past victimization experience: yes vs. no) between-participants design. One hundred

[1]Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, USA
[2]Rutgers University, Newark, NJ, USA

Corresponding Author:
Nicole M. Sachs, Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice, Fairleigh Dickinson University, 1000 River Road, Mail Stop: T-RA2-01, Teaneck, NJ 07666, USA.
Email: nmsachs@fdu.edu

eighty-one undergraduate student participants were recruited and randomized into one of two conditions: (a) an experimental condition reminding them of a previous victimization experience or (b) a control condition whereby they did not receive a reminder. All participants then completed one Single-Category Implicit Association Test, and self-report measures of explicit self-victim associations and victimization experience. Between-participants analyses of variance were used to analyze data. Results indicated that individuals who were reminded of a previous victimization exhibited stronger explicit and implicit self-victim associations compared to those who were not reminded. This research provides initial evidence that victim is a contextually salient identity, which has implications for the factors and processes underlying identity formation, revictimization, and the prevention of repeat victimization.

Keywords

memory and trauma, adult victims, sexual assault, violence exposure

Victimization is a harmful experience imposed on individuals by the actions of another person, group of people, institutional policy or practice, or structural or environmental harm (Herman, 1992; Holstein & Miller, 1990). This experience can have profound effects on cognitions of the self, including self-blame and/or the association with a new social group—victims (Dignan, 2005; Herman, 1992; Janoff-Bulman, 1979; Phillips & Daniluk, 2004; Whiston, 1981). While some people attempt to physically, emotionally, and cognitively distance themselves from a past victimization, including avoiding people, places, and things that remind them of the experience (Herman, 1992), others may not be able to avoid such reminders or may confront reminders head-on to regain a sense of control or agency as a way of coping (e.g., Herman, 1992; Phillips & Daniluk, 2004). In this regard, it is important to understand how people are cognitively impacted by victimization and its contextual reminders. Our previous work provided evidence that individuals who experienced victimization at least once in their past lives cognitively associate themselves with the social group victims (i.e., self-victim associations; Sachs, Veysey, & Rivera, 2017). This study extends our past research by examining the immediate impact of situational victimization cues on self-victim associations, both explicitly (i.e., consciously) and implicitly (i.e., nonconsciously). As a preview, we hypothesize and

find that making victimization salient in an experimental setting results in stronger explicit and implicit self-victim associations. This research provides evidence of the social cognitive mechanisms by which individuals who experience victimization identify with victims.

Social Identity and Implicit Social Cognitive Perspectives of Self-Victim Associations

The effects of social experiences on the self-concept can be understood through social identity and self-categorization theories (Oakes, 1987; Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986; Turner et al., 1987). Social identity theory suggests that one's social identities are formed by the groups to which one belongs; that is, social identities represent individuals' self-concept as social group members (Hogg, 2006; Hogg et al., 1995; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This is consistent with a social cognition definition—as per Greenwald and colleagues (2002), social identity is "the [cognitive] association of the self with a social category" (p. 9). Self-categorization theory (Hogg & Turner, 1987; Turner et al., 1987) extends social identity theory to highlight the role of contexts in individuals' association (i.e., categorizing) with a social group. When individuals self-categorize with a social group, they mentally *represent their self-concept in terms of their group and its attributes*. Moreover, understanding the contexts in which individuals self-categorize with their groups is important because self-group associations help individuals gain a better understanding of the social world, especially their ability to anticipate or predict self and others' behaviors in social interactions (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

We recently extended the above social identity and self-categorization processes to victimization by adopting an implicit social cognition framework and examining the explicit versus implicit associations between the self-concept and the group victims (Sachs, Veysey, & Rivera, 2017). First, we argued that the experience of victimization should result in a cognitive association between the self-concept and the group victims and its attributes, even those attributes that are negative, such as weak and helpless (cf. Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Greenwald et al., 2002). Second, when individuals reflect on their past victimization experience(s) and acknowledge their identification with the group victim, this represents an explicit, or consciously controlled, cognitive self and identity process (see Greenwald et al., 2002), which we refer to as an *explicit self-victim association*. To test this hypothesis, we asked participants to indicate their past violent

victimization experience on the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2008), a well-known national measure of victimization, then they self-reported the extent to which they associated themselves with victim-related nouns (e.g., victim, prey). We found that participants who self-reported a past violent victimization experience exhibited relatively strong explicit self-victim associations when compared to participants who did not report a past violent victimization.

Moreover, and consistent with implicit social cognition theory (Greenwald et al., 2002), we hypothesized that past victimization experiences should automatically affect beliefs and judgments outside of conscious awareness, including mental associations between the self and groups to which they belong (i.e., victims). We refer to this automatic association in memory between self and victim as an *implicit self-victim association*. We measured implicit self-victim associations with a Single-Category Implicit Association Test (SC-IAT; Karpinski & Steinman, 2006; also see Greenwald et al., 1998), which measures individual differences in strength of evaluative associations with a single attitude object. Unlike the above findings on explicit self-victim associations, and contrary to our original hypothesis, we found that participants who reported a past victimization were no more likely to implicitly associate themselves with the group victims compared to those who did not report a past victimization.

One potential explanation for the null effect on implicit self-victim associations is that victim may be a contextually salient identity. That is, relevant contexts may activate associations with a group. For example, being in the place where an individual was victimized acts as a contextual reminder of a victimization experience that in turn activates the association of self with the group victims. The present research adopts an experimental design to manipulate a contextual cue to make victimization vividly salient and test its effect on implicit (and explicit) self-victim associations.

Contextually Salient Identities: Application to Self-Victim Associations

Individuals typically identify with multiple groups and enact related group cognitions and behaviors (Deaux & Major, 1987; Ellemers et al., 2002; Hopkins & Reicher, 2011; Oakes, 1987; Turner et al., 1994). There are some identities of which we are constantly reminded, and, by consequence, think of more often. In the psychological

literature, these are referred to as chronically salient identities (Oakes, 1987); in the criminological literature, these are most consistent with master statuses (Becker, 1963). Because of their sheer frequency, we do not need many cues to be reminded of (and activate) chronically salient identities, such as gender, race, and ethnicity. Conversely, there are some identities that we may not think of constantly, but contextual cues remind us of them; we refer to these as *contextually salient identities*. Contextually salient identities are acute or stand out in the moment (cf. Crocker, 1999; Deaux & Major, 1987; Oakes, 1987), though individuals may be reminded of some identities more frequently than others (Oakes, 1987). This is akin to identity hierarchies, whereby our various identities are ranked, and those at the top of the hierarchy are more likely to be activated across different contexts compared to those at the bottom (Stryker, 1968, 1980). For example, those with justice-involved experience are frequently reminded of their associations with criminals in both formal (e.g., meeting with a parole officer) and informal (e.g., talking to a friend about one's experiences in court) contexts. For those with victimization experience, they also may be reminded of their association with victims in formal (e.g., court) and informal (e.g., watching television) contexts.

Our study examines contextual effects of vividly recalling a past victimization experience on victim identity processes as operationalized by explicit and implicit self-victim associations. While individuals who have experienced victimization may actively avoid places or things that remind them of their victimization experience (Finkelhor et al., 2001; Herman, 1992; Saunders, 1994), there are some contexts that are more likely than not to make salient a past victimization experience. Such contexts include those that remind the individual of the victimization experience or directly require the individual to confront memories of being victimized, like going to court to testify, participating in support or treatment groups, or attending events such as Take Back the Night, an international event typically held on college campuses where individuals often share their domestic and sexual abuse experiences during marches or vigils. People may also be reminded of their victimization experiences via media, such as viewing a television show involving a similar victimization (Elliott, 1997).

Following previous research, one way to examine if victim is a contextually salient identity is to adopt a contextual cue that reminds individuals of a past victimization experience (see, for example, Chiao et al., 2006; Coleman & Williams, 2013). The underlying assumption of the use of contextual cues is that those who are reminded of a specific

experience will more strongly (at least temporarily) associate the self with others who have similar experiences, both explicitly and implicitly, compared to those who do not encounter such a contextual cue. Indeed, the effect of contextual cues on strengthening associations between the self and social groups and their attributes has been demonstrated in past research (Gaither et al., 2013; Rudman & Phelan, 2010).

Overview of the Present Research

The goal of the present experiment is to extend our previous work by examining the effect of a victimization cue on victim identity processes, namely explicit and implicit self-victim associations. To this end, we predict that a contextual cue that reminds (vs. not) individuals of a victimization experience will result in stronger explicit (Hypothesis 1) and implicit (Hypothesis 2) self-victim associations. We experimentally manipulated the salience of a victimization experience by adopting a writing prompts exercise in which participants were asked to recall an autobiographical memory related to a personal victimization experience. This experimental manipulation is similar to a reminder that victims might receive from cues in their real lives (e.g., recalling events to a counselor, filing a police report, testifying in court). We measured explicit self-victim associations and implicit self-victim associations consistent with our past research. This also allowed us to test if we replicate our previous findings—the role of measured past victimization experience (using the NCVS; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2008) in strengthening explicit but not implicit self-victim associations.

Method

Participants and Design

One hundred eighty-nine undergraduate students at an urban public university participated in exchange for course credit.[1] Eight (4.2%) participants' responses were excluded from analyses due to Implicit Association Test (IAT) (described below) error rates that were either greater than 30% overall or 40% for any response block (as recommended by Greenwald et al., 2003). Of the final 181 participants, 72.9% were female. The mean age was 20.7 years ($SD = 5.52$, age range: 18–63). Twenty-five percent of participants were White, 24% were Asian or Pacific Islander, 19% were Hispanic/Latino, 18% percent were African American/Black, 12% did not identify with any of the

listed ethnicity-racial groups, 3% were multi-racial, and 1% were American Indian/Alaskan Native. The experiment adopted a 2 (Victimization salience: yes vs. no) × 2 (Past victimization experience: yes vs. no) between-participants design.

Manipulated Variable

Victimization salience. Participants randomly assigned to the victimization salience condition first read the following brief statement: "Sometimes in life there are people who harm others. Think about the worst time in your life when you were seriously threatened or badly hurt by someone." Participants were required to remain on this screen for a minimum of 1 min before prompted to describe the event on the next screen. Following this, on a separate screen, participants were prompted to describe their feelings about the event. The goal of this manipulation procedure was to allow participants to vividly re-experience a past victimization. Participants in the no salience control condition did not complete this procedure; instead, they proceeded directly from the informed consent to the measured variables.

Measured Variables

Implicit self-victim associations. An SC-IAT (Karpinski & Steinman, 2006) was adopted and modified from our previous research (Sachs, Veysey, & Rivera, 2017). The present SC-IAT used reaction time to measure the strength of the mental association between the self and the group victims. The SC-IAT is preferred over a double-category IAT in this research for two reasons: (a) it measures differences in strength of evaluative associations with a single attitude object, and (b) there is no clear comparison group to victim. The SC-IAT stimuli were words representing self (*I, me, my, mine, self*), others (*they, them, their, theirs, others*), and victim (*victim, prey, abused*). Relatively high SC-IAT scores indicate faster reaction times when self stimuli were paired with victim stimuli than when other stimuli were paired with victim stimuli. Put differently, higher scores indicate relatively strong implicit self-victim associations ($\alpha = .72$).

SC-IAT stimuli pre-testing. Here, we summarize the methodology and analyses for pre-testing the SC-IAT stimuli listed above. For additional details, including data on all stimuli, interested readers are referred to (Sachs, Veysey, & Rivera, 2017), Pretest Studies A and B. In Pretest Study A, participants read one of five randomly assigned vignettes in

which a victimization event was described. After reading the vignette, participants were asked to write down five words to describe the victim. In Pretest Study B, participants rated the words from Pretest Study A on how well they described a *crime victim* and on valence. The goal was to select at least two nouns related to victim and as similar as possible to each other on valence to be included in the SC-IAT. Nosek et al. (2005) recommended that the minimum number of stimuli in an IAT is two and that four is the "ideal" number of stimuli per category. Furthermore, they note that IAT effect sizes increase (albeit slightly) when the number of stimuli is larger than two. A series of one-sample *t*-tests were utilized to determine which of the nouns were rated relatively high on the victim relatedness scale and as similar as possible to each other on valence, in this case negative valence. These tests yielded a total of three nouns, *victim, prey,* and *abused.*

Explicit self-victim associations. Participants reported the extent to which they associated themselves with the three victim words in the SC-IAT on a 7-point scale ranging from *Not at all characteristics of me* (0) to *Extremely characteristic of me* (6). Higher scores indicate relatively strong explicit self-victim associations ($\alpha = .78$).

Past victimization experience. We administered modified questions from the NCVS (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2008), a widely used self-report measure that assesses victimization experience (Peytchev et al., 2012).[2] The NCVS inquires about multiple victimization events (e.g., burglary, robbery, assault, sexual assault, or rape), including where they took place, and in some cases the respondent's relationship to the offender. We were primarily interested in participants' responses to the questions that captured violent victimization. Specifically, participants were asked if they were ever attacked or threatened: (a) with any weapon (e.g., a gun or a knife); (b) by something thrown (e.g., a rock or a bottle); (c) with anything like a baseball bat, frying pan, or scissors; (d) by physical force, including any grabbing, punching, or choking; (e) by rape, attempted rape, or other type of sexual attack; or (f) none of the above.[3] From this question and following our past research (Sachs, Veysey, & Rivera, 2017), we created a dichotomous victimization experience variable: participants who selected one or more of responses (a)–(e) versus those who selected response (f).

Demographics. Participants were asked to identify their gender, age, race/ethnicity, income level, and employment status.

Procedure

A female research assistant informed participants that the study was examining "people's beliefs about their identity and experiences." All participants completed the study on a computer. After completing the procedure to manipulate victimization salience (described above), participants completed the measures of implicit self-victim associations, explicit self-victim associations, past victimization experience, and demographics (in that order). At the end of the study, all participants were debriefed: they were told of the study's purpose ("Today you have completed a study that is examining the extent to which a person's past experiences with victimization influence the development of an identity with victims."), they were reminded that their information was being kept confidential, and they were given researchers' contact information and a phone number for the on-campus counseling center. Finally, participants could choose to withdraw from the study and have their recorded data deleted during this time.

Results

Table 1 lists the zero-order correlations of the manipulated and measured variables.

To test Hypothesis 1, we conducted a Victimization Salience × Past Victimization Experience between-participants analysis of variance (ANOVA) on explicit self-victim associations. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, we found a significant main effect of experimentally manipulated victimization salience on explicit self-victim associations, $F(1,177) = 4.19$, $p = .042$, $d = .306$, such that participants in the salience

Table 1. Zero-Order Correlations of Manipulated and Measured Variables With Outcome Variables ($N = 181$).

Manipulated or Measured Variable	Implicit Self-Victim Associations	Explicit Self-Victim Associations
Victimization salience	.145[†]	.166*
Victimization experience	−.035	.173*
Gender	.139[†]	.120
Age	−.019	−.057
Race/ethnicity	.023	−.016
Income	−.010	.050
Employment	−.025	.028

[†]$p < .1$. *$p < .05$.

condition ($M = 1.99$, $SD = 1.60$) exhibited stronger explicit self-victim associations than participants in the no salience control condition ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 1.33$). Furthermore, and replicating our past work, we found a significant main effect of victimization experience on explicit self-victim associations, $F(1,177) = 5.98$, $p = .015$, $d = .366$, such that participants with a past victimization experience ($M = 1.95$, $SD = 1.51$) exhibited stronger explicit self-victim associations than participants without such experience ($M = 1.43$, $SD = 1.40$). Finally, the Victimization Salience × Past Victimization Experience interaction was not significant, $F(1,177) = 1.50$, $p = .222$.

To test Hypothesis 2, we performed the same analyses from above, but implicit self-victim associations was the dependent variable. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, there was a significant main effect of experimentally manipulated victimization salience on implicit self-victim associations, $F(1,177) = 4.16$, $p = .043$, $d = .305$, such that participants in the salience condition ($M = -.18$, $SD = .32$) exhibited stronger implicit self-victim associations than participants in the no salience control condition ($M = -.26$, $SD = .29$). However, and replicating our previous work, there was *no* significant main effect of past victimization experience on implicit self-victim associations, $F(1,177) = .17$, $p = .681$, $d = .062$. Finally, the Victimization Salience × Past Victimization Experience interaction was not significant, $F(1,177) = .48$, $p = .487$.[4,5]

Altogether, the above results suggest that making victimization salient by recalling (in a writing task) an autobiographical memory related to a personal victimization experience can strengthen (at least temporarily) explicit and implicit victim identities.

Supplementary: Descriptive Analyses of Responses to Victimization Salience Manipulation

As noted above, the procedure asked participants to recall a time in which they had been seriously injured or badly hurt. As part of our analyses, we also explored the responses of participants in the victimization salience condition. Two undergraduate research assistants independently coded 90 responses on type of act. We were particularly interested in differentiating completed violent physical acts (i.e., acts involving a weapon, something thrown, or some object, assault, and/or rape; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2008) from nonviolent or nonphysical acts (i.e., threat only, witness of violence, no clear physical attack or threat, other nonviolent act, emotional hurt, other

victimization). The interrater reliability between the two research assistants was 87%.

Supplementary descriptive analyses of responses demonstrated that participants provided a range from violent (e.g., "The worst time was when my boyfriend and I were fighting and it got so intense that he struck me") to nonviolent or non-physical (e.g., "An ex mate was extremely rude to me and it caused our breakup") victimization descriptions. These results suggest that the prompt captured a breadth of victimization experiences. Nevertheless, our above data show that participants who were randomly assigned to write about *any* past victimization experience demonstrated stronger implicit and explicit self-victim associations compared to those who were randomly assigned to the control condition.

General Discussion

Individuals typically have multiple group identities. Some group identities are chronically salient because individuals are constantly reminded of certain identity-based experiences, and, by consequence, they think of these groups more often (Oakes, 1987). Other group identities are made salient or are temporarily activated in a particular context (Crocker, 1999; Deaux & Major, 1987; Oakes, 1987). In our previous work, we found that participants with past violent victimization experience exhibited relatively strong explicit self-victim associations, but not *implicit* self-victim associations, when compared to participants with no past violent victimization. In the present research, we posit that one reason for this null effect is that victim may be a contextually salient identity, and we provide initial evidence to support this hypothesis. Victims is one of many groups that an individual might identify with, but he or she may not be constantly reminded of a victimization experience, and/or he or she may avoid contexts that would otherwise elicit a reminder (Finkelhor et al., 2001; Herman, 1992; Saunders, 1994). This study introduced an experimental manipulation of victimization salience, which served as a contextual cue to influence self-victim associations. In support of our hypotheses, participants who re-experienced a past victimization exhibited stronger explicit and implicit self-victim associations when compared to those in a control condition. Altogether, these data suggest that contexts in which a person is reminded of a past victimization experience(s) may strengthen explicit and implicit victim identities.

When an identity is activated in a certain context, it may have psychological functionality (Oakes, 1987). That is, identities can aid individuals in understanding their surroundings, determining how people feel, forming expectations of others, and influencing behavior. While we do not examine the relation between explicit and implicit self-victim associations and behavior in the present research, Greenwald and colleagues (2009) suggest that both measures of implicit and explicit cognition about socially sensitive topics have good predictive validity, but for different behavioral outcomes. Explicit social cognition tends to predict more thoughtful, controlled behaviors (e.g., Friese et al., 2008), while implicit social cognition tends to predict more subtle, automatic behavior (for a review, see Payne & Gawronski, 2010).

Identifying as a victim explicitly may help individuals understand and overcome their past experiences. Past research has demonstrated that individuals who have experienced victimization, and who are receiving counseling, associate strongly with their victimized past at the outset of therapy (Bass & Davis, 1992; Matsakis, 1996; Phillips & Daniluk, 2004). In other words, the victimization experience largely affects how individuals perceive themselves (e.g., as victims, as isolated) in the beginning of counseling, as described in qualitative accounts. The purpose of acknowledging past victimization and a victim identity in counseling is to assist with coping and with identity transformation (e.g., see Herman, 1992). That is, moving from victim to survivor may increase people's sense of agency and belonging, help to view themselves more positively, and provide a source of strength. For example, when describing the shift to a survivor identity, one individual described, "It was like a little life raft in a way, that I made it and if I hung on to that identity I'd be okay" (Phillips & Daniluk, 2004, p. 180). Counseling practices assume that victim identity-based behaviors stem only from explicit self-victim cognitive associations; however, both explicit *and* implicit cognitions can influence behavior.

Identifying as a victim implicitly may influence nonverbal behaviors that can increase one's risk of revictimization. As presented in the introduction, victimization is an event *imposed* on individuals. As such, the cognitive and/or behavioral consequences that result from victimization should not be used to blame past victims for any past or future victimizations. Rather, understanding the consequences of victimization should be used to aid victims in coping with their experiences. Limited research has shown that those who are victimized exhibit automatic responses and/or behavior related to victimization and vulnerability to assault, for example, startle response (Herman, 1992), chronic

hyperarousal (Burgess & Holmstrom, 1974; van der Kolk, 1986; van der Kolk & Saporta, 1991), and walking gait (Book et al., 2010; Grayson & Stein, 1981; Gunns et al., 2002; Sakaguchi & Hasegawa, 2006; Wheeler et al., 2009). To some degree, measures of implicit social cognition have been predictive of automatic actions—those that are impulsive, uncontrollable, or unintentional (Deutsch & Strack, 2010). As it relates to the present research, perhaps our measure of implicit self-victim associations are cognitive markers for the automatic behaviors previously mentioned, such as walking gait. If such behavioral indicators exist, individuals may signal past victimization to others, and by consequence may be more vulnerable to revictimization.

We experimentally manipulated victimization salience by asking participants to briefly recall a time when they were seriously injured or badly hurt. Although we did not explicitly ask participants to think about others who played a role in the victimization experience, Oakes (1987) suggests that achieving optimal salience of a social identity occurs when a clear comparison group is present. To the extent that activating self-victim association strengthens identification with victims, when past victims are in contexts in which they are face-to-face with their perpetrator, this comparison should make the victim identity even stronger. Past research shows that the stronger an implicit attitude or identity one has, the *more* likely he or she will exhibit behavior related to that attitude or identity (Lane et al., 2007). This research suggests that a stronger implicit victim identity may lead to a greater likelihood of victim-related behavior, and a higher risk of (re)victimization. Future research in this area should therefore examine the potential link between implicit (and explicit) victim identity and behavior.

Conclusion

Violent victimization has been declared a public health issue for over two decades (Freire-Vargas, 2018; Krug et al., 2002), in large part because, annually, it affects over 2 million men and women from all racial-ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds (Truman & Morgan, 2016). To bolster current efforts in helping victims cope, the present research suggests that we need to understand how victimization-related contextual cues might affect victims' cognition—specifically, their self-victim mental associations because they have implications for identity. Our experiment is a first attempt to examine this issue by demonstrating that re-experiencing a past victimization can activate both explicit and implicit self-victim associations. Knowing that contextual cues in which

victims find themselves can have significant effects on their cognition, practitioners may be better able to aid victims in understanding their experiences, including the potential effects of victim cognition (i.e., identity processes) on behavior that may make a victim more vulnerable to revictimization.

Authors' Note

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

ORCID iD

Nicole M. Sachs https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3229-175X

Notes

1. This research was approved by the Rutgers University Institutional Review Board, study title "Identity and Experiences Study," protocol number 14-559M.
2. While the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) asks participants about victimization experiences within the past 6 months, our modified questionnaire asked about lifetime victimization. Participants could select the following options when asked how long ago a particular victimization occurred: (a) within the last 6 months, (b) within the last year, (c) over 1 year ago but less than 2 years ago, (d) over 2 years ago but less than 5 years ago, (e) more than 5 years ago, or (f) do not recall.

3. As part of the adopted questionnaire from the NCVS, participants can indicate if they have been attacked or threatened by any rape, attempted rape, or other type of sexual attack. The National Research Council (2014) suggests that this wording should better differentiate between rape and sexual assault (perhaps by listing them separately) and be explicit in the acts that encompass each term. This may lead to an increase in definitional understanding among participants and in overall reporting of these acts (see National Research Council, 2014, for a complete discussion of critiques and recommendations related to questions about rape and sexual assault).

4. For interested readers, we examined the correlation between explicit and implicit self-victim associations among all participants, and in the victimization salience versus no salience conditions. Participants in general exhibited a positive association between explicit and implicit self-victim associations, but this relation was marginally related, $r(181) = .13$, $p = .071$, and it appears to be driven by participants in the victimization salience condition, $r(90) = .19$, $p = .074$, and not those in the no salience control condition, $r(91) = .01$, $p = .912$.

5. Although this study was an experiment and thus we used random assignment, research on violent victimization suggests that individuals vary considerably in the factors that put them at risk for victimization. Therefore, we explored if the above main effects supporting our hypotheses held after controlling for these risk factors. As per Table 1, no demographic variables were significantly correlated with implicit or explicit self-victim associations, so we did not continue with covariate analyses.

References

Bass, E., & Davis, L. (1992). *The courage to heal: A guide for women survivors of childhood sexual abuse*. Collins Living.

Becker, H. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. Free Press.

Book, A., Costello, K., & Camilleri, J. A. (2010). Psychopathy and victim selection: The use of gait as a cue to vulnerability. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *28*, 2368–2383.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2008). *National Crime Victimization Survey— NCVS-1 Basic Screen Questionnaire*. http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ncvs1_2014.pdf

Burgess, A. W., & Holmstrom, L. L. (1974). Rape trauma syndrome. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *131*, 981–986.

Chiao, J. Y., Heck, H. E., Nakayama, K., & Ambady, N. (2006). Priming race in biracial observers affects visual search for Black and White faces. *Psychological Science*, *17*, 387–392.

Coleman, N. V., & Williams, P. (2013). Feeling like my self: Emotion profiles and social identity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *40*, 203–222.

Crocker, J. (1999). Social stigma and self-esteem: Situational construction of self-worth. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *35*, 89–107.

Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. *Psychological Review*, *94*, 369–389.

Deutsch, R., & Strack, F. (2010). Building blocks of social behavior: Reflective and impulsive processes. In B. Gawronski & B. K. Payne (Eds.), *Handbook of implicit social cognition: Measurement, theory, and applications* (pp. 62–79). The Guilford Press.

Dignan, J. (2005). *Understanding victims and restorative justice*. Open University Press.

Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (2002). Self and social identity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*, 161–186.

Elliott, D. M. (1997). Traumatic events: Prevalence and delayed recall in the general population. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, *65*, 811–820.

Finkelhor, D., Wolak, J., & Berliner, L. (2001). Police reporting and professional help seeking for child crime victims: A Review. *Child Maltreatment*, *6*, 17–30.

Freire-Vargas, L. (2018). Violence as a public health crisis. *AMA Journal of Ethics*, *20*(1), 25–28.

Friese, M., Hofmann, W., & Wänke, M. (2008). When impulses take over: Moderated predictive validity of explicit and implicit attitude measures in predicting food choice and consumption behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *47*, 397–419.

Gaither, S. E., Sommers, S. R., & Ambady, N. (2013). When the half affects the whole: Priming identity for biracial individuals in social interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *49*, 368–371.

Grayson, B., & Stein, M. I. (1981). Attracting assault: Victims' nonverbal cues. *Journal of Communication*, *31*, 68–75.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, beliefs, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 4–27.

Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M. R., Rudman, L. A., Farnham, S. D., Nosek, B. A., & Mellott, D. S. (2002). A unified theory of implicit attitudes, stereotypes, self-esteem, and self-concept. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 3–25.

Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1464–1480.

Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the implicit association test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*, 197–216.

Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A, Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the implicit association test III: Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*, 17–41.

Gunns, R. E., Johnston, L., & Hudson, S. M. (2002). Victim selection and kinematics: A point-light investigation of vulnerability to attack. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *26*, 129–158.

Herman, J. (1992). *Trauma and recovery*. Basic Books.

Hogg, M. A. (2006). Social identity theory. In P. J. Burke (Ed.), *Contemporary social psychological theories* (pp. 111–136). Stanford University Press.

Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. (1995). A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *58*, 255–269.

Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1987). Intergroup behaviour, self-stereotyping and the salience of social categories. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *26*, 325–340.

Holstein, J. A., & Miller, G. (1990). Rethinking victimization: An interactional approach to victimology. *Symbolic Interaction*, *13*, 103–122.

Hopkins, N., & Reicher, S. (2011). Identity, culture, and contestation: Social identity as a cross-cultural theory. *Psychological Studies*, *56*, 36–43.

Janoff-Bulman, R. (1979). Characterological versus behavioral self-blame: Inquiries into depression and rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 1798–1809.

Karpinski, A., & Steinman, R. B. (2006). The single category implicit association test as a measure of implicit social cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 16–32.

Krug, E. G., Dahlberg, L. L., Mercy, J. A., Zwi, A. B., & Lozano, R. (2002). *World report on violence and health: Summary*. World Health Organization.

Lane, K. A., Banaji, M. R., Nosek, B. A., & Greenwald, A. G. (2007). Understanding and using the implicit association test: IV. What we know (so far) about the method. In B. Wittenbrink & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Implicit measures of attitudes* (pp. 59–102). The Guilford Press.

Matsakis, A. (1996). *I can't get over it: A handbook for trauma survivors*. New Harbinger.

National Research Council. (2014). *Estimating the incidence of rape and sexual assault*. The National Academies Press.

Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). Understanding and using the implicit association test: II. Method variables and construct validity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*, 166–180.

Oakes, P. J. (1987). The salience of social categories. In J. C. Turner, M. A. Hogg, P. J. Oakes, S. D. Reicher, & M. S. Wetherell (Eds.), *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory* (pp. 117–141). Blackwell.

Payne, B. K., & Gawronski, B. (2010). A history of implicit social cognition: Where is it coming from? Where is it now? Where is it going. In B. Gawronski & B. K. Payne (Eds.), *Handbook of implicit social cognition: Measurement, theory, and applications* (pp. 1–15). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Peytchev, A., Caspar, R., Neely, B., & Moore, A. (2012). *NCVS screening questions evaluation: Final report*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rti_finalreport.pdf

Phillips, A., & Daniluk, J. C. (2004). Beyond "survivor": How childhood sexual abuse informs the identity of adult women at the end of the therapeutic process. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *82*, 177–184.

Rudman, L. A., & Phelan, J. E. (2010). The effect of priming gender roles on women's implicit gender beliefs and career aspirations. *Social Psychology*, *41*, 192–202.

Sachs, N. M., Veysey, B. M., & Rivera, L. M. (2017). Implicit social cognitive processes underlying victim self and identity: Evidence with college-aged adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517741625

Sakaguchi, K., & Hasegawa, T. (2006). Person perception through gait information and target choice for sexual advances: Comparison of likely targets in experiments and real life. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *30*, 63–85.

Saunders, D. G. (1994). Posttraumatic stress symptom profiles of battered women: A comparison of survivors in two settings. *Violence and Victims*, *9*, 31–44.

Stryker, S. (1968). Identity salience and role performance: The importance of symbolic interaction theory for family research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *30*, 558–564.

Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version.* Benjamin-Cummings Publishing Company.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter group behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Nelson Hall.

Truman, J. L., & Morgan, R. E. (2016). *Criminal victimization, 2015*. U.S. Department of Justice.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory.* Basil Blackwell.

Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A., & McGarty, C. (1994). Self and collective: Cognition and social context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *20*, 454–463.

van der Kolk, B. A. (1986). *Psychological trauma.* American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc.

van Der Kolk, B. A., & Saporta, J. (1991). The biological response to psychic trauma: Mechanisms and treatment of intrusion and numbing. *Anxiety research*, *4*, 199–212.

Wheeler, S., Book, A., & Costello, K. (2009). Psychopathic traits and perceptions of victim vulnerability. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *36*, 635–648.

Whiston, S. K. (1981). Counseling sexual assault victims: A loss model. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *59*, 363–366.

Author Biographies

Nicole M. Sachs, PhD, is an assistant professor of criminal justice at Fairleigh Dickinson University—Metropolitan Campus. She earned her PhD in criminal justice from Rutgers University, Newark. Her research examines victims and criminals at the intersection of criminal justice and social psychology. Specifically, she focuses on implicit and explicit identification with the social group victim and victim stereotypes, the relation between professional sports and domestic violence, media and violence, and prisoner reentry. Her work has implications for revictimization, desistance, and policy. In addition to her academic work, she serves as a Board Member and Registered Agent to the L.I.N. D.A. Organization, whereby she bridges her research interests with community outreach.

Bonita M. Veysey, PhD, is a professor in the School of Criminal Justice at Rutgers University-Newark. Her research to date has focused largely on behavioral health and justice systems interactions, including continuity of care and reentry and correctional behavioral health treatment in jails and prisons. She is particularly interested in recovery and desistance issues. More recently, she has developed projects to investigate (a) how individuals with stigmatized statuses overcome their pasts, (b) the nature of offender reform through the collection of oral histories of formerly incarcerated persons, and (c) how implicit social cognition can be applied to persons with criminal and victim experiences.

Luis M. Rivera is an associate professor of psychology and the principal investigator of the Rutgers Implicit Social Cognition Lab at Rutgers University, Newark. He earned his PhD in experimental social psychology from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. His research focuses on the implicit social cognitive processes that underlie the expression of intergroup attitudes and how these processes shape the self-concept, identity, and health of individuals from stigmatized groups. Specifically, his work examines the conditions under which implicit stereotypes and prejudice are expressed and their relation to discrimination; the role of biases in health and education; and implicit criminal self and identity processes, which call into question the role of intention in criminality. His scholarship, funded by the *National Institutes of Health* and the *National Science Foundation*, has clear implications for health disparities, education, law, policy, and social justice in general.