

8-27-2013

The Impact of Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Victim Injury Severity on Perceptions of Intimate Partner Violence

Jennifer L. Gaskins

University of Connecticut - Storrs, gaskinsjen@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/dissertations>

Recommended Citation

Gaskins, Jennifer L., "The Impact of Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Victim Injury Severity on Perceptions of Intimate Partner Violence" (2013). *Doctoral Dissertations*. Paper 204.

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Connecticut Graduate School at DigitalCommons@UConn. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UConn. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@uconn.edu.

The Impact of Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Victim Injury Severity on
Perceptions of Intimate Partner Violence

Jennifer Lynette Gaskins

University of Connecticut, 2013

The current research investigated the impact of perceiver attitudes (i.e., homonegativity, traditional gender-roles, and same-sex violence misconceptions) and victim injury on perceptions of intimate partner violence (IPV). Due to gender-role stereotypes about different injury capabilities for men and women, it has been proposed that such stereotypes alone are substantial enough to explain why prototypical IPV (i.e., male-on-female) is perceived as more serious than non-prototypical IPV (i.e., male-on-male, female-on-female, and male-on-male). Study 1 found that prototypical IPV was perceived as significantly more serious than non-prototypical IPV, with the female-on-male incident rated as the least serious among all incidents. These results are consistent with gender-role stereotypes and physical sex differences which hold that males are more capable of injuring victims than females, while females are more likely to be injured than males. However, this study also found that perceiver attitudes influenced evaluations of seriousness for all instances of non-prototypical IPV in unique ways. In addition, individuals appeared to create a gendered framework for victims (i.e., feminine) and perpetrators (i.e.,

masculine) of IPV regardless of sex. Relatedly, study 2 found a non-significant difference in evaluations of seriousness between an incident of prototypical and non-prototypical IPV (i.e., female-on-female) when the degree of victim injury was controlled. Taken together, these findings suggest that gender-role stereotypes, perceiver attitudes, and degree of injury all influence evaluations of seriousness for both prototypical and non-prototypical IPV.

The Impact of Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Victim Injury Severity on
Perceptions of Intimate Partner Violence

Jennifer L. Gaskins

B.A., Montclair State University, 2006

M.A., University of Connecticut, 2010

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the

University of Connecticut

2013

Copyright by
Jennifer Lynette Gaskins

2013

iv

APPROVAL PAGE

Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation

The Impact of Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Victim Injury Severity on Perceptions
of Domestic Violence Seriousness and Blame Attributions

Presented by

Jennifer L. Gaskins, M.A.

Major Advisor _____
Michelle Williams, PhD

Associate Advisor _____
Stephanie Milan, PhD

Associate Advisor _____
Vicki Magley, PhD

University of Connecticut

2013

Acknowledgements

I owe a great deal of gratitude to the many people who have made this dissertation and my journey through graduate school possible.

First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Michelle K. Williams. I was amazingly fortunate for the opportunity to continue pursuing my interest in perceptions of non-prototypical IPV under your guidance. You provided me with an excellent atmosphere for doing research and professional growth. Thank you for all your support, encouragement, and patience over the past 6 years.

Special thanks my committee members Dr. Stephanie Milan, Dr. Vicki Magley, Dr. Kimberly Treadwell, and Dr. Amy Gorin for their insightful comments and suggestions on the document. I appreciate the time and effort you each put into your service as committee members. I would also like to thank my research team members, Francisco Quintana, Nicole Oversteet, and Aleyfiah Pishori for their encouragement and care. Matthew Tuscanco, thank you for all the hard work and effort you put into this project as a research assistant.

Many friends have helped me stay sane through these difficult years. Your support helped me overcome setbacks, laugh, and create wonderful grad school memories that I will always cherish. I greatly value your friendship and I deeply appreciate your belief in me. Cheers to Judy Tan, Randi Garcia, Shehreen Latif, Eileen Pipitan, and Laramie Smith!

Most importantly, none of this would have been possible without the love, support, and endless encouragement of my family. To my parents, Linda and Daniel, you have been my “rocks” throughout this entire process. I would also to thank my brothers, Darryl and Jamal, for their endless support. My deepest gratitude is owed to this family, which has been a constant source of both love and strength all these years. This dissertation is dedicated to you.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	ix
INTRODUCTION.....	10
Chapter 1 Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence.....	12
Prevalence and Dynamics.....	12
Perceptions of Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence.....	14
Help-Seeking in Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence.....	18
Chapter 2 Heterosexual Male Victimization.....	20
Prevalence and Dynamics.....	20
Effects of IPV on Male Victims.....	22
Perceptions of Heterosexual Male Victimization.....	24
Chapter 3 Factors Influencing Perceptions of Non-Prototypical IPV.....	25
Participant Gender.....	25
Gender Role Attitudes and Stereotypes.....	26
Same-sex Violence Misconceptions	28
Chapter 4 Overview of the Present Research.....	29
STUDY 1: Purpose and Hypotheses.....	31
Method.....	32
Results.....	39
Discussion.....	51
STUDY 2: Purpose and Hypotheses.....	56
Method.....	57
Results.....	60
Discussion.....	63
GENERAL DISCUSSION	
Summary of Findings and Implications.....	64
Limitations of Present Research.....	67
Future Directions.....	68
REFERENCES.....	71
APPENDIXES.....	98-120

List of Tables

<i>Table 1.</i> Independent samples t-tests of DVs and attitude measures by manipulation check status in Study 1.....	80
<i>Table 2.</i> Correlations among dependent variables in Study 1.....	81
<i>Table 3.</i> Descriptive statistics of attitude measures by sex in Study 1.....	82
<i>Table 4.</i> Correlations among attitude variables in Study 1.....	83
<i>Table 5.</i> Hierarchical regression on seriousness in female-on-female condition.....	84
<i>Table 6.</i> Hierarchical regression on seriousness in male-on-male condition.....	85
<i>Table 7.</i> Hierarchical regression on seriousness in female-on-male condition.....	86
<i>Table 8.</i> Hierarchical regression on seriousness in male-on-female condition.....	87

List of Figures

Figure 1. Mean of seriousness by condition.....	88
Figure 2. Interaction between SSV Misconceptions and ATSM in female same-sex condition.....	89
Figure 3. Interaction between MHS-G and ATSM in male same-sex condition.....	90
Figure 4. Mean attributions of victim blame by condition.....	91
Figure 5. Mean attributions of perpetrator blame by condition.....	92
Figure 6. Mean ratings of victim and perpetrator blame within condition.....	93
Figure 7. Mean ratings of victim and perpetrator femininity by condition.....	94
Figure 8. Mean ratings of victim and perpetrator masculinity by condition.....	95
Figure 9. Mean ratings of seriousness by relationship type and injury severity.....	96
Figure 10. Mean ratings of victim femininity and perpetrator masculinity by injury severity.....	97

INTRODUCTION

Intimate partner violence (IPV) in romantic relationships is a widely recognized social problem. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2002), IPV can be defined as physical, sexual, or psychological harm caused by a current or former partner. The occurrence of IPV is a tremendous public health concern and has many costs to society. Almost 3 in 10 women and 1 in 10 men have experienced rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner (Black et. al., 2011). In 2007, IPV resulted in 2,340 U.S. deaths, with 70% of those individuals being females and 30% being males. Beyond deaths and injuries, IPV is associated with various direct (e.g., bruises, broken bones) and indirect health consequences (e.g., conditions such as asthma, migraines, cardiovascular disease; Black, 2011). Moreover, it is estimated that the combined costs of medical care, mental health services, and lost work productivity from IPV is approximately \$8.3 billion (CDC, 2003; Max et. al., 2004).

Although awareness around IPV has increased, this issue has traditionally been viewed as a heterosexual woman's problem. However, IPV is a significant problem among same-sex couples and heterosexual male victims. Research on IPV indicates that the prevalence rate is similar among heterosexual and same-sex couples (Merrill & Wolfe, 2000; Renzetti 1992; Turell, 2000). Findings also suggest that heterosexual males and females initiate acts of physical violence towards one another at similar rates (Archer, 2000). Despite the frequent occurrence of non-prototypical forms of IPV (i.e., male against female, female against female, female against male, and male against male), studies indicate that such scenarios are often perceived as less serious and deserving of intervention than prototypical IPV (i.e., male-on-female; Brown & Groscup, 2009; Poorman, Seelau, & Seelau, 2003; Seelau & Seelau, 2005). For instance, police are generally less likely to arrest perpetrators, intervene, or enforce restraining

orders in cases that do not involve prototypical male-on-female violence (Connolly, Huzurbazar, & Routh-McGee, 2000).

Additional prevention and intervention barriers also exist for victims of non-prototypical IPV. Domestic violence support groups and shelters are primarily designed for the use of heterosexual women. Male victims of IPV may find it particularly challenging to receive services since most shelters prohibit men.

Unique issues for reporting non-prototypical IPV must also be considered with regard to victim sexuality and gender. For same-sex victims, reporting one's victimization can lead to being "outed" (i.e., disclosure of their sexual orientation) or encountering homonegativity and heterosexism from service providers (e.g., dismissive comments, negative evaluations, and limited services for same-sex victims; National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs [NCAVP], 2000). Heterosexual male victims must also encounter gender-role stereotypes that assert males should be capable of self-defense and maintaining power and control, especially against a female perpetrator. This stereotype can make it difficult for both victims and service providers to view same-sex victims or heterosexual male victims seeking support as "true victims."

Despite the literature demonstrating that scenarios of non-prototypical IPV are perceived as less serious, few studies offer explanations for why these differences exist, whereas for prototypical male-on-female IPV, much is known about the individual factors that influence perceptions of IPV. Furthermore, because the vast majority of studies that focus on non-prototypical instances of IPV have primarily examined perceptions of seriousness and intervention likelihood (Seelau & Seelau, 2005; Poorman et al., 2003; Hamby & Jackson, 2010), there is a limited understanding of how perceiver attitudes (e.g., homonegativity, gender roles) may contribute to these evaluations. In particular, how such attitudes may differentially impact

perceptions among the various forms of non-prototypical (i.e., female same-sex, male same-sex, and female-on-male) has been relatively unexamined.

The goal of the current work is to offer an integrated perspective for examining non-prototypical instances of IPV. Considering the complex factors that intersect with same-sex and female on-male IPV, the present research attempts to investigate how victim injury, traditional gender roles, and attitudes towards gays and lesbians influence perceptions of non-prototypical IPV. This perspective can inform both researchers and practitioners who are interested in improving their understanding of unique dynamics of non-prototypical IPV.

Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence

Prevalence and Dynamics

Important research has highlighted the many similarities between same-sex and heterosexual IPV. The prevalence rates of same-sex IPV, which are estimated to be 25% to 33% of all same-sex relationships, are comparable to the rates found among heterosexual couples (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 2000; Turell, 2000; Waldner-Haugrud et al., 1997). Similar to heterosexual relationships, these prevalence rates often vary and range from 17% to 52% of gay and lesbian relationships (Murray & Mobley, 2009; Ristock, 2002). Research considering whether the prevalence rates for male and female same-sex IPV vary has also been difficult to discern. For instance, Bimbi et al. (2008) found that lesbian women were 1.5 times more likely to report any form of physical violence than gay men. Lesbians were also more likely to report verbal threats, being verbally put down in front of strangers, and having property destroyed or damaged by an intimate partner. In contrast, Hequembourg et al. (2008) found that gay men both perpetrated and reported being victimized more often than lesbians. These findings suggests that there may be gender differences in the prevalence of IPV for gay men and lesbians,

yet more research is needed to distinguish these possibilities. What is agreed upon is that same-sex IPV occurs at a significant rate, which is relatively comparable to the rates of heterosexual IPV.

Another similarity between heterosexual and same-sex IPV is the cycle of violence. Without intervention, the frequency and severity of violence increases over time (Ristock, 2002). The various forms of abuse reported by same-sex and heterosexual couples are also similar. These forms of abuse include physical, sexual, financial, psychological, and emotional abuse (Merrill & Wolfe, 2000). Studies have also found similar abuse dynamics among same-sex and heterosexual IPV. For instance, stress and substance use are both related to increased relationship violence for same-sex couples (Carvalho et al., 2011). These findings indicate that same-sex IPV is comparable to heterosexual IPV in regards to prevalence rates, cycle of violence, abuse dynamics, and types of abuse experienced. Taken together, these findings suggest that same-sex IPV is just as serious and harmful as heterosexual IPV.

Despite the many similarities in the occurrence of IPV for same-sex and heterosexual couples, there are differences in how IPV is experienced and perceived for same-sex couples. A unique consideration of the dynamics of same sex-IPV is the stigmatization of sexual minorities. Sexual stigma can be defined as the “negative regard, inferior status, and relative powerlessness that society accords to anyone associated with non-heterosexual behaviors, identity, relationships, or communities” (Herek, 2007, p.906-907). The sexual stigma around same-sex relationships can create additional stress to relationships. Carvalho et al. (2011) examined the relationship between stigma consciousness (i.e., extent to which members of a stigmatized group expect to be stereotyped or discriminated against by others) and IPV victimization and perpetration among a large LBGT sample. They found that individuals high in stigma

consciousness were significantly more likely to be involved in violent relationships. Given the correlational nature of this study, it was impossible to determine if stigma consciousness leads to relationship violence or if experiencing relationship violence increases concerns about stigma. Although both possibilities exist, this study demonstrated that minority stress and stigma consciousness are associated with partner violence.

Perceptions of Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence

Although research has demonstrated comparable dynamics between both same-sex and prototypical IPV, incidents of same-sex violence are generally perceived as less serious than those of prototypical violence. Studies that have directly examined perceptions of same-sex IPV have typically been evaluated with experimental vignette designs in university samples. Such studies examine participants' responses (e.g., ratings of seriousness, victim/perpetrator blame, victim believability) to scenarios of IPV as a function of sexual orientation or victim/perpetrator sex. Generally speaking, these studies have found that scenarios of same-sex IPV are perceived as less serious and less deserving of intervention than prototypical IPV (Brown & Groscup, 2009; Harris & Cook, 1994; Poorman, Seelau, & Seelau, 2003; Seelau & Seelau, 2005).

Poorman, Seelau, and Seelau (2003) found that instances of same-sex IPV were perceived as less serious than male-on-female violence. Moreover, participants were less likely to recommend that same-sex victims press charges. Same-sex victims were also seen as less believable than the heterosexual female victim, which was correlated with sentencing recommendations for perpetrators.

A pivotal study by Seelau and Seelau (2005) examined perceptions of all four potential instances of IPV (i.e., male against female, female against female, female against male, and male

against male). In this study, participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions where they read about an incident of IPV. Sealau and Seelau (2005) found that prototypical male-on-female violence was evaluated as the most serious and most deserving of active intervention in comparison to non-prototypical cases of IPV. Although the authors did not find significant differences in ratings of seriousness for the three non-prototypical scenarios, the gay male scenario had the lowest seriousness rating. From most to least serious, the mean ratings of seriousness for the dyads were as follows: male-on-female, female-on-female, female-on-male, and male-on-male.

In addition, the authors examined perceptions toward the capacity to injure victims and the seriousness of victim injuries. They found that male perpetrators were seen as more capable of injuring victims than female perpetrators, and that female victims were seen as more likely to be injured than male victims (Sealau & Seelau, 2005). These findings are consistent with more recent research which found that male-on-female violence was seen as more serious than non-prototypical IPV largely due to the physical differences (i.e., size and strength) between men and women (Hamby & Jackson, 2010). Given these findings, it has been argued that victim sex, gender-role stereotypes, and physical differences between men and women play the greatest role in explaining these findings, with males being seen as more powerful and threatening and women being seen as more weak and vulnerable (Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Sealau & Seelau, 2005). Furthermore, these authors argued that differential perceptions of same-sex and heterosexual relationships did not seem to play role in how individuals evaluate domestic violence.

While prior research recognized the importance of gender role stereotypes and physical differences between men and women, there are many unanswered questions from such studies.

With regard to the Seelau and Seelau's (2005) logic for injury potential, one would assume that male perpetrators would be more capable of injuring male victims (male against male IPV) than female perpetrators would be of injuring male victims (female against male IPV); thus, the lowest rating of seriousness should occur for female-against-male scenario which was not the case in their study. In addition, the authors concluded that participant attitudes towards gays and lesbians did not seem to influence their IPV evaluations; however, the authors drew these conclusions without actually measuring such attitudes. Beyond gender roles, researchers and practitioners should be mindful that same-sex IPV exists in a dominant culture that is rooted in heterosexism and stigmatizes sexual minorities (Herek, 2007). Given that gay and lesbian individuals and their relationships are devalued within the larger society, assessing attitudes towards gays and lesbians may be an important factor to explore in understanding perceptions of same-sex IPV. For instance, individuals with more negative attitudes towards gays and lesbians (i.e., homonegativity) may be less concerned about the violence same-sex victims' experience.

Gaskins (2010) examined this hypothesis by including a measure of homonegativity in her examination of seriousness perceptions for incidents of male-on-female and female same-sex violence. As expected, results indicated that the male-on-female violence was perceived as significantly more serious than female same-sex violence. Moreover, there was a significant negative correlation of homonegativity on perceptions of incident seriousness. As homonegativity increased, perceptions of seriousness decreased for the female same-sex scenario (Gaskins, 2010). Although this correlation was small to moderate, the findings do suggest that homonegativity does seem to play a role in how female same-sex partner violence is perceived. However, a notable limitation of Gaskins' (2010) study is the inability to extend these findings to same-sex IPV more broadly due to the lack of a gay male incident. Discerning if homonegativity

differentially impacts perceptions towards female and male same-sex violence is yet to be examined. For instance, one might expect homonegativity to play a stronger role in the gay male incident given findings that negative attitudes towards gay men tends to stronger than those towards lesbians (Herek, 2002).

Beyond university-based samples, studies on perceptions of same-sex IPV have also been extended to service providers. Brown and Groscup (2009) examined perceptions of same-sex IPV among domestic violence crisis center staff. They found a significant main effect for sexual orientation, where both male and female same-sex scenarios were perceived as less serious than male-on-female and female-on-male heterosexual scenarios. Providers rated same-sex violence as less likely to reoccur and less likely to get worse over time than heterosexual IPV. In addition, they believed that it was easier for same-sex victims to leave their partners than heterosexual victims and felt less confident in determining if a same-sex scenario constituted IPV in comparison to a heterosexual scenario. These findings highlight the presence of several misconceptions about same-sex IPV dynamics in comparison to prototypical IPV.

More recently, Bascow and Thompson (2012) examined service providers' responses to scenarios of IPV as a function of abuse type (i.e., physical and emotional) and sexual orientation. In their scenarios, the sex of victim (i.e., female) remained constant and the sex of the perpetrator was varied. Contrary to predictions, sexuality of the victim did not impact variables such as perceiving the situation as domestic violence or willingness to accept the woman as a client (Bascow & Thompson, 2012). Negative attitudes towards lesbians were also not significantly related to any of the findings. However, providers' were significantly less likely to label the woman in a same-sex relationship as a victim, especially in the emotionally abusive scenario. In addition, service providers' willingness to accept a lesbian victim as their client was more

dependent on their degree of comfort in working with her than was their willingness to accept a heterosexual woman. The researchers concluded that service providers appear to need stronger evidence for perceiving a lesbian as a victim of IPV in comparison to a heterosexual woman. While subtle, they argued that this distinction highlights the dominant male as perpetrator and female as victim model (Bascow & Thompson, 2012). As a result, lesbian victims may be treated differently or initially perceived as less believable when seeking treatment.

Such findings hold particularly important implications because they suggest that the belief that same-sex IPV is less serious may not be limited to those who are uninformed about the nature of IPV. Since crisis personnel are often at the frontline of assisting victims of partner violence, these findings that same-sex victims may not be treated the same as heterosexual victims are particularly troubling. Both of these studies also suggest that the amount of evidence needed for perceiving same-sex victims as legitimate victims is higher than that needed for prototypical victims. Taken together, research exploring perceptions of same-sex IPV indicate that the victimization experience is minimized for same-sex victims. Understandably, the possibility of having one's victimization experience minimized can serve as a potential barrier to help-seeking.

Help-Seeking in Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence

Literature on help-seeking indicates that the perceived usefulness of support services plays a large role in same-sex victims' decisions to seek help. There are several studies to suggest that gay men and lesbians perceive more formal sources of support as less helpful. According to Turell (1999), 54% of lesbians, gay men, bisexual, and transgender people have sought support related to abusive relationships. The sources of help most frequently sought and

reported as most helpful include friends, counselors, and relatives (McClennen et. al., 2002; Merrill & Wolfe, 2000; Renzetti, 1996). In contrast, the sources of help least utilized include police, legal services, crisis hotlines, and domestic violence agency and shelter services.

The predominant reason given for why the above services were perceived as less helpful were biased responses from service providers. Victims anticipate encountering heterosexist reactions by service provider (Renzetti, 1996; Turell, 1999). Among lesbians, Balsam (2001) found that over 60% of the lesbians in her sample stayed in their abusive relationship due to a perceived lack of resources. Other studies have also found that lesbian survivors of IPV do not view domestic violence services as truly accessible, open, or accepting of lesbians (Giorgio, 2002; Simpson & Helfrich, 2007). Given the literature review on service providers' perceptions, these expectations of differential treatment, perceptions, or acceptance of their victimization experience is not necessarily inaccurate.

Another recent study by Turrell and Cornell-Swason (2005) examined differences in help-seeking among a LGBT sample (N=760) of individuals who experienced emotional, physical, or sexual abuse. They found significant gender differences in the type of help sought and the perceived usefulness of the help. For instance, lesbians were significantly more likely to seek out mental health professionals and engage in counseling. The researchers argued that this finding was consistent with utilization of mental health services in the general population, where women are more likely to seek counseling than men. However, Merrill and Wolfe (2000) found that gay men are willing to seek out help from more formal sources if such services are perceived to be culturally competent. In their study, battered gay men reported viewing gay men's shelters, counseling, HIV services, and the police as helpful (Merrill & Wolfe, 2000). This finding was attributed to geographic area, where specific and competent services for gay male victims were available. These findings highlight the need for staff training on treating LGBT victims of IPV in

a culturally competent way. Moreover, education around the similarities in prevalence and abuse dynamics between heterosexual and same-sex violence can help to increase awareness about seriousness of same-sex IPV.

Heterosexual Male Victimization

Prevalence and Dynamics

In recent years, there has been much debate about heterosexual male victims of IPV. Activists have made great efforts to increase public awareness about IPV and enact prevention and intervention initiatives to assist victims (e.g., laws, services). These efforts have generally been gendered, with a focused on women as the victims of IPV and men as the perpetrators. Yet, current research suggests equal rates of IPV among both men and women (Archer, 2000; Fiebert & Gonzalez, 1997). Archer (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of 82 studies examining sex differences in the use of physical aggression in intimate relationships. He found that women were slightly more likely than men to report using physical violence in their intimate relationships. However, men inflicted more injury during acts of partner violence than women and 62% of victims injured by partner violence were women.

While this meta-analytic review found that women hit men as much as men hit women, researchers have cautioned consumers of such data to be mindful of the potential differences between male and female acts of partner violence (Gelles, 2000; Kimmel, 2002). Presently, there are two competing perspectives on the role of gender in IPV. The family violence perspective argues that men and women are equally violent in relationships, while the feminist perspective argues that men constitute the majority of perpetrators while women constitute the majority of victims (Milton & Sillito, 2012). A recent study reviewed 815 official reported cases of IPV to examine gender differences among male and female offenders (Milton & Sillito, 2012). They

found that males constituted 87% of offenders, while females accounted for 13%. In addition, males were more likely to have a history of violence and to reappear as offenders in future cases. In contrast, female offenders were more likely to reappear as victims in future cases. The researchers concluded that these findings suggest that males are more likely to be primary offenders while females are more likely to be victims, even if they used violence in this specific reported incident (Milton & Sillito, 2012).

Furthermore, this study found notable gender differences in the response to violence and methods of violence perpetration. Female victims of male offenders were more likely to report being scared than male victims of female offenders. Moreover, while there were numerous similarities in terms of the methods used for violence perpetration (e.g., pushing, hitting, shoving), female offenders were more likely to use weapons (i.e., hit with an object or stab with a knife) than male offenders (Milton & Sillito, 2012). They argued that this could suggest equal seriousness of female and male perpetrated violence. Additionally, it could indicate that females are responding with self-defense or attempts to equalize the physical discrepancy. Considering all of the contextual factors in gender differences of perpetration, the authors concluded that their results support the feminist perspective of the role of gender in the perpetration of IPV (Milton & Sillito, 2012).

The specific impact of victim injury on ratings of seriousness for non-prototypical IPV is another poorly understood factor in the current literature. Previous research is yet to manipulate victim injury when examining seriousness perceptions and intervention likelihood. Thus, vignette studies have described that act of violence but do not indicate the degree or injury sustained (e.g., bloody nose). Although Seelau and Seelau (2005) proposed that the greater potential for males to injure female victims as an explanation for the minimization of non-

prototypical IPV in comparison to male-on-female violence, their study neglected to control for actual victim injury on their outcome variables (e.g., rating of seriousness, likelihood of intervention). For instance, it may be that controlling for the degree of victim injury leads to similar evaluations of seriousness across both prototypical and non-prototypical incidents of IPV. On the other hand, the discrepancy in seriousness between prototypical and non-prototypical instances of IPV may still hold after controlling for victim injury. Controlling for the degree of victim injury would help clarify if victim injury does in fact play a substantial role in explaining the minimization of non-prototypical IPV. We will address this limitation in Study

Effects of IPV on Male Victims

Despite the gender differences in the use of IPV, the fact remains that there are occurrences of men who are battered or victimized by their female partners. When male victims experience IPV, it is important to understand the seriousness of the issue and the difficulty that this demographic faces. In society, identifying oneself as a victim of IPV can be stigmatizing. However, being a victim of IPV may be more stigmatizing for men than women given gender role expectations. Much research has examined the effect of IPV on women, but few studies have looked at the impact of IPV on men. Randle and Graham (2011) conducted a review of several studies examining the psychological effects of IPV on male victims. Their results indicate that men experienced similar psychological symptoms from IPV, including PTSD, depression, and suicidal ideation (Randle & Graham, 2011).

Hines and Douglas (2011) conducted another study that coincides with the findings of from Randle & Graham (2011). They investigated the association of IPV and PTSD symptoms in both community and clinical samples of men. The clinical sample consisted of 302 men who

experienced intimate terrorism (i.e., a form of IPV defined by extreme violence and controlling behaviors) from their female partners and sought help. The community sample consisted of 520 men, with 16% of them reporting common couple violence (i.e., a lower level of more minor, reciprocal violence). Findings indicated that in both samples, IPV was significantly correlated with PTSD symptoms. In addition, men who sustained intimate terrorism were at increased risk for surpassing the clinical cut-off for PTSD in comparison to those in relationships with no physical violence or common couple violence. Results from this study demonstrate that similar to women, men who experience IPV are at-risk for developing PTSD. Moreover, those experiencing intimate terrorism are at a much greater risk than those experiencing common couple violence (Hines & Douglas, 2011).

Arguably, male victims of IPV deserve the same services as female victims but face many additional barriers towards help-seeking. One of the most pertinent barriers male victims face is the discrepancy between their victimization experience and masculinity. Masculinity can be defined as a set of characteristics or qualities seen as appropriate or typical of men (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005). These characteristics are perpetuated and legitimized through both social institutions and social interactions. Hegemonic masculinity tends to be the masculine norm, and represents an idealized set of qualities that legitimizes the dominant position of men and the subordination of women. These characteristics include such things as dominance over women, aggression, power, physical strength, rationality, and self-determination (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

Given these gender stereotypes, men can have an especially difficult time perceiving themselves as victims and reporting their abuse due to fears of appearing less masculine. Studies examining the experiences of heterosexual males reporting IPV have found that male victims

tend to minimize their injuries, present themselves as self-reliant, and fear being perceived as less masculine for disclosing their abuse (Eckstein, 2011; Migliaccio, 2001). Migliaccio (2001) conducted a qualitative study on the narratives of 12 men who had been physically abused by their female partners. The primary reason men gave for not reporting the violence or seeking help was their need to maintain a masculine identity. As a result, the men experienced increased feelings of shame, embarrassment, and anticipated stigma towards their victimization experience. Such findings indicate that gender role violation can be a significant help-seeking barrier for male victims. In addition, it can add substantially more feelings of shame and embarrassment to the victimization experience.

Perceptions of Male Victimization

Similar to same-sex IPV, the consequence for victims who fall outside of the dominant prototype of a male perpetrator and female victim is the perception that such incidents are less serious. Several experimental studies have found that heterosexual male victimization is perceived as less serious and less deserving of intervention than heterosexual female victimization (Poorman, Seelau, & Seelau, 2003; Seelau & Seelau, 2005). Terrance, Plum, and Thomas (2011) investigated the impact of victim gender on perceptions of heterosexual IPV. In general, they found that female victims were given more sympathy than male victims. These findings are interesting because they suggest that not only is male victimization taken less seriously, but that attributions of empathy also differ for male and female heterosexual victims.

Hines, Brown, and Dunning (2007) conducted an integral study on understanding the experiences of male victims of IPV. This study examined the common themes and experiences of 190 men who called the first ever domestic abuse hotline for men. While this study revealed

several similarities to female victims, it also noted several unique differences. Male callers highlighted the lack of appropriate services available for men and how they were often re-victimized with responses of suspicion or disbelief when reporting their abuse (Hines, Brown, & Dunning, 2007). This finding is consistent with a recent Muller, Demarais, and Hamel's (2009) study which found that among a random sample of 150 temporary restraining order requests for intimate partners, judges were almost 13 times more likely to grant the request for a female plaintiff against a male partner than vice versa. Thus, we can see that similar to same-sex IPV, the victimization experience is often minimized for heterosexual male victims.

Potential Factors Influencing Perceptions of Non-Prototypical Intimate Partner Violence

Participant Gender

Previous research indicates that two identified predictors of perceptions and attributions towards victims of IPV are one's sex and level of endorsement of traditional gender-roles. In comparison to their female counterparts, males perceive such incidents as less serious and attribute more blame to female victims. Conversely, compared to males, females attribute more blame to male perpetrators (Bryant & Spencer, 2003). For instance, a study by Nabors, Dietz, and Jasinski (2006) found that males were more likely to endorse myth-based causes of partner violence than women. One potential explanation for why partner violence is perceived as more serious by females may be because of their potential to be victims of IPV. Defensive attribution theory holds that individuals empathize more with others if they perceive themselves to be personally or situationally similar to the victimized other (Shaver, 1985). Because a majority of the IPV literature has focused on a male perpetrator and female victim, women may view partner violence as more serious and empathize more with the victim because they identify more with

him/her. Past research has found that regardless of victim sex, women are more likely to believe the victim, call the police, or recommend that the victim press charges (Poorman et al., 2003).

Gender-Role Attitudes and Stereotypes

Gender-role attitudes or beliefs about appropriate behaviors for men and women can be a key component to understanding perceptions of prototypical and non-prototypical IPV. Gender-roles can range from traditional to egalitarian, with traditional roles holding individuals to strict expectations of behavior based on their sex (e.g., men should be head dominant and women should be nurturing) while egalitarian perspectives do not dictate rigid expectations based on sex (e.g., both men and women can be dominant and nurturing). In general, research has found that individuals who endorse more traditional gender-roles tend to perceive heterosexual IPV as less serious and attribute more blame to the female victim (Berkel, Vandiver, & Bahner, 2004; Willis, Hallinan, Melby, 1996).

The endorsement of traditional gender roles has also been directly associated with the perpetration of IPV. For instance, Brownridge (2002) found that males who held traditional gender role attitudes were more likely to physically assault their female partners than males with more egalitarian attitudes. Perhaps the strongest piece of evidence for this proposed association is a meta-analysis conducted by Stith et al. (2004). These authors reviewed 85 studies and found a moderate effect size between IPV perpetration and traditional attitudes about women's gender roles.

In relation to non-prototypical IPV, it is important to consider the consequence of perceived gender-role violations. Traditional gender role stereotyping has portrayed women as being innately nonviolent, caretaking, and nurturing. In contrast, men are portrayed as being

dominant, assertive, and capable of self-defense (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Inherent in both of these traditional gender roles is the assumption of heterosexuality. These perceptions have significant implications for men and women who behave in ways that are incongruent with traditional gender stereotypical roles, such as male victims, female perpetrators, and individuals in same-sex relationships.

Studies have found that both men and women tend to display more aggression or anger towards their same-sex counterparts who violate traditional gender roles (Parrott, Zeichner, & Hoover, 2006; Reidy, Sloan, & Zeichner, 2009). Moreover, violations of traditional gender-roles have been associated with increased attributions of blame for female victims of IPV and rape (Harrison & Esqueda, 2000). This suggests that the possession of non-stereotypical roles may lead to difficulty in perceiving some victims of IPV as “true victims,” which minimizes the severity of such instances. Moreover, the punishment for these violations can lead to increases in attributions of victim blame.

The influence of role violations provides a relevant context for exploring perceptions of non-prototypical IPV, since both same-sex and female-on-male IPV represent violations of gender conformity. There are several unique impacts such violations can have on perceiver evaluations. One impact is the minimization of non-prototypical violence. For example, a qualitative study examining how gender-role stereotypes influenced lesbians’ experience of IPV found that perceivers’ assumptions of lesbian violence as a simple “catfight” influenced their ability to access appropriate services in the community (Hassoune & Glass, 2008).

Second, perceivers may attribute more blame to victims who violate such gender roles, subsequently attributing less blame to perpetrators. Gaskins (2010) examined attributions of blame among a prototypical (i.e., male-on-female) and non-prototypical (i.e., female-on-female)

incident of IPV. In addition to the non-prototypical incident being perceived as less serious, she also found a lack of clear victim/perpetrator distinction in the same-sex scenario with regard to blame attributions (Gaskins, 2010). Although the perpetrator was blamed significantly more than the victim in the heterosexual condition, there was a non-significant degree of blame attributed to the same-sex victim and perpetrator. In short, both parties were blamed to a similar degree. This finding suggests that perceivers may begin to remove appropriate levels of responsibility and blame to perpetrators when incidents of IPV do not fit the male-on-female prototype.

Finally, a more complex impact gender role violations may have on perceivers is an attempt to reconcile this nonconformity. When evaluating ratings of gender-stereotypical traits (e.g., nurturing, dominant, aggressive, passive) for victims and perpetrators in the prototypical and non-prototypical incidents of IPV, Gaskins (2010) found that the perpetrators (i.e., male and female) in both incidents were seen as significantly more masculine than their victims. This finding highlights the potential application of a gender-based prototype to relationship violence, where perpetrators are viewed as more masculine than victims regardless of sex. The current study will attempt to replicate these findings and extend them other non-prototypical IPV conditions.

Same-Sex IPV Misconceptions

Beyond negative attitudes towards gays and lesbians, researchers have argued that societal misconceptions about same-sex IPV may contribute to the minimization of this issue (Cruz & Firestone, 1998; Merril & Wolfe, 2000; Potoczniak et al., 2003). These misconceptions are thought to be the result of socialized gender roles and heterosexism. Common examples of such misconceptions include notions that same-sex violence is not as serious as heterosexual

violence; battering amongst same-sex couples is a “mutual” or “fair fight,” or it is easier for LGBT victims of domestic violence to leave abusive relationships than heterosexual victims (NCAVP, 2000; Renzetti, 1992; Peterman & Dixon, 2003). A study by Brown & Groscup (2009) did find that individuals perceived leaving an abusive same-sex relationship to be easier than leaving a heterosexual relationship. In addition, individuals were less likely to perceive IPV in same-sex relationships as likely to reoccur in comparison to prototypical IPV. Such findings lend some support to the existence of misconceptions about same-sex IPV.

The misconceptions about same-sex IPV arguably work to delegitimize same-sex victims as “true victims” and continue to perpetuate beliefs that same-sex violence is less serious. Though this has been proposed, there is little empirical evidence to support this argument. Only one study has evaluated the influence of misconceptions about same-sex IPV on perceptions of seriousness for female same-sex violence (Gaskins, 2010). Results indicated that such misconceptions were significantly negatively correlated with perceptions of seriousness. As individuals endorsed these misconceptions to a higher degree, their perceptions of seriousness decreased (Gaskins, 2010). However, a major limitation of this study was the lack of a gay male condition. While it appears that the endorsement of misconceptions about same-sex IPV is associated with the minimization of same-sex violence, the inclusion of a gay male incident would be needed to demonstrate this finding to same-sex IPV more broadly.

The Present Research

The present research applies an integrative perspective to understanding the various factors associated with the minimization of non-prototypical IPV. This perspective will examine the impact of perceiver attitudes, gender-role stereotypes, and victim injury on perceptions of

seriousness and victim/perpetrator attributions of blame. In doing so, this study will contribute to the previous literature on understanding the minimization of IPV in several ways.

First, this research will examine the impact of perceiver attitudes (i.e., homonegativity, traditional gender roles, and misconceptions about same-sex violence) on evaluations of seriousness across all instances of non-prototypical IPV. This will allow for a more broad generalization of study findings. Second, this work uniquely evaluates perceivers' ratings of gender-stereotypical traits for victims and perpetrators across conditions. Thus, one can fully examine if a gender-based prototype seems to be applied to all non-prototypical instances of partner violence. Lastly, no prior studies have actually controlled for the degree of injury a victim has sustained. Gender-role stereotypes and physical sex differences both highlight the difference in the capacity for victim injury based on participant sex. Though this is accurate and logical, manipulating the actual degree of injury a victim sustains allows researchers to explore if such differences in perceptions continue to exist. This would contribute substantially to the current literature by strongly clarifying if discrepancies in evaluations of seriousness are largely due to injury capacity, or if a minimization of non-prototypical IPV continues to exist.

In order to address these important questions, two studies were conducted. Study one will highlight gaps in our current understanding of how perceiver attitudes influence perceptions of seriousness and blame attributions for all non-prototypical instances of IPV. In addition, the application of gender-based prototype for non-prototypical instances of IPV will be explored. After gaining better understanding of these relationships across all four conditions, study two will then evaluate if injury largely explains seriousness evaluations. Beyond simply asking participants how injured they believe the victim to be, this study will manipulate this factor by specifically controlling for injuries sustained by the victim. Thus, we will examine if victim

injury primarily explains differential perceptions of seriousness among prototypical and non-prototypical IPV.

Purpose of Study 1

The purpose of study 1 is to evaluate how perceiver attitudes influence perceptions of seriousness and attributions of victim/blame for non-prototypical instances of IPV. More specifically, this study will examine the role of traditional gender roles, attitudes towards gays and lesbians, and same-sex violence misconceptions on such evaluations. This study will also examine ratings of gender-stereotypical traits across four conditions of heterosexual and same-sex domestic violence. The four conditions are as follows: male-against-male, female-against-female, male-against-female, and female-against-male. The hypotheses for the current study are:

H1: Compared to the male-on-female condition, participants in the non-prototypical conditions will perceive incidents of partner violence as less serious.

H2: Compared to the male-on-female condition, participants within the non-prototypical conditions will attribute non-significant levels of blame to both victims and perpetrators. In contrast, the male perpetrator will be blamed significantly more than the female victim in the prototypical scenario.

H3: Traditional gender roles, homonegativity, and the endorsement of same-sex violence misconceptions will predict seriousness for the same-sex conditions while traditional gender roles will predict seriousness for the heterosexual condition.

H4: Participants will attribute more blame to male victims than female victims, regardless of perpetrator sex. In contrast, participants will attribute less blame to female perpetrators, regardless of victim sex.

H5: There will be a moderating effect of gender, such that male participants will perceive all conditions of IPV as less serious than female participants. In addition, male participants will attribute significantly more blame to victims than female participants while doing the inverse for perpetrators.

H6: Among all non-prototypical conditions of IPV, victims will be perceived as possessing significantly more feminine traits than perpetrators. Likewise, perpetrators will be perceived as possessing significantly more masculine traits than victims.

Method

Participants

Participants were 462 undergraduate students (274 females and 188 males) enrolled at a large northeastern university. Participants were recruited through the psychology department's participant pool and received two experimental credits for completing the study. The sample was 77% White or European American, 9% Asian American or Pacific Islander, 5% Black or African American, 4% Latino/a, and 4% identified as other (e.g., mixed racial background). Among the participants, 94% identified as heterosexual and 6% identified as gay, lesbian, or questioning. Ages ranged from 18 to 40 ($M = 19.3$ years old and $SD = 1.62$ years).

Procedure

Participants signed up to participate in a study entitled "Perceptions of Societal Behaviors and Policies" through the psychology department's participant pool. They were informed that the study would be online and related to perceptions of societal behaviors and policies. This deception was used to keep participants from knowing the true nature of the study,

as attitudes toward sexual minorities and domestic violence are sensitive topics likely to elicit desirable responding.

After signing up to participate in the study, participants were e-mailed a link for the survey and asked to complete the online survey within 24 hours. After completing the informed consent and demographic questionnaire, participants were asked to carefully read an incident report detailing a recent event that led to police intervention (i.e., partner violence vignette) and answer questions about the incident. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: male-on-female violence, female-on-male violence, male-on-male violence, and female-on-female violence. Participants were also asked to rate their perceptions of gender-based traits of the victim and perpetrator and then complete a series of follow-up questionnaires.

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire. Participants provided information about their age, sex, race, student class status (e.g., freshmen, sophomore, etc.), religious/spiritual affiliation, and sexual orientation.

Partner Violence Vignette. The partner violence vignette created for this study was a mock police report detailing a domestic dispute. The vignette included verbatim transcripts from the victim and perpetrator detailing their perspective of the incident. In each vignette, the victim is depicted as nagging his/her partner about his/her reason for arriving home late. The perpetrator, who is exhausted from work and requests to be left alone, grows increasingly frustrated and eventually slaps the victim in the face (See Appendix A). The vignette was intended to be ambiguous and statements from the victim and perpetrator overlap to help ensure the perceived accuracy of both accounts. All vignettes were identical except for the name of the victims (Erica/David) perpetrator (Chris/Janet) and the use of male versus female pronouns.

Partner Violence Attributions Questionnaire. The Partner Violence Questionnaire was created for this study and contained 24 items measuring participants' perceptions about the domestic violence incident, the behavior and blame of the victim and perpetrator, and the impact of the incident on both partners. Participants rated both the victim and perpetrator along 11 attribution items and two items that served as manipulation checks (See Appendix B). Participants indicated their response to all items on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from “*not at all*” to 6 “*very much so*.” For example, “How much was Erica (*victim*) to blame for the incident?”

Seriousness Composite Score. In order to evaluate incident seriousness, a composite score for seriousness was created by taking the mean of four summed variables from the attribution questionnaire. This composite score was created in order to develop a more thorough understanding of the components that would be used to indicate perceptions of incident seriousness. The four items that comprise the composite variable include perceptions of incident seriousness, harmfulness, and the extent to which intervention is needed. More specifically, the intervention items assessed: 1) how likely the participants would be to call the police as neighbors aware of the situation, and 2) how necessary participants felt police intervention was for the incident. The Cronbach alpha's was .84, suggesting that the variable had good inter-item reliability

Victim and Perpetrator Blame Composites Scores. In order to evaluate victim and perpetrator blame, composite scores for blame were created by taking the mean of five summed variables from the attribution questionnaire. The five variables that comprise the blame composite include: responsibility, blame, abusiveness, provocation, and deservedness. A blame

composite variable was created for both the victim and perpetrator. The Cronbach's alpha for victim and perpetrator blame were .70 and .73, respectively.

Manipulation Checks. In addition, manipulation checks followed the questionnaire to ensure that participants were aware of the victim and perpetrator in the vignette, as well as the couples' relationship-type (heterosexual or same-sex). More specifically, these items were true or false statements that asked participants to correctly identify which partner initiated the act of violence (e.g., "David hit Janet during their dispute"), and whether the couple was same-sex or heterosexual (e.g., "David and Janet are a heterosexual couple"). Within the sample, there were 87 participants who incorrectly identified one or both of the manipulation checks. There were 76% of participants (n=66) who incorrectly identified which partner initiated the act of violence while 24% of participants (n=21) incorrectly identified the couples' relationship type.

Victim and Perpetrator Gender-Trait Evaluations. Participants evaluated the perpetrator and victim along 22 masculine/feminine trait dimensions developed by the researcher. The trait dimensions represented commonly held beliefs about feminine and masculine traits, such as kind, passive, independent, assertive, dominant, nurturing, gentle, tough, and emotional (See Appendix C). Participants were asked to indicate how likely they believed each trait was characteristic of the victim/perpetrator on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from "*not at all*" to "*very much so*." Both the victim and perpetrator were rated along the same 22 gender-traits.

Composite scores of masculinity and femininity were created in order to evaluate the hypothesis on victim and perpetrator gender. Our hypothesis is that regardless of sex, victims in non-prototypical incidents will be perceived as possessing significantly more feminine traits than perpetrators. In addition, perpetrators will be perceived as possessing significantly more masculine traits than victims. The composite score for femininity included the average score of

the following nine traits: passive, nurturing, gentle, sensitive, emotional, weak, talkative, kind, and nonviolent ($\alpha = .69$). The composite score for masculinity was created from the average score of the following seven items: independent, assertive, strong, aggressive, tough, violent, and dominant ($\alpha = .77$). Since participants evaluated both the victim and perpetrator along the same gender-traits, masculine and feminine composite scores were created for both the victim and perpetrator. The reliabilities of the composite scores for masculinity and femininity did not differ for victim and perpetrator.

Traditional Gender Roles. Two measures were used to assess different aspects of traditional gender roles. The first was the Hostile Sexism (HS) subscale of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996). This subscale was selected because it specifically measures ideas about male dominance and female submissiveness. The HS subscale has 11 items (See Appendix D). Participants indicate their response to the items by using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from “*strongly disagree*” to “*strongly agree*.” Examples of items: “Women seek to gain power by getting control over men” and “When women lose to men in a fair fight, they typically complain about being discriminated against.” The HS subscale is scored by adding the item scores, with higher scores indicating higher levels of sexism. HS is significantly correlated with other measures of sexism and the reported reliability is .81. Cronbach’s alpha in the current study for the HS scale was .87.

The second is the Attitudes towards Women Scale (AWS) Short Version (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973). This is a 25-item scale that measures participants’ attitudes towards women’s rights and level of gender role stereotyping (See Appendix E). Each item uses a 4-point response scale with extremes labeled as “*agree strongly*” and “*disagree strongly*.” Although the scale was devised to measure attitudes towards women, many items are

comparative such as “The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.” The AWS is scored by adding the item scores. Higher scores on the AWS indicate a more egalitarian liberal attitude while lower scores indicate a more traditional conservative attitude. Given the opposite directionality of other attitude measures in the current study, several items were reverse scored to maintain a consistent interpretation of study findings. Therefore, lower scores indicated a more egalitarian attitude while higher scores indicated more traditional attitudes. Reported reliability for the AWS is generally .85 or higher. Cronbach alpha in the current study was .88.

Modern Homonegativity Scale. The Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS) is a 24-item scale that measures contemporary negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). The MHS consists of two parallel, 12-item forms, one for gay men (MHS-G) and one for lesbians (MHS-L). For example, the item “Many gay men use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges” is revised to read “Many lesbians use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges.” Both versions use a 6-point Likert scale ranging from “*strongly disagree*” to “*strongly agree*” which was used in the current study (See Appendix F). Scores can range from 12 to 72 for subscales and 24 to 144 for the total MHS, with higher scores indicating greater homonegativity. Reported reliabilities for the MHS-G and MHS-L are .91 and .89, respectively. Cronbach alphas in the current study for the MHS-G and MHS-L were .91, and .93, respectively. It should also be noted that 6-filler items about a controversial issue unrelated to sexual orientation (i.e., abortion) were included in the MHS to disguise its intended purpose and reduce socially desirable responding.

Same-Sex Domestic Violence Misconceptions Scale. The SSV Misconceptions Scale was created in a previous study to measure individuals’ endorsement of common SSV

misconceptions. The development of the SSV Misconceptions Scale involved using a separate sample of university students ($n = 568$) with 19-items pertaining to SSV including: misconceptions, victim barriers to help-seeking, and perceptions of service providers' response to SSV. An exploratory principal component analysis was performed on the 19-items. Four criteria were used to determine the retention of factors: (1) eigenvalues over 1.0; (2) scree test; (3) factor loadings greater than .40; and (4) total variance explained by factor.

Three main components were extracted and a principle component analysis with varimax rotation conducted. The three factors, which accounted for 44% of the variance, were named General SSV Misconceptions (accounted for 21% of variance), Service Provider Response (accounted for 14% of variance), and Help-Seeking Barriers (accounted for 10% of the variance). Internal reliability analyses were performed on all three factors. To maximize the subscales' alphas, items that lowered the overall alpha were removed ($n = 4$), leaving 15-items on the final measure. The Cronbach's alpha of the SSV misconceptions, service provider response, and help-seeking barriers subscales were .73, .75, and .63, respectively. For purposes of this study, only the SSV misconceptions subscale was used.

The endorsement of SSV Misconceptions subscale ($\alpha = .73$) consists of 5-items about common SSV misconceptions (See Appendix G). Sample items include: "SSV is not as harmful as opposite-sex domestic violence" "Women in same-sex relationships are rarely perpetrators of domestic violence" and "Violence between a same-sex couple is a fair fight." Participants indicated their response to all items on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from "*strongly disagree*" to "*strongly agree*." The SSV Misconceptions Scale had a Cronbach's alpha .77 in the present study.

It should also be noted that due to the sensitive nature of the topic, this scale includes filler items embedded into each of the subscales around other sensitive topics such as immigration and sex education in attempts to not expose the true intent of these items to participants. Thus, the SSV scale included 23 items but only 5 were related to SSV misconceptions.

Attitudes toward Same-Sex Marriage Scale. The Attitudes toward Same-Sex Marriage Scale (ATSM) is a 17-item measure designed to assess participants' attitudes towards same-sex marriage (Pearl & Galupo, 2007). Given the relevance of this topic to current political and social events, this measure was created to uniquely capture several of the issues expressed in the current media. This includes beliefs about marriage as a societal institution, the ensuring of equal civil rights, or ideas that same-sex marriage undermines gender roles and normalizes homosexuality. An example item is: "Same-sex marriage undermines the meaning of the traditional family" (See Appendix H). Higher scores on the ATSM indicate more positive attitudes towards same-sex marriage while lower scores indicate negative attitudes. Given the opposite directionality of other attitude measures in the current study, items were reverse scored to maintain a consistent interpretation of study findings. Therefore, lower scores indicated more positive attitudes while higher scores indicated more negative attitudes toward same-sex marriage. Reported reliability for the ATSM is .96. Cronbach alpha in the current study was .96.

Results

Manipulation Checks

Given the large number of participants who failed one or two of the manipulation check variables, a series of independent samples t-tests were conducted to evaluate if significant

differences existed among those who answered correctly ($n = 375$) and incorrectly ($n=87$). The following variables were examined: seriousness, victim blame, perpetrator blame, and attitude measures (i.e., AWS, HS, SSV Misconceptions, MHS, and ATSM). Results indicated that the sample who incorrectly answered the manipulation check variables did significantly differ from those who answered correctly across several variables (See Table 1). Participants who answered incorrectly blamed the perpetrator significantly less than those who answered correctly. In addition, there was a marginally significant difference ($p = .06$) with victim blame. Participants who answered incorrectly blamed the victim significantly more than those who answered correctly. Moreover, those who answered incorrectly displayed significantly higher levels of negative attitudes towards women and same-sex marriage than those who answered correctly. These findings suggest non-random differences among both groups of participants. Given this pattern, the correct identification of the manipulation check variables was used as a covariate across subsequent analyses to control for such differences.

Correlations Among Dependent Variables

In order to evaluate the relationship between seriousness, victim blame, perpetrator blame, victim femininity, and perpetrator masculinity, correlations were calculated among these dependent variables across all four conditions. These correlations are presented in Table II. There were significant correlations among several of the variables. For instance, seriousness was positively correlated with perpetrator blame and perpetrator masculinity. Thus, as the incidents of IPV were rated as more serious participants attributed the perpetrator more blame and viewed him/her as possessing more masculine gender traits. Inversely, seriousness' was negatively correlated with victim blame.

Partner Violence Seriousness

Effects of Condition and Participant Sex on Perceptions of Seriousness

A 2 x 4 (Sex of Participant X Condition) analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with the seriousness composite as the dependent variable (DV) and manipulation check status as a covariate. The covariate of manipulation check status was non-significant on the effect of incident seriousness, $F(1,461) = .557$, $p = .46$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$. There was a significant main effect of condition on perceptions of seriousness, $F(3,461) = 19.54$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$ (See Figure 1). As expected, Tukey's HSD test revealed that participants rated the male-on-female scenario ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 1.02$) as significantly more serious in comparison to the non-prototypical cases of partner violence (male-on-male $M = 3.43$, $SD = .97$; female-on-female $M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.05$; and female-on-male $M = 2.98$, $SD = 1.02$). In addition, post hoc analyses revealed that the male-on-male condition was perceived as significantly more serious than the female-on-male condition. Given the variables that comprise the seriousness composite score, these results suggest that participants perceived incidents of partner violence involving male perpetrators (i.e., male-on-female and male-on-male) to be more serious and deserving of intervention than those involving female perpetrators. These findings are consistent with the hypothesis that the male-on-female incident would be perceived as more serious than the non-prototypical instances of IPV.

With regard to participant sex, there was no significant main effect of sex on incident seriousness, $F(1,461) = 2.42$, $p = .12$, $\eta_p^2 = .005$. Across the conditions, males ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 1.10$) perceived the incidents to be just as serious as females ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.05$). This main effect was not qualified by any significant Condition x Sex of Participant interaction, $F(3,461) = .75$, $p = .52$, $\eta_p^2 = .005$. These results did not support the hypothesis that males would perceive the incidents of IPV as significantly less serious than females.

Relationships Between Seriousness and Attitude Measures

Descriptive Statistics of Attitude Measures

A series of one-way ANOVA's were conducted to test for significant sex differences among each of the attitude variables given the literature, which suggests differences between men and women on such measures. See Table III for the means, standard deviations, and p-values of the sex comparisons. Statistically significant differences between men and women were found on the following attitude variables including: attitudes toward women, hostile sexism, modern homonegativity towards gay men and lesbians, attitudes toward same-sex marriage, and the endorsement of SSV misconceptions. Men endorsed significantly higher levels of non-egalitarian gender role attitudes, modern homonegativity, negative attitudes toward same-sex marriage, and SSV misconceptions than women.

In order to evaluate the relationship between attitudes towards traditional gender roles, homonegativity, same-sex marriage, and SSV misconceptions, correlations were calculated among these variables. These correlations are presented in Table IV. There were significant positive correlations among all of the attitude variables, indicating that each of attitude measures were significantly associated with one another.

Predicting Seriousness in the Same-sex Conditions

In order to further evaluate the hypothesis that traditional gender roles, homonegativity, and the endorsement of same-sex violence misconceptions will predict seriousness for the same-sex conditions, two hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. Participant sex and manipulation check status were entered as covariates, and homonegativity, AWS, ATSM, and SSV misconceptions as the predictor variables. The seriousness composite was the DV. In

addition, interaction terms were created by centering the predictor variables, dummy coding for sex (i.e., male= 0 and female = 1), and calculating centered product terms.

Female-on-Female Incident

A three step hierarchical regression analysis was conducted on incident seriousness for the female same-sex incident. In Step 1 of the analysis, participant sex and manipulation check status were regressed on incident seriousness. Results revealed that perceptions of incident seriousness were not significantly predicted by participant sex and manipulation check status in Step 1, $F(2,99) = .304, p > .05, R^2 = .006$. The predictive power of the model did not significantly improve by adding the main effects of MHS-L, AWS, ATSM, and SSV misconceptions in Step 2, $F(6,95) = .89, p > .05, R^2 = .05; \Delta R^2 = .047, \Delta F(4,95) = 1.18, p > .05$. Lastly, all two-way interaction terms were added to Step 3 of the regression equation. The addition of the interaction terms did not yield a significantly predictive regression equation, $F(9,92) = 1.27, p > .05, R^2 = .11; \Delta R^2 = .06, \Delta F(3,92) = 1.98, p > .05$. In the final model, the SSV Misconceptions x ATSM interaction term was the only significant predictor of incident seriousness (see Table V). None of the three way interactions were significant.

The results of the final model revealed that there were no significant main effects of the predictor variables. The two way interaction terms between SSV Misconceptions and ATSM revealed those high in the endorsement of SSV Misconceptions and negative attitudes towards same-sex marriage perceived the incident significantly less serious than those who were lower on both measures (See Figure 2). Taken together, these results demonstrate partial support for the hypothesis that individuals who endorsed higher levels of traditional gender roles, negative attitudes towards lesbians and same-sex marriage, and SSV misconceptions will perceive the

female same-sex scenario as less serious. Although higher levels of such attitudes did not directly predict perceptions of incident seriousness, the significant SSV Misconceptions x ATSM interaction demonstrated that the endorsement of both attitude measures significantly moderated perceptions of seriousness.

Male-on-Male Incident

A three step hierarchical regression analysis was conducted on incident seriousness for the male same-sex incident. In Step 1 of the analysis, participant sex and manipulation check status were regressed on incident seriousness. Results revealed that incident seriousness was not significantly predicted by participant sex and manipulation check status in Step 1, $F(2,105) = 1.96$, $p > .05$, $R^2 = .04$. The predictive power of the model did not significantly improve by adding the main effects of MHS-G, AWS, ATSM, and SSV misconceptions in Step 2, $F(6,101) = 1.41$, $p > .05$, $R^2 = .08$; $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F(4,101) = 1.14$, $p > .05$. Lastly, all two-way interaction terms were added to Step 3 of the regression equation. The addition of the interaction terms did not yield a significant predictive regression equation, $F(9,98) = 1.72$, $p = .10$, $R^2 = .14$; $\Delta R^2 = .06$, $\Delta F(3,98) = 2.22$, $p > .05$. In the final model, MHS-G and the interaction terms Sex x ATSM and MHS-G x ATSM were significant predictors of incident seriousness (see Table VI). None of the three way interactions were significant.

The results of the final model suggest that MHS-G was the only significant main effect among the predictor variables. This finding indicates that individuals with more negative attitudes toward gay men perceived the incident as significantly less serious than those with more positive attitudes. The two-way interaction term MHG-G x ATSM revealed that homonegativity did moderate the effect of seriousness for individuals who are low in negative attitudes towards

same-sex marriage. More specifically, those who have egalitarian beliefs towards marriage but more negative attitudes toward gay men rated the incident as significantly less serious than those with egalitarian beliefs towards marriage but more positive attitudes towards gay men (see Figure 3).

Predicting Seriousness in the Heterosexual Conditions

In order to evaluate the hypothesis that traditional gender roles will predict seriousness for the heterosexual conditions two hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. Participant sex and manipulation check status served as the covariates, AWS and Hostile Sexism as the predictor variables, and incident seriousness as the DV. In addition, interaction terms were created by the covariate and predictor variables, dummy coding for sex (i.e., male = 0 and female = 1), and calculating product terms.

Female-on-Male Incident

A two step hierarchical regression analysis was conducted on incident seriousness. In Step 1 of the analysis, participant sex and manipulation check status were regressed onto incident seriousness. Results revealed that perceptions of incident seriousness were significantly predicted by participant sex and manipulation check status in Step 1, $F(2,102) = 3.42$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .06$. The predictive power of the model improved significantly by adding the main effects of AWS and hostile sexism HS in Step 2, $F(4,100) = 4.11$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .14$; $\Delta R^2 = .08$, $\Delta F(2,100) = 4.55$ (see Table VII). In the final model, manipulation check status and hostile sexism were both significant predictors of incident seriousness.

With regard to manipulation checks status, those who incorrectly answered either or both of the manipulation checks variables (i.e., perpetrator identification and/or the sexual orientation of the couple) rated the incident as significantly more serious than those who correctly answered the manipulation checks. This may be due to these individuals misperceiving this incident as male-on-female violence as opposed to female-on-male violence. In addition, the main effect of hostile sexism supported the hypothesis that those with a higher endorsement of traditional gender roles rated the incident as significantly less serious. None of the two-way interactions were significant.

Male-on-Female Incident

A two step hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with incident seriousness. In Step 1 of the analysis, participant sex and manipulation check status were regressed on incident seriousness. Results revealed that perceptions of incident seriousness were not significantly predicted by participant sex and manipulation check status in Step 1, $F(2,106) = .646$, $p > .05$, $R^2 = .01$. The predictive power of the model improved significantly by adding the main effects of AWS and Hostile Sexism in Step 2, $F(4,108) = 3.16$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .11$; $\Delta R^2 = .10$, $\Delta F(2,104) = 5.61$ (see Table VIII). AWS was significant predictor of incident seriousness. Similar to the female-on-male condition, this finding indicates that those with more traditional gender role attitudes rated the incident as significantly less serious. None of the two-way interactions were significant.

Victim and Perpetrator Attributions

Effects of Condition and Participant Sex on Victim and Perpetrator Blame

A 2 x 4 (Sex of Participant X Condition) multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was conducted using the victim and perpetrator blame composites as the DVs and manipulation check status as a covariate. Results indicated that manipulation check status was not a significant covariate for victim blame, $F(1, 446) = 1.86$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .004$. However, manipulation check status was a significant covariate for perpetrator blame, $F(1, 446) = 12.78$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. Participants who incorrectly answered the manipulation check variable(s) attributed significantly less perpetrator blame ($M = 3.57$, $SD = .86$) than those who correctly answered the manipulation check variables ($M = 4.00$, $SD = .90$).

Results of the overall MANCOVA revealed model significance for both victim blame, $F(3, 446) = 5.28$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, and perpetrator blame, $F(3, 446) = 5.16$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. For victim blame, Tukey's HSD test revealed that the heterosexual male victim ($M = 3.68$, $SD = .78$) was attributed significantly more blame than the heterosexual female victim ($M = 3.23$, $SD = .86$). In addition, the same-sex female victim ($M = 3.54$, $SD = .84$) was attributed significantly more blame than the heterosexual female victim. While these findings do not support the hypothesis that more blame would be attributed to male victims than female victims (See Figure 5), it does highlight how the highest degree of victim blame was attributed to the incidents rated as less serious (i.e., female-on-male, female-on-female).

With regard to perpetrator blame, the heterosexual female perpetrator ($M = 3.75$, $SD = .91$) was attributed significantly less blame than the heterosexual male perpetrator ($M = 4.19$, $SD = .77$). Additionally, there was a significant difference between the heterosexual male and same-sex female perpetrator ($M = 3.80$, $SD = .81$), with the same-sex female perpetrator being attributed less blame (see Figure 6). Inversely to the findings for victim blame, these results

indicate that the highest degree of perpetrator blame was attributed to the incident rated as the most serious.

Given the variables that comprise the blame composite scores, these results suggest that participants' perceived the heterosexual male victim as having provoked and deserved the violence more than the heterosexual female victim. In addition, he was perceived as being more responsible for his victimization experience. With respect to perpetrator blame, the inverse relationship was found such that the heterosexual male perpetrator was blamed more for his perpetration of partner violence while both female perpetrators (i.e., heterosexual and same-sex) were blamed less.

With regard to participant sex, there was no significant main effect on victim blame, $F(1,446) = 2.14, p > .05$. Furthermore, no significant main effect of participant sex was found for perpetrator blame, $F(1,446) = 2.16, p > .05$. These main effects were not qualified by any significant Sex of participant x Condition interaction for victim blame, $F(3,446) = 1.22, p > .05$, or perpetrator blame, $F(3,383) = .313, p > .05$. These results suggest that there were no gender differences in victim or perpetrator blame across all conditions. Thus, the hypothesis that males would be higher in attributions of victim blame than females was not supported. There was also no support for the hypothesis that males would attribute less perpetrator blame than females.

Attributions of Victim and Perpetrator Blame within Conditions

Repeated measures t-tests were performed for each of the four conditions to examine the degree of difference in blame attributions between victims and perpetrators. Separate analyses were conducted by manipulation check status, in order to examine potential difference across groups.

For participants who correctly answered the manipulation checks, results revealed that while perpetrators were attributed significantly more blame than victims in the male-on-female, $t(102) = -7.32, p < .001$; male-on-male, $t(87) = -3.53, p < .01$; and female-on-female scenarios, $t(86) = -3.49, p < .05$, there was no significant difference in the attributions of blame between the victim and perpetrator in the female-on-male incident, $t(92) = -1.14, p > .05$. These findings do not support the hypothesis that victims and perpetrators will be blamed similarly across non-prototypical instances of IPV. However, we did find that the victim and perpetrator were blamed to an equal degree in the female-on-male condition, which was rated as the least serious. Moreover, we see a larger difference in the degree of blame attributed to the victim and perpetrator in the prototypical male-on-female condition than the degrees of blame attributed to the victims and perpetrators in the non-prototypical conditions (see Figure 7).

For participants who incorrectly answered the manipulation checks, results revealed no significant differences in the level of blame attributed to victims and perpetrators. In the male-on-female, $t(11) = -1.48, p > .05$; male-on-male, $t(25) = -.12, p > .05$; female-on-female, $t(24) = 1.16, p > .05$; and female-on-male scenarios, $t(20) = .78, p > .05$, there were no significant differences in attributions of victim and perpetrator blame. Since the vast majority (76%) of the participants who incorrectly answered one of the manipulation check variables failed to correctly identify which partner initiated the act of violence, these non-significant differences are likely reflective of this misperception.

Effects of Condition on Perceived Victim and Perpetrator Gender

Repeated measures t-test were performed to evaluate our hypothesis that regardless of sex, victims in non-prototypical incidents will be perceived as possessing significantly more

feminine traits than perpetrators. In addition, we predicted that perpetrators will be perceived as possessing significantly more masculine traits than victims. Separate analyses were conducted by manipulation check status, in order to examine potential difference across groups.

For participants who correctly answered the manipulation checks, results revealed that victims were perceived as possessing significantly more feminine traits than perpetrators in the female-on-female, $t(87) = 9.52, p < .001$; male-on-male, $t(85) = 11.80, p < .001$; and female-on-male scenarios, $t(91) = 3.87, p < .001$ (see Figure 8). The inverse relationship was found for perpetrators, such that perpetrators were perceived as significantly more masculine than victims in the female-on-female, $t(88) = -6.98, p < .001$; male-on-male, $t(84) = -11.15, p < .001$; and female-on-male scenarios, $t(93) = -5.76, p < .001$ (see Figure 9).

Taken together, these findings did support the predictions made for ratings of victim and perpetrator gender. Regardless of sex, all non-prototypical victims were rated as possessing more feminine traits than their perpetrators. In addition, all non-prototypical perpetrators were seen as possessing more masculine traits than their victims.

For participants who incorrectly answered the manipulation checks, results revealed that victims were perceived as possessing a non-significant degree of feminine traits than perpetrators in the female-on-female, $t(25) = -.03, p > .05$; male-on-male, $t(26) = -.32, p > .05$; and female-on-male scenarios, $t(20) = 1.49, p > .05$. The inverse relationship was found for perpetrators, such that perpetrators were perceived as possessing a non-significant degree of masculine traits than victims in the female-on-female, $t(25) = -6.98, p > .05$; male-on-male, $t(27) = .62, p > .05$; and female-on-male scenarios, $t(20) = -2.36, p > .05$. Since the vast majority (76%) of the participants who incorrectly answered one of the manipulation check variables failed to correctly identify which partner initiated the act of violence, these non-

significant differences in perceived victim and perpetrator gender are likely reflective of this misperception.

Discussion

Summary of Findings

Similar to previous research, results demonstrated a clear difference between prototypical and non-prototypical IPV with regard to seriousness. Male-on-female violence was perceived as significantly more serious than all non-prototypical incidents of partner violence. In addition, the male-on-male incident was perceived as significantly more serious than the female-on-male incident, suggesting that incidents involving male perpetrators are viewed as more harmful and deserving of intervention than those involving female perpetrators. Among all incidents of IPV, the female-on-male incident had the lowest mean rating in regards to seriousness. This pattern of results not only highlights the difference in seriousness perceptions between prototypical and non-prototypical IPV, but it also points to the differences within incidents of non-prototypical IPV.

Overall, this study did find some evidence that perceiver attitudes play a role in how incidents of IPV are perceived. In the female-on-female incident, we found that those with a higher endorsement of SSV misconceptions and negative attitudes towards same-sex marriage perceived the incident as less serious than those with a lower endorsement of SSV misconceptions and more positive attitudes towards same-sex marriage. Interestingly, these findings did not hold for the male-on-male condition. Within the male-on-male condition, we found that individuals with more homonegativity towards gay men rated the incident as significantly less serious than those with more favorable attitudes. In addition, those with more

affirming attitudes towards same-sex marriage but negative attitudes towards gay men perceived the incident as significantly less serious than those with more affirming attitudes towards both same-sex marriage and gay men.

In terms of the female-on-male condition, results indicated that those higher in hostile sexism and not negative attitudes toward women, rated the incident as less serious than those with more egalitarian gender roles. Hostile sexism may have been a significant predictor above and beyond the AWS because it specifically measures ideas of female submissiveness and male dominance, which is a gender role violation most relevant for the female-on-male incident. In comparison to the other incidents of IPV, perceptions towards female-on-male violence stood out in several unique ways. In addition to being rated the lowest in regards to seriousness, the male victim was also attributed with the highest degree of victim blame. It is important to note that the differences in victim blame were non-significant among the other non-prototypical instances of IPV (i.e., male and female SSV). However, there was significantly more victim blame attributed to the male victim in the female-on-male incident than to the female victim in in the male-on-female incident. Inversely, significantly more perpetrator blame was attributed to the male perpetrator in the male-on-female incident than to the female perpetrator in the female-on-male incident. In sum, the male victim was blamed more for his victimization while his female perpetrator was blamed less for her perpetration. These differences were further supported by the within condition analysis of blame, which revealed that the female-on-male incident was the only incident of IPV where an equal degree of blame was attributed to both the victim and perpetrator.

With regard to perceiver sex, surprisingly no differences were found between men and women in their perceptions of seriousness or attributions of victim or perpetrator blame. Men and women were similar in their decreased ratings of seriousness from prototypical to non-

prototypical instances of IPV. However, there were significant sex differences in each of the attitude measures, with men reporting a higher degree of non-egalitarian gender roles, homonegativity, negative attitudes towards same-sex marriage, and endorsement of SSV misconceptions than females. Although these differences in attitude measures were found, there were no significant interactions between perceiver sex and such attitude measures.

Gender-based perceptions of masculinity and femininity emerged as a consistent and notable finding in this study as well. Regardless of sex, perpetrators of IPV were seen as possessing significantly more masculine traits than their victims. Likewise, victims were rated as possessing significantly more feminine traits than their perpetrators.

Finally, it is important to note that several of the findings (i.e., blame attributions, gender-based perceptions of masculinity and femininity) did not hold for the sample of participants who incorrectly answered the manipulation check variables. The vast majority of these individuals wrongly identified who perpetrated the act of violence in the vignette. The non-significant differences within this sample may be explained by their misperception of victim and perpetrator identity. In addition, this sample was significantly higher in negative attitudes towards women, same-sex marriage, and victim blaming than the sample who correctly answered the manipulation check variables. These sample differences may have also contributed to minimization of perpetrator blame.

Implications

Although this study supports the findings of previous research that male-on-female violence is perceived as significantly more serious than all non-prototypical cases of IPV, it is unique in its examination of how perceiver attitudes influence such ratings. This study found that

perceiver attitudes influenced perceptions of seriousness for all instances of non-prototypical IPV. However, different attitudes (i.e., traditional gender roles, homonegativity, attitudes towards same-sex marriage) influenced perceptions of seriousness in unique ways. For the female-on-male and male-on-female incidents, individuals with higher levels of traditional gender role attitudes rated the incident as significantly less serious than those more egalitarian gender role beliefs. Those who endorse more traditional gender role beliefs hold that men should be more dominant while women are more passive and nurturing. Such individuals may have rated the female-on-male and male-on-female incidents as less serious than those with more egalitarian gender role attitudes due to the gender-role violations by both the victim and perpetrator. For instance, they may be punishing the male victim for his lack of dominance over his female partner. More specifically, if one feels that women should be more passive and nurturing while men are more dominant, they may be less likely to believe that a woman can enact harm onto a male victim.

Within the incidents of SSV, there were several interesting findings with regard to perceiver attitudes. For female SSV, individuals' high in the endorsement of SSV Misconceptions and negative attitudes towards same-sex marriage perceived the incident significantly less serious than those who were lower on both measures. For male SSV, the strongest predictor of seriousness was homonegativity. Participants with more negative attitudes towards gay men rated the incident as less serious. Moreover, there was an interaction between ATSM and homonegativity. This interaction found that even among individuals with more affirming attitudes towards same-sex marriage, holding more negative attitudes toward gay men resulted in perceiving the incident as significantly less serious than those with positive attitudes toward same-sex marriage and gay men. While such attitudes are related, this finding highlights

how one can arguably support the legalization of same-sex marriage while holding less affirming attitudes towards gay men individually.

Taken together, these findings indicate that the endorsement of misconceptions about SSV, homonegativity, and traditional gender role attitudes do influence perceptions of seriousness for SSV in unique ways. These findings do not support previous assertions in the literature that such attitudes are not relevant in the examination of seriousness perceptions towards SSV. However, as noted earlier, the findings were not consistent across both male and female SSV. While attitudes towards gays and lesbians, same-sex marriage, and gender roles are moderately correlated, it appears that the intersection of such attitudes is rather complicated. For instance, in the male-on-male incident we found that those with egalitarian attitudes towards same-sex marriage but negative attitudes towards gay men perceived the incident as less serious than those with egalitarian attitudes towards both same-sex marriage and gay men. This highlights the distinctness of such attitudes, and how holding more positive attitudes towards one social issue (e.g., marriage equality) does not necessarily indicate positive attitudes toward another (e.g., gay men).

This study also found that individuals appeared to create a gendered framework for victims and perpetrators of IPV regardless of sex. One interpretation of this finding is that it represents participants' attempt to reconcile perceived gender-role violations or fit IPV into it prototypical framework. Traditional gender roles assert that men are dominant and capable of maintaining power and control while women are nurturing and passive. Thus, same-sex and female-on-male violence both suggest gender-role violations for men (i.e., victimization of violence) and women (i.e., perpetration of violence). However, if perpetrators are viewed as

characteristically more masculine while victims are viewed as characteristically more feminine, then the occurrence of non-prototypical IPV continues to fit within the prototypical framework.

Moreover, participants are likely generating their ratings for victim and perpetrator gendered traits from the individual's behavior (i.e., perpetrating violence or being victimized). This suggests that the perpetration of violence is associated with dominance and masculinity while victimization is associated passivity and femininity. This finding has several important implications for both same-sex and female-on-male violence. For SSV, it indicates that the stereotype of same-sex relationships consisting of a more masculine (i.e., "the man") and more feminine (i.e., "the woman") partner may be especially applied when individuals are evaluating same-sex IPV. For male victims of female perpetrated violence, research has identified the fear of being perceived as less masculine as a significant barrier in victims' disclosure of their abuse (Eckstein, 2009; Migliaccio, 2001). The implication of this study is that such concerns are valid and realistic, as victims are consistently seen as more feminine and less masculine than their perpetrators.

Purpose of Study 2

The purpose of study 2 was to examine the impact of victim injury severity on perceptions of a heterosexual and same-sex IPV. As noted previously, the greater potential for males to injure female victims has been proposed as an explanation for the minimization of non-prototypical violence in comparison to male-against-female violence. However, previous studies have neglected to manipulate or control for the specific impact of injury on outcome variables (e.g., rating of seriousness, likelihood of intervention, etc.). This study will examine the effect of victim injury (i.e., no injury, low injury, or high injury) as a function of relationship type (i.e.,

heterosexual or same-sex). Thus, victim sex (i.e., female) will remain constant yet perpetrator sex (i.e., male or female) will vary. The hypotheses for the current study are:

H1: Across the heterosexual and SSV conditions, there will be a main effect of injury severity, such that higher injury conditions will be perceived as significantly more serious than lower injury conditions.

H2: There will be a main effect of relationship type, such that the heterosexual incidents of IPV will be perceived as significantly more serious than same-sex incidents of IPV.

H3: There will be a main effect of gender, such that male participants will perceive all conditions of IPV as less serious than female participants.

H4: Across conditions, there will be a main effect of injury severity on perceived victim and perpetrator gendered traits. Victims in higher injury conditions will be perceived as significantly more feminine than those in lower injury conditions, while perpetrators in higher injury conditions will be rated as significantly more masculine than those in lower injury conditions.

Method

Participants

Participants were 236 undergraduate students (64% female and 36% male) enrolled at a large northeastern university. Participants were recruited through the psychology department's participant pool and received two experimental credits for completing the study. The sample was 77% White or European American, 12% Asian American or Pacific Islander, 4% Black or African American, 5% Latino/a, and 2% identified as other (e.g., mixed racial background). Among the participants, 98% identified as heterosexual and 2% identified as gay, lesbian, or

questioning. An additional 39 participants were also removed from the analyses for failing one or more manipulation checks. The final sample size was 198 (71 men and 126 women). Ages ranged from 18 to 43 ($M = 19.8$ years old and $SD = 2.50$ years).

Procedure

Participants signed up to participate in a study entitled “Perceptions of Societal Behaviors and Policies” through the psychology department’s participant pool. They were informed that the study would be online and related to perceptions of societal behaviors and policies. This deception was used to keep participants from knowing the true nature of the study, as attitudes toward sexual minorities and domestic violence are sensitive topics likely to elicit desirable responding.

After signing up to participate in the study, participants were e-mailed a link for the survey and asked to complete the online survey within 24 hours. After completing the informed consent and demographic questionnaire, participants were asked to carefully read an incident report detailing a recent event that led to police intervention (i.e., partner violence vignette) and answer questions about the incident. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: male-on-female violence or female-on-female violence. Participants were also asked to rate their perceptions of gender-based traits of the victim and perpetrator and then complete a series of follow-up questionnaires.

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire. Participants provided information about their age, sex, race, student class status (e.g., freshmen, sophomore), religious/spiritual affiliation, and

sexual orientation.

Partner Violence Vignette. The partner violence vignette created for this study was a mock police report detailing a domestic dispute. The vignette included verbatim transcripts from the victim and perpetrator detailing their perspective of the incident. In each vignette, the victim is depicted as nagging his/her partner about his/her reason for arriving home late. The perpetrator, who is exhausted from work and requests to be left alone, grows increasingly frustrated and eventually pushes the victim into a wall (See Appendix I). The vignette was intended to be ambiguous and statements from the victim and perpetrator overlap to help ensure the perceived accuracy of both accounts. All vignettes were identical except for the name of the perpetrator (Chris/Janet), the use of male versus female pronouns, and observed injuries noted at the end of the police report. For the no injury condition, no injuries are indicated. In the low injury condition, the victim is reported to have sustained a black eye. Finally, in the high injury condition the victim is reported to have sustained a broken nose.

Partner Violence Attributions Questionnaire. The Partner Violence Questionnaire used in this study was the same questionnaire from study 1. It contained 24 items measuring participants' perceptions about the IPV incident, the behavior and blame of the victim and perpetrator, and the impact of the incident on both partners. Participants rated both the victim and perpetrator along 11 attribution items and two items that served as manipulation checks (See Appendix B). Participants indicated their response to all items on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from "not at all" to 6 "very much so." For example, "How much was Erica (*victim*) to blame for the incident?" In addition, manipulation checks followed the questionnaire to ensure that participants the couples' relationship-type (heterosexual or same-sex) and the degree of injury sustained by the victim (i.e., no, low, or high). Participants (n = 39) who incorrectly identified

one or both of the manipulation checks were removed from all analyses. Those who were omitted from the sample did not differ significantly in gender, race, or age in comparison to those who remained.

Victim and Perpetrator Gender-Trait Evaluations. Participants evaluated the perpetrator and victim along the same masculine/feminine trait dimensions used by the researcher in study 1.

Results

Partner Violence Seriousness

Effects of Relationship Type, Injury Severity, and Participant Sex on Perceptions of Seriousness

In order to evaluate incident seriousness, a composite score for seriousness was created by taking the mean of four summed variables. The four items that comprise the composite variable were the same as Study 1. The Cronbach alpha's was .84, suggesting that the variable had good inter-item reliability.

A 2 x 2 x 3 (Sex of Participant X Relationship Type (Heterosexual/Same-Sex) X Injury Severity (No, Low, or High) analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with the seriousness composite as the dependent variable (DV). There was a significant main effect of injury severity on perceptions of seriousness, $F(2,193) = 9.01$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$ (See Figure 10). Tukey's HSD test revealed that participants rated the high injury incident ($M = 4.02$, $SD = .97$) as significantly more serious than the no injury incident ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 1.17$). The main effect of relationship type on perceptions of seriousness was non-significant, $F(1,193) = 3.33$, $p = .075$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. The trend of the data suggests that the heterosexual incidents ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 1.11$) were rated as slightly more serious than the same-sex incidents ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 1.15$), however,

this trend was non-significant. These effects were not qualified by a significant relationship type x injury severity interaction, $F(2,193) = .08$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$.

Given the variables that comprise the seriousness composite score, these results indicate that participants perceived incidents where victims sustained a higher degree of injury to be more serious and deserving of intervention than those where victims sustained no or a lower degree of injury. These findings are consistent with the hypothesis that higher injury incidents will be perceived as more significantly more serious than lower injury incidents. Additionally, while there was a trend towards the heterosexual incidents of IPV being perceived as more serious than the same-sex incidents, it is important to note that this main effect was non-significant. Contrary to predictions, heterosexual IPV was not perceived as more serious than same-sex IPV.

With regard to participant sex, there was a significant main effect of sex on incident seriousness, $F(1,198) = 4.71$, $p = .03$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. Across the degrees of injury severity, females ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.15$) perceived the incidents to be significantly more serious than males ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 1.07$). This main effect was not qualified by a significant Relationship Type x Sex of Participant interaction, $F(1,193) = .39$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$, or an Injury Severity x Sex of Participant interaction, $F(2,193) = 1.19$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$. These results suggest support the hypothesis that women would perceive the incidents of IPV as significantly more serious than men.

Effects of Condition on Perceived Victim and Perpetrator Gender

Composite scores of masculinity and femininity were created in order to explore how ratings of victim and perpetrator gender are influenced by injury severity. The composite score for victim femininity included the average score of the same nine traits used in study 1 ($\alpha = .67$).

Similarly, the composite score for perpetrator masculinity included the average score of the same seven traits used in study 1 ($\alpha = .77$).

A 2 x 3 (Relationship Type (Heterosexual/Same-Sex) X Injury Severity (No, Low, and High) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with perceptions of victim femininity and perpetrator masculinity as the dependent variables (DV). Results indicated that there was a non-significant main effect of injury severity on perceptions of victim femininity, $F(2,184) = .316$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .004$. However, there was a significant main effect of injury severity on perceptions of perpetrator masculinity, $F(2,184) = 4.78$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$ (see Figure 11). Tukey's HSD test revealed that participants rated the perpetrator in the high injury incident ($M = 4.12$, $SD = .74$) as significantly more masculine than the perpetrator in the no injury incident ($M = 4.53$, $SD = .77$). These results were not qualified by a significant relationship type x injury severity interaction for victim femininity, $F(2,184) = .09$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$, or perpetrator masculinity, $F(2,184) = .08$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .007$.

With regard to relationship type, there was a significant main effect of relationship type on victim femininity, $F(2,184) = 4.00$, $p = .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. The same-sex female victim was perceived as more feminine ($M = 3.57$) than the heterosexual victim ($M = 3.39$). However, there was no significant effect of relationship type on perpetrator masculinity, $F(2,184) = 2.38$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$.

Taken together, these results partially support study predictions. While victims in the higher injury conditions were not perceived as significantly more feminine than those in the lower injury conditions, the perpetrator in the high injury condition was perceived as significantly more masculine than the perpetrator in the no injury condition. This effect was consistent regardless of relationship type.

Discussion

Summary of Findings

Consistent with the study's hypothesis, results found that when victims sustained a high degree of injury, the incident was perceived as significantly more serious and deserving of intervention than when victims sustained no injury. Counter to study predictions, there was no significant main effect of relationship type. Though there was in trend in the mean seriousness ratings suggesting that incidents of equal injury were rated as slightly more serious in the prototypical condition, this effect did not approach significance. Thus, regardless of relationship type (i.e., prototypical or non-prototypical IPV), the incidents were perceived as more serious if the victims sustained a greater degree of injury.

This study did find a significant effect of participant sex. Overall, females rated incidents of IPV as more serious than males. Moreover, results indicated that ratings of victim femininity were not influenced by the degree of injury victims sustained. However, ratings of perpetrator masculinity were. Perpetrators who inflicted a high degree of physical injury onto their victims were perceived as significantly more masculine than perpetrators who inflicted no degree onto their victims. Again, this effect held regardless of relationship type or perpetrator sex (i.e., male/female).

Implications

This study was the first to actually control for the degree of victim injury sustained in scenarios or prototypical and non-prototypical violence. Previous literature has argued that gender-role stereotypes and physical sex differences highlight the difference in the capacity for victim injury based on perpetrator sex. The current study manipulated the degree of injury

sustained by victims in attempt to clarify if discrepancies in evaluations of seriousness for non-prototypical violence are largely due to perceived injury capacity.

The results of this study indicate that evaluations of seriousness are largely influenced by victim injury. Regardless of relationship type (prototypical or non-prototypical IPV), when perceivers were made aware that victims sustained the same degree of injury, they rated both incidents as equally serious and deserving of intervention. This is a substantial contribution to the literature because it empirically demonstrates that victim injury does have a specific impact on seriousness perceptions. Given this finding, there are several implications to consider.

One implication is that perceivers are assuming that a smaller degree of injury is sustained by victims in instances of non-prototypical violence (i.e., same-sex and female-on-male violence). Though this is certainly logical given physical sex differences between men and women, it has potentially dangerous implications. For female-on-male violence, these findings highlight the assumption that females are incapable of inflicting harm or physical injury upon male victims. Though researchers are still exploring potential explanations for this finding, research has found that females are more likely to use weapons when perpetrating acts of violence than males (Archer, 2000). With regard to SSV, it appears that partners are assumed to be physically matched. The danger of these assumptions for all non-prototypical instances of IPV is that the seriousness of their victimization is then trivialized and downplayed.

General Discussion

Study Findings and Implications

The findings of study 1 and study 2 do suggest that gender-role stereotypes and physical sex differences between men and women largely explain perceiver ratings of seriousness for

prototypical and non-prototypical IPV. In study 1, the mean ratings of dyad seriousness were as follows: male-on-female, male-on-male, female-on-female, and female-on-male. In regards to significance, the male-on-female incident was perceived as significantly more serious than all non-prototypical instances of IPV. Moreover, the finding that the male-on-male incident was perceived as significantly more serious than the female-on-male incident also supports a gender-stereotypical assumption. Overall, the pattern of results are consistent with gender-role stereotypes and physical sex differences that hold that males are more capable of injuring victims than females, while females are more likely to be injured than males. Moreover, the findings of study 2 further support the substantial role of injury capacity in evaluations of seriousness.

Although these studies offer a great deal of clarification regarding how injury severity contributes to seriousness perceptions, there are several potentially harmful implications. We can see from study 1 that perceivers are relying on gender-role stereotypes to assume that less physical injury is occurring in non-prototypical IPV, since no actual information is provided about the degree of injury the victim sustains in this study. Given the physical sex differences between males and females, these assumptions are certainly rational in one sense. However, males are in fact capable of being injured and females are in fact capable of inflicting serious injuries upon others. Moreover, engaging in this process of comparison ultimately allows for non-prototypical IPV to be trivialized and downplayed in comparison to prototypical IPV.

Once perceiver's were provided with information about injury severity, results indicated a similar evaluation of seriousness across instances of prototypical and non-prototypical IPV in study 2 (i.e., female SSV). Though this finding was encouraging, it subtly suggests that the seriousness of one's victimization experience is measured by the degree of injury sustained. This

sole focus disregards the emotional and psychological harm that can also be associated with one's victimization of IPV.

Another interesting finding of the current study was the rating of female-on-male IPV as the least serious. The minimization of female-on-male violence was unique from the other instances of IPV in several ways. For instance, this was the only incident in which attributions of victim and perpetrator blame were non-statistically different from one another. Thus, the victim was blamed to the same degree as the perpetrator for the act of violence he experienced. In addition, the heterosexual male victim was blamed significantly more for his victimization than the heterosexual female victim.

There are several potential explanations for these findings. The most obvious is that the occurrence of female-on-male violence represents the biggest violation of gender-role stereotypes in comparison to the other instances of IPV. While the heterosexual female victim is assumed to be weaker than her male perpetrator, the male and female same-sex victims are presumed to be equally matched. Therefore, the female-on-male incident represents the only incident where the victim is stereotypically presumed to be physically stronger than his perpetrator. The lower ratings of seriousness could represent participants' perception that he is least likely to be hurt. This interpretation does seem to align with prior research demonstrating that males are less likely to sustain injury from female perpetrators than females with male perpetrators (Milton & Sillito, 2012).

Beyond this minimization of seriousness, we can also see that male victims of female perpetrated violence are blamed more for their victimization experience. This could indicate that perceivers are punishing him for his gender-role violation or lack of masculinity and dominance over his female partner. Along those lines, this study also found that regardless of sex, victims

are perceived as more feminine and less masculine than their perpetrators. Thus, it appears that the concern male victims have about being viewed as less masculine for reporting the occurrence of IPV is substantial and valid. This highlights the many additional help-seeking barriers male victims of female perpetrated violence may face as a result of gender-role stereotypes.

Finally, the current research also demonstrated that perceiver attitudes play a significant role in one's evaluation of non-prototypical IPV. Although study 2 certainly found that injury severity explains a great deal about seriousness evaluations, study 1 showed that such evaluations are moderated by perceiver attitudes. With regard to the female-on-male incident, those with more traditional ideas about male dominance and female submissiveness rated the incident as significantly less serious than those with more egalitarian gender-role beliefs. For SSV, the picture was notably more complicated. Though attitudes towards same-sex marriage, homonegativity, traditional gender roles, and misconceptions about SSV played role in moderating such perceptions, they did so in a more complex and intersectional manner.

Limitations of Present Research

There are a few limitations that need to be considered when interpreting the results of this study. First, a convenience sample of students from a public Northeastern university was used. University students tend to hold more favorable and homogenous attitudes towards gays, lesbians, same-sex marriage, and egalitarian gender roles than that of the generable population. It is possible that such attitudes would have emerged as more significant predictors of seriousness perceptions if there were more variability in the sample (e.g., age, sexual orientation, SES, region, etc). Therefore, the results of this study cannot be generalized to all university students or a more community-based sample.

A second limitation of the current study was the predominant focus on attitudes toward women in the measures of traditional gender roles. While the measures did assess traditional gender role beliefs, they were more focused on the equality for the roles of women in comparison to men. Individuals' attitudes toward the expectation of hegemonic masculinity and the violation of such expectations for men were not adequately assessed. The use of a measure that specifically captured traditional gender role expectations for men could be of use for future research.

Another limitation of the current studies was their exclusive focus on physical violence in the examination of IPV. IPV is multifaceted and includes several forms of abuse such as sexual or psychological abuse. Moreover, research has found that other forms of abuse can be just as detrimental to victims as physical violence (Hamby and Jackson, 2012). The sole focus on physical violence in the current studies is especially likely to prompt perceivers to focus on the physical differences between men and women. As these Study 2 found, injury severity is a substantial factor in explaining perceptions of seriousness for physical violence in relationships. However, psychological abuse appears to level the playing field between men and women in regards to the potential for emotional harm.

Conclusions and Future Directions

Despite these limitations, this study offers a substantial contribution to the current literature on non-prototypical IPV. It provides empirical support for the notion that the seriousness discrepancies between prototypical and non-prototypical of IPV are largely explained by how gender-role stereotypes influence perceived victim injury severity. Additionally, it demonstrates that perceiver attitudes also play a role in moderating perceptions

of seriousness for non-prototypical instances of IPV. For instance, those with more egalitarian gender role attitudes are more likely to see the female-on-male incident as serious in comparison to those with more traditional beliefs. Thus, perceptions of IPV represent a complex interaction between the incident one is observing, their gender role beliefs, homogeneity, and the attitudes they may hold towards same-sex relationships and the occurrence of SSV.

Another conclusion from these studies is that a gendered prototype is applied to all forms of IPV. Regardless of sex, victimization is associated more feminine traits, while perpetration of violence is associated with more masculine traits. Given our society's prominent gender stereotypes, it is not surprising that victimization is associated with more vulnerability and passivity while perpetration of violence is associated with aggression and dominance. The findings of the current work tell a consistent story of how gender-role stereotypes strongly influence perceptions of IPV. Unfortunately, these stereotypes maintain the minimization of SSV and female-on-male violence. Male victims of female perpetrated violence are especially vulnerable for having their victimization downplayed when seeking assistance.

Organizations with individuals providing formal assistance to victims of IPV (e.g., police, domestic violence staff, counselors, etc.) would benefit greatly from having formal training about the prevalence and dynamics of non-prototypical IPV. Since perceiver attitudes influence perceptions of IPV, such trainings should also promote cultural competency by encouraging providers to examine their own biases and attitudes towards gender-roles and same-sex relationships. If organizations and their providers are seen as more accepting and understanding of male and same-sex victims, then victims of non-prototypical IPV may be more likely to seek out formal services.

Future research would benefit greatly from investigating if the minimization of non-prototypical cases of IPV still holds for instances of psychological abuse. We now know that gender-role stereotypes and physical sex differences play a large role in perceived injury capacity, which strongly influences seriousness perceptions. However, psychological abuse often occurs alongside of physical violence in IPV (CDC, 2008). Exploring if the use of psychological abuse is seen as equally serious for all instances of IPV would further our understanding of IPV more broadly.

Furthermore, it would be worthwhile to attempt a replication of study 1's findings for SSV. The results of this study indicated that the intersection of multiple factors (i.e., SSV, gender-role attitudes, homonegativity, and attitudes towards same-sex marriage) influenced perceptions of seriousness for female and male SSV in various ways. A replication of these findings would provide a more consistent and coherent story to support how these perceiver attitudes interact and influence perceptions of SSV.

References

- Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(5), 651-680. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.126.5.651
- Balsam, K. F. (2001). Nowhere to hide: Lesbian battering, homophobia, and minority stress. *Women & Therapy*, 23(3), 25-37. doi: 10.1300/J015v23n03_03
- Bartholomew, K., Regan, K. V., White, M. A., & Oram, D. (2008). Patterns of abuse in male same-sex relationships. *Violence and Victims*, 23(5), 617-636. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.23.5.617
- Basow, S. A., & Thompson, J. (2012). Service providers' reactions to intimate partner violence as a function of victim sexual orientation and type of abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(7), 1225-1241. doi: 10.1177/0886260511425241
- Berkel, L. A., Vandiver, B. J., & Bahner, A. D. (2004). Gender role attitudes, religion, and spirituality as predictors of domestic violence attitudes in white college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(2), 119-133. doi: 10.1353/csd.2004.0019
- Bimbi, D.S., Palmadessa, N.A., & Parsons, J.T. (2007). *Substance Use and Domestic Violence among Urban Gays, Lesbians and Bisexuals*. *Journal of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Health Research* 3: 1 – 7.
- Blosnich, J. R., & Bossarte, R. M. (2009). Comparisons of intimate partner violence among partners in same-sex and opposite-sex relationships in the united states. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99(12), 2182-2184. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2008.139535

- Bornstein, D. R., Fawcett, J., Sullivan, M., Senturia, K. D., & Shiu-Thornton, S. (2006). Understanding the experiences of lesbian, bisexual and trans survivors of domestic violence: A qualitative study. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51(1), 159-181. doi:10.1300/J082v51n01_08
- Brown, C. (2008). Gender-role implications on same-sex intimate partner abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*, 23(6), 457-462. doi: 10.1007/s10896-008-9172-9
- Brown, M. J., & Groscup, J. (2009). Perceptions of same-sex domestic violence among crisis center staff. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(2), 87-93. doi: 10.1007/s10896-008-9212-5
- Brownridge, D. A. (2002). Cultural variation in male partner violence against women: A comparison of québec with the rest of canada. *Violence Against Women*, 8(1), 87-115. doi: 10.1177/10778010222182955
- Carlson, E. B., & Dutton, M. A. (2003). Assessing experiences and responses of crime victims. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 16(2), 133-148. doi: 10.1023/A:1022843122227
- Carvalho, A. F., Lewis, R. J., Derlega, V. J., Winstead, B. A., & Viggiano, C. (2011). Internalized sexual minority stressors and same-sex intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 26(7), 501-509. doi: 10.1007/s10896-011-9384-2
- Chaudhuri, T. (2012). Patterns of male victimization in intimate relationships: A pilot comparison of academic and media reports. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 20(1), 57-72. doi: 10.3149/jms.2001.57
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829-859. doi: 10.1177/0891243205278639

- Connolly, C., Huzurbazar, S., & Routh-McGee, T. (2000). Multiple parties in domestic violence situations and arrest. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28(3), 181-188. doi: 10.1016/S0047-2352(00)00034-9
- Cruz, J. M., & Firestone, J. M. (1998). Exploring violence and abuse in gay male relationships. *Violence and Victims*, 13(2), 159–173.
- Eckstein, J. J. (2011). Reasons for staying in intimately violent relationships: Comparisons of men and women and messages communicated to self and others. *Journal of Family Violence*, 26(1), 21-30. doi: 10.1007/s10896-010-9338-0
- Fiebert, M. S., & Gonzalez, D. M. (1997). College women who initiate assaults on their male partners and the reasons offered for such behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 80(2), 583-590. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1997.80.2.583
- Gaskins, J. (2010). Same-Sex domestic violence: The effects of gender role attitudes, homonegativity, and misconceptions on attributions of seriousness and blame. (Unpublished thesis). University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.
- Gelles, R. J. (2000). Estimating the incidence and prevalence of violence against women: National data systems and sources. *Violence Against Women*, 6(7), 784-804. doi: 10.1177/10778010022182146
- Giorgio, G. (2002). Speaking silence: Definitional dialogues in abusive lesbian relationships. *Violence Against Women*, 8(10), 1233-1259. doi: 10.1177/107780102320562709
- Girshick, L. B. (2002). No sugar, no spice: Reflections on research on woman-to- woman sexual

- violence. *Violence Against Women*, 8, 1500-1520. doi: 10.1177/107780102237967
- Hamby, S., & Jackson, A. (2010). Size does matter: The effects of gender on perceptions of dating violence. *Sex Roles*, 63(5-6), 324-331. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9816-0
- Hardesty, J. L., Oswald, R. F., Khaw, L., & Fonseca, C. (2011). Lesbian/bisexual mothers and intimate partner violence: Help seeking in the context of social and legal vulnerability. *Violence Against Women*, 17(1), 28-46. doi: 10.1177/1077801209347636
- Harris, R. J., & Cook, C. A. (1994). Attributions about spouse abuse: It matters who the batterers and victims are. *Sex Roles*, 30(7-8), 553-565. doi: 10.1007/BF01420802
- Hassounah, D., & Glass, N. (2008). The influence of gender role stereotyping on women's experiences of female same-sex intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women*, 14(3), 310-325. doi: 10.1177/1077801207313734
- Hequembourg, A. L., Parks, K. A., & Vetter, C. (2008). Sexual identity and gender differences in substance use and violence: An exploratory study. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, 2(3), 174-198. doi: 10.1080/15538600802119301
- Herek, G. M. (2002). Gender gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66(1), 40-66. doi: 10.1086/338409
- Herek, G. M. (2007). Confronting sexual stigma and prejudice: Theory and practice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63(4), 905-925. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00544.x
- Hines, D. A., Brown, J., & Dunning, E. (2007). Characteristics of callers to the domestic abuse helpline for men. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22(2), 63-72. doi: 10.1007/s10896-006-90520

- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2011). Symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder in men who sustain intimate partner violence: A study of helpseeking and community samples. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12*(2), 112-127. doi: 10.1037/a0022983
- Kelly, B. C., Izienicki, H., Bimbi, D. S., & Parsons, J. T. (2011). The intersection of mutual partner violence and substance use among urban gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. *Deviant Behavior, 32*(5), 379-404. doi: 10.1080/01639621003800158
- Kimmel, M. S. (2002). 'Gender symmetry' in domestic violence: A substantive and methodological research review. *Violence Against Women, 8*(11), 1332-1363. doi: 10.1177/107780102762478037
- Klostermann, K., Kelley, M. L., Milletich, R. J., & Mignone, T. (2011). Alcoholism and partner aggression among gay and lesbian couples. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 16*(2), 115-119. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2011.01.002
- Lewis, R. J., Milletich, R. J., Kelley, M. L., & Woody, A. (2012). Minority stress, substance use, and intimate partner violence among sexual minority women. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17*(3), 247-256. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2012.02.004
- Little, B., & Terrance, C. (2010). Perceptions of domestic violence in lesbian relationships: Stereotypes and gender role expectations. *Journal of Homosexuality, 57*(3), 429-440. doi: 10.1080/00918360903543170

- Max, W., Rice, D. P., Finkelstein, E., Bardwell, R. A., & Leadbetter, S. (2004). The economic toll of intimate partner violence against women in the united states. *Violence and Victims*, 19(3), 259-272. doi: 10.1891/vivi.19.3.259.65767
- McClennen, J. C. (2005). Domestic violence between same-gender partners: Recent findings and future research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(2), 149-154. doi: 10.1177/0886260504268762
- Melton, H. C., & Sillito, C. L. (2012). The role of gender in officially reported intimate partner abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(6), 1090-1111. doi: 10.1177/0886260511424498
- Merrill, G. S., & Wolfe, V. A. (2000). Battered gay men: An exploration of abuse, help seeking and why they stay. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 39(2), 1-30. doi: 10.1300/J082v39n02_01
- Migliaccio, T. A. (2001). Marginalizing the battered male. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 9(2), 205-226. doi: 10.3149/jms.0902.205
- Muller, H. J., Desmarais, S. L., & Hamel, J. M. (2009). Do judicial responses to restraining order requests discriminate against male victims of domestic violence? *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(8), 625-637. doi: 10.1007/s10896-009-9261-4
- Murray, C. E., & Mobley, A. K. (2009). Empirical research about same-sex intimate partner violence: A methodological review. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 56(3), 361-386. doi: 10.1080/00918360902728848
- National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs. (2000). *Annual report on lesbian, gay,*

bisexual, and transgender domestic violence. Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

- Oringher, J., & Samuelson, K. W. (2011). Intimate partner violence and the role of masculinity in male same-sex relationships. *Traumatology, 17*(2), 68-74. doi: 10.1177/1534765610395620
- Pearl, M., & Galupo (2007). Development and validation of the attitudes towards same-sex marriage scale. *Journal of Homosexuality, 53*(3), 117-143. doi: 10.1300/J082v53n03_07
- Poorman, P. B., Seelau, E. P., & Seelau, S. M. (2003). Perceptions of domestic abuse in same-sex relationships and implications for criminal justice and mental health responses. *Violence and Victims, 18*(6), 659-669. doi: 10.1891/vivi.2003.18.6.659
- Randle, A. A., & Graham, C. A. (2011). A review of the evidence on the effects of intimate partner violence on men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12*(2), 97-111. doi: 10.1037/a0021944
- Reidy, D. E., Shirk, S. D., Sloan, C. A., & Zeichner, A. (2009). Men who aggress against women: Effects of feminine gender role violation on physical aggression in hypermasculine men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10*(1), 1-12. doi: 10.1037/a0014794
- Renzetti, C. M. (1992). *Violent betrayal: Partner abuse in lesbian relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Renzetti, C. M. (1996). The poverty of services for battered lesbians. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 4*(1), 61-68. 10.1300/J041v04n01_07
- Ristock, J. I. (2002). *No more secrets: Violence in lesbian relationships*. New York: Routledge.

Saltzman, L.E., Fanslow, J.L., McMahon, P.M., & Shelley, G.A. (2002). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Atlanta, GA.

Seelau, S. M., & Seelau, E. P. (2005). Gender-role stereotypes and perceptions of heterosexual, gay and lesbian domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 20(6), 363-371. doi: 10.1007/s10896-005-7798-4

Seelau, S. M., & Seelau, E. P. (2005). Gender-role stereotypes and perceptions of heterosexual, gay and lesbian domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 20(6), 363-371. doi: 10.1007/s10896-005-7798-4

Shaver, K. G. (1985). *The attribution of blame: Causality, responsibility, and lameworthiness*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Simpson, E. K., & Helfrich, C. A. (2007). Lesbian survivors of intimate partner violence: Provider perspectives on barriers to accessing services. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services: Issues in Practice, Policy & Research*, 18(2), 39-59. doi: 10.1300/J041v18n02_03

Stith, S. M., Smith, D. B., Penn, C. E., Ward, D. B., & Tritt, D. (2004). Intimate partner physical abuse perpetration and victimization risk factors: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 10(1), 65-98. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2003.09.001

- Terrance, C. A., Plumm, K. M., & Thomas, S. A. (2011). Perceptions of domestic violence in heterosexual relationships: Impact of victim gender and history of response. *Partner Abuse*, 2(2), 208-223. doi: 10.1891/1946-6560.2.2.208
- Turell, S. C. (2000). Seeking help for same-sex relationship abuses. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 10(2), 35-49. 10.1300/J041v10n02_02
- Turell, S. & Cornell-Swanson, L. (2005). Not all alike: within group differences in seeking help for same-sex relationship abuses. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Services*, 18(1), 77-88. doi:10.1300/J041v18n01_06
- Walters, M. L. (2011). Straighten up and act like a lady: A qualitative study of lesbian survivors of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services: The Quarterly Journal of Community & Clinical Practice*, 23(2), 250-270. doi: 10.1080/10538720.2011.559148
- Willis, C. E., Hallinan, M. N., & Melby, J. (1996). Effects of sex role stereotyping among european american students on domestic violence culpability attributions. *Sex Roles*, 34(7-8), 475-491. doi: 10.1007/BF01545027

Table I. Independent Samples t-tests of DV's and attitude measures by manipulation check status for Study 1

	Included		Excluded		
	<i>n</i> = 375		<i>n</i> = 87		<i>T</i>
Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Seriousness	3.41	1 .08	3.41	1.02	-.02
Victim Blame	3.46	.83	3.64	.79	-1.89*
Perpetrator Blame	4.00	.86	3.57	.90	4.05**
Hostile Sexism	3.31	.87	3.43	.86	-1.13
AWS	44.08	10.38	48.28	11.57	-3.24**
ATSM	35.16	14.97	40.57	14.98	-2.97**
MHS-G	35.44	13.03	35.16	14.97	-1.44
MHS-L	33.35	13.31	35.00	12.01	-1.09
SSV Misconceptions	2.47	.85	2.62	.80	-1.40

**p<.01; *p = .06

Note. **AWS** = Attitudes towards women scale; **ATSM**=Attitudes towards same-sex marriage scale;

SSV Misconceptions= Same-Sex Violence Misconceptions Scale; **MHS**=Modern Homonegativity Scale (G or L indicates Gay or Lesbian Version)

Table II. Correlations Among Dependent Variables in Study 1

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Seriousness	-	-.138**	.382**	.072	.164**
2. Victim Blame		-	-.226**	.056	.051
3. Perpetrator Blame			-	.246**	.347**
4. Victim Femininity				-	.440**
5. Perpetrator Masculinity					-

Note. ** $p < .01$

Table III. Descriptive Statistics: Means and Standard Deviations of Attitude Measures by Sex for Study 1

	Men		Women		
	<i>n</i> =188		<i>n</i> =274		<i>F</i>
Characteristics	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
AWS	49.45	10 .47	41.70	9.72	63.66**
Hostile Sexism	3.67	.87	3.10	.78	53.40**
MHS-L	38.34	12.56	30.47	11.63	46.96**
MHS-G	38.32	12.09	30.58	11.40	48.37**
ATSM	39.69	15.49	33.64	14.32	18.04**
SSV Misconceptions	2.77	.78	2.32	.83	34.04**

Note. ** $p < .001$

Note. **AWS** = Attitudes towards women scale; **ATSM**=Attitudes towards same-sex marriage scale;

SSV Misconceptions= Same-Sex Violence Misconceptions Scale; **MHS**=Modern Homonegativity Scale (G or L indicates Gay or Lesbian Version)

Table IV. Correlations Among Attitude Variables in Study 1

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.Hositle Sexism	-	.434**	.349**	.441**	.493**	.284**
2. AWS		-	.458**	.520**	.565**	.582**
3. SSV Misconceptions			-	.399**	.409**	.375**
4. MHS-G				-	.855**	.629**
5. MHS-L					-	.634**
6. ATSM						-

Note. ** p<.01

Note. **AWS** = Attitudes towards women scale; **ATSM**=Attitudes towards same-sex marriage scale;

SSV Misconceptions= Same-Sex Violence Misconceptions Scale; **MHS**=Modern Homonegativity Scale (G or L indicates Gay or Lesbian Version)

Table V. Hierarchical regression on seriousness in the female same-sex condition in Study 1 (N=101)

Predictor	Step 1 β	Step 2 β	Step 3 β
Sex	.08	.05	.07
Manipulation Check Status	.006	.05	.08
SSV Misconceptions		-.14	-.24
ATSM		-.006	-.05
AWS		.23	.21
MHS-L		-.20	-.17
Sex x SSV Misconceptions			.12
SSV Misconceptions x ATSM			-.22*
ATSM x AWS			.23

*p = .05

Note. **AWS** = Attitudes towards women scale; **ATSM**=Attitudes towards same-sex marriage scale;

SSV Misconceptions= Same-Sex Violence Misconceptions Scale; **MHS**=Modern Homonegativity Scale (G or L indicates Gay or Lesbian Version)

Table VI. Hierarchical regression on seriousness in the male same-sex condition in Study 1 (N=107)

Predictor	Step 1 β	Step 2 β	Step 3 β
Sex	.19	.12	.15
Manipulation Check Status	-.04	-.05	-.04
SSV Misconceptions	.	.04	.27
ATSM		.19	-.11
AWS		-.13	-.11
MHS-G		-.24	-.33*
Sex x ATSM			.19
Sex x SSV Misconceptions			-.24
MHS-G x ATSM			.23*

*p < .05

Note. **AWS** = Attitudes towards women scale; **ATSM**=Attitudes towards same-sex marriage scale;

SSV Misconceptions= Same-Sex Violence Misconceptions Scale; **MHS**=Modern Homonegativity Scale (G or L indicates Gay or Lesbian Version)

Table VII. Hierarchical regression on seriousness in the female-on-male condition (N=104)

Predictor	Step 1 β	Step 2 β
Sex	.17	.12
Manipulation Check Status	-.19	-.23*
AWS		.09
Hostile Sexism		-.31**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Note. **AWS** = Attitudes towards women scale

Table VIII. Hierarchical regression on seriousness in the male-on-female condition in Study 1 (N=111)

Predictor	Step 1 β	Step 2 β
Sex	-.05	-.16
Manipulation Check Status	.10	.04
Hostile Sexism		-.13
AWS		-.27*

* $p < .05$

Note. AWS = Attitudes towards women scale

Figure 1. Mean of seriousness by condition in Study 1






Figure 2. Interaction between SSV misconceptions and attitudes towards same-sex marriage in the female same-sex condition in Study 1



Note. Means are plotted 1 SD above and below the sample mean for low and high of measures

Figure 3. Interaction between homonegativity towards gay men and same-sex marriage in the male same-sex condition in Study 1



Note. Means are plotted 1 SD above and below the sample mean for low and high of measures

Figure 4. Mean attributions of victim blame by condition in Study 1




Figure 5. Mean attributions of perpetrator blame by condition






Figure 6. Mean attributions of victim and perpetrator blame within conditions in Study 1




Note. Results among participants with correct manipulation checks

Figure 7. Mean ratings of victim and perpetrator femininity by condition



Note. Results among participants with correct manipulation checks

Figure 8. Mean ratings of victim and perpetrator masculinity by condition



Note. Results among participants with correct manipulation checks

Figure 9. Mean ratings of seriousness by relationship type and injury severity in Study 2.





Figure 10. Mean ratings of victim femininity and perpetrator masculinity by injury severity in Study 2.



Appendix A

IPV Vignette (example is for female-on-female incident)

INCIDENT REPORT

ANEIDA COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT

Telephone: () Fax: ()

INCIDENT: Domestic Dispute

CASE #: 43-5170

COMPLAINANT: Unknown

ADDRESS OF OCCURANCE:

DATE OF REPORT: 10/16/2008

TIME: 2025 Hrs.

DAY: THURSDAY

REPORTED TO: Dispatch

REPORTING OFFICER: J. Anderson #17229

SHIFT: NIGHT

DETAILS:

On October 16, 2008, I responded to an anonymous phone call from dispatch reporting the occurrence of a domestic dispute. When I arrived at the residence of the reported dispute, the dispute between both parties appeared to have ended. After gathering all necessary information from the individuals involved, I conducted separate interviews with Janet [REDACTED] and Erica [REDACTED].

STATEMENTS:

Below are verbatim transcripts from the statements both parties provided the officer at the scene.

Erica [REDACTED]'s Statement:

"I was cooking dinner and Janet was late. I was pretty annoyed because she didn't even bother to call me to um, to let me know that she was going to be getting home late. Then, when she finally did walk in the door I started to ask her why she was coming home at this time. What she told me was that it had been a long day and that I need to just leave her alone. So, since she didn't answer my question, I asked her again why she was getting home late you know, and still no response.

She was just being so rude and disrespectful, treating me like I'm nothing and blatantly ignoring me. Because I wanted an answer and felt like I deserved one, I followed her into the living room and kept asking about it. She was still ignoring me. I asked "did you have to stay at work late?", "did you go out with some of your co-workers after work?" All she had to do was give me a simple head nod or something, but nothing. Now I am pissed and just uh, just feeling so frustrated. I started yelling, "where were you!", you didn't even have the decency to call!". Then all of a sudden she starts getting real angry and yelled at me to "get the hell out of her face and leave her alone!" Now, we are both screaming things back and forth at each other. Next thing I know she storms up to me and hits me in the face."

Janet [REDACTED]'s Statement:

"I had an extremely long and busy day at work today and so I didn't have time to call Erica to tell her that I wouldn't be home on time. Then, as soon as I open the door there she goes just nagging me about 99 reasons why I'm getting home late. So I calmly told her that it had been a long day and that, that I just wanted to relax and be left alone. But Erica just kept on following me around everywhere in the house, bugging me and screaming at me, "where were you!" and "you didn't even have the decency to call!" So now I'm starting to get pretty upset and I'm telling her to leave me alone for just one second. I mean it, it was like she didn't even hear me. All I wanted was to be left alone for a little while, just a little while so I could relax. It had been such an exhausting day and I um, I literally had like no energy left in me for a silly conversation with her. But she just continues to follow my every step and keeps on yelling in my face, demanding that "I need to tell her why I'm late right now". I tried real hard to walk away from her, but but she kept on following me, nagging me over and over again about this question. I even warned her to get out of my face and leave me alone, but no, she's still following me around. After a while, I couldn't take her nagging anymore and I just, I just lost control and hit her."

SUBSEQUENT INFORMATION:

No weapons were used and Erica [REDACTED] reported that neither she nor Janet [REDACTED] had consumed any alcohol that evening.

STATUS:

Incident report was filed with the Aneida County Police Department.

Officer Jeffery Anderson # 17229
10/17/08 1900 hrs.

Appendix B

Attribution Questionnaire (female-on-female incident example)

Given the statements provided, please indicate your response to the following questions.

1. How serious was the incident?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

2. How harmful was the incident?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

3. How responsible was Erica?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

4. How believable is Erica's statement about the incident?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

5. How much did Erica provoke Janet's response?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

6. How much do you understand Erica's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

7. How abusive was Erica's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

8. How much was Erica to blame for the incident?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

9. How much did Erica deserve Janet's response?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

10. How sorry do you feel for Erica?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

11. How hurt do you think Erica was due to the incident?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

12. How much do you identify with Erica?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

13. How easily do you think Erica will get past this incident?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

14. How responsible was Janet?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

15. How believable is Janet's statement about the incident?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

16. How much did Janet provoke Erica's response?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

17. How much do you understand Janet's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

18. How abusive was Janet's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

19. How much was Janet to blame for the incident?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

20. How much did Janet deserve Erica's response?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

21. How sorry do you feel for Janet?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

22. How hurt do you think Janet was due to the incident?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

23. How much do you identify with Janet?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

24. How easily do you think Janet will get past this incident?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

25. If you were a neighbor who was aware of this situation, how likely would you be to call the police?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

26. How easily do you think the couple will reconcile?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

27. How likely do you think it is that the couple will break up?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

28. How likely do you think it is that this situation will occur again?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

29. How necessary was police response or intervention for this incident?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not necessary					Very necessary

30. Please indicate how you feel the police should later respond to Janet as a result of the domestic dispute.

_____ Talk to Janet

_____ Issue Janet a citation

_____ Arrest Janet

_____ Encourage Janet to seek treatment

Manipulation Check for Female-on-Female Incident

Please answer true or false to the following statements:

1. Erica slapped Janet during their dispute.	TRUE	FALSE
--	------	-------

2. Janet and Erica are a same-sex couple.	TRUE	FALSE
---	------	-------

Appendix C

Victim and Perpetrator Gender Trait Evaluations (Female-on-female incident example)

Please indicate how characteristic you think the following traits are of Erica/Janet.

KIND					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
PASSIVE					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
INDEPENDENT					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
ASSERTIVE					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
GENTLE					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
STRONG					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
AGGRESSIVE					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
GENTLE					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
AMBITIOUS					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
NURTURING					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

DOMINANT					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
SENSITIVE					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
NONVIOLENT					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
TOUGH					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
ATHLETIC					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
SOPHISTICATED					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
VIOLENT					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
EMOTIONAL					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
ATTRACTIVE					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
INTELLIGENT					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
WEAK					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so
TALKATIVE					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all					Very much so

Appendix D

Hostile Sexism Scale

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over women, under the guise of asking for “equality”.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

2. Most women interpret innocent remarks of acts as being sexist.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

3. Women are often too easily offended.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

4. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

5. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

6. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

7. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

8. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

9. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

10. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

11. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

Appendix E

Attitudes Towards Women Scale-Short Version

Instructions: The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the roles of women in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you (A) agree strongly, (B) agree mildly, (C) disagree mildly, or (D) disagree strongly.

1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

2* Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

3.* Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

4. Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

5. Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

6.* Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

7.* It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

8.* There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

9.* A woman should be free as a man to propose marriage.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

10. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

11.* Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

12.* Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

13. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

14. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

15. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

16. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

17. Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiancés.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

18.* The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

19. Women should be concerned with their duties of childbearing and house tending rather than with desires for professional or business careers.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

20. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

21.* Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

22. On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

23. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

24.* Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

25.* The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.

A	B	C	D
Agree strongly	Agree mildly	Disagree mildly	Disagree strongly

*Indicates a reverse scoring of an item.

Appendix F

The Modern Homonegativity Scale

Please read each statement carefully and respond by indicating a number on the scale.

1. Many gay men use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

2. Gay men seem to focus on the ways in which they differ from heterosexuals, and ignore the ways in which they are the same.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

3. Gay men do not have the rights they need.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

4. The notion of universities providing students with undergraduate degrees in Gay and Lesbian studies is ridiculous.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

5. Celebrations like “Gay Pride Day” are ridiculous because they assume that an individual’s sexual orientation should constitute a source of pride.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

6. Gay men still need to protest for equal rights.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

7. Gay men should stop shoving their lifestyle down people’s throats.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

8. If gay men want to be treated like everyone else, then they need to stop making such a fuss about their sexuality/culture.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

9. Gay men who are “out of the closet” should be admired for their courage.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

10. Gay men should stop complaining about the way they are treated in society and simply get on with their lives.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

11. In today’s tough economic times, Americans’ tax dollars shouldn’t be used to support gay men’s organizations.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

12. Gay men have become far too confrontational in their demand for equal rights.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

Embedded Filler Items

**Life begins at conception.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

**Abortion should be legal if the parents cannot afford the baby.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

**Women should make the decision for or against abortion since it is their bodies.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

**Abortion is morally wrong.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

**Abortion should be legal in the cases of rape or incest

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

**Abortion should be legal if the parents do not want that particular sex of the child.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

13. Many lesbians use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

14. Lesbians seem to focus on the ways in which they differ from heterosexuals, and ignore the ways in which they are the same.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

15. Lesbians do not have the rights they need.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

16. The notion of universities providing students with undergraduate degrees in Gay and Lesbian studies is ridiculous.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

17. Celebrations like "Gay Pride Day" are ridiculous because they assume that an individual's sexual orientation should constitute a source of pride.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

18. Lesbians still need to protest for equal rights.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

19. Lesbians should stop shoving their lifestyle down people's throats.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

20. If lesbians want to be treated like everyone else, then they need to stop making such a fuss about their sexuality/culture.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly					Strongly
Agree					Disagree

21. Lesbians who are “out of the closet” should be admired for their courage.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

22. Lesbians should stop complaining about the way they are treated in society and simply get on with their lives.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

23. In today’s tough economic times, Americans’ tax dollars shouldn’t be used to support lesbian organizations.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

24. Lesbians have become far too confrontational in their demand for equal rights.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree

Appendix G

Same-Sex Violence Misconceptions Scale

1. Violence between a same-sex couple is a fair fight.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. It is easier for victims of same-sex domestic violence to leave their relationships than victims of opposite-sex domestic violence.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. Men in same-sex relationships are rarely victims of domestic violence.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. Women in same-sex relationships are rarely perpetrators of domestic violence.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. Same-sex domestic violence is not as harmful as opposite-sex domestic violence.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Appendix H

Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Marriage Scale (ATSM)

1. Same-sex marriage undermines the meaning of the traditional family.*

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

2. Two loving same-sex parents can provide the same quality of parenting and guidance as a man and a woman.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

3. A primary purpose of marriage is to provide stability in a loving relationship. Same-sex partners should have this legal right available to them.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

4. The recognition of same-sex marriage poses a threat to society because public schools will be forced to teach that homosexuality is normal.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

5. Marital protections, such as social security and health care benefits, should be available to same-sex partners.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

6. Same-sex marriage will strengthen the morals of society by supporting equality.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

7. I support individuals who are not heterosexual seeking marriage rights.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

8. Because more people will have the benefits of marriage, family will be strengthened by the recognition of same-sex marriages.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

9. Men and women naturally complement one another, therefore a union between two men or two women should not be recognized in marriage.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree
--	------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------

10. The legalization of same-sex marriage is an important step toward the acceptance of individuals who are not heterosexual.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

11. A primary purpose of marriage is to raise children, therefore only a man and a woman should be married.*

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

12. Same-sex marriage ensures equal rights for all relationships regardless of sexual orientation.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

13. The legalization of same-sex marriage will lead to unnecessary financial burdens, such as social security and health care benefits.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

14. The legalization of same-sex marriage will jeopardize religious freedom.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

15. Individuals should be free to enter into marriage with another same-sex consenting adult because God created all people and does not make mistakes.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

16. Same-sex marriage will lead to the moral decay of society.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

17. I oppose the legalization of same-sex marriage.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither agree or disagree	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

Appendix I

INCIDENT REPORT

ANEIDA COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT

Telephone: () Fax: ()

INCIDENT: Domestic Dispute

CASE #: 43-5170

COMPLAINANT: Unknown

ADDRESS OF OCCURANCE:

DATE OF REPORT: 10/16/2008

TIME: 2025 Hrs.

DAY: THURSDAY

REPORTED TO: Dispatch

REPORTING OFFICER: J. Anderson #17229

SHIFT: NIGHT

DETAILS:

On October 16, 2008, I responded to an anonymous phone call made to dispatch reporting the occurrence of a domestic dispute. When I arrived at the residence of the reported dispute, the dispute between both parties appeared to have ended. After gathering all necessary information from the individuals involved, I conducted separate interviews with the two residents Chris and Erica .

STATEMENTS:

Below are verbatim transcripts from the statements both parties provided the officer at the scene.

Erica 's Statement:

"I was cooking dinner and Chris was late. I was pretty annoyed because he didn't even bother to call me to um, to let me know that he was going to be getting home late. Then, when he finally did walk in the door I started to ask him why he was coming home at this time. What he told me was that it had been a long day and that I need to just leave him alone. So, since he didn't answer my question, I asked him again why he was getting home late you know, and still no response. He was just being so rude and disrespectful, treating me like I'm nothing and blatantly ignoring me. Because I wanted an answer and felt like I

deserved one, I followed him into the living room and kept asking about it. He was still ignoring me. I asked "did you have to stay at work late?", "did you go out with some of your co-workers after work?" All he had to do was give me a simple head nod or something, but nothing. Now I am pissed and just uh, just feeling so frustrated. I started yelling, "where were you!", you didn't even have the decency to call!". Then all of a sudden he starts getting real angry and yelled at me to "get the hell out of his face and leave him alone!" Now, we are both screaming things back and forth at each other. I admit that I got in his face and started yelling back at him. I was standing in the doorway and the next thing I know he grabs me and pushes me into the wall, and I hit my face against it."

Chris [REDACTED]'s Statement:

"I had an extremely long and busy day at work today and so I didn't have time to call Erica to tell her that I wouldn't be home on time. Then, as soon as I open the door there she goes just nagging me about 99 reasons why I'm getting home late. So I calmly told her that it had been a long day and that, that I just wanted to relax and be left alone. But Erica just kept on following me around everywhere in the house, bugging me and screaming at me, "where were you!" and "you didn't even have the decency to call!" So now I'm starting to get pretty upset and I'm telling her to leave me alone for just one second. I mean it, it was like she didn't even hear me. All I wanted was to be left alone for a little while, just a little while so I could relax. It had been such an exhausting day and I um, I literally had like no energy left in me for a silly conversation with her. But she just continues to follow my every step and keeps on yelling in my face, demanding that "I need to tell her why I'm late right now". I tried real hard to walk away from her, but but she kept on following me, nagging me over and over again about this question. I even warned her to get out of my face and leave me alone, but no, she's still following me around. After a while, I couldn't take her nagging anymore. I tried to leave the house but she was blocking the door so I grabbed her and pushed her out of the way. When I pushed her, she hit the wall.

OBSERVED INJURIES: ***No injury condition***

I did not observe any injuries on either party. No weapons were used and Chris [REDACTED] and Erica [REDACTED] reported that neither had consumed any alcohol that evening.

OBSERVED INJURIES: ***Low injury condition***

I observed that Erica [REDACTED] had bruising around her right eye along with some swelling. Chris [REDACTED] did not have any visible injuries. No weapons were used and Chris [REDACTED] and Erica [REDACTED] reported that neither had consumed any alcohol that evening.

OBSERVED INJURIES: ***High injury condition***

I observed that Erica [REDACTED] had sustained a broken nose and had bruising and swelling around her right eye. Chris [REDACTED] did not have any visible injuries. No weapons were used and Chris [REDACTED] and Erica [REDACTED] reported that neither had consumed any alcohol that evening.

Officer Jeffery Anderson # 17229
10/17/08 1900 hrs.