

**Gender differences in bystanders' intention to help towards female and male victims of
domestic violence: a web-based online survey**

Milla Grigorova

A thesis submitted for the degree of Masters by Dissertation

Department of Psychology

University of Essex

Date: 01/2020

Abstract

The purpose of the current research is to explore the attitudes towards domestic violence victims by looking at empathy, sexism and personality traits and the willingness to help domestic violence male and female victims. The project's aim was to answer 4 main questions: Whether females experience higher empathy than males? Whether females and males will feel more empathic concern towards same sex victims? Whether higher empathy scores will lead to stronger willingness to help domestic violence victim? Whether personality traits such as: extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism are going to affect the willingness to intervene and help the victims. To answer these questions we used 4 questionnaires, measuring empathy, sexism and personality traits associated with violence and altruistic behaviours. There were two tests, which were used to measure empathy: The Empathy Quotient and the Interpersonal Reactivity Index. To measure sexism the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory was used. Lastly to measure neuroticism, extraversion and psychoticism was the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Short Version. There were 18 images with descriptive text separated into 3 conditions: male victim; female victim and happy couple. The results showed that females tend to be more empathic than males in general, and while there was a positive correlation between empathic concern and helping both male and female victims across the male participants, females showed empathic concern only towards females. Additionally, participants with high empathy scores, showed tendencies for helping victims of domestic violence. Further research is needed with more realistic stimuli and testing brain regions related to empathy and decision making, while participants are exposed to the domestic violence images.

Domestic violence (DV) is a worldwide issue, which occurs in both intimate and familial relationships. This type of violence mainly occurs at home, but there are cases where it is observed outside the domestic environment (Harne & Radeford, 2008). According to the government the definition of domestic violence and abuse is including: 'Any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive, threatening behavior, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are or have been intimate partners or family members regardless of the gender or sexuality.' Domestic violence encompasses different types of abuse, but it is not limited to the following: psychological, physical, financial, emotional and sexual abuse (Home Office, Brown & Clegg, 2012).

According to the Arizona coalition to end sexual and domestic violence (ACESDV) physical abuse includes any type of abusive physical actions such as: kicking, slapping, shaking, punching, hair pulling, burning and many more. Some of the examples for sexual abuse include forcing, guilt tripping and manipulating the victim to be part of unwanted sexual actions, these can be and are not limited to prostitution, making the victim have sexual intercourse with others and the abuser. There are two types of abusive sexual contact: by penetration (vaginal, oral and anal) and by touching (licking, kissing, sucking). Another example for DV type of abuse is emotional, this includes public humiliation, threats to hurt or kill the victim, manipulating the victim's perception of the relationship and coercing the victim into feeling powerless and unsupported by others. Furthermore, as aforementioned there is also financial abuse this includes: controlling the finances, having secret accounts, giving the victim an allowance, taking away their salary and also the abuser may make the victim lose their job. (ACESDV,2019).

The latest statistics from the year ending March 2016 show that 1.9 million adults, who are aged between 16 and 59 have been victims of DV. From them 1.2 million were females and 713.000 - males. However, reports show that this gender difference (522,000) is much

lower compared to previous years. For the last year the most common abuse reported by both female (5.2%) and male (2.7%) was non-sexual partner abuse. Domestic abuse was most common among 20-24-year-old females – 11.2%, which was significantly higher compared to the statistics for older females. These age differences were observed as well with male victims, those aged 16-19 and 20-24 were more likely to be victims compared to the older male victims. The statistics from the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) (Flatley, 2008) showed that both male and female victims who were married, cohabiting or have a civil partnership were less likely to be victims compared to the other marital statuses. The data showed that 22.6% females and 11.6% males were separated, 19.2% females and 8.8% males were divorced and 6.6% of male victims were single. Moreover, reports on domestic homicides from 2013 to 2016 showed that nearly 70% of the victims were females. However, the latest estimates from the Crime Survey for England and Wales shows that nearly every 4 in 5 victims of domestic partner abuse have not reported the incidents to the police.

Domestic violence statistics

According to the statistics of the ManKind Initiative Helpline (Brooks, 2018) around 50% of the male victims have not spoken about the abuse to anyone and around 71% of the callers would have not called the line, if it was not anonymous. They reported that the male victims who called have experienced the following abuses: Emotional (91%), Physical (61%), Psychological (38%), Financial (17%), Coercive control (13%) and Sexual (3%). Still male victims report that they stay in an abusive relationship due to several reasons: 89% are concerned about the children, while 81% believe in marriage for life, 71% report they would not leave the relationship because they love their partner, 68% are scared they may not see their children again, or because they do not want to take the kids from the mother (46%), 56% of the males believe their partner will change. Moreover, the statistics showed that 52% were worried about being homeless, 52% were embarrassed about being a victim and 53%

did not have enough financial stability to leave the relationship. Finally, 28% have been threatened by their partner, that they would commit suicide and 24% were scared of being murdered (The ManKind Initiative helpline, 2017).

Statistics from the Amnesty International UK (2018) reported that worldwide about 1/3 of women who have been in a relationship have experienced some sort of violence by their partner. Moreover, according to the World Health Organization (WHO) about 38% of murdered women were killed by their partner rather than a stranger. However, in the UK, reports show that 2 women are killed per week, 40% of the homicides of females are as a result of domestic violence. 89% of the calls the police receive are reports of women being abused by a male (WHO, 2017). According to the Women's Aid the CSEW only 18% of the female victims report domestic violence to the police by the ending of March 2018 (Women's Aid, n.d.). Moreover, this annual report show that women do not report domestic violence because of a few different reasons, such as: being scared and endangered; isolation; shame, embarrassment or denial; trauma and low confidence; practical reasons; or not enough support when needed (Women's Aid, n.d.). Furthermore Women's Aid explains that women feel threatened for their lives and the annual report for 2017 showed there was a total of 139 women killed by male violence, of whom 64 women (46%) were killed by their current or former partner. Moreover, from these 64 women 55% were killed within a month following a separation and 87% of the women were killed within the first year (Long, Harper, K & Harvey, 2017).

By isolating the victim, the perpetrator weakens the connections of the victim by making seeking support harder, this isolation leads to the victim becoming more dependent on the partner. Most of the partners are charismatic and may appear to be model citizens, which may make the victim minimizing the abuse and blame the abuse on themselves. Many of the victims are traumatized and allowed little to no freedom, they are consistently nagged

about being useless and unable to take care of herself. In some cases, the victim may depend on the perpetrator financially, furthermore in some cases the female is scared for her children been taken away or her to be deported, if she has an insecure immigration status. Last, but not least, there may be complicated cases where professionals not being familiar with the features of the occurring case, may fail helping the victim in reporting and dealing with the abuse appropriately.

However, the ManKind Initiative and the Parliamentary Select Committee report that there are about 269 refuges across the UK, providing sanctuary for many victims of domestic violence both male and female. Moreover, there has been a slight increase in 2016, providing 18 more organizations to provide refuge and safe house (Future of supported housing, 2017).

Additional research shows that in some cases where the male is a victim of domestic abuse the legal consequences are not as strict as when the female is a victim, based on the size and strength that a man possesses, this leads to the assumption that males are able to protect themselves better and cannot be harmed seriously in an abusive dispute (Pagelow, 1985). According to Migliaccio men who claim they are victims of domestic violence are seen as weak and denying their role of dominant gender attributed by society at large. By 'coming out' males start being seen as anti-masculine and accepting a role normally recognized as a woman's (Doyle, 1995; Kimmel, 1994). Therefore, male victims of domestic abuse struggle both on the inside and outside of domestic walls to maintain the image of the dominant male and foster the masculine ideal. The situation can worsen when the purported abuse becomes a public matter as it can cause a devastating effect on the male identity, exactly because of these social stigmas (Migliaccio, 2001).

A study tested the prevalence and consequences of domestic violence for both male and female victims, in a total of 16,000 participants (8,000 men and 8,000 women) (Tjaden &

Thoennes, 2000). The sample data was taken from the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAW) and both males and females were asked about their experience being victims of abuse. The data included only participants who were abused by former or current spouse in a heterosexual relationship. The study formulated 4 research questions. First, they asked whether male and female individuals experience similar proportions of victimization by the hand of opposite sex partner. They discovered that female victims were more likely to go to the police than male victims, 0.2% of the males and 4.5% of the females reported they have been raped by their partner, 7% males and 20.4% females reported being physically abused by their partner and 0.5% males and 4.1% females reported being stalked by their partner. The second research question looked at the frequency (how many times they were abused by same perpetrator) and the duration of the violence (first and last time they were abused by same perpetrator). The results showed that females (7.1 incidents) were significantly more frequently abused than males (4.7 incidents) and the duration was also significantly higher in female victims (3.8 years) than with male victims (3.3 years). The third question looked at the similarity of the amount of threats and physical harm or death. The results showed that there were significantly higher amounts for females than males, 26.4% of the males and 32.6% of the females reported that they have been threatened by their abusive partner. The data also showed that 19.6% males and 44.7% females were scared from bodily injury or death. The last question looked at the consequences of the violence for both females and males and the results showed that the consequences were significantly bigger for female compared to male victims, where 41.6% of the females and 18.8% of the males sustained injuries. From these victims only 3.8% of the males and 11.3% of the female sought medical care with 2.9% males and 11.3 females were hospitalized. The data also showed that females (27.4%) sought counselling more than males (21.7%). From the victims 13.4% of the

males and 27.8% of the females reported the abuse to the police and 3.6% males and 17.9% females obtained a restraining order.

Overall, these results suggest that domestic violence has a higher prevalence on females. However domestic violence is a human issue and affect both genders. According to McNeely and Mann (1990) recognition of male victimization in domestic violence and female perpetrators can help build awareness of the problem and ways to deal with it and reduce the impact on the victims.

There is a great deal of research papers focused on domestic violence. However, most of this research is based on the prevalence and impact of domestic violence on the victim and children, who witness the abuse. Other research looks at female victims and the causes behind the abuser's behavior. Little research is done on the bystanders of domestic abuse and why they would or would not help a victim. The aforementioned statistics show a pattern of females being victims of domestic abuse more often than males. However, Lupri and Grandin (2004) revealed that males are more reluctant to come forward and report partner abuse due to fear of being stigmatized and perceived by society and authorities as individuals who lack masculinity. Moreover, the recognition that domestic violence is mainly affects women and puts more pressure on male victims to report (Lupri & Grandin, 2004; Dasgupta, 2002). Migliaccio (2001) discusses various issues that men who encounter domestic abuse face. He suggests that male victims are faced with the fear of being 'marginalized', another reason he mentions is that many of the male victims have to come to terms with the concept of them not being in control anymore (Harris, 1995; Connell, 1995). This lack of control is mainly associated with the inability to keep the marriage and relationship going and moving forward. The male victims from Migliaccio's study reported that the lack of control of their life, which lead to the collapse of their relationships, affected negatively their masculinity. Furthermore, he proposes that male victims may experience embarrassment, because of the stigma around

men being masculine and the patriarch in the family. He explains further that this embarrassment leads to shame and anger in victims, which leads to them being silent about the abuse. The next problem that male victims may experience is the way the institutions react to such reports. Some of the subjects reported that the police dismissed their case only because the victim was a male, rather than a female. He states that the problem is with acting from legal institutions is connected with the belief that women cannot be abusive towards males. As mentioned before most of the research on domestic violence is focused on prevalence, impact on the victims, the effect it has on children coming from abusive homes and the reasons behind the abusive behavior of the perpetrators. At the same time there is little to no research on why bystanders may intervene and help or ignore the victim of domestic abuse. With this in mind, the current research will be looking at the bystanders' attitudes to domestic violence and the different reasons to why some would help a victim and why some would not. We will be looking at empathy, sexism and personality traits that are relevant to abusive behavior and willingness to help as factors that may affect this decision in the events of witnessing domestic violence.

There is a growing body of research which shows the link between empathy, sexism and different personality traits associated with acts of violence and its acceptance. In the next three paragraphs it will be discussed this past research and the reasons to why these three factors are used as variables in the current project.

Empathy, Violence and Altruism

In the past empathy has been described as the ability of humans to understand and reflect on the emotional and/or cognitive state of others (Borke, 1971; Kohut, 1971; Hogan, 1969). Moreover, empathy has been considered to have many interpretations and definitions.

Researchers who work in the field of empathy usually agree with one of two approaches: the affective and the cognitive approach. However, according to Baron-Cohen and Wheelwright (2004) both approaches are important concepts in describing empathy and in most cases the two approaches cannot be separated with ease.

The affective approach is associated with the emotional response of the observer to the affective state of another person. Considering the definition in mind it varies depending on how extensive or limited this emotional response must be. Work from previous research shows that there are four different variations of empathy: the emotional response in the onlooker should match that of the person who is observed (Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Hoffman, 1984); the emotional response of the observer is properly associated with that of the other person, whoever it is not matched completely (Stotland, 1969); the emotional response of the observer may be due to the emotion of the person who is observed, also referred to as 'contrast empathy' (Stotland, Sherman, & Shaver, 1971) and the last variation is associated with the concern and compassion evoked in the observer, while witnessing other's distress (Batson, 1991).

The cognitive approach, however, focuses on the assumption that empathy requires understanding of other people's emotions (Kohler, 1929). Some of the theories in support of this approach refer to the attention switching in order to take another person's perspective (Mead, 1934) or to respond to other people's feelings in a not self-centered manner (Piaget, 1932). In the 50s empathy was referred to as 'social acuity' or in other words social intelligence (Chapin, 1942; Kerr & Speroff, 1954). However, in the 90s empathy has been associated more with 'Theory of mind' (Wellman, 1990) or 'mindreading' which is rather understood as reading the feelings and mental state of another (Whiten, 1991).

Furthermore, there are two major interpretations of empathy known: the understanding of the emotions of another individual and mirroring these emotions, or as an effective response to another person's situation compared to our own. According to De Vignemont and Singer (2006) a person is experiencing empathy, when they are in a similar affective state as the other person and when this emotion is provoked by the observed or imagined state of another person. Lastly, it is important for the person experiencing empathy to be aware of the source of their own affective state, as triggered by someone else's, rather than their own.

Moreover, recent studies have been using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) to show that when an individual is observing another person and the emotional state they are in, it activates neural networks in the brain which are associated with the processing of one's own emotional states, such as: touch, disgust and pain (Botvinick, Jha, Bylsma, Fabian, Solomon & Prkachin, 2005). Additionally, studies show that when observing someone in pain, individuals do not react only to people they love and know, but react to strangers, too (Lloyd, Di Pellegrino & Roberts, 2004; Singer, Seymour, O'Doherty, Kaube, Dolan & Frith, 2004).

When an individual observes others, there is a likelihood they will react in one of two potential ways – by offering to help, or by leaving the situation (Toi & Batson, 1982). Toi and Batson's research showed evidence that people with high empathic concern were more likely to help in either the easy or the difficult situations, while people with lower empathic concern showed lower to no willingness to help.

Furthermore, a more recent study provides evidence on the positive relationship between altruistic behavior and empathy levels (Burks, Youll & Dutschi, 2012). This data suggests that the higher the individual's empathy levels the higher is the likelihood to feel concern for the welfare of others.

More in-depth research on empathy and its role in the moral development and behavior was carried out by Hoffman, where he theorizes and tries to give a better understanding to why people help each other and care for each other in relation to morality. He suggests that empathy and empathic concern are vital for the survival of humans and the improvement of the capacity of life and social interactions. He argues that the empathic development is formed as children grow through cognitive mechanisms, which includes attribution, perspective taking and appraisal. Moreover, he further explains that parents and other adults, who are important to the child, are shaping the child's internal prosocial motivation by directly teaching, disciplining and socializing. Lastly, he provides evidence that punishment or threats of being punished and withdrawing of love as punishment can affect negatively the prosocial moral development in children while growing up (Hoffman, 2000).

Through the 1960s and 1970s group of theorists suggested that empathy and sympathy are crucial stimuli for prosocial behavior (Batson, 1991; Hoffman, 2000; Staub, 1979). For example, research carried out by Batson on adults revealed that participant who experienced sympathetic concern, for a person in distress or in need for help, were more likely to assist them compared to participants who experienced personal distress. This was mostly observed in situations where the participant could not escape the cues of distress or there was no specific or social reward to be gained for assisting the person in need (Batson, 1991).

Moreover, researchers have discovered that individual differences in sympathy and empathy are correlated with individual differences in prosocial behavior (Eisenberg, Miller, Shell, McNalley & Shea, 1991), and that empathy and sympathy are connected generally with social competent behavior as well (Eisenberg, Fabes, Murphy, Karbon, Smith & Maszk, 1996; Zhou, Eisenberg, Losoya, Fabes, Reiser, Guthrie, Murphy, Cumberland & Shepard, 2002).

Further research provides empirical data suggesting that increased feelings of empathy towards a person in need of assistance can increase the willingness to help that individual (Batson, 1991; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987). In 1997 Batson and colleagues proposed a three-step model looking at the effect of empathy on attitudes towards stigmatized groups. The first step of this model embodies that when a person assumes the perspective of another individual in need who is a part of a stigmatized group can lead to an increase of the empathic feelings towards this person. The second step posits that when experiencing these empathic feelings, they can lead to an increased regard for this individual's wellbeing (Batson, Turk, Shaw & Klein, 1995). For the last step it was assumed that when a person considers that the individual in need belongs to a certain group these empathic feelings can affect the perception and the value of the group as a whole and can reflect in a more positive attitude towards the stigmatized group in question (Batson, Polycarpou, Harmon-Jones, Imhoff, Mitchener, Bednar, Klein & Highberger, 1997).

A research conducted in 2002 investigated further the three-step model and attempted to add a fourth step where the empathic feeling that resulted from step 1 to 3 will provide the foundation for amplified motivation to help the stigmatized group (Batson, Chang, Orr & Rowland, 2002). They tested 54 participants in 3 conditions. In the first 2 conditions participants were asked to listen to an audiotaped interview of a 22-year-old man, who was convicted for using and selling heroin. However, one of the groups was asked to imagine the feelings of the interviewee (high empathy) and the other to remain objective while listening to the audio (low empathy). The last group was asked to imagine the feelings of the drug dealer, but only after they were told that this was a mock interview (fictional interview with high empathy). The results demonstrated that participant from the high empathy group showed more positive attitudes towards drug addict compared to those in the low empathy condition. However, compared to the individuals in the low empathy group, those from the

high empathy condition were more willing to give funds to an agency that helps drug addicts rather than other community projects. Moreover, participants from the last condition showed less empathy than the first group, even though it was not significantly lower. Participants in the third condition showed significantly more positive attitudes towards drug addicts than those in the second group (low empathy). These results show that empathy can be used as a technique for producing increased positive responses and can increase the willingness to help not only the individual from a stigmatized group, but the whole group represented by the individual in need of help.

From the studies mentioned above it can be concluded that empathy is indeed linked to helping behavior and can increase the positive feelings people experience towards others. However, it is important to note that helping behavior is not only based on one single thing, but rather a collection of various factors. For this reason, we investigate further whether factors such as sexism, narcissism, psychopathic traits and extraversion affect a person's decision to help another individual.

Sexism, Violence and Altruism

Many suggest that domestic violence is mainly a female issue and cases where the perpetrator is a male and the victim a female is treated more seriously than other types of domestic abuse (Seelau & Seelau, 2005). Other body of research shows that many believe that most females deserve to be abused in a relationship (Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira & de Souza, 2002). Also, men who have been abused by their partner are to be blamed for their situation, because they were not 'men enough' to deal with it (Harris, 1995; Connell, 1995). For these reasons in the current project it will be investigated whether sexist attitudes may affect people's response to provide help or not to both male and female victims of domestic

violence. Gender inequality is an issue that has been prevalent for years in the society. There is a lot of research that investigates and theorizes about the underlying causes and ways of preventing of sexism. One of these theories is the Ambivalent sexism theory created by Glick and Fiske in 1996. This theory suggests that sexist beliefs and attitudes towards women are helpful for the justification and maintenance of men's power and higher status. Moreover, they argue that in the modern sexism there are two dimensions of it, hostile and benevolent. According to them these two dimensions coexist and are strongly related, which is also evident in another empirical research. Hostile sexism is recognized as a classic characterization of bias that reflects on the hostile denigration of women who may pose a threat to the gender hierarchy, while benevolent sexism is characterized as affection towards women, who are embracing their traditional role as a female (housewife, mother, etc.). Even though benevolent sexism may appear to be positive it reinforces women to embrace a subordinate status. However, there is some research that suggests that benevolent sexism is seen by women as harmless and even romantic in some cases (Becker & Swim, 2011; Rudman & Heppen, 2003). Furthermore, earlier research suggests that an individual who has ambivalent sexist beliefs, would suppress one pole (hostile/ benevolent) while the other one is active. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier, the two types of sexism have been strongly correlated, which shows that ambivalent sexists subjectively use positive and negative attitudes in order to reinforce their ideologies. In other words, these two types of sexism that embody ambivalent sexism are not mutually exclusive but used together: hostile sexism as a punishment and benevolent as a reward. Even though the major difference in attitudes they create, both of them work together to control and maintain the traditional gender status (Glick & Fiske, 2011).

On one hand, research shows that hostile sexism in men could lead to aggression towards women, moreover reports show that men high in hostility are more frequently

engaged in verbal aggression towards their partners, but also, they could be more sexually aggressive towards individuals of the opposite sex (Forbes, Adams-Curtis & White, 2004). According to Wood's research (2004) male abusers with high hostile sexism believe that as the superior gender, men have the right and the power to use violent attributes to control women. Another research showed that men with high hostile sexism were perceiving more negatively their female partners' behavior than the partner report would state (Hammond & Overall, 2013). These men would also explain their partner's behaviour as manipulative, which leads to increased hostility and subordinate relationship quality.

On the other hand, benevolent sexism has a different approach: this type of sexism offers a protection to females from male aggression as long as they conform to their assigned gender role. However, research shows that alike hostile sexism, high benevolent sexism can lead to victim blaming and justification of the perpetrator's crime in case of acquaintance rape (Yamawaki, 2007). Nevertheless, data showed that when there was a case of rape where the perpetrator was a stranger, there was no correlation between benevolent sexism scores and offender's blame or sentence length. Unfortunately, even though some women view benevolent sexism as attractive and somewhat positive, many women do not realize that both types of sexism (hostile and benevolent) exist together in individuals and ambivalent sexists are more common than the univalent ones (Sibley & Becker, 2012). For example, research suggested that men with high hostile sexism are more likely to have positive attitudes towards wife beating and are more likely to blame the female victim as the one responsible for the abuse (Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira & de Souza, 2002). This research also provided evidence of the correlation of benevolent sexism with the acceptance of wife beating. The study investigated the aforementioned relationship in two countries: Turkey and Brazil. The data demonstrated that there was a positive relationship between hostile and benevolent sexism with individuals' attitudes towards wife abuse, moreover they found that hostile

sexism was greater predictor of positive attitudes towards wife beating, even when benevolent sexism was controlled for, unlike the opposite scenario. However, this research demonstrates that benevolent sexism acts to validate wife abuse, likely making violent behavior more likely for men, and more tolerable to women, who endorse it. In conclusion, this research gives a reason to believe that ambivalent men tend to simultaneously want to help women in need of help, but at the same time view abuse as a reasonable measure to deal with wives who fail to endorse on their traditional, stereotypical role (Glick, et al., 2002).

Further research investigating the relationship between benevolent sexism and helpful behavior towards people from the opposite sex theorized that the endorsement of or the exposure to benevolent sexism will lead to more males to be willing to help females and provide dependency-oriented help (Kende & Shnabel, 2017). To test their hypotheses researchers used domains, which are usually recognized as mainly dominated by males such as mechanics, technology and mathematics. In most cases females are seen as less capable and suitable to work in these fields. The first study used the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) to assess the benevolent sexism in male and female participants and then correlated the score with their intentions to provide and seek help. The data showed that males with high levels of benevolent sexism were more likely to engage in dependency-oriented helping to a woman. Moreover, female with high benevolent sexism levels correlated positively with intentions of seeking help by a male. The second study used 2 groups – one exposed to benevolent sexism and the other with no previous exposure to sexism. Then participants were given scenarios and were asked to state their intentions to ask or give help within either opposite sex or same sex interactions. Similar to the first study, results showed that females exposed to benevolent sexism were more willing to seek help from males and male participants exposed to benevolent sexism were more willing to provide help to females. However, there was no correlation between seeking/providing help and exposure to

benevolent sexism in same sex interactions. The final study investigated actual helping behavior in male participants, which was then correlated with benevolent sexism scores. The participants had to provide help to both female and male students on a psycho-technical test. The results demonstrated that men with high benevolent sexism scores were having increased tendency to help the other sex, while they provided less help to same sex students. These results suggest that indeed benevolent sexism in males can lead to higher willingness to help a female in need, however, all the scenarios given were in domains which do not conform with the female stereotypical role.

Abrams, Viki, Masser and Bohner (2003) investigated how individuals' perception of rape victims can be affected by hostile and benevolent sexism. They also suggest like many others that benevolent sexism is aimed at women who conform into the traditional role and hostile is for those who are seen as feminists and careerists (Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner, & Zhu, 1997; Masser & Abrams 2001). The results from the study showed that people high on benevolent sexism were more likely to blame the victim of acquaintance rape and they suggest that these results may be due to the idea that the woman may have acted in an inappropriate way (Abrams et al., 2003). Moreover, they found out that male's rape penchant had a significant relationship with hostile but not benevolent sexism and the results also suggested that hostile sexism functions as a way to justify sexual abuse, which is why they found a significant relationship between the tendency of rape acceptance and hostile sexism. All this data is in support of previous research from 1995 that interpersonal violence and rape acceptance is linked to hostile beliefs towards females. The data from the research found a moderate positive correlation between hostility towards women and acceptance of interpersonal violence (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995).

Personality Traits (neuroticism, extraversion and psychoticism), Violence and Altruism

There is a lot of research on personality and many scholars have created numerous classifications of the personality traits. Cattell was one of the first to classify these traits through an empirical work, he started with 18 000 and more traits, which were collected by Allport and Odbert (1936). Cattell reduced them to 16 traits by removing synonyms, followed by cluster and factor analysis. These 16 traits are measured in Cattell's test – the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (Cattell, Eber & Tatsuoka, 1970). Later, other researchers have furthermore collected Cattell's 16 traits into smaller number of higher order traits. One of the first to attempt this process were Tupes and Christal in 1961, and their work was replicated by Norman, who used grouped Cattell's original 20 traits by using factor analysis and reduced their number to five higher order dimensions - extraversion/surgency, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability and culture (1963).

Furthermore, in 1973, Eysenck also used factor analysis to identify and clarify the many traits into three higher order dimensions; they can be measured by the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ). However, the first two dimensions that were included into Eysenck's model were the neuroticism and extraversion (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1964). The third dimension was the psychoticism; moreover, this questionnaire measures social desirability in participants. According to Eysenck, extrovert people have decreased chronical arousal levels and are easily bored; this leads to them needing various external stimulations to bring up the normal optimal performance levels. On the other hand, introvert people have increased chronical arousal levels and can become easily anxious, which leads to them needing quieter environment and peace to reduce themselves to their optimal performance levels. Furthermore, according to Eysenck and Eysenck (1991) higher scores in extraversion would suggest that a person is more sociable, popular and does not like to be by themselves.

Moreover, they suggest that these people desire to have excitement in their life, they like to act in the moment and are generally impulsive. Neuroticism is associated with increased levels of negative affect, such as anxiety and depression. In general, neurotic people are known to have low activation threshold, which is not allowing them to control their reactions, also they experience negative affects when faced with minor stressing factors. People with high neuroticism scores are described as nervous, anxious, moody and often experiencing depression. There is a likelihood they experience trouble sleeping and might suffer from psychosomatic disorders. On the other hand, emotionally stable people have high threshold activation and have good control over their emotions. Usually they experience negative affect only when faced with major stressing factors. Moreover, people who score higher on the emotional stability are reacting less emotionally and are not easily upset in stressful situations.

High scores in the psychoticism dimension suggest that the person is single-minded and not conforming, these individuals are likely to be cold, detached and aggressive. Furthermore, they are prone to be antisocial and Machiavellians. Typically, individuals with high scores on the psychoticism scale are hostile, unfriendly, lacking in affection, untrusting, cold and rude. However, people who score low in this dimension possess a well-adjusted personality; they are empathic, conscientious, friendly, warm, tolerant and agreeable (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975, 1991). The final scale in the EPQ is the social desirability, this scale is used to measure how socially desirable are the participants in their answers. Higher scores are associated with participants giving answers, which make them, look better and may suggest that they have not been completely honest in their responses.

There is a lot of research that demonstrates the validity and reliability of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire across different countries. One of them was conducted by Barrett and Eysenck (1984) and was investigating the validity of the EPQ across 24 countries the

empirical data demonstrated that the questionnaire is valid and applicable measure. Another more recent research, investigating the invariance of the EPQ's personality trait dimensions showed that across 33 countries the four scales were stable (Bowden, Saklofske, Van de Vijver, Sudarshan & Eysenck, 2016). This could suggest that the EPQ is a reliable measure that is measuring the three personality traits without much variance.

There are various researches investigating the relationship of the different personality traits with altruism in bullying and aggressiveness. Tani, Greenman, Schneider and Fregoso (2003) investigated how the personality traits of the Big Five are correlated with bullying. The Big Five factors of personality usually include: Openness to experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Costa and McCrae (1992) argue that anxiety, depression, impulsiveness, angry hostility, self-consciousness and vulnerability are encompassed in the Neuroticism factor. Tani et al. looked at 6 roles in bullying: the bully, the victim, the bully's supporters and bully's helpers, the victim defenders and the outsiders. All of these roles are part of the bullying process, only the outsiders tend to avoid getting involved in bullying altogether by not taking part or side during bullying. The results reported that children who were victims of bullying scored low on the extraversion scale and high on the neuroticism scale. Moreover, they found that children who defend victims of bullying score lower on emotional instability than pro-bullies and victims. Also, they discovered that people who were outsiders of the bullying scored lower than pro-bullies and defenders on the extraversion scale. This lower score is corresponding to and explaining the discoveries from other research papers (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, Österman & Kaukiainen, 1996). However, one of the limitations to Tani et al.'s study is that the results do not show that personality differences are unique factors leading to bullying in children, the research shows that there are other factors that need to be taken into account, such as: self-esteem and social status of the people involved in

the bullying situation. Moreover, as mentioned earlier researchers have been investigating the relationship between personality traits and bully-victims, in one of these studies children's predispositions to bullying have been linked to psychoticism (Slee & Rigby, 1993)

Ben-Ner and Kramer (2011) also studied the correlation between altruistic behaviors and personality traits. Their study showed that participants with high scores on the neuroticism and extraversion scales were having the highest altruistic levels in giving to all the target groups. However, there was a U-shaped correlation between extraversion and altruism, where high introvert scores were associated with higher amount of money, while lower introvert scores with lower amount. Moreover, there was a positive strong relationship between altruistic behavior and scores above the mean of the extraversion scales.

Finally, psychoticism has been associated with deficits of empathy and emotional response in non-clinical samples. Ali, Amorim and Chamorro-Premuzic (2009) worked on a project investigating that relationship in students, who have not been diagnosed with psychopathy. Primary psychopathy is defined by insensitivity, lack of emotional response to certain situations, manipulative tendencies and being very smooth, charming and verbally effortless. While secondary psychopathy is characterized by impulsive behaviors, lack of future goals, this type of psychopathy is strongly associated with violent outbursts and actions (Osumi & Ohira, 2017). They discovered that there was a positive association between primary psychopathy and experiencing positive affect while observing sad images, which means that these images are highly unlikely to trigger for them a distress. These findings are consistent with the hypothesis that people with high primary psychopathy are not experiencing negative emotions (Mealey, 1995). Moreover, this data shows a dysfunction in the empathic response, which supports previous findings that people with psychopathic traits show a selective dysfunction in emotional empathy while observing sad images (Blair, 1995). Further research on the relationship between psychopathic traits and empathy in prosocial

behavior was conducted by White (2014). The data from the research showed that there was a positive correlation between primary psychopathy and public prosocial behavior, while the secondary psychopathy was controlled for. Moreover, the data showed that secondary psychopathy was inverted and weakly correlated with public, anonymous and altruistic prosocial behavior and empathy. The data suggests that empathy plays a crucial role in the link between psychopathic traits and some classes of prosocial behavior.

All of these research papers suggest that the ‘Giant Three’ personality traits (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) are linked to helping behavior and empathy, which is why the current paper will be investigating these relationships when exposed to domestic violence scenarios.

The Current Study

The current research will be investigating the gender differences in bystander attitudes towards male and female victims of domestic violence. As mentioned earlier there is little to no research on the reasons why bystanders may or may not help victims of personal violence. The current study aims to investigate how and why people react in certain ways when exposed to Domestic violence. Moreover, due to the aforementioned studies we will be testing how empathy and more specifically empathic concern and sexism will be affecting the participants decision to intervene and help the victims. This research will be also investigating if there is any relationship between the personality trait scores tested by the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Short Version (EPQS-r) (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism). Considering past research shows that people who help in bullying score high on extraversion and low on narcissism scales. Moreover, psychopathic traits have been linked with violent behaviors.

The first hypothesis is expected to provide data, which would replicate the aforementioned findings and show that females would have higher empathy scores than males. However, earlier research by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) created a review on the gender differences in empathic responding and social sensitivity. They looked at 29 papers, which were associated with empathy and discovered that there was no evidence for gender differences. However, Eisenberg and Lennon (1983) wrote an article focusing on the literature on sex differences in empathy and they found that in general the results were inconsistent due to the various methods used to test empathy. They discovered some sex differences in favour of females where participants were asked to rate themselves on behavioural and emotional scales associated with empathy and/or sympathy. They also found weak difference favouring females where images and pictures are used to provoke empathy. Another important reason for the inconsistencies was found to be age, according to Eisenberg and Lennon older children and adults showed more evident in research using questionnaires than any other age group. Moreover, the studies where emotional responses were provoked by simulated empathic situations, the sex difference was much less evident than using questionnaires methods to evaluate empathy.

The second hypothesis is expected to show that that females and males are going to show higher empathic concern towards victims of the same sex. As previous research shows females have been more likely to intervene and help when they are witnesses of sexual assault towards a female rather than a male (Burn, 2009). Burn also suggests that this reaction is possibly due to the acknowledgement that females are the 'weaker' sex and that the female may experience empathic identification with the victim (Gerber, Cronin & Steigman, 2004; Lambdin, 2005).

The third hypothesis is that there would be a positive correlation between empathy scores and willingness to intervene when participants are exposed to domestic violence

scenario. Research shows that when a person is observing another in need, they are likely to react by either offering help or escaping the situation they are in (Toi & Batson, 1982). This prediction was tested by correlating two variables (2 levels each) - empathic concern (low/high) and fleeing the situation and avoiding to help (easy/difficult). The data showed that people who had high empathic concern were more likely to help in both the easy and the difficult situation, while people with low empathic concern provided less help and were inclined to escape the situation. The current research is expected to provide data to support these findings – people with high empathic concern are expected to be more likely to help the victim of domestic violence.

For the fourth hypothesis, the current research will be investigating the relationship between benevolent and hostile sexism and willingness to help victims of domestic violence. It is expected that high scores in both types of sexism would affect negatively the willingness to help female victims who do not confide in their submissive role. Hammond and Overall (2013) showed that males with high hostile sexism perceive their female partners more negatively than stated, which leads to increased hostility and subordinate relationship quality. Furthermore, Yamawaki (2007) showed that high benevolent sexism leads to victim blaming and justification of female rape victims. While another research linked benevolent sexism to positive attitudes towards wife beating and higher possibility to blame the victim as the responsible for the physical abuse (Glick et al., 2002).

Lastly, we will be investigating if the giant three personality traits would be linked to helping behaviour in domestic violence scenarios. Due to no sufficient amount of research on the correlation between extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism with willingness to help victims of domestic violence it cannot be suggested with certainty how these measures could affect the willingness of the participants to provide help. However, based on research some personality traits such as neuroticism and extraversion are positively correlated to altruistic

behaviours to all the targeted groups (Ben-Ner & Kramer, 2011). Furthermore, Blair (1995) showed that people with psychopathic traits show selective dysfunction in emotional empathy while observing sad images.

Pilot Study

The pilot was created to test whether the images and the scenarios were going to be suitable to use in the research project. We investigated the reliability and suitability of the stimuli (images with descriptive text). Both the pilot and the main study used images and descriptive text because studies show that people perceive and comprehend images and text that accompanies them easier and faster (Horn, 2002). Moreover, emotional image cues are believed to have a significant effect on people's behaviors (Winkielman & Gogolushko, 2018).

Methods

Participants:

There were 64 participants that took part in the pilot session voluntarily online. There were 17 Male and 47 females, the age ranged from 18 to 61 years with a mean of 28.92, standard deviation of 8.67. Participants varied in ethnicity: White (73.4%), Black or African American (4.7%), Asian/Pacific Islander (15.6%) and Other (6.3%). The educational level varied as well with 1.6% having less than high school degree, 4.7% high school degree, 6.3% some college but no degree, 46.9% undergraduate degree, 35.9% master's degree, 3.1% doctoral degree and 1.6% professional degree.

Design:

For the pilot we used a correlational design. There were three measures, which included the images with the scenarios (male victim/female abuser; female victim/male abuser and happy couple) and the answers to the five questions (how believable are the images and text; if the text and image was negative or positive; how uncomfortable or comfortable the stimuli were and how threatened was the victim) (Appendix 1).

Materials:

The study used 18 color images, separated into 3 conditions: 6 images of female abused by a male, 6 images of male abused by a female and 6 images of a happy, smiling heterosexual couples. These images were taken from an unpublished undergraduate project, which was on the same topic (Grigorova, 2017). The images were found online, and we used IRoot Mean Squared contrast to measure each of the 18 images. By using MATLAB Psychophysics Toolbox, there were no natural differences found between the 18 images ($F(2,10) = 2.820, p = .107$). Therefore, the stimuli were not normalised for physical contrast. Moreover, we included 18 scenarios to each image where the word count was ranging from 156 to 164 words per scenario. These scenarios were based on the image and included a description of the relationship from the beginning up to the events prior to the image of abusive physical behavior. Each scenario included demographic information such as age and employment status, how the couple met, what circumstances changed and how the situation escalated up to the abusive behavior. To measure the variability of the relationship between the images and the scenarios there were four 5-point Likert scale questions and one 6-point Likert scale (Appendix 2)

Each block consisted of an image followed by a scenario to read, after that the participants were asked the 4 questions found in appendix 2. At the end of each of these blocks the participants were asked to leave a comment about their perception of the text and the image and were asked to give a feedback at the end of the survey.

Procedure:

To begin with piloting the study, we obtained the necessary ethics with Ethics code: EV1501.

At the beginning of the online questionnaire, the participants were given information regarding the study and were presented with a consent form. After that they were asked to complete the demographics information. Following that they were presented with the 18 randomized blocks, each including an image, scenario, followed by the 5 questions, which were presented randomly as well. The participants were asked to look at the image and read the descriptive text and then to answer the questions.

Results

In the pilot, we focused on the three main questions from each block: Is the text appropriate description of the image (Appropriateness), How believable were the images and scenarios (Believable) and if the texts and scenarios were positive or negative according to the participants (Negativity). The frequency descriptive statistics showed that all participants perceived the 18 scenarios as definitely appropriate and probably appropriate descriptions of the images, moreover, participants rated both the texts and the images as believable. (Appendix 3). Furthermore, participants evaluated both the female and male victim images and scenarios as negative, while they rated the happy couple stimuli as positive. Across all the images participants considered that the female victims were extremely threatened, male victims were somewhat threatened and that there was no victim for the happy couple condition. Moreover, we created new variables for the 5 questions, which were consisting the average scores of the six images and scenarios for the three different conditions (Female victim, Male victim and Happy couple). To clarify further there were three new variables for Appropriateness, three for Believability, three for Negativity, three for the level of threat the

victim experienced and three for the comfortableness that the participants experienced. To create these variables, we used the following formula:

$$(\text{image1} + \text{image2} + \text{image3} + \text{image4} + \text{image5} + \text{image6}) / 6.$$

To test the relationship between all the new variables which were nonparametric and ordinal we used Spearman's rho correlation. It was expected that these correlations will confirm that the variables were consistent and have positive relationships, with the exception of the Happy couple condition (control), where we were looking for negative correlations with Negativity variables.

For the female victim condition, we discovered that there was a positive strong correlation between the appropriateness (A) ($M=1.78$; $SD = .69$) and the believability (B) ($M= 1.75$; $SD= .75$) of the stimuli – $\rho = .711, p < .001$. There was a strong positive correlation between the appropriateness (A) and negativity (N) ($M= 1.31$; $SD= .39$) of the stimuli – $\rho = .582, p < .001$. Also, there was a strong positive relationship between the negativity and believability of the stimuli – $\rho = .646, p < .001$. Furthermore, the data showed there were another 7 correlations for the female victim condition. There was a moderate negative correlation between A and Comfortableness (C) ($M=4.19$; $SD = .75$) $\rho = -.326, p = .009$, also there was a strong positive correlation between A and victim threat (VT) ($M = 1.22$; $SD = .39$) $\rho = .557, p < .001$. There was a moderate negative correlation between B and C – $\rho = -.250, p = .046$, also moderate negative relationship was found between C and N – $\rho = -.387, p = .002$, strong positive correlation was observed between VT and B – $\rho = .634, p < .001$ and also between VT and N – $\rho = .727, p < .001$ (Table 1).

Table 1. Summary of correlations between all stimuli for the Female victim condition

	ρ	p
Appropriateness x Comfortableness	-.326	.009
Appropriateness x Victim Threat	.557	<.001
Believability x Comfortableness	-.250	.046
Believability x Victim Threat	.634	<.001
Negativity x Comfortableness	-.387	.002
Negativity x Victim Threat	.727	<.001
Comfortableness x Victim Threat	-.296	.017

For the male victim condition, we discovered three strong positive correlations between the appropriateness, believability and negativity of the stimuli: $A \times B - \rho = .747, p < .001$, $A \times N - \rho = .643, p < .001$, $N \times B - \rho = .799, p < .001$. For the rest of the correlation the data showed similar results as seen in the female victim condition (Table 2).

Table 2. Summary of correlations between all stimuli for the Male victim condition.

	ρ	p
Appropriateness x Comfortableness	-.432	<.001
Appropriateness x Victim Threat	.529	<.001
Believability x Comfortableness	-.450	<.001
Believability x Victim Threat	.541	<.001
Negativity x Comfortableness	-.504	<.001
Negativity x Victim Threat	.544	<.001
Comfortableness x Victim Threat	-.430	<.001

The last three correlations were investigating the relationship between the appropriateness, believability and negativity of the stimuli for the control condition. We discovered one strong positive correlation between appropriateness and believability – $rs = .789, p < .001, \alpha = .879$. We also discovered two negative correlations one for the relationship between appropriateness and negativity – $rs = -.683, p < .001, \alpha = -.4016$ and the other between the believability and the negativity of the stimuli $rs = -.561, p < .001, \alpha = -.3806$ (Table 3).

Table 3. Correlations between all stimuli for the Happy couple (control) condition

	ρ	p
Appropriateness x Comfortableness	.594	<.001
Appropriateness x Victim Threat	-.576	<.001
Believability x Comfortableness	.545	<.001
Believability x Victim Threat	-.576	<.001
Negativity x Comfortableness	-.705	<.001
Negativity x Victim Threat	.566	<.001
Comfortableness x Victim Threat	-.438	<.001

Based on these results we decided that all 18 images and scenarios were reliable variables and were suitable to be used in the actual study.

Main Study

Methods

Participants:

There were 210 paid participants in this study, which were recruited through an online platform – Prolific (<https://www.prolific.co>). There were 110 males and 110 females, with the age ranging from 18 to 67 years, mean = 30.98, SD = 10.13 and variance = 102.59. The ethnicity of the sample consisted mainly of White participants (82.9%), the rest ethnic groups were Hispanic/Latino (7.6%), Asian/Pacific Islanders (3.3%), Others (3.3%) and Black/African American (2.9%). The educational level of the data was mostly Undergraduate students (39%), the rest included 22.4% some college, but no degree, 18.1% High school graduates, 12.9% Master students, 2.9% professional degree, 2.9% less than high school degree and doctoral degree 1.9%.

There were 37.6% who have been or currently are in a domestic violence situation, 57.6% who are not and 4.8% who preferred not to say.

Materials:

The stimuli used for the study included 18 images and 18 descriptive scenarios of domestic violence acts. There were 3 conditions: male victim with female abuser, female victim with a male abuser and control condition – happy couples. Each condition consisted of 6 images and 6 scenarios.

In the first part of the study all participants were asked to provide demographic information, such as: age, gender, ethnicity and educational level. Moreover, they were asked to answer a yes-no-prefer not to say question giving information whether the participants

have experience with domestic violence: ‘Have you or someone you know have been or currently are in a domestic violence situation?’.

To investigate empathy, sexism levels, and personality traits we used 4 different questionnaires: 2 for empathy, 1 for ambivalent sexism and 1 for personality traits. The 2 questionnaires that were used to measure empathy were: The Empathy Quotient (EQ) and the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI). For testing the ambivalent sexism, we used the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) and for the personality traits – Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Short Version (EPQS). All tests were presented in random order, before the images and scenarios blocks.

The Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) is a measurement tool for assessment of multi-dimensional empathy (Davis, 1980). this test is used to measure four dimensions of empathy: Perspective taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern and Personal Distress. It is suggested that the IRI is one of the most reliable measures of empathy because it consists of 3 dimensions which are directly related to empathy (Baren-Cohen and Wheelwright, 2004). Moreover, Davis (1980), conducted factor analysis in order to provide empirical evidence for the application of the 4 multi-dimensions. The data indicated that there was a strong relationship between the 4 subscales in both females and males. Moreover, it showed that the IRI had a strong internal reliability. (Appendix 4)

Perspective taking is a tool measuring the tendency to adopt the perspective of others in everyday life. Fantasy is measuring the ability to transpose oneself into the actions and feelings of characters from fictional books, movies and plays. The empathic concern measures the ability to feel compassion, affection and concern for others. The last subscale – personal distress is measuring the personal feeling of distress, unease and discomfort in reaction to the emotions of others. There were 28 questions with 5-point Likert scale answers.

The 5-point Likert scale was ranging from ‘Does not describe me very well’ to ‘Describes me very well’ (Appendix 2).

The second questionnaire was the Empathy Quotient (EQ), which is a self-reported psychological measure of empathy in adults with normal intelligence, (Baron Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004). There were 15 items answered on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’ (Appendix 5).

The third questionnaire was the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI), which is a tool for measuring overall sexism and the subscales: hostile and benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996). It consists of 22 items answered on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from ‘0=Disagree Strongly’ to ‘5=Agree Strongly’ and the two subscales consisting of 11 items each. The hostile sexism measures the individual’s position on three dimensions: dominative paternalism, heterosexual hostility and competitive gender differentiation. The benevolent sexism is measuring the individual’s attitudes on three different dimensions: protective paternalism, heterosexual intimacy and complementary gender differentiation. An example for hostile sexism question is: ‘Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.’ An example for benevolent sexism questions is: ‘Women should be cherished and protected by men’ (Appendix 6).

The fourth questionnaire was the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Short Version (EPQS-r), which is a measure used to test 8 types of personality traits. It consists of 48 questions measuring on 4 dimensions: Extraversion/introversion, neuroticism/stability, psychoticism/socialisation and lie/social desirability. Each of the 4 dimensions consist of 12 questions, which are answered with ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ answers. An example for extraversion question is: ‘Are you a talkative person?’ and an example for the introversion question is: ‘Do you tend to keep in the background on social occasions?’. An example for question

testing neuroticism and stability is: ‘Does your mood often go up and down?’. Example for psychoticism/socialisation is: ‘Would you take drugs which may have strange or dangerous effects?’. Lastly, example for lie/social desirability is: ‘If you say you will do something, do you always keep your promise no matter how inconvenient it might be?’ (Eysenck, Eysenck & Barrett, 1985. (Appendix 7).

For the last part of the study there were 18 blocks presented randomly, which included all the 18 images and scenarios from the pilot and 3 questions after each image and scenario. As mentioned in the pilot section there were 3 conditions with 6 images and 6 scenarios each. First condition portrayed a female victim, the second – male victim and the third - happy couples. The couples in these images and scenarios varied in age, educational and professional level and ethnicity. After each set participants had to answer 3 questions presented randomly, the first two were 5-point Likert scale and one 4-point Likert scale (Appendix 8).

Design:

The study used a repeated measures design.. Also, we used a correlational design to test the relationships between the stimuli.

The repeated measures design was used to measure the gender differences for the 4 questionnaires, the willingness to help the victims in the 3 conditions and the ways participants chose to help the said victims regardless of their sex. Moreover, we tested the gender differences for the participants’ previous experience with domestic violence. The independent variable included the 3 conditions: female victim, male victim and happy couple (control condition). The dependant variables included: the 4 questionnaires and their subscales, the willingness to help the victim, the ways in which they would help and the experience with domestic violence situations.

The correlational design was used to test the relationship between the variables mentioned above.

Procedure:

At the beginning of the study, the participants were given information about the types of tasks they had to complete. Starting with the 4 questionnaires, which were followed by the 18 randomized blocks. They were informed that some of the images and the scenarios in the study may contain violence throughout and were made aware that they can withdraw at any time through the study and their data discarded.

The first information collected was the demographic background, followed by the 4 randomly presented questionnaires. Lastly, they were asked to complete the 18 blocks, which were also presented randomly, where in each block the questions following the image and descriptive text were randomized as well.

Results

The raw data from the 4 questionnaires, was coded in Qualtrics following the guidance provided by the authors (Appendix 4, 5, 6, 7). After that the data was exported in Excel to be summed individually and the subscales for the IRI, ASI and ESPQ-S were calculated.

Moreover, we computed new variables for each of the 3 conditions (male victim, female victim and happy couple) by averaging the scores from each block using the formula:

$(\text{image1} + \text{image2} + \text{image3} + \text{image4} + \text{image5} + \text{image6}) / 6$. This is the same calculations we used to find the average scores for the pilot variables. Finally, we split each of the variables by the participants gender, so we can have the data only from the female and only from the male participants.

Descriptive statistics

First, we looked at the descriptive statistics for each of the images for each condition. Across all the images presenting violence towards female victims, participants showed higher likelihood to help, compared to the other two conditions (Table 3,4,5).

Table 3. Means and Standard deviations for likelihood to help the female victim condition

	Image 1	Image 2	Image 3	Image 4	Image 5	Image 6
Means	4.71	4.62	4.65	4.60	4.61	4.46
Standard Deviations	.75	.73	.72	.67	.67	.81

Table 4. Means and Standard deviations for likelihood to help the male victim

	Image 1	Image 2	Image 3	Image 4	Image 5	Image 6
Means	3.91	4.09	4.04	3.95	4.02	4.00
Standard Deviations	1.11	1.02	1.06	1.08	1.12	1.07

Table 5. Means and Standard deviations for likelihood to help the happy couple
(control)

	Image 1	Image 2	Image 3	Image 4	Image 5	Image 6
Means	1.75	1.79	1.75	1.83	1.74	1.76
Standard Deviations	1.12	1.15	1.12	1.20	1.12	1.10

Moreover, participants preferred to call the police to help both, male and female victims rather than intervening themselves or calling a third party for assistance for immediate help (Table 6 and 7).

Table 6. Means and standard deviations for ways to help a female victim

	Image 1	Image 2	Image 3	Image 4	Image 5	Image 6
Means	1.37	1.32	1.32	1.37	1.37	1.53
Standard Deviation	.77	.72	.70	.71	.71	.79

Table 7. Means and Standard Deviations for ways to help a male victim

	Image 1	Image 2	Image 3	Image 4	Image 5	Image 6
Means	1.49	1.73	1.46	1.48	1.51	1.58
Standard Deviation	.88	1.07	.86	.90	.88	.94

Furthermore, the results of the new variables for the average scores for the three conditions, demonstrated that participants were slightly more willing to help the female victims, rather than the male victims or the happy couples. We also looked at the likelihood to help a victim regardless of their sex and participants' responses indicating that there is a slight likelihood to help ($M=3.46$, $SD=.57$) (Table 8).

Table 8. Average means and standard deviations for likelihood to help for the 3 conditions

	Helping Female Victim	Helping Male Victim	Helping Happy couple	General Help
Mean	4.61	4.00	1.77	3.46
SD	.59	.92	1.01	.57

Correspondingly, the new variables for ways the participants were willing to help the victim showed that participants in general were more prone to call the police rather than intervening themselves for both the male and female victim conditions. (Table 9).

Table 9. Means and standard deviations for ways to help the victim for the 3 conditions

	Helping Female Victim	Helping Male Victim	General Help
Mean	1.30	1.50	1.31
SD	.69	.92	.74

After that we calculated the means and standard deviations of the questionnaires. For the short version of the EQ the mean was 14.05 and the standard deviation was 5.34, the IRI scores were above average ($M = 65.00$, $SD = 12.67$). By looking at the means for the IRI subscales we found that participants scored highest in the empathic concern subscale ($M = 18.30$, $SD = 5.24$) (Table 10).

Table 10. The means, standard deviations and variances for the IRI subscales

	IRI_PT	IRI_FS	IRI_EC	IRI_PD
Mean	18.03	16.36	18.30	12.79
SD	4.77	5.64	5.24	5.06

In the ASI participants scored higher in the hostile sexism subscale ($M = 1.96$, $SD = 1.13$) (Table 11)

Table 11. Means and Standard Deviation for the ASI and ASI Subscales

	ASI	ASI_Hostile	ASI_Benevolent
Mean	43.07	1.96	1.95
SD	20.40	1.13	.98

The descriptive statistics showed that for the EPQS-r highest means were found for the neuroticism/stability subscale (M= 6.57, SD= 3.61) (Table 12).

Table 12. Means and Standard Deviation for the EPQS-r Subscales

	Extraversion/ Introversion	Neuroticism/ stability	Psychoticism/ socialisation	Lie/ social desirability
Mean	5.12	6.57	2.90	4.87
SD	3.55	3.61	1.82	2.54

Inferential Statistics

Gender Differences

To investigate the gender differences for the variables mentioned above we carried out Mann Whitney's independent samples test and discovered that there were no significant differences between males (Mdn = 4.833) and females (Mdn= 4.833) ($U(N_{\text{males}}=105, N_{\text{females}}=105)=5484.500, Z=-.067, p= .947$) for likelihood to help the female victim. Moreover, the data showed that there was no significant difference between males (Mdn= 4.00) and females (Mdn= 4.167) ($U(N_{\text{males}}=105, N_{\text{females}}=105)= 4778.5, Z= -1.675, p= .094$) for the likelihood to help male victims. Similarly, no significant difference was found for the likelihood of helping happy couples between males (Mdn= 1.167) and females (Mdn= 1.333) ($U(N_{\text{males}}=105, N_{\text{females}}=105)= 5405, Z= -.256, p= .798$).

However, there were 3 significant gender differences for the ways of helping a victim. The test indicated that males (Mdn= 1) scored higher for the female victim condition than females (Mdn= 1), $U(N_{\text{males}} = 99, N_{\text{females}} = 103)=4102, Z=-3.547, p= .001$. Males (Mdn= 1) also scored higher for the male victim condition compared to females (Mdn= 1), $U(N_{\text{males}} = 86, N_{\text{females}} = 92)=3353.00, Z=-2.206, p= .027$.

To test the gender differences for the empathy quotient, IRI and the Ambivalent sexism inventory there were carried out 5 Mann Whitney's independent samples tests. The results showed that female participants (Mdn = 15) scored higher on the EQ than males (Mdn = 13) – $U(N_{\text{males}} = 105, N_{\text{females}} = 105) = 4646, -1.972, p= .49$. Moreover, Females (Mdn = 20) scored significantly higher on the IRI_EC scale compared to men (Mdn = 17) as well - $U(N_{\text{males}} = 105, N_{\text{females}} = 105)=3975.5, -3.497, p< .001$. However, there was no significant gender difference found for the other 3 subscales of the IRI. The last questionnaire that was tested for gender differences was the ASI where we expected to have significantly higher scores in

both subscales for males. The results supported this expectation and found out that for the hostile sexism males (Mdn= 2.45) scored higher than females (Mdn= 1.55) – $U(N_{\text{males}} = 105, N_{\text{females}} = 105) = 3674.5, -4.176, p < .001$. Similarly, females (Mdn=1.45) scored lower than males (Mdn=2.27) on the benevolent scale – $U(N_{\text{males}} = 105, N_{\text{females}} = 105) = 3502, -4.569, p < .001$.

Relationships with willingness to help victims

To investigate the relationship between the variables mentioned above and the willingness to help the victims we carried out Spearman correlations. We used Spearman correlations because the data was nonparametric.

The first correlation that was investigated was between willingness to help a male and female victim and the scores of the empathy quotient. The male responses of the EQ had a moderate positive correlation to the likelihood to help female victims ($\rho = .278, 95\% CI = [.079, .460], p = .002$) and male victims ($\rho = .284, 95\% CI = [.101, .451], p = .002$). The female scores from the EQ also showed a positive moderate correlation with the likelihood to help female ($\rho = .286, 95\% CI = [.092, .467], p = .002$) and male victims ($\rho = .202, 95\% CI = [.017, .394], p = .020$). The next set of correlation investigated the relationship between the likelihood of helping male and female victims and the IRI subscales. The male responses of the perspective taking scale were positively correlated to the willingness to help males ($\rho = .227, 95\% CI = [.047, .402], p = .010$) and female victims ($\rho = .277, 95\% CI = [.085, .448], p = .002$). Next even though the initial spearman correlation showed that there is a weak positive correlation between likelihood to help and IRI fantasy scale scores the bootstrapping CI range showed inconsistency, and this suggested that there was a no significant p-value. However, there was a moderate positive correlation between empathic concern and helping female ($\rho = .319, 95\% CI = [.127, .487], p =$

.000) and male victims ($\rho = .357, 95\% CI = [.173, .522], p = .000$). There was no significant relationship found for the IRI personal distress scores. The female responses showed weak correlation between perspective taking scores and male ($\rho = .248, 95\% CI = [.054, .425], p = .005$) and moderate correlation to female ($\rho = .308, 95\% CI = [.112, .475], p = .001$) victim help. There was a moderate positive correlation between the fantasy scale and helping male ($\rho = .310, 95\% CI = [.123, .479], p = .001$) and female ($\rho = .257, 95\% CI = [.070, .417], p = .004$) victims. Finally, there was a moderate correlation between empathic concern and helping females ($\rho = .278, 95\% CI = [.085, .456], p = .002$). There was only one correlation that could not reject the null hypothesis for the females' responses, which was between empathic concern and helping male victims ($\rho = .164, 95\% CI = [-.031, .340], p = .047$). There were no correlations found for the personal distress scores and helping the victims, similarly to the male responses.

The last set of correlations were testing the relationship with hostile and benevolent sexism. There were significant correlations only for the male responses – two with hostile sexism and one with benevolent. The hostile sexism responses were negatively correlated with helping female ($\rho = -.233, 95\% CI = [-.414, -.045], p = .008$) and male victims ($\rho = -.214, 95\% CI = [-.411, -.014], p = .014$), while the negative correlation was between benevolent sexism and helping male victims ($\rho = -.251, 95\% CI = [-.411, -.071], p = .005$).

To investigate if there is a relationship of Eysenck's personality traits and willingness to help domestic violence victims, we carried 3 more Spearman correlations. The results showed that there were only two traits that have an association to helping in domestic violence situations. Negative correlations between the psychoticism traits and helping female

($\rho = -.141, 95\% CI = [-.259, -.007], p = .041$) and male victims ($\rho = -.181, 95\% CI = [-.309, -.044], p = .008$). There was also one positive correlation between extraversion and willingness to help female victims ($\rho = .144, 95\% CI = [.016, .276], p = .037$). There was no significant relationship between the neuroticism scores and helping in domestic violence.

Discussion

Gender differences

The results in the current study show that there was no significant difference between male and female responses when it comes to helping a victim in domestic violence situation. However, the data showed that males scored higher on the ways to help the victim, which means that females were more likely to call the police, while males were more likely to interfere themselves or involve a third party to help them. Regarding the questionnaires, female scored higher on the empathy quotient and on the IRI's empathic concern scales, these results show that females experienced more empathy than males in general and the data shows supportive evidence to one of the hypotheses and supports previous research (Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004). Moreover, these results give more evidence that female may have higher emotional intelligence than males (Muncer & Ling, 2006). Baron-Cohen (2002) proposes that the human mind has two main dimensions – empathising and systemising, with empathising being more female trait and systemising – males. Empathising is associated with understanding the social world and systemising with how various things work and creating rules to explain the process (Baron-Cohen, Richler, Bisarya, Gurunatham & Wheelwright, 2003). The next sex differences were found in the ASI scores, where for both dimensions – hostile and benevolent sexism males scored significantly higher than females, which supports previous findings from various research on ambivalent sexism (Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner & Zhu, 1997).

Empathy and willingness to help

The data provides evidence of the relationship between empathy and willingness to help the victims of domestic violence in both male and female participants regardless of the sex of the victim. These results support the 2nd hypothesis. This positive correlation shows that the

higher the empathy score the more likely are participants to help the victim. Previous research on empathy suggests that individuals help more when they have empathised with the victims. Although Eisenberg and Morris (2001) propose that this action of prosocial help may be due to personal distress, still though there is the possibility they experience concern and care for the other person. Our data showed no relationship of the IRI personal distress scale and willingness to help, which provide with information that maybe the participants were willing to help out of care rather than distress. However, there were weak to moderate positive correlations in both male and female participants between willingness to help victims and the 3 of the IRI subscales. The first correlations were between perspective taking and helping male and female victims. These results showed that both males and females were showing tendencies of adopting the psychological point of the victims spontaneously. In other words, the likelihood to take altruistic actions can be affected by the ability of a person to imagine how another being feels, compared to how they feel themselves in a particular situation. (Batson, Early & Salvarani, 1997; Batson, Lishner, Carpenter, Dulin, Harjusola-Webb, Stocks, Gale, Hassan & Sampat, 2003). Moreover, it is suggested that as these two perspectives taking strategies boosts empathic concern, it also increases the personal distress. However, the results from the current study showed no significant relationship between helping behaviour and personal distress, which can suggest that participants did not particularly put themselves in the victims' shoes but reacted as a bystander to the situation. Nevertheless, there was positive correlation between helping behaviour and empathic concern. In male participants high empathic concern lead to high willingness to help both male and female victims, while female participants; empathic concern seemed to be associated only with helping female victims. One possible explanation about why females would be willing to help only female victims can be due to them being able to empathise more with same sex gender victims. Still male participants with high empathic concern were

more willing to help both males and females. These results may be explained by looking at the Social Norm theory (Eagly & Crowley, 1986). This theory suggests that the gender difference in the likelihood to help is related to 4 conditions: the type of encounter (long-term and short-term), the risk involved in helping, the relationship with the person in need of help and the skills needed to provide help. They argue that females provide more caring and nurturing help than males, for example females are more likely to provide emotional support and experience empathy (Aries & Johnson, 1983; Feshbach & Feshbach, 1982; Vaux, 1985). On the other hand, males are believed to be more involved in chivalrous and heroic helping. For example, the more risk a situation implies the more likely it is for a male to help (Belansky & Boggiano, 1994). A study using fMRI to test emotional response when presented with negative and positive images, provides some evidence that men are more likely than women to take action when faced with a negative, risky situation (Brazdil, Roman, Urbanek, Chladek, Spok, Marecek, Mikl, Jurak, Halamek, Danieal & Rektor, 2009). The fMRI imaging provided data that in women the part of the brain associated with transmitting sensory information to and from the cerebral cortex were activated while being exposed to the stimuli. While in males there was more activation in the areas, which measure the physical state of the whole body and then creates emotions, which can lead to taking an action. In other words, the parts of the brain that were activated in males are correlated with brain structures that are also involved in decision making. These results may help with explaining some of the findings from our study and why men were more willing to help compared to females. However, further research will be needed for this.

Moreover, the last correlation investigating the fantasy scale and helping victims of domestic violence was found only for female participants helping male victims. The fantasy scale is associated with the ability of a person to connect and transfer themselves into the feelings and actions of fictional characters from books, plays or movies. This could be based

on that the current study used fictional scenarios to test the participants attitudes towards the victims. Still interestingly there was no positive correlation when it comes to female victims, considering it is supposed to be easier to connect and empathies with someone with similar characteristics.

Ambivalent sexism and willingness to help

Next the study investigated the relationship of ambivalent sexism and helping victims of domestic abuse. There were negative relationships only for the male participants. It was observed that males with high benevolent sexism were less likely to help male victims. Benevolent sexism is associated with reinforcing women to a subordinate status and they are seen as superior to males only on aspects where the relationship between men and women is unimportant or when women are dependent on men (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999; Glick & Fiske, 1996; Jackman, 1994). A scenario where a man is being abused by a female would be preposterous and endangering this believe, which may be the reason why men would help less males in such abusive relationship. The other relationship that was investigated was between hostile sexism and helping victims of abuse, however, here there was negative correlation not only to male victims but to female as well. Hostile sexism is known for being more negative and described as the distinctive hostility, which is usually assumed to portray sexist bias (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Moreover, hostile sexism is targeted mainly to nonconforming females and career women (Glick et al., 1997). According to Glick and Fiske (2001) while hostile sexism is promoted by male dominance, benevolent sexism is fostered by straight, mainly romantic interdependence in a relationship. Looking at previous research on ambivalent sexism it can be concluded that the data from the current data supports the ideology of sexism. Moreover, the decreased willingness to help both male and female victims in individuals with high hostile sexism is lead exactly by that male dominance, which is the most important concept of hostility. Males being victims of abuse show that this male is

not worthy and does not portray male dominance in the relationship, while female victims of abuse are seen as deserving to be punished by their partners. Previous research on domestic violence towards women and sexism showed exactly that hostile sexism seems to be stronger predictor than benevolent (Valor-Segura, Exposito & Moya, 2011), also data suggests that individuals with more traditional beliefs display reactions that have a tendency to legitimize abuse more (Haj-Yahia, 2003; Khawaja, Linos & El-Roueliheb, 2008; Yoshihama, 2005). Moreover, other studies found that individuals with high hostile sexism scores tend to evaluate women abuse more positively (Abrams, Viki, Masser & Bonher, 2003; Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira & Aguiar de Souza, 2002; Russell & Trigg, 2004).

Personality traits and willingness to help

Lastly the current research investigated the relationship of some personality traits to helping victims of domestic violence. To examine this relationship, it was used the ESPQ r which measures extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism and social desirability. It was discovered that people with high psychoticism were less willing to provide help to both male and female victims of domestic violence. Usually psychopathy and psychopathic traits are associated with antisocial behaviour and lack of empathy (Blair, Colledge, Murray, & Mitchell, 2001; White, 2013). In forensics psychopathy is usually measured by using the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised, which consists of two different factors of psychopathy. Factor 1 is characterised by affective deficits, arrogance and deceitful interpersonal traits (lack of remorse, superficial charm, insincerity, egocentrism and others). While factor 2 is associated with antisocial, deregulated behavioural traits (irresponsibility, prone to boredom, impulsivity recklessness and others) (Hare, Harpur, Hakstian, Forth, Hart & Newman, 1990).

However, there is research that found that certain types of psychopathy can be associated with prosocial behaviour. Furthermore, psychopathic traits are found in the general

population as well (Coid & Yang, 2008), and there are various self-report measures used to assess these psychopathy traits (Ray, Hall, Rivera-Hudson, Poythress, Lilienfeld & Morano, 2013). A recent study investigated how these two types of psychopathy may be linked to public, altruistic and anonymous prosocial behaviours, furthermore, they hypothesised that the empathy or the lack of empathy would mediate the negative relationship between primary psychopathy and anonymous and altruistic behaviours but will mediate the positive relationship between primary and public prosocial behaviour. However, they expected that secondary psychopathy would have a weak negative correlation with all three prosocial behaviours and empathy. The results confirmed the hypotheses and showed that primary psychopathy to be positively correlated to public behaviour and negatively with the other two prosocial behaviours, which were mediated by the lack of empathy. The other findings from the study demonstrated that there was a no direct relationship between secondary psychopathy and anonymous or altruistic prosocial behaviours, this was probably as a result of the negative relationship between empathy and secondary psychopathy. When including empathy to the relationship of secondary psychopathy and public prosocial behaviour though it was discovered a direct association between the two. However as both public prosocial behaviour and empathy are negatively related to secondary psychopathy and empathy is negatively related to public prosocial behaviour the properties of empathy and secondary psychopathy contradict each other when it comes to public prosocial behaviour (White, 2013). Lastly the findings from this research demonstrates that empathy plays a crucial role in the link between psychopathic traits and different types of prosocial behaviour and this relationship should be investigated further in regards of how they relate in domestic violence situations. The current project showed that psychopathic traits are negatively related to helping both male and female victims, but maybe future research should investigate how the

different types of psychopathy are linked to helping victims of abuse, moreover how these relationships are mediated by empathy.

The other relationship that was found was between extraversion and helping female victims of domestic violence. According to McCrae and Costa (1999) extraversion is associated with assertiveness, sociability, warmth, friendliness, positive emotions and being active. Moreover, extraversion has been associated with volunteering (Burke & Hall, 1986; Smith & Nelson, 1975). Due to volunteering being connected to a lot of social interactions, many researchers have linked extraversion to these unpaid jobs (Burke & Hull, 1986). A study from the beginning of this century investigated further how agreeableness and extraversion are related to social behaviours such as volunteering. They predicted that these two personality traits will be positively linked to volunteering (Carlo, Okun, Knight & Guzman, 2005). As they theorise in their paper traits such as agreeableness and extraversion are related to volunteering stronger than conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness. Furthermore, they suggest that prosocial value motivation is acting as a mediator in the relationship between extraversion, agreeableness and volunteering behaviours. The data from their study showed that there was no direct effect of extraversion on volunteering, but they found a significant indirect relationship. Moreover, they found that extraversion influences prosocial value motive when agreeableness is low. Another study that shows evidence of the relationship between extraversion and altruism used the HEXACO model of personality and found that extraversion was significantly correlated to altruism ($r=.19$) (Aghababaei, Mohammadtabar & Saffarinia, 2014). Moreover, there is evidence that extraversion is also correlated to daily altruism towards friends, family, associates and strangers (Oda, Machii, Takagi, Kato, Takeda, Kiyonari, Fukukawa & Hiraishi, 2014). Lastly, Furnham, Treglown, Hyde and Trickey (2016) found that only one dimension of extraversion (sociability) was correlated to altruism. This result is possibly an explanation of the confusing findings

regarding extraversion and how it is measured. There is also a suggestion that extraversion needs to be investigated by splitting surgency from the outgoing sociable side of extraversion because it's aspect is focused more on achievement (Hogan, Hogan & Warrenfeltz, 2007). Furthermore Furnham et al. (2016) suggest that more social people tend to find altruism is useful in founding and preserving relationships at work and other areas.

Even though there was no significant relationship between neuroticism and helping victims of domestic abuse, we looked at previous research and how this personality trait may be correlated to other types of help. As individuals with high neuroticism are described as nervous, moody, anxious and dealing negatively with major stressing factors, the idea of them putting themselves in the situation to help a victim of abuse would seem low. A study by King, Geirge & Hebl (2005) tested how personality traits are linked to interpersonal helping behaviours at the workplace, they examined how conscientiousness and helping correlate when agreeableness, neuroticism and extraversion were controlled. What they found was that when these three personality traits were high there was a positive correlation and when they were low there was negative correlation. It is assumed that this is connected to the notion that people with low agreeableness are rude and hostile, while people with low extraversion are independent and prefer to be in solitary, lastly individuals with high neuroticism are usually hostile, distressed and aggressive (Costa & McCrae, 1992, John & Srivastava, 1999). This project may give some idea to why the current data showed that there was a positive relation between extraversion and helping and no significant correlation between neuroticism and helping behaviour. Still further investigation is needed on how and why personality difference may be associated with helping behaviour in domestic violence situations. Possibly using a different test and looking at these relationships by using empathy as a mediator may be useful tool to measure them.

Future research

In brief the data from the current research gives some explanations to how different personality traits, empathy and sexism are associated to helping male and female victims of domestic violence. The current study presented participants with hypothetical situation where strangers needed help in a domestic, abusive relationship. Most of the female participants suggested they would call the police and most of the male partakers stated they would interfere themselves or call for help from a third party. It would be interesting to see if knowledge on domestic violence may show stronger correlations to helping victims. A recent unpublished manuscript showed a positive association between the willingness to help victims of domestic violence, report the abuse and familiarity with domestic violence (Grigorova, 2017). Moreover, future studies may have two groups – control and experimental, where the experimental group is exposed to different information and links to domestic violence helplines, which are sent through email after completing the questionnaires measuring empathy, sexism and personality traits. In this way when they come to the lab for the second part of the study their knowledge is tested, and the results are compared between the two groups. According to Bryant and Spencer (2003) more programs need to be offered by universities to explain and educate students on the consequences from dating violence. Furthermore, they suggest that programs focusing on preventing individual abuse needs to be enforced across campus societies, such can include practice role-play of dating scenarios. Also, actual educational classes teaching students about dating and domestic abuse needs to be added as part of the health and wellbeing programs of campuses. Additionally, they propose that all new students and transfer students must take part in these programs in order to be more aware of how to address issues with safety, reporting and prosecuting abuse. Finally, they provide information that many campuses have started having public safety

officers who engage in the events and integrate into the campus life, in this way students feel more secure and comfortable to confide in the community police.

Another study that focuses on bystander education aimed to help prevent sexual violence and help victims on campuses. They concluded that this approach would be useful to initiate more of the community members to be more mindful of sexual violence, prevention and the consequences for both the perpetrator and the victim. Additionally, they proposed that this approach sends a powerful message, which is challenging the myths around sexual violence and may generate stronger empathy towards victims nonetheless they are friends, associates or even strangers. It is suggested that with this approach to educating bystanders of sexual violence there is a decreased reaction in the uncertain situations which are either before or during the sexual assault, also it creates important skills to act as ally to survivors of such violence. Not only that, but the approach seems to send a message which is fitting for immediate prevention and everyone from the community have a role they can take on (Banyard, Plante & Moynihan, 2004).

Moreover, future studies may obtain better results if they use video stimuli with the scenarios instead of images. A study showed significant differences in both empathy and sympathy in females after participants were presented with videos of people being victims of aggressive and upsetting behaviours and none of the people around them helped (Wispe, Kiecolt & Long, 1977). Another study that was looking at how educational program aimed for teenagers affect prevention of sexual coercion in dating cases. The main focus of this study was on rising awareness of sexual coercion by exploring the primary attitudes, thoughts and views, as well as teaching teens how to handle refusal of sexual intercourse. The activities the teens were exposed to included videos, discussions, virtual dates and role playing. The findings from the research showed that using this kind of educational programs was beneficial and scores showed that they were effective for the students with original

coercive scores above the mean (Pacifici, Stoolmiller & Nelson, 2001). Furthermore, Craig and Lowery (1969) provided data, which showed significant differences again for empathy and sympathy in female participants, who were exposed to videos of people receiving electrical shocks.

Furthermore, future studies may look at how EEG data is correlated to the attitudes of participants towards victims of domestic violence. A lot of research has been investigating how the neurological paths in the brain are related to prejudice and judgment, while observing someone in pain (Cui, Ma & Luo, 2016). Moreover, EEG has been used to measure empathy levels in participants who observe either human or robotic hands in pain or not in pain (Suzuki, Galli, Ikeda, Itakura & Kitazaki, 2015). Phelps and Anderson (1997) suggested that the activity of the amygdala has a role in the assessment of the affective significance, additionally to facilitate emotional memory (LaBar & Cabeza, 2006).

Limitations

Finally, limitations of the current study could be that to collect the data it was used a platform such as prolific and it cannot be guaranteed that participants were completely focused on accurately completing the tasks and reading carefully through the scenarios, therefore it is believed that this type of study needs to be done in person. Additionally, as mentioned above not providing more realistic stimuli may have affected their perception and participants may have not been influenced as strongly as witnessing a real-life domestic violence situation.

Conclusion

In conclusion the current study aimed to answer 5 questions: Whether female participants will measure higher on the empathy measures than males? Whether male and female participants will experience higher empathic concern towards same sex victims? Whether high empathy would lead to higher willingness to intervene? Whether high scores on the sexism subscales would lead to less willingness to intervene in domestic violence situation? And, lastly whether there is any correlation between Eysenck's personality traits (neuroticism, extraversion and psychoticism) and helping victims of domestic violence. The results showed that female participants scored higher on the empathy quotient and the IRI empathic concern subscale, which is observed through the Mann Witney's test. However, the data showed that male participant showed empathic concern for both male and female victims, while females showed empathic concern only towards female victims. Furthermore, high empathy scores predicted higher willingness to help both male and female victims. Sexism was significantly higher in male participant, which was in support of previous findings and interestingly the high hostile sexism scores predicted less willingness to help both male and female victims, while benevolent predicted less willingness to help only male victims. Lastly, the research showed that there was a positive association between extraversion scores and helping victims and negative correlation between psychoticism and helping, unfortunately there was no significant results for the neuroticism. Being a bystander can be complicated and how one reacts depends on a few factors, according to Latane and Darley (1970) there are 5 steps in order to take action in an emergency situation. These steps are as follows: (1) they have to notice the incident, (2) then they have to interpret it as an emergency, which requires intervention, (3) after that they need to take responsibility to take action, (4) then they need to have the knowledge of how to intervene and finally (5) enforce a decision on how they would react. This model known as the bystander intervention model has

been applied to various research on helping behaviours involving prevention of sexual abuse (Burn, 2009), donation of organs (Anker & Feeley, 2011), driving intoxicated (Rabow, Newcomb, Monto & Hernandez, 1990) and many other situations. The data from the current research shows that in preventing and helping in domestic violence situations there are more underlying factors for the bystander actions. Hopefully further research will investigate the different factors for dealing with domestic violence, considering it is a worldwide issue and can happen to anyone.

Reference

- Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 84(1), 111.
- Arizona Coalition to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (ACESDV). (2019b, February 14). Types of Domestic Violence. Retrieved from <https://www.acesdv.org/domestic-violence-graphics/types-of-abuse/>
- Adams-Curtis, L.E. and Forbes, G.B. (2004) College women's experiences of sexual coercion: a review of cultural, perpetrator, victim, and situational variables. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse* [online]. 5 (2), pp.91-122.
- Aghababaei, N., Mohammadtabar, S., & Saffarinia, M. (2014). Dirty Dozen vs. the H factor: Comparison of the Dark Triad and Honesty–Humility in prosociality, religiosity, and happiness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 6-10.
- Ali, A., & Toner, B. (2001). Self- esteem as a predictor of attitudes toward wife abuse among Muslim women and men in Canada. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 141, 23-31.
- Ali, F., Amorim, I. S., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2009). Empathy deficits and trait emotional intelligence in psychopathy and Machiavellianism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(7), 758-762.
- Allport, G. W., & Odbert, H. S. (1936). Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological monographs*, 47(1), i.
- Amnesty International UK (2018, May 14). Violence against women. Retrieved from <https://www.amnesty.org.uk/violence-against-women>

- Anker, A. E., & Feeley, T. H. (2011). Are nonparticipants in prosocial behavior merely innocent bystanders?. *Health Communication*, 26(1), 13-24.
- Annett, C., Tracy T., & Chabot, H. F. (2005, May). Abuser's sex, not self-esteem of witness, predicts intervention in domestic violence situations. Poster presented at the annual meet- ing of the American Psychological Society, Los Angeles.
- Aries, E. J., & Johnson, F. L. (1983). Close friendship in adulthood: Conversational content between same-sex friends. *Sex roles*, 9(12), 1183-1196.
- Banyard, V. L. (2008). Measurement and correlates of pro-social bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Violence and Victims*, 23, 85-99.
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. g. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35, 463-481.
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of community psychology*, 32(1), 61-79.
- Banyard, V.L., Plante, E.G. and Moynihan, M.M. (2004) Bystander education: bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology* [online]. 32 (1), pp. 61-79.
- Banyard, V.L., Plante, E.G. and Moynihan, M.M. (2005) Rape Prevention Through Bystander Education: Bringing a Broader Community Perspective to Sexual Violence Prevention [online]. Washington DC: US Department of Justice. Available from: www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/208701.pdf

- Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. (2004). The empathy quotient: an investigation of adults with Asperger syndrome or high functioning autism, and normal sex differences. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 34(2), 163-175.
- Barros, H., Costa, D., Soares, J., Lindert, J., Hatzidimitriadou, E., Sundin, O., Toth, O. & Ioannidi-Kapolou, (under review) Intimate partner violence: a study in men and women from six European countries. *Bulletin of the World Health Organisation*
- Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question: Toward a social-psychological answer*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Batson, C. D. (1995). Prosocial motivation: Why do we help others? In A. Tesser (Ed.), *Advanced psychology* (pp. 333-374). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Batson, C. D., Chang, J., Orr, R., & Rowland, J. (2002). Empathy, attitudes, and action: Can feeling for a member of a stigmatized group motivate one to help the group?. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(12), 1656-1666.
- Batson, C. D., Early, S., & Salvarani, G. (1997). Perspective taking: Imagining how another feels versus imagining how you would feel. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 23(7), 751-758.
- Batson, C. D., Lishner, D. A., Carpenter, A., Dulin, L., Harjusola-Webb, S., Stocks, E. L., ... & Sampat, B. (2003). "... As you would have them do unto you": Does imagining yourself in the other's place stimulate moral action?. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(9), 1190-1201.
- Batson, C. D., Polycarpou, M. P., Harmon-Jones, E., Imhoff, H. J., Mitchener, E. C., Bednar, L. L., ... & Highberger, L. (1997). Empathy and attitudes: Can feeling for a member

- of a stigmatized group improve feelings toward the group? *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 72(1), 105-118.
- Batson, C. D., Turk, C. L., Shaw, L. L., & Klein, T. R. (1995). Information function of empathic emotion: Learning that we value the other's welfare. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 68(2), 300.
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2011). Seeing the unseen: Attention to daily encounters with sexism as way to reduce sexist beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35(2), 227-242.
- Ben-Ner, A., & Kramer, A. (2011). Personality and altruism in the dictator game: Relationship to giving to kin, collaborators, competitors, and neutrals. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(3), 216-221.
- Berkowitz, A.D. (2013) A Grassroots' Guide to Fostering Healthy Norms to Reduce Violence in our Communities: Social Norms Toolkit [online]. Atlanta, GA: CDC.
- Berlinger, J. S. (2001). Domestic violence. *Nursing*, 31, 58-64.
- Blair, R. J. R. (1995). A cognitive developmental approach to morality: Investigating the psychopath. *Cognition*, 57(1), 1-29.
- Borke, H. (1971). Interpersonal perception of young children: Egocentrism or empathy?. *Developmental psychology*, 5(2), 263.
- Botvinick, M., Jha, A. P., Bylsma, L. M., Fabian, S. A., Solomon, P. E., & Prkachin, K. M. (2005). Viewing facial expressions of pain engages cortical areas involved in the direct experience of pain. *Neuroimage*, 25(1), 312-319.
- Bowden, S. C., Saklofske, D. H., Van de Vijver, F. J. R., Sudarshan, N. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (2016). Cross-cultural measurement invariance of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire across 33 countries. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 103, 53-60.

- Brázdil, M., Roman, R., Urbánek, T., Chládek, J., Špok, D., Mareček, R., ... & Rektor, I. (2009). Neural correlates of affective picture processing—A depth ERP study. *NeuroImage*, 47(1), 376-383.
- Brooks, M. (2018, March). Male victims of domestic and partner abuse 35 key facts [PDF]. ManKind Initiative.
- Bryant, S. A., & Spencer, g. A. (2003). University students' attitudes about attributing blame in domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18, 369-376.
- Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*, 60(11-12), 779-792.
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 452-459.
- Buzawa, E., ; Buzawa C Stark E (2012). Responding to domestic violence.
- Carlo, G., Okun, M. A., Knight, G. P., & de Guzman, M. R. T. (2005). The interplay of traits and motives on volunteering: Agreeableness, extraversion and prosocial value motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38(6), 1293-1305.
- Carpenito, L. J. (2001). Domestic violence: None of your business? *Nursing Forum*, 360, 3-4.1712 *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*
- Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W., & Tatsuoka, M. M. (1970). Handbook for the sixteen personality questionnaire. *Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing*.

- Chabot, H. F., Tracy, T. L., Manning, C. A., & Poisson, C. A. (2009). Sex, attribution, and severity influence intervention decisions of informal helpers in domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(10), 1696-1713.
- Chapin, F. S. (1942). Preliminary standardization of a social insight scale. *American Sociological Review*, 7, 214–225.
- Challita, M. (2016). From empathic mind to moral behaviour: the “who”, “why” and “how”. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, 19(4), 517-522.
- Christy, C. A., & Voigt, H. (1994). Bystander responses to public episodes of child abuse. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 824-847.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). Politics of changing men. *Radical Society*, 25(1), 135.
- Costa Jr, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO five-factor (NEO-FFI) inventory professional manual. *Odessa, FL: PAR*.
- Costa, D., Soares, J., Lindert, J., Hatzidimitriadou, E., Karlsson, A., Sundin, O., Toth, O., Ioannidi-Kapoulou, E., Degomme, G., Cervilla, J., & Barros, H. (2013). Intimate partner violence in Europe: design and methods of a multi-national study. *Gaceta Sanitaria*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gaceta.2013.03.001>
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1988). Personality in adulthood: a six-year longitudinal study of self-reports and spouse ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 54(5), 853.
- Cui, F., Ma, N., & Luo, Y. J. (2016). Moral judgment modulates neural responses to the perception of other's pain: an ERP study. *Scientific reports*, 6, 20851.

- Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85.
- Dasgupta, S. D. (2002). A framework for understanding women's use of nonlethal violence in intimate heterosexual relationships. *Violence against women*, 8(11), 1364-1389.
- De Vignemont, F., & Singer, T. (2006). The empathic brain: how, when and why?. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 10(10), 435-441.
- De Waal, F. (2010). *The age of empathy: Nature's lessons for a kinder society*. Broadway Books.
- Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological bulletin*, 100(3), 283.
- Eisenberg, N., & Morris, A. S. (2001). The origins and social significance of empathy-related responding. A review of empathy and moral development: implications for caring and justice by ML Hoffman. *Social Justice Research*, 14(1), 95-120.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Murphy, B., Karbon, M., Smith, M., & Maszk, P. (1996). The relations of children's dispositional empathy-related responding to their emotionality, regulation, and social functioning. *Developmental psychology*, 32(2), 195-209.
- Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Shell, R., McNalley, S., & Shea, C. (1991). Prosocial development in adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Developmental psychology*, 27(5), 849-857.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1970). *The structure of human personality*. (Rev. ed.) London: Methuen.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. Hodder and Stoughton, London.

- Eysenck, H. J., and Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Adult and Junior)*. London, UK: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Eysenck, H. J., and Eysenck, S. B. G. (1991). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scale (Adults)*. London, UK: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Eysenck, H.J., & Eysenck, S.B.G. (1991). *Manual for the EPQ-R*. San Diego, CA: EdITS..
- Eysenck, S. B., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. *Personality and individual differences*, 6(1), 21-29.
- Feshbach, N. D., & Feshbach, S. (1982). Empathy training and the regulation of aggression: Potentialities and limitations. *Academic Psychology Bulletin*.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fiske, S. T., Xu, J., Cuddy, A. C., & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis) respecting versus (dis) liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth. *Journal of social issues*, 55(3), 473-489.
- Flatley, J., (2018, February 08). Domestic abuse: findings from the Crime Survey for England and Wales: year ending March 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/articles/domesticabusefindingsfromthecrimesurveyforenglandandwales/yearendingmarch2017>
- Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L. E., & White, K. B. (2004). First-and second-generation measures of sexism, rape myths and related beliefs, and hostility toward women: Their interrelationships and association with college students' experiences with dating aggression and sexual coercion. *Violence against women*, 10(3), 236-261.

- Furnham, A., Treglown, L., Hyde, G., & Trickey, G. (2016). The bright and dark side of altruism: Demographic, personality traits, and disorders associated with altruism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 134(3), 359-368.
- Future of supported housing. (2017, April 28). Short-term supported housing. Retrieved from https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201617/cmselect/cmcomloc/867/86707.htm#_idT_extAnchor023
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 70(3), 491.
- Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(12), 1323-1334.
- Glick, P., Sakalli-Ugurlu, N., Ferreira, M. C., & Souza, M. A. D. (2002). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward wife abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 292-297.
- Grigorova, M., (2017). *Domestic Violence towards male and female victims: underlying factors -empathy levels, gender differences and familiarity with prevention*. Unpublish manuscript.
- Haj-Yahia, M. M. (2003). Beliefs about wife beating among Arab men from Israel: The influence of their patriarchal ideology. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18(4), 193-206.
- Hammond, M. D., & Overall, N. C. (2013). Men's hostile sexism and biased perceptions of intimate partners: Fostering dissatisfaction and negative behavior in close relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(12), 1585-1599.

- Hare, R. D., Harpur, T. J., Hakstian, A. R., Forth, A. E., Hart, S. D., & Newman, J. P. (1990). The revised Psychopathy Checklist: Reliability and factor structure. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 2, 338–341.
- Harne, L., & Radford, J. (2008). *Tackling domestic violence: theories, policies and practice: theories, policies and practice*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Hoffman, M. L. (1984). Interaction of affect and cognition in empathy. *Emotions, cognition, and behavior*, 103-131.
- Hogan, R. (1969). Development of an empathy scale. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 33(3), 307.
- Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Warrenfeltz, R. (2007). *The hogan guide. Interpretation and Use of Hogan Inventories*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.
- Home Office, Browne, J., & Clegg, N. (2012, September 18). New definition of domestic violence. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-definition-of-domestic-violence>
- Horn, R. E. (2002). Visual language and converging technologies in the next 10-15 years (and beyond). *Converging Technologies for Improving Human Performance*, 52(7), 124.
- Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. Univ of California Press.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 2(1999), 102-138.

- Kende, A., & Shnabel, N. (2017). Benevolent sexism and cross-gender helping: A subtle reinforcement of existing gender relations. In *Intergroup helping* (pp. 23-43). Springer, Cham.
- Kerr, W. A., & Speroff, B. G. (1954). Validation and evaluation of the empathy test. *Journal of General Psychology*, 50, 369–376
- Khawaja, M., Linos, N., & El-Roueiheb, Z. (2008). Attitudes of men and women towards wife beating: Findings from Palestinian refugee camps in Jordan. *Journal of family Violence*, 23(3), 211-218.
- King, E. B., George, J. M., & Hebl, M. R. (2005). Linking personality to helping behaviors at work: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 73(3), 585-608.
- Kohut, H. (1971). *The Analysis of the Self* New York: Int.
- LaBar, K. S., & Cabeza, R. (2006). Cognitive neuroscience of emotional memory. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 7(1), 54.
- Latané, B. and Darley, J.M. (1970) *The Unresponsive Bystander: Why Doesn't He Help?* New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Lloyd, D., Di Pellegrino, G., & Roberts, N. (2004). Vicarious responses to pain in anterior cingulate cortex: is empathy a multisensory issue?. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 4(2), 270-278.
- Long, J., Harper, K., & Harvey, H. (2017). *THE FEMICIDE CENSUS: 2017 FINDINGS* Annual Report on UK Femicides 2017. Retrieved from

<https://1q7dqy2unor827bqjls0c4rn-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Femicide-Census-of-2017.pdf>

Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical reexamination. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 68(4), 704

Lupri, E., & Grandin, E. (2004). Intimate partner violence against men. *Ottawa, Ontario: National clearinghouse on family violence.*

Masser, B., & Abrams, D. (2001). When women still lose: The consequences of hostile and benevolent sexism for prejudice and discrimination against individual targets. *Manuscript submitted for publication, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia*

McNEELY, R. L., & Mann, C. R. (1990). Domestic violence is a human issue. *Journal of interpersonal Violence*, 5(1), 129-132.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society* (Vol. 111). University of Chicago Press.: Chicago.

Mealey, L. (1995). The sociobiology of sociopathy: An integrated evolutionary model. *Behavioral and Brain sciences*, 18(3), 523-541.

Migliaccio, T. A. (2001). Marginalizing the battered male. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 9(2), 205-226.

Muncer, S. J., & Ling, J. (2006). Psychometric analysis of the empathy quotient (EQ) scale. *Personality and Individual differences*, 40(6), 1111-1119.

- Nabi, R. I., Southwell, B., & Hornik, R. (2002). Predicting intentions versus predicting behaviors: Domestic violence prevention from a theory of reasoned action perspective. *Health Communications*, 14, 429-449.
- Nabi, R., & Horner, J. (2001). Victims with voices: How abused women conceptualize the problem of spousal abuse and implications for intervention and prevention. *Journal of Family Violence*, 16, 237-253.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66(6), 574.
- Oda, R., Machii, W., Takagi, S., Kato, Y., Takeda, M., Kiyonari, T., Fukukawa, Y., & Hiraishi, K. (2014). Personality and altruism in daily life. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, 206-209.
- Office for National Statistics (ONS). (2018) Domestic abuse in England and Wales: year ending March 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/domesticabuseinenglandandwalesyearendingmarch2018>
- Osumi, T., & Ohira, H. (2017). Selective fair behavior as a function of psychopathic traits in a subclinical population. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, 1604.
- Pacifici, C., Stoolmiller, M., & Nelson, C. (2001). Evaluating a prevention program for teenagers on sexual coercion: a differential effectiveness approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 69(3), 552-559.
- Phelps, E. A., & Anderson, A. K. (1997). Emotional memory: what does the amygdala do?. *Current biology*, 7(5), R311-R314.

- Piaget, J. (1932). The moral development of the child.
- Piliavin, J. A., Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Clark, R. D., III. (1981). Emergency intervention. New York: Academic Press.
- Potter, S. J., Stapleton, J. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2006). Designing, implementing, and evaluating a media campaign illustrating the bystander role. Unpublished manuscript, The University of New Hampshire.
- Powell, A. (2011) Review of Bystander Approaches in Support of Preventing Violence Against Women [online]. Victoria, New South Wales: Victoria Health Promotion Foundation. Publication P-052-V B.
- Prah, P. M. (2006). Domestic violence. *CQ Researcher*, 16, 1-35
- Prah, P. M. (2006). Domestic violence. *CQ Researcher*, 16, 1-35
- Rabow, J., Newcomb, M. D., Monto, M. A., & Hernandez, A. C. (1990). Altruism in drunk driving situations: Personal and situational factors in intervention. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 199-213.
- Ray, J. V., Hall, J., Rivera-Hudson, N., Poythress, N. G., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Morano, M. (2013). The relation between self-reported psychopathic traits and distorted response styles: A meta-analytic review. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 4, 1-14.
- Reitman, J. (2006). Sex and scandal at Duke. *The Rolling Stone*, 72-109.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Rudman, L. A., & Heppen, J. B. (2003). Implicit romantic fantasies and women's interest in personal power: A glass slipper effect?. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(11), 1357-1370.
- Russell, B. L., & Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of sexual harassment: An examination of gender differences, ambivalent sexism, social dominance, and gender roles. *Sex Roles*, 50(7-8), 565-573.
- Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, 22(1), 1-15.
- Seelau, S. M., & Seelau, E. P. (2005). Gender-role stereotypes and perceptions of heterosexual, gay and lesbian domestic violence. *Journal of family violence*, 20(6), 363.
- Sibley, C. G., & Becker, J. C. (2012). On the nature of sexist ambivalence: Profiling ambivalent and univalent sexists. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(5), 589-601.
- Singer, T., Seymour, B., O'Doherty, J., Kaube, H., Dolan, R. J., & Frith, C. D. (2004). Empathy for pain involves the affective but not sensory components of pain. *Science*, 303(5661), 1157-1162.
- Slee, P. T., & Rigby, K. (1993). The relationship of Eysenck's personality factors and self-esteem to bully-victim behaviour in Australian schoolboys. *Personality and individual differences*, 14(2), 371-373.

- Staub, E. (1979). Positive social behavior and morality, Volume 2: Socialization and development. Academic Press, New York.
- Stotland, E. (1969). Exploratory investigations of empathy. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 4(1), 271-314.
- Stotland, E., Sherman, S. E., & Shaver, K. G. (1971). Empathy and birth order: Some experimental explorations.
- Suzuki, Y., Galli, L., Ikeda, A., Itakura, S., & Kitazaki, M. (2015). Measuring empathy for human and robot hand pain using electroencephalography. *Scientific reports*, 5, 15924.
- Tani, F., Greenman, P. S., Schneider, B. H., & Fregoso, M. (2003). Bullying and the Big Five: A study of childhood personality and participant roles in bullying incidents. *School Psychology International*, 24(2), 131-146.
- The ManKind Initiative Helpline. (2017). Male victims of domestic and partner abuse. 35 key facts. Retrieved from <https://www.mankind.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/35-Key-Facts-Male-Victims-March-2018-1.pdf>
- Tice, D., & Baumeister, R. (1985). Masculinity inhibits helping in emergencies : Personality does predict the bystander effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 420-428.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Violence against women*, 6(2), 142-161.
- Toi, M., & Batson, C. D. (1982). More evidence that empathy is a source of altruistic motivation. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 43(2), 281.
- Tupes, E. C., & Christal, R. E. (1992). Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings. *Journal of personality*, 60(2), 225-251.

- Valor-Segura, I., Expósito, F., & Moya, M. (2011). Victim blaming and exoneration of the perpetrator in domestic violence: The role of beliefs in a just world and ambivalent sexism. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 14(1), 195-206.
- Vaux, A. (1985). Variations in social support associated with gender, ethnicity, and age. *Journal of Social issues*, 41(1), 89-110.
- Wellman, H. (1990). Children's theories of mind. Bradford: MIT Press.
- West, A., & Wandrei, M. L. (2002). Intimate partner violence: A model for predicting interventions by informal helpers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, 972-986.
- White, B. A. (2014). Who cares when nobody is watching? Psychopathic traits and empathy in prosocial behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, 116-121.
- White, B. A. (2014). Who cares when nobody is watching? Psychopathic traits and empathy in prosocial behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, 116-121.
- Whiten, A. (1991). Natural theories of mind. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Winkielman, P., & Gogolushko, Y. (2018). Influence of suboptimally and optimally presented affective pictures and words on consumption-related behavior. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, 2261.
- Women's Aid (n.d.). How common is domestic abuse?. Retrieved from <https://www.womensaid.org.uk/information-support/what-is-domestic-abuse/how-common-is-domestic-abuse/>
- Women's Aid (n.d.). Why don't women leave abusive relationships? Retrieved from <https://www.womensaid.org.uk/information-support/what-is-domestic-abuse/women-leave/>

- World Health Organization (2017, November 29). Violence against women. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/violence-against-women>
- Wood, J. T. (2004). Monsters and victims: Male felons' accounts of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 21
- Yamawaki, N. (2007). Rape perception and the function of ambivalent sexism and gender-role traditionality. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(4), 406-423.
- Yoshihama, M. (2005). A web in the patriarchal clan system: Tactics of intimate partners in the Japanese sociocultural context. *Violence Against Women*, 11(10), 1236-1262.
- Zhou, Q., Eisenberg, N., Losoya, S. H., Fabes, R. A., Reiser, M., Guthrie, I. K., ... & Shepard, S. A. (2002). The relations of parental warmth and positive expressiveness to children's empathy-related responding and social functioning: A longitudinal study. *Child development*, 73(3), 893-915.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Scenarios and images for pilot and main study

Appendix 2 Questions from pilot study

Appendix 3 Frequency descriptive statistics for pilot study

Appendix 4 IRI

Appendix 5 EQ short version

Appendix 6 ASI

Appendix 7 EPQR s

Appendix 8 Questions from Main study

Appendix 1 Scenarios and images from pilot study and main study

Female victim scenarios and images

Scenario 1



She was 26 years old and her boyfriend was 29. They have been living together for 6 months and were in a relationship for a year and a half. He was usually calm and charming but was possessive of her at times. Usually he didn't approve of her going out without him, and on the rare occasions she did, he used to get annoyed and aggressive with her upon her return. One night she came home after a get together with her friends and her partner was waiting for her, drunk. He started questioning her about where she has been and who she was with. He started swearing and putting her down, which resulted in her being punched in the face. Her mouth started bleeding in the corner and her eye got swollen and bruised. She was screaming for help and begging him to stop hitting her, but he continued hitting her and screaming at her.

Scenario 2



They had a relationship for 2 years and occasionally he was showing signs of jealousy. After they got married everything seemed good and they were happy with their life. They bought a house and had stable jobs. They had a big circle of friends and family they enjoyed spending time with. But after a year, things started to change, he started being more aggressive, more judgmental, and more jealous. He started forbidding her to go out and meet with her friends and family. She was only allowed to go to work alone. Otherwise, she would have had to go out with him. He was taking her salary and controlling everything in her life, blaming her for

being irresponsible and unworthy. Sometimes he beat her up after being drinking, and every time the beatings got more and more severe. One night while he was hitting her, she started screaming for help, hoping someone will hear from the open window.

Scenario 3



They were couple for 1 year. The first 6 months their relationship was going smoothly. They were an active, social couple. They were used to go out with friends and enjoyed each other's company. They also decided to start going to the gym together, but after some time he became possessive and aggressive. They stopped meeting with friends, she did not feel comfortable anymore to be out without him and stopped going to the gym. He started putting her down, calling her worthless, unfit and lazy. He was beating her most nights. She was only trying to hide her bruises with make-up, because she was scared to tell her family or friends as he was threatening her. She could not leave him either, as he was telling her that if she had left him, he would have killed her. One night they had an argument. He shoved her in the wall and started beating her up while she was screaming for help.

Scenario 4



They were married for 3 years and have been living together for 4. Their relationship was based on trust and love. He was the most charming person and worked in estate agency. She was lovely, bubbly person, who loved helping people and worked as a nurse in a hospital. They were well established couple with many friends. Unfortunately, the agency he worked

for started losing money and people were fired. He was one of them. After he lost his job he became a completely different person. He started to put her down, telling her that she is worthless, that she cannot do anything properly, he started forbidding her to meet with her friends. He started taking her money, as she 'was not responsible enough'. He started shouting at her, shoving her around and beating her up. Once, he started choking her and she nearly lost consciousness. After struggling for a bit, she could break free from his grip and started shouting for help.

Scenario 5



They were a couple for 2 years. During this time their relationship was happy, full of excitements and joy. They were traveling around the country every now and then and going out with friends. They spent most weekends watching TV at home and enjoying each other's company. They respected and loved each other. He was always supportive of her and her career, but at some point, he started getting jealous of her success and her contacts with different companies. He started putting her down and telling her she was unattractive and was not worth of her success. One night after a company party she came home late, and he was waiting for her. He was furious and drunk, after asking why she was late he stood up and shoved her in the wall. She fell and tried to protect her face from his fists. He kept shouting and swinging at her. She started shouting for help.

Scenario 6



They were together for 5 months. He was a little jealous every now and then and she did not think much of it at the time. Apart from that their relationship was good and they seemed like a happy couple. After a night out with friends, they decided to go to spend the night at his place. He was acting strangely on the way home: nervous, angry, and edgy. She tried to ask what was going on with him, he turned towards her and told her that she seemed really close with her male best friend and he didn't like it. She told him that he is imagining things, and nothing was going on and that they were just friends. Suddenly, he turned towards her and

grabbed her by the back of her neck. She instinctively put her hands in front of her face. He raised his hand and slapped her while she was screaming for help.

Male victim scenarios and images

Scenario 1



They were high school sweethearts and have been together for 7 years. They moved in together 6 months ago. Their relationship was unstable and consisted of many fights most of which were based on jealousy, which was coming from both of them. They were going to couples counselling and were trying to work on their problems and for a while it seemed to be working...One night, while preparing dinner together, his phone rang. When she looked at the screen, she saw it was his female best friend. When he refused to pick up the phone, she got angry and suspicious. She started yelling at him and blaming him for cheating on her with this girl. He was trying to defend himself, as she became more and more violent. She took the first pottery at hand and swung towards him. He tried defending himself without hurting her. All the neighbors could hear them fighting and shouting.

Scenario 2



They were a couple for 1 year. They were happy and they trusted each other but she was always overprotective when it came to their relationship. After losing his job she became more patronizing towards him and started to verbally abuse him and putting him down. He used to have many friends, but she forced him to stop talking and going out with them, these bans resulted in losing touch with many people he knew before their relationship started. This caused him to lose confidence in himself and became antisocial. After time, when a conflict occurred, she started becoming more violent and physical with him. She was threatening him

and telling him nobody will want to be with him as he was unemployed and unworthy. He was scared and unsure on how to deal with the situation because sometimes the humiliation was happening in public places and most of the neighbors could hear their arguments.

Scenario 3



They were a couple for 5 years. Their relationship has always been happy and healthy, they had the usual arguments, but nothing serious. Both had stable jobs and after 3 years together they decided to buy a new house, they also started planning on having kids, but after years of trying to have children, their attempts were unsuccessful. This unfortunate circumstance shook their relationship and weakened their trust and love for each other. They started having more and more arguments and fights. She started being more aggressive and abusive towards him. She used to blame him all the time about their fertility problems. As the time was passing by their relationship became more unstable and depressing. One evening during a fight she became physical. She punched him in the face and screamed at him. He tried to protect himself, but he didn't want to hurt her. Their shouts and screams could be heard through the open window.

Scenario 4



They were together for 15 years and married for 12. They had a good relationship and were both successful in their careers. After being in the same company for many years he was offered a promotion, which required a relocation. After discussing their options, both of them decided to accept and move to a new city in a different state. After time though she started feeling lonely and unworthy, and they were having arguments every night. At the beginning she was only verbally abusive, blaming him for having left their home, family and friends. She couldn't fit in the new company she worked in and this put more pressure on their relationship. She started fighting with her husband every night and sometimes she was getting physical with him. He was coming home late and she started blaming him at cheating and

was punching him sometimes. Most of the times their neighbours and onlookers could hear their fights and screams.

Scenario 5



They were together for 3 years and their relationship seemed like the perfect one for others. She was successful businesswoman and he was working in the same office building as a computer technician. They were a popular couple among their friends, and everyone approved of it, but when there was no one around she was aggressive and possessive of him. She used to put him down and make him feel worthless. She used to make him feel like he was not masculine enough. With time she became more confident and she started getting physically abusive towards him as well. One day while out with friends she noticed he was too friendly with one of their girlfriends. When they arrived home, she started blaming him for flirting with her. Even though he tried to explain that he didn't do anything wrong she got angrier. She started hitting him. You could hear the shouts through the window.

Scenario 6



They were together for 4 years. Their relationship started while they were university students. As freshers they enjoyed partying and spending time with their friends. He was attractive and fit man and she was a beautiful woman, but used to be insecure, because she was bullied through her years at school. She used to be jealous occasionally and he never minded it as he saw it as sign of love. But now 2 years later, she was becoming more possessive. She was accusing him of flirting with other women every time they went out. He started losing most of his friendships. One night after they attended the birthday party of her best friend, she started being moody. At first, she seemed sad, but shortly after she became aggressive, she

started blaming him and throwing stuff at him. Suddenly she started punching him and swearing on him. You could hear all the rumble coming from their flat.

Happy couple scenarios and images/Control

Scenario 1



They met at the beginning of the first academic year at University. Both studied the same subject and had a lot of interests in common. They quickly became friends and after half a year started to have a romantic relationship. They enjoyed each other's company and gave each other space when wanted, even though there were disagreements they still worked on keeping their relationship going. Loved going out and having fun with their friends. They enjoyed spending the night in and watching movies, reading and just talking. After 3 years in the relationship they moved to another city and applied for postgraduate education in the local university. Both got accepted and started working on their projects. On their graduation day he proposed to her after getting their diploma. Years later their relationship was as strong and happy as before. They bought a lovely house in the countryside and had 2 children and a dog.

Scenario 2



They met at the beginning of the first academic year at University. Both studied the same subject and had a lot of interests in common. They quickly became friends and after half a year started to have a romantic relationship. They enjoyed each other's company and gave

each other space when wanted, even though there were disagreements they still worked on keeping their relationship going. Loved going out and having fun with their friends. They enjoyed spending the night in and watching movies, reading and just talking. After 3 years in the relationship they moved to another city and applied for postgraduate education in the local university. Both got accepted and started working on their projects. On their graduation day he proposed to her after getting their diploma. Years later their relationship was as strong and happy as before. They bought a lovely house in the countryside and had 2 children and a dog.

Scenario 3



They met online 2 years ago and have been talking nearly every other evening. He was from a different country but was considering moving to the same country she was into study at university. She was in her first year of university and he was preparing for entering the army, before continuing his education. Gradually they became close friends and were spending a lot of time talking to each other. For the last 1 year though their contact was more limited as he was in the army and she was busy with exams. One day she was at university enjoying the sunny day, when heard someone calling her by name. She turned around and saw him in front of her. She couldn't believe that he was able to come to visit. Since then they have been in a relationship for more than 4 years, both graduated and working. Currently they are discussing moving in together and building life together.

Scenario 4



They have been together for 10 years now but knew each other since they were kids. Their families were close friends, and this is how they knew each other. They attended the same nursery, preschool and high school. They started having romantic feelings for each other

when they started high school. And their relationship kept getting stronger and stronger with the years. Currently they are living together and have a dog. They love spending time with each other and their families. Usually love having heated discussions on many different topics, which was something they always appreciated in their relationship. Both were confident and understanding to each other, loved pushing each other to do more with their lives. Moreover, they were always there for each other in the good and bad moments, which was a big foundation for their relationship. Recently they found out they are expecting a baby and are considering buying their first home in the next few months.

Scenario 5



They knew each other in high school, but never really talked or hanged out together. But at the 6th year class reunion they spoke all the evening and decided to keep in touch. They started meeting for coffee and going out for walks. A year later they were in a relationship. Now 15 years later they have 3 kids (14-year-old daughter and 4-year-old twins). They were both working for a marketing firm and were a well-known couple. They had the usual arguments any couple have but tried to discuss any issues that may have raised, which helped them maintain a healthy relationship. They bought a house and moved to another city, where all the family could enjoy. They loved each other and showed it every day. Every now and again on the weekends they used to travel around the country with their kids. They we supportive and loving towards each other and their kids, which helped their lives and kept their relationship strong.

Scenario 6



They have been together for 7 years now. They met at a party 8 years ago and were introduced to each other by a common friend. They spoke all night and turned out they had a lot of common interests. They kept seeing each other and kept contact for the next year or so after their first meeting. They started talking nearly every day and a year later they started

dating. On their 3rd year anniversary, he took her on a trip to France, where he proposed to her, the wedding took place 5 months later. They loved and respected each other and did everything together, had lots of friends and had a lot of get together with them. However, life wasn't always easy, and they went through some losses, she had a miscarriage, but this never stopped them from supporting each other. Currently they have a 2-year-old son, whom they love with all their hearts and their love and respect continue growing.

Appendix 2 Questions from pilot study

- Is the text an appropriate description for the image?
 1. Definitely yes
 2. Probably yes
 3. Might or might not
 4. Probably not
 5. Definitely not
- Did you feel the situation described by the image and the text were believable?
 1. Extremely believable
 2. Somewhat believable
 3. Neither believable nor unbelievable
 4. Somewhat unbelievable
 5. Extremely unbelievable
- Did you experience the image and the text as:
 1. Extremely negative
 2. Somewhat negative
 3. Neither negative, nor positive
 4. Somewhat positive
 5. Extremely positive
- How uncomfortable did the image and the text make you feel?
 1. Extremely comfortable
 2. Somewhat comfortable
 3. Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable
 4. Somewhat uncomfortable
 5. Extremely uncomfortable

- How threaten do you think the victim feels?

1. Extremely threatened
2. Somewhat threatened
3. Neither threatened nor safe
4. Somewhat safe
5. Extremely safe
6. There is no victim

Questions from main study

- Did you feel the situation described by the image and the text were believable?

- 1- Extremely Believable
- 2- Somewhat believable
- 3- Neither believable nor unbelievable
- 4- Somewhat unbelievable
- 5- Extremely unbelievable

- Did you experience the image and the text as negative or positive?

1. Extremely negative
2. Somewhat negative
3. Neither negative, nor positive
4. Somewhat positive
5. Extremely positive

- How uncomfortable did the image and the text make you feel?

1. Extremely comfortable
2. Somewhat comfortable

3. Neither comfortable, nor uncomfortable
 4. Somewhat uncomfortable
 5. Extremely uncomfortable
- How threaten do you think the victim feels?
 1. Extremely threatened
 2. Somewhat threatened
 3. Neither threatened, nor safe
 4. Somewhat safe
 5. Extremely safe
 - 6.** There is no victim

Appendix 3. Frequency tables for pilot study data

1. Is the text an appropriate description for the image?

Definitely yes =1; Definitely not=5

Correlation FEMALE VICTIM

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
FV1	1.64	.92
FV2	1.84	.98
FV3	1.83	.99
FV4	1.88	1.09
FV5	1.83	.97
FV6	1.64	.86

Correlation MALE VICTIM

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
MV1	2.23	1.15
MV2	2.03	.98
MV3	1.83	.92
MV4	2.03	.91
MV5	1.88	.90
MV6	1.98	.88

Correlation HAPPY COUPLE

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
HC1	1.64	.72
HC2	1.61	.73
HC3	1.73	.80
HC4	1.63	.81
HC5	1.56	.73
HC6	1.66	.88

2. Did you feel the situation described by the image and the text were believable?

Extremely believable = 1; Extremely unbelievable = 5

Believable Female victim

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
FV1	1.58	.99
FV2	1.86	1.13
FV3	1.69	1.02
FV4	1.86	1.07
FV5	1.77	.83
FV6	1.77	1.05

Believable Male victim

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
MV1	2.17	1.15
MV2	1.88	.97
MV3	1.81	1.02
MV4	1.75	.78
MV5	1.86	.91
MV6	1.98	1.02

Believable Happy couple scenarios

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
HC1	1.72	1.03
HC2	1.47	.69
HC3	1.70	.79
HC4	1.59	.92
HC5	1.59	.85
HC6	1.67	.98

3. Did you experience the image and the text as negative or positive?

Extremely negative = 1; Extremely positive = 5

Negativity Female victim

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
FV1	1.23	.58
FV2	1.33	.62
FV3	1.23	.46
FV4	1.25	.50
FV5	1.36	.623
FV6	1.42	.66

Negativity Male victim

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
MV1	1.81	.75
MV2	1.47	.59
MV3	1.58	.71
MV4	1.61	.87
MV5	1.64	.74
MV6	1.61	.66

Negativity Happy couple

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
HC1	4.52	.91
HC2	4.55	.59
HC3	4.56	.64
HC4	4.63	.72
HC5	4.56	.79
HC6	4.50	.76

4. **How uncomfortable did the image and the text make you feel?**

Extremely comfortable = 1; Extremely uncomfortable = 5

Comfortableness Female victim

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
FV1	4.36	.95
FV2	4.20	1.09
FV3	4.36	.93
FV4	4.08	1.23
FV5	4.08	1.06
FV6	4.03	1.07

Comfortableness Male victim

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
MV1	3.91	.85
MV2	3.80	1.13
MV3	3.95	.92
MV4	3.84	1.01
MV5	3.80	1.10
MV6	3.75	.91

Comfortableness Happy couple

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
HC1	1.70	.97
HC2	1.66	.82
HC3	1.72	.79
HC4	1.63	1.00
HC5	1.64	.98
HC6	1.64	.82

5. How threaten do you think the victim feels?

Extremely threatened =1; extremely safe =5; there is no victim =6

Victim threat Female victim

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
FV1	1.14	.43
FV2	1.23	.71
FV3	1.16	.41
FV4	1.25	.54
FV5	1.28	.68
FV6	1.28	.49

Victim threat Male victim

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
MV1	1.97	.85
MV2	1.52	.67
MV3	1.83	.75
MV4	1.75	.82
MV5	1.77	.85
MV6	1.95	.70

Victim Threat Happy couple

Scenario N	Mean	Standard deviation
HC1	5.28	1.30
HC2	5.56	.87
HC3	5.53	.85
HC4	5.55	.93
HC5	5.39	1.08
HC6	5.55	.93

Appendix 4 Interpersonal Reactivity Index

Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI)

ANSWER SCALE:

A	B	C	D	E
DOES NOT DESCRIBE ME WELL				DESCRIBES ME VERY WELL

1. I daydream and fantasize, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me.
(FS)
 2. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me. (EC)
 3. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other guy's" point of view. (PT) (-)
 4. Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems. (EC)
(-)
 5. I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel. (FS)
 6. In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease. (PD)
 7. I am usually objective when I watch a movie or play, and I don't often get completely caught up in it. (FS) (-)
 8. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision. (PT)
 9. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.
(EC)
 10. I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation. (PD)
 11. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective. (PT)
- Self Report Measures for Love and Compassion Research: Empathy
12. Becoming extremely involved in a good book or movie is somewhat rare for me. (FS) (-)
 13. When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm. (PD) (-)
 14. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. (EC) (-)
 15. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other

people's arguments. (PT) (-)

16. After seeing a play or movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters. (FS)

17. Being in a tense emotional situation scares me. (PD)

18. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them. (EC) (-)

19. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies. (PD) (-)

20. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen. (EC)

21. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both. (PT)

22. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person. (EC)

23. When I watch a good movie, I can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character. (FS)

24. I tend to lose control during emergencies. (PD)

25. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in his shoes" for a while. (PT)

26. When I am reading an interesting story or novel, I imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me. (FS)

27. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces. (PD)

28. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place. (PT)

NOTE: (-) denotes item to be scored in reverse fashion

PT = perspective-taking scale

FS = fantasy scale

EC = empathic concern scale

PD = personal distress scale

A = 0
B = 1
C = 2
D = 3
E = 4

Except for reversed-scored items, which are scored:

A = 4
B = 3
C = 2
D = 1
E = 0

Appendix 5 Empathy Quotient Short Version

1. I am good at predicting how someone will feel
2. I am quick to spot when someone in a group is feeling awkward or uncomfortable
3. I can sense if I am intruding, even if the other person does not tell me
4. I can tune into how someone else feels rapidly and intuitively
5. I can easily work out what another person might want to talk about

Social skills

6. I find it difficult to explain to others, things that I understand easily, when they do not understand it first time
7. I find it hard to know what to do in a social situation
8. Friendships and relationships are just too difficult, so I tend not to bother with them
9. I often find it difficult to judge if something is rude or polite
10. I do not tend to find social situations confusing

Emotional reactivity

11. I really enjoy caring for other people
12. If I say something that someone else is offended by, I think that is their problem, not mine
13. Seeing people cry does not really upset me
14. I usually stay emotionally detached when watching a film
15. I tend to get emotionally involved with a friend's problems

Score two points for each of the following items if you answered 'definitely agree' or one point if you answered 'slightly agree': 1,2,3,4,5,10,11,15

Score two points for each of the following items if you answered 'definitely disagree' or one point if you answered 'slightly disagree': 6,7,8,9,12,13,14

Appendix 6 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

Relationships Between Men and Women

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale: 0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = disagree slightly; 3 = agree slightly; 4 = agree somewhat; 5 = agree strongly.

B(1) 1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.

H 2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favour them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."

B(P)* 3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.

H 4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.

H 5. Women are too easily offended.

B(I)* 6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.

H* 7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.

B (G) 8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.

B(P) 9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.

H 10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.

H 11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.

B(I) 12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.

B(1)* 13. Men are complete without women.

H 14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

H 15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.

H 16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.

B(P) 17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.

H* 18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.

B(G) 19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

B(P) 20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

H* 21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.

B(G) 22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Note. Copyright 1995 by Peter Glick and Susan T. Fiske. Use of this scale requires permission of one of the authors. A Spanish-language version of the ASI is available from the authors. H = Hostile Sexism, B = Benevolent Sexism, (P) = Protective Paternalism, (G) = Complementary Gender Differentiation, (I) = Heterosexual Intimacy, * = reversescored item.

Scoring Instructions

The ASI may be used as an overall measure of sexism, with hostile and benevolent components equally weighted, by simply averaging the score for all items after reversing the items listed below. The two ASI subscales (Hostile Sexism and Benevolent Sexism) may also be calculated separately. For correlational research, purer measures of HS and BS can be obtained by using partial correlations (so that the effects of the correlation between the scales is removed).

Reverse the following items (0 = 5, 1 = 4, 2 = 3, 3 = 2, 4 = 1, 5 = 0): 3, 6,7, 13, 18,21.

Hostile Sexism Score = average of the following items: 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18,21.

Benevolent Sexism Score = average of the following items: 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 19,20,22.

Appendix 7 Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Short Version

1.	Does your mood often go up and down?	YES NO
2.	Do you take much notice of what people think?	YES NO
3.	Are you a talkative person?	YES NO
4.	If you say you will do something, do you always keep your promise no matter how inconvenient it might be?	YES NO
5.	Do you ever feel 'just miserable' for no reason?	YES NO
6.	Would being in debt worry you?	YES NO
7.	Are you rather lively?	YES NO
8.	Were you ever greedy by helping yourself to more than your share of anything?	YES NO
9.	Are you an irritable person?	YES NO
10.	Would you take drugs which may have strange or dangerous effects?	YES NO
11.	Do you enjoy meeting new people?	YES NO
12.	Have you ever blamed someone for doing something you knew was really your fault?	YES NO
13.	Are your feelings easily hurt?	YES NO
14.	Do you prefer to go your own way rather than act by the rules?	YES NO
15.	Can you usually let yourself go and enjoy yourself at a lively party?	YES NO
16.	Are all your habits good and desirable ones?	YES NO
17.	Do you often feel 'fed-up'?	YES NO
18.	Do good manners and cleanliness matter much to you?	YES NO
19.	Do you usually take the initiative in making new friends?	YES NO
20.	Have you ever taken anything (even a pin or button) that belonged to someone else?	YES NO
21.	Would you call yourself a nervous person?	YES NO
22.	Do you think marriage is old-fashioned and should be done away with?	YES NO
23.	Can you easily get some life into a rather dull party?	YES NO
24.	Have you ever broken or lost something belonging to someone else?	YES NO
25.	Are you a worrier?	YES NO
26.	Do you enjoy co-operating with others?	YES NO
21.	Do you tend to keep in the background on social occasions?	YES NO
28.	Does it worry you if you know there are mistakes in your work?	YES NO
29.	Have you ever said anything bad or nasty about anyone?	YES NO
30.	Would you call yourself tense or 'highly-strung'?	YES NO
31.	Do you think people spend too much time safeguarding their future with savings and insurances? ...	YES NO
32.	Do you like mixing with people?	YES NO
33.	As a child were you ever cheeky to your parents?	YES NO
34.	Do you worry too long after an embarrassing experience?	YES NO
35.	Do you try not to be rude to people?	YES NO
36.	Do you like plenty of bustle and excitement around you?	YES NO
37.	Have you ever cheated at a game?	YES NO
38.	Do you suffer from 'nerves'?	YES NO
39.	Would you like other people to be afraid of you?	YES NO
40.	Have you ever taken advantage of someone?	YES NO
41.	Are you mostly quiet when you are with other people?	YES NO
42.	Do you often feel lonely?	YES NO
43.	Is it better to follow society's rules than go your own way?	
44.	Do other people think of you as being very lively?	
45.	Do you always practice what you preach?	
46.	Are you often troubled about feelings of guilt?	
47.	Do you sometimes put off until tomorrow what you ought to do today?	
48.	Can you get a party going?	

Short-scale EPQ-R scoring key

P

YES: 10. 14, 22, 31, 39

NO: 2.6, 18.26. 28. 35,43 0

E

YES: 3, 7, 11, 15, 19.23. 32, 36,44,48

NO: 27,41 0

N

YES: 1. 5.9. 13. 17, 21, 25, 30, 34. 38.42,46 0

L

YES: 4,16.45

NO: 8, 12,20, 24.29, 33,37,40,47 0

Appendix 8. Questions from main study, which were presented in each block after the photo with scenario.

- How likely are you to help the victim in this situation?
 1. Extremely likely
 2. Somewhat likely
 3. Neither likely nor unlikely
 4. Somewhat unlikely
 5. Extremely unlikely
- How threatened do you think the victim feels?
 1. Extremely threatened
 2. Mildly threatened
 3. Neither threatened nor safe
 4. Mildly safe
 5. Extremely safe
- How would you help the victim? (this question was presented to those who chose they are extremely likely or somewhat likely to help the victim)
 1. By calling the police
 2. By firsthand physical action
 3. By calling a third person for immediate physical action
 4. Other (with option to leave a typed in answer)