MASTERARBEIT | MASTER'S THESIS

Titel | Title

Societal Perceptions and Attitudes Towards Psychological Intimate Partner Violence: An Analysis of the Influence of Gender Specific Norms

verfasst von | submitted by

Franziska Ella Magel BSc MSc.

angestrebter akademischer Grad | in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien | Vienna, 2024

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt | Degree programme code as it appears on the student record sheet:	UA 066 808
Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt | Degree programme as it appears on the student record sheet:	Masterstudium Gender Studies
Betreut von | Supervisor:	Dr. Tomi Adeaga Privatdoz. M.A.

Abstract

Intimate partner violence (IPV) has been an uprising topic within research and society. However, attitudes and perceptions towards non-physical and non-sexual forms of IPV are still underrepresented within research up until today. The question arises of what proliferates the trivialising and accepting attitudes towards psychological IPV (PIPV). This thesis aimed to research how gender specific norms and constructs influence societal perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs about psychological intimate partner violence. A survey was constructed using four vignettes which included four different hypothetical PIPV scenarios. Each vignette was manipulated by changing the gender and sexual identity of the perpetrator and abused individual as well as feminine and masculine traits displayed by the perpetrator. A total of 306 data points were collected with individuals (aged 18-40 years). Results of the survey revealed a tendency for male participants to trivialise the situations displayed in the vignette with a tendency of rating them as less abusive and more harmless than female and queer participants. Queer participants showed a tendency in rating the vignettes as more abusive and less harmless than female and male participants. Overall, PIPV acts ending in unwanted sexual actions were rated as more harmless when it was perpetrated by a female participant. Overall LGBTQIA* acceptance among participants was demonstrated as a strong protective factor against trivialising the abusive scenario. Results display an urgent need for early and broad interventions regarding PIPV acceptance within society and education on PIPV not being a gender specific concept.

Abstrakt

Gewalt in der Partnerschaft ist ein aufstrebendes Thema in der Forschung als auch in der Gesellschaft. Einstellungen und Wahrnehmungen zu nicht-körperlichen und nicht-sexuellen Formen von intimer Partner*innengewalt (PIPG) sind jedoch bis heute in der Forschung unterrepräsentiert. Es stellt sich die Frage, was die trivialisierende und akzeptierende Haltung gegenüber psychischen Formen von PIPG fördert. Ziel dieser Arbeit war es, zu untersuchen, wie geschlechtsspezifische Normen und Konstrukte die gesellschaftliche Wahrnehmung, Einstellung und Überzeugung zu PIPG beeinflussen. Es wurde eine Umfrage mit vier Vignetten erstellt, die vier verschiedene hypothetische PIPG-Szenarien enthielten. Jede Vignette wurde manipuliert, indem das Geschlecht und die sexuelle Identität der Täter*innen und der missbrauchten Person sowie die weiblichen und männlichen Eigenschaften der Täter*innen verändert wurden. Insgesamt wurden 306 Datenpunkte mit Personen (im Alter von 18-40 Jahren) gesammelt. Die Ergebnisse der Umfrage zeigten, dass männliche Teilnehmende dazu neigen, die in der Vignette dargestellten Situationen zu trivialisieren und sie als weniger missbräuchlich und harmloser zu bewerten als weibliche und queere Teilnehmende. Queere Teilnehmende bewerteten die Vignetten tendenziell als missbräuchlicher und weniger harmlos als weibliche und männliche Teilnehmer*innen. Insgesamt wurden PIPG-Handlungen, die in unerwünschten sexuellen Handlungen endeten, als harmloser eingestuft, wenn sie von einer weiblichen Täter*in verübt wurden. Die allgemeine Akzeptanz von LGBTQIA* unter den Teilnehmenden erwies sich als starker Schutzfaktor gegen die Verharmlosung des Missbrauchsszenarios. Die Ergebnisse zeigen, dass es dringend erforderlich ist, frühzeitig und umfassend zu intervenieren, um die Akzeptanz von PIPG als Gewaltform in der Gesellschaft zu fördern und darüber aufzuklären, dass PIPG kein geschlechtsspezifisches Konzept ist.

Table of Contents

Table Directory

1 Introduction

In the past years, the anti-violence campaigns and research have shifted their focus from domestic abuse towards Intimate Partner Violence (IPV), opening a conversation about violence outside of one's own home and towards abuse happening during dating. Since 2002, IPV has been declared a major public health issue by the World Health Organization (WHO), and many studies about the severe consequences of IPV have been published. Intimate partner violence can be defined as any events of physical, sexual, and psychological abuse perpetrated by a current or former intimate partner (WHO, 2021). Normally, research uses the terminology 'victim' and 'perpetrator', this thesis however will not engage in such terminology. The term 'victim' is associated with attributes such as weak and battered, and further suggests being 'subordinate' to the perpetrator, even after the abuse has happened. In addition, many individuals affected by IPV do not wish to identify themselves as victims, and the identity of being a victim is often associated with shame and hinders individuals from seeking help. Similar experiences were made in a previous study using qualitative interviews, conducted during the master thesis of the researcher (see Magel, 2023). Individuals felt ashamed using the term 'victim' as well as feeling portrayed as less than the perpetrator which they did not identify with (Magel, 2023). Therefore, this thesis will use the terminology 'the abused' instead of 'victim' and stick with the term 'perpetrator', as it accurately describes the individual acting abusive.

Since 1992, Austria has taken part in the '*16 Days of Activism Against Gender-Based Violence'* campaign (Autonome Österreichische Frauenhäuser, n.d.). This campaign starts on the 25th of November, which is the 'International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women' and ends on the 10th of December being the 'Human Rights Day' (see WHO, n.d.). The city council of Vienna launched many marketing initiatives in the last years regarding the '*16 Days*

of Activism Against Violence Targeting Women' campaign, which included workshops targeting abused women, and male individuals, to educate and implement precautionary measures to prevent violence against women. On the 23rd of November 2022, the campaign was accompanied by a decision made by the council of ministers, presenting a detailed statement including measures that have been and should be implemented, regarding the prevention of gendered violence against women, as well as increasing the post-incident care of abused individuals (see Bundeskanzleramt Österreich, *16 Tage gegen Gewalt,* n.d.). However, as stated in its title, the anti-violence campaign was solely focused on women as abused individuals of IPV, and even though anyone was welcome to participate or join certain workshops, the program was constructed by looking at it through a heteronormative lens, and non-heteronormative partner dynamics were not picked up upon. Even though, it has been proven that IPV does exist at potentially higher rates in LGBTQIA* individuals and that LGBTQIA* individuals rarely reach out to institutions for help as they do not feel that the programs address their needs and fear homophobia and discrimination because of their sexual or gender identity (Bytheway & Stephens-Lewis 2024; Langenderfer-Magruder et al., 2016; Reuter et al., 2017; Whitfield, 2021). The further proliferation of looking at IPV through a heteronormative lens leads to victim silencing of LGBTQIA* individuals which eventually leads to longer times endured within abusive dynamics (Hassouneh & Glass, 2008).

Despite the missing diversity regarding gender identity, sexual orientation as well as different partner dynamics, these campaigns almost solely thematise physical and sexual forms of IPV and exclude the forms of psychological IPV. Psychological Intimate Partner Violence (PIPV) is defined as any acts of violence, perpetrated by a current or former intimate partner, that consist of emotional, monitoring, and controlling behaviours. These behaviours can entail isolation, denying and withdrawing affection, controlling messages, cyber abuse, denying economic resources, verbal assaults, intimidation and questioning the partner's psychological integrity (Follingstad et al., 2005; Johnson, 1995; Stark, 2007; Woodyatt & Stephenson, 2016). Even though, only been a

vastly researched concept since the 1990s, studies on PIPV have already proven that it has more destructive outcomes, regarding psychological and physical health than do physical and sexual forms of IPV. This especially applies when looking at long-term outcomes (Dye, 2019; Estefan et al., 2016; Follingstad et al., 2005; Lagdon et al., 2014; Williams et al., 2008). Possible adverse consequences of PIPV are post-traumatic stress symptoms, depression, anxiety, suicidal ideation, substance abuse as well as somatic illnesses related to increased cortisol levels, like coronary heart disease as consequences of PIPV (Brown et al., 2020; Calvete et al., 2008; Cirici Amell et al., 2023; Comecanha et al., 2017; Devries et al., 2013; Dokkedahl et al., 2022; White et al., 2024). Despite all these outcomes, awareness of PIPV as well as preventative interventions, and education are still scarce. As a result of this, the phenomenon of psychological violence is not widely represented nor recognised within the general society. This further proliferates the legitimization of PIPV and in turn leads to an immense delay regarding individuals breaking out of psychologically abusive cycles experienced by an intimate partner (Cinquegrana et al., 2022). As a probable cause of the underrepresentation but also the psychological abuse's unique nature of not being immediately visible, many studies have demonstrated that psychological abuse is consistently perceived as less abusive than physical or sexual forms (Bowen et al., 2013; Capezza & Arriaga, 2008a, 2008b; Dardis et al., 2017; Lagdon et al., 2014). Research on domestic partner violence cases has shown that at least 35 incidents happen before the abused individual reaches out and calls the police (Hawkins & Laxton, 2014). Acknowledging that this number is regarding abuse that also contains physical and sexual forms of IPV it still leads one to wonder whether the number of incidents is higher for individuals that only experience psychological forms of IPV since psychological abuse is less recognised within society.

When looking at LGBTQIA* individuals it has been shown that in crisis centres, IPV experienced by LGBTQIA* individuals is taken less seriously than IPV happening in heteronormative partner dynamics (Brown & Groscup, 2009). Additionally, studies underscored

how male and female individuals who have experienced IPV in same-sex partner dynamics fear discrimination because of their sexual orientation, which in turn poses as a barrier for them when seeking help (Harden et al., 2022; Kay & Jeffries, 2010). The effects of societal attitudes on help seeking behaviours go as far as also inhibiting help seeking in abused individuals when physical and sexual forms of IPV are condemned by society and law, but psychological forms of IPV are not. In these countries abused individuals who have experienced PIPV, question the validity of their claims and often stay silent in fear of societal reprisal (Pokharel at al., 2020). This is extremely dangerous because experiencing psychological abuse comes with an increase loss of identity and autonomy, through psychological abusive tactics like isolation and manipulation, which proliferate a feeling of hopelessness and loss of control in the abused (Sackett & Saunders, 1999). It has further been proven to be accompanied by experiencing higher levels of fear, which in turn leads to staying within the abusive dynamic, which is further influenced by the social isolation instigated by the perpetrator (Escriba-Aguir et al., 2010; Sackett & Saunders, 1999)

Research in the past years has emphasised that the more time is endured within an abusive intimate partner dynamic, the more adverse mental and physical health outcomes for the abused individuals arise and victim silencing is further proliferated (Estefan et al., 2016; Henry et al., 2021; Machado et al., 2018; Sackett & Saunders, 1999; Scott-Storey et al., 2022). Moreover, it has been proven that psychological forms of IPV are often a precursor for sexual and physical forms of IPV and therefore early intervention is crucial for breaking abuse cycles from further spiralling (Cinquegrana et al., 2022; Salis et al., 2014). The current studies reporting prevalence rates on PIPV show different outcomes, which is due to definitional differences and further depend on which gender identities, intimate partner dynamics, sexual orientation as well as whether lifetime prevalence is included within the study (Henry et al., 2021; Follingstad, 2009; Woodyatt & Stephenson, 2016). A most recent study by White et al. (2024) has found that PIPV has the highest prevalence rate in women out of all forms of IPV, with a lifetime prevalence of 32,9 per cent of

women above 16 years of age. Up till today, there are no clear prevalence rates regarding all gender identities and sexual orientations. However, gender symmetry has been proven, showing that female to male IPV exists at rates that are as similar to male-to-female IPV (Comecanha et al., 2017). LGBTQIA* studies report different prevalence rates between 10 per cent and 50 per cent, depending on the gender identity or sexual orientation focused on (Whitfield et al., 2021; Henry et al., 2021). Transgender and gender non-conforming individuals' lifetime prevalence differed regarding when they transitioned (Henry et al., 2021). However, in a recent study by Whitfield et al. (2021), it has been shown that LGBTQIA* individuals were more likely to report psychological forms of IPV than heteronormative students.

The definitional differences within research display the difficulties in measuring nonphysical aspects of abuse as well as the missing education on the broadness of PIPV. For this reason, Follingstad et al. (2005), have proposed to use the term psychological aggression instead of psychological violence, since it may be easier to categorise certain actions as psychologically aggressive than it is to categorise them as abusive and hence give a more accurate understanding of behaviours that fall underneath the umbrella term psychological violence. However, since the term 'psychological violence' is still a more commonly known term in general society, this thesis as well as the study that is conducted will use the latter.

Many studies have thematised the emergence of IPV and PIPV. In recent years, it has been concluded that stereotypical gender specific norms and constructs play a major role in the emergence as well as the persistence of IPV (e.g. Jewkes, 2002; Hassouneh & Glass, 2008; Rached et al., 2021). Further in interpersonal relationships hierarchies and power imbalances exist and are influenced by the individuals' behaviours and desires to be part of society (Archer, 1994). Gender specific norms are social scripts and rules which pose as guidelines on how one, according to their prescribed societal gender role, should behave (Rached et al., 2021; Winker & Degele, 2009). Stereotypical social concepts of gender identity are based on the heteronormative idea that there

is a binary gender system, based on the biological male and female sex, in which intimate relationships exist between men and women (EIGE, n.d.). Women are seen as caring and emotional whereas men are seen as strong, aggressive, and non-emotional (Rached et al., 2021). Through parental nurturing and the patriarchal environment that we live in, such norms are replicated and even when condemned or distanced from still influencing our behaviours and perceptions (Rached et al., 2021; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Studies have shown that beliefs about stereotypical female behaviours as well as attitudes towards female individuals influence the judgement of abuse (Capezza & Arriaga 2008c; Dardis et al., 2017; Hassouneh & Glass, 2008). This has been proven in the judgement of lesbian abusive dynamics as well as in heterosexual dynamics, according to stereotypical belief, female characteristics are deemed as characteristics that make one seem to be unable to be abusive (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008c; Hassouneh & Glass, 2008).

In earlier years of IPV research, the concept of gender specific norms was purely introduced to show how heteronormative gender ideas and patriarchy account for the number of men perpetrating abuse and how patriarchal ideals are the explanation for the emergence of IPV (Dobash & Dobash, 1977). However, the idea of patriarchy being at fault for the emergence of IPV would mean that women would not be able to perpetrate violence, which we know is not the case (Bell & Naugle, 2008). In accordance with this, studies started to focus on females and males being perpetrators yet solely focusing on heteronormative dynamics. This eventually led to a new bias in research on abuse, which gave the idea that violence only exists within heteronormative dynamics as within in these traditional gender specific norms are assumed to still apply. This eventually led to silencing abused individuals and the complete misrepresentation of the concept of IPV within the LGBTQIA* community therefore resulting in missing awareness (Hassouneh & Glass, 2008). Research today still mostly focuses on certain gender identities or sexual identities regarding perpetrators rather than researching a broad picture, even though studies have proven that vast similarities exist across gender identities and different intimate partner dynamics (Turell,

2000). Once again, this misrepresentation severely influences the public's attitudes and belief system and leads to a lack of awareness regarding PIPV and therefore victim silencing within society. In addition, there is even less research on factors that influence the individual's judgement of psychological forms of IPV.

Taking the underrepresentation of PIPV in general and the missing data about what influences the perceptions of PIPV developments as well as missing data on non-heteronormative dynamics compared to heteronormative dynamics into account: this thesis aims to give an insight into the effects of gender identity and partner dynamics regarding the perceptions of individuals between 18 and 40 years old, living in the Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, towards PIPV and how these are influenced by gender specific norms and constructs. Previous studies have mostly focused on one group of sexual orientation or gender identity when assessing violent situations between intimate partners. This study will aim to lessen the heteronormative focus and introduce different scenarios to participants to detect whether there are differences in judging the situation when non-heteronormative couples versus when heteronormative couples are shown.

Specifically, this thesis aims to investigate the influence of gender specific norms and constructs regarding the perception and attitudes towards PIPV. A detailed description and overview of the hypotheses can be found in Chapter 3.

The study was conducted via an online survey using SoSci Survey in which participants were asked to read vignettes displaying different situations between intimate partners and were asked to judge whether the conflict displayed was abusive, aggressive, or harmless. In addition, measures regarding LGBTQIA* acceptance, previous individual experiences of PIPV and the acceptance attitudes towards PIPV were collected.

The analysis was done by conducting Kruskal Wallis tests, Friedmann tests and multiple regression analyses (see Subchapter 4.7 for full details on the data analytic strategy).

2 Theoretical Background[1]

In this chapter, the backgrounds of the concepts used within this thesis will be analysed. The concept of PIPV and included behaviours will be discussed, followed by an analysis of the background of gender specific norms and constructs. In addition, the connection of gender specific norms and constructs regarding PIPV are discussed. Subsequently, current research on attitudes towards PIPV will be discussed and concluded by displaying the current data on the perpetration of PIPV through different individuals and within different intimate partner dynamics. Finally, an overview of studies regarding blame attribution in psychological forms of IPV is given.

2.1 The Concept of Psychological Intimate Partner Violence (PIPV)

As previously mentioned, psychological intimate partner violence is a relatively new concept which was only introduced to research nearly 34 years ago (Follingstad et al., 2005). Even though, bullying has been a long-standing concept with many intervention strategies and preventative measures taken in schools, psychological abuse within intimate partner dynamics has yet to gain such recognition. In 2005, Follingstad et al. developed a broad definition of behaviours that can be described under the umbrella term of 'psychological abuse'. This was not only done to ensure a more uniform and inclusive definition of the phenomenon but also to illustrate the diverse acts included in psychological abuse. They developed the Follingstad Psychological Aggression Scale (Follingstad et al., 2005) which included 17 categories of psychological aggression. Each category has three different levels of severity which Follingstad et al. (2005) categorised as mild item, moderate item, and severe item. For example, some of the categories included in the scale

[1] The following chapter regarding the literature review and theoretical background will show similarities to my previous master thesis in clinical psychology: *Psychological Intimate Partner Violence and the Influence of Gender Specific Norms and Constructs: An Analysis of Victims Experiences*. The thesis in clinical psychology researched the effects on gender specific norms and constructs regarding the experiences made by individuals who have experienced PIPV. Hence the structure and theoretical groundworks are very similar.

are rigid gender roles, verbal abuse/criticism, treatment as inferior and isolation/monopolization and control over personal behaviour (see Follingstad et al., 2005). The abused individual's perception, identity, and integrity are undermined through these acts of PIPV (Stark, 2007; Woodyatt & Stephenson, 2016). Perpetrators therefore continuously attack the individual's human rights (WHO, 2013). Due to its unique form of undermining the integrity and identity of the individual, long-term consequences of having experienced PIPV are severe and abused individuals experience difficulties in trusting their perceptions of realities as well as forming and trusting new relationships in the future (Sackett & Saunders, 1999). In addition, the risk for developing PTSD after having experienced IPV is the highest when having experienced a psychological form of IPV (Cirici Amell et al., 2023).

Studies have shown that psychological forms of IPV often precede physical or sexual acts of IPV which displays the urgency of early intervention (Cinquegrana et al., 2022; Salis et al., 2014). As previously discussed, mental health outcomes of individuals who have experienced psychological forms of IPV are detrimental and worse than in individuals who have been affected by physical or sexual forms of IPV (see for example Dye, 2019; Estefan et al., 2016). The long-term effects of having experienced PIPV have also been demonstrated to be more harmful than those demonstrated in individuals who have experienced physical or sexual acts of IPV (Dye, 2019; Williams et al., 2008). These effects are even bigger in individuals belonging to minorities, as socioeconomic resources are lower and add to the effects of minority stress, which is experienced due to societal and institutional inequalities (Brooks, 1981; Comecanha et al., 2017; Dye, 2019; Porsch et al., 2022; Rana et al., 2022; Williams et al., 2008). In recent years, a new phenomenon of PIPV, namely psychological cyber abuse, has been thematised. The online perpetration of PIPV can entail intimidation, stalking and gaslighting via digital pathways such as social media as well as spreading private pictures and or information throughout the internet without the individual's consent (Zweig et al., 2014).

Especially among younger generations, online perpetration rates are quite high (Schokkenbroek et al., 2022). Online perpetrations are an easier accessible way of perpetration and display a tactic that allows the perpetrator to find a way to humiliate the individual and more so, in the public sphere, it poses as an act of abuse that potentially has even bigger risks and severe consequences (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010). Having this in mind as well, studies have shown that online perpetration in adolescents and younger individuals is often downplayed as something that belongs to normal dating behaviours, it is shown that for extensive intervention, education is needed to raise awareness and prevent immense outbreaks of PIPV (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010; Lucero et al., 2014).

2.2 The Role of Gender Specific Norms and Social Constructs in Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

The research regarding the origin of IPV as well as its emergence is endless (Bell & Naugle, 2008). Intimate partner violence was and still is demonstrated as a concept that arises through social inequalities and power imbalances and uses a potential hierarchy within two individuals to legitimise its actions (Bell & Naugle, 2008; Cinquegrana et al., 2022; Jewkes, 2002; Rached et al., 2021; Rana et al., 2022). Traditionally, IPV research was focused on male perpetrated violence which was targeted towards their female partners. This fuelled many studies researching the emergence of IPV which focussed on the effects of gender specific norms, gender identity, and patriarchal ideas (see Jewkes 2002; Dobash & Dobash, 1977; Rached et al., 2021). The studies showed that the inequalities within partner dynamics were mostly explained by gender specific norms and stereotypical gender identity beliefs (see Jewkes 2002; Dobash & Dobash, 1977; Rached et al., 2021). A different approach towards these power inequalities is delivered by Archer (1994). He proposed that power imbalances between gender identities can be proliferators for inequalities and the need to regain power in order to fulfil one’s identity, yet he also based that

power inequalities can stem from general social and cultural constructs and are not confined by gender identity. If an individual feels a lack of power or the need to regain power, their self-esteem and identity is endangered which can lead to power and abuse exertion in order to regain power and self-esteem. It bases the need for regaining power or the feeling of generally wanting power as the origin of violence and is based on cultural beliefs and norms rather than being specific to gender norms. Similarly, to the idea that power imbalances are rooted in the patriarchal gender binarity, this theory generally assumes that the individual lacks power and wants to regain it. In the following concepts of gender specific norms and their role within the emergence of and during the experience of IPV as well as the role it plays afterwards is demonstrated.

2.2.1 Gender specific norms and schemas regarding Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

Within the domains of gender studies, gender has been proven to be a social concept proliferated by society (Winker & Degele, 2009). Judith Butler (1999) even stated that anatomical gendered features exist in their categorisation because of societal beliefs and norms. The concept of gender identity and its prescribed norms are therefore based on the social constructs that were built based on the biological sex male and female. Gender specific norms are social prescriptions that entail beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours that are ascribed to one's gender identity (Rached et al., 2021; Winker & Degele, 2009). Such norms have been replicated within society and are reinforced through one's own experiences and environmental exposure to patriarchal ideals (Winker & Degele, 2009). Within our society, gender specific norms stereotypically subscribe to the concept of heteronormativity, which maintain that it is natural for men and women to be attracted towards each other and that other concepts of gender identities, beyond the binary system of male/female, as well as other sexualities, are inferior to it (EIGE, n.d.). Within these

concepts, stereotypical beliefs about the female gender identity as well as the male identity have been built. These gender identity norms obtain emotional behaviours, ascribed positions within society as well as roles that are to be acted out by the individuals of each group. Women are seen as being caring, obedient, and taking care of the emotional and relational work. Their role involves doing care work and being positioned underneath the male gender identity. Men on the other hand are seen as powerful, strong, and dominant, taking care of finances, and doing 'labour' work (Rached et al., 2020). Concerning emotional gendered stereotypes, women are seen as emotional and soft. On the contrary, men are seen as emotionless, though, and unbothered by most things. All these norms and their attribution can be explained by the gender schema theory (Bem, 1981). A schema is a cognitive construct which exists in one's consciousness. Incoming information is therefore processed by trying to fit the information into one pre-existing schema in order to categorise it and make sense of it (Taylor & Crocker 1981). Schemas hence influence how we perceive things as they contain previously learned information. Consequently, traditional gender specific norms function as gender schemas in which we engage in sex typing (Bem, 1981). Sex typing describes the attribution of perceptions and attributes to the female or male gender role, it is an automated process that sometimes happens unconsciously (Bem, 1981). Gender schema theory can also be used to explain certain perceptions of IPV, such as why men rate IPV consistently as less abusive than their female opponents (see e.g., Dardis et al., 2017). The stereotypical gender role and the hegemonic ideal of masculinity entail aggression and violence as accepted behaviours for this role (Bem, 1981; Connell, 2015). Therefore, men are more likely to accept abuse as an acceptable behaviour as it is incorporated into their stereotypical gender role and seen as their normality.

Despite one's own preferred gender and sexual identity, such stereotypical characteristics are ascribed to the individual depending on how one is read in terms of appearance. Gender schema theory also correlates with the concept of doing gender by West and Zimmerman (1987), which explains how we act out gender roles unconsciously and consciously by using the social constructs of gender identity that we have learned. Individuals themselves as well as others they interact with consistently rely on schemas built in their heads and consciously as well as unconsciously act based on such. Especially with psychological abuse being a form of IPV that influences one's identity and integrity as well as using techniques to undermine one's gender identity, these concepts play an important role in understanding IPV perpetration and perception. It is necessary to implement these findings when developing help structures and education on psychological forms of IPV, for anyone to feel included within these measures. Further effects on the perceptions when non-heteronormative individuals experience IPV are given in Subchapter 2.3.

2.2.2 Gender specific norms as proliferators for Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

In earlier studies, gender specific norms are mostly named as one of the most prevalent factors that proliferate the emergence of IPV. However, as previously mentioned, the sole existence of patriarchal norms and the male gender being at fault for the emergence does not justify IPV in all partner dynamics especially regarding non-male perpetrators. Despite this, gender specific norms do still play a crucial role in the emergence as well as proliferators of IPV. In low-income countries, patriarchal norms have a higher status and therefore when women experience IPV, they are more likely to endure longer time in such relationships as they do not want to admit having broken such norms as well as have the feeling that what they experience is justified as the male perpetrator is allowed to be

dominant (Wessells & Kostelny, 2022). In a different example, Puerto Rican immigrants in New York were too poor to fulfil the male ideal of supporting one's family and having a house. To overcome this gender identity crisis, they were urged to find new ideals that are attributed to masculinity and that they could reach in order to restore their masculine identity. This resulted in them turning towards becoming gang members as they could restore the unfulfilled needs of their masculine identity. This however entailed different norms which included a normalization of violence against women and misogyny and therefore made them turn to abusing their intimate partners (Bourgouis, 1996). Gender norms also play a role in non-heteronormative partner dynamics in which IPV is experienced. It has been suggested that IPV in non-heteronormative intimate partner dynamics perpetrated by men could be partially connected with them reacting against the attributed role of being submissive and being attributed feminine traits as their sexual identity contradicts masculine norms. As a means to restore their masculine identity they engage in violence (Kay & Jeffries, 2010). In heterosexual men, this effect has been demonstrated in men who did not comply with stereotypical masculine norms. These men also engaged in acts of abuse as a means to mitigate their shortcomings in other domains of masculinity (Jewkes, 2002).

A further effect of gendered stereotypes proliferating IPV experiences is shown when looking at help seeking behaviour. LGBTQIA* individuals and male abused individuals display a tendency to stay longer within abusive dynamics as they are too ashamed to seek help and fear being believed less because of their gender identity or sexual identity (Bowen et al., 2013; Brown & Groscup, 2009; George, 1994; Harden et al., 2022; Kay & Jeffries, 2010). This effect arises since most intervention programs, crisis centres, as well as public marketing campaigns, are targeted towards heterosexual cis women.

2.2.3 The Impact of Gender Specific Norms and Constructs regarding Societal Judgement and Beliefs concerning Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) Experiences

As mentioned previously, women have certain prescribed characteristics to their stereotypical gender role which they are expected to fulfil. The expectance of this however also goes as far as women expecting themselves to fulfil them. Not adhering to such norms and breaking them by having a relationship that is not harmonic is presented as failing in the stereotypical female role and therefore, especially in low-income countries as a failure and increases the shame and stigma put on women who have experienced abuse (Wessells & Kostelny, 2022).

Previous research has vastly proven that especially male individuals have a level of shame and guilt when it comes to reaching out for help after experiencing IPV. Since male individuals are stereotypically seen as strong and emotionless, it contradicts the notion that they could be seen as abused individuals and therefore such internalised beliefs often lead men to refrain from getting help as they do not want to endanger their masculine identity (Bowen et al., 2013; George, 1994). In addition, it has been proven that male individuals who have experienced IPV are generally believed less than female individuals who did, as it contradicts the stereotypical male gender role (Turchik & Edwards, 2012). In line with this, it has been underscored that male-to-female perpetrated IPV is consistently rated as more severe than female-to-male perpetrated violence (Dardis et al., 2017; Capezza, 2008b; Hamby & Jackson, 2010). Similar experiences are made by LGBTQIA* individuals and their help seeking behaviours. LGBTQIA* individuals are often afraid to seek help as they fear stigmatisation and not being believed in help centres and therefore turn to therapy instead in hopes of getting the support they need (see Bytheway & Stephens-Lewis, 2024). Studies have also shown that professional staff of crisis centres rate IPV experienced in

non-heteronormative partner dynamics as less serious than IPV in heteronormative dynamics (Brown & Groscup, 2009).

2.2.4 The Concept of Intersectionality within Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

Acknowledging that gender specific norms and constructs play a huge role, not only in the emergence and proliferation but also regarding the side effects of experiencing IPV, they do not solely explain the adverse outcomes. The concept of intersectionality, defined by the African American lawyer and gender activist, Kimberlè Crenshaw in 1989, describes that one is not merely affected by discrimination regarding one's gender for example, but is continuously affected by multiple aspects. One can be discriminated against because of their gender, class, race, and sexual orientation. Therefore, experiences of IPV and its outcomes are highly affected by the individuals also experiencing discrimination based on their sexual orientation, class race and many other aspects. It has been shown that, for example, women who are part of a minority group are more likely to be affected by IPV than women who are not (Harden et al., 2022). This effect has also been proven for LGBTQIA* individuals (Whitfield et al., 2021). This increased risk is further explained by minority stress, which describes the increased burden and stress level of individuals belonging to a marginalised group that experiences discrimination on multiple intersectional levels (Brooks, 1981). Previously, it was established that prevention centres are often focused on heterosexual privilege and have been proven to use tactics or frameworks that have been developed for heterosexual dynamics and do not apply to non-heteronormative dynamics. In addition, access to programs and or shelters is also restricted, as they mostly choose biological sex as a criterion for taking part, which excludes trans* individuals, and further also not receptive to IPV in LGBTQIA* individuals (Donovan & Barnes, 2020, Henry et al., 2021).

2.3 Attitudes and perceptions of Psychological Intimate Partner Violence (PIPV) within society

IPV in general, specifically existing outside of the context of domestic violence, which is confined to abuse happening in one's home, is a concept only recently established within society. Societal attitudes and perceptions influence norms and vice versa regarding attitudes towards PIPV and IPV in general. Research on attitudes towards PIPV is still very scarce. Regarding all forms of IPV societal attitudes and the influence of gender specific norms are currently proliferating staying within abusive intimate partner dynamics. Social norms such as not getting involved in other people's conflicts as well as attributing the capacity to leaving such abusive dynamics, especially when abused individuals appear confident or are male lead to further silencing of the abused (Taylor & Sorenson, 2005). Societal attitudes and perceptions are therefore extremely influenced by appearances and previous beliefs. Furthermore, attitudes regarding IPV are shaped through heteronormative norms and therefore research and interventions often exclude LGBTQIA* individuals. As demonstrated before LGBTQIA* individuals have been proven to be seen as not experiencing IPV. The exclusion of LGBTQIA* individuals in practice and theory of IPV is partly due to heteronormative privilege, which entails heteronormativity being superior and valued as the norm while non-heteronormativity is framed as the other (Sedgewick, 1990). Also, non-heteronormative relationships and partner dynamics are not seen as serious, compared to heteronormative partner dynamics, which further proliferates this effect (Testa et al., 1981). Moreover, it has been demonstrated that researchers are afraid of stigmatising the LGBTQIA* community even more by publishing IPV perpetration within the community, which in turn leads to victim silencing and further proliferates the bias that IPV only exists in heteronormative dynamics (Hassouneh & Glass, 2008; Rollè et al., 2018). A recent study regarding IPV against women showed that women saw IPV as more severe and were less likely to accept and support

IPV perpetration than did men (Garcia et al., 2020). However, as this study and most other thy compare physical and sexual acts of IPV and psychological acts of IPV are only included in combination with displayed physical or sexual abuse, leaving a big lack of data regarding beliefs about psychological violence. It has been shown that psychological abuse is often belittled and generally seen as less severe than physical or sexual acts of abuse (Bowen et al., 2014; Capezza & Arriaga, 2008a, 2008b; Dardis et al., 2017; Lagdon et al., 2014). Moreover, research also showed that displayed acts of psychological abuse were judged as rather aggressive but not abusive, which underscored the missing education on boundaries regarding the beginning of violence (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008a, 2008b). In a qualitative study by Bowen et al. (2013) adolescents between 12 and 17 years old rated psychological abuse as partly worse than physical abuse yet rated the consequences of physical forms of IPV as worse and denounced them more as compared to psychological abuse. It shows that perceptions even in younger generations who were born after psychological forms of IPV became a topic of research have similar attitudes to older generations, regarding perceiving psychological abuse as less abusive than physical abuse.

Perceptions of society are extremely influenced by IPV legitimation myths, which entail certain myths and statements that justify violence within intimate partner dynamics and are fuelled by concepts of sexism, patriarchal ideals, and other social constructs (Cinquegrana et al., 2022). These myths further lead to victim blaming and stigmatising individuals that have been affected by abuse of their intimate partner (see Taccini & Mannarini 2023). Multiple studies showed that male perpetrated psychological abuse was rated as more severe than female perpetrated psychological abuse (Capezza et al., 2021, Dardis et al., 2017). This once again demonstrates the biased perception of female individuals, as suggested by gender schema theory, as being nonviolent and not being seen as having the ability to able to harm other individuals (see Hassouneh & Glass, 2008).

Another example for legitimization myths is demonstrated in the study by Conroy et al.

(2023), where more men in the United Kingdom accepted female perpetrated IPV than women, as men themselves have a higher perpetration rate in the United Kingdom and consequently legitimise their actions by accepting others doing it as well. In a review by Williams et al. (2012), it further has been demonstrated that abusive acts were proven to be taken more serious if they happened in a committed and long lasting relationships, such as IPV happening between a married couple, than if the abuse happened in a non-committed dating dynamic.

In 2022, the most recent statistic regarding "Gendered Violence Against Women" was published by Statistik Austria. It demonstrated that one in three women experiences abuse once in their lifetime. It gives a great overview regarding physical and sexual IPV yet only focusses on psychological IPV in the detailed report. When looking at the report, the statistics regarding psychological forms of IPV are clearly placed in less visible areas. In addition, when looking at the prevalence rate and the measures that the research used to gain the prevalence rates, it leaves to question whether the named prevalence rate, 36.2 per cent in women between 18 and 74 years old, is an accurate display of individuals who have experienced PIPV. The measures used for questioning the participants regarding PIPV completely left out elements like withdrawing affection and gaslighting (see Enachescu & Hinsch, 2022), resulting in skewed and inaccurate results. As a result of this graphic misrepresentation as well as the unimportance directed toward psychological abuse in the study, Austrian media did nearly solely report about sexual and physical forms of violence and therefore further contributing to the skewed representation. It is clear that even though researching the concept of PIPV for decades, little to no interventions targeted on education regarding psychological abuse have been done, which would be crucial due to the unique factors of being a form of violence without physical elements and is hence hard to recognise.

2.4 Perpetration of Psychological Intimate Partner Violence (PIPV) within different intimate partner dynamics

Research has shown that perpetration behaviours are mostly uniform across different partner dynamics. It has also been shown that there is a gender symmetry regarding the gender of the perpetrator of PIPV (Comecanha et al., 2017). However, many different studies mostly focused on one gender identity or partner dynamic. Therefore, within this subchapter a brief overview of the perpetration of IPV regarding different partner dynamics and different gender identities of the perpetrators is given. As a result of missing diverse studies that thematise the perpetration of more than the binary gender identities and focus on the broader LGBTQIA* community, only one chapter regarding non-heteronormative dynamics is created.

2.4.1 Perpetration in Heteronormative Dynamics Through Cis Men

The most researched aspect of psychological forms of IPV are studies concerning male perpetrators when it comes to heteronormative dynamics. This originates from the initial focus on IPV resulting from research regarding abuse through one's spouse (Dobash & Dobash, 1977). Many of the frameworks that try to explain the emergence of IPV name stereotypical gender roles and patriarchal values within the society as the proliferators of IPV. Which eventually also led to the misrepresentation of female being seen as non-violent and most research only focusing on male to female perpetrated violence and therefore silencing victims that do not fit into this framework (see Hassouneh & Glass, 2008). Physical and sexual intimate IPV still constitutes as the main researched area regarding male perpetrated IPV up until today (Comecanha et al., 2017). It has been shown that gender specific norms and stereotypes are frequently used by cis men to perpetrate psychological violence. They utilise gendered stereotypes to undermine the female identity

of the abused individual. In addition, they pose irrationality as a trait of being female, which makes the affected women question their perceptions of reality and consequently gaslights them (Rana et al., 2022).

2.4.2 Perpetration in Heteronormative Partner Dynamics Through Cis Women

The gendered stereotype that holds women as being unable to engage in violence, also proliferates the view, that female perpetrated IPV has been rated as less harmful, which was shown in a study by Walker et al. (2018). In addition, this study showed that participants attributed self-defence as the reason for female perpetrated IPV, and therefore justifying the abusive actions based on the gender identity. It has been proven that gendered stereotypes also play a role in female to male perpetrated psychological intimate partner violence (Nybergh et al., 2016). Female perpetrators use tactics such as questioning the masculine identity, questioning their heterosexuality by also making homophobic comments and making fun of them for being too emotional and not complying to the emotional gendered norms. The overall term for this is “gender role harassment” (p. 168, Mc Hugh et al., 2013). Gender role harassment also exists in other partner dynamics and applying or forcing rigid gender roles on to the individual is an included form of PIPV on the Follingstad Psychological Aggression Scale (FPAS) developed by Follingstad et al. (2005). Female perpetrators have been proven to engage in more psychological abuse than male perpetrators (Machado et al., 2018; Williams et al., 2008). In female-to-male perpetrated IPV it has been shown that men in the US mostly experience being monitored, called names, being accused of being a loser and being insulted, and humiliated (Black et al., 2011). All things that are in line with female perpetrators urging the male individuals that they have abused to comply to the stereotypical male role of being though, dominant, and emotionless.

2.4.3 Perpetration in Non-heteronormative Same-Sex Female Partner Dynamics

The issue with many studies regarding IPV in same-sex female dynamics is the frequent non-existent preciseness regarding bisexual participants in studies, where it is hard to tell whether prevalence rates also include IPV experienced by a male partner or only female perpetrated IPV. Nonetheless, biases towards seeing female perpetrators as non-violent also persist within female same-sex partner dynamics (Hassouneh & Glass, 2008). In addition, the notion of IPV existing because of stereotypical gender specific norms, which are believed to be non-existent in non-heteronormative relationships further proliferated the lack of awareness and studies within the LGBTQIA* community (Hassouneh & Glass, 2008). In line with research demonstrating that psychological forms of IPV are the most used form of IPV among women, this has also been proven in self-identified lesbians (Badnes-Ribera et al., 2016).

2.4.4 Perpetration in Non-heteronormative Same-Sex Male Partner Dynamics

As discussed earlier, male individuals in heteronormative partner dynamics utilise gendered stereotypes. However, this is not only limited to heteronormative partner dynamics. Studies have shown that PIPV in same-sex partner dynamics among men also utilise gendered stereotypes. One way of doing this is insulting the abused individual using homophobic slurs and outing them in front of others (Stults et al., 2022). Another way of doing this is expecting the partner to “act straight” in front of others and consistently adding blame for not behaving straight (p. 3, Stephenson & Finneran, 2013). However, gendered stereotypes also played a role in keeping the abused individuals within the abusive dynamic, as perpetrators used homophobia to intimidate the abused and making them believe that no one would believe them since they are in a same-sex partner dynamic (Kay & Jeffries, 2010). Woodyatt and Stephenson (2016) illustrated in their study that men

viewed psychological abuse as more damaging than sexual or physical abuse. As a result of minority stress that also includes internalised homophobia and experienced homophobic discrimination, gay and bisexual men have an increased risk of experiencing IPV (Finneran & Stephenson, 2014; Kimmes et al., 2019; Whitfield et al., 2021). This is in line with the findings of Stults et al. in 2016, who discovered that male perpetrators of same-sex IPV are found to uphold stereotypical male gender roles and endorse stereotypical masculine ideals. In general, research has demonstrated that bidirectional perpetration of IPV is common among same-sex male partner dynamics (Stults et al., 2022).

2.4.5 Perpetration in other LGBTQIA* dynamics

In general, it has been proven that IPV has similar and sometimes even higher prevalence rates in LGBTQIA* partner dynamics than in heterosexual dynamics (Langenderfer-Magruder et al., 2016; Reuter et al., 2017; Whitfield, 2021). Transgender and gender non-conforming individuals show especially high prevalence rates regarding the experience of IPV (Langenderfer-Magruder et al., 2016; Peitzmeier et al., 2020). It has further been demonstrated, that LGBTQIA* PIPV holds specific ways of perpetration that are unique to these partner dynamics. Perpetrators abusing transgender and gender non-conforming individuals utilise misgendering the abused and threatening to out their gender identity (Henry et al., 2021; Cook-Daniels, 2015). Furthermore, also doubting the person's gender identity is another form of PIPV that is especially unique to transgender and gender non-conforming individuals (Cook-Daniels, 2015). Moreover, withholding prostheses, wigs and or clothes that are essential for the person to be present in their desired gender identity, is a unique form of PIPV in transgender and gender nonconforming individuals. This can go even further when perpetrators restrict access to medication and hormones physically or by withholding financial resources to access the aforementioned (Cook-Daniels, 2015).

2.5 Blame attribution within Psychological Intimate Partner Violence (PIPV)

Multiple studies have proven that blame attribution within IPV scenarios is influenced by multiple factors. It is influenced by the gender identity of the people judging the situation. Further effects have been shown regarding the assignment of blame being influenced by gender identity and characteristics displayed both by the perpetrators as well as the abused individual of IPV. In recent studies, male perpetrators have been proven to be assigned more blame than female perpetrators (Dardis et al., 2017; D'Costa & Saklofske, 2023). However, Capezza and Arriaga (2008c) found that stereotypical housewife traits, which entailed warmth, evoking sympathy and being less negative which are traditionally assigned to the female gender identity, were an indicator for less blame attribution towards the female victim in hypothetical IPV scenarios. This is in line with findings that stereotypical female traits are seen as belonging to a victim identity and stereotypical male attributes being judged as belonging to a perpetrator identity (George, 1994). Some studies have found effects for men, across different age groups, judging the abused individual as more blame worthy, than female individuals did in hypothetical scenarios (see Dardis et al., 2017; Morrison et al., 2023; Wakelin & Long,2003)

Besides the influences of gender identity and associated norms, it has been demonstrated that blame attribution immensely effects long-term effects and help seeking behaviours of the abused individuals of IPV. Victim blaming does signal non supportive attitudes and is perceived by the abused as not being worthy of help which in turn leads to even more detrimental physical and mental health outcomes in affected of IPV (Moe, 2007). It can further have long-term consequences regarding self-blame and slows down recovery by those who have experienced IPV.

3 Hypotheses

Taking the findings, regarding previous literature, presented above into account, several hypotheses have been derived. The main aim of this thesis was to assess the influence that gender specific norms have on societal perceptions regarding psychological intimate partner violence.

3.1 Hypothesis 1

Previous literature has underscored the differential perceptions and ratings of psychological abusive situations when looking at the gender identity of the individual judging the situation (see Capezza & Arriaga, 2008b, Capezza et al., 2021, Dardis et al., 2017). Therefore, it is hypothesised that the gender identity of the participant will influence whether a vignette is rated as abusive or not. Men have further been proven to generally see IPV as less abusive and problematic than other individuals (Conroy et al., 2023). Queer individuals, meaning individuals not identifying as male or female, are hypothesised to trivialise IPV more and consequently rate scenarios as less abusive as research has demonstrated that it is often overlooked in the LGBTQIA* community (see Hassouneh & Glass, 2008).

H1: The gender identity of the participant influences whether they judge the vignette as abusive.

H1(a): Male participants will judge the vignettes less abusive than other participants.

H1(b): Individuals holding a gender identity non heteronormative gender identity will judge the vignettes as less abusive.

3.2 Hypothesis 2

Previous literature has thematised LGBTQIA* partner dynamics being judged as relationships that are not real and showing less love than heteronormative relationships (Testa et al., 1981). Furthermore, IPV is often seen as restricted towards heteronormative relationships, as IPV is seen as stemming from traditional gender norms which are 'non-existent' in non-heteronormative dynamics. A study by Wakelin and Long (208) has further shown that men who have experienced rape indicated being straight when seeking help in order to be believed more. Consequently, it could be hypothesised that non-heteronormative partner dynamics will be judged as less abusive than heteronormative dynamics. However, it could be hypothesised that supportive attitudes toward the LGBTQIA* community function as a protective factor when judging intimate partner dynamics. It could be hypothesised that endorsing such attitudes do not only influence the judgement when rating non-heteronormative pattern dynamics but also heteronormative ones, as individuals who hold these attitudes may have educated themselves on the concept of gender identities and specific norms. Therefore, they could also be more open to female perpetrated violence.

H2: Non-heteronormative relationships are rated as less abusive than heteronormative relationships.

H2(a): Participants endorsing a high LGBTQIA acceptance, will rate vignettes as more abusive.*

3.3 Hypothesis 3

Gender schema theory has shown that being female is associated with being emotional, devoted and in comparison, to being male, seen as tough, powerful and emotionless (Bem, 1981;

Rached et al., 2021). The male gender role schema is attributed being tough and violent and therefore holding the perpetrator role. This has influenced the notion that female perpetrators are judged as less abusiveness male perpetrators and further women not being seen as violent and holding the victim role (Bem 1981; Hassouneh & Glass, 2008; Turchik & Edwards, 2012). This effect potentially goes as far as an individual, for example, homosexual males being judged as less abusive, as they are assigned stereotypical female traits because they are not fulfilling the ideal of hegemonic masculinity due to of their sexual identity (Connell, 2015; Wakelin & Long, 2008). Furthermore, according to the sexual orientation hypothesis of McCreary's (p., 520, 1994) gay men are attributed a female gender role and feminine traits as they are attracted to the same biological sex as women

It is to be hypothesised that the level of abusiveness depends on the gender identity of the perpetrator as well as their displayed characteristics. This thesis will further broaden the investigation and use female perpetrators displaying stereotypical male characteristics in order to see whether the effect goes as far.

H3: Female perpetrators will be judged as less abusive.

H3(a): Vignettes that include female perpetrators will be judged as less abusive.

H3(b): Vignettes that include perpetrators who display female characteristics are judged as less abusive than perpetrators who display male characteristics.

H3(c): Differences in judgments regarding abusiveness are shown between vignettes, when perpetrators display female characteristics versus male characteristics.

3.4 Hypothesis 4

In studies comparing different forms of IPV, PIPV was consequently rated as less severe (see Capezza & Arriaga, 2008a, 2008b; Dardis et al., 2017; Lagdon et al., 2014). Even though this

study abstained from including physical and sexual forms of IPV, as it was important to solely focus on the perceptions of PIPV, it is acknowledged that between different acts of PIPV differential judgements could arise. It is to be hypothesised that psychological acts of IPV leading to physical or sexual consequences are rated as more abusive as they hold physical features. In addition, acts of PIPV that are perpetrated online and or through cell phones are possibly judged as less abusive, as it has been demonstrated to being a part of dating someone, as illustrated in previous studies (Lucero et al., 2014; Schokkenbroek et al., 2022). Furthermore, previous literature has shown that the attributed seriousness to a intimate partner dynamic influences the judgement of the abuse within the intimate partner dynamic (Williams et al., 2012). Therefore it is hypothesised that intimate partner dynamics in which individuals just started seeing each other will be rated as less abusive than intimate partner dynamic that have been in an exclusive relationship for a while.

H4: The kind of psychological abuse displayed influences the perception of abusiveness

H4(a): Vignette 2 displaying a situation that ends in unwanted sexual behaviours will be rated as more abusive than the other vignettes.

H4(b): Vignette 1 displaying a situation that includes digital forms of PIPV will be judged as less abusive than other vignettes.

H4(c): Vignettes that display intimate partner dynamics that include individuals Having dated for four months will be rated as more abusive than vignettes including partner dynamics that individuals that started seeing each other three weeks ago.

3.5 Hypothesis 5

Past findings have been incongruent regarding the influence of having had experienced IPV and its effect on the individual's judgement of a hypothetical abusive scenario. Some studies have found past experiences with IPV mitigates the individual's judgements regarding rating a scenario as abusive. Other studies however could not replicate this effect (Dardis et al., 2017). Besides these incongruences, none of these studies have looked at solely PIPV experience as an influencing factor, as well as testing this effect including any gender identity in participants as well as whether this effect exists when judging non-heteronormative partner dynamics. It is suggested that having experienced PIPV will lead to a lower recognition of the vignettes as abusive, as psychological abuse is often unrecognised by the abused individuals as well as trivialised by them, as a result of the missing education on and normalization of PIPV within society.

H5: Individuals who have experienced PIPV will judge the vignettes as less abusive.

3.6 Hypothesis 6

Vast evidence exists on psychological forms of IPV not being recognised or even being termed as abusive (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008a, 2008b, Dardis et al., 2017; Lagdon et al., 2014). Besides this being due to missing education on PIPV, it has been demonstrated that IPV legitimisation myths further play a role in this (see Cinquegrana et al., 2022; Taccini & Mannarini, 2023). This effect is potentially stronger in psychological forms of IPV as it is not a widely recognised form of IPV within society. Furthermore, some forms of PIPV, especially when perpetrated online and or jealousy is involved, have been proven to be seen as part of normal dating or simply seen as aggressive but not abusive (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010; Lucero et al., 2014). Therefore, it could be assumed that holding supporting attitudes towards psychological abusive behaviours and seeing

PIPV as less harmful than physical and sexual forms of IPV, will lead to rating the scenarios as less abusive. In addition, previous research demonstrated that men are more supportive towards abuse within intimate partner dynamics, as violence is legitimised in their gender specific norm (see Conroy et al., 2023; Garcia et al., 2020). It is to be hypothesised that male participants will have higher endorsement of supportive attitudes towards PIPV.

H6: Participants endorsing supporting attitudes towards PIPV will judge the vignettes as less abusive.

H6(a): Male individuals will have higher levels regarding endorsing supportive attitudes of PIPV.

3.7 Hypothesis 7

Overall, male perpetrators get attributed more blame than female perpetrators in studies using hypothetical vignette scenarios (Dardis et al., 2017; D'Costa & Saklofske, 2023). Gender specific norms dictate women as being caring, submissive and non-violent and also sexually passive versus men being the opposite. In a study by Capezza and Arriaga (2008c), it was further shown, that if female perpetrators held traits like being warm, caring and less negative, therefore traits belonging to the stereotypical feminine gender schema, they were judged as less blameworthy than if they held non-stereotypical female traits such as appearing as cold, though and distant.

Regarding blame attribution towards individuals who have experienced IPV, research has underscored, that men, in any age group, continuously attribute more blame towards the abused individual than women do (see Morrison et al., 2023; Dardis et al., 2017). Studies researching differences like this including non-heteronormative scenarios and looking for effects regarding other gender identities on this have yet to be done. Previous findings lead to question how blame

attribution is affected by non-heteronormative partner dynamics as well as whether feminine attributes also affect blame attribution regarding non female perpetrators. Based on previous findings the following hypotheses were constructed:

H7: Male perpetrators in heteronormative and non-heteronormative partner dynamics will be blamed more than female perpetrators in these partner dynamics.

H7(a): Less blame is attributed to perpetrators that display stereotypical feminine characteristics.

H7(b): Individuals endorsing PIPV acceptance attitudes will assign less blame to perpetrators.

3.8 Hypothesis 8

Research has demonstrated IPV legitimization myths are proliferating PIPV acceptance. This is partly done through blaming the abused individual for 'wanting' or having provoked the incident. It is hypothesised that endorsing PIPV perpetration will lead to higher levels of attributed blame towards the victim. In addition, studies have shown that men generally assign more blame towards the abused individuals compared to women. Studies have yet to discover this effect in relation to individuals not belonging to a binary gender identity. It is to be hypothesised that the effect of men assigning more blame towards the abused is robust towards the latter mentioned individuals.

H8: Individuals endorsing PIPV acceptance attitudes will attribute more blame towards abused individuals

H8(a): Men will blame the abused individual more than other individuals across all partner dynamics

4 Method

4.1 Access to the field

Individuals between 18 and 40 years old, living in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland, were recruited for the study. The age range was set as it is to be believed that the phenomenon of PIPV is something recent that has mostly gained recognition among the younger generations. As previous studies have shown that attitudes towards PIPV are different in children and adolescents only individuals above 18 years of age were included (see Morrison et al., 2023; Courtain & Glowacz, 2021). The sampling was reduced to participants local to Germany, Austria and Switzerland, as previous studies have predominately focused on non-German speaking regions.

The chosen sampling method was chosen was the snowball-process, which uses participants and individuals within the field to recruit more participants for the study (Przyborski & Wohlrab-Sahr, 2014). For the recruitment itself, flyers (see Appendix A) containing information about the study, as well as a QR Code, that when scanned lead to the online survey, were designed and shared digitally through personal and professional contacts, using social media networks such as Instagram, WhatsApp, and LinkedIn. The digital distribution was chosen to reach a broad spectrum of individuals from different backgrounds as well as assuring that enough participants were recruited.

4.2 Construction of the Vignettes

The vignettes were constructed using the Follingstad Psychological Aggression Scale (FPAS) that has been constructed by Follingstad et al. (2005) to choose the included acts of psychological abuse, within the vignettes. In pursuance of staying within the scope of the thesis framework the vignettes were limited to one severity level. Only the items coded as mild items, severity level A according to the FPAS, were included when constructing the vignettes. This also

assured the comparability between each vignette. Each vignette contained one form of psychological violence as means of keeping the data analysis within the thesis framework, avoiding interaction effects between certain acts of psychological violence, and keeping the vignettes as short as possible. The first vignette included acts of psychological abuse according to item 8A (*monitoring/checking)* of the FPAS. The second vignette entailed aspects of item 15A (*guilt induction/blaming)*, the third vignette used item 9A (*rigid gender roles*) and the fourth vignette displayed psychological violence according to item 7A (*jealousy/suspicion).*

Two of the vignettes showed psychological abuse within a dating dynamic, the individuals knew each other for three weeks. The other two vignettes showed psychological abuse within a partnership dynamic that has lasted for four months. The four different vignette base stories were each replicated using each of the four different victim-perpetrator dynamics. The victim-perpetrator dynamics used are Lea (bisexual cis-female) and Xandi (homosexual cis-female perpetrator), Maren (heterosexual cis-female) and Juli (heterosexual cis-male perpetrator), Tom (heterosexual cis-male) and Lina (heterosexual cis-female perpetrator), Aaron (homosexual cis-male) and Linus (homosexual cis-male perpetrator). This was done as it was hypothesised that the form of abuse was possibly judged differently, depending on the sexual identity and the gender identity of the perpetrator and victim included in the vignette.

Each vignette was accompanied by the same short description of the individuals included in the story, as well as their partner dynamic. All individuals were 25 years old and identified as cis gender. The attributes of the perpetrator, holding stereotypical feminine or masculine attributes, were manipulated for each perpetrator vignette by either stating *„…wears dark clothes, has short brown hair, and is rather tall“* or *„… wears pastels/wears colourful clothes, has long/longer blonde hair, and is rather petite“.* As previous research showed, stereotypical feminine attributes held by the perpetrator would mitigate or even erase the blame attribution towards the perpetrator, as women and individuals displaying or believed to display stereotypical female attributes are

judged as unharmful or unable to be violent (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008c; Hassouneh & Glass, 2008). Furthermore, it was hypothesised, that individuals that are described as stereotypical masculine and tall may appear as more violent, as these characteristics follow the stereotypical description of a perpetrator (Hamby & Jackson, 2010). When the perpetrator was described as stereotypical female the description of cis-female and cis-male perpetrators were sightly adjusted depending on the gender identity of the perpetrator regarding the colours of the clothes and the hair. Cis-female perpetrators were described as wearing *"pastels"* and their hair as *"long blonde"* versus in cis-male perpetrators the clothes were described as *"colourful*" and their hair as *"longer blonde".*

Following an example for one of the introductions:

„Lea is 25 years old and identifies as a bisexual cis woman. Lea and Xandi have been seeing each other for three weeks. Xandi is 25 years old and identifies as homosexual cis woman. Xandi wears dark clothes, has short brown hair and is rather tall."

Each vignette was constructed to consist of around 150 words, to assure that participants would not lose attention after reading four vignettes, and to keep the time needed to participate in the study to a minimum. All base vignettes were only adjusted by changing the names of the individuals included and their assigned pronouns. Only in the second vignette using rigid gender roles as a form of psychological abuse, the scenario was manipulated in one sentence. One of the insulting sentences was adjusted pushing for stereotypical feminine or stereotypical masculine behaviour of the abused, depending on the abused individual's gender identity. On the one hand, *"…Why can't you just look after me and be caring? "*, was used when pushing for a stereotypical female role in cis-female victims, utilising stereotypical feminine characteristic of being caring and devoted. On the other hand, the sentence *"…Why don't you have a backbone and behave like*

a man?“ was used when the perpetrator wanted the cis-male victims to adhere to a stereotypical male role, using the masculine characteristics of being strong and emotionless.

Following an example of a vignette as displayed in the survey, using the base vignette 2 and the partner dynamic Maren and Juli:

> *“Maren is 25 years old and identifies as a heterosexual cis woman. Maren and Juli have been seeing each other for three weeks. Juli is 25 years old and identifies as heterosexual cis man. Juli wears dark clothes, has short brown hair and is rather tall.*
>
> *Maren is out with her friends that evening and sees that Juli has texted her several times about what she is doing and where she is. Maren replies that she is in a bar with friends. After 10 minutes, she looks at her mobile phone and notices that Juli has texted her several times again: "Why aren't you saying anything? Who are you with and why aren't you answering me?". Maren apologises, saying she doesn't look at her phone as often because she wants to be with her friends. Juli replies with angry emojis: "Who are you there with now?" Maren is startled, feels uncomfortable but answers by telling him exactly who is there. Over the course of the evening, Juli keeps texting her and wants exact details about what's happening.”*

Taking all manipulations and partner dynamics into account, a total of 32 different versions of the four base vignettes were constructed. All the four base vignettes can be found in Appendix B.

4.3 Conduction of the Survey

The survey was constructed using the software SoSci Survey. The survey was published online on the 22nd of March 2024 and was open for entries until the 2nd of April 2024, therefore collecting data points for a total of 12 days. Within this period the recruiting flyer, attached in Appendix A, was published multiple times through private social media channels, and further distributed within internal communications of the psychosocial crisis helpline Krisenchat and through professional contacts. After seven days of marketing the survey, a disclaimer that stressed the possibility of anyone being able to join despite their sexual and or gender identity was issued, as many people who were reached by the flyer indicated not being sure if they could join, since they thought there would be restrictions as the study thematised abuse and was conducted as part of the gender studies masters' programme. After adding the disclaimer, the participation numbers rose by fifty participants within one day. In addition to private and professional contacts, the study was also marketed in Facebook study groups that target students all over Austria, Germany, and Switzerland regarding participations in online surveys.

The survey was programmed in SocSci survey in order to randomly assign each person who clicked on the survey link or scanned the assigned QR-code to one experimental group. A new assignment to a group only happened if the participant clicked on the link or scanned the QR code again. Therefore, participants could read the disclaimer and information text and complete the survey at a point of time of their choosing without being assigned to a new group.

4.4 Sample

Within the survey period, a total of 312 valid data points, meaning that all pages of the survey were completed, had been collected. After removing five data points for not passing the integrated

attention check and one for not living within Germany, Austria or Switzerland, 306 data points were eligible for the analysis.

Participants were between 18 and 40 years old with a mean age of 27 years of age ($\mu = 26.98$; $\sigma = 4.87$). Out of all participants fifty per cent indicated living in Germany, 46.7 per cent live in Austria, and 3.3% stated living in Switzerland. In the sample, 69.3 per cent identified as female, 23.2 per cent identified as male, 5.2% identified as non-binary, 1% as gender queer, 0.3% as gender fluid and 1% did not want to indicate their gender. Most of the participants identified as heterosexual, with 63.7 per cent, 11.1 per cent identified themselves as bisexual, 7.2% as pansexual, 5.9% identified as homosexual, 4,9% identified as bicurious, 2,3% identified as asexual, 1% as aromantic and asexual, 1% identified themselves as queer, 0.7% were unsure about their sexual identity, 0.3% identified as asexual and lesbian and finally 0.3% identified as pansexual and demisexual. Out of all participants, 1.6% did not want to indicate their sexual identity. The datapoints are not evenly distributed between the individual experimental groups. This is, on the one hand, due to the fact that if people clicked on the link they were already allocated to an experimental group and on the other hand due to exclusion of data points from the data set for not meeting the criteria.

4.5 Procedure

All participants got the same questionnaires with the difference being that the vignettes were manipulated for each experimental group. In pursuance of each participant reading four vignettes, that included each of the four different partner dynamics, and in addition, considering the manipulation of the characteristics of the perpetrator, a total of 20 experimental groups were derived. The software SoSci Survey was programmed so that each participant was randomly assigned into one group when clicking on the link for the study. As it was possible that people would follow the link but would maybe not start the study or finish it, the randomisation was

programmed to not create equal groups as this would skew the outcomes when dealing with unfinished datasets. The survey abstained from using the term psychological intimate partner violence, psychological abuse, or intimate partner violence as it was to be assumed that many individuals may not recognise these terms. Consequently, only direct descriptions of behaviours as well as examples were given in order to ensure the highest level of comprehension possible.

Participants were first presented with a brief introduction, the participation requirements, and a brief description of the researched topic. However, it was only mentioned, that the study would research the effect of certain factors on one's own judgement. This was followed by a trigger warning stating that the study uses short stories that could contain violent topics and that topics regarding gender justice and prejudice against LGBTQIA* individuals are addressed within the study. This ensured that participants knew what topics they would have to deal with, however, it did not fully inform them, and therefore influence the study outcomes, that the stories would contain abuse, as they would have to judge that later. After informing the participant about the usage of data, consent was obtained. If the participant did not consent to the participation the software automatically ended the study. When consent was obtained the software randomly assigned the individuals to a questionnaire group. The participant was once again informed about the potential triggers within the vignettes and that they could stop the study at any time without consequences. The participant was then presented with the first vignette. After reading it, the participant was asked to rate the whole situation on the next page. Following this, the behaviour of the perpetrator as well as the one of the victims were asked to be judged. Each participant did this process a total of four times, meaning that each participant read the same four base stories, but with four different partner dynamics, and rated the situation and the individuals afterwards. The vignette base stories were always in the same chronological order, starting with vignette 1 and ending with vignette 4. Vignette 1 and vignette 2 always displayed a dynamic in which the individuals started seeing each other 3 weeks ago. This was done to avoid any effects regarding

the order of vignettes exposed to. On the same page as judging the first vignette as well as the last vignette, an attention check was implemented, which asked the participant to answer a separate question by choosing “no” as the answer.

After reading and judging the vignettes, participants were asked to judge five statements regarding their acceptance toward PIPV. Subsequently participants were asked to indicate what acts of PIPV they have experienced themselves by judging seventeen umbrella categories modelled after the Follingstad Aggression Scale (Follingstad et al., 2005). Followed by this, participants were asked to judge sixteen statements regarding LGBTQIA* acceptance. The statements were derived from different questionnaires namely: Genderism and Transphobia Scale (Hill & Willoughby, 2005), the Attitudes towards Homosexuals Questionnaire (Kite & Deaux, 1986), the LGBT Assessment Scale (Logie et al., 2007) and the Sex Education and Knowledge about Homosexuality Questionnaire (Dunjić-Kostić et al., 2012). Finally, participants were asked to indicate their age, sexual identity, gender identity and their country of residence. After completing the study participants were informed about the end of the study and thanked for their participation. In addition, they were presented with a list of psychosocial helplines and chats as well as information about LGBTQIA* and abuse helplines and chats they could contact in case the study affected them in any way or they wanted to gain more information on IPV.

4.6 Materials

In the following, the used materials and questionnaires that were used are described in detail. The full questionnaires, as used in the survey using German language, can be found in Appendix C.

Perception of the vignette. In order to assess how participants judge each vignette, they were asked to rate the situation after each vignette by judging three items (*abusive, aggressive, harmless*) using a five-point Likert scale: 1 = *completely disagree*, 5 = *completely agree*.

Perceptions of the individuals in the vignette. Following the study design of Capezza and Arriaga (2008a) three items regarding the perception of the perpetrator (e.g. *I see Xandi's behaviour as abusive, I see Xandi's behaviour as acceptable behaviours towards an intimate partner, I find Xandi to blame for this situation*) and one regarding the abused individual (e.g. *I find Lea to blame for this situation*) were developed. Participants rated these statements through a five-point Likert scale: 1 = *completely disagree*, 5 = *completely agree*.

Acceptance of Psychological Intimate Partner Violence. Using the Follingstad Psychological Aggression Scale (Follingstad et al., 2005) item categories 6 (*verbal abuse/criticism*), 13 (*emotionally wounding behaviour around fidelity*), 10 (*control over personal behaviour*), 3 (*isolation and monopolization*) and 2 (*destabilising the person's perception of reality*) four statements were developed. The statements were formulated as subjective statements (e.g. *I see it as unproblematic if my whole life revolves around the person, I am intimate with and or is determined by them*). A fifth statement (*Verbal offences by people with whom I am intimate (e.g. insults or threats) are not as bad as physical or sexual offences*) was derived based on the previous research findings that psychological abuse is perceived as less harmful than physical and or sexual abuse within society (e.g., Capezza et al., 2021). All five items were judged through a five-point Likert scale: 1 = *completely disagree*, 5 = *completely agree*. The statements were not summed into a scale as it was not reliable (α = .28)

Previous experience of Psychological Intimate Partner Violence. The seventeen abuse categories of the Follingstad Psychological Aggression Scale (FPAS) (Follingstad et al., 2005) were used to assess previously experienced forms of PIPV by the participants and converted into seventeen items (e.g. *threats/intimidation, rigid gender* roles). The seventeen items of the FPAS

were translated to German. Each item was to be judged on a five-point Likert scale: 1 = *completely disagree*, 5 = *completely agree*. All items were summed into a scale (α = .94).

Acceptance of LGBTQIA* individuals. A combination of items from the Genderism and Transphobia Scale (Hill & Willoughby, 2005), the Attitudes towards Homosexuals Questionnaire (Kite & Deaux, 1986), the LGBT Assessment Scale (Logie et al., 2007) and the Sex Education and Knowledge about Homosexuality Questionnaire (Dunjić-Kostić et al., 2012) was used to comprise a scale assessing the individual's acceptance of LGBTQIA* individuals and topics. A total of sixteen items were used and translated into German (e.g. *Changing a person's gender (hormones and/or surgery) is against my moral values*, *People are either men or women*) The items were judged through a five-point Likert scale: 1 = *completely disagree*, 5 = *completely agree*. All items were summed into a scale (α = .85).

Gender identity. Individuals were asked to indicate their gender identity by using a single choice question, that included the options *"female", "nonbinary", "male"* and *"I identify myself as"* which had an open text field allowing individuals to name their identity if it was not displayed correctly in the options above. Finally, participants could also refrain from answering and choose *"no specification"*. Hence the gender identity being one of the key elements for the analysis it was crucial to design this item as accessible as possible.

Age. The item age was answered through an open text field stating, *"I am ... years old"*, allowing individuals to make precise indications regarding their age without having to scroll down a top-down selection, which resulted in a quicker answering time.

Sexual identity. Individuals were given the options *"asexual", "bisexual",* "*bicurious"*, *"polysexual"*, *"heterosexual", "homosexual", "pansexual"* and again an open text field starting

with *"I identify myself as",* which allowed the participant to name their sexual identity if it was not mentioned yet. The participant was also given the choice to choose *"no specification,"* if they did not feel comfortable sharing their sexual identity.

Country of residence. Individuals were asked to indicate the country they live in. Since the study focused on individuals living in Austria, Germany or Switzerland, these options were given. The participant could also choose *"none of the above-mentioned countries"* and was then excluded from the data analysis.

4.7 Data Preparation and Analytic Strategy

For the data analysis the IBM software SPSS Version 28.0.1.0 was used. The significance level was set at $\alpha = .05$. The data set for the analysis was created through the survey program SoSci Survey. Nonparametric tests as well as multiple regression analyses were conducted.

As previous literature did not show any specific effects for differences between nonbinary gender identities or non-heteronormative sexual orientations and as the collected data points were not sufficient in each non-heteronormative sexual or gender identity, the items sexual identity and gender identity were adjusted for analytical purposes. It is to be hypothesised that individuals who belong to a sexual or gender minority, regardless of which of these minorities they belong to spent an extensive time questioning and reflecting their identity. Consequently, it can be assumed that differences between each minority are not crucial regarding rating vignettes as abusive, but rather the sole belonging to a gender or sexual minority will already have an effect. As a result of this, the gender identity variable was categorised into 'female,' 'male,' and 'queer'. The latter term is used solely in regard to a queer gender identity, within the analysis. The variable sexual identity was reduced to individuals belonging to a heteronormative sexual identity and individuals belonging to a non-heteronormative identity.

The first hypothesis (H1) assumed there are differences regarding the judgment of the vignettes between gender identities. A non-parametric test, specifically the Kruskal Wallis test was conducted in order test for these differences. The sub hypotheses H1(a), suggesting that male participants would rate the vignettes as less abusive, and H1(b) which implied that participants who are neither female nor male will judge the vignette as less abusive were also tested through the Kruskal Wallis test.

For the second hypothesis (H2), which suggested that vignettes including non-heteronormative partner dynamics will be judged as less abusive than vignettes that include heteronormative partner dynamics and its sub hypothesis (H2(a)) that participants endorsing high LGBTQIA* acceptance rating the vignettes as more abusive multiple regression analyses were conducted for each vignette. Hypothesis 3 (H3) assuming that female perpetrators are judged as less abusive than male perpetrators was tested through a Friedman test. Effects for judging a vignette as less abusive when female perpetrators were included (H3(a)) as well as whether this effect was demonstrated when the perpetrator held stereotypical female traits (H3(b)) was analysed using a multiple regression analysis regarding each vignette. The sub hypothesis H3(c) regarding differences in judgment regarding abusiveness between vignettes between vignettes that included perpetrators with female traits or masculine traits, was assessed by using a Kruskal Wallis test.

In order to test for differences in the judgment regarding the act of PIPV displayed (H4) a Friedman test was conducted. The same test results were used to check for effects whether vignette 2 will be judged as more abusive than the other vignettes (H4(a)), if vignette 1 is judged as least abusive compared to other vignettes(H4(b)), and whether the displayed individuals were dating for 4 months or just seeing each other influenced the attributed level of abusiveness (H4(c)).

Hypothesis 5 (H5) suggesting that previous experience of PIPV will mitigate participants judging the vignettes as abusive was tested through multiple regression analyses for each vignette. The effect of endorsing supportive PIPV attitudes judging the vignettes as less abusive (H6) was

tested via multiple regression analyses, regarding each vignette. The sub hypothesis H6(a) which implied male participants holding higher supportive attitudes towards PIPV than other participants were tested administering a Kruskal Wallis test.

Higher blame attribution towards male perpetrators across all partner dynamics, as suggested in hypothesis 7 (H7) was tested by using a Friedman test. The sub hypotheses of less blame attribution towards individuals holding stereotypical feminine characteristics (H7(a)) as well was less blame attribution if PIPV accepting attitudes were endorsed (H7(b)) were tested through multiple regression analyses regarding each perpetrator.

Finally, hypothesis 8 (H8), stating that more blame would be attributed to the abused when the participant endorsed PIPV supportive attitudes and the sub hypothesis that male participants generally will attribute more blame towards the abused individual (H8(a)) were tested through multiple regression analysis regarding all abused individuals included in the vignettes.

Multiple regression analyses predictor variables did not meet the requirements of a normal distribution. It was expected that judging the situations as abusive, aggressive, and harmless would not be normally distributed as people would probably have tendencies towards extremes in the Likert-Scale. However, it is known that such tests can also be robust against non-normal distribution, therefore they are still applied within this thesis. The multiple regression analyses were tested regarding uncorrelatedness of residuals, using the Durbin Watson statistics and multicollinearity where the cut off value was set at <10 according to Netter et al. (1996).

A hierarchical regression analysis approach was chosen for all multiple regression analyses in order to see which PIPV acceptance items significantly add to the models, as PIPV acceptance could not be summed into a scale ($\alpha = .28$). The first block always included Age, Sexual identity, Gender dummy variables, LGBTQIA* acceptance and one's own PIPV experiences. Furthermore, in regression analyses with vignette judgment as a dependent variable the according vignette variables for heteronormative vs. nonheteronormative, masculine traits vs. feminine traits and male

perpetrator vs. female perpetrator were included within the first block. In regression analyses regarding blame attribution to the perpetrator included, the variable masculine versus feminine traits according to the partner dynamic that is analysed, was additionally included in the first block. In regression analyses looking at blame attribution towards the abused individual the first block included no extra variables. The second block was then filled with PIPV acceptance 3, followed by block three including PIPV acceptance 1, followed by block four including PIPV acceptance 2. In block five PIPV acceptance 5 was included and lastly block six included PIPV acceptance 4. The order of the PIPV acceptance item inclusion was based on their effect on the Cronbach's alpha when deleted from the scale.

5 Results

All multiple regression analyses had uncorrelated residuals according to Durbin Watson and values ranged between 1.90 and 2.06, which is within the normal range. All regressions were further checked for variance inflation factors (VIF) and were all <1.3, which is well below the cut-off value of 10, therefore no signs for multicollinearity were given (Netter et al. 1996). A full table including the tests statistics for each multiple regression analyses can be found in Appendix D.

The following results are reported according to the chronological order of hypotheses. Results from the regression analyses are demonstrated using the model with the highest change in significance level after hierarchically adding PIPV acceptance levels.

5.1 The Influence of Gender identity on the Judgement of the Vignettes

The first hypothesis suggested influences of the gender identity regarding the judgement of the vignettes (H1). We further hypothesised that male participants (H1(a)) and queer participants (H1(b)) would judge the vignettes as less abusive. The data that was collected was first assessed

regarding normal distribution. This was done by conducting a Shapiro-Wilk Test using gender identity as a factor variable. Individuals who did not indicate their gender identity were excluded from this analysis which reduced the sample to n =303. Data points were not normally distributed in any of the four vignettes regarding the judgement of abusiveness, aggressiveness or harmless. The Kruskal Wallis test was chosen in order to compare judgement tendencies between the different gender identity groups.

Each vignette was assessed regarding the judgement of it being abusive, aggressive, or harmless. The complete results of the tests for each vignette can be found in Table 1. In vignette 1, displaying online perpetration of monitoring and controlling, the Kruskal Wallis test showed that judgement of the vignette as 'abusive' (Chi-Square (2) = 11.75, p = .003) and as harmless (Chi-Square (2) = 13.12, p = .001) is influenced by the gender identity of the participant. Post – hoc tests revealed that male participants differed significantly from queer participants (z = - 2.47; p=.040), in judging the situation as abusive. When looking at judging the situation as harmless, significant differences between queer and male participants were found (z = -3.04; p =.007) as well as between female and male participants (z = -3.03; p =.007). It leads to assume that male individuals tend to rate the vignette as potentially harmless in comparison to female and queer participants.

For vignette 2, using guilt induction and blaming, the Kruskal Wallis test showed that judgement of the vignette as abusive (Chi-Square (2) = 17.06, p < .001) and as harmless (Chi- Square (2) = 12.78, p = .002) is influenced by the gender identity of the participant. Post – hoc tests revealed that male participants differed significantly from queer participants (z = 3.26; p =.003), as well as from female participants (z = -3.64; p = .001) when judging the situation as abusive. In the judgement of vignette 2 regarding it being harmless, a significant difference was found between queer and male participants (z = 2.91; p = .011) as well as between female and male participants (z = -3.08; p =. 006). It leads to assuming that male individuals tend

to rate the situation displayed in vignette 2 as potentially harmless in comparison to female and queer participants.

When looking at vignette 3, which displayed psychologically abusive acts that utilised rigid gender roles, the Kruskal Wallis test showed that judgement of the vignette as abusive was influenced by the gender identity of the participant (Chi-Square (2) = 11.07, p = .004). Post - hoc tests revealed that male participants differed significantly from female participants (z = 2.70; p =.020) as well as queer participants (z = -2.87; p = .012) when judging the situation as abusive. It leads to assuming that male individuals tend to rate the situation displayed in vignette 2 as potentially less abusive in comparison to female and queer participants.

Vignette 4 displayed a situation thematising jealousy and suspicion, the Kruskal Wallis test displayed that the judgement of the vignette as aggressive (Chi-Square (2) = 6.73, p = .035) as well, and regarding judging it as harmless (Chi-Square (2) = 6.75, p = .034), was influenced by the gender identity of the participant. Post – hoc tests revealed that female participants differed significantly from queer participants (z = -2.56; p = .031) when judging whether the situation could be categorised as aggressive. It leads to assuming that female individuals tend to rate the situation displayed in vignette 4 as potentially less aggressive in comparison to queer participants. When looking at whether a situation was judged as harmless, a significant difference was detected between divers and male participants (z = 2.57; p = .030). Illustrating that male participants tended to rate vignette 4 as more harmless than queer participants. All significant differences between gender identities show a low effect size according to Cohen (1992), and all effect sizes (see Table 2).

All in all, results show, that male participants gravitate towards rating the situations displayed as less abusive in vignettes 1, 2, and 3. In vignette 4, this effect was only shown when judging the situation as aggressive. In all vignettes, male participants had a higher tendency towards rating situations as potentially harmless as compared to female or queer participants.

Overall, queer participants show more tendency towards rating the vignettes as abusive and less tendencies to rate the situations displayed in the vignettes as harmless. The results prove the first hypothesis that gender identity influences the individual's judgement regarding whether a vignette is seen as abusive as well as our hypothesis H1(a) that male participants judged the vignettes as less abusive than other participants and in line with that they also tend to rate the vignettes as more harmless. However, the hypothesis H1(b) that queer participants will rate the vignettes as less abusive was not supported. The opposite effect was underscored. The results demonstrated that queer participants tended to rate the vignettes as more abusive and less harmless than other participants.

Table 1

Effect of gender identity on judgement of the vignettes (H1)

Variable	Test statistic	df	p
Abusive V1	11.75	2	**.003**
Aggressive V1	2.88	2	.237
Harmless V1	13.12	2	**.001**
Abusive V2	17.06	2	**<.001**
Aggressive V2	1.71	2	.424
Harmless V2	12.78	2	**.002**
Abusive V3	11.07	2	**.004**
Aggressive V3	1.48	2	.477
Harmless V3	3.04	2	.219
Abusive V4	5.29	2	.071
Aggressive V4	6.73	2	**.035**
Harmless V4	6.75	2	**.034**

a. V1 = Vignette 1; V2 = Vignette 2; V3 = Vignette 3; V4 = Vignette 4

b. The sample size was n = 303.

c. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 2

Effect sizes for significant post-hoc tests results

Significant pairwise comparisons	r
Abusive V1 male-queer	.14
Harmless V1 queer-male	.17
Harmless V1 female-male	.17
Abusive V2 male-queer	.20
Abusive V2 female-queer	.21
Harmless V2 male-queer	.17
Harmless V2 male-female	.18
Abusive V3 male-female	.16
Abusive V3 male-queer	.16
Aggressive V4 female-queer	.15
Harmless V4 queer-male	.15

a. V1 = Vignette 1; V2 = Vignette 2; V3 = Vignette 3; V4 = Vignette 4

b. The sample size was n = 303.

5.2 Non-Heteronormative Dynamics are seen as less abusive than Heteronormative Dynamics

In this subchapter we will look for potential support for the second hypothesis H2. In hypothesis 2 (H2) it was suggested that vignettes including non-heteronormative partner dynamics will be judged as less abusive. Furthermore, it was hypothesised that participants holding high

LGBTQIA* acceptance will rate the vignettes as more abusive than individuals with low LGBTQIA* acceptance (H2(a)). When looking at the results of the multiple regression analysis regarding judging the vignettes, no significant effects regarding vignettes including non-heteronormative partner dynamics being rated as less abusive can be found. Also, no significant effects for judging the vignette as less aggressive when non-heteronormative partner dynamics were judged, were found in any vignette. However, there is a significant effect regarding judging the vignette as harmless. In vignette 2, non-heteronormative partner dynamics do significantly impact judging the vignette as less harmless. Therefore, the opposite of our original hypothesis 2 is shown (see Table 3). Regarding hypothesis H2(a), higher LGBTQIA* acceptance has consistently been shown to influence the judgment of a vignette regarding abusiveness. High LGBTQIA* acceptance leads to judging a vignette as more abusive in vignette 1 (β = .15, t(301) = 2.32, p = .020; see Table 6), vignette 2 (β = .30, t(301) = - 4.90, p <.001; see Table 8), vignette 3 (β = .23, t(301) = 3.62, p <.001, see Table 9), and vignette 4 (β = .16, t(301) = 2.33, p = .020, see Table 10). In vignette 2 (β = .27, t(301) = 4.26, p <.001, see Table 7), and 3 (β = .19, t(301) = 2.79, p = .006, see Table 13), LGBTQIA* acceptance significantly predicted rating the vignette as more aggressive. Finally, LGBTQIA* acceptance further significantly precited rating vignettes 2 (β = - .40, t(301) = - 6.30, p = <.001, see Table 3), 3 (β = -.30, t(301) = - 4.53, p = <.001, see Table 14), and 4 (β = - .24, t(301) =- 3.71, p = <.001,see Table 16), as less harmless.[2] The presented results broadly confirm our hypothesis H2(a) by demonstrating LGBTQIA* acceptance as a protective factor towards rating the vignette as inaccurate regarding the scenarios displayed.

[2] Table 6 can be found in Subchapter 5.5, Table 7 can be found in Subchapter 5.6, Tables 8,9 and 10 can be found in Subchapter 5.7, Tables 13,14 and 16 can be found in Subchapter 5.8

Table 3

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 10 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 2 Regarding Harmlessness

	R^2	B	SE	t	p
Model	.28				<.001
Age		.04	.01	.80	.422
Sex ID		-.02	.09	-.34	.731
Gender male		.11	.10	2.01	**.045**
Gender queer		.00	.16	-.01	.995
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		-.40	.01	-6.30	**<.001**
Own Experience PIPV		.02	.00	.28	.775
V2 heteronormative vs. nonheteronormative		-.13	.08	-2.52	**.012**
V2 masculine traits vs. feminine traits		.02	.08	.34	.734
V2 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator		.17	.08	3.43	**<.001**
PIPV Acceptance 3		.14	.03	2.62	**.009**

a. Dependent variable: JudgmentV2: harmless.

b. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was ‘female.’

c. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = ‘male perpetrators’/’masculine traits’/’heteronormative dynamic’ and 1 = ‘female perpetrators’/’feminine traits’/’non heteronormative dynamic.’

d. The sample size was n = 301.

e. P- values in bold indicate significant effects.

5.3 Female Perpetrators or Individuals holding Female Traits are seen as less abusive

In hypothesis 3 (H3) it was assumed that female perpetrators are judged as less abusive than male perpetrators. In our sub hypothesis H3(a) we suggested that vignettes will be judged as less abusive when female perpetrators are included. Moreover, we hypothesised attributing less abusiveness towards a vignette will also happen when perpetrators display stereotypical female traits (H3(b)). In the third sub hypothesis H3(c) it was suggested that there will be differences in

judgment regarding abusiveness between vignettes when looking at vignettes including stereotypical feminine traits versus vignettes including stereotypical masculine traits.

H3 was tested for by using a Freidman test, since the data was not normally distributed. Significant differences between the mean ranks in attributing abusiveness towards the perpetrators were shown (ChiSquare (3) = 28.55, p <.001). Post-hoc tests revealed a significant difference between judging Lina and Xandi (z = 3.18, p = .009), as well as between judging Lina and Juli (z = 3.93, p =.001) and finally between Linus and Juli (z = 2.65, p = .049). Participants showed a tendency in rating Lina as significantly less abusive than Xandi and Juli. Furthermore, they judged Linus as less abusive than Juli. Regarding our hypothesis H3 only Lea was judged as less abusive than a male perpetrator. Therefore, the hypothesis H3was not fully confirmed.

The multiple regression analysis regarding H3(a) and H3(b) revealed only support for sub hypothesis H3(a). If the participants read vignette 2 including a partner dynamic that showed a female perpetrator, the vignette was rated as significantly more harmless than versions of vignette 2 that included male perpetrators (see Table 3, in Subchapter 5.2). Similar effects could not be demonstrated in any other vignettes (see Tables 7 – 17)[3]. Therefore, our hypothesis H3(a) could only be partly supported.

Effects for feminine attributes of perpetrators mitigating the rating of a situation as abusive have not been demonstrated in the multiple regression analyses in any vignette. Following our sub hypothesis H3(c) we further looked at the significant differences in tendencies implementing a Kruskal Wallis test, due to the non-normality of the data. Effects for significant differences in vignette 1 regarding the perception of the vignette being abusive (Chi-Square(1) = 4.71, p =.030) and aggressive (ChiSquare(1) = 4.12, p = .042) can be demonstrated. When reading a variation of vignette 1 and the perpetrator displayed feminine characteristics, tendencies of rating the vignette

[3] Table 7 can be found in Subchapter 5.5, Table 8 in Subchapter 5.6, Tables 9-11 in Subchapter 5.7, Tables 12-17 in Subchapter 5.8

as less abusive as well as less aggressive were shown. Therefore, our hypothesis H3(c) could partly be supported within the scenario of vignette 1.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of Judging the Perpetrators as Abusive

Perpetrators	*Abusiveness*
Xandi	M = 3.49 SD = 1.20
Juli	M = 3.54 SD = 1.18
Lina	M = 3.20 SD = 1.22
Linus	M = 3.26 SD = 1.25

a. The Freidman test compares mean ranks, as means of easier interpretation for the reader, means and standard deviations of the vignette ratings are given.

b. The attributed abusiveness to the perpetrator's behaviour was judged on a five-point Likert-scale with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

5.4 The Type of Psychological Abuse Displayed Influences Perceiving the Vignette as Abusive

In order to analyse differences between vignette ratings (H4) and whether vignette 2 (would be rated as more abusive (H4(a)) and vignette 1 as less abusive (H4(b)), and time and seriousness of partner dynamic would influence the level of abusiveness attributed (H4(c)), a Friedman test was conducted as the data did not follow a normal distribution. All means and standard deviations for each vignette can be found in Table 5. Full results of the Friedmann test can be found in Table 6. Differences between all vignettes regarding their attributed level of abusiveness have been

demonstrated (Chi-Square (3) = 219.74, p = .000). There was a significant difference in judging vignettes 1 and 2 as abusive (z = -8.30, p = .000). Further, significant differences in the judgment of the vignette as abusive was also demonstrated between vignettes 1 and 3 (z = -10.10, p = .000)., as well as Vignette 4 and 2 (z = 7.14, p <.001) and finally vignette 4 and 3 (z = 8.92, p = .000). Mean ranks did not significantly differ between vignette 1 and 4 (p = 1.000) and vignettes 2 and 3 (p = .446). A tendency towards ranking vignette 2 and 3 as more abusive has been underscored.

Significant differences between mean ranks could also be demonstrated between vignettes regarding the judgement of aggressiveness (ChiSquare (3) = 364.95, p =.000). Vignettes 2 and vignette 4 differed significantly (z = -6.92, p = .000) as well as vignette 2 and vignette 1 (z = 9.44, p = .000), vignettes 2 and 3 (z = -15.40, p = .000), vignette 4 and 3 (z = 8.47, p = .000) and vignette 1 and vignette 3 (z = -5.95, p = .000). Vignettes 4 and 1 did not differ significantly (p = .070). A tendency towards less attribution of aggressiveness in vignette 2 compared to all other vignettes has been displayed. In vignette 3, participants tended to rate it as more aggressive than the other vignettes. Vignettes 1 and 4 showed no difference in tendencies between each other.

Mean ranks between vignettes regarding the judgement of the displayed scenario being harmless differed significantly from each other (Chi-Square (3) = 112.07, p = .000). Specifically, significant differences could be found between the attributed level of harmlessness between vignette 2 and 3 (z = -3.43, p = .004), vignette 2 and 1 (z = 5.42, p = .000), vignette 2 and 4 (z = -7.44, p = .000) and vignette 3 and 4 (z = -4.00, p = .000). Mean ranks between vignette 3 and 1 (p = .281) and between vignette 1 and 4 (p = .261) did not differ significantly. A tendency regarding judging vignette 1 as more harmless than vignettes 2 and 3 as well as judging vignette 4 as more harmless than vignette 2 can be demonstrated. In addition, vignette 3 was also significantly judged as more harmless than vignette 2. These findings are in line with vignettes 2 and 3 being judged as more abusive than vignettes 1 and 4.

In line with our hypothesis H4 differences in rating a scenario as abusive, aggressive, or harmless have been demonstrated. In addition, as it was stated in sub hypothesis H4(a), vignette 2, that showed a scenario ending in unwanted sexual acts, was consistently rated as more abusive and less harmless than other vignettes. Moreover, vignette 3 further displayed similar tendencies in ratings. Regarding the sub hypothesis H4(b), vignette 1 was rated as more harmless and less abusive than other vignettes, assumed. However, similar effects have been demonstrated within tendencies of the ratings of vignette 4. Overall vignettes 1 and 4 have been rated as less abusive and more harmless than vignettes 2 and 3. Looking at the effect of seriousness of the relationship and time spent within it as suggested in sub hypothesis H4(c), no significant effects can be found. Vignettes 1 and 2 included the dynamics where individuals had just started seeing each other three weeks ago. However, only vignette 1 was rated as less abusive than vignettes 2 and 3. Vignette 2 posed as one of the vignettes rated more abusive and less harmless. Therefore, sub hypothesis H4(c) cannot be supported.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings Across Vignettes

Vignette	Abusive	Aggressive	Harmless
V1	M = 2.77	M = 4.32	M = 1.71
	SD = 1.17	SD =. 64	SD = .75
V2	M = 3.50	M = 3.39	M = 1.37
	SD = 1.28	SD = 1.11	SD = .74
V3	M = 3.68	M = 4.10	M = 1.59
	SD = 1.08	SD = .86	SD = .79
V4	M = 2.91	M = 4.71	M = 1.90
	SD = 1.18	SD = .53	SD = .94

a. V1 = Vignette 1; V2 = Vignette 2; V3 = Vignette 3; V4 = Vignette 4

b. The Freidman test compares mean ranks, as means of easier interpretation of the reader means and standard deviations of the vignette ratings are given.

Table 6

Friedman Test statistics

Variable	Chi-Square	df	p
Abusive	219.74	3	.000
Aggressive	364.95	3	.000
Harmless	112.07	3	.000

a. The sample size was n = 306

5.5 Effects of Sexual Orientation on the Perceptions of Vignettes

The following finding was not part of our hypotheses but is reported for informational reasons. Within the analysis, effects of sexual orientation on the judgment of the vignettes were demonstrated in vignette 1. When rating the vignette regarding abusiveness, it was demonstrated that a non-heteronormative sexual orientation (β = .14, t(301) = 2.11, p = .035) was a significant predictor for rating the vignette as abusive (see Table 7). This effect was solely demonstrated when rating vignette 1 as abusive but not in any rating dimension or vignette.

Table 7

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 10 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 1 regarding Abusiveness

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	0.14				<.001
Age		.05	.01	.95	.344
Sex ID		.14	.16	2.11	**.035**
Gender male		-.08	.16	-1.31	.190
Gender queer		-.03	.27	-.47	.639
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		.15	.01	2.33	**.020**
Own Experience PIPV		.01	.004	.18	.856

V1 heteronormative vs. nonheteronormative	-.04	.13	-.63	.532
V1 masculine traits vs. feminine traits	-.08	.14	-1.60	.113
V1 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator	-.08	.13	-1.59	.113
PIPV Acceptance 3	-.17	,059	-2.98	**.003**

c. Dependent variable: JudgmentV1: abusive.

d. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was 'female.'

e. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = 'male perpetrators'/'masculine traits'/'heteronormative dynamic' and 1 = 'female perpetrators'/'feminine traits'/'non heteronormative dynamic.'

f. The sample size was n = 301.

g. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

5.6 Effects of Age on the Judgment of Vignettes

Although not being part of the hypotheses, an effect for age being a predictor for rating the vignette as abusive has been demonstrated. In vignette 2, including pressuring an individual into unwanted sexual acts, age was a significant predictor (β = .21, t(301) = 3.58, p <.001) for rating the vignette es more aggressive (see Table 8). Showing that older participants rated vignette 2 as more aggressive than younger participants. This effect was solely shown in vignette 2 regarding judgement of aggressiveness.

Table 8

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 9 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 2 regarding Aggressiveness

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.13				**<.001**
Age		.21	.01	3.58	**<.001**
Sex ID		.01	.15	.16	.870
Gender male		.06	.16	1.01	.315
Gender queer		.03	.26	.43	.669
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		.27	.009	4.26	**<.001**
Own Experience PIPV		-.04	.004	-.78	.438

V2 heteronormative vs. nonheteronormative	.05	.13	.94	.350
V2 masculine traits vs. feminine traits	-.06	.13	-.98	.326
V2 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator	-.03	.16	-.53	.594

a. Dependent variable: JudgmentV2: aggressive.
b. V2 = Vignette 2
c. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was 'female.'
d. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = 'male perpetrators'/'masculine traits'/'heteronormative dynamic' and 1 = 'female perpetrators'/'feminine traits'/'non heteronormative dynamic.'
e. The sample size was n = 301.
f. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

5.7 Psychological Intimate Partner Violence (PIPV) Experience Influence on the Judgement of Vignettes

In this subchapter we will look at the results regarding our hypothesis H5, suggesting that previous PIPV experience will mitigate their judgement of a vignette being abusive. In vignette 2 (β = .12; t(301) = 2.26, p = .025) higher values in the own PIPV experience scale significantly influenced the judgment of the vignette as abusive (see Table 9). The same effect was shown in vignette 3 (β = .12; t(301) = 2.11, p = .036, see Table 10) and vignette 4 (β = .15; t(301) = 2.54, p < .001, see Table 11). Opposite to our hypothesis H5 and findings of previous research, previous experience of PIPV makes one more perceptible to recognising abuse in other scenarios. This effect however was not demonstrated in vignette 1 (see Table 7, in Subchapter 5.5).

Table 9

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 10 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 2 regarding Abusiveness

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.24				**<.001**
Age		-.02	.01	-.32	.752
Sex ID		.10	.16	1.35	.178
Gender male		-.07	.17	-1.29	.197
Gender queer		.02	.28	.41	.682
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		.30	.01	4.90	**<.001**
Own Experience PIPV		.12	.00	2.26	**.025**
V2 heteronormative vs. nonheteronormative		.07	.13	1.32	.187
V2 masculine traits vs. feminine traits		.02	.14	.41	.685
V2 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator		-.04	.13	-.81	.416
PIPV acceptance 3		-.16	.06	-2.97	**.003**

a. Dependent variable: JudgmentV2: abusive.

b. V2 = Vignette 2

c. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was ‘female.’

d. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = ‘male perpetrators’/’masculine traits’/’heteronormative dynamic’ and 1 = ‘female perpetrators’/’feminine traits’/’non heteronormative dynamic.’

e. The sample size was n = 301.

f. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 10

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 9 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 3 regarding Abusiveness

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.16				**<.001**
Age		.00	.01	.02	.987
Sex ID		.03	.14	.53	.598
Gender male		-.06	.15	-1.03	.302
Gender queer		.02	.25	.35	.723
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		.23	.009	3.62	**<.001**
Own Experience PIPV		.12	.003	2.11	**.036**
V3 masculine traits vs. feminine traits		-.05	.13	-.83	.408

V3 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator	-.08	.12	-1.54	.124
PIPV Acceptance 3	-.15	.05	-2.62	**.009**

a. Dependent variable: JudgmentV3: abusive.

b. V3 = Vignette 3

c. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was 'female.'

d. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = 'male perpetrators'/'masculine traits'/'heteronormative dynamic' and 1 = 'female perpetrators'/'feminine traits'/'non heteronormative dynamic.'

e. The variable V3 heteronormative vs. non-heteronormative was excluded from the analysis by SPSS.

f. The sample size was n = 301.

g. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 11

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 14 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 4 regarding Abusiveness

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.13				**<.001**
Age		.03	.01	.46	.648
Sex ID		.03	.16	.53	.599
Gender male		-.01	.17	-,12	.902
Gender queer		-.04	.28	-.74	.461
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		.16	.01	2.33	**.020**
Own Experience PIPV		.15	.00	2.53	**.012**
V4 heteronormative vs. non-heteronormative		-.02	.13	-.36	.718
V4 masculine traits vs. feminine traits		-.00	.14	-.05	.959
V4 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator		-.04	.13	-.76	.447
PIPV Acceptance 3		-.14	.06	-2.36	**.019**
PIPV Acceptance 2		.01	.06	.21	.837
PIPV Acceptance 1		.07	.10	1.16	.249
PIPV Acceptance 5		-.06	.08	-.99	.319
PIPV Acceptance 4		.12	.06	1.97	**.050**

a. Dependent variable: JudgmentV4: abusive.

b. V4 = Vignette 4

c. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was 'female.'

d. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = 'male perpetrators'/'masculine traits'/'heteronormative dynamic' and 1 = 'female perpetrators'/'feminine traits'/'non heteronormative dynamic.'

e. The sample size was n = 301.

f. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

5.8 Supportive Attitudes towards Psychological Intimate Partner Violence (PIPV) Influence on the Judgement of Vignettes

Hypothesis 6 (H6) implied that endorsing PIPV accepting attitudes would mitigate the individual's judgement of the vignettes as abusive. It was further implied that male participants would have higher levels of PIPV accepting attitudes (H6a). We tested for H6 using a multiple regression analysis which showed significant effects of supportive attitudes towards PIPV influencing the judgements of vignettes. As the five PIPV acceptance items were not reliable enough to be summed up into a scale (α = .27) they were individually added to the regressions. All items were included block wise into the regressions. The order was chosen after the effect on the Cronbach's alpha each item had been left out. Therefore, the PIPV acceptance item 3 was first included and then followed by 2, 1, 5 and lastly 4. A list of the PIPV acceptance items that were used can be found in Appendix C.

When participants endorsed item PIPV acceptance 3, which stated that physical and sexual forms of IPV being more harmful than psychological forms of IPV, they consistently rated vignette 1 (β = - .17, t(301) = -2.98, p = .003, vignette 2 (β = - .16, t(301) = -2.97, p = .003), vignette 3 (β = - .15, t(301) = -2.62, p = .009), and vignette 4 (β = -. 14, t(301) = -3.36, p = .019) as less abusive (see Tables 7, 9, 10 and 11)[4]. In vignettes 2 (β = .14, t(301) = 2.62, p = .009) and 3 (β = .15, t(301) = 2.71, p = .007), they further also rated the vignette as more harmless (see Tables 3 and 15)[5].

Participants that endorsed that seeing friends questioning their perception of reality after conflicts with their intimate partner (PIPV acceptance 5) is a normal part of a relationship rated vignettes 1 (β = .16; t(301) = 2.77, p = .006), vignette 3 (β = .20; t(301) = 3.56, p <.001) and

[4] Table 7 can be found in Subchapter 5.5, Tables 9, 10 and 11 can be found in Subchapter 5.7
[5] Table 3 can be found in Subchapter

vignette 4 (β = .23; t(301) = 3.94, p <.001) as significantly more harmless than participants who did not endorse this statement (see Tables 13, 15, and 17). In vignette 3 (β = - .15; t(301) = - 2.58, p = .010) and 4 (β = - .18; t(301) = - 2.94, p = .004) participants who endorsed this item also rated the situation as less aggressive than participants who did not endorse this item (see Tables 14 and 16). PIPV acceptance 1, stating monopolization of one's life through an intimate partner is seen as unproblematic, showed less level of aggressiveness attributed in vignette (β = - .11; t(301) = - 1.97, p = .050, see Table 12) as well as seeing vignette 1 as more harmless (β = .13; t(301) = 3.55, p <.001, see Table 13).

Seeing being insulted by one's intimate partner as unproblematic, which is stated in item PIPV acceptance 2, influenced rating vignette 1 (β = .,11; t(301) = - 1.97, p = .050, see Table 12) and vignette 3 (β = - .19; t(301) = - 3.28, p = 001, see Table 14) as less aggressive than individuals who did not endorse this statement.

Finally, individuals who endorsed the statement that having an intimate partner brag about individuals that potentially find them attractive or would make out with them is unproblematic (PIPV acceptance 4) rated vignette 4 (β = .12; t(301) = 1.97, p = .050, see Table 11) as more abusive. Besides the findings for PIPV acceptance item 4, endorsing PIPV supportive attitudes significantly predicted the vignettes being rated as less abusive, less aggressive, and more harmless. This confirms our hypothesis 6 (H6).

In addition to the multiple regression, a Kruskal Wallis test was done to check for differences between endorsing attitudes supportive of PIPV regarding gender identities (H6(a)).The Kruskal Wallis test was chosen as the data was not normally distributed. Significant differences were found for PIPV acceptance items 2 (Chi-Square(2) = 9.81, p = .007), 3 (Chi-Square(2) = 10.05, p = .007), 4 (Chi-Square(2) = 10.27, p = .006), and 5 (Chi-Square(2) = 11.11, p = .004). Post Hoc tests revealed a significant difference between female and male participants (z = - 3.06; p = .007) in PIPV acceptance item 2. It revealed that male participants tended to see constant insults from an

intimate partner as more unproblematic than female participants. In PIPV acceptance item 3, male participants once again differed significantly from female participants (z = - 3.09; p = .006). A significant higher tendency to seeing sexual and physical acts of IPV as more abusive than psychological acts has been demonstrated. Within PIPV acceptance item 4, queer participants had a significant higher tendency to see bragging about potential love interest to one's exclusive partner as unproblematic compared to female (z = - 3.05; p = .007), and male participants (z = - 3.11; p = .006). Finally, in PIPV acceptance item 5, queer participants significantly differed from male (z = 2.58; p = .029), and female participants (z = - 2.97; p = .009). Queer individuals showed a tendency to be less accepting towards destabilisation of the individual's perception of reality through a partner. The presented findings are supportive of our sub hypothesis H6(a) and demonstrate male participants as more endorsing of PIPV acceptance attitudes.

Table 12

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 12 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 1 regarding Aggressiveness

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.10				.003
Age		.06	.01	.97	.333
Sex ID		.11	.09	1.66	.097
Gender male		.06	.09	.96	.339
Gender queer		.06	.16	.90	.368
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		.09	.01	1.26	.210
Own Experience PIPV		-.01	.002	-.18	.859
V1 heteronormative vs. non-heteronormative		.06	.07	1.10	.272
V1 masculine traits vs. feminine traits		-.07	.07	-1.28	.201
V1 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator		-.09	.07	-1.53	.126
PIPV Acceptance 3		-.10	.03	-1.60	.110
PIPV Acceptance 2		-.11	.06	-1.97	**.050**
PIPV Acceptance 1		-.11	.03	-1.97	**.050**

a. Dependent variable: JudgmentV1: aggressive.

b. V1 = Vignette 1
c. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was ‘female.’
d. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = ‘male perpetrators’/’masculine traits’/’heteronormative dynamic’ and 1 = ‘female perpetrators’/’feminine traits’/’non heteronormative dynamic.’
e. The sample size was n = 301.
f. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 13

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 13 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 1 regarding Harmlessness

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.19				<.001
Age		-.06	.01	-1.00	.282
Sex ID		-.10	.10	-1.54	.126
Gender male		.12	.10	1.98	**.048**
Gender queer		-.02	.18	-.30	.763
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		-.06	.01	-.88	.381
Own Experience PIPV		-.09	.00	-1.58	.116
V1 heteronormative vs. non-heteronormative		.00	.08	.08	.939
V1 masculine traits vs. feminine traits		.03	.09	.62	.538
V1 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator		.06	.08	1.05	.295
PIPV Acceptance 3		.09	.04	1.52	.130
PIPV Acceptance 2		.19	.06	.30	.762
PIPV Acceptance 1		.13	.04	3.55	**<.001**
PIPV Acceptance 5		.16	.05	2.77	**.006**

a. Dependent variable: JudgmentV1: harmless.
b. V1 = Vignette 1
c. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was ‘female.’
d. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = ‘male perpetrators’/’masculine traits’/’heteronormative dynamic’ and 1 = ‘female perpetrators’/’feminine traits’/’non heteronormative dynamic.’
e. The sample size was n = 301.
f. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 14

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 12 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 3 regarding Aggressiveness

	R^2	β	SE	T	p
Model	.14				**<.001**
Age		.04	.01	.68	.494
Sex ID		-.00	.07	-.04	.970
Gender male		.11	.07	1.82	.069
Gender queer		.06	.13	.99	.321
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		.19	.01	2.79	**.006**
Own Experience PIPV		-.04	.00	-.68	.494
V3 masculine traits vs. feminine traits		-.04	.06	-.80	.427
V3 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator		-.01	.06	-.17	.866
PIPV Acceptance 3		-.05	.03	-.80	.429
PIPV Acceptance 1		-.04	.03	-.70	.488
PIPV Acceptance 2		-.19	.04	-3.28	**.001**
PIPV Acceptance 5		-.15	.03	-2.58	**.010**

a. Dependent variable: JudgmentV3: aggressive.

b. V3 = Vignette 3

c. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was ‘female.’

d. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = ‘male perpetrators’/’masculine traits’/’heteronormative dynamic’ and 1 = ‘female perpetrators’/’feminine traits’/’non heteronormative dynamic.’

e. The variable V3 heteronormative vs. non heteronormative was excluded from the analysis by SPSS.

f. The sample size was n = 301.

g. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 15

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 12 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 3 regarding Harmlessness

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.22				**<.001**
Age		-.07	.01	-1.20	.232
Sex ID		.10	.10	1.27	.205
Gender male		-.04	.11	-.67	.503
Gender queer		-.06	.18	-1.02	.311
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		-.30	.01	-4.53	**<.001**
Own Experience PIPV		-.02	.00	-.35	.725

V3 masculine traits vs. feminine traits	.07	.09	1.36	.175
V3 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator	-.04	.08	-.70	.484
PIPV Acceptance 3	.15	.04	2.71	**.007**
PIPV Acceptance 1	.01	.04	.16	.885
PIPV Acceptance 2	.02	.06	.33	.744
PIPV Acceptance 5	.20	.05	3.56	**<.001**

a. Dependent Variable: JudgmentV3: harmless.

b. V3 = Vignette 3

c. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was ‘female.’

d. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = ‘male perpetrators’/’masculine traits’/’heteronormative dynamic’ and 1 = ‘female perpetrators’/’feminine traits’/’non-heteronormative dynamic.’

e. The variable V3 heteronormative vs. non heteronormative was excluded from the analysis by SPSS.

f. The sample size was n = 301.

g. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 16

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 13 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 4 regarding Aggressiveness

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.10				**.028**
Age		.05	.01	.87	.385
Sex ID		.01	.12	.20	.839
Gender male		.02	.13	.32	.747
Gender queer		.11	.21	1.80	.073
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		.06	.01	.78	.436
Own Experience PIPV		.05	.003	.92	.358
V4 heteronormative vs. non heteronormative		-.06	.10	-1.09	.277
V4 masculine traits vs. feminine traits		-.06	.11	-1.07	.286
V4 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator		.01	.10	.24	.808
PIPV Acceptance 3		.04	.05	.59	.559
PIPV Acceptance 2		-.05	.05	-.83	.407
PIPV Acceptance 1		-.02	.08	-.27	.789
PIPV Acceptance 5		-.18	.06	-2.94	**.004**

a. Dependent Variable: JudgmentV4: aggressive.

b. V4 = Vignette 4

c. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was ‘female.’

d. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = ‘male perpetrators’/’masculine traits’/’heteronormative dynamic’ and 1 = ‘female perpetrators’/’feminine traits’/’non heteronormative dynamic.’
e. The sample size was n = 301.
f. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 17

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 13 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Vignette 4 regarding Harmlessness

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.20				**<.001**
Age		-.04	.01	-.73	.468
Sex ID		.05	.12	.82	.411
Gender male		-.01	.13	.24	.810
Gender queer		-.06	.22	-1.17	.245
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		-.24	.01	-3.71	**<.001**
Own Experience PIPV		-.06	.00	-1.14	.257
V4 heteronormative vs. non heteronormative		.10	.10	1.90	.058
V4 masculine traits vs. feminine traits		-.02	.11	-.43	.669
V4 male perpetrator vs. female perpetrator		.10	.10	1.82	.070
PIPV Acceptance 3		.07	.05	1.17	.242
PIPV Acceptance 2		.06	.05	1.08	.279
PIPV Acceptance 1		-.05	.08	-.86	.388
PIPV Acceptance 5		.23	.06	3.94	**<.001**

a. Dependent variable: JudgmentV4: harmless.
b. V4 = Vignette 4
c. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was ‘female.’
d. Vignette variables were dummy coded as 0 = ‘male perpetrators’/’masculine traits’/’heteronormative dynamic’ and 1 = ‘female perpetrators’/’feminine traits’/’non heteronormative dynamic.’
e. The sample size was n = 301.
f. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

5.9 Blame Attribution towards the Perpetrator

In the following the results for testing hypothesis H7, suggesting higher blame attribution towards male perpetrators as well as for testing hypothesis H7(a) stating that less blame is

attributed towards perpetrators holding stereotypical feminine characteristics are displayed. Furthermore results for testing hypotheses H7(b) which predicts less blame attribution if PIPV accepting attitudes are endorsed, are demonstrated.

The regression analysing blame attribution towards Linus is excluded since it was not significant ($F(12,288) = 1.18$, $p = .298$).

As a means to analysing differences in blame attribution between perpetrators, a Freidman test was conducted. The test was significant (Chi-Square (3) = 26.01; $p < .001$). Post-Hoc tests revealed that after the Bonferroni correction, only the difference between blame attribution towards Lina versus blame attribution towards Juli was robust ($z = 3.49$; $p = .003$). Mean ranks did not differ significantly between Lina and Linus ($p = 1.000$), Lina and Xandi ($p = .177$), Linus und Xandi ($p = 1.000$), Linus und Juli ($p = .084$), and Xandi and Juli ($p = 1.000$). Participants displayed a tendency to rating Juli as more blameworthy than Lina. Therefore, our hypothesis H7 was only partly supported.

Regarding our hypothesis H7(a), that perpetrators would be blamed less if they presented with feminine characteristics, the only significant effect demonstrated was in the blame attribution towards Xandi ($\beta = -.18$, $t(301) = -3.10$, $p = .002$, see Table 18). The hypothesis H7(a) could only be partly supported. When looking at the data regarding whether blame attribution towards the perpetrator is influenced by endorsing PIPV supportive attitudes significant effects can be demonstrated when looking at blame attribution towards Juli and Lina (see Table 19 and 20). When participants agreed to PIPV acceptance item 5, seeing it as a normal part of dating when one's perception of reality is questioned through their partner after each conflict, they attributed less blame towards Juli ($\beta = -.13$, $t(301) = -2.17$, $p = .031$) and Lina ($\beta = -.15$, $t(301) = -2.50$, $p = .014$) was lower. Participants that agreed with experiencing constant verbal assault through an intimate partner as being normal attributed less blame towards Juli's behaviours ($\beta = -.22$, $t(301) = -3.19$, $p = .031$). Therefore, the data results support hypothesis H7(b).

In accordance with findings in Subchapter 5.2, LGBTQIA* acceptance was a protective factor towards judging perpetrators as less blameworthy. Blame attribution towards Juli (β = .21, t(301) = 3.09, p = .002, see Table 19) and Lina (β = .22, t(301) = 3.27, p = .001, see Table 20) was significantly lower when LGBTQIA* acceptance was high. This however was not demonstrated when looking at blame attribution towards Xandi (β = .08, t(301) = 1.24, p = .217, see Table 18).

Table 18

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 8 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Xandi being to blame for the Situation

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.03				.052
Age		-.06	.01	-.98	.327
Sex ID		-.02	.11	-.26	.798
Gender male		-.10	.12	-1.12	.243
Gender queer		-.04	.20	-.72	.471
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		.08	.01	1.24	.217
Own Experience PIPV		.00	.00	.07	.941
Masculine traits vs. feminine traits (XL)		-.18	.10	-3.10	**.002**

a. Dependent variable: 'I think Xandi is to blame for the situation.'

b. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was 'female.'

c. The variable masculine traits vs. feminine traits (XL) coded as 0 = 'masculine traits' and 1 = 'feminine traits' in all vignettes that included Xandi and Lea.

d. The sample size was n = 301.

e. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 19

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 11 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Juli being to blame for the Situation

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.13				**<.001**
Age		-.07	.01	-1.30	.193
Sex ID		-.07	.108	-1.00	.316
Gender male		.01	.11	.18	.860
Gender queer		-.10	.19	-1.70	.090
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		.21	.01	3.09	**.002**
Own Experience PIPV		-.01	.00	-.21	.834
Masculine traits vs. feminine traits (JM)		-.01	.09	-.17	.869
PIPV Acceptance 3		.10	.04	1.74	.084
PIPV Acceptance 1		.04	.07	.61	.543
PIPV Acceptance 2		-.22	.04	-3.19	**<.001**
PIPV Acceptance 5		-.13	.05	-2.17	**.031**

a. Dependent variable: 'I think Juli is to blame for the situation.'

b. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was 'female.'

c. The variable masculine traits vs. feminine traits (JM) coded as 0 = 'masculine traits' and 1 = 'feminine traits' in all vignettes that included Juli and Maren.

d. The sample size was n = 301.

e. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 20

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 11 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Lina being to blame for the Situation

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.13				**<.001**
Age		-.08	.01	-1.50	.142
Sex ID		-.06	.11	-.95	.345
Gender male		-.06	.12	-1.10	.287
Gender queer		.03	.20	.48	.630
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		.22	.01	3.27	**.001**
Own Experience PIPV		.09	.00	1.50	.134

Masculine traits vs. feminine traits (LT)	.05	.10	.92	.356
PIPV Acceptance 3	.04	.04	.73	.468
PIPV Acceptance 2	-.01	.07	-.29	.770
PIPV Acceptance 1	-.07	.04	-1.27	.205
PIPV Acceptance 5	-.15	.05	-2.50	**.014**

a. Dependent variable: 'I think Lina is to blame for the situation.'

b. The chosen reference category for the dummy gender variables was 'female.'

c. The variable masculine traits vs. feminine traits (LT) coded as 0 = 'masculine traits' and 1 = 'feminine traits' in all vignettes that included Lina and Tom.

d. The sample size was n = 301.

e. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

5.10 Blame attribution towards the abused individual

In the beginning we stated that participants would attribute more blame toward the abused individual when the participant judging the vignette endorses PIPV supportive attitudes, as hypothesised in H8. Further we suggested that male participants generally attribute more blame towards abused individuals in sub hypothesis H8(a).

The regression analysing blame attribution towards Aaron is excluded since it was not significant ($F(5,295) = 1.19$, $p = .312$).

Endorsing PIPV supportive attitudes was a significant predictor for attributing more blame towards the abused individual concerning Maren and Tom (see Tables 22 and 23). The regression regarding blame attribution towards Lea excluded PIPV acceptance items as none of the items did significantly contribute to the model. Maren ($\beta = .18$; $t(301) = 3.11$, $p = .002$) and Tom ($\beta = .17$; $t(301) = 2.80$, $p = .006$) were both attributed more blame if participants agreed with PIPV acceptance item 5, which stated the constant destabilisation of the individual's reality is unproblematic. Maren further got attributed less blame if individuals agreed with PIPV acceptance item 4 ($\beta = -.11$, $t(301) = -1.97$, $p = .050$, see Table 22), which indicated making one's partner jealous and questioning one's faithfulness on purpose. The negative effect on blame attribution is

probably explained due to the fact, that PIPV acceptance item 4 was phrased conflictingly (see Chapter 6). The presented results give support for hypothesis 8 (H8).

A significant effect for male participants blaming abused individuals more than female or queer participants, were only demonstrated when looking at blame attribution towards Lea (β = .24, t(301) = 2.23 p = .027) (see Table 21). Consequently, hypothesis H8(a) was therefore only partly supported.

Outside of the proposed hypotheses it was demonstrated that blame attribution towards Maren (β = - .29, t(301) = - 4.40 p = <.001, see Table 22) and Tom (β = - .14, t(301) = - 2.10, p = .040, see Table 23) was lower if participants had high LGBTQIA* acceptance. This is in line with higher blame attribution towards perpetrators (see Subchapter 5.9) and over all judging the vignette as more abusive and less harmless when having high LGBTQIA* acceptance (see Subchapter 5.2). This however was not the case regarding blame attribution towards Lea (β = - .12, t(301) = - 1.87, p = .063, see Table 21).

Table 21

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 7 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Lea being to blame for the Situation

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.05				**.031**
Age		.09	.01	1.50	.148
Sex ID		.04	.11	.54	.589
Gender male		.14	.12	2.23	**.027**
Gender queer		.02	.20	.37	.714
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		-.12	.01	-1.87	.063
Own Experience PIPV		-.01	.00	-.18	.861

a. Dependent variable: ‘I think Lea is to blame for the situation.’

b. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was ‘female.’

c. The sample size was n = 301.

d. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 22

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 12 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Maren being to blame for the Situation

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.20				**.003**
Age		.05	.01	.90	.369
Sex ID		.08	.11	1.34	.181
Gender male		.01	.11	.10	.918
Gender queer		.02	.19	.31	.756
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		-.29	.01	-4.40	**<.001**
Own Experience PIPV		-.06	.00	-1.00	3.16
PIPV Acceptance 3		-.07	.04	-1.29	.197
PIPV Acceptance 2		.16	.04	2.93	.004
PIPV Acceptance 1		.01	.07	.14	.892
PIPV Acceptance 5		.18	.05	3.11	**.002**
PIPV Acceptance 4		-.11	.04	-1.97	**.050**

a. Dependent variable: 'I think Maren is to blame for the situation.'

b. The reference category chosen for the dummy gender variables was 'female.'

c. The sample size was n = 301.

d. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

Table 23

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of 7 Predictor Variables Association with the Judgment of Tom being to Blame for the Situation

	R^2	β	SE	t	p
Model	.10				**.006**
Age		.07	.01	1.24	.216
Sex ID		.09	.11	1.40	.163
Gender male		-.06	.12	-.91	.365
Gender queer		-.07	.20	-1.20	.230
LGBTQIA* Acceptance		-.14	.01	-2.10	**.040**
Own Experience PIPV		-.06	.00	-1.01	.314
PIPV Acceptance 3		.05	.04	.75	.452
PIPV Acceptance 2		-.01	.07	-.23	.817
PIPV Acceptance 1		.04	.04	.70	.489
PIPV Acceptance 5		.17	.05	2.80	**.006**

a. Dependent variable: 'I think Tom is to blame for the situation.'

b. The chosen reference category for the dummy gender variables was 'female.'

c. The sample size was n = 301.
d. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect.

5.11 Psychological Intimate Partner Violence (PIPV) Experiences within the Sample

The prevalence rate of PIPV within the sample and their gender differences were not included within hypotheses but are displayed here as a means to informative measures. Within the survey, participants also had to indicate their own experiences made regarding experiencing or having experienced acts of PIPV. The overall scale (lowest value 17; highest value 80), modelled after the FPAS (Follingstad et al., 2009), had an average score of 45 (M = 45.06; SD = 17.63). In total 6.5% of all participants indicated never having experienced any of the seventeen forms of PIPV in the past or present time. The most frequent experienced form of PIPV was the destabilization of the individual's perception of reality, which 64 per cent of participants had experienced. The second most experienced form of PIPV was having experienced guilt induction, through a current or former partner, with 53 per cent. In addition, verbal abuse and criticism was further illustrated as a frequent form of PIPV experienced within the sample with 47.7 per cent (see Table 24 for a full overview). When looking at gender differences from the percentages alone one can see that queer individuals have indicated having experienced more forms of PIPV more frequently. Queer individuals also present with the highest experience rate of being forced into rigid gender roles with 65 per cent. Overall past experiences made by individuals holding a queer gender identity are even higher than the ones displayed in the other gender identities.

When looking at whether significant differences between gender identities exists a Kruskal Wallis test was administered, since the data was not normally distributed. Significant differences between groups could be found (Chi-Square (2) = 10.42, p = .005, n = 303). Post-hoc tests revealed that male participants differed significantly from female participants (z = 2.58, p = .030). They further showed that male and queer individuals also differed significantly (z = - 2.82, p = .014).

Results clearly demonstrate that male participants had a tendency towards having experienced less PIPV from a current or former partner.

All in all, results show significant differences in experiences between gender identities as well as differences within each form of PIPV between the gender identities. Queer individuals show the highest percentages in destabilising the persons reality and (75 per cent) and rigid gender roles (65 per cent) compared to female participants (destabilising persons perception of reality: 66 per cent; rigid gender roles: 40.1 per cent) and compared to male participants (destabilising persons perception of reality: 57.8 per cent; rigid gender roles: 16.9 per cent).

Table 24

Frequencies of PIPV Forms within the Sample

Act of psychological abuse	Percentage of Participants Indicating having experienced PIPV			
	Total	Female	Male	Queer
Threats/intimidation	31%	35.9%	16.9%	35%
Destabilising the persons perception of reality	64%	66%	57.8%	75%
Isolation/monopolization	31%	31.6%	29.5%	45%
Treatment as inferior	23.6%	37.8%	18.3%	50%
Establish power through refusals	32.6%	32.6%	28.1%	55%
Verbal abuse/criticism	47.7%	50%	36.6%	70%
Jealousy/suspicion	44.1%	45.3%	43.7%	40%
Monitoring/checking	24.5%	26%	18.3%	35%
Rigid gender roles	36%	40.1%	16.9%	65%

Control over personal behaviour	32.6%	34.9%	38%	50%
Withholding emotionally/physically	38.2%	39.6%	35.2%	40%
Public embarrassment	13.7%	14.2%	9.8%	25%
Emotionally wounding behaviour around fidelity	34.6%	38.2%	28.2%	25%
Lying/deception	42.5%	44.3%	36.7%	50%
Guilt induction/blaming	53%	55.7%	42.3%	70%
Manipulation	42.4%	45.2%	32.4%	55%
Attacking looks and sexuality	20.4%	34.9%	15.5%	40%

a. The sample size was n = 306
b. Queer refers to individuals that indicated a gender identity that was not 'male' or 'female'

5.12 Overview of Supported and Non-supported Hypotheses

An overview of all hypotheses is given in Table 25. Hypotheses are shown chronologically and are categorised by being supported or not supported. Hypotheses are indicated as supportive also if there was only partial support towards the hypothesis.

Table 25

Hypothesis	Supported/ Not supported	Supported regarding…
Hypothesis 1	S	Gender identity did influence the judgement of the vignettes .
Hypothesis 1(a)	S	Male participants trivialised the vignettes
Hypothesis 1(b)	nS	Queer individuals rated vignettes as more abusive.
Hypothesis 2	nS	-
Hypothesis 2(a)	S	V1, V2, V3, V4
Hypothesis 3	nS	Only one FP was judged as less abusive
Hypothesis 3(a)	S	FP in V2 lead to judging it more harmless

Hypothesis 3(b)	nS	-
Hypothesis 3(c)	S	Significant in V1
Hypothesis 4	S	Differences between vignettes are significant
Hypothesis 4a	S	V2 is rated as more abusive
Hypothesis 4(b)	S	V1 is rated as less abusive
Hypothesis 4(c)	nS	-
Hypothesis 5	nS	-
Hypothesis 6	S	V1, V2, V3, V4
Hypothesis 6(a)	S	Male participants have higher PIPV acceptance.
Hypothesis 7	S	Only supported regarding differences Juli-Lina.
Hypothesis 7(a)	S	Only supported regarding blame towards Xandi.
Hypothesis 7(b)	S	Supported regarding Juli and Lina.
Hypothesis 8	S	Supported regarding Maren and Tom.
Hypothesis 8(a)	S	Male participants blame abused individuals more.

a. V1 = Vignette 1; V2 = Vignette 2; V3 = Vignette 3; V4 = Vignette 4

b. FP = female perpetrator

c. S = supported, nS = not supported

6 Discussion

Taking all results into account various effects can be demonstrated. As predicted, male participants rated the vignettes as less abusive and tended to be rating the scenarios as more harmless compared to female and queer individuals. Previous research has also reported this effect in studies that solely focussed on heterosexual dynamics when including only male and female

participants (see Capezza & Arriaga, 2008b & Dardis et al., 2017). Therefore, the current findings deliver a new perspective on queer attitudes towards PIPV. Queer individuals showed a strong tendency to condemn the scenarios as abusive and rate them as less harmless compared to other participants. In previous research, the opposite was suggested as queer individuals were more likely to ignore IPV within their dynamics (see Hassouneh & Glass, 2008). This was hypothesised to be originating in the belief that IPV is confined to heteronormative partner dynamics since IPV traditionally was believed to solely stem from traditional gender specific norms which are assumed to be obsolete in non-heteronormative partner dynamics (Hassouneh & Glass, 2008). The current findings could be explained by the fact that holding a non-heteronormative gender identity comes with having questioned societal beliefs and having reflected on one's own identity. This process also potentially opens the individual discourse on personal boundaries and their violations. Therefore, they may recognise situations as abusive more quickly. Queer individuals specifically condemned violence in vignette 2, thematising pressuring an individual in unwanted sexual actions and in vignette 3 which entailed forcing the abused individual into rigid gender roles. Taking aside that vignette 2 was rated overall as quite abusive due to the sexual aspect, it can be assumed that queer individuals are especially sensitive to topics regarding being forced into a rigid gender role. Queer individuals continuously challenge the binary and heteronormative belief system and try to break out of it. Hence, they are constantly challenged with patriarchal and binary beliefs within society and potentially therefore react more strongly than other individuals. Moreover, queer individuals are probably more likely to recognise when stereotypic gender norms are applied than others. The current findings suggest that the perceptions of PIPV within the LGBTQIA* community have potentially changed. The results further show that more research combining all gender identities and not only including either heteronormative or non-heteronormative partner dynamics is needed as a means to check for diverse influencing factors.

Non-heteronormative partner dynamics were not significantly rated as less abusive than heteronormative dynamics. The only significant effect demonstrated for differences in judgements between heteronormative and non-heteronormative partner dynamics was demonstrated in vignette 2. In vignette 2 non-heteronormative vignettes were rated as significantly less harmless than vignette 2 variations that included heteronormative partner dynamics. Therefore, the opposite of the proposed hypothesis 2 was demonstrated. Non-heteronormative intimate partner dynamics were not rated as less abusive but even taken more seriously, at least concerning vignette 2. This is probably also in connection with queer participants' overall rating of the vignettes as more abusive and less harmless than other participants within the study. Being in line with these findings LGBTQIA* acceptance has continuously proven to be a significant predictor for judging the scenarios as more abusive, more aggressive, and less harmless across all vignettes. Follwoing this, blame attribution towards the perpetrators was proven to be higher if participants had a high LGBTQIA* acceptance. Further, blame towards abused individuals was attributed less when LGBTQIA* acceptance was high. It is to be assumed that higher LGBTQIA* acceptance is connected to higher knowledge regarding the influence of gender-specific norms towards our behaviours as well as in society. This knowledge potentially also leads to more awareness about personal boundaries and when they are crossed. The sensibility regarding accurate blame attribution concerning the perpetrator and less blame attribution towards the individual further underlines that education and awareness of gender and sexual identities as well as individual boundaries make individuals less perceptible to engage in traditional blame attribution towards the abused individual. Further studies regarding the influence of feminist ideals and gender norm beliefs could give more insight into what influences accurate judgments and blame attribution towards perpetrators and abused individuals.

Female perpetrators were not uniformly rated as less abusive than male perpetrators. However, results showed that Lina and Linus were consequently rated as less abusive than Xandi

and Juli. Therefore, the suggested hypothesis 3 could not be supported. However, Lina poses as the only heterosexual female perpetrator and Linus as the homosexual perpetrator, which could indicate an influence of the "sexual orientation hypothesis" of Mc Creary (p.520, 1994), which states that because homosexual men and heterosexual women have sexual attraction towards the same gender, they are attributed the same feminine identity. In a previously mentioned study by Wakelin and Long (2008), it was demonstrated that based on the sexual orientation hypothesis homosexual men and heterosexual women were attributed the same amount of blame when being raped. It could be hypothesised that this effect also demonstrates when judging other forms of abuse and further being robust when judging perpetrators instead of abused individuals. Even though these results were not controlled for masculine and feminine traits displayed it could be hypothesised that the stereotypical image of a lesbian image includes a rather tough appearance which adheres more with the stereotypical masculine picture and therefore is categorised within the gender schema of a perpetrator. Future research regarding IPV could further investigate which stereotypical gender attributes and therefore which role within an abusive dynamic is attributed towards which individual, and how this is influenced by gender and sexual identity. Moreover, further studies should test the robustness of lesbian women and heterosexual men are judged equally just as homosexual men and heterosexual women are.

Scenarios that included female perpetrators were consistently not rated as significantly less abusive across all vignettes. However, in vignette 2, which ended in the abused engaging in unwanted sexual activities, variations that included female perpetrators were significantly rated as more harmless than variations that included male perpetrators. This could be due to gender schemas not seeing women as perpetrators of sexual abuse and in addition stereotypically not seen in the perpetrator role (see Denov, 2001; Hassouneh & Glass, 2008; Turchik & Edwards, 2012). In the past, it has further been demonstrated by research that perceptions of female perpetrated sexual abuse are fuelled by stereotypical gender specific norms that exclude women from being

seen as perpetrating sexual abuse and go as far as influencing professional's opinions as not accepting them as perpetrators (Denov, 2001; Clements et al., 2013). No broad effects for rating vignettes as less abusive or more harmless when perpetrators who held feminine traits were found. When looking at the general judgment of the vignette tendencies towards rating the scenario in vignette 1 as less abusive and less aggressive when female traits were applied to the perpetrator were shown. Vignette 1 included a scenario where the perpetrator used excessive text messages to control and monitor the abused individual. It could be hypothesised that being overly concerned and engaging in a lot of contact is seen as stereotypical female and consequently rated as less abusive and less aggressive since it fits in the gender schema for women. The lack of a broad effect is probably because manipulations of feminine and masculine characteristics through a short description were not strong enough to influence the participants. Studies using stronger manipulations with the potential additional visual stimuli of the perpetrators could deliver more significant results.

Differences between the form of PIPV that was displayed in the vignettes were found. Participants tended to rate vignettes 2 and 3 as more abusive than vignettes 1 and 4. The vignettes 1 and 4 were perceived as rather aggressive and more harmless. Vignette 2 included sexual acts, hypothesis 4(a), this scenario was more likely to be rated as abusive as sexual elements were included, was supported. This was based on the notion that physical and sexual elements are more likely to be recognised as they are more commonly known in society. Furthermore, vignette 2 which included pressuring the abused individual into unwanted sexual acts, was rated as more aggressive with higher age. It can be hypothesised that violating one's boundaries regarding sexual acts is seen as more aggressive in older participants because awareness regarding personal boundaries and consent are recent topics. Older participants potentially have crossed their personal boundaries in the past and therefore frame it as aggressive rather than abusive. By this, they do acknowledge that such actions may not be harmless yet do not frame their own experiences as

abusive. Vignette 3, which included forcing the abused individuals into rigid gender roles, was also rated as more abusive, as hypothesised. The higher level of abusiveness attribution is partly explained by queer individuals being more condemning towards abusiveness when rigid gender roles are included. Moreover, it could also illustrate that forcing stereotypical gender roles onto individuals is not highly accepted within the sample as the mean age was 27 years of age. The sample potentially is highly perceptible towards old traditional gender roles and the vignettes used quite drastic and extreme gender roles. Furthermore, forcing one into rigid gender roles further constitutes one of the forms of PIPV that especially attack one's identity and integrity. It could be hypothesised that such forms of PIPV are more easily recognised as they openly and directly target the person, than other more subtle forms of PIPV. Looking closer at the effect of age and generational tendencies towards PIPV including rigid gender roles as a form of abuse could be researched in future studies that also include adolescents. Vignettes 1 and 4 include forms of monitoring and controlling as well as jealousy and suspicion. Both acts of PIPV could be displayed as acts of PIPV that are often framed as a normal part of dating within society and hence judged as less abusive. Vignette 1 being rated as more harmless and less abusive is in line with the hypothesis and current research that online perpetration of PIPV is trivialised due to it being seen as normal parts of dating (Lucero et al.,2014). Vignette 4 included questioning the partner's faithfulness and displaying extreme jealousy. Jealously is a construct that is normalised within our society and often framed as a sign of love rather than an indicator of potential unhealthy relationship behaviours (Jiménez-Picón et al., 2023). The analysis revealed no significant effects regarding the type of intimate partner dating dynamic displayed. Even though vignette 1, which was one of the scenarios including a sporadic dating dynamic where individuals have been seeing in other for 3 weeks, was rated as less abusive, this effect is probably due to the online perpetration of PIPV. Vignette 3 which was the second scenario including sporadic dating was rated as even more abusive than other vignettes instead of less abusive due to the short time spent within the

partner dynamic. The failed proof for attributing more abusiveness to more serious relationships is probably due to the fact that the manipulation was not strong enough. In addition, vignettes 1 and 3 both displayed an act of PIPV that were attributed to opposite levels of abusiveness. All in all, the results once again underscore the need for more education on the different possible forms of PIPV and their online perpetration, as online perpetration is possible at any time it is hypothesised to be longer lasting and therefore more harmful than in-person perpetration (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010).

At the beginning of the thesis, it was hypothesised that previous experience of PIPV would mitigate the perceptions of the vignettes as abusive, following previous findings in other studies (see Dardis et al., 2017). However, the opposite was demonstrated within the current sample. Previous PIPV experience was a significant predictor for rating vignettes 2, 3 and 4 as more abusive than when someone has not experienced PIPV. Taking aside that Vignettes 2 and 3 were also the most accurately recognised vignettes due to the characteristics of the scenario, PIPV experience within the sample further also suggests that experiences within these domains of PIPV are high (see Table 23). This is further also true for vignette 4. It opens a new field for further research investigation into whether the personally experienced forms of PIPV when someone has potential influence when PIPV is accurately recognised. It could be that participants potentially recognise situations that include PIPV forms that they have experienced themselves more than situations that include forms that they have not experienced.

Within the study, it has been vastly demonstrated that endorsing supportive attitudes towards PIPV perpetration led to judging vignettes as less abusive, more aggressive, and more harmless than when not endorsing such attitudes. These findings demonstrate that IPV legitimisation myths also account for PIPV and are quite influential. Especially seeing physical and sexual forms of IPV as more harmful than psychological forms of IPV influenced the misperceptions of the read scenarios. This is in line with the various findings in previous research of psychological forms of

IPV not being taken as seriously as physical and sexual IPV (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008a, 2008b, Dardis et al., 2017; Lagdon et al., 2014). It underscores the trivialisation of PIPV which is especially dangerous when looking at long-term and short-term consequences that are more severe in PIPV than other forms of IPV (see Dye, 2019; Estefan et al., 2016). In addition, this item was also the one where male participants showed a tendency towards being significantly more supportive of it than did female participants. The second most commonly endorsed PIPV acceptance attitude, was seeing it as unproblematic when one questions their perception of reality after each conflict with the partner. Seeing this in connection with destabilising the individual's reality being the most experienced form of PIPV within the sample, further underscores the urgent need for intervention regarding education on manipulation and gaslighting. The awareness of manipulation and gaslighting has to reach further within public domains, also considering that manipulation and gaslighting was not even an asked for item within the recent Statistik Austria 'Violence against Women Report' (see Enachescu & Hinsch, 2022). Finally, it was further underscored that if endorsed PIPV acceptance attitudes items thematised similar concepts to what was demonstrated in the vignettes, perceptions were significantly influenced towards not seeing the vignette as abusive. In vignette 1, for example, lower attribution of abusiveness was demonstrated when individuals saw monitoring and controlling behaviours as unproblematic. When looking at differences across gender identities regarding supportive attitudes towards PIPV perpetration, it was demonstrated that male participants had more supportive attitudes than other participants. This is in line with previous research demonstrating that men are more likely to justify violence in general as well as IPV (see Gracia et al, 2020). However, this only applied for PIPV acceptance attitudes 2 - 5, no significant differences between gender identities were found for PIPV acceptance item 1 that thematised monopolisation. PIPV acceptance item number 4 was the least reliable item, which in hindsight, and taking into account that queer individuals did not see it as unproblematic, probably implies that the formulation of the item was too ambiguous. The item

was regarding one's partner talking excessively about potential intimate partners and bragging about potential hook-ups that they encountered this evening, even though they are in an exclusive intimate partner dynamic. This was potentially phrased in a way that it was apprehended as not being able to talk about attractions towards other people within in intimate dynamic regardless of being exclusive or not, which is not something that describes a PIPV endorsing attitude. The probable confusion about PIPV acceptance item 4 therefore potentially explains the paradox of its endorsement by queer individuals and being a significant predictor for assigning less blame towards Maren, even though it should be a predictor for more blame attribution towards a victim (see Subchapter 5.10). Therefore, it can be concluded that in future studies formulation of PIPV endorsing attitudes has to be carefully reviewed and tested with individuals from different sexual and gender identities in order to ensure the transmission of the desired content. The findings imply that even though the sample had a mean age of 27 years old, PIPV supportive attitudes were still present and further significantly influencing the individual's judgements.

Blame attribution between female and male perpetrators only differed significantly between Lina and Juli. This effect could be because Lina and Juli are the only heteronormative partner dynamics and therefore stereotypical blame attribution towards male perpetrators may be more present in heteronormative partner dynamics. There was no effect for less blame attribution when feminine traits were displayed by the perpetrator, which once again could be attributed to the weak manipulation within the vignettes. Male participants only blamed Xandi significantly more than other participants when feminine characteristics were displayed. This is potentially due to the fact that Xandi identifies as a lesbian cis woman and when displaying stereotypical feminine traits, she is potentially seen as more adhering to the female gender role and hence assigned more blame. As suggested before further research is needed in order to assess blame and abusiveness attribution regarding heterosexual versus homosexual women and whether lesbian individuals are attributed stereotypical male roles.

Endorsing PIPV supportive attitudes was a significant predictor for attributing more blame towards the perpetrator but also towards the abused individual. This was however only applicable towards Juli and Lina and Maren and Tom. The other dynamics were not significant. It remains unknown whether blame attribution towards non-heteronormative partner dynamics is not significantly influenced by PIPV supportive attitudes since these scenarios were always rated as more abusive and therefore individuals who rate them accordingly do not hold PIPV acceptance attitudes. Male participants only differed significantly in their blame attribution towards Lea. Potentially since Lea is female in a non-heteronormative dynamic gave a drastic enough effect and consequently blame attribution was higher.

Finally, findings have demonstrated that more than half of the participants (64 per cent) have experienced at least one psychological form of IPV in their current or past intimate partner dynamics. In contrast to this, only 6.5% of the whole sample indicated never having experienced any one form of PIPV. Questioning the individual's perception of reality was the most frequent form of PIPV that has been experienced. This also represents a form of PIPV that, for example, has not been included in the recent Statistik Austria violence against women report, which reported a PIPV prevalence of 38 per cent in individuals between 17 and 74 years old (see Enachescu & Hinsch, 2022). The current findings could indicate that the prevalence rates could potentially be higher when including a diverse and exact measure of PIPV like the FPAS by Follingstad et al. (2005). In addition, not mentioning the wording PIPV or psychological abuse probably also made it possible for participants, who may have not termed their experiences as such or are yet to recognise these experiences as problematic, to indicate their experiences accordingly. In the previous master's thesis in clinical psychology difficulties in recruiting were experienced, since many individuals did not feel like their experiences fell underneath the umbrella term psychological abuse (see Magel, 2023). In addition, all individuals who eventually participated and presented as having experienced quite severe forms of PIPV still questioned whether what

they had experienced was ‘abusive enough’ to qualify for the study. Besides formal and overall differences, higher prevalence rates regarding having experienced PIPV have been found in queer individuals. This is in line with previous studies demonstrating that LGBTQIA* individuals have higher prevalence rates than individuals not belonging to a gender or sexual minority. Being forced into rigid gender roles presents as one of the highest forms experienced by LGBTQIA* individuals. It could be hypothesised that the prevalence of this certain form is probably higher as LGBTQIA* individuals must often face discrimination against their chosen gender and or sexual identity and therefore are more sensible towards such acts happening than individuals who have not experienced that, even though of course this is abusive towards any person. Additionally, forms of PIPV that utilise questioning the individual’s gender identity and misgendering them have been proven forms of PIPV peculiar to perpetration towards LGBTQIA* individuals (Henry et al., 2021; Cook-Daniels, 2015). The results deliver support for previous studies and yet also deliver new insights into the perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes towards psychological intimate partner violence. The study constitutes findings from Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, which constitutes a new insight on the perceptions, attitudes, and prevalence rates within this region.

7 Conclusion

The thesis aimed to shed light on the societal perceptions and attitudes on psychological forms of IPV in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. Further effects of gender specific norms on these perceptions and attitudes were researched. Findings have demonstrated and replicated previous findings that male participants were the ones to describe the scenarios as abusive least accurately and further had a tendency to judge the vignettes as more harmless. Further endorsing attitudes supportive of PIPV perpetration led to an overall misjudgement of the hypothetical PIPV scenarios and PIPV accepting attitudes were significantly higher in male participants. These findings urge

for educational interventions regarding PIPV acceptance. This is especially crucial due to the fact that the perceived support after experiencing IPV and also the level of blame attribution that the abused perceives significantly influence help seeking behaviours and short as well as long-term consequences for the abused individual (see, Moe, 2007).

Further differences between displayed acts of PIPV could be demonstrated, which indicates an urgent need for studies focussing only on PIPV scenarios when researching perceptions and attitudes on PIPV. Even though, a lot of previous findings could be replicated the study further suggests new findings regarding the LGBTQIA* community. Individuals not identifying within the binary gender system have been underscored to be more accurate in perceiving the scenarios as more abusive and less harmless than male or female participants. This finding contradicts previous literature and calls for further investigation regarding influencing factors such as age and the influence of a specific sexual or gender identity. Furthermore, results indicated that LGBTQIA* acceptance is a protective factor for misperceiving and trivialising an abusive situation, as it was a significant predictor for accurate judgement of the vignettes. This effect has been further underscored for blame attribution towards the abused individual, where it led to less blame attribution towards the abused and consequently more blame attribution towards the perpetrator. Further investigations regarding this effect should be done in order to see whether there are specific LGBTQIA* acceptance attitudes that specifically proliferate this.

No broad significant effects for stereotypical feminine characteristics held by the perpetrator and seriousness of the relationship within the intimate dynamic influencing the judgement of the scenarios regarding abusiveness could be demonstrated. This was partly due to weak manipulations in the vignettes but also the influence of other variables, such as acts of PIPV included in the vignette. For future research stronger manipulations as well as controlling for the type of PIPV included in the scenario should be implemented in order to research the effect of the seriousness of the relationship and feminine attributes of the perpetrator on perceiving PIPV.

The demonstrated prevalence rates of PIPV within the sample show a severe difference from previous prevalence rates. Even though PIPV prevalence rates in queer individuals were also higher than the ones of binary individuals in previous studies, it still shows higher prevalence rates for queer individuals than before. The prevalence rates of this study illustrate an alarming need for using precise measures as a means to collect accurate numbers regarding PIPV experiences. Further the exclusion of the term PIPV within the study and simply giving examples of experienced acts probably lead to higher recognition and should be taken into account in future research. Furthermore, these high prevalence rates also underscore the urgency of measures needed to educate individuals about PIPV and its consequences, as PIPV is a precursor of physical and sexual forms and is also known for more detrimental outcomes. Moreover, many participants still did not rate the scenarios as highly abusive, but rather as aggressive. It further displays the gap between seeing psychological acts of violence as abusive as physical and sexual acts of violence are. Therefore, also more awareness must be created to accept psychological acts as being violent and being associated with violence, as past studies demonstrated the detrimental effects PIPV can have.

8 Limitations

Since this research had to stay within the limits of a master thesis, a few limitations had to be applied beforehand. The sample is not representative of each country hence not enough participants were found to answer within the possible timeframes. In addition, the study only addresses cis-gender scenarios and does not include trans* individuals or non-binary individuals. This is due to the fact, that adding more vignettes but ensuring that each participant reads at least 4 different vignettes containing different versions of PIPV would have demanded a much bigger sample size which was not doable. The manipulations regarding the stereotypical feminine or masculine characteristics were limited to the perpetrator, using only three attributes, namely

clothing, hairstyle, and body appearance. In further studies, this could be complemented by showing images and or vector graphics including rough sketches of the individuals in the story, displaying stereotypical attributes to influence participants more and have a stronger manipulation. In addition, groups were not evenly distributed since the manipulation effect was lost in the last 3 questionnaires due to a programming error in the survey. Regarding the sample, only 20 non-heteronormative individuals participated in the study, which is not representative for the gender identity and therefore does not deliver accurate results regarding gender minorities. Future studies should be focused more on collecting enough participants within each gender identity in order to gain representable measures. Furthermore, the study was only offered in German and not more languages that are represented within Austria, Germany, and Switzerland. This potentially influenced the diversity of the sample and posed as a barrier to a broad overview of attitudes within the society.

Lastly, the collection of data regarding the values that participants held about feminist and gender ideals could have been interesting, as a means to see whether such beliefs influence the judgement of the vignettes such as the demonstrated influence of the LGBTQIA* acceptance. However, this would have required a bigger sample as well as developing a valid measure since most gender attitude and feminist attitude scales are using outdated statements that are binary only. The latter named measures would have been beyond the scope of this thesis.

9 References

Archer, J. (Ed.). (1994). *Male Violence* (1st ed.). Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781003342717

AOEF. (n.d.). *16 Tage gegen Gewalt an Frauen*. Autonome Österreichische Frauenhäuser. https://www.aoef.at/index.php/16-tage-gegen-gewalt

Badenes-Ribera, L., Bonilla-Campos, A., Frias-Navarro, D., Pons-Salvador, G., & Monterde-I Bort, H. (2016). Intimate Partner Violence in Self-Identified Lesbians: A Systematic Review of Its Prevalence and Correlates. *Trauma, violence & abuse*, *17*(3), 284–297. doi:10.1177/1524838015584363

Bell, K. M., & Naugle, A. E. (2008). Intimate partner violence theoretical considerations: moving towards a contextual framework. *Clinical psychology review*, *28*(7), 1096 1107.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2008.03.003

Bem S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. Psychological Review, 88, 354-364. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354

Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report.* Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Bourgois, P. (1996). In Search of Masculinity: Violence, Respect and Sexuality Among Puerto Rican Crack Dealers in East Harlem. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *36*(3), 412–427. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a014103

Bowen, E., Holdsworth, E., Leen, E., Sorbring, E., Helsing, B., Jaans, S., & Awouters, V. (2013). Northern European adolescent attitudes toward dating violence. *Violence and victims*, *28*(4), 619–634. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.vv-d-12-0009

Brooks, V., R. (1981). M*inority stress and lesbian women*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Brown, M. J., & Groscup, J. (2009). Perceptions of same-sex domestic violence among crisis center staff. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*(2), 87–93. doi:10.1007/s10896-008-9212-5

Brown, S. J., Conway, L. J., FitzPatrick, K. M., Hegarty, K., Mensah, F. K., Papadopoullos, S., Woolhouse, H., Giallo, R., & Gartland, D. (2020). Physical and mental health of women exposed to intimate partner violence in the 10 years after having their first child: an Australian prospective cohort study of first-time mothers. *BMJ open*, *10*(12), e040891. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-040891

Bundeskanzleramt. (n.d.). *16 Tage gegen Gewalt*. Bundeskanzleramt Österreich. https://www.bundeskanzleramt.gv.at/agenda/frauen-und-gleichstellung/gewalt gegen-frauen/initiative-gewalt-gegen-frauen-und-kampagnen/16-tage-gegen gewalt.html

Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.

Bytheway, S. & Stephens-Lewis, D. (2024). Heteronormative discourse: Therapist social constructions of intimate partner violence in queer relationships. *Feminism & Psychology*, doi: 10.1177/09593535241235462

Calvete, E., Corral, S., & Estévez, A. (2008). Coping as a Mediator and Moderator Between Intimate Partner Violence and Symptoms of Anxiety and Depression. *Violence Against Women*, *14*(8), 886–904 https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801208320907

Capezza, N.M., & Arriaga, X. B. (2008a). Factors Associated with Acceptance of Psychological Aggression Against Women. *Violence Against Women*, *14*(6), 612–633. doi: 10.1177/1077801208319004

Capezza, N.M., & Arriaga, X. B. (2008b). You can degrade but you can't hit: Differences in perceptions of psychological versus physical aggression. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *25*(2), 225–245. doi: 10.1177/0265407507087957

Capezza, N. M., & Arriaga, X. B. (2008c). Why do People Blame Victims of Abuse? The Role of Stereotypes of Women on Perceptions of Blame. *Sex Roles*, *59*(11-12), 839–850. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9488-1

Capezza, N.M.; D'Intino, L. A., Flynn, M. A., & Arriaga, X. B. (2021). Perceptions of Psychological Abuse: The Role of Perpetrator Gender, Victim's Response, and Sexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *36*(3-4), 1414–1436. doi: 10.1177/0886260517741215

Cinquegrana, V., Marini, M. & Galdi S. (2022). From Endorsement of Ambivalent Sexism to Psychological IPV Victimization: The Role of Attitudes Supportive of IPV, Legitimating Myths of IPV, and Acceptance of Psychological Aggression. *Frontiers of Psychology*, *13*,922814 922814. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.922814

Cirici Amell, R., Soler, A. R., Cobo, J., & Soldevilla Alberti, J. M. (2023). Psychological consequences and daily life adjustment for victims of intimate partner violence. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*, *58*(1), 6–19. doi: 10.1177/00912174211050504

Clements, H., Dawson, D. L., & das Nair, R. (2014). Female-perpetrated sexual abuse: a review of victim and professional perspectives. *The Journal of Sexual Aggression*, *20*(2), 197 215. doi: 10.1080/13552600.2013.798690

Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical Power Analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 1*(3), 98-101. doi: 10.1111/1467-8721.ep10768783

Começanha, R., Basto-Pereira, M., & Maia, Â. (2017). Clinically speaking, psychological abuse matters. *Comprehensive psychiatry, 73*, 120–126. doi: 10.1016/j.comppsych.2016.11.015

Connell, R. (2015). *Der gemachte Mann. Konstruktion und Krise von Männlichkeiten* (4th ed.). Springer VS. doi: 10.1007/978-3-531-19973-3

Cook-Daniels, L. (2015). Intimate partner violence in transgender couples: "Power and control" in a specific cultural context. *Partner Abuse*, 6, 126–139. doi.org:10.1891/19466560.6.1.126

Courtain, A., & Glowacz, F. (2021). Exploration of Dating Violence and Related Attitudes Among Adolescents and Emerging Adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(5-6), NP2975–NP2998. doi: 10.1177/0886260518770185

Crenshaw, K. (1989). "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics," University of Chicago Legal Forum: Vol. 1989: Iss. 1, Article 8.

Dardis, C. M., Edwards, K. M., Kelley, E. L., & Gidycz, C. A. (2017). Perceptions of Dating Violence and Associated Correlates: A Study of College Young Adults. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, *32*(21), 3245–3271. doi: 10.1177/0886260515597439

D'Costa, M., & Saklofske, D. H. (2023). Perpetrator Blame Attribution in Heterosexual Intimate Partner Violence: The Role of Gender and Perceived Injury. *Violence against women*, *29*(11), 2039–2059. doi: 10.1177/10778012221132298

Denov, M. S. (2001). A culture of denial: Exploring professional perspectives on female sex offending. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 43*(3), 303–329. doi: 10.3138/cjcrim.43.3.303

Devries, K. M., Mak, J. Y., Bacchus, L. J., Child, J. C., Falder, G., Petzold, M., Astbury, J., & Watts, C. H. (2013). Intimate partner violence and incident depressive symptoms and suicide attempts: a systematic review of longitudinal studies. *PLoS medicine, 10*(5), e1001439. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001439

Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1977*). Wives: The appropriate victims of marital violence.* Victimology*, 2, 426−442.*

Dokkedahl, S. B., Kirubakaran, R., Bech-Hansen, D., Kristensen, T. R., & Elklit, A. (2022). The psychological subtype of intimate partner violence and its effect on mental health: a systematic review with meta-analyses. *Systematic reviews*, *11*(1), 163. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-022-02025-z

Donovan, C., & Barnes, R. (2020). *Queering narratives of domestic violence and abuse*. Springer International Publishing.

Draucker, C. B., & Martsolf, D. S. (2010). The role of electronic communication technology in adolescent dating violence. *Journal of child and adolescent psychiatric nursing: official publication of the Association of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nurses, Inc*, *23*(3), 133–142. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6171.2010.00235.x

Dunjić-Kostić, B., Pantović, M., Vuković, V., Randjelović, D., Totić-Poznanović, S., Damjanović, A., … Ivković, M. (2012). Knowledge: A possible tool in shaping medical professionals' attitudes towards homosexuality. *Psychiatria Danubina*, *24*(2), 143–151.

Dye H. L. (2019). Is Emotional Abuse as Harmful as Physical and/or Sexual Abuse? *Journal of child & adolescent trauma*, *13*(4), 399–407. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40653-019 00292-y

EIGE. (n.d.). *Heteronormativity*. European Institute for Gender Equality. Retrieved February 23, 2023, from https://eige.europa.eu/thesaurus/terms/1237

Enachescu, J., & Hinsch, S. (2022). *Geschlechtsspezifische Gewalt Gegen Frauen In Österreich.* Statistik Austria.

Escribà-Agüir, V., Ruiz-Pérez, I., Montero-Piñar, M. I., Vives-Cases, C., Plazaola-Castaño, J., Martín-Baena, D., & G6 for the Study of Gender Violence in Spain (2010). Partner violence and psychological well-being: buffer or indirect effect of social support. *Psychosomatic medicine*, *72*(4), 383–389. doi:10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181d2f0dd

Estefan, L. F., Coulter, M. L., & VandeWeerd, C. (2016). Depression in Women Who Have Left Violent Relationships. *Violence Against Women, 22*(11), 1397–1413. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215624792

Follingstad, D.R., Coyne, S., & Gambone, L. (2005). A representative measure of psychological aggression and its severity. *Violence and Victims*, *20*(1), 25–38. doi:10.1891/vivi.2005.20.1.25

Follingstad D. R. (2009). The impact of psychological aggression on women's mental health and behavior: the status of the field. *Trauma, violence & abuse*, *10*(3), 271–289. doi:10.1177/1524838009334453

George, M. J. (1994). Riding the Donkey Backwards: Men as the Unacceptable Victims of Marital Violence. The Journal of Men's Studies, 3(2), 137-159. doi: 10.1177/106082659400300203

Gracia, E., Lila, M., & Santirso, F. A. (2020). Attitudes Toward Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the European Union: A Systematic Review. *European Psychologist*, *25*(2), 104–121. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040/a000392

Hamby, S., Jackson, A. (2010). Size Does Matter: The Effects of Gender on Perceptions of Dating Violence. *Sex Roles* 63, 324–331. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9816-0

Harden, J., McAllister, P., Spencer, C. M., & Stith, S. M. (2022). The Dark Side of the Rainbow: Queer Women's Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence. *Trauma, violence & abuse*, *23*(1), 301–313. doi: 0.1177/1524838020933869

Hassouneh, D. & Glass, N. (2008). The Influence of Gender Role Stereotyping on Women's Experiences of Female Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence. *Violence Against Women*, *14*(3), 310–325. doi: 10.1177/1077801207313734

Hawkins, S., & Laxton, C. (2014). *Women's access to justice: From reporting to sentencing*. Women's Aid Federation of England.

Henry, R. S., Perrin, P. B., Coston, B. M., & Calton, J. M. (2021). Intimate Partner Violence and Mental Health Among Transgender/Gender Nonconforming Adults. Journal of interpersonal violence, 36(7-8), 3374–3399. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518775148

Hill, D. B., Willoughby, B. L. B. (2005). The development and validation of the Genderism and Transphobia Scale. Sex Roles, 53, 531–544. doi:10.1007/s11199-005-7140-x.

Jewkes, R. (2002). Intimate partner violence: Causes and prevention. *The Lancet, 359*(9315), 1423–1429. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(02)08357-5

Jiménez-Picón, N., Romero-Martín, M., Romero-Castillo, R., Palomo-Lara, J. C., & Alonso Ruíz, M. (2023). Internalization of the Romantic Love Myths as a Risk Factor for Gender Violence: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, *20*(3), 837–854. doi: 10.1007/s13178-022-00747-2

Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence: Two Forms of Violence against Women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *57*(2), 283–294. doi: 10.2307/353683

Kay, M., & Jeffries, S. (2010). Homophobia, Heteronormativism and Hegemonic Masculinity: Male Same-Sex Intimate Violence from the Perspective of Brisbane Service Providers. *Psychiatry, Psychology, and Law*, *17*(3), 412–423. doi: 10.1080/13218710903566953

Kimmes J. G., Mallory A. B., Spencer C., Beck A. R., Cafferky B., Stith S. M. (2019). A meta analysis of risk markers for intimate partner violence in same-sex relationships. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 20(3), 374–384. doi: 10.1177/1524838017708784

Kite, M., Deaux, D. (1986). Attitudes toward homosexuality: Assessment and behavioral consequences. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 7, 137–162. doi: 10.1207/s15324834basp0702_4.

Lagdon, S., Armour, C., & Stringer, M. (2014). Adult experience of mental health outcomes as a result of intimate partner violence victimisation: a systematic review. *European journal of psychotraumatology*, *5*, 10.3402/ejpt.v5.24794. doi:10.3402/ejpt.v5.24794

Langenderfer-Magruder, L., Whitfield, D. L., Walls, N. E., Kattari, S. K., & Ramos, D. (2016). Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence and Subsequent Police Reporting Among Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Adults in Colorado: Comparing Rates of Cisgender and Transgender Victimization. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, *31*(5), 855 871. doi: 10.1177/0886260514556767

Lucero, J. L., Weisz, A. N., Smith-Darden, J., & Lucero, S. M. (2014). Exploring Gender Differences: Socially Interactive Technology Use/Abuse Among Dating Teens. Affilia, 29(4), 478-491. doi: 10.1177/0886109914522627

Logie, C., Bridge, T. J., & Bridge, P. D. (2007). Evaluating the phobias, attitudes, and cultural competence of Master of Social Work students toward the LGBT populations. *Journal of homosexuality*, *53*(4), 201–221. doi: 10.1080/00918360802103472

Machado, A., Hines, D., & Matos, M. (2018). Characteristics of Intimate Partner Violence Victimization Experienced by a Sample of Portuguese Men. *Violence and victims*, *33*(1), 157–175. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-1600095

Magel, F. E. (2023). *Psychological Intimate Partner Violence and the Influence of Gender Specific Norms: An Analysis of Victims Experiences* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Sigmund Freud PrivatUniversität.

McCreary, D. R. (1994). The male role and avoiding femininity. *Sex Roles*, *31*(9-10), 517–531. doi: 10.1007/BF01544277

McHugh, Rakowski, S., & Swiderski, C. (2013). Men's Experience of Psychological Abuse: Conceptualization and Measurement Issues. *Sex Roles*, *69*(3-4), 168 181. doi:10.1007/s11199-013-0274-3

Messinger, A. M. (2017). *LGBTQ Intimate Partner Violence: Lessons for Policy, Practice, and Research* (1st ed.). University of California Press.

Moe A. M. (2007). Silenced voices and structured survival: battered women's help seeking. *Violence against women*, *13*(7), 676–699. doi: 10.1177/1077801207302041

Morrison, K. E., Hymel, S., Craig, W., Dirks, M., & Holfeld, B. (2023). Teen perceptions of adolescent dating violence. Journal of adolescence, 95(7), 1348–1364. doi: 10.1002/jad.12206

Netter, J., Kutner, M. H., Nachtsheim, C. J., & Wasserman, W. (1996). Applied linear statistical models (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nybergh, L., Enander, V. & Krantz, G. (2016). Theoretical Considerations on Men's Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence: An Interview-Based Study. *Journal of Family Violence*, *31*(2),191–202. doi:10.1007/s10896-0159785-8

Peitzmeier, S. M., Malik, M., Kattari, S. K., Marrow, E., Stephenson, R., Agénor, M., & Reisner, S. L. (2020). Intimate Partner Violence in Transgender Populations: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Prevalence and Correlates. *American journal of public health*, *110*(9), e1-e14. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2020.305774

Pokharel, B., Hegadoren, K., & Papathanassoglou, E. (2020). Factors influencing silencing of women who experience intimate partner violence: An integrative review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 52,* 101422. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2020.101422

Porsch, L. M., Xu, M., Veldhuis, C. B., Bochicchio, L. A., Zollweg, S. S., & Hughes, T. L. (2022). Intimate Partner Violence Among Sexual Minority Women: A Scoping Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 152483802211228 15248380221122815. doi:10.1177/15248380221122815

Przyborski, A. & Wohlrab-Sahr, M. (2014). *Qualitative Sozialforschung: ein Arbeitsbuch* (4., erweiterte Auflage.). Oldenbourg Verlag.

Rached, M. A., Hankir, A., & Zaman, R. (2021). Emotional abuse in women and girls mediated by patriarchal upbringing and its impact on sexism and mental health: a narrative review. *Psychiatria Danubina, 33*, 137–144.

Rana, W., Mukhtar, S., & Mukhtar, S. (2022). Countering Emotional and Psychological Manipulation Abuse by Cultivating Resilience, Meaning, and Well-Being Among Victims of Male Intimate Partner Violence-Working Frontline Health Care Workers During COVID-19 Lockdown: A Qualitative Study. *Asia-Pacific journal of public health, 34*(67), 671-674. doi: 10.1177/10105395221107139

Reuter, T. R., Newcomb, M. E., Whitton, S. W., & Mustanski, B. (2017). Intimate Partner Violence Victimization in LGBT Young Adults: Demographic Differences and Associations with Health Behaviors. *Psychology of violence, 7*(1), 101–109. doi: 10.1037/vio0000031

Rollè, L., Giardina, G., Caldarera, A. M., Gerino, E., & Brustia, P. (2018). When Intimate Partner Violence Meets Same Sex Couples: A Review of Same Sex Intimate Partner Violence. *Frontiers in psychology*, *9*, 1506. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01506

Sackett, L. A., & Saunders, D. G. (1999). The impact of different forms of psychological abuse on battered women. *Violence and victims*, *14*(1), 105–117.

Salis, K. L., M.A., Salwen, J., M.A., & O'Leary, K. D., PhD. (2014). The Predictive Utility of Psychological Aggression for Intimate Partner Violence. *Partner Abuse, 5*(1), 83-97. https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.5.1.83

Schokkenbroek, J.M., Ouytsel, J. V., Hardyns, W., & Ponnet, K. (2022). Adults' Online and Offline Psychological Intimate Partner Violence Experiences. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 37*(15-16), NP14656–NP14671. doi:10.1177/08862605211015217

Scott-Storey, K., O'Donnell, S., Ford-Gilboe, M., Varcoe, C., Wathen, N., Malcolm, J., & Vincent, C. (2022). What About the Men? A Critical Review of Men's Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence. *Trauma, violence & abuse*, 15248380211043827. Advance online publication doi:10.1177/15248380211043827

Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: the entrapment of women in personal life*. Oxford University Press.

Stephenson, R., & Finneran, C. (2013). The IPV-GBM Scale: A New Scale to Measure Intimate Partner Violence among Gay and Bisexual Men. *PloS One*, *8*(6), e62592–e62592. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0062592

Stults C. B., Javdani S., Greenbaum C. A., Kapadia F., Halkitis P. N. (2016). Intimate partner violence and sex among young men who have sex with men. *Journal of Adolescent Health,* 58(2), 215–222. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.10.008

Stults, C. B., Brandt, S. A., Hale, J. F., Rogers, N., Kreienberg, A. E., & Griffin, M. (2022). A Qualitative Study of Intimate Partner Violence Among Young Gay and Bisexual Men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *37*(3-4), NP2251 NP2287. doi:10.1177/0886260520936365

Taccini, F., & Mannarini, S. (2023). An Attempt to Conceptualize the Phenomenon of Stigma toward Intimate Partner Violence Survivors: A Systematic Review. *Behavioral sciences (Basel, Switzerland)*, *13*(3), 194. doi: 10.3390/bs13030194

Taylor, C. A., & Sorenson, S. B. (2005). Community-based norms about intimate partner violence: Putting attributions of fault and responsibility into context. *Sex Roles*, *53*(7-8), 573–589. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-7143-7

Testa, R. J., Kinder, B. N., & Ironson, G. (1987). Heterosexual bias in the perception of loving relationships of gay males and lesbians. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *23*(2), 163–172. doi: 10.1080/00224498709551355

Turchik, J. A., & Edwards, K. M. (2012). Myths About Male Rape: A Literature Review. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *13*(2), 211–226. doi: 10.1037/a0023207

Turell, S. C. (2000). A descriptive analysis of same-sex relationship violence for a diverse sample. *Journal of Family Violence*, *15*(3), 281–293. doi: 10.1023/A:1007505619577

Wakelin, A., & Long, K. (2003). Effects of Victim Gender and Sexuality on Attributions of Blame to Rape Victims. *Sex Roles*, *49*(9-10), 477–487. doi: 10.1023/A:1025876522024

Wessells, M. G., & Kostelny, K. (2022). The Psychosocial Impacts of Intimate Partner Violence against Women in LMIC Contexts: Toward a Holistic Approach. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *19*(21), 14488. doi:10.3390/ijerph192114488

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender and Society*, *1*(2), 125–151.

White, S.J., Sin, J., Sweeney, A., Salisbury, T., Wahlich, C., Montesinos Guevara, C.M., Gillard, S., Brett, E., Allwright, L., Iqbal, N., Khan, A., Perot, C., Marks, J., Mantovani, N. (2024).Global Prevalence and Mental Health Outcomes of Intimate Partner Violence Among Women: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Trauma Violence Abuse. 25(1):494-511. doi:10.1177/15248380231155529

Whitfield, D. L., Coulter, R. W. S., Langenderfer-Magruder, L., & Jacobson, D. (2021). Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence Among Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender College Students: The Intersection of Gender, Race, and Sexual Orientation. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, *36*(11-12), NP6040–NP6064. doi: 10.1177/0886260518812071

Williams, C., Richardson, D. S., Hammock, G. S., & Janit, A. S. (2012). Perceptions of physical and psychological aggression in close relationships: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *17*(6), 489–494. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2012.06.005.

Williams, J. R., Ghandour, R. M., & Kub, J. E. (2008). Female perpetration of violence in heterosexual intimate relationships: adolescence through adulthood. *Trauma, violence abuse, 9*(4), 227–249. doi:10.1177/1524838008324418

Winker, G. & Degele, N. (2009). *Intersektionalität. Zur Analyse sozialer Ungleichheiten.* Transkript.

World Health Organization. (2013). *Responding to intimate partner violence and sexual violence against women: WHO clinical and policy guidelines.* Geneva: World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2021, March 9). *Violence info – intimate partner violence*. World Health Organization. https://apps.who.int/violenceinfo/intimate-partner-violence/

WHO. (n.d.). *16 days of activism against gender-based violence*. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/campaigns/16-days-of-activism-against-gender-based-violence

Woodyatt, C.R., Stephenson, R. (2016). Emotional intimate partner violence experienced by men in same-sex relationships. *Cult Health Sex,18*(10):1137 49. doi: 10.1080/13691058.2016.1175027

Zweig, Lachman, P., Yahner, J., & Dank, M. (2014). Correlates of Cyber Dating Abuse Among Teens. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *43*(8), 1306–1321. doi: 10.1007/s10964-013-004.

10 Appendix

10.1 Appendix A

Teilnehmer*innen gesucht:
Online Studie über den Zusammenhang zwischen bestimmten Einflussfaktoren und dem Urteilsvermögen

Im Zuge meiner Masterarbeit in Gender Studies and der Universität Wien erforsche ich den Einfluss von bestimmten Faktoren auf das Urteilsvermögen.

Gesucht werden Personen, egal welcher Geschlechts- oder sexuellen Identität, die im DACH Raum leben und zwischen 18 und 40 Jahren alt sind.

Die Studie wird online durchgeführt und dauert ca. 15-20 Minuten.

Angesprochene Themen während der Erhebung sind LGBTQIA* Themen sowie Inhalte die manche Menschen als potentiell gewaltvoll empfinden.

Es kommen keine detailierten Beschreibungen oder physische Gewalt vor.

Bei Interesse oder Nachfragen an:
xxxxxxxx@unvie.ac.at

10.2 Appendix B

Vignette 1

Lea ist 25 Jahre alt und identifiziert sich als bisexuelle Cis-Frau. Lea trifft seit 3 Wochen Xandi. Xandi ist 25 Jahre alt und identifiziert sich als homosexuelle Cis-Frau. Xandi kleidet sich dunkel, hat kurze braune Haare und ist eher groß.

Lea ist am Abend mit Freund*innen aus und sieht, dass Xandi ihr mehrmals geschrieben hat, was sie tut und wo sie ist. Lea antwortet ihr, dass sie mit Freund*innen in einer Bar ist. Nach 10 Minuten schaut sie auf ihr Handy und bemerkt, dass Xandi ihr wieder mehrfach geschrieben hat: „Warum sagst du nichts? Mit wem bist du da und warum antwortest du mir nicht?“ Lea entschuldigt sich, sie schaue nicht so aufs Handy, da sie mit ihren Freund*innen sein will. Xandi antwortet mit wütenden Emojis: „Mit wem bist du jetzt dort?!“. Lea ist erschrocken, fühlt sich unwohl aber antwortet jedoch genau, wer dabei ist. Im Laufe des Abends schreibt ihr Xandi immer wieder und will genaue Details darüber, was passiert.
(157 Item 8A *monitoring/controlling*)

Vignette 2

Maren ist 25 Jahre alt und identifiziert sich als heterosexuelle Cis-Frau. Maren trifft seit 3 Wochen Juli. Juli ist 25 Jahre alt und identifiziert sich als heterosexueller Cis-Mann. Juli kleidet sich dunkel, hat kurze braune Haare und ist eher groß.

Heute waren sie bei Marens Lieblingsrestaurant und gingen anschließend noch zu Maren. Juli kommt ihr immer näher. Maren genießt es, doch sagt klar: „Ich will es langsam angehen und bin nicht bereit fürs Übernachten.“ Juli antwortet: „Alles in deinem Tempo!“. Nach einer Stunde bittet sie ihn zu gehen, aber Juli will noch bleiben: „Wir sind extra zu dir, obwohl ich neben dem Restaurant wohne. Das hab´ ich gern gemacht für dich, weil ich dich mag und du mich ja auch.“ Maren nickt, nachdem Juli weiter argumentiert, willigt sie ein das er übernachtet. Im Bett liegend, sagt Juli: „Wenn du mich magst, wieso willst du nicht mit mir schlafen?“ Maren sagt: „Ich bin einfach noch nicht bereit“. Juli bezweifelt es: “Du magst mich gar nicht!“. Maren fühlt sich unwohl, aber da sie Juli nicht verletzen und zeigen will, dass sie ihn mag, gibt sie nach und schläft mit ihm.
(Item 15A *guilt induction/blaming*)

Vignette 3

Tom ist 25 Jahre alt und identifiziert sich als heterosexueller Cis-Mann. Seit 4 Monaten sind Tom und Lina zusammen. Lina ist 25 Jahre alt und identifiziert sich als heterosexuelle Cis-Frau. Lina kleidet sich in dunkel, hat kurze braune Haare und ist eher groß.

Tom und Lina sind zum Kochen verabredet, und Tom sollte alles besorgen. Lina bemerkt, dass Tom die falschen Tomaten gekauft hat und wird wütend: „Warum kannst Du nicht einfach das kaufen, was du sollst?“ Tom ist erschrocken: „Tut mir leid, ich hab`s nicht gemerkt“ aber das besänftigt Lina nicht: „Nie passt du auf, und ich muss immer alles regeln!“. Tom versucht Lina zu beschwichtigen, entschuldigt sich nochmal, aber Lina schreit: „Komm mir nicht so! Warum hast

du kein Rückgrat und verhältst dich wie ein Mann?“ Tom ist betroffen von der Situation, was Lina noch wütender macht: „Wirst du jetzt zur Heulsuse? Darauf hab´ ich keinen Bock. Koch allein, ich muss mich beruhigen.“ Lina verlässt die Küche.
(Item 9A *rigid gender roles*)

Vignette 4

Aaron ist 25 Jahre alt und identifiziert sich als homosexueller Cis-Mann. Seit 4 Monaten sind Aaron und Linus zusammen. Linus ist 25 Jahre alt und identifiziert sich als homosexueller Cis-Mann. Linus kleidet sich dunkel, hat kurze braune Haare und ist eher groß.

Heute treffen sie sich in einem Café. Als Linus aufs Klo geht, spricht ein Mann Aaron an. Aaron gibt ihm zu verstehen, dass er mit jemanden anderen hier ist, und der Mann geht weg. Linus beobachtet, die Situation und zischt Aaron an, was das sollte. Aaron erklärt ihm die Situation, aber Linus lässt sich nicht beschwichtigen: „Während ich am Klo bin, suchst du den Nächsten und streitest es jetzt noch ab? Echt heftig, dass du mich verletzt und so tust, als wäre nichts!“. Aaron ist erschrocken: „Das stimmt doch nicht, es war wirklich nicht so“. Linus ist nicht überzeugt: „Weißt du eigentlich, wie sehr du mich verletzt?“. Aaron fühlt sich schuldig und entschuldigt sich noch mehrmals, was Linus nur bedingt beruhigt.
(Item 7A *jealously/suspicion)*

10.3 Appendix C

Original version of the used items within the study are collected here. All items were answered through a 5-point Likert-scale that were termed as following: 1= *Ich stimme gar nicht zu*, 2= *Ich stimme eher nicht zu*, 3 = *Ich stimme weder gar nicht zu, noch zu*, 4 = *Ich stimme eher zu*, 5 = *Ich stimme vollkommen zu*

LGBTQIA Acceptance

AK01_02: *Die Änderung des Geschlechts einer Person (Hormone und/oder chirurgische Eingriffe) ist gegen meine moralischen Werte*.

AK01_03: *Homosexuelle Paare sollten heiraten dürfen*.

AK01_05: *Sich als trans* zu identifizieren sollte als psychische Krankheit angesehen werden*.

AK01_06: *Gruppierungen, die Rechte von LGBTQIA*-Menschen verteidigen, sind notwendig*.

AK01_07: *Homosexuelle Paare sollten Kinder adoptieren dürfen.*

AK01_08: *Die Vorstellung von gleichgeschlechtlichen Menschen in intimen Situationen bereitet mir Unbehagen.*

AK01_09: *Wenn ich andere Menschen treffe, nehme ich normalerweise an, dass sie heterosexuell sind.*

AK01_26: *Wenn ich ein Kind hätte, könnte ich akzeptieren, wenn es queer wäre.*

AK01_14: *Homosexuelle Männer sind im Allgemeinen feminin und homosexuelle Frauen im Allgemeinen maskulin*.

AK01_24: *Ich hätte nichts dagegen, queere Freund*innen zu haben*.

AK01_15: *Homosexuelle Menschen lassen sich an ihrem Aussehen und ihren Verhaltensweisen erkennen.*

AK01_17: *Chirurgische Eingriffe zur Geschlechtsangleichung sollen für transidente Personen ohne weiteres verfügbar sein und von der Krankenversicherung übernommen werden*.

AK01_19: *Ich treffe in meinem Alltag regelmäßig auf LGBTQIA*-Menschen.*

AK01_20: *Der Unterschied zwischen sexueller Orientierung und Geschlechtsidentität ist mir klar.*

AK01_22: *Schulunterricht und Schulbücher sollten Informationen über diverse Geschlechteridentitäten enthalten.*

AK01_23: *Menschen sind entweder Männer oder Frauen.*

PIPV Acceptance

Psychische Gewalt Akzeptanz 1: *Ich sehe es als unproblematisch, wenn sich mein ganzes Leben um die Person dreht, mit der ich intim bin und oder durch sie bestimmt wird.*

Psychische Gewalt Akzeptanz 2: *Wenn mir ein*e Freund*in sagt, dass sie oft beschimpft, wird von der Person, mit der sie intim ist, sehe ich das als problematisch.*

Psychische Gewalt Akzeptanz 3: *Verbale Taten von Personen, mit denen ich intim bin (z.B. Beleidigungen oder Bedrohungen) sind nicht so schlimm wie körperliche oder sexuelle Taten.*

Psychische Gewalt Akzeptanz 4: *Ich sehe es als problematisch, wenn die Person mit der ich abgesprochen exklusiv intim bin mir von ihrem Abend erzählt, wer sie attraktiv fand und wen sie hätte, haben können.*

Psychische Gewalt Akzeptanz 5: *Wenn mir ein*e Freund*in sagt, dass sie nach Streitigkeiten mit der Person, mit der sie intim ist, das Gefühl bekommt ihre Wahrnehmung sei falsch sehe ich das als normalen Teil einer Beziehung an.*

Own Experiences of PIPV

PG03_1: *Bedrohungen/Einschüchterungen*

PG03_2: *Hinterfragen der eigenen Wahrnehmung der Realität*

PG03_3: *Isolation (Leben/soziales Umfeld (sollte) drehte sich nur noch um Partner*in)*

PG03_4: *Als minderwertig dargestellt werden*

PG03_5: *Partner*in hat Macht erlangt durch Verweigern von Wünschen/Bedürfnissen*

PG03_6: *Beleidigungen/Kritik*

PG03_7: *Eifersucht/Verdächtigt werden*

PG03_8: *Kontrolliert/beobachtet werden*

PG03_9: *Kontrolliert/beobachtet werden*

PG03_10: *Aktivitäten und Meinungen werden durch Partner*in bestimmt*

PG03_11: *Bewusstes Zurückhalten von Zuneigung emotional oder physisch*

PG03_12: *Androhung/Durchführung von Öffentlicher Bloßstellung/Verraten von Geheimnissen*

PG03_13: *Emotionales verletzendes Verhalten was die Treue der Partner*in in Frage stellt*

PG03_14: *Belügen/Täuschen*

PG03_15: *Beschuldigt werden/das Gefühl bekommen schuld an etwas zu sein, ohne es tatsächlich zu sein*

PG03_16: *Partner*in benutzt Verhaltensweisen (z.B. Wut, Schweigen oder Sarkasmus) bis nachgegeben wird*

PG03_16: *Infrage stellen der eigenen Attraktivität/Sexualität durch Partner*in*

10.4 Appendix D

Table 26

Test statistics for multiple regression analyses

		F	df1	df2	p
MRA DV: abusiveness	V1	4.86	10	290	**<.001**
MRA DV: aggressiveness	V1	2.61	12	288	**.003**
MRA DV: harmlessness	V1	5.08	13	287	**<.001**
MRA DV: abusiveness	V2	8.89	10	290	**<.001**
MRA DV: aggressiveness	V2	4.65	9	291	**<.001**
MRA DV: harmlessness	V2	3.75	12	288	**<.001**
MRA DV: abusiveness	V3	5.97	9	291	**<.001**
MRA DV: aggressiveness	V3	4.01	12	288	**<.001**
MRA DV: harmlessness	V3	6.83	12	288	**<.001**
MRA DV: abusiveness	V4	3.09	14	286	**<.001**
MRA DV: aggressiveness	V4	1.92	13	287	**.028**
MRA DV: harmlessness	V4	5.59	13	287	**<.001**
MRA DV: Xandi	Blame	2.02	7	293	**.052**
MRA DV: Juli	Blame	3.91	11	289	**<.001**
MRA DV: Lina	Blame	3.75	11	289	**<.001**
MRA DV: Aaron	Blame	6.21	6	294	.312
MRA DV: Lea	Blame	2.35	6	294	**.031**
MRA DV: Maren	Blame	6.21	11	289	**<.001**

MRA Tom	DV:	Blame	2.40	10	290	**.009**
MRA Linus	DV:	Blame	1.18	12	288	**.298**

a. The sample size was n = 301

b. P-values in bold indicate a significant effect

c. MRA = multiple regression analysis; DV = dependent variable