

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DIVISION OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

ASSAULT IN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES: EVALUATING THE GENDER,
SEXUAL ORIENTATION, AND ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE INITIATOR

LAUREN MARIE COUGHLIN
Spring 2012

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degree
in Applied Psychology
with honors in Applied Psychology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Dr. Brenda Russell
Associate Professor of Psychology
Thesis Supervisor

Dr. Sandy Feinstein
Associate Professor of English
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

Individuals perceive domestic assaults differently based upon a number of variables. The purpose of this research is to analyze how perpetrator and victim gender and sexual orientation affects attributes of responsibility, guilt, and sentencing. I also investigated the extent to which a perpetrator's perceived attractiveness and likeability can mediate these attributions of guilt and responsibility. There were 266 college students who participated in a research study that manipulated perpetrator and victim gender and sexual orientation. Results found that attributes of perpetrator guilt, responsibility, and sentencing were significantly higher when the victim was a female. When likeability of the perpetrator was controlled, there were significant effects suggesting that likeability affected attributions of guilt and responsibility. Lastly, consistent with gender norms, participants were more likely to arrest a male perpetrator when the victim was female and would actually arrest a male victim when the perpetrator was female. This demonstrates the ingrained belief that females are perceived as victims and not perpetrators of assault.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Methods	13
Procedure	17
Results	18
Discussion	22
References	26
Tables	
Table 1.....	31
Table 2.....	32
Table 3.....	33
Table 4.....	34
Table 5.....	35
Table 6.....	36
Appendices	
Appendix A.....	37
Appendix B.....	39
Appendix C.....	41
Appendix D.....	43
Appendix E.....	44
Appendix F.....	46
Appendix G.....	48
Appendix H.....	52

Appendix I.....	53
Appendix J.....	55
Appendix K.....	57
Appendix L.....	58
Appendix M.....	59
Appendix N.....	60

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank those who made this thesis possible. First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Brenda Russell, for without her willingness to share her knowledge and expertise, not only in dealing with the topic of my thesis, but also the research process as a whole, this thesis would not have been possible. I could not have asked for a more helpful and reliable supervisor, who patiently answered my persistent questions, and reviewed draft after draft. I have learned a great deal from her over the past few months, and for that I am forever grateful. Next I would like to thank Dr. Sandy Feinstein for making my transition to Penn State Berks so successful, as well as devoting her time and energy into reading and reviewing each of my drafts. I thank my wonderful mother and sisters for supporting me throughout all my educational and life endeavors. I am also especially grateful for my daughter's immense patience with me as I completed my education.

Introduction

Public displays of domestic violence often occur in society; however, some incidents may go unnoticed or overlooked by the public as a “disagreement.” Perhaps people are so embarrassed by seeing others in a domestic dispute that they tend to “look the other way,” or perhaps there is a measurable reason as to why individuals do not feel as though it is necessary to intervene. In order to fully understand a bystander’s thinking processes, it is important to comprehend different aspects of domestic abuse itself.

Domestic Abuse

Although not a commonly held belief, research has found that domestic abuse is perpetrated equally by both men and women. This discovery occurred in the 1970’s by Straus and his colleagues. Straus’s studies revolved around heterosexual couples and found that women physically assaulted their partners as often as men (Steinmetz, 1978; Straus et. al., 1980; Straus, 1997). These studies showed that in 25.9 percent of domestic violence incidents, men were considered the perpetrators, and in 25.5 percent of domestic violence incidents women were considered the perpetrators. While men can inflict greater physical harm than women (Archer, 2000), men and women were found equally violent in 48.6 percent of domestic disputes (Straus, 2005).

An array of research supports Straus’s findings that women commit acts of domestic violence just as much as men do, however society tends to overlook these findings due to cultural norms and social stigma (Adams & Freeman, 2002; Ferguson & Negy, 2004; Gelles, 1999; Straus, 1993; Straus, 1994; Straus, 2005; Straus, Kaufman, Kantor, & Moore, 1997). In America, for example, it is culturally acceptable for a spouse to hit his or her partner, depending

on the given situation (i.e. unfaithfulness in the relationship) (Ptacek, 1988). Also, society is more willing to find violence committed by a female to be more acceptable than violence committed by a male (Feather, 1996; Ferguson & Negy, 2004; George, 1994; Straus et. al., 1997). According to the National Violence Against Women (NVAW) Survey by Tjaden & Thoennes (2000), an estimated 1.5 million women and 834,732 men are raped and/or physically assaulted by an intimate partner annually in the United States. According to Tjaden & Thoennes' (2000) findings, the number of actual victimizations is even higher due to the amounts of revictimization by the same intimate partner. Their results found that women were physically assaulted by an intimate partner in the previous 12 months an average of 3.4 times, and men were physically assaulted by an intimate partner in the same interval of time an average of 3.5 times.

The majority of the research on domestic abuse analyzes heterosexual relationships. However, recent research suggests that there is an equal or even greater amount of domestic abuse experienced by homosexual couples. According Tjaden & Thoennes (2000), 39.2 percent of women in same sex relationships reported being raped, physically assaulted, and/or stalked by a marital/cohabitating partner at some point in their lifetime, compared to 21.7 percent of women in a heterosexual relationship. In addition, they found 23.1 percent of men in same sex relationships reported being raped, physically assaulted, and/or stalked by a marital/cohabitating partner at some point in their lifetime, compared to 7.4 percent of men in heterosexual relationships.

One of the main reasons why there has been little data collected on the domestic abuse of homosexual couples, other than the previous study mentioned by Tjaden & Thoennes (2000), is due to the fact that a majority of the abuse is not reported to the criminal justice system for this

population. Homosexual victims of domestic violence may be less forthcoming about abuse due to a fear of not being protected under the laws, as well as the fear of an unreceptive response due to homophobia (Dalton & Schneider, 2011). According to Dalton and Schneider (2001), society sees gay and lesbian couples to be equally matched when it comes to physical build and strength, therefore it treats domestic violence between them differently than it would treat a heterosexual relationship.

Russell, Ragatz and Kraus (2009; 2010) conducted research that found that in self-defense cases and crimes of passion, heterosexual female defendants were rated significantly less guilty than heterosexual male defendants and homosexual defendants. Their research has also found that there is a difference among heterosexual male and female defendants and homosexuals when guilt was rated (Russell, et. al., 2009).

Blame, Guilt, and Sentencing

Blame and guilt are the two most critical items decided in a legal case. It is therefore important to analyze if individuals hold preconceptions about blame and guilt, whether it be intentional or unintentional. Russell, Ragatz and Kraus (2009) found that there is a difference among heterosexual men and women and homosexual men when guilt was rated in a self-defense case. They found that there were higher ratings of guilt attributed to heterosexual males and homosexual females, while heterosexual females and homosexual males had lower rates of guilt (Russell, et. al., 2009). This lowered guilt rating for heterosexual females and homosexual males could be explained by the societal view that women are typically seen as the victim, therefore women are more justified in their actions than heterosexual men (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009).

Although blame and guilt are entities in and of themselves, they are made up of different measureable elements. The Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines blame as, "to find fault with; censure; to hold responsible; to place responsibility for" (*Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary*, 2003, p. 130). The Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines guilt as, "the fact of having committed a breach of conduct especially violating law and involving a penalty; the state of one who has committed an offense especially consciously; feelings of culpability especially for imagined offenses or from a sense of inadequacy; a feeling of culpability for offenses" (*Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary*, 2003, p. 555). The current study utilized these definitions of blame and guilt. The perpetrator blame is measured by the extent to which the perpetrator is considered responsible for the assault and the perpetrator guilt is measured by the extent to which the perpetrator should be charged with assault.

Once blame and guilt are determined in a legal case, the next step in seeking justice is to decide on the severity of sentencing for the guilty perpetrator. The criminal justice system is set up so that the severity of the sentence is supposed to be equal to the severity of the crime. Since jury members may disagree on how severe they believe the crime to be, general guidelines from previous cases are typically used when determining the sentence as a statute. Not only will this thesis evaluate the distribution of guilt, blame and sentencing between male and female predators, but it will also assess theoretical correlates such as a bystander's willingness to intervene in a domestic violence situation, perceived attractiveness and likeability of the perpetrator, and belief in a just world.

Bystander's Willingness to Intervene

Latane and Darley (1970) created a decision making model that they based on reinforcement theory (cited by Ungar, 2000, p. 25). This model evaluates how effective a bystander is at identifying that someone else is in distress and acting to attempt to alleviate the victim's distress due to empathetic feelings held by the bystander (Ungar, 2000). Latane and Darley (1970), "postulated that for intervention to occur, the bystander needs to (1) notice a critical situation, (2) construe the situation as an emergency, (3) develop a feeling of personal responsibility, (4) believe that he or she has the skills necessary to succeed, and (5) reach a conscious decision to help" (Fischer et. al. 2011, p. 518). Latane and Darley (1970) also state that bystanders who decided not to help the distressed individual experience a feeling of guilt as a "punishment" for not helping (Ungar, 2000). Research has shown that the sex of the victim has an impact on the bystander's decision to help. Howard and Crano (1974) found that female victims are significantly more likely to be helped in a distressed state than male victims (Laner, Benin, & Ventrone, 2001). Also, Latane and Nida's (1981) research found that there was no sex differences in the occurrence of the effect. The bystander effect is present in both sexes of participants and victims and individuals of all ages. Very young children were the only population unsusceptible to the effect (Fisher et al., 2011; Latane & Dabbs, 1975; Staub, 1970). Howard and Crano (1974) believe that an individual's perception of deservingness of the victim is theoretically important as well.

The bystander effect has become a highly researched topic due to unfortunate news stories depicting individuals in public situations where help is vital; however, their chances of receiving help become reduced (Darley & Latane, 1968; Latane & Darley, 1968, 1970; Latane & Nida, 1981; Fisher et al., 2011). Fisher et al. (2011) defines the bystander effect as "the

phenomenon that an individual's likelihood of helping decreases when passive bystanders are present in a critical situation" (p. 517). When a critical situation arises in a place with a large group of people, the delegation of duties and responsibilities of the individuals in the group are often neglected. Each individual feels as though someone else will step up and take responsibility and typically no one responds to the victim's aid. The case of Kitty Genovese in 1964, in particular, made the public aware of the unwillingness of others to provide help during an emergency (Latane & Darley 1968).

Fisher et al. (2011) conducted a meta-analysis in which they anticipated that the bystander effect would decrease when dealing with dangerous emergencies rather than non-dangerous emergencies. They found evidence supporting their hypothesis, in that the effect is reduced when the situation is considered a dangerous emergency. They also found that the effect is reduced when the perpetrator is present and when the bystander perceives that intervening would be a physical risk to them (Laner, Benin, & Ventrone, 2001).

Attractiveness and Likeability

For the purpose of this study, attractiveness is considered to be an aspect of an individual's physical appearance that is considered pleasing or gratifying to an observer. Individual's perception of attractiveness is very precise and sometimes limited to specific "looks" or even limited to certain ethnic or racial backgrounds. Due to these personal specifications based on attractiveness, individuals have the ability pass judgments on others by simply glancing at them.

Likeability is similar to attractiveness in that there is a personal connection needing to be made in order for likeability to occur. If someone is attracted to someone else, likeability is

expected to follow. For the purpose of the current study, likeability is the overall feeling felt about an individual based upon a set description. As I stated above, likeability and attractiveness go hand in hand when it comes to making face value judgments about other people.

Since attractiveness and likeability are two attributes that create a sense of personal bias when interacting with other individuals, it is important to be aware of these potential biases and how they may affect legal cases. It would seem as though perpetrators who are rated highly attractive and likeable by potential witnesses or jurors would have a lowered desire for conviction by them. Therefore, it is extremely likely that perpetrators, who are rated higher in attractiveness and likeability, would receive a lower rating in attributions of blame and guilt.

Numerous research studies have been conducted evaluating the effects of physical attractiveness and jury decisions in court cases. The results concluded from these studies were mixed. The type of crime that the individual was being charged with seemed to have a great effect on the outcome of the study. Efran (1974) conducted a simulation jury trial and found that when the defendant was physically attractive, jurors were more indecisive when it came to conforming to a guilty verdict and were more lenient on their sentencing as opposed to unattractive individuals. However, Stephen and Tully (1977) found that in certain situations physical attractiveness could end up hurting the defendants. If the jury believes that the defendant used their physical attractiveness to either commit the crime or to attempt to get away with the crime, the defendant will be held more accountable for their crimes. Although a lot of research has been conducted examining physical attractiveness and the establishment of guilt, there has been very little research relating it to domestic violence assault cases.

Just World Scale

In the past, research had suggested that individuals needed to believe that they lived in a just world, a world where “good” people received reward and “bad” people received punishment (Callan, Powell, & Ellard, 2007). This belief that we live in a world where people get what they deserve is in a way beneficial to society. If people believe that if they will be rewarded if they obey the law, treat others with respect, and live a humble life filled with good clean fun, in theory, the world would be a better place. In fact, if no one believed in this theory, legal systems and governments would not be able to maintain themselves. If everyone felt that they could get away with committing crimes and that nothing bad would come from it, chances are crime rates would skyrocket. A human’s main focus in life is to survive. In order to survive humans need food, water, and shelter. If people can figure out a way to receive all of those things without needing to work for it and without facing a negative consequence because of it, chances are they will jump at the opportunity. Since the world operates in a very strict economic manner, most of its inhabitants conform to its laws, therefore, reinforcing the belief that if they are “good” they will live a rewarding life.

Distinguishing characteristics that define a person as “good” or “bad” would most likely be based upon an individual’s personal moral values and an overall obedience to societal norms and laws. Since there is most likely a personal hierarchical standard for evaluating the goodness of people, there is no specific concrete measure for goodness. Differences in individual’s lives such as age, religion, sex, socioeconomic status (SES), religion (faith), career, prior life experiences, and direct experience with injustice may have an effect on his or her belief in a just world (Kohlberg, 1963; Lerner & Elkinton, 1970; Mirels & Garrett, 1971; Rubin & Peplau, 1973). Dion and Dion (1987) found evidence to support that even indirect experience with

injustice has a strong effect on an individual's belief in a just world. They stated that when people become aware of an innocent victim, they also become aware that the same thing could happen to them, thus, involuntarily personalizing an indirect experience with injustice, which creates similar feelings to a direct experience. There is evidence to support the idea that in order to preserve a belief in a just world, individuals sometimes disparage the victim in an attempt to validate the victim's suffering as indeed deserved (Dion & Dion, 1987). An example of this would be if a teenager got into a car accident and lost his or her life. Since it does not seem right for people to die at such a young age, sometimes people who read stories like this in the newspaper begin to come up with reasons as to why the teenager crashed the car. They may come up with a rationale that the teen was under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time of the car crash, or perhaps he or she was driving over the speed limit, or maybe even because he or she was texting their friends while they were driving. People do not want to know that the teen had in fact been wearing his or her seat belt, was not under the influence, was driving in accordance with the posted speed limit, and was on the way home from work. Situations like this one tend to make people feel uneasy and question whether the world is just.

In fact, research supports the idea that when an individual sees injustice occur, he or she has a tendency of necessitating retribution for the victim (Rubin & Peplau, 1975). A pilot study conducted by Izzett (1974) found that a participant with high just world beliefs produced more severe verdicts to a criminal defendant in a negligent homicide case than participants with low just world beliefs. For example, if the reason why the teenager crashed his or her car in the example depicted above, was simply due to a haphazard repair by an auto-mechanic, that auto-mechanic would not have a leg to stand on in court. It would take a criminal defense attorney a matter of minutes to garner a guilty verdict for negligent homicide.

In 1957, Rubin and Peplau developed a way to measure an individual's belief in a just world. They developed a 20-item instrument they called The Just World Scale. Lerner's (1980) just world theory suggests that it is necessary for people to believe that they live in a world where people get what they deserve. Dion and Dion (1987) propose that an individual's need for a belief in a just world might lead him or her to quantify the quality of beauty when determining who is considered deserving (Callan, Powell, & Ellard, 2007). As stated previously, research confirming that attractiveness influences the outcomes of verdicts and sentencing in court cases is very prevalent (Burke et. al., 1990; Kulka & Kessler; Piehl, 1977). Seligman et al. (1974) discovered that individuals possessing attributes that made them physically attractive were held more accountable for good outcomes than bad outcomes in a situation, whereas individuals possessing attributes that made them physically unattractive were held more accountable for bad outcomes in a given situation.

Current Study

The current study was based off of a larger study on perceptions of assault conducted by Russell and Kraus. The study sought to examine the extent to which gendered characteristics of the initiator of the assault, gender of the victim, and the perpetrator gender, are associated with perceptions of blame and guilt of domestic assault. This study also examines the extent to which perceptions of blame and guilt of the perpetrator vary as a function of defendant gender and sexual orientation. Based on previous research by Russell and colleagues, it is possible that ratings of guilt and blame will be lowest for female heterosexual defendants who initiate an assault against a male, while male heterosexual defendants who initiate an assault toward a female should most likely be rated highest in guilt and blame. However, it is also possible that women who initiate an assault may be perceived as going against the traditional gender roles and

therefore may be judged more harshly than a male defendant. Results with regard to homosexuals are exploratory in nature. This study will also examine the extent to which perceived attractiveness of the defendant plays a role in decisions of guilt and blame. By statistically controlling for perceived attractiveness of the defendant, it can be determined whether blame and guilt are affected. For instance, if attractiveness and likeability play a role in blame and guilt, then if I statistically control for these variables the strength of the relationship of blame and guilt among male and female and same-sex individuals in a case of assault should be affected.

Research suggests that men are found more blameworthy. Similarly, it is hypothesized that ratings of guilt and blame may be affected by belief of a just world. A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation will also assess the relationship between guilt and Just World Theory. I hypothesize that there will be a positive correlation between guilt and Just World Theory. In addition, just world attitudes may actually mediate ratings of guilt and blame. Results are examined using a 2 (perpetrator gender) X 2 (sexual orientation: homosexual or heterosexual couple) between subjects factorial ANOVA using blame and guilt as dependent variables. I hypothesize that guilt and blame will be positively correlated to the severity of sentencing. The more guilty and blameworthy the perpetrator is found by the participants, the greater the severity of sentencing should be placed on the perpetrator.

The current study will assess a bystander's willingness to intervene in a domestic violence situation as well. I hypothesize that attractiveness and likeability should be negatively correlated or reduce ratings of guilt, meaning the more attractive or likeable the participant finds the perpetrator, the less likely he or she will place blame and punishment on the perpetrator for his or her actions. I believe that there will be a perpetrator main effect wherein males (despite

sexual orientation) will be more blameworthy (guilty) than females. I hypothesize that the effects that attractiveness and likeability of the individual will play the largest role in homosexual relationships. Since homosexual couples are both the same sex and presumed to be on the same level when classifying strength, research by Dalton and Schneider (2001) suggests that they should be categorized differently for that reason. Therefore, how attractive the individual is, is expected to play a role in the decision-making of the participant in the position of the bystander in the hypothetical situation.

Methods

Participants. Participants included 266 college students recruited from an introductory psychology class from an Eastern university. There were 114 males (42.9%) and 149 females (56%) and three respondents did not indicate their gender (1.1%). The age of participants ranged from 18 to 33 with a mean age of 18.86 ($SD = 1.5$). The majority of the sample identified their race as White/Caucasian (73.7%) followed by Latino/Hispanic (8.6%), Black/African American (7.1%), other (5.3%), Asian American (3.8%), and 1.5% did not indicate their race. The majority of respondents were single (85.3%), followed by partnered (9.8%), cohabitating (1.5%), married (1.1%), and divorced (.4%). Five participants (1.9%) did not indicate their marital status. Most students reported completing high school (93.6%), and (2.6%) completed a bachelor degree. The remaining participants completed some high school, completed an advanced degree or did not indicate their level of education. The sexual orientation of the sample was as follows: heterosexual (93.2%), bisexual (3.4%), lesbian (1.1%), uncertain (1.1%), did not indicate sexual orientation (.8%) and gay (.4%). Almost 13% of the participants admitted to being the victim of domestic abuse.

Materials

Case Description and Independent Variables. Participants were instructed to imagine that they were a witness to a domestic abuse scenario and were asked how they would respond to the scenario based upon their knowledge of the incident (*see Appendix A*). Participants were then asked a series of questions pertaining to the unambiguous perpetrator in the scenario: The degree to which the perpetrator should be charged with assault was measured on a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 = not at all and 7 = definitely. The degree to which the perpetrator should be sentenced

was measured on a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 = minimum, and 7 = maximum. The perpetrator's level of responsibility for the assault was measured on a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 = not at all responsible, and 7 = completely responsible. The degree to which the participant would intervene was rated on a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 = not at all willing, and 7 = very willing.

Attractiveness was rated on a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 = not at all attractive, and 7 = very attractive. Likeability was measured on a Likert scale, where 1 = not at all likeable, and 7 = very likeable. (*see Appendix B*). Next, participants were asked the same series of questions pertaining to the unambiguous victim in the scenario, measured on a 7-point Likert scale, with the same anchors indicating the minimum and maximum values as they did in the series of questions pertaining to the perpetrator (*see Appendix C*).

Participants were randomly assigned to read one of eight domestic abuse scenarios depicting couples who are intending to become married (heterosexual couples) or joined in a civil union (homosexual couples). The independent variables included the perpetrator gender, victim gender and participant gender. The gender of the perpetrator and the gender of the victim were manipulated based upon the sexual orientation of the couples depicted in the scenarios and by the names assigned to the perpetrator and the victim in each case. The eight domestic abuse scenarios include: Condition 1: homosexual male with masculine features (*see Appendix K*), Condition 2: homosexual male with feminine features (*see Appendix L*), Condition 3: heterosexual male with masculine features (*see Appendix K*), Condition 4: heterosexual male with feminine features (*see Appendix L*), Condition 5: heterosexual female with masculine features (*see Appendix N*), Condition 6: heterosexual female with feminine features (*see Appendix M*), Condition 7: homosexual female with masculine features (*see Appendix N*), and Condition 8: homosexual female with feminine features (*see Appendix M*).

Dependent Variables and Co-variates. Our dependent variables include the extent to which the perpetrator should be sentenced, perpetrator guilt (which was measured by the extent to which the perpetrator should be charged with assault), and the extent to which the perpetrator was considered responsible for the assault. The degree to which the perpetrator should be charged with assault was measured on a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 = not at all and 7 = definitely. The degree to which the perpetrator should be sentenced was measured on a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 = minimum, and 7 = maximum. The perpetrator's level of responsibility for the assault was measured on a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 = not at all responsible, and 7 = completely responsible. Our co-variates, which will have an effect on the dependent variable include, perpetrator attractiveness, perpetrator likeability, and a participant's willingness to intervene, and a participant's belief in a just world. Perpetrator attractiveness was measured on a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 = not at all attractive, and 7 = very attractive. Perpetrator likeability was measured on a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 = not at all likeable, and 7 = very likeable. A participant's willingness to intervene was measured on a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 = not at all willing, and 7 = very willing. A participant's belief in a just world was measured by analyzing their scores on the just world scale. If these co-variates are used to control for those effects, differences in the dependent variables of blame, responsibility, and sentencing might be explained.

The Just World Scale. The Just World Scale is a 20-item instrument used for the measurement of an individual's belief in a just world created in 1975 by Rubin and Peplau. Participants are asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement of 11 "just" (e.g., "It is rare for an innocent man to be wrongly sent to jail.") and 9 "unjust" (e.g., "It is a common occurrence for a guilty person to get off free in American courts.") statements on a 5-point Likert

scale (0 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree). Before data analysis, the 9 unjust items must be recoded (#1, #4, #5, #8, #10, #13, #16, #17, and #20). High scores mean that the participant has a greater belief in a just world, whereas low scores mean that the participant has a lesser belief in a just world. Although the reliability in the current study was too low for further analysis ($\alpha = .50$), previous research was successful in attaining high reliability in their sample. Studies conducted at both Boston University and Oklahoma State University, for example, attained high reliability when assessed in the Just World Theory, with ($\alpha = .80$) in the Boston, and ($\alpha = .81$) in the Oklahoma sample (Rubin & Peplau, 1975).

Demographic Questionnaire. A demographic questionnaire was completed by the participants at the end of the survey. Participants were asked to indicate their age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, level of education, occupation, sexual orientation, weight, height, and experience with domestic abuse (*See Appendix J*).

Manipulation Check Question. A manipulation check question was added at the end of the study to assess the sexual orientation of the couple involved in the dispute. Three participants (2 males and 1 female) answered this question incorrectly and were subsequently removed from analyses.

Procedure

All measures were in counterbalanced order and experimental conditions were randomized upon administering the survey. Students were provided with a verbal description of the study and then if they assented to participate they were provided with informed consent forms. Upon completion of informed consent, participants were provided with one of eight experimental conditions that were randomized and counterbalanced.

Each of the eight scenarios are the same with the exception of the sexual orientation of the couple, the career that the perpetrator possessed, 2 identifying characteristic traits of the perpetrator, and the photograph of the perpetrator. The difference in career choice and photograph of the perpetrator was intended to reflect masculine or feminine characteristics associated with that individual. These differences in masculinity and femininity are based upon the specific social norms and gender roles commonly found in the United States. However, for the purpose of this study masculinity and femininity were not explored. It should be noted that different levels of masculinity and femininity most likely play a role in the perception of attractiveness. There were a total of 2 career choices used in the scenarios, these included: a local carpenter (masculine) and a local school teacher (feminine). There were a total of 4 identifying characteristic traits used to describe the perpetrator, these included: Strong and powerful (masculine traits) and tender and compassionate (feminine traits). There were a total of 4 photographs, 2 male (1 masculine and 1 feminine) and 2 female (1 masculine and 1 feminine), used to visually represent the perpetrator. Each scenario used 1 of the 4 photographs in alignment with the appropriate level of masculinity/femininity and career choice of the perpetrator. The victim was purposefully not described or visually represented in the scenarios in order to leave an aspect of the couple's relationship to the discretion of the participants taking the survey.

Results

We initially created the just world scale, however the reliability was low ($\alpha = 0.50$), therefore the scale could not be used in subsequent analyses. A series of Pearson Product Moment Correlations were conducted to assess whether there were any significant correlations between any of the variables. Person Product Moment Correlations were conducted between charging the perpetrator with assault, sentencing the perpetrator, the perpetrator's level of responsibility for the assault, the degree to which the participant would intervene, and the degree to which the participants rated the perpetrator on levels of attractiveness and likeability. Correlations generally ranged from low ($r = .00$) to moderate ($r = -.14$). Some variables were highly correlated (i.e. charged and sentenced were correlated at $r = .42$) and likeability and attractiveness were correlated the highest at ($r = .59$)) (*see Table 1*).

In order to test whether being charged with aggravated assault varied as a function of perpetrator gender and victim gender, we conducted a 2 (perpetrator gender) X 2 (victim gender) X 2 (participant gender) ANOVA using the extent to which the perpetrator should be charged with assault as the dependent variable. Results found a main effect for victim gender, $F(1, 252) = 9.36, p = .002$, indicating that ratings of being charged with assault were significantly higher when the victim was a female ($M = 6.09, SD = 1.12$) compared to when the victim was a male ($M = 5.63, SD = 1.27$). These findings were supported regardless of the gender of the perpetrator, and there were no participant gender effects across the board. While a *Perpetrator Gender by Victim Gender Interaction* approached significance, $F(1, 252) = 3.64, p = .057$, means did not differ significantly. There were no significant main effects or interactions for participant gender.

We then examined the extent to which attractiveness and likeability of the perpetrator would affect willingness to charge the perpetrator. A 2 (perpetrator gender) X 2 (victim gender) X 2 (participant gender) ANCOVA was used to assess covariates of perpetrator attractiveness and likeability. While attractiveness of the perpetrator was not a significant covariate, $F(1, 252) = .030, p = .862$, likeability of the perpetrator was a significant covariate, $F(1, 252) = 6.14, p = .01$. When likeability of the perpetrator was statistically controlled, results showed a significant *Perpetrator Gender by Victim Gender Interaction*, $F(1, 252) = 4.89, p = .02$. Mean scores showed males who assault a female victim were significantly more likely to be charged with assault compared to all other conditions (*see Table 2*). This means that when likeability of the perpetrator was statistically controlled for, the interaction became significant, whereas before we controlled for likeability there was no significance. This shows that likeability contributed to these findings.

We then tested the perception of the extent to which the perpetrator is considered responsible for the assault. A 2 (perpetrator gender) X 2 (victim gender) X 2 (participant gender) ANOVA using the extent to which the perpetrator was responsible for the assault as the dependent variable. Results found a main effect for victim gender, $F(1, 252) = 3.96, p = .04$, indicating that again, if the victim was a female, the perpetrator was more likely to be found responsible for the assault ($M = 5.50, SD = 1.26$) compared to male victims ($M = 5.18, SD = 1.30$). These findings were supported regardless of the gender of the perpetrator. In addition, a *Perpetrator Gender by Participant Gender Interaction* was significant, $F(1, 252) = 5.04, p = .02$. An analysis of the mean scores showed that male participants rated male perpetrators significantly lower in responsibility ($M = 5.07, SD = 1.29$) than female perpetrators ($M = 5.46, SD = 1.06$) compared to female participants (*see Table 3*).

A 2 (perpetrator gender) X 2 (victim gender) X 2 (participant gender) ANCOVA was then conducted to assess the influence of perpetrator attractiveness and likeability. Results revealed likeability was the only significant covariate, $F(1, 252) = 5.51, p = .02$. Controlling for likeability of the perpetrator we found that the main effect for victim of assault is no longer significant, $F(1, 252) = 3.76, p = .053$, suggesting that likeability of the perpetrator plays a role on the amount of responsibility attributed to the perpetrator. The *Perpetrator Gender by Participant Gender Interaction* remained significant, $F(1, 252) = 5.58, p = .02$. Therefore, if a male perpetrator is liked, the chivalrous effect of finding males more responsible for the assault when they hit a woman dissipates.

A 2 (perpetrator gender) X 2 (victim gender) X 2 (participant gender) ANOVA was then conducted to investigate how participants would sentence the perpetrator. Results found a significant victim gender main effect, $F(1, 258) = 7.33, p = .007$. Mean scores showed if the victim was a female sentences were significantly higher ($M = 4.61, SD = 1.61$) compared to if the victim was a male ($M = 4.06, SD = 1.71$) regardless of the perpetrator gender. There was a significant *Perpetrator Gender by Victim Gender Interaction*, $F(1, 258) = 17.78, p = .000$, indicating males who assaulted a female received the most harsh sentences ($M = 5.04, SD = 1.31$) while males who assaulted males received the least harsh sentences ($M = 3.63, SD = 1.64$) (see Table 4). Lastly, a *Perpetrator Gender by Participant Gender* approached significance, $F(1, 258) = 3.33, p = .07$.

An ANOVA was conducted to assess willingness to intervene. Results found a participant gender main effect, $F(1, 252) = 14.66, p = .000$. Mean scores for participant gender showed that male participants were significantly more likely to intervene ($M = 4.84, SD = 1.76$) compared to female participants ($M = 3.91, SD = 2.10$). In addition, there was a significant

Perpetrator Gender by Victim Gender Interaction, $F(1, 252) = 10.71, p = .001$. Respondents who witness a male assaulting a female are significantly most likely to intervene ($M = 5.04, SD = 2.07$) compared to males who assault males and females who assault females. Interestingly, respondents who witness females hitting a male are also likely to intervene in the situation (*see Table 5*).

After reading the domestic abuse scenario, the participants were instructed to consider what they would do as a bystander. They were asked the question: “If you believe the police should make an arrest, who should they arrest?” and were given the option of choosing the perpetrator, the victim, both the perpetrator and the victim, or neither (I would let them cool off and walk away) (*See Appendix A*). There was a very interesting gender difference in terms of making an arrest. A total of 34 (53.1%) participants would arrest a male perpetrator if the victim was male. This is consistent with the view that some people feel as though the couple was evenly matched in strength and build, no further repercussions are necessary, whereas others saw this as a serious issue. A total of 58 (81.7%) participants would arrest a male perpetrator if the victim was female. These findings are consistent with stereotypical gender norms, with the female victim being the damsel in distress. A total of 41 (64.1%) participants would arrest a female perpetrator if the victim was female. This once again is similar to the case of a male perpetrator against a male victim; however, it seems that people feel more sympathy for the female victim in this case than the male, perhaps because females are typically seen as victims more often. The most interesting result found about the participant’s decision to arrest was that a total of 39 (62.9%) participants would arrest a male victim if the perpetrator is female. This shows how strongly the perception that females are seen as victims is ingrained in individuals (*see Table 6*).

Discussion

Participants in this study rated the degree to which the perpetrator should be charged significantly higher when the victim was female as opposed to when the victim was male. The findings also found that participants rated the degree to which the perpetrator should be held responsible to be significantly higher when the victim was female as opposed to when the victim was male as well. These findings supported previous hypotheses. Results also found that likeability of the perpetrator plays a role on the amount of responsibility attributed to the perpetrator. The higher the perpetrator was rated on a likeability scale, the lower he or she was rated on a responsibility scale as hypothesized. Also, participants sentenced the perpetrator significantly higher if the victim was female, compared to if the victim was male in all cases regardless of sexual orientation. However, males who assaulted a female received the harshest sentences.

Consistent with previous research about domestic abuse in heterosexual couples, this study supported the finding that males who assault a female victim were significantly more likely to be charged with assault compared to all other conditions. Russell, Ragatz and Kraus (2009) evaluated the relationships between heterosexual men and women, and homosexual men when guilt was rated in a self-defense case. They found that heterosexual men were found more guilty than women or heterosexual men. In alignment with my hypothesis that the more guilty the perpetrator is found, the more likely that he or she will be charged with a crime, heterosexual men were found more likely to be charged with assault.

The study found no significant differences in whether the perpetrator should be charged with assault between males who assaulted males, females who assaulted males, and females who

assaulted females. These findings assessing who should be charged with assault mimicked typical social norms for the United States, except perhaps in the case of females who assaulted males. It was expected that participants may associate females who assaulted males as a rise against typical social norms and charged those females more harshly than the same sex pairs. Since this was not the case, participants must have been in agreement with Blashill & Powlishta's (2009) theory stated previously, that women are typically seen as the victim, therefore they feel more justification in their actions than heterosexual men do. This theory became apparent in the current study when the participants were asked to make a decision about whether an arrest should be made. The results found that 81.7% of participants would arrest a male perpetrator if the victim was female, and 62.9% of participants would arrest a male victim if the perpetrator is female. This shows that no matter who the actual aggressor is in a domestic dispute between a male and a female, the female is typically looked at as the victim even when she is not. I think that this may have to do with the potential for her to become a victim at some point in the dispute due to a female's physical build strength. The idea that physically the playing field is uneven, and men are given the upper hand due to their potential to harm, lead bystanders to perceive that the female is in danger. It would be interesting to conduct further research on the perception of female aggressors.

This study also found that male participants were significantly more likely to intervene in the domestic abuse scenario than female participants. It should be mentioned that the height, weight, and build of the participants were not taken into consideration for this study, which may have had an impact on their willingness to intervene.

It was interesting to find a low reliability in the just world scale. Since previous research by Rubin and Pepelau (1975) found high reliability in this scale, it would have been thought that

the reliability would remain high for the current study. Perhaps this scale has become outdated and is no longer relevant in today's society. Some factors that may account for individuals in today's society to no longer believe in a just world might include recent natural disasters such as the tsunami in Japan in 2004 and hurricane Katrina in 2005, as well as the threat of terrorism that plagued our nation after the 9/11 attack in 2001. Catastrophic events like these make it clear to individuals that there is injustice present in the world, which would severely lower their beliefs in a just world. It would be interesting to conduct further research on this topic in order to decipher if disasters such as the ones stated earlier have had an impact on individuals overall belief in a just world. There are many other limitations of this study that may have impacted the overall results as well.

Limitations. This study encompassed many limitations that may have affected the overall results and outcome. One limitation was the diversity of the participant pool. The surveys were only administered to college students recruited from an introductory psychology class from an Eastern university. There was not a large variety in the sample. The majority of the sample consisted of Caucasian, heterosexual participants in their early 20's who were mostly single. A larger percentage of these participants were female. The limitation of the diversity of the participant pool may have had an effect on the perception of the perpetrator. Another limitation was the fact that all of the couples mentioned in the study were Caucasian. This limitation may have had an effect on the participant's level of attraction to the perpetrator. Another limitation is that we did not include a picture of the victim for the participants to evaluate. This limitation may have had an effect on the way that the participants viewed the relationship. Lastly, another limitation was the Just World Scale Reliability. Since the reliability of the Just World Scale was low, it was not able to be used in subsequent analyses. Despite these limitations, the results

found in this study were valuable for recognizing areas for further needed analysis on this subject. In order to address the shortcomings of this research, a larger and more diverse sample should be used in further studies. It would also be interesting to see what differences would be found in the results if race was to be brought into the equation. This would be interesting when evaluating attractiveness and willingness to intervene most importantly. Would participants be more willing to intervene in a domestic abuse scenario involving a couple of their same race rather than a couple of a different race? Would there be a gender effect following these differences? Does race matter when it comes to the severity of domestic abuse and how dangerous the situations become (i.e. the use of lethal weapons as opposed to body and physical strength)? Does the socioeconomic status (SES) of the couple and the participant have an influence on a participant's willingness to intervene? All of these questions could be areas for needed further analysis in order to further evaluate individual's perceptions of domestic abuse in the hopes to increase other people's willingness to help in a domestic dispute regardless of age, attractiveness, race, or gender to create a safer society.

References

- Adams, S. R., & Freeman, D. R. (2002). Women who are violent: Attitudes and beliefs of professionals working in the field of domestic violence. *Military Medicine*, 167(6), 445-450.
- Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(5), 651-680.
- Blashill, A. J., & Powlishta, K. K. (2009). The impact of sexual orientation and gender role on evaluations of men. *The Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10(2), 160-173.
- Burke, D. M., Ames, M. A., Etherington, R., & Pietsch, J. (1990). Effects of victim's and defendant's physical attractiveness on the perception of responsibility in an ambiguous domestic violence case. *Journal of Family Violence*, 5, 199-207.
- Callan, M. J., Powell, N. G., & Ellard, J. H. (2007). The consequence of victim physical attractiveness on reactions to injustice: The role of observers' belief in a just world. *Social Justice Research*, 20, 433-456.
- Darley, J. M., & Latane, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8(4), 377-383.

Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is Beautiful is Good. *Journal Personality and Social Psychology*, 24, 285-290.

Dion, K. L., & Dion, K. K. (1987). Belief in a just world and physical attractiveness stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 775-780.

Feather, N. T. (1996). Domestic violence, gender and perceptions of justice. *Sex Roles*, 35(7-8), 507-519.

Ferguson, C. J., & Negy, C. (2004). The influence of gender and ethnicity on judgments of culpability in a domestic violence scenario. *Violence and Victims*, 19(2), 203-220.

Fisher, P., Krueger, J. I., Greitemeyer, T., Vogrincic, C., Kastenmiller, A., Frey, D., Heene, M., Wicher, M., & Kainbacher, M. (2011). The bystander-effect: A meta-analytic review on bystander intervention in dangerous and non-dangerous emergencies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137(4), 517-537.

Hafer, C. L. (2000). Do innocent victims threaten the belief in a just world? Evidence from a modified Stroop task. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 165-173.

Howard, W., & Crano, W. D. (1974). Effects of sex, conversation, location, and size of observer group on bystander intervention in a high risk situation. *Sociometry*, 37(4), 491-507.

Izzett, R. Personal communication, 1974.

- Kulka, R. A., & Kessler, J. B. (1978). Is justice really blind? The influences of litigant physical attractiveness on juridical judgment. *The Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 8(4), 366-381.
- Laner, M. R., Benin, M. H., & Ventrone, N. A. (2001). Bystander attitudes toward victim of violence: who's worth helping? *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 22, 23-42.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10(3), 215-221.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1975). Sex, group size and helping in three cities. *Sociometry*, 38(2), 180-194.
- Latane, B., & Nida, S. (1981). Ten years of research on group size and helping. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89(2), 308-324.
- Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary* (11th ed.). (2003). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Mirels, H. L., & Garrett, J. B. (1971). The protestant ethic as a personality variable. *The Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 36(1), 40-44.

- Ragatz, L. L., & Russell, B. (2010). Sex, sexual orientation, and sexism: What influences do these have on verdicts in a crime-of-passion case? *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 150(4), 341-360.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. A. (1975). Who believes in a just world? *Journal of Social Issues*, 31(3), 65-89.
- Russell, B., Ragatz, L. L., & Kraus, S. (2009). Does ambivalent sexism influence verdicts for heterosexual and homosexual defendants in a self-defense case? *The Journal of Family Violence*, 24, 145-157.
- Seelau, E. P., Seelau, S. M., & Poorman, P. B. (2003). Gender and role-based perceptions of domestic abuse: does sexual orientation matter? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 21, 199-214.
- Staub, E. (1970). A child in distress: The influence of age and number of witnesses on children's attempts to help. *The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 14(2), 130-140.
- Straus, M. (1993). Identifying offenders in criminal justice research on domestic assault. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 36(5), 587-601.

Straus, M., & Kantor, G. K. (1994). Corporal punishment of adolescents by parents: A risk factor in the epidemiology of depression, suicide, alcohol, child abuse, and wife beating.

Adolescents, 29(115), 543-561.

Straus, M. (2006). Future research on gender symmetry in physical abuse assaults on partners.

Violence Against Women, 12(11), 1086-1097.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Intimate Partner

Violence. *The National Institute of Justice*, 1-57.

Ungar, S. (1979). The effects of effort and stigma on helping. *Journal of Social Psychology*,

107(1), 23-28.

Table 1*Correlation Table of Dependent Variables and Covariates*

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Charged	5.88	1.21	---	.42**	.32**	.13*	-.18**	-.14*
2. Sentenced	4.36	1.71		---	.34**	.17**	-.09	.00
3. Responsible	5.35	1.30			---	.13*	-.16**	-.09
4. Intervene	4.33	2.01				---	.08	.07
5. Likable	3.95	1.61					---	.59**
6. Attractive	3.16	1.82						---

*Note: ** $p < .001$* ** $p < .05$*

Table 2

Interaction Means for Gender of the Perpetrator X Victim Gender: Rating for Willingness to Charge the Perpetrator with Assault with Likeability and Attractiveness as a Covariate

Perpetrator Gender	Victim Gender	Mean	SD	95% CI
Male	Male	5.53	1.28	[5.2, 5.8]
	Female	6.32	1.02	[6.0, 6.6]
Female	Male	5.73	1.28	[5.4, 6.0]
	Female	5.86	1.20	[5.5, 6.1]

Note: $F(1, 252) = 4.89, p < .05$

Table 3

Interaction Means for Gender of the Perpetrator X Participant Gender: Rating for the Extent to Which the Perpetrator is Responsible for the Assault

Perpetrator Gender	Victim Gender	Mean	SD	95% CI
Male	Male	5.07	1.29	[4.7, 5.3]
	Female	5.58	1.30	[5.3, 5.9]
Female	Male	5.46	1.06	[4.9, 5.6]
	Female	5.25	1.39	[5.0, 5.7]

Note: $F(1, 252) = 5.04, p < .05$

Table 4

Interaction Means for Gender of the Perpetrator X Victim Gender: Rating for Harshness of Sentencing the Perpetrator

Perpetrator Gender	Victim Gender	Mean	SD	95% CI
Male	Male	3.63	1.64	[3.3, 4.1]
	Female	5.04	1.31	[4.7, 5.4]
Female	Male	4.48	1.69	[3.9, 4.7]
	Female	4.17	1.79	[3.7, 4.5]

Note: $F(1, 258) = 17.78, p < .001$

Table 5

Interaction Means for Gender of the Perpetrator X Victim Gender: Rating for Willingness to Intervene in a Domestic Abuse Scenario

Perpetrator Gender	Victim Gender	Mean	SD	95% CI
Male	Male	3.90	2.06	[3.3, 4.2]
	Female	5.04	2.07	[4.5, 5.4]
Female	Male	4.50	2.00	[4.0, 5.0]
	Female	4.04	1.74	[3.5, 4.5]

Note: $F(1, 252) = 10.71, p = .001$

Table 6

Chi Square table evaluating the question: If you believe the police should make an arrest, who should they arrest?

Perpetrator Gender	Victim Gender	The Perpetrator n (%)	The Victim n (%)	Both the Perpetrator and the Victim n (%)	Neither n (%)
Male	Male	34 (53.1%)	3 (4.7%)	22 (34%)	5 (7.8%)
	Female	58 (81.7%)	-----	12 (16.9%)	1 (1.4%)
Female	Male	2 (3.2%)	39 (62.9%)	17 (27.4%)	4 (6.5%)
	Female	41 (64.1%)	-----	20 (31.3%)	3 (4.7%)

Appendix A

Below, you will find a summary of a domestic assault you witnessed in your neighborhood. Please carefully read over the scenario and imagine that you are really a witness to this event. Remember, you will be asked to answer questions about this event later. Here is a picture of David who is involved in the dispute.

Your neighbors, David and Henry, have lived next door to you for almost three years. You are not close friends; instead, you know them as acquaintances. *Over the years, you have come to realize that David and Henry are homosexual (gay). In fact, you heard they intend to be married in a civil union in the next few months. You know that David works as a local carpenter in town, and is very handy around the house. You believe that David is strong and powerful. For example, he once helped you cut down a large tree in your yard.* Over the years, you have never known David and Henry to have problems and, to your knowledge, the police have never been called to their house for domestic disputes.

On the day of the incident, you were outside doing yard work when you noticed that your neighbors were having a fight. This appeared odd to you since you have never seen them fight in public. Although you did not see any signs of physical fighting, you heard yelling from their driveway. Even though your driveway is only about a 100 yards away from your neighbor's driveway, their heated words are so loud you could hear them while working in your yard (e.g., you heard them yell out profane words to each other).

You also noticed that David's partner Henry was screaming at David who was standing at the front doorway as he walked past him toward his car yelling, "Let me go!" *At this point, you see David run toward Henry with what appeared to be a knife in his hand. David then threatened Henry by saying he was going to kill him. Meanwhile, Henry turned around and tried to talk to David as he backed closer toward his car. Despite his effort to calm David down, the yelling between them continued. However, Henry was able to get into the car and locked the doors. You then saw David say something to Henry through the car window and then stick the knife into the front driver's side tire. At this point, Henry began screaming at David to leave him alone. You then saw Henry get out of the car. As Henry stepped out of the car, David slapped him across the face. At that moment, they engaged in a physical fight with one another. At one point, David pulled the knife out of the car tire and held it up toward Henry. Henry then pushed David away and tried to get the knife away from David. As they wrestled for the knife, you noticed that Henry had blood on his hands and shirt.*

Based on your knowledge of the incident, please circle how YOU would respond to the altercation. (Please choose only one):

- I would try to talk to the couple
- I would call the police
- I would call a domestic violence hotline
- I would do nothing

Based on your knowledge of the incident, please place a check mark on the category that best reflects how you think **THE POLICE** should respond to this altercation (Please choose only one).

- They should just try to talk to the couple
- They should issue a citation
- They should make an arrest

If you believe the police should make an arrest, who should they arrest?

- David only
- Henry only
- Both David and Henry
- Neither David or Henry (I would let them cool off and walk away)

Appendix B

Please think about David and answer the questions below.

1. Please rate the extent to which you believe David should be charged with assault?
Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Definitely

2. Please rate the extent to which you believe David is guilty of assault?
Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Definitely

3. If you believe David is guilty of assault, please rate the extent to which he should be sentenced:
Minimum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Maximum

4. Rate how serious you believe this fight (assault) to be.
Not at all serious 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely serious

5. Please rate the degree to which you believe that David initiated (started) the fight (assault).
Do not believe 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believe completely

6. Please rate the degree to which you believe David threatened bodily harm against Henry.
Do not believe 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believe completely

7. To what extent do you believe David experienced fear of bodily injury?
Do not believe 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believe completely

8. Rate the extent to which you believe David is mentally unstable.
Do not believe 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believe completely

9. To what extent do you believe that David is to blame for the incident?

Not at all blameworthy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely blameworthy

10. How reasonable do you think David reacted in this situation?

Not at all reasonable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely reasonable

11. To what extent do you believe David's actions were justified in this assault?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely justified

12. How likely do you think it is that David was previously physically abused by Henry?

Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely likely

13. To what extent do you believe David was responsible for this assault?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely responsible

14. Please rate how masculine or feminine you believe David to be.

Very feminine 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very masculine

15. How willing would you be to intervene and try to stop this situation?

Not at all willing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very willing

16. Please rate how attractive you believe David to be.

Not at all attractive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very attractive

17. Please rate the extent that you feel as though David is a likeable person?

Not at all likeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very likeable

Appendix C

Please think about Henry (David's Partner) and answer the questions below:

1. Please rate the extent to which you believe Henry should be charged with assault?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Definitely

2. Please rate the extent to which you believe Henry is guilty of assault?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Definitely

3. If you believe Henry is guilty of assault, please rate the extent to which he should be sentenced:

Minimum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Maximum

4. Please rate the degree to which you believe that Henry initiated (started) the fight (assault).

Do not believe 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believe completely

5. Please rate the degree to which you believe Henry threatened bodily harm against David.

Do not believe 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believe completely

6. To what extent do you believe Henry experienced fear of bodily injury?

Do not believe 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believe completely

7. Rate the extent to which you believe Henry is mentally unstable.

Do not believe 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believe completely

8. To what extent do you believe that Henry is to blame for the incident?

Not at all blameworthy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely

Blameworthy

Appendix D

16. Based on what you read, who do you believe started the fight (assault)?

_____ David
_____ Henry
_____ Can't tell

17. Based on what you read, who do you believe is primarily responsible for the fight (assault)?

_____ David
_____ Henry
_____ Can't tell

18. What was the sexual orientation of the couple in the scenario you just read? (circle one):

Heterosexual (straight)

Homosexual (gay)

19. In the scenario that you read do you believe David is:

_____ masculine _____ feminine _____ can't tell

Appendix E

Instructions: Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible.

Think about David. Indicate the degree to which each trait describes David. Use the following scale:

	A	B	C	D	E	
	not at all					very much
1.	Not at all aggressive		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very aggressive
2.	Not at all independent		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very independent
3.	Not at all emotional		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very emotional
4.	Very submissive		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very dominant
5.	Not at all excitable in a major crisis		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very excitable in a major crisis
6.	Very passive		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very active
7.	Not at all able to devote self completely to others		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Able to devote self completely to others
8.	Very rough		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very gentle
9.	Not at all helpful to others		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very helpful to others
10.	Not at all competitive		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very competitive
11.	Very home oriented		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very worldly
12.	Not at all kind		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very kind
13.	Indifferent to others' approval		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Highly needful of others' approval
14.	Feelings not easily hurt		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Feelings easily hurt
15.	Not at all aware of feelings of others		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Very aware of feelings of others
16.	Can make decisions easily		A.....B.....C.....D.....E			Has difficulty making decisions

- | | | |
|--|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 17. Gives up very easily | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Never gives up easily |
| 18. Never cries | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Cries very easily |
| 19. Not at all self-confident | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very self-confident |
| 20. Feels very inferior | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Feels very superior |
| 21. Not at all understanding of others | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very understanding of others |
| 22. Very cold in relations with others | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very warm in relations with others |
| 23. Very little need for security | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very strong need for security |
| 24. Goes to pieces under pressure | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Stands up well under pressure |

Appendix F

Instructions: The following survey contains various statements about attitudes concerning the relationships between men and women. Please read each statement carefully and indicate in the space on the left of the item, the extent to which you agree with the statement. Please note, however, that some of the statements may not completely apply to you. In such cases, please try to imagine what your response would be if it DID apply to you, and answer accordingly. Please use the following scale to make your responses:

1-Strongly disagree 2-Disagree 3-Slightly disagree 4-Slightly agree 5-Agree 6-Strongly agree

1. ___ I think it's gross and unfair for a man to use alcohol and drugs to convince a woman to have sex with him.
2. ___ Physical violence never solves an issue.
3. ___ Most women need a man in their lives.
4. ___ I like to see a relationship in which the men and women have equal power.
5. ___ Using alcohol or drugs to convince someone to have sex is wrong.
6. ___ Gays sicken me because they are not real men.
7. ___ Sex should never be used as a bargaining tool.
8. ___ A real man fights to win.
9. ___ Real men look for fast cars and fast women.
10. ___ A true man knows how to command others.
11. ___ When a man spends a lot of money on a date, he should expect to get sex for it.
12. ___ The only thing a lesbian needs is a good, stiff, cock.
13. ___ I like relationships in which both partners are equals.
14. ___ Sometimes it doesn't matter what you do to get sex.
15. ___ Women should show off their bodies.
16. ___ Men should be ready to take any risk, if the payoff is large enough.
17. ___ A woman can be complete with or without a partner
18. ___ No wife is obliged to provide sex for anybody, even her husband.
19. ___ Most women use their sexuality to get men to do what they want.
20. ___ Most women play hard to get.
21. ___ Women should break dates with female friends when guys ask them out.
22. ___ Lesbians have chosen a particular life style and should be respected for it.
23. ___ Men have to expect that most women will be something of a prick tease.
24. ___ A real man can get any woman to have sex with him.
25. ___ Women should be flattered when men whistle at them.
26. ___ It is important that my partner and I are equally satisfied with our relationship.
27. ___ Some gay men are good people, and some are not, but it has nothing to do with their sexual orientation.
28. ___ Women instinctively try to manipulate men.

29. ___ Most women will lie to get something they want.
30. ___ Men shouldn't measure their self-worth by their sexual conquests.
31. ___ Get a woman drunk, high, or hot and she'll let you do whatever you want.
32. ___ Men should be in charge during sex.
33. ___ If you've not prepared to fight for what's yours, then be prepared to lose it.
34. ___ It's okay for a man to be forceful to get sex.
35. ___ Women don't mind a little force in sex sometimes because they know it means they must be attractive.
36. ___ Homosexuals can be just as good at parenting as heterosexuals.
37. ___ Any man who is a man can do without sex.
38. ___ Gays and lesbians are generally just like everybody else.
39. ___ Pick-ups should expect to put out.
40. ___ Some women are good for only one thing.
41. ___ Women often dress provocatively to get men to do them favors.
42. ___ If men pay for a date, they deserve something in return.
43. ___ It's natural for men to get into fights.
44. ___ Effeminate men deserve to be ridiculed.
45. ___ All women, even feminists, are worthy of respect.
46. ___ If a woman goes out to a bar for some drinks, she's looking for a real good time.
47. ___ I do what I have to do to get sex.
48. ___ Any man who is a man needs to have sex regularly.
49. ___ Masculinity is not determined by sexual success.
50. ___ Homosexuality is probably the result of a mental imbalance.
51. ___ Nobody should be in charge in a romantic relationship.
52. ___ Real men look for danger and face it head on.
53. ___ A gay man is an affront to real men.
54. ___ He who can, fights; he who can't, runs away.
55. ___ Gay men often have masculine traits.
56. ___ Women sometimes say "no" but really mean "yes".
57. ___ I believe some women lead happy lives without having male partners.

Appendix G

Instructions: The following questions ask you about your perceptions regarding alternative lifestyles. Please circle the answer that best corresponds to your attitude.

1. Gay people make me nervous.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

2. Gay people deserve what they get.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

3. Homosexuality is acceptable to me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

4. If I discovered a friend was gay, I would end the friendship.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

5. I think homosexual people should not work with children.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

6. I make derogatory remarks about gay people.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

7. I enjoy the company of gay people.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

8. Marriage between homosexual individuals is acceptable.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

9. I make derogatory remarks like “faggot” or “queer” to people I suspect are gay.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

10. It does not matter to me whether my friends are gay or straight.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

11. It would not upset me if I learned that a close friend was homosexual.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

12. Homosexuality is immoral.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

13. I tease and make jokes about gay people.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

14. I feel that you cannot trust a person who is homosexual.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

15. I fear homosexual persons will make sexual advances towards me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

16. Organizations which promote gay rights are necessary.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

17. I have damaged property of gay persons, such as "keying" their cars.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

18. I would feel comfortable having a gay roommate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

19. I would hit a homosexual for coming on to me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

20. Homosexual behavior should not be against the law.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

21. I avoid gay individuals.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

22. It does not bother me to see two homosexual people together in public.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

23. When I see a gay person I think "What a waste."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

24. When I meet someone I try to find out if he/she is gay.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

25. I have rocky relationships with people that I suspect are gay.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly						strongly
disagree						agree

Appendix H

Instructions: PLEASE BE EXTREMELY HONEST AND THINK ABOUT YOURSELF VERY CAREFULLY WHEN RESPONDING TO EACH STATEMENT!

There are no right or wrong answers. The questions may appear repetitive, but it is necessary that the questionnaires are constructed in this way. Please be very patient and thoughtful in answering each one.

This questionnaire asks you about your general beliefs people have about sexual behavior with another person (e.g., kissing, petting, oral sex, intercourse, etc.). For the following questions, use the scale below to indicate how much you agree with each statement.

Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very much agree
agree			somewhat agree					

1. During sex, one person is typically “in charge” of the other.
2. Sex is about one person submitting to the will of another.
3. Sex is about one person persuading another to do something they are reluctant to do.
4. During sex, one person should feel a little vulnerable and the other should feel in control.
5. During sex, one person should be dominant and the other should be submissive.
6. Sex means that one person is in control of the relationship.
7. Sex means that one person is in control of the other person’s body.
8. In sex, to penetrate someone is to give up power.
9. Having sex means gaining possession of someone else’s body.
10. Having sex means giving up possession of my body to someone else.

Appendix I

Instructions: Indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements in the blank space next to each item. Respond to every statement and use the following code:

5 = strongly agree

4 = moderately agree

3 = slightly agree

2 = slightly disagree

1 = moderately disagree

0 = strongly disagree

- _____ 1. I've found that a person rarely deserves the reputation he has.
- _____ 2. Basically, the world is a just place.
- _____ 3. People who get "lucky breaks" have usually earned their good fortune.
- _____ 4. Careful drivers are just as likely to get hurt in traffic accidents as careless ones.
- _____ 5. It is a common occurrence for a guilty person to get off free in American courts.
- _____ 6. Students almost always deserve the grades they receive in school.
- _____ 7. Men who keep in shape have little chance of suffering a heart attack.
- _____ 8. The political candidate who sticks up for his principles rarely gets elected.
- _____ 9. It is rare for an innocent man to be wrongly sent to jail.
- _____ 10. In professional sports, many fouls and infractions never get called by the referee.
- _____ 11. By and large, people deserve what they get.
- _____ 12. When parents punish their children, it is almost always for good reasons.
- _____ 13. Good deeds often go unnoticed and unrewarded.
- _____ 14. Although evil men may hold political power for a while, in the general course of history good wins out.

- _____ 15. In almost any business or profession, people who do their job well rise to the top.
- _____ 16. American parents tend to overlook the things most to be admired in their children.
- _____ 17. It is often impossible for a person to receive a fair trial in the USA.
- _____ 18. People who meet with misfortune have often brought it on themselves.
- _____ 19. Crime doesn't pay.
- _____ 20. Many people suffer through absolutely no fault of their own.

Appendix K



Appendix L



Appendix M



Appendix N



ACADEMIC VITA

Lauren M. Coughlin

Lauren M. Coughlin
1057 Front Street
Hellertown, PA 18055
lmc5235@psu.edu

EDUCATION

Bachelor of Science Degree in Applied Psychology, Penn State University, Spring 2012
Honors in Applied Psychology

- ❖ Thesis Title: “Assault in Domestic Violence Cases: Evaluating the Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Attractiveness of the Initiator”
- ❖ Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Brenda Russell

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Managing Aggressive Behaviors (MAB)
Confidentiality/ Professional Boundaries
Suicide Prevention Training
The Proper Handling of Portable Fire Extinguishers During Live Burning Training
Mandated Reporting/ Child Abuse/ CPS Laws
Suicidal/ Homicidal Risk Assessment and Management

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Research Internship at Pennsylvania State Berks Campus (300 hours)

- ❖ Coding videotape interaction between children for specific behaviors, writing abstracts for research articles, and editing research articles
- ❖ Supervisor: Dr. Eric Lindsey
- ❖ Fall 2011

AWARDS & HONORS

Young Investigator Award 2012
Chancellor Award
Donald E. Allen Memorial Scholarship
Dean’s List

PRESENTATIONS/ACTIVITIES

Penn State Berks Psi Chi Chapter member 2011

Penn State Lehigh Valley Psi Chi Chapter Vice President 2011

Participant in the Undergraduate Research and Scholarship Symposium 2009

Orchard Press Newspaper-- writer/ photographer: September 2008- 2009

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Valley Youth House Shelter- Child Care Worker Bethlehem, PA

- ❖ Anticipate children's needs while assisting them in their daily lives by teaching them life skills
- ❖ Answering crisis calls, accepting referrals, conducting intakes and discharges of clients
- ❖ Supervisor: Lorrie Reddy
- ❖ 2011- Present

Reading Specialists Safe Guards Foster Care (150 hours), Bethlehem, PA

- ❖ Interacting with clients through facilitating and observing group therapy and art therapy
- ❖ Supervisor: Jennifer Monji
- ❖ 2012-Present

Waffle House- Sales person (waitress)/ Grill Operator Hellertown, PA

- ❖ Provide excellent customer service through use of multitasking abilities
- ❖ Take on managerial responsibilities such as changing and validating the drawer when needed
- ❖ Supervisor: Ercon Yildiran
- ❖ 2005-Present

CVS Pharmacy- Pharmacy Technician Allentown, PA

- ❖ Provide medical assistance to pharmacists while interacting with customers.
- ❖ Assisting with a multitude of tasks from filling a prescription to dealing with insurance issues
- ❖ 2008-2009