

PERCEPTIONS OF VICTIMS AND PERPETRATORS OF INTIMATE PARTNER
ABUSE

by

Sarah Belle Parker

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts in Psychology
Middle Tennessee State University
August 2022

Thesis Committee:

Mary Ellen Fromuth, Ph.D., Committee Chair

James P. Loveless, Ph.D., Committee Member

Dana K. Fuller, Ph.D., Committee Member

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I want to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Fromuth, for her countless hours of guidance throughout the process of writing and editing my thesis. I could not have done this without her. I also want to thank my two committee members, Dr. Fuller and Dr. Loveless, for their assistance and advice. Also, I want to extend a special thanks to Dr. Davis for her help in recruiting participants for my thesis and for being a continual mentor while I pursued my degree. Next, I want to thank my family, friends, and other loved ones for the overwhelming support they have given me while in graduate school. I want to especially thank my parents, siblings, and grandparents for the sacrifices they have made to help me get to where I am now. Finally, I want to thank my sister Megan, who has always inspired me to keep going.

ABSTRACT

This study explored how type of abuse (physical versus psychological), sex dyad, and respondent sex affected how perpetrators and victims of intimate partner abuse were perceived. Respondents (137 undergraduates) read a scenario depicting intimate partner abuse. Results were analyzed with a series of 2x2x2 ANOVAs. For type of abuse, respondents were more likely to indicate that they would respond by taking action when the intimate partner abuse was physical rather than psychological. In addition, respondents perceived psychological abuse as more normative than physical abuse. Regarding the sex dyad, respondents indicated they would be more likely to take action when the perpetrator was male and the victim was female. When compared to male respondents, female respondents viewed intimate partner abuse as more harmful. Finally, a male perpetrator committing physical abuse was viewed as more responsible for the abuse than a female perpetrator. There was no difference found for psychological abuse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF APPENDICES	vii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Perceptions Based on Type of Intimate Partner Abuse	5
Perceptions Based on Sex of Perpetrator and Victim Dyad	7
Perceptions Based on Sex of Respondent	10
Summary	12
Hypotheses	14
CHAPTER II: METHOD	17
Respondents	17
Measures	20
Demographics	20
Scenarios	20
Questionnaires	20
Procedure	21
CHAPTER III: RESULTS	23
Descriptive Statistics	23
Hypotheses Testing and Analytical Strategy	23
Main Effects for Type of Abuse	25

Main Effects for Perpetrator and Victim Sex Dyad	25
Main Effects for Respondent Sex	28
Interactions	28
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION	33
REFERENCES	42
APPENDICES	45

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Demographic Information	18
2. Number of Respondents per Scenario by Sex of Respondent	19
3. Descriptive Statistics for Scales	24
4. Main Effects for Type of Abuse	26
5. Main Effects for Perpetrator and Victim Sex Dyad	27
6. Main Effects for Respondent Sex	29
7. Interactions for Type of Abuse and Perpetrator/Victim Sex Dyad	30
8. Interactions for Type of Abuse and Respondent Sex	31
9. Interactions for Respondent Sex and Perpetrator/Victim Sex Dyad	32

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
A. IRB Approval Form (Research Pool)	46
B. IRB Approval Form (General Psychology Courses)	49
C. Demographic Form	52
D. Intimate Partner Abuse Scenarios	53
E. Thesis Questions by Dependent Scales	55
F. Intimate Partner Abuse Questionnaires	58
G. Informed Consent Form (Research Pool)	82
H. Informed Consent Form (General Psychology Courses)	85
I. Debriefing Information	88

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Intimate partner abuse, also referred to as domestic abuse or intimate partner violence, is demonstrated as a major public health concern by data included in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Intimate Partner Violence Surveillance by Breiding et al. (2015). Breiding et al. (2015) broadly defines intimate partner abuse as physical violence, psychological aggression, sexual violence, stalking, and control of sexual or reproductive health by a current or past intimate partner. Additionally, intimate partners are identified as current or past spouses, boyfriends or girlfriends, dating partners, or ongoing sexual partners; spouses can include married, common-law, civil union, or domestic partner spouses (Breiding et al., 2015). Intimate partners may or may not be living with one another (Breiding et al., 2015).

Two common types of intimate partner abuse are physical intimate partner abuse and psychological intimate partner abuse. Physical intimate partner abuse includes behaviors such as slapping, shoving, punching, kicking, hair pulling, choking, beating, and using weapons to threaten or harm (Breiding et al., 2015). Psychological intimate partner abuse includes nonphysical acts that can be perceived as aggressive and are typically manipulative in nature (Breiding et al., 2015). For example, psychological intimate partner abuse includes behaviors such as humiliation, degradation, name-calling, coercive control, threatening physical or sexual violence, exploitation of victim's vulnerability, and "gaslighting" (Breiding et al., 2015).

The prevalence of intimate partner abuse reveals how serious of an issue it is. Breiding et al. (2015) concluded in their study of intimate partner abuse in the United States that roughly 29 million women and 16 million men had experienced some form of physical intimate partner abuse in their lifetimes. Furthermore, data gathered by Smith et al. (2017) for the CDC's National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) 2010-2012 State Report were used to estimate differences in reported instances of intimate partner abuse by sex. The data in the report by Smith et al. (2017) indicated that 28.3% of men and 32.4% of women reported experiencing physical violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime. In addition, 4.7% of these men and 3.6% of these women reported experiencing some form of physical intimate partner abuse in the last 12 months. As for psychological aggression in intimate partner relationships, 47.3% of men and 47.1% of women reported experiencing psychological aggression in their lifetime. Approximately 18.2% of these men and 14.1% of these women reported experiencing psychological aggression in the last 12 months of their intimate partner relationships (Smith et al., 2017).

There is research that details the negative correlates faced by victims of intimate partner abuse. Mechanic et al. (2008) researched negative correlates of physical intimate partner abuse by giving women, who were found through community agencies serving battered women, inventories on both abuse and adjustment. The inventories were then followed by interviews regarding the abuse experienced by the women. Mechanic et al. (2008) found that approximately one-third of their sample fell into the severe range for post-traumatic stress disorder symptomology and that 39% of their sample fell into the

severe range for depression symptomology (Mechanic et al., 2008). Smith et al. (2017) noted in their 2010-2012 NISVS State Report for the CDC that both men and women who reported experiencing physical intimate partner abuse also reported experiencing negative correlates such as fear, post-traumatic stress disorder symptomology, injuries, absences from work or school, and the need for the following services: medical care, housing services, victim's advocacy services, legal aid, or a crisis hotline, as well as other negative correlates related to the experience of intimate partner abuse.

In addition to the negative correlates mentioned previously, some research has suggested that suicidal ideation can be experienced by victims of intimate partner abuse. Wolford-Clevenger et al. (2016) surveyed 588 college students on their experience with intimate partner abuse and their subsequent feelings of depression and/or suicidal ideation. There was no significant difference between men and women when it came to prevalence of physical abuse, psychological abuse, depressive symptoms, and suicidal ideation (Wolford-Clevenger et al., 2016). The research found some variation between female and male students and their experience of suicidal ideation related to intimate partner abuse. Specifically, the experience of psychological intimate partner abuse was a significant predictor of suicidal ideation for female students (Wolford-Clevenger et al., 2016). Conversely, experiencing physical intimate partner abuse was a significant predictor of suicidal ideation for male students (Wolford-Clevenger et al., 2016).

Studying how intimate partner abuse victims are perceived is important because how victims believe they are perceived by others may impact whether they seek help or not (Tsui et al., 2010). A study of 699 women who described their experience of physical

intimate partner abuse to the Chicago Women's Health Risk Study (CWHRS) found that the most often reported reasons for not seeking help included that they did not think the services available would help them and because they did not think what happened was serious enough to seek care (Fugate et al., 2005). A study by Tsui et al. (2010) asked 76 mental health service organizations to report the most common reasons their male clients, who had experienced intimate partner abuse, did not report the abuse to their mental health service provider. The findings showed different responses for men than those previously reported by Fugate et al. (2005) for women. The mental health service organizations reported that the most common reasons their male clients did not seek help for intimate abuse were the perceptions of others, including the service provider, and feelings of shame or embarrassment (Tsui et al., 2010).

The shame, embarrassment, and feelings of fear about perceptions of others reported by Tsui et al. (2010) were further explored in similar research by Machado et al. (2016). That research examined the prevalence, nature, reactions to, and impact of intimate partner abuse with a sample of 1,557 adult men from Portugal. Machado et al. (2016) found that 91% of the men in their study reported having experienced at least one instance of physical, psychological, or sexual intimate partner abuse against them in the past year. Machado et al. (2016) also asked about help-seeking behaviors and found that 76.4% of their sample did not seek any form of help. Furthermore, the 23.6% who did seek help reported only seeking informal types of help such as talking to friends or family. Machado et al. (2016) found that of the 76.4% of the sample who sought no form of help, 64.7% reported they did not seek help because they did not realize they were a

victim of intimate partner abuse. Additionally, 30.9% reportedly did not seek help due to “shame,” 19.1% due to “distrust of the support system,” 10.3% due to “fear of them not believing my story,” and 8.8% due to “fear of retaliation from my partner” (Machado et al., 2016, p. 259).

Perceptions Based on Type of Intimate Partner Abuse

There is research to suggest that intimate partner abuse is perceived differently based on the type of abuse, physical or psychological. Hammock et al. (2017) gathered data from a sample of undergraduate university students. All respondents were given two vignettes describing an intimate partner abuse situation. The situations varied by type of abuse (physical versus psychological). Then the respondents were given questionnaires on their perceptions of the abuse. Hammock et al. (2017) found that the respondents perceived physical intimate partner abuse situations as significantly more negative than psychological abuse situations. Similarly, perpetrators of physical intimate partner abuse were evaluated more negatively character-wise than perpetrators of psychological abuse (Hammock et al., 2017). Respondents also perceived psychological abuse victims more negatively than physical abuse victims (Hammock et al., 2017). No significant interactions were found when type of abuse was a factor, though (Hammock et al., 2017).

There is evidence that these perceptions exist in other cultures as well. Wang (2019) conducted research on Chinese university students’ perceptions and attitudes regarding intimate partner abuse by type of abuse. A sample of 2,057 students were given questionnaires assessing their knowledge and perception of intimate partner abuse. The same students were then given a questionnaire with a description of one situation of

physical, sexual, or psychological intimate partner abuse. Finally, the students were asked to identify whether an abuse situation was being described (Wang, 2019). The results found that 51.1% of respondents correctly identified all instances of physical abuse and 58.3% correctly identified all instances of sexual abuse. Additionally, 12.7% of respondents correctly identified all instances of psychological abuse (Wang, 2019). There also were differences in identifying specific acts of abuse based on the type of abuse. For example, 97.9% of respondents identified situations of slapping a partner as abuse; similar percentages were found for other acts of physical abuse. As for acts of psychological abuse, 35.3% of respondents identified situations involving shouting or slamming doors as abuse, and 47.9% identified situations involving throwing items as abuse (Wang, 2019). There was one exception to this for acts of psychological abuse; 85.5% of respondents were able to identify threatening to hit a partner as psychological abuse (Wang, 2019). Therefore, it is evident that psychological intimate partner abuse is less identifiable and, thus, less likely to be taken seriously when reported by or discussed with a victim.

In conclusion, there are some differences in how physical and psychological intimate partner abuse are perceived (e.g., Hammock et al., 2017; Wang, 2019). Physical intimate partner abuse is perceived more negatively by respondents than psychological abuse (Hammock et al., 2017). Wang's (2019) research makes it clear that these perceptions are not confined to the United States but exist in other parts of the world as well. It is worth noting that there seems to be much more research exploring physical intimate partner abuse than psychological abuse.

Perceptions Based on Sex of Perpetrator and Victim Dyad

Research has found differences in perceptions of physical intimate partner abuse based on the sex of the perpetrator and victim (Seelau et al., 2003). Seelau et al. (2003) surveyed college students on their perceptions of victims and perpetrators of abuse. This research by Seelau et al. (2003) fully crossed victim sex, perpetrator sex, and respondent sex in a between-subjects design. Seelau et al. (2003) found that male perpetrators were rated as significantly more unreasonable in their actions than female perpetrators. Male victims were rated as significantly more responsible for the abuse situation than their female counterparts (Seelau et al., 2003). Sylaska and Walters (2014) had similar results in research of 178 United States college students; they found that female victims were evaluated as less responsible for the abuse than male victims. Seelau et al. (2003) found that respondents also evaluated abuse as more serious for female victims than for male victims. Seelau et al. (2003) found that situations of physical intimate partner abuse involving a male perpetrator and a female victim were rated as significantly more serious than situations of physical abuse where the perpetrator and victim were both male. Victim sex was not a significant indicator of seriousness of abuse when the perpetrator was female (Seelau et al., 2003). Lastly, respondents indicated that female victims of intimate partner abuse would be significantly less tolerant of abuse than male victims (Seelau et al., 2003).

Hammock et al. (2017) had similar findings in their research on the same topic. The research by Hammock et al. (2017) had each respondent read two scenarios, one describing an incident of physical intimate partner abuse and one describing an incident

of psychological abuse. Although each respondent read two scenarios, the perpetrator and victim sex were held constant in both scenarios for each respondent. Sex of perpetrator had a statistically significant main effect, namely that male perpetrators were evaluated more negatively by respondents than female perpetrators (Hammock et al., 2017). Similarly, Sylaska and Walters (2014) found that female perpetrators were evaluated less seriously than male perpetrators in their research of the same topic. Additionally, the perpetrator was perceived more negatively, regardless of the perpetrator's sex, when the victim was female instead of male (Hammock et al., 2017). Female victims were evaluated as responding to abuse with more negative emotions than male victims (Hammock et al., 2017). There were no statistically significant findings for perceptions of the victim based on the sex of the perpetrator, though (Hammock et al., 2017).

Russell et al. (2015) similarly studied perceptions of physical intimate partner abuse based on the victim's and perpetrator's sex. This research differed in that the variables of sexual orientation (heterosexual, gay, or lesbian couples) and law enforcement protective orders (absence of protective order versus inclusion of protective order) were added. Scenarios of abuse, followed by questionnaires, were given to 640 college students in the United States. Russell et al. (2015) found no significant main effects for perpetrator sex in their research; however, they did find a significant main effect for law enforcement protective orders being issued after an incident of physical intimate partner abuse. Russell et al. (2015) concluded that variables such as protective orders may have a larger impact on perceptions of physical intimate partner abuse than sex of the perpetrator alone. In addition, Russell et al. (2015) did not find any statistically

significant main effects for victim sex alone, but instead found main effects for the sexual orientation of the victim. Physical intimate partner abuse between a heterosexual couple was evaluated more seriously than physical intimate partner abuse between gay or lesbian couples (Russell et al., 2015).

In summary, there is some research to suggest that there are differences in perceptions of intimate partner abuse based on sex of victims and perpetrators (e.g., Hammock et al., 2017; Seelau et al., 2003). For example, male perpetrators were significantly rated as more unreasonable in their actions than female perpetrators (Seelau et al., 2003). Hammock et al. (2017) found that male perpetrators were perceived more negatively by respondents for both physical and psychological abuse; similarly, Sylaska and Walters (2014) found that female perpetrators were evaluated less seriously than male perpetrators. Hammock et al. (2017) also found that male and female perpetrators were evaluated equally negatively when the victim was female instead of male. Additionally, female victims were evaluated as less responsible for the abuse occurring than male victims (Sylaska & Walters, 2014); intimate partner abuse was evaluated as more serious overall when the victim was female (Seelau et al., 2003). Lastly, Russell et al. (2015) added the variables of sexual orientation of the couple and the absence or presence of law enforcement protective orders in their research. By adding these two variables, Russell et al. (2015) found no significant main effects for victim or perpetrator sex; instead, they found significant main effects for sexual orientation of the victim and the presence of protective orders.

Perceptions Based on Sex of Respondent

There is previous research that also has found a relationship between sex of the respondent and perceptions of intimate partner abuse. Research by Masci and Sanderson (2017) explored this relationship in a study of 291 college students in the United States. Masci and Sanderson (2017) found that male respondents were significantly more likely than female respondents to find a man perpetrating psychological aggression against a woman more acceptable in intimate relationships. Masci and Sanderson (2017) found that female respondents were significantly more likely to report psychological abuse as common in intimate relationships; the same results were not found with physical abuse. Female respondents also were less likely than male respondents to report feeling that psychological abuse is normal in intimate relationships (Masci & Sanderson, 2017).

The research of Seelau et al. (2003) also found significant differences in perceptions of physical intimate partner abuse by the respondent's sex. For example, male respondents were significantly more likely to report that they would leave the couple involved in the physical intimate partner abuse situation alone. Male respondents also were significantly less likely to indicate that they would call the police after witnessing an intimate partner abuse situation (Seelau et al., 2003). Female respondents were significantly more likely than male respondents to believe the victim's account of events over the perpetrator's, regardless of the sex of the perpetrator and victim (Seelau et al., 2003). Similar research conducted by Russell et al. (2015) found that female respondents were significantly more likely than male respondents to believe a physical intimate partner abuse situation should be considered abuse.

Previously mentioned research by Sylaska and Walters (2014) found some slight differences in perceptions based upon respondent sex regarding perceptions of physical intimate partner abuse. Sylaska and Walters (2014) gave respondents vignettes describing a situation of physical intimate partner abuse. This was followed by questions regarding the students' perceptions of the seriousness of the situation, victim responsibility, and their response to the intimate partner abuse. In this research, there was a statistically significant result for female respondents perceiving the victim as less responsible than male respondents; there was no significant sex difference found, however, in respondent's perception of the seriousness of the abuse (Sylaska & Walters, 2014). It was found also that male respondents were more likely to report that they would ignore an intimate partner abuse situation; this was only found to be statistically significant if the victim also was male and the respondent perceived the victim as more responsible for the abuse occurring (Sylaska & Walters, 2014). Finally, female respondents were more likely to suggest the victim seek help after telling the respondent about the abuse. Similarly, female respondents were more willing to discuss the abuse with another person (Sylaska & Walters, 2014).

To summarize, there is research to suggest there are statistically significant findings regarding perceptions of intimate partner abuse being affected by sex of the respondent (e.g., Masci & Sanderson, 2017; Russell et al., 2015; Seelau et al., 2003; Sylaska & Walters, 2014). Masci and Sanderson (2017) found that male respondents were significantly more likely than female respondents to perceive psychological abuse perpetrated by a man against a woman as acceptable. Seelau et al. (2003) found that male

respondents were more likely than female respondents to report that they would leave a couple involved in a physical abuse situation alone. Female respondents were significantly more likely than male respondents to find victims less responsible for the abuse occurring (Sylaska & Walters, 2014) and believe the victim's account of intimate partner abuse (Seelau et al., 2003). Additionally, female respondents were more likely than male respondents to indicate that physical intimate partner abuse should be considered abuse (Russell et al., 2015). Research by Sylaska and Walters (2014) did not find a significant difference in how male and female respondents perceived the seriousness of intimate partner abuse. Overall, however, female respondents tended to be more pro-victim. Thus, respondent sex is an important factor in studying perceptions of intimate partner abuse victims, as it does seem to have some impact.

Summary

Intimate partner abuse has been identified as a public health issue (Breiding et al., 2015). The CDC has reported that millions of people have been victims of intimate partner abuse in the United States alone (Breiding et al., 2015). The CDC also found that 28.3% of men and 32.4% of women reported experiencing physical intimate partner abuse in their lifetime; the same report by the CDC showed that 47.3% of men and 47.1% of women reported experiencing psychological intimate partner abuse in their lifetime (Smith et al., 2017). The negative impacts of intimate partner abuse also have been explored. Victims can be greatly impacted, with effects of intimate partner abuse including depression (Mechanic et al., 2008), post-traumatic stress disorder

symptomology, injuries, missing work or school (Smith et al., 2017), and suicidal ideation for some (Wolford-Clevenger et al., 2016).

Societal perceptions of intimate partner abuse may affect whether victims of intimate partner abuse report the abuse or feel comfortable seeking help (e.g., Machado et al., 2016; Tsui et al., 2010). There is much research regarding the differences in perceptions of intimate partner abuse and how perceptions may differ based on variables such as type of intimate partner abuse (e.g., Hammock et al., 2017; Wang, 2019), sex of the perpetrator and victim (e.g., Hammock et al., 2017; Seelau et al., 2003), and sex of the respondent (e.g., Masci & Sanderson, 2017; Russell et al., 2015; Seelau et al., 2003; Sylaska & Walters, 2014). Understanding how perceptions of intimate partner abuse victims differ can be important in developing better methods of helping victims and victim advocacy.

The aim of the current research was to further investigate factors that affected perceptions of intimate partner abuse. Some research has found that respondents report differences in how they perceive intimate partner abuse by type of abuse committed. For instance, respondents in one study evaluated psychological intimate partner abuse as having less of a negative effect on the victim when compared to physical intimate partner abuse (Hammock et al., 2017). The CDC's report on intimate partner abuse found that prevalence rates of psychological abuse are higher for both men and women than that of physical intimate partner abuse (Smith et al., 2017). Although prevalence of psychological intimate partner abuse is reportedly higher than that of physical intimate partner abuse, it is often more difficult for respondents to identify psychological abuse as

an abusive situation than it is for them to identify physical abuse, as seen in research by Wang (2019). The current research also aimed to further examine both physical and psychological intimate partner abuse using a wider variety of dependent variables.

Additionally, the current research further investigated how the sex of the respondents and the cross-sex dyads for victims and perpetrators affected perceptions of intimate partner abuse. Past research found that male perpetrators are viewed more negatively than female perpetrators (Hammock et al., 2017). Both male and female perpetrators were perceived more negatively when the victim was female as opposed to male (Hammock et al., 2017). As for differences in perceptions based upon the respondent's sex, female respondents are more "pro-victim" than male respondents. This means that female respondents are more likely to evaluate the victim as more believable in their account of the abuse (Seelau et al., 2003), less responsible for the abuse occurring (Sylaska & Walters, 2014), and more likely to identify intimate partner abuse situations as abuse (Russell et al., 2015). The current research aimed to further investigate the relationships between sex and perceptions of intimate partner abuse. It also explored more interactions between sex and type of abuse using a wider variety of dependent scales.

Hypotheses

1. It was predicted that there would be a significant main effect for type of abuse (physical versus psychological). Specifically, respondents who read the physical intimate partner abuse scenarios would evaluate the abuse as more harmful to the victim and less of a normal occurrence between intimate partners

than respondents who read the psychological intimate partner abuse scenarios. Respondents who read the physical abuse scenarios also would evaluate the victim as less responsible for the abuse occurring and the perpetrator as more responsible for their actions regarding the abuse; respondents reading the physical abuse scenarios also would evaluate the victim as more believable and would be more likely to say they would hypothetically take action after hearing about the abuse.

2. It was predicted that there would be a significant main effect for the cross-sex dyads of the perpetrator and the victim. The male perpetrator/female victim dyad would be evaluated as more harmful to the victim and more normal in intimate relationships than the female perpetrator/male victim dyad. In addition, the male perpetrator/female victim dyad would result in the victim being evaluated as less responsible and the perpetrator as being more responsible for the abuse. The male perpetrator/female victim dyad would be evaluated as the victim being more believable than the female perpetrator/male victim dyad. Lastly, respondents who read the male perpetrator/female victim dyad scenario would be more likely to report that they would hypothetically take action after hearing about the abuse.

3. It was predicted that there would be a significant main effect for sex of the respondent (male versus female). Overall, female respondents would evaluate intimate partner abuse as more harmful to the victim and less normal in intimate relationships than male respondents. Female respondents would evaluate the

victim as more believable and less responsible for the abuse occurring; they also would evaluate the perpetrator as more responsible for the abuse occurring.

Additionally, female respondents would be more likely to respond that they would hypothetically take action after hearing about the abuse than male respondents.

4. It was predicted that there would be significant interactions between type of abuse and the cross-sex dyad; the cross-sex dyad and sex of the respondent; and type of abuse and sex of the respondent. It also was predicted that there would be significant three-way interactions among all three variables. No specific predictions were made for these interactions.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Respondents

Respondents for this study were either from two general psychology classes (96) or from a psychology research pool (41) at a public, midsize, southeastern university in the United States. Respondents were restricted to those between the ages of 18 and 35 years old and those who indicated male or female on a demographic question about sex. Data were collected from 147 undergraduate students, but, in total, 10 questionnaires were excluded. Seven were excluded because the respondent answered “Nonbinary” or “Prefer not to answer” for sex, two because the respondent answered “Prefer not to answer” for age, and one because there was a substantial amount of missing data. In this study, data from 137 respondents (45 men and 92 women) were analyzed.

As can be seen in Table 1, the majority of respondents were 18 to 21 years old (90.51%) and white (56.20%). Prior to collecting data, this study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Middle Tennessee State University. See Appendix A for IRB approval for data collection using the research pool, and see Appendix B for IRB approval for data collection using the general psychology courses. Respondents either received research credit (those obtained from the research pool) or extra credit in their classes (those obtained from the general psychology courses) for their participation in the study. See Table 2 for number of respondents per scenario by sex.

Table 1

Demographic Information

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Sex		
Male	45	32.85
Female	92	67.15
Nonbinary/Prefer not to answer ^a	7	N/A
Age (in years)		
18-21	124	90.51
22-25	9	6.57
26-35	4	2.92
Prefer not to answer ^a	2	N/A
Race or Ethnicity		
African American/Black	27	19.71
Caucasian/White	77	56.20
Other (Asian, Hispanic/Latino/a, Native American, etc.)	32	23.36
Prefer not to answer	1	0.73

^aRespondents for this study were restricted to those between the ages of 18 and 35 years old and those who identity as male or female. Due to this, these respondents were not included in data analysis.

Table 2

Number of Respondents per Scenario by Sex of Respondent

	Male	Female
	Respondent	Respondent
Scenario	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Male perpetrator, female victim physical abuse	11	23
Female perpetrator, male victim physical abuse	11	21
Male perpetrator, female victim psychological abuse	12	24
Female perpetrator, male victim psychological abuse	11	24

Measures

Demographics. Respondents first completed a demographic form prior to completing other measures. The demographic form asked about sex (male, female, nonbinary/prefer not to answer), age (in categories: 18-21, 22-25, 26-35, prefer not to answer), and ethnicity (African American/Black, Caucasian/White, Other [Asian, Hispanic or Latino/Latina, Native American, etc., and prefer not to answer]). See Appendix C for the demographic form.

Scenarios. After completing the demographic form, respondents were asked to read one of four different author-constructed scenarios describing an incident of either physical or psychological intimate partner abuse. This research used a 2 (type of intimate partner abuse: physical or psychological) x 2 (cross-sex dyad: male perpetrator/female victim or female perpetrator/male victim) x 2 (respondent sex: male or female) design. Two scenarios involved physical intimate partner abuse and two scenarios involved psychological intimate partner abuse. One of each of the two physical and psychological intimate partner abuse scenarios included a man as the perpetrator of intimate partner abuse with a woman as the victim of abuse, and the other of each scenario included a woman as the perpetrator of intimate partner abuse and a man as the victim of abuse (see Appendix D).

Questionnaires. After reading the scenario, respondents were asked to complete items regarding the scenario they received. There were 24 questions across six author-constructed scales, and all questions used ratings on a 1 to 7 Likert Scale (1 meaning *strongly disagree* and 7 meaning *strongly agree*). Each of the six scales had four

questions. The questions were used to assess six different issues related to intimate partner abuse. Three of these scales were victim-focused (Harm to Victim, Responsibility of Victim, and Believability of Victim) and attempted to gauge how the respondent perceived the victim in the intimate partner abuse situation. The next scale was perpetrator-focused (Responsibility of Perpetrator) and attempted to gauge how responsible for the abuse the respondent found the perpetrator. The final two scales were situation-focused (Respondent's Hypothetical Response and Normalization of Intimate Partner Abuse). The former attempted to gauge whether the respondent would respond to hearing about the abuse by taking action; the latter attempted to gauge whether or not the respondent perceived intimate partner abuse as normal in intimate relationships. After reverse coding some items, higher scores indicated greater endorsement of the scales. See questions by dependent scales in Appendix E. See the four different intimate partner abuse questionnaires in Appendix F.

Procedure

After this research was approved by Middle Tennessee State University's Institutional Review Board, data were collected on ground in groups. Respondents were recruited through the university's psychology department research pool (see Appendix G for this Informed Consent Form) and by offering extra credit in two general psychology courses (see Appendix H for this Informed Consent Form). In both instances respondents were initially given a packet of all documents needed for this study in order to reduce person to person contact due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Respondents were first prompted to provide informed consent. The informed consent document included

information on procedures, risks involved in research, and benefits of research. Once respondents consented to participate in this study, they then completed a demographic form (see Demographic Form in Appendix C). Respondents then read a randomly assigned scenario describing an incident of intimate partner abuse (see Intimate Partner Abuse Scenarios in Appendix D). After reading the scenario, respondents could then answer a corresponding questionnaire regarding their perceptions of the intimate partner abuse scenario (see Questions by Dependent Scales in Appendix E; Intimate Partner Abuse Questionnaires in Appendix F). After either completing or skipping the questionnaire and turning it in to the researcher, the respondents were given a debriefing form (see Debriefing Information in Appendix I). Respondents were then awarded research credit if they were in the research pool or extra credit if they were from the two psychology classes.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics included means, standard deviations, and coefficient alphas on the six dependent scales (Harm to Victim, Responsibility of Victim, Believability of Victim, Responsibility of Perpetrator, Respondent's Hypothetical Response, and Normalization of Intimate Partner Abuse). See Table 3 for descriptive statistics for the scales.

Hypotheses Testing and Analytical Strategy

Results were analyzed with a series of 2 (type of intimate partner abuse) x 2 (cross-sex dyads) x 2 (respondent sex) ANOVAs. There was an ANOVA for each of the six dependent scales, and the alpha level was set at .01 due to the number of analyses. The first hypothesis was that there would be statistically significant main effects for type of intimate partner abuse (physical versus psychological). The second hypothesis was that there would be statistically significant main effects for the perpetrator/victim sex dyad (male perpetrator/female victim versus female perpetrator/male victim). The third hypothesis was that there would be statistically significant main effect for respondent sex (male versus female). Finally, the fourth hypothesis was that there would be statistically significant two and three-way interactions among type of abuse (physical versus psychological), the perpetrator/victim sex dyad (male perpetrator/female victim

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Scales

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>α</i>
Harm to Victim	21.42	2.11	.71
Responsibility of Victim	11.28	5.10	.76
Believability of Victim	21.38	4.34	.80
Responsibility of Perpetrator	23.21	4.14	.80
Respondent's Hypothetical Response	19.71	4.86	.72
Normalization of Intimate Partner Abuse	7.86	4.08	.76

Note. *N* = 137.

versus female perpetrator/male victim), and respondent sex (male versus female). Follow-up analyses were conducted using the Bonferroni (Dunn) post-hoc test with a family-wise alpha set at .0125.

Main Effects for Type of Abuse

There were two statistically significant main effects for type of abuse, Respondent's Hypothetical Response, $F(1, 129) = 41.56, p < .001$, and Normalization of Intimate Partner Abuse, $F(1, 129) = 24.57, p < .001$. As seen in Table 4, respondents were more likely to answer that they would hypothetically respond to hearing about the abuse situation by taking some form of action (e.g., alerting authorities, telling the victim to leave the relationship) for physical intimate partner abuse than for psychological abuse. Similarly, respondents were more likely to acknowledge psychological abuse as more normative in intimate relationships than physical abuse.

Main Effects for Perpetrator and Victim Sex Dyad

There was a statistically significant main effect for the perpetrator/victim sex dyad. This main effect was found for the variable Respondent's Hypothetical Response, $F(1, 129) = 33.80, p < .001$. As shown in Table 5, respondents were more likely to respond that hypothetically they would take some form of action (e.g., alerting authorities, telling the victim to leave the relationship) upon hearing about the abuse situation if the perpetrator was male and the victim was female compared to scenarios where the perpetrator was female and the victim was male.

Table 4

Main Effects for Type of Abuse

Variable	Physical		Psychological		<i>F</i>	ω_p^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Harm to Victim	21.70	2.05	21.14	2.15	2.57	.011
Responsibility of Victim	10.73	5.51	11.81	4.64	1.52	.004
Believability of Victim	21.96	4.27	20.83	4.37	2.20	.009
Responsibility of Perp.	23.61	4.15	22.83	4.13	1.73	.005
Respondent's Hyp. Response	21.96	4.31	17.56	4.38	41.56**	.228
Normalization of IPA	6.24	3.32	9.41	4.17	24.57**	.147

Note. Perp. is the abbreviation for Perpetrator, Hyp. for Hypothetical, and IPA for Intimate Partner Abuse.

df = (1, 129).

p* < .01. *p* < .001.

Table 5

Main Effects for Perpetrator and Victim Sex Dyad

Variable	Male Perpetrator Female Victim		Female Perpetrator Male Victim		<i>F</i>	ω_p^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Harm to Victim	21.54	2.10	21.29	2.13	0.03	.000
Responsibility of Victim	10.28	4.79	12.31	5.22	4.61	.026
Believability of Victim	22.38	4.16	20.37	4.33	4.68	.026
Responsibility of Perpetrator	24.20	3.54	22.21	4.48	5.70	.033
Respondent's Hypothetical Response	21.67	4.67	17.72	4.22	33.80**	.193
Normalization of Intimate Partner Abuse	7.16	3.45	8.57	4.55	3.62	.019

df = (1, 129).

p* < .01. *p* < .001.

Main Effects for Respondent Sex

As seen in Table 6, there was a statistically significant result for respondent's sex for the variable Harm to Victim, $F(1, 129) = 7.45, p = .0072$. Female respondents were more likely than male respondents to indicate that they found intimate partner abuse more harmful to the victim.

Interactions

A statistically significant interaction was found. As can be seen in Table 7, a significant interaction between type of abuse and perpetrator/victim sex dyad was found for the variable Responsibility of Perpetrator, $F(1, 137) = 7.61, p = .0067$. Follow-up analyses using the Bonferroni (Dunn) method revealed respondents who read the scenario that included a male perpetrator committing physical intimate partner abuse against a female victim were more likely to find the perpetrator responsible for the abuse than respondents who read the scenario with a female perpetrator committing physical abuse against a male victim. There was no difference found for psychological abuse.

No statistically significant interactions were found between type of abuse and respondent sex or the perpetrator/victim sex dyad and respondent sex, as can be seen in Tables 8 and 9. It was hypothesized that these interactions would exist, but no specific hypotheses were made. Finally, there were no statistically significant three-way interactions among type of abuse, perpetrator/victim sex dyad, and respondent sex. It was hypothesized that a three-way interaction would exist, however, no specific hypotheses were made.

Table 6

Main Effects for Respondent Sex

Variable	Male Respondent		Female Respondent		<i>F</i>	ω_p^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Harm to Victim	20.73	2.52	21.75	1.81	7.45*	.045
Responsibility of Victim	12.60	5.22	10.64	4.94	4.59	.026
Believability of Victim	20.44	4.35	21.84	4.29	3.23	.016
Responsibility of Perpetrator	22.58	4.32	23.52	4.04	1.56	.004
Respondent's Hypothetical Response	18.87	5.23	20.12	4.64	3.37	.017
Normalization of Intimate Partner Abuse	8.49	4.02	7.55	4.10	2.19	.009

df = (1, 129).

p* < .01. *p* < .001.

Table 7

Interactions for Type of Abuse and Perpetrator/Victim Sex Dyad

Variable	Physical Abuse				Psychological Abuse				<i>F</i>	ω_p^2
	Male Perp. Female Victim		Female Perp. Male Victim		Male Perp. Female Victim		Female Perp. Male Victim			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Harm to Victim	22.03	2.17	21.36	1.90	21.06	1.95	21.23	2.35	2.23	.009
Responsibility of Victim	9.29	4.71	12.21	5.95	11.23	4.75	12.40	4.53	2.41	.010
Believability of Victim	23.35	3.40	20.52	4.63	21.43	4.63	20.23	4.08	1.97	.007
Responsibility of Perpetrator	25.26	2.74	21.91	4.68	23.17	3.94	22.49	4.34	7.61*	.046
Respondent's Hyp. Response	24.50	2.73	19.33	4.07	18.91	4.53	16.20	3.83	5.24	.030
Normalization of IPA	5.29	2.01	7.21	4.08	8.97	3.62	9.86	4.66	2.55	.011

Note. Perp. is the abbreviation for Perpetrator, Hyp. for Hypothetical, and IPA for Intimate Partner Abuse.

df = (1, 129).

p* < .01. *p* < .001.

Table 8

Interactions for Type of Abuse and Respondent Sex

Variable	Physical Abuse				Psychological Abuse				<i>F</i>	ω_p^2
	Male Respondent		Female Respondent		Male Respondent		Female Respondent			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Harm to Victim	21.04	2.53	22.05	1.68	20.41	2.52	21.48	1.89	0.02	.000
Responsibility of Victim	12.17	5.82	9.98	5.25	13.05	4.60	11.25	4.60	0.02	.000
Believability of Victim	20.96	4.45	22.48	4.13	19.91	4.28	21.25	4.40	0.00	.000
Responsibility of Perpetrator	23.17	4.62	23.84	3.92	21.95	4.01	23.23	4.16	0.29	.000
Respondent's Hyp. Response	21.04	4.74	22.43	4.04	16.59	4.81	18.00	4.15	0.04	.000
Normalization of IPA	6.78	4.08	5.95	2.85	10.27	3.15	9.02	4.53	0.16	.000

Note. Hyp. is the abbreviation for Hypothetical, and IPA for Intimate Partner Abuse.

df = (1, 129).

p* < .01. *p* < .001.

Table 9

Interactions for Respondent Sex and Perpetrator/Victim Sex Dyad

Variable	Male Respondent				Female Respondent				<i>F</i>	ω_p^2
	Male Perp. Female Victim		Female Perp. Male Victim		Male Perp. Female Victim		Female Perp. Male Victim			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Harm to Victim	20.55	2.54	20.91	2.54	22.00	1.71	21.49	1.89	1.38	.003
Responsibility of Victim	11.64	5.14	13.52	5.24	9.64	4.54	11.69	5.16	0.01	.000
Believability of Victim	20.82	4.27	20.09	4.48	23.11	3.94	20.51	4.29	1.50	.004
Responsibility of Perp.	23.09	4.43	22.09	4.26	24.72	2.95	22.27	4.64	1.11	.001
Respondent's Hyp. Response	21.14	5.89	16.70	3.39	21.91	4.02	18.24	4.54	0.41	.000
Normalization of IPA	7.95	4.18	9.00	3.88	6.79	3.04	8.36	4.89	0.09	.000

Note. Perp. is the abbreviation for Perpetrator, Hyp. for Hypothetical, and IPA for Intimate Partner Abuse.

df = (1, 129).

p* < .01. *p* < .001.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine how victims and perpetrators of intimate partner abuse are perceived. The three specific factors that were addressed in this study were type of abuse (physical versus psychological), perpetrator/victim sex dyad, and respondent sex. This study explored whether these factors affected perceptions of intimate partner abuse scenarios based upon the following scales: Harm to Victim, Responsibility of Victim, Believability of Victim, Responsibility of Perpetrator, Respondent's Hypothetical Response, and Normalization of Intimate Partner Abuse.

Consistent with the hypotheses, the main effect for type of abuse (physical versus psychological) was statistically significant for Respondent's Hypothetical Response and Normalization of Abuse. The respondents were more likely to indicate that they would hypothetically take some type of action, such as contacting authorities on the victim's behalf or encourage the victim to leave the perpetrator, for physical abuse scenarios than for psychological abuse scenarios. In addition, respondents were more likely to report that they found scenarios of psychological intimate partner abuse to be more normative in intimate relationships than that of physical abuse. These findings suggest that psychological abuse is viewed as less serious and more normative in intimate relationships than physical intimate partner abuse. Previous research has been consistent with these findings. For example, research by Hammock et al. (2017) found that respondents perceived psychological intimate partner abuse as less negative for the victim than physical intimate partner abuse. In general, it can be theorized that

psychological intimate partner abuse is perceived as less serious or harmful for a number of different reasons. For instance, psychological intimate partner abuse may be more difficult to identify as abuse due to a lack of physical symptoms. Also, psychological abuse is viewed as more normative, therefore making it more difficult to be perceived as harmful and as abuse. In research by Wang (2019), 51.1% of respondents correctly identified instances of physical abuse, compared to the 12.7% of respondents who correctly identified instances of psychological abuse. No other specific hypotheses for type of abuse were found to have achieved statistical significance.

In addition, the main effect for the perpetrator/victim sex dyad was statistically significant for the variable Respondent's Hypothetical Response. The respondents indicated that they would be more likely to hypothetically take action, such as contacting authorities or telling the victim to leave the relationship, if the perpetrator was male and victim was female compared to when the perpetrator was female and the victim was male. This suggests that respondents find intimate partner abuse committed by males against females more serious than intimate partner abuse committed by females against males. This is similar to past research, such as research by Hammock et al. (2017), which found that respondents viewed male perpetrators of abuse more negatively than female perpetrators. Similarly, Felson (2000) found that incidents of intimate partner abuse were more likely to have law enforcement involvement if the perpetrator was male and the victim was female. Felson (2000) theorized that these results were explained by his theory, Norm Protecting Women, which states that due to multiple factors, such as history of intimate partner abuse being directed towards females by males, individuals are

more likely to feel the need to protect females when witnessing intimate partner abuse. Contrary to what was hypothesized, in the current study no other variables had statistical significance for the perpetrator/victim sex dyad.

As was hypothesized, there was a main effect for respondent sex. This main effect was found for the variable Harm to Victim. Specifically, female respondents rated the scenario as more harmful to the victim compared to male respondents. This finding suggests that female respondents are more likely than male respondents to take intimate partner abuse more seriously or find it more harmful to the victim. This finding is similar to past research, such as research by Russell et al. (2015), which found that female respondents were more likely to identify intimate partner abuse situations as abuse. Similarly, Seelau et al. (2003) found that, compared to males, females were more pro-victim. In explaining these findings, Seelau et al. (2003) theorized that females view themselves to be at higher risk for abuse. No other hypotheses for respondent sex were found to be statistically significant in the current study.

Lastly, there was a statistically significant interaction found between type of abuse and the perpetrator/victim sex dyad. This interaction was significant for the variable Responsibility of Perpetrator. The interaction indicated that respondents found male perpetrators of physical abuse against a female victim to be more responsible for the abuse occurring than female perpetrators of physical abuse against a male victim. No such difference was found for psychological abuse. These findings suggest that both type of abuse and the sex of the perpetrator/victim impacted perceptions of intimate partner abuse situations. In this instance, the results suggest that respondents are less likely to

find female perpetrators responsible for committing physical intimate partner abuse than male perpetrators committing physical intimate partner abuse.

This interaction has aspects that are consistent with past research. For example, Hammock et al. (2017) found that physical intimate partner abuse situations were perceived as more negative than psychological abuse situations. It was hypothesized that there would be additional statistically significant interactions, as well as a statistically significant three-way interaction. The interaction between type of abuse and the perpetrator/victim sex dyad, however, was the only interaction found to have achieved statistical significance. In understanding these findings, it also is important to discuss the limitations of this study.

There were a number of limitations to this study. First, there are issues related to the sample. The sample for this study was limited to undergraduate students from a psychology research pool and two general psychology classes. Initially, the sample was only to be undergraduate students from the psychology research pool. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there were less students enrolled in the research pool and the two psychology classes had to be added to help increase the sample size. Despite these efforts, the sample size was limited. There were 147 respondents initially, but 10 responses could not be used for various reasons; this left only 137 responses used for the research. Nine of the responses that could not be used in the final analyses for this study were not used because they did not meet restrictions for respondents. These restrictions are another limitation of this study. Respondents were restricted to those who identify as male or female, and those who are ages 18 to 35 years old. This was due to the

demographics of the university making it difficult to adequately represent groups such as respondents over the age of 35 years old or respondents who identify as nonbinary. This, as well as other issues, created limitations with demographics for this study.

Because of issues with the demographics, this study may not be generalizable to other age ranges, ethnicities, or geographic areas due to sample issues involving the sex, age, and ethnicity of the respondents. There were more female respondents (67.15%) than male respondents (32.85%). In addition to this, respondents who identified as nonbinary or answered “Prefer not to answer” were not included in the analyses as the current study was limited to male and female respondents. Age also was restricted for this study, and the majority of respondents were 18 to 21 years old (90.51%). The majority of respondents identified their ethnicity as “Caucasian/White” (56.20%). These demographics may mean that the results of this study may not be consistent with results from studies that have different demographics. Finally, respondents for this study were recruited in the southeastern United States. Results from this study may not be generalizable to other geographic areas with different sociocultural standards compared to this region of the United States.

Another limitation to this study involving demographics was that the answer choices on the demographic form were purposely listed in broad categories, such as the answer choices for ethnicity being as follows: African American/Black, Caucasian/White, Other (Asian, Hispanic or Latino/Latina, Native American, etc.), Prefer not to answer. This was done to give added anonymity to respondents whose identities may have had less representation in this study. This means, however, that the specific

ethnicity of the respondents who chose certain categories, such as the “Other” category for ethnicity, is unknown. Further research may focus on increasing sample sizes to adequately represent those with other gender identities, ages, or ethnic groups.

Issues with the sample are not the only limitations for this study. Another limitation regards the dependent measures used in this study. The questionnaire used in this study was author-constructed. This could mean there are issues with reliability and validity. Coefficient alphas, however, indicated adequate internal consistency for this study. There is no information, however, on other forms of reliability and validity.

Additionally, the questionnaire was self-report for respondents. This means that we cannot know that every respondent clearly read and understood each question or answered all questions honestly. Due to the nature of the topic for this study, it also is not possible to be sure that respondents were not answering in a way they deem to be socially acceptable. Also, it would be impossible to confirm whether or not respondents would actually respond in the hypothesized ways reported in this study when actually confided in by a friend that they may be abused by an intimate partner. Respondents may not know what actions they would take in this situation, or they may take actions that were not listed as options in the current study.

Similar to limitations with the questionnaire, there are limitations to the scenarios used in this study. The scenarios used to describe an incident of intimate partner abuse also are author-constructed. The primary limitation of author-constructed scenarios would be the adequacy of the scenarios in describing an incident of intimate partner abuse. Specifically, there could be limitations with whether or not the physical or psychological

abuse scenarios adequately conveyed an act of intimate partner abuse to respondents. In addition to this, another limitation to the current research was that the perpetrator and victim sex dyads were not fully crossed. This means that only opposite-sex relationships were evaluated in this study. Same-sex relationships could not be included in the current study because of previously mentioned sample size constraints. Finally, this study also was not able to explore possible differences in perceptions of intimate partner abuse that might emerge if the scenarios included perpetrators and victims of varying ethnicities.

Future research on how perpetrators and victims of intimate partner abuse are perceived could expand on the current study in many ways. The sample could be expanded to include more specific data for additional demographic groups. Specifically, perhaps larger samples could be gathered for certain groups, such as those who identify as nonbinary, those who are over the age of 35 years old, and those who have ethnic backgrounds such as Asian, Hispanic or Latino/Latina, Native American, etc. In addition to this, future research could use similar variables, such as Harm to Victim, Responsibility of Perpetrator, Respondent's Hypothetical Response, etc., with fully crossed sex dyads. Including same-sex relationships is important as there is currently less research in this area when it comes to specific scenarios such as male perpetrators committing psychological intimate partner abuse against male victims, or vice versa with female perpetrators and victims. Finally, future research could include scenarios that incorporate perpetrators and victims of varying ethnicities.

Future research also could focus on the intimate partner abuse related perceptions of those who specifically work in helping professions, such as law enforcement and

mental health professionals. Those in law enforcement and mental health professions may be more likely to interact with perpetrators and victims of intimate partner abuse.

Understanding how these specific professions may perceive perpetrators and victims could be crucial to better identification, treatment, and protection of victims.

Despite its limitations, this study expanded upon previous research in some ways as well. For instance, this study examined psychological intimate partner abuse using the same parameters to examine physical abuse. In addition, this study expanded previous research by using cross-sex dyads instead of focusing only on perceptions of intimate partner abuse when the perpetrator is male and the victim is female. Despite the limited sample size, the current study demonstrated the importance of examining type of abuse, the perpetrator/victim sex dyad, and respondent sex in studying intimate partner abuse.

The current study also demonstrated the need for further education and prevention efforts. For example, in the current study, respondents were less likely to report that they would take action if the perpetrator was female and the victim was male compared to a scenario where the perpetrator was male and the victim was female. Thus, male victims may receive less support than female victims. Given that the victimization of males may not be as acknowledged, Masci and Sanderson (2017) note that prevention programs for intimate partner abuse should address males as possible victims. Similarly, education and prevention efforts should continue to focus on psychological intimate partner abuse as well. As Masci and Sanderson (2017) noted in their study, psychological abuse continues to be perceived as less severe than physical abuse. They further theorized that until psychological abuse is perceived more seriously it may not be reported. Thus, there is a

need to continue education and prevention efforts regarding psychological intimate partner abuse.

REFERENCES

- Breiding, M. J., Basile, K. C., Smith, S. G., Black, M. C., & Mahendra, R. (2015). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements* (2nd ed.). National Center for Injury Prevention and Control of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/intimatepartnerviolence.pdf>
- Felson, R. B. (2000). The normative protection of women from violence. *Sociological Forum*, 15(1), 91-116. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007598204631>
- Fugate, M., Landis, L., Riordan, K., Naureckas, S., & Engel, B. (2005). Barriers to domestic violence help seeking. *Violence Against Women*, 11(3), 290-310.
- <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801204271959>
- Hammock, G. S., Richardson, D. S., Lamm, K. B., Taylor, E. & Verlaque, L. (2017). The effect of gender of perpetrator and victim on perceptions of psychological and physical intimate partner aggression. *Journal of Family Violence*, 32(3), 357-365.
- <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-016-9850-y>
- Machado, A., Hines, D., & Matos, M. (2016). Help-seeking and needs of male victims of intimate partner violence in Portugal. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 17(3), 255-264. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000013>
- Masci, S. F., & Sanderson, S. (2017). Perceptions of psychological abuse versus physical abuse and their relationship with mental health outcomes. *Violence and Victims*, 32(2), 362-376. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-15-00180>

- Mechanic, M. B., Weaver, T. L., & Resick, P. A. (2008). Mental health consequences of intimate partner abuse: A multidimensional assessment of four different forms of abuse. *Violence Against Women, 14*(6), 634-654.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801208319283>
- Russell, B., Chapleau, K. M., & Kraus, S. W. (2015). When is it abuse? How assailant gender, sexual orientation, and protection orders influence perceptions of intimate partner abuse. *Partner Abuse, 6*(1), 47-64. <https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.6.1.47>
- Seelau, E. P., Seelau, S. M., & Poorman, P. B. (2003). Gender and role-based perceptions of domestic abuse: Does sexual orientation matter? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 21*(2), 199-214. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.524>
- Smith, S. G., Chen, J., Basile, K. C., Gilbert, L. K., Merrick, M. T., Patel, N., Walling, M., & Jain, A. (2017). *The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey (NISVS): 2010-2012 state report*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/NISVS-StateReportBook.pdf>
- Sylaska, K. M., & Walters, A. S. (2014). Testing the extent of the gender trap: College students' perceptions of and reactions to intimate partner violence. *Sex Roles, 70*(3-4), 134-145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-014-0344-1>

Tsui, V., Cheung, M., & Leung, P. (2010). Help-seeking among male victims of partner abuse: Men's hard times. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(6), 769-780.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20394>

Wang, L. (2019). Education, perception factors, and prevention of intimate partner violence: Empirical research on Chinese university students' perceptions and attitudes concerning intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34(8), 1611-1632. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516652263>

Wolford-Clevenger, C., Vann, N. C., & Smith, P. N. (2016). The association of partner abuse types and suicidal ideation among men and women college students. *Violence and Victims*, 31(3), 471-485. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-14-00083>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

IRB Approval Form (Research Pool)

IRB

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Office of Research Compliance,
010A Sam Ingram Building,
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd
Murfreesboro, TN 37129
FWA: 00005331/IRB Regn.. 0003571



IRBN007 – EXEMPTION DETERMINATION NOTICE

Wednesday, October 13, 2021

Protocol Title **Perceptions of Victims and Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Abuse**
Protocol ID **22-1047 21**

Principal Investigator **Sarah Parker** (Student) **Faculty Advisor:** Mary Ellen Fromuth
Co-Investigators James Loveless and Dana Fuller
Investigator Email(s) sbp2x@mtmail.mtsu.edu; maryellen.fromuth@mtsu.edu
Department/Affiliation Psychology

Dear Investigator(s),

The above identified research proposal has been reviewed by the MTSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) through the **EXEMPT** review mechanism under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) within the research category **(2) Educational Tests, surveys, interviews or observations of public behavior (in-person survey)**. A summary of the IRB action and other particulars of this protocol are shown below:

IRB Action	EXEMPT from further IRB Review Exempt from further continuing review but other oversight requirements apply		
Date of Expiration	12/31/2022	Date of Approval: 10/11/21	Recent Amendment: NONE
Sample Size	TWO HUNDRED (200)		
Participant Pool	Healthy adults (18 or older) – MTSU SONA participants		
Exceptions	1. In-person interaction is permitted. 2. Collection of identifiable information is allowed for COVID-19 management. 3. Participant information retention to comply with SONA policy is permitted.		
Type of Interaction	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-interventional or Data Analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual/Remote/Online Interview/survey <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In person or physical – Mandatory COVID-19 Management (refer next page)		
Mandatory Restrictions	1. All restrictions for exemption apply. 2. The participants must be 18 years or older. 3. Mandatory ACTIVE informed consent. Identifiable information including, names, addresses, voice/video data, must not be obtained. 4. NOT approved for online data collection.		
Approved IRB Templates	IRB Templates: SONA recruitment script and in-person informed consent Non-MTSU Templates: NONE		
Research Inducement	Research Credit (1)		
Comments	NONE		

Summary of the Post-approval Requirements: The PI and FA must read and abide by the post-approval conditions (Refer "Quick Links" in the bottom):

- **Final Report:** The Faculty Advisor (FA) is responsible for submitting a final report to close-out this protocol before **12/31/2022**; if more time is needed to complete the data collection, the FA must request an extension by email. **REMINDERS WILL NOT BE SENT. Failure to close-out (or request extension) may result in penalties** including cancellation of the data collected using this protocol or withholding student diploma.
- **Protocol Amendments:** IRB approval must be obtained for all types of amendments, such as:
 - Addition/removal of subject population and sample size.
 - Change in investigators.
 - Changes to the research sites – appropriate permission letter(s) from may be needed.
 - Alternation to funding.
 - Amendments must be clearly described in an addendum request form submitted by the FA.
 - The proposed change must be consistent with the approved protocol and they must comply with exemption requirements.
- **Reporting Adverse Events:** Research-related injuries to the participants and other events, such as, deviations & misconduct, must be reported within 48 hours of such events to compliance@mtsu.edu.
- **Research Participant Compensation:** Compensation for research participation must be awarded as proposed in Chapter 6 of the Exempt protocol. The documentation of the monetary compensation must Appendix J and MUST NOT include protocol details when reporting to the MTSU Business Office.
- **COVID-19:** Regardless whether this study poses a threat to the participants or not, refer to the COVID-19 Management section for important information for the FA.

COVID-19 Management:

The FA must enforce social distancing guidelines and other practices to avoid viral exposure to the participants and other workers when physical contact with the subjects is made during the study.

- The study must be stopped if a participant or an investigator should test positive for COVID-19 within 14 days of the research interaction. This must be reported to the IRB as an "adverse event."
- The FA must enforce the MTSU's "Return-to-work" questionnaire found in Pipeline must be filled and signed by the investigators on the day of the research interaction prior to physical contact.
- PPE must be worn if the participant would be within 6 feet from the each other or with an investigator.
- Physical surfaces that will come in contact with the participants must be sanitized between use
- **FA's Responsibility:** The FA is given the administrative authority to make emergency changes to protect the wellbeing of the participants and student researchers during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the FA must notify the IRB after such changes have been made. The IRB will audit the changes at a later date and the PI will be instructed to carryout remedial measures if needed.

Post-approval Protocol Amendments:

The current MTSU IRB policies allow the investigators to implement minor and significant amendments that would not result in the cancellation of the protocol's eligibility for exemption. **Only THREE procedural amendments will be entertained per year (changes like addition/removal of research personnel are not restricted by this rule).**

Date	Amendment(s)	IRB Comments
NONE	NONE.	NONE

Post-approval IRB Actions:

The following actions are done subsequent to the approval of this protocol on request by the PI or on recommendation by the IRB or by both.

Date	IRB Action(s)	IRB Comments
10/13/2021	Mistake(s) in the mandatory requirements corrected.	Admin

Mandatory Data Storage Requirement:

All research-related records (signed consent forms, investigator training and etc.) must be retained by the PI or the faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) at the secure location mentioned in the protocol
IRBN007 – Exemption Notice (Stu)

Institutional Review Board, MTSU

FWA: 00005331

IRB Registration: 0003571

application. The data must be stored for at least three (3) years after the study is closed. Additionally, the Tennessee State data retention requirement may apply (*refer "Quick Links" below for policy 129*). Subsequently, the data may be destroyed in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity of the research subjects. **The IRB reserves the right to modify/update the approval criteria or change/cancel the terms listed in this notice.** Be advised that IRB also reserves the right to inspect or audit your records if needed.

Sincerely,

Institutional Review Board
Middle Tennessee State University

Quick Links:

- Post-approval Responsibilities: <http://www.mtsu.edu/irb/FAQ/PostApprovalResponsibilities.php>
- Exemption Procedures: <https://mtsu.edu/irb/ExemptPaperWork.php>
- MTSU Policy 129: Records retention & Disposal: <https://www.mtsu.edu/policies/general/129.php>

APPENDIX B

IRB Approval Form (General Psychology Courses)

IRB

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Office of Research Compliance,
010A Sam Ingram Building,
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd
Murfreesboro, TN 37129
FWA: 00005331/IRB Regn.. 0003571



IRBN007 – EXEMPTION DETERMINATION NOTICE

Thursday, April 14, 2022

Protocol Title *Perceptions of Victims and Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Abuse*
Protocol ID *22-1047 2i*

Principal Investigator *Sarah Parker (Student)* **Faculty Advisor:** Mary Ellen Fromuth
Co-Investigators James Loveless and Dana Fuller
Investigator Email(s) *sbp2x@mtmail.mtsu.edu; maryellen.fromuth@mtsu.edu*
Department/Affiliation Psychology

Dear Investigator(s),

The above identified research proposal has been reviewed by the MTSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) through the **EXEMPT** review mechanism under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) within the research category **(2) Educational Tests, surveys, interviews or observations of public behavior (in-person survey)**. A summary of the IRB action and other particulars of this protocol are shown below:

IRB Action	EXEMPT from further IRB Review Exempt from further continuing review but other oversight requirements apply
Date of Expiration	12/31/2022 Date of Approval: 10/11/21 Recent Amendment: 4/14/22
Sample Size	TWO HUNDRED (200)
Participant Pool	Healthy adults (18 or older) – University/College Students
Exceptions	1. In-person interaction is permitted. 2. Collection of identifiable information is allowed for COVID-19 management. 3. Participant information retention to comply with SONA policy is permitted.
Type of Interaction	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-interventional or Data Analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual/Remote/Online Interview/survey <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In person or physical– Mandatory COVID-19 Management (refer next page)
Mandatory Restrictions	1. All restrictions for exemption apply. 2. The participants must be 18 years or older. 3. Mandatory ACTIVE informed consent. Identifiable information including, names, addresses, voice/video data, must not be obtained. 4. NOT approved for online data collection.
Approved IRB Templates	IRB Templates: SONA recruitment script and in-person informed consent Non-MTSU Templates: NONE
Research Inducement	Research Credit (1)
Comments	NONE

Summary of the Post-approval Requirements

The PI and FA must read and abide by the post-approval conditions (Refer "Quick Links" in the bottom):

- **Final Report:** The Faculty Advisor (FA) is responsible for submitting a final report to close-out this protocol before **12/31/2022**; if more time is needed to complete the data collection, the FA must request an extension by email. **REMINDERS WILL NOT BE SENT. Failure to close-out (or request extension) may result in penalties** including cancellation of the data collected using this protocol or withholding student diploma.
- **Protocol Amendments:** IRB approval must be obtained for all types of amendments, such as:
 - Addition/removal of subject population and sample size.
 - Change in investigators.
 - Changes to the research sites – appropriate permission letter(s) from may be needed.
 - Alternation to funding.
 - Amendments must be clearly described in an addendum request form submitted by the FA.
 - The proposed change must be consistent with the approved protocol and they must comply with exemption requirements.
- **Reporting Adverse Events:** Research-related injuries to the participants and other events, such as, deviations & misconduct, must be reported within 48 hours of such events to compliance@mtsu.edu.
- **Research Participant Compensation:** Compensation for research participation must be awarded as proposed in Chapter 6 of the Exempt protocol. The documentation of the monetary compensation must Appendix J and MUST NOT include protocol details when reporting to the MTSU Business Office.
- **COVID-19:** Regardless whether this study poses a threat to the participants or not, refer to the COVID-19 Management section for important information for the FA.

COVID-19 Management:

The FA must enforce social distancing guidelines and other practices to avoid viral exposure to the participants and other workers when physical contact with the subjects is made during the study.

- The study must be stopped if a participant or an investigator should test positive for COVID-19 within 14 days of the research interaction. This must be reported to the IRB as an "adverse event."
- The FA must enforce the MTSU's "Return-to-work" questionnaire found in Pipeline must be filled and signed by the investigators on the day of the research interaction prior to physical contact.
- PPE must be worn if the participant would be within 6 feet from the each other or with an investigator.
- Physical surfaces that will come in contact with the participants must be sanitized between use
- **FA's Responsibility:** The FA is given the administrative authority to make emergency changes to protect the wellbeing of the participants and student researchers during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the FA must notify the IRB after such changes have been made. The IRB will audit the changes at a later date and the PI will be instructed to carryout remedial measures if needed.

Post-approval Protocol Amendments:

The current MTSU IRB policies allow the investigators to implement minor and significant amendments that would not result in the cancellation of the protocol's eligibility for exemption. **Only THREE procedural amendments will be entertained per year (changes like addition/removal of research personnel are not restricted by this rule).**

Date	Amendment(s)	IRB Comments
04/01/2022	Christopher Dale Parker (cdp6m CITI11088174) is added to this protocol.	IRBA2022-355
04/14/2022	The target population definition is altered. Informed consent is changed accordingly.	IRBA2022-355

Post-approval IRB Actions:

The following actions are done subsequent to the approval of this protocol on request by the PI or on recommendation by the IRB or by both.

Date	IRB Action(s)	IRB Comments
10/13/2021	Mistake(s) in the mandatory requirements corrected.	Admin
10/26/2021	Missing pages in the in person informed consent were rectified.	Admin

Institutional Review Board, MTSU

FWA: 00005331

IRB Registration: 0003571

11/05/2021	Part B of the informed consent is updated .	Admin
------------	---	-------

Mandatory Data Storage Requirement:

All research-related records (signed consent forms, investigator training and etc.) must be retained by the PI or the faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) at the secure location mentioned in the protocol application. The data must be stored for at least three (3) years after the study is closed. Additionally, the Tennessee State data retention requirement may apply (*refer "Quick Links" below for policy 129*). Subsequently, the data may be destroyed in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity of the research subjects. **The IRB reserves the right to modify/update the approval criteria or change/cancel the terms listed in this notice.** Be advised that IRB also reserves the right to inspect or audit your records if needed.

Sincerely,

Institutional Review Board
Middle Tennessee State University

Quick Links:

- Post-approval Responsibilities: <http://www.mtsu.edu/irb/FAQ/PostApprovalResponsibilities.php>
- Exemption Procedures: <https://mtsu.edu/irb/ExemptPaperWork.php>
- MTSU Policy 129: Records retention & Disposal: <https://www.mtsu.edu/policies/general/129.php>

APPENDIX C

Demographic Form

Please complete the following questions regarding demographic information.

To avoid respondents and their answers being identifiable, the answer choices have purposely been asked in broad categories.

1. What is your sex?
 - A. Male
 - B. Female
 - C. Nonbinary/Prefer not to answer

2. What is your age?
 - A. 18-21
 - B. 22-25
 - C. 26-35
 - D. Prefer not to answer

3. What is your ethnicity?
 - A. African American/Black
 - B. Caucasian/White
 - C. Other (Asian, Hispanic or Latino/Latina, Native American, etc.)
 - D. Prefer not to answer

APPENDIX D

Intimate Partner Abuse Scenarios

A. Physical Abuse Scenario:

Your friend, James, asks to speak with you about a problem he has been having with his girlfriend, Kate. He tells you that two nights ago, he and Kate were watching television when Kate took his phone and asked for his passcode. James said he decided to give Kate the passcode to avoid issues. He says that Kate then began looking through his phone at his social media accounts, and that she also questioned him on interactions he had with other people. James tells you that after looking at his phone for some time, Kate became angry and threw the phone directly at him. He says the phone hit him in the face and left a small mark. He added that he complained about Kate throwing the phone, and that she responded by slapping him across the face. He said that Kate then grabbed his phone again and threw it against the wall, cracking the screen. He said he then went to pick up his phone, and as he bent over Kate began kicking him from behind. James ends the conversation by saying that he is concerned with this behavior and has been feeling upset by this interaction and others with Kate.

B. Psychological Abuse Scenario:

Your friend, James, asks to speak with you about a problem he has been having with his girlfriend, Kate. He tells you that two nights ago, he and Kate were watching television when Kate took his phone and asked for his passcode. James said that when he refused, Kate accused him of hiding something on his phone. James said he decided to give Kate the passcode to avoid issues. He says that Kate looked at his social media

accounts and questioned him on interactions he had with other people, particularly other women. James said he explained to Kate that these women were coworkers and friends, but Kate forbid him from speaking to these women again. He says that when he protested further Kate became angry and began shouting and cussing at him. He says that Kate told him that no one else would love him so he must listen to her. He added that she also began making fun of him for complaining and being upset and told him that this is what he gets for talking to other women. James ends the conversation by saying that he is concerned and has been feeling upset by this interaction and others with Kate.

APPENDIX E

Thesis Questions by Dependent Scales

Harm to Victim – How harmful does the respondent perceive the situation to be for the victim?

1. I believe this incident was harmful to the victim.
2. I believe this incident will cause emotional harm to the victim.
3. I think that the victim will not be affected by this incident in any future relationships. (Reversed)
4. I think the victim is upset right now but will quickly move on from any harm they faced during this incident. (Reversed)

Responsibility of Victim – Who does the respondent consider to be responsible for the abuse situation and any subsequent reactions?

1. I believe that the victim had no part in starting this incident. (Reversed)
2. I believe that the victim could have done something to calm the perpetrator during this incident.
3. I believe that the victim did nothing wrong before, during, or after this incident. (Reversed)
4. I believe that the victim should change some aspect of their behavior to avoid more incidents like this in the future.

Believability of Victim – How believable does the respondent perceive the victim?

1. I believe that the incident happened exactly as the victim reported.
2. I believe the victim may be overstating the severity of the incident. (Reversed)

3. I believe that the victim may have just wanted to complain about something when talking to me about this incident. (Reversed)
4. I completely believe what the victim has told me without hearing the perpetrator's side.

Responsibility of Perpetrator – How responsible does the respondent perceive the perpetrator for the abuse?

1. I believe that the perpetrator started this incident with the victim.
2. I believe that the perpetrator should change some aspect of their behavior to avoid more incidents like this in the future.
3. I believe the perpetrator had good reason to be upset with the victim in the first place. (Reversed)
4. I think the perpetrator's actions were a response to them being treated unfairly. (Reversed)

Respondent's Hypothetical Response – What actions, if any, will the respondent engage in after hearing about this incident?

1. I would recommend the victim seek out professional help after this incident.
2. I would encourage the victim to leave the relationship after this incident.
3. I would tell someone about this incident on the victim's behalf for fear the victim will not seek help.
4. I would encourage the victim to attempt to work things out with the perpetrator. (Reversed)

Normalization of Intimate Partner Abuse – To what degree does the respondent find what has happened to the victim “normal” in an intimate relationship?

1. I believe that the situation described is a normal interaction between two people in an intimate relationship.
2. I believe that the victim should be less upset by this situation than they are.
3. I believe that (men/women) should be used to this type of behavior in intimate relationships.
4. I believe that this type of behavior is normal for (men/women) to experience in intimate relationships.

APPENDIX F

Intimate Partner Abuse Questionnaires

Questionnaire 1: Male Perpetrator/Female Victim Physical Abuse Scenario

1. What is your sex?
 - A. Male
 - B. Female
 - C. Nonbinary/Prefer not to answer
2. What is your age?
 - A. 18-21
 - B. 22-25
 - C. 26-35
 - D. Prefer not to answer
3. What is your ethnicity?
 - A. African American/Black
 - B. Caucasian/White
 - C. Other (Asian, Hispanic or Latino/Latina, Native American, etc.)
 - D. Prefer not to answer

Please read the following scenario. Once you are finished reading, there will be questions about this scenario.

Your friend, Kate, asks to speak with you about a problem she has been having with her boyfriend, James. She tells you that two nights ago, she and James were watching television when James took her phone and asked for her passcode. Kate said she decided to give James the passcode to avoid issues. She says that James then began looking through her phone at her social media accounts, and that he also questioned her on interactions she had with other people. Kate tells you that after looking at her phone for some time, James became angry and threw the phone directly at her. She says the phone hit her in the face and left a small mark. She added that she complained about James throwing the phone, and that he responded by slapping her across the face. She said that James then grabbed her phone again and threw it against the wall, cracking the screen. She said she then went to pick up her phone, and as she bent over James began kicking her from behind. Kate ends the conversation by saying that she is concerned with this behavior and has been feeling upset by this interaction and others with James.

1. I believe this incident was harmful to Kate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. I believe that Kate should change some aspect of her behavior to avoid more incidents like this in the future.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. I believe Kate may be overstating the severity of the incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. I believe James had good reason to be upset with Kate in the first place.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. I would recommend Kate seek out professional help after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. I believe that this type of behavior is normal for women to experience in intimate relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. I believe this incident will cause emotional harm to Kate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. I believe that Kate did nothing wrong before, during, or after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

9. I believe that the incident happened exactly as Kate reported.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

10. I think James's actions were a response to him being treated unfairly.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

11. I would encourage Kate to leave the relationship after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

12. I believe that women should be used to this type of behavior in intimate relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

13. I think Kate is upset right now but will quickly move on from any harm she faced during this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

14. I believe that Kate had no part in starting this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

15. I believe that Kate may have just wanted to complain about something when talking to me about this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

16. I believe that James should change some aspect of his behavior to avoid more incidents like this in the future.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

17. I would encourage Kate to attempt to work things out with James.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

18. I believe that the situation described is a normal interaction between two people in an intimate relationship.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

19. I think that Kate will not be affected by this incident in any future relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

20. I believe that Kate could have done something to calm James during this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

21. I completely believe what Kate has told me without hearing James's side.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

22. I believe that James started this incident with Kate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

23. I would tell someone about this incident on Kate's behalf for fear she will not seek help.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

24. I believe that Kate should be less upset by this situation than she is.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Questionnaire 2: Female Perpetrator/Male Victim Physical Abuse Scenario

1. What is your sex?
 - A. Male
 - B. Female
 - C. Nonbinary/Prefer not to answer

2. What is your age?
 - A. 18-21
 - B. 22-25
 - C. 26-35
 - D. Prefer not to answer

3. What is your ethnicity?
 - A. African American
 - B. Caucasian
 - C. Other (Asian, Hispanic or Latino/Latina, Native American, etc.)
 - D. Prefer not to answer

Please read the following scenario. Once you are finished reading, there will be questions about this scenario.

Your friend, James, asks to speak with you about a problem he has been having with his girlfriend, Kate. He tells you that two nights ago, he and Kate were watching television when Kate took his phone and asked for his passcode. James said he decided to give Kate the passcode to avoid issues. He says that Kate then began looking through his phone at his social media accounts, and that she also questioned him on interactions he had with other people. James tells you that after looking at his phone for some time, Kate became angry and threw the phone directly at him. He says the phone hit him in the face and left a small mark. He added that he complained about Kate throwing the phone, and that she responded by slapping him across the face. He said that Kate then grabbed his phone again and threw it against the wall, cracking the screen. He said he then went to pick up his phone, and as he bent over Kate began kicking him from behind. James ends the conversation by saying that he is concerned with this behavior and has been feeling upset by this interaction and others with Kate.

1. I believe this incident was harmful to James.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. I believe that James should change some aspect of his behavior to avoid more incidents like this in the future.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. I believe James may be overstating the severity of the incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. I believe Kate had good reason to be upset with James in the first place.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. I would recommend James seek out professional help after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. I believe that this type of behavior is normal for men to experience in intimate relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. I believe this incident will cause emotional harm to James.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. I believe that James did nothing wrong before, during, or after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

9. I believe that the incident happened exactly as James reported.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

10. I think Kate's actions were a response to her being treated unfairly.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

11. I would encourage James to leave the relationship after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

12. I believe that men should be used to this type of behavior in intimate relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

13. I think James is upset right now but will quickly move on from any harm he faced during this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

14. I believe that James had no part in starting this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

15. I believe that James may have just wanted to complain about something when talking to me about this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

16. I believe that Kate should change some aspect of her behavior to avoid more incidents like this in the future.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

17. I would encourage James to attempt to work things out with Kate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

18. I believe that the situation described is a normal interaction between two people in an intimate relationship.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

19. I think that James will not be affected by this incident in any future relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

20. I believe that James could have done something to calm Kate during this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

21. I completely believe what James has told me without hearing Kate's side.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

22. I believe that Kate started this incident with James.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

23. I would tell someone about this incident on James's behalf for fear he will not seek help.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

24. I believe that James should be less upset by this situation than he is.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Questionnaire 3: Male Perpetrator/Female Victim Psychological Abuse Scenario

1. What is your sex?
 - A. Male
 - B. Female
 - C. Nonbinary/Prefer not to answer

2. What is your age?
 - A. 18-21
 - B. 22-25
 - C. 26-35
 - D. Prefer not to answer

3. What is your ethnicity?
 - A. African American
 - B. Caucasian
 - C. Other (Asian, Hispanic or Latino/Latina, Native American, etc.)
 - D. Prefer not to answer

Please read the following scenario. Once you are finished reading, there will be questions about this scenario.

Your friend, Kate, asks to speak with you about a problem she has been having with her boyfriend, James. She tells you that two nights ago, she and James were watching television when James took her phone and asked for her passcode. Kate said that when she refused, James accused her of hiding something on her phone. Kate said she decided to give James the passcode to avoid issues. She says that James looked at her social media accounts and questioned her on interactions she had with other people, particularly other men. Kate said she explained to James that these men were coworkers and friends, but James forbid her from speaking to these men again. She says that when she protested further James became angry and began shouting and cussing at her. She says that James told her that no one else would love her so she must listen to him. She added that he also began making fun of her for complaining and being upset and told her that this is what she gets for talking to other men. Kate ends the conversation by saying that she is concerned and has been feeling upset by this interaction and others with James.

1. I believe this incident was harmful to Kate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. I believe that Kate should change some aspect of her behavior to avoid more incidents like this in the future.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. I believe Kate may be overstating the severity of the incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. I believe James had good reason to be upset with Kate in the first place.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. I would recommend Kate seek out professional help after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. I believe that this type of behavior is normal for women to experience in intimate relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. I believe this incident will cause emotional harm to Kate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. I believe that Kate did nothing wrong before, during, or after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

9. I believe that the incident happened exactly as Kate reported.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

10. I think James's actions were a response to him being treated unfairly.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

11. I would encourage Kate to leave the relationship after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

12. I believe that women should be used to this type of behavior in intimate relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

13. I think Kate is upset right now but will quickly move on from any harm she faced during this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

14. I believe that Kate had no part in starting this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

15. I believe that Kate may have just wanted to complain about something when talking to me about this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

16. I believe that James should change some aspect of his behavior to avoid more incidents like this in the future.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

17. I would encourage Kate to attempt to work things out with James.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

18. I believe that the situation described is a normal interaction between two people in an intimate relationship.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

19. I think that Kate will not be affected by this incident in any future relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

20. I believe that Kate could have done something to calm James during this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

21. I completely believe what Kate has told me without hearing James's side.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

22. I believe that James started this incident with Kate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

23. I would tell someone about this incident on Kate's behalf for fear she will not seek help.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

24. I believe that Kate should be less upset by this situation than she is.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Questionnaire 4: Female Perpetrator/ Male Victim Psychological Abuse Scenario

1. What is your sex?
 - A. Male
 - B. Female
 - C. Nonbinary/Prefer not to answer

2. What is your age?
 - A. 18-21
 - B. 22-25
 - C. 26-35
 - D. Prefer not to answer

3. What is your ethnicity?
 - A. African American
 - B. Caucasian
 - C. Other (Asian, Hispanic or Latino/Latina, Native American, etc.)
 - D. Prefer not to answer

Please read the following scenario. Once you are finished reading, there will be questions about this scenario.

Your friend, James, asks to speak with you about a problem he has been having with his girlfriend, Kate. He tells you that two nights ago, he and Kate were watching television when Kate took his phone and asked for his passcode. James said that when he refused, Kate accused him of hiding something on his phone. James said he decided to give Kate the passcode to avoid issues. He says that Kate looked at his social media accounts and questioned him on interactions he had with other people, particularly other women. James said he explained to Kate that these women were coworkers and friends, but Kate forbid him from speaking to these women again. He says that when he protested further Kate became angry and began shouting and cussing at him. He says that Kate told him that no one else would love him so he must listen to her. He added that she also began making fun of him for complaining and being upset and told him that this is what he gets for talking to other women. James ends the conversation by saying that he is concerned and has been feeling upset by this interaction and others with Kate.

1. I believe this incident was harmful to James.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. I believe that James should change some aspect of his behavior to avoid more incidents like this in the future.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. I believe James may be overstating the severity of the incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. I believe Kate had good reason to be upset with James in the first place.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. I would recommend James seek out professional help after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. I believe that this type of behavior is normal for men to experience in intimate relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. I believe this incident will cause emotional harm to James.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. I believe that James did nothing wrong before, during, or after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

9. I believe that the incident happened exactly as James reported.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

10. I think Kate's actions were a response to her being treated unfairly.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

11. I would encourage James to leave the relationship after this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

12. I believe that men should be used to this type of behavior in intimate relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

13. I think James is upset right now but will quickly move on from any harm he faced during this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

14. I believe that James had no part in starting this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

15. I believe that James may have just wanted to complain about something when talking to me about this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

16. I believe that Kate should change some aspect of her behavior to avoid more incidents like this in the future.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

17. I would encourage James to attempt to work things out with Kate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

18. I believe that the situation described is a normal interaction between two people in an intimate relationship.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

19. I think that James will not be affected by this incident in any future relationships.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

20. I believe that James could have done something to calm Kate during this incident.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree/Disagree	Agree		Agree

21. I completely believe what James has told me without hearing Kate's side.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

22. I believe that Kate started this incident with James.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

23. I would tell someone about this incident on James's behalf for fear he will not seek help.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

24. I believe that James should be less upset by this situation than he is.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

APPENDIX G

Informed Consent Form (Research Pool)

IRB

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Office of Research Compliance,
010A Sam Ingram Building,
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd, Murfreesboro, TN 37129



INFORMED CONSENT – RESEARCHERS' DISCLOSURES

(Part A – Participant's Copy)

Study Title *Factors that Affect Perceptions of Negative Dating Relationships*

Principal Investigator **Sarah Parker**
Faculty Advisor Dr. Mary Ellen Fromuth
Contact Information sbp2x@mtmail.mtsu.edu

IRB ID: 22-1047 2i
Approval Date: 10/11/2021
Expiration Date: 12/31/2022

Dear Participant,

On behalf of the research team, the Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU) would like to thank you for considering to take part in this research study. You have been contacted by the above identified researcher(s) to enroll as a participant in this study because you met its eligibility criteria.

This consent document describes the research study for the purpose of helping you to make an informed decision on whether to participate in this study or not. It provides important information related to this study, possible interventions by the researcher(s) and proposed activities by you. This research has been reviewed by MTSU's internal oversight entity - Institutional Review Board (IRB) - for ethical practices in research (visit www.mtsu.edu/irb for more information).

As a participant, you have the following rights:

- You should read and understand the information in this document before agreeing to enroll
- Your participation is absolutely voluntary and the researchers cannot force you to participate
- If you refuse to participate or to withdraw midway during this study, no penalty or loss of benefits will happen
- With the exception of COVID-19 contact tracing, the investigator MUST NOT collect identifiable information from you, such as, name, SSN, and phone number
- The researcher(s) can only ask you to complete an interview or a survey or similar activities and you must not be asked to perform physical activities or offer medical/psychological intervention
- Any potential risk or discomforts from this study would be lower than what you would face in your daily life

After you read the following disclosures, you can agree to participate in this study by completing "Part B" of this informed consent document. You do not have to do anything further if you decide not to participate.

1. What is the purpose of this study?

This research project is designed to help us evaluate factors that may affect perceptions of negative dating relationships.

2. What will I be asked to do in this study?

All respondents will first be asked to read the consent form and give their consent to participate. If consent is given, then you will be asked to read and complete a demographic form that will ask questions about age (in categories), sex, and ethnicity. You will then be given one scenario involving a negative dating relationship to read. Then, you will be asked to answer some questions regarding the scenario. This study will take less than 30 minutes to complete. The questionnaire is anonymous and will not include your name. You will not be asked about your own history with negative dating

IRBF004IC – Informed Consent EXEMPT

relationships or any negative experiences you have had while dating or in a relationship.

Please note: you must be between the ages of 18 and 35 years old to participate in this research.

3. **How many times should I participate or for how long?**
Participation is only needed one time for this study. The study will be for less than thirty minutes.
4. **What are the risks and benefits if I participate?**
No discomforts are to be expected from this study. The risks involved are less than minimum. There is no direct benefit for you for participating in this study. Your only compensation for this study will be one research credit. The potential benefit to science and humankind that may result from this study is that we will be able to learn more about how negative dating relationships are perceived.
5. **What will happen to the information I provide in this study?**
All information provided in this study will remain completely anonymous. Your answers to the demographic questions and survey questions will be used in research to evaluate perceptions of negative dating relationships.
6. **What will happen if I refuse to participate and can I withdraw if I change my mind in the middle?**
Participation is voluntary throughout the entire length of the study. You may withdraw at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer. If you no longer wish to participate at any time, turn in your research-related documents and retrieve your blue card before leaving. You will still receive one research credit for your participation.
7. **Compensation:** The participants will receive one (1) research credit. The participant information will be retained to abide by SONA policies but the information will not be used for other purposes.
8. **Study-related Injuries, bodily harms and COVID-19 issues:** The survey is not expected to pose any bodily injuries. The participants may face the same risk for exposure for COVID-19 as they would face in all public places. The PI plans to implement safety measures. The investigators will record identifiable participant details to contact them in the event there are any infections in this study. The information will be destroyed after a certain number of days if no infections are reported.
9. **Whom can I contact to report issues and share my concerns?**
You can contact the researcher(s) by email or telephone (**Sarah Parker at sbp2x@mtmail.mtsu.edu or Dr. Fromuth at MaryEllen.Fromuth@mtsu.edu**). You can also contact the MTSU's Office of Research Compliance by email – irb_information@mtsu.edu. Report compliance breaches and adverse events by dialing 615 898 2400 or by emailing compliance@mtsu.edu.
10. **Confidentiality Statement:** All efforts, within reason, will be made to keep the personal information in your research record private but total privacy cannot be promised, for example, your information may be shared with the MTSU IRB. In the event of questions or difficulties of any kind during or following participation, you may contact the Principal Investigator as indicated above. For additional information about giving consent or your rights as a participant in this study, please feel free to contact our Office of Compliance at (615) 898 2400.

You do not have to do anything if you decide not to participate in this study. But if wish to enroll as a participant, please complete "Part B" of this informed consent form and return it to the researcher. Please retain the signed copy of "Part A" for your future reference.

Investigator Name & Signature

Faculty Advisor Name & Signature

Date

IRBF004IC – Informed Consent EXEMPT

IRB**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**

Office of Research Compliance,
010A Sam Ingram Building,
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd, Murfreesboro, TN 37129

INFORMED CONSENT

(Part B – Researcher's Copy)

Study Title	<i>Factors that Affect Perceptions of Negative Dating Relationships</i>	
Principal Investigator	Sarah Parker	IRB ID: 22-1047 2i
Faculty Advisor	Dr. Mary Ellen Fromuth	Approval Date: 10/11/2021
Contact Information	sbp2x@mtmail.mtsu.edu	Expiration Date: 12/31/2022

You have been contacted by the investigator(s) because the researchers believe you meet the eligibility criteria to participate in the above referenced research study. Be aware that you must NOT be asked by the investigator(s) to do anything that would pose risk to your health or welfare, such as:

- Identifiable information – name, phone number, SSN, address, College ID, social media credentials (FaceBook page, twitter, etc.), email, identifiable information of closest relatives and etc.
- Physical activities – like exercise studies
- Medical intervention – testing drugs, collection of blood/tissue samples or psychological questions
- Nothing risky – any proposed activity that would expose you to more risk than what you would face on a day to day basis is not approved by the IRB

However, you can do the following:

- Withdraw from the study at any time without consequences
- Withdraw the information you have provided to the investigators before the study is complete
- Ask questions so the researcher must explain the procedures used in the research verbally.

The investigators must give you enough time to ask any questions. Once you have had a chance to read "Part A" (Participant's Copy), indicate your acceptance by checking the appropriate boxes:

	NO	YES
➤ I have read investigator(s)' disclosure (Part A) for the above identified research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
➤ The researcher(s) explained the procedures to be conducted verbally	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
➤ I understand each part of the interventions and all my questions are answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
➤ I understand that identifiable information will be collected for the purpose of contact tracing in to mitigate the spread of COVID-19	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
➤ The researcher(s) gave me a signed copy of the disclosure page (Part A)		

By initialing below, I give my consent to participate in this study. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without facing any consequences.

X

----- NON-IDENTIFIABLE PARTICIPANT ID# -----
Participant initial Date

Please complete the COVID-19 information page and return it along with this page. Please retain the information page for your future reference.

APPENDIX H

Informed Consent Form (General Psychology Courses)

IRB

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Office of Research Compliance,
010A Sam Ingram Building,
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd, Murfreesboro, TN 37129



INFORMED CONSENT – RESEARCHERS' DISCLOSURES

(Part A – Participant's Copy)

Study Title	<i>Factors that Affect Perceptions of Negative Dating Relationships</i>	
Principal Investigator	Sarah Parker	IRB ID: 22-1047 2i (IRBA2022-355)
Faculty Advisor	Dr. Mary Ellen Fromuth	Approval Date: 04/14/2022
Contact Information	sbp2x@mtmail.mtsu.edu	Expiration Date: 12/31/2022

Dear Participant,

On behalf of the research team, the Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU) would like to thank you for considering to take part in this research study. You have been contacted by the above identified researcher(s) to enroll as a participant in this study because you met its eligibility criteria.

This consent document describes the research study for the purpose of helping you to make an informed decision on whether to participate in this study or not. It provides important information related to this study, possible interventions by the researcher(s) and proposed activities by you. This research has been reviewed by MTSU's internal oversight entity - Institutional Review Board (IRB) - for ethical practices in research (visit www.mtsu.edu/irb for more information).

As a participant, you have the following rights:

- You should read and understand the information in this document before agreeing to enroll
- Your participation is absolutely voluntary and the researchers cannot force you to participate
- If you refuse to participate or to withdraw midway during this study, no penalty or loss of benefits will happen
- With the exception of COVID-19 contact tracing, the investigator MUST NOT collect identifiable information from you, such as, name, SSN, and phone number
- The researcher(s) can only ask you to complete an interview or a survey or similar activities and you must not be asked to perform physical activities or offer medical/psychological intervention
- Any potential risk or discomforts from this study would be lower than what you would face in your daily life

After you read the following disclosures, you can agree to participate in this study by completing "Part B" of this informed consent document. You do not have to do anything further if you decide not to participate.

1. What is the purpose of this study?

This research project is designed to help us evaluate factors that may affect perceptions of negative dating relationships.

2. What will I be asked to do in this study?

All respondents will first be asked to read the consent form and give their consent to participate. If consent is given, then you will be asked to read and complete a demographic form that will ask questions about age (in categories), sex, and ethnicity. You will then be given one scenario involving a negative dating relationship to read. Then, you will be asked to answer some questions regarding the scenario. This study will take less than fifteen minutes to complete. The questionnaire is anonymous and will not include your name. You will not be asked about your own history with negative dating

relationships or any negative experiences you have had while dating or in a relationship. **Please note:** you must be between the ages of 18 and 35 years old to participate in this research.

3. **How many times should I participate or for how long?**
Participation is only needed one time for this study. If you have already participated in this study for research credit through the Sona System please do not participate again. The length of the study will be no longer than fifteen minutes.
4. **What are the risks and benefits if I participate?**
No discomforts are to be expected from this study. The risks involved are less than minimum. There is no direct benefit for you for participating in this study. Your only compensation for this study will be two points of extra credit in this PSY-1410 class. The potential benefit to science and humankind that may result from this study is that we will be able to learn more about how negative dating relationships are perceived.
5. **What will happen to the information I provide in this study?**
All information provided in this study will remain completely anonymous. Your answers to the demographic questions and survey questions will be used in research to evaluate perceptions of negative dating relationships.
6. **What will happen if I refuse to participate and can I withdraw if I change my mind in the middle?**
Participation is voluntary throughout the entire length of the study. You may withdraw at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer. If you no longer wish to participate at any time, turn in your research-related documents. You will still receive two points of extra credit for your participation.
7. **Compensation:** Your compensation for this study will be two points of extra credit in PSY-1410 class
8. **Study-related Injuries, bodily harms and COVID-19 issues:** The survey is not expected to pose any bodily injuries. The participants may face the same risk for exposure for COVID-19 as they would face in all public places.
9. **Whom can I contact to report issues and share my concerns?**
You can contact the researcher(s) by email or telephone (**Sarah Parker at sbp2x@mtmail.mtsu.edu or Dr. Fromuth at MaryEllen.Fromuth@mtsu.edu**). You can also contact the MTSU's Office of Research Compliance by email – irb_information@mtsu.edu. Report compliance breaches and adverse events by dialing 615 898 2400 or by emailing compliance@mtsu.edu.
10. **Confidentiality Statement:** All efforts, within reason, will be made to keep the personal information in your research record private but total privacy cannot be promised, for example, your information may be shared with the MTSU IRB. In the event of questions or difficulties of any kind during or following participation, you may contact the Principal Investigator as indicated above. For additional information about giving consent or your rights as a participant in this study, please feel free to contact our Office of Compliance at (615) 898 2400.

You do not have to do anything if you decide not to participate in this study. But if wish to enroll as a participant, please complete "Part B" of this informed consent form and return it to the researcher. Please retain the signed copy of "Part A" for your future reference.

Investigator Name & Signature

Faculty Advisor Name & Signature

Date

IRBF004IC – Informed Consent EXEMPT

IRB**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**

Office of Research Compliance,
010A Sam Ingram Building,
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd, Murfreesboro, TN 37129

INFORMED CONSENT

(Part B – Researcher's Copy)

Study Title	<i>Factors that Affect Perceptions of Negative Dating Relationships</i>	
Principal Investigator	Sarah Parker	IRB ID: 22-1047 2i (IRBA2022-355)
Faculty Advisor	Dr. Mary Ellen Fromuth	Approval Date: 04/14/2022
Contact Information	sbp2x@mtmail.mtsu.edu	Expiration Date: 12/31/2022

You have been contacted by the investigator(s) because the researchers believe you meet the eligibility criteria to participate in the above referenced research study. Be aware that you must NOT be asked by the investigator(s) to do anything that would pose risk to your health or welfare, such as:

- Identifiable information – name, phone number, SSN, address, College ID, social media credentials (FaceBook page, twitter, etc.), email, identifiable information of closest relatives and etc.
- Physical activities – like exercise studies
- Medical intervention – testing drugs, collection of blood/tissue samples or psychological questions
- Nothing risky – any proposed activity that would expose you to more risk than what you would face on a day to day basis is not approved by the IRB

However, you can do the following:

- Withdraw from the study at any time without consequences
- Withdraw the information you have provided to the investigators before the study is complete
- Ask questions so the researcher must explain the procedures used in the research verbally.

The investigators must give you enough time to ask any questions. Once you have had a chance to read "Part A" (Participant's Copy), indicate your acceptance by checking the appropriate boxes:

- | | NO | YES |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| ➤ I have read investigator(s)' disclosure (Part A) for the above identified research | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ➤ The researcher(s) explained the procedures to be conducted verbally | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ➤ I understand each part of the interventions and all my questions are answered | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ➤ I understand that identifiable information will be collected for the purpose of contact tracing to mitigate the spread of COVID-19 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ➤ The researcher(s) gave me a signed copy of the disclosure page (Part A) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

By initialing below, I give my consent to participate in this study. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without facing any consequences.

X

----- NON-IDENTIFIABLE PARTICIPANT ID# -----
Participant initial Date

Please complete the COVID-19 information page and return it along with this page. Please retain the information page for your future reference.

IRBF004IC – Informed Consent EXEMPT

APPENDIX I

Debriefing Information

It is suggested that you keep this page for your records. This will give you access to the resources on this page after the study has ended. It also may serve as additional proof of your participation if needed.

Physical abuse and psychological abuse are two types of intimate partner abuse (Breiding et al., 2015). Physical abuse against an intimate partner can include the act of slapping, shoving, punching, kicking, and hair pulling (Breiding et al., 2015). Psychological abuse can include humiliation, name-calling, threatening physical abuse, manipulation, and “gaslighting” (Breiding et al., 2015). Abuse is associated with many different types of negative outcomes for those who experience the abuse (e.g., Mechanic et al., 2008; Smith et al., 2017; Tsui et al., 2010; Wolford-Clevenger et al., 2016); therefore, it is an important area to study. There is research on the differences in how men and women experience and react to intimate partner abuse; there is less research on how men and women outside of the relationship perceive the people involved in intimate partner abuse. Thus, the purpose of this study was to explore whether men and women perceive the people involved differently.

If you would like more information about this study or your rights as a participant, please contact Sarah Parker at sbp2x@mtmail.mtsu.edu or Dr. Mary Ellen Fromuth at MaryEllen.Fromuth@mtsu.edu. You can also contact the MTSU Office of Compliance by calling 615-494-8918 or by email at compliance@mtsu.edu. If you feel the need to reach out to a counselor following this study, you can contact MTSU’s Counseling Services at 615-898-2670. This service is free for students. There also is a local Domestic Violence Hotline; it can be reached by calling 615-896-2012.

Thank you for your participation.

Sarah Parker

Dr. Mary Ellen Fromuth

sbp2x@mtmail.mtsu.edu

MaryEllen.Fromuth@mtsu.edu