

Interpreting the Situation: The Relationship of  
Gender Stereotypes and Adherence to Attitudes and  
Beliefs to Reactions to Wife Abuse

S. A. Jackson ©

Lakehead University

ProQuest Number: 10611372

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10611372

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et  
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0N4

*Your file* *Votre référence*

*Our file* *Notre référence*

**The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.**

**L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.**

**The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.**

**L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.**

ISBN 0-315-78933-6

Abstract

This study examined the relationship of gender stereotypes and cultural beliefs with responses to victimization. When women are victimized in a marital violence context, intervention likelihood and attributions about marital violence may be related to adherence to gender stereotypes and cultural beliefs about battered women. This study elicited reactions to written scenarios which depicted differing levels of abuse. Respondents were required to complete a measure of sex-role stereotyping, adherence to cultural beliefs about wife beating, likelihood of victimization and intervention, perceptions of sanctions, believability and probability of victimization, and responsibility of spouses for origin and solutions of abuse. It was expected that individuals who subscribe to gender stereotypes would adhere to cultural beliefs and differ from individuals who do not subscribe to gender stereotypes in their responses to these measures. Findings provided evidence for the influence of gender-based expectations and cultural beliefs on perceptions and judgments of victimization. Suggestions for future research were discussed.

Interpreting the Situation: The Relationship of  
Gender Stereotypes and Adherence to Attitudes and  
Beliefs on Reactions to Wife Abuse

Domestic violence has been recognized by researchers as a compelling social problem. Studies indicate that the majority of assaults in the home are against women and children. Evidence supporting this statement includes the following: 1) between 75 to 95 percent of all assaults taking place in the home are directed at women; 2) between 10 (McLeod, 1980) to 50 (Straus & Hotaling, 1980; Walker, 1979) percent of all women in a relationship will be assaulted at least once by a male partner (McLeod, 1980; Straus, 1978; Walker, 1979); 3) violence against wives will occur at least once during two-thirds of all marriages (Roy, 1980); and 4) 25 percent of all wives are severely beaten during the course of their marriage (Straus, 1980; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980).

Sinclair (1985) defined wife abuse as an intent by the husband to intimidate in order to control his wife's behaviour by inducing fear; Sinclair also stated that the power imbalance between victim and victimizer underlies all abuse. This study is concerned with physical abuse, and for its purposes, wife abuse will be defined according to Sinclair (1985) as slapping, punching,

kicking, shoving, choking, pinching, throwing things, using objects such as belts or coat hangers to beat the victim, and the use of weapons such as guns or knives.

Walker (1979) discussed many "myths" that are popularly held regarding battered women, batterers, and the relationship between them. Some of the myths described by Walker include: 1) battered women are masochistic and derive gains from violence they encourage; 2) battered women are crazy and precipitate violent incidents with their negative personality characteristics; 3) battered women bring violence upon themselves with constant nagging that pushes spouses beyond the breaking point; 4) batterers are always crazy; and 5) battered women are free physically and emotionally to break out of the abusive relationship. Authors suggest that many members of the general public and professional groups hold erroneous, stereotyped beliefs about battered women (Bograd, 1982; Burriss & Jaffe, 1984; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Ewing & Aubrey, 1987; Gelles, 1976; Saunders, Lynch, Grayson & Linz, 1987; Straus, 1976).

In the Ewing & Aubrey (1987) study, for example, the researchers presented a hypothetical battering scenario to 216 males and females who were members of the general public. Their sample included primarily white, well-

educated, married, middle-class individuals. After presentation of the scenario, subjects were asked to respond "true" or "false" to eight statements designed to determine the prevalence of the types of "myths" Walker (1979) discusses. Their results supported the hypothesis that many members of the general public do subscribe to various myths about battered women, including the belief that battered women are probably somewhat masochistic, emotionally disturbed, partially responsible for the battering, and simply free to leave the relationship.

Saunders, Lynch, Grayson & Linz (1987) constructed a scale of attitudes about wife beating, which measures attitudes regarding the act of wife beating, the victim, and the offender. The scale was constructed from rape-attitude scales, research and literature on wife abuse, feedback from staff at a battered women's shelter, and clinical work with victims and offenders. Data was collected from three populations: 675 students, 71 male batterers, and 70 advocates for battered women. The researchers found that many individuals do hold negative attitudes toward battered women (e.g. believing them to be masochistic, feeling that battered women are free to leave). In addition, there was a general approval of wife abuse, with abusers and advocates differing the most in their attitudes, and students falling between the two groups.

Burris & Jaffe (1984) sent questionnaires to various professionals who came in contact with battered women, including physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and clergy members, in order to determine their perceptions, awareness and treatment of wife beating. On interpreting the results, Burris & Jaffe (1984) concluded that very few victims of wife abuse are identified and treated by professionals. In addition, the most popular form of intervention chosen is couple or marriage counselling, despite the prevalence of research which suggests that this is an ineffective form of counselling, since the violence is not a function of the quality of communication and relationship issues. Studies have confirmed that many people do, in fact, believe that battered women derive satisfaction from a violent relationship, that they are responsible for abuse, that the abuse is not serious, and, therefore, that little is required in the way of attention and intervention with this issue (Bograd, 1982, 1984; Resick, 1983; Rossi, Waite & Berk, 1974; Sinclair, 1985; Symonds, 1979; Sugarman & Cohn, 1986; Waites, 1977-78; Walker, 1979). This failure to identify abuse, to find excuses for it by "blaming the victim," and to treat it with inappropriate intervention strategies is all the more serious when one realizes that abuse tends to get more severe with time.



Sex-Role Stereotyping

Recently, efforts to explain wife abuse have suggested that sexual inequality and ascribed traditional sex role attitudes (in which males are described as dominant, aggressive, and authoritarian; females as passive, submissive, and self-sacrificing), act as social mechanisms supporting the legitimization of wife abuse. Empirical evidence supports the argument that implicit cultural norms condone the use of violence by men against women, and encourage the socialization of men and women into sex roles as a model for family roles and decision-making (Albrecht, Bahr & Chadwick, 1979; Bell & Newby, 1976; Finn, 1986, Osmond & Martin, 1975; Straus, 1976, 1978; Tomeh, 1978).

Albrecht, Bahr & Chadwick (1979) assessed 759 married couples at different points in their life cycles with respect to family and sex roles (e.g., division of labour, actual family role enactment, marital decision-making). They concluded that although the provider role has been "liberalized" somewhat with women sharing in this role, overall traditional patterns in decision-making, housekeeper and kinship roles have not changed. Although the trend has been for the husband to become somewhat more involved in child care, the wives continue to carry the bulk of that responsibility. Tomeh (1978)

sampled 642 college students in order to investigate male and female sex-role orientation and the structural and attitudinal predictors of sex-role ideology. A questionnaire was presented consisting of several questions on a variety of issues related to sex roles (e.g., attitudes toward married working women, personality role behaviour, role conflict, division of responsibility). Although results demonstrated a moderate nontraditional position overall for females and males, females were significantly more likely to endorse nontraditional items than the males. The structural variables (e.g., socio-economic status) were weakly related to sex-role ideology. The variable most crucial to sex role ideology was demonstrated to be the attitudinal factor.

It has been demonstrated that individuals who embrace traditional attitudes toward women are more likely to express the desirability of the use of physical force by men in the marital relationship. Many spouse abusers do hold rigid sex role stereotypes, and those holding such rigid stereotypes are less sensitive to what constitutes abuse. Males were found to be more traditional than females in their sex role attitudes and more likely to endorse the legitimacy of using physical force in relationships (Coleman, 1980; DeGregoria, 1987; Finn, 1986; Steinmetz, 1978; Straus, 1978; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980). DeGregoria (1987) sampled 214 women using the Attitude

Toward Women Scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1972) in order to differentiate subjects on traditionality and nontraditionality regarding sex role attitude. She then presented five vignettes depicting four categories of psychological abuse and a neutral vignette and elicited perceptions of each situation. DeGregoria found that sex role attitude does relate to perception of psychological abuse. Traditional women rated the abuse vignettes as less abusive than did non-traditional women.

In addition, for some batterers, a link has been demonstrated between the approval of marital violence and the propensity to carry out actual abuse (Dibble & Straus, 1980). Dibble & Straus (1980) investigated the degree to which attitudes and behaviours are consistent with domestic violence. As well, they focused on social structural determinants (e.g., segregated family-decision norms, sex, income) of attitude-behaviour consistency. They sampled 2,143 American adults in conjugal relationships with information taken on the violent or nonviolent behaviours of respondent and spouse, attitudes with respect to violence, and spouse's behaviour. Respondents were asked to read "minor violence counts" developed from the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) on dichotomized rating scales. Dibble & Straus (1980) found that a pro-violent attitude is related to the use of violence against one's spouse, that segregated

family-decision norms are related to the use of violence, and further that a partner's use of violence may serve to legitimize the use of violence by parents with respect to child punishment. Dibble & Straus argued that the attitude-behaviour consistency demonstrated in their study relates to the extent to which the larger society facilitates or inhibits family roles and patterns of interaction within the family.

Walker (1983) found that sex role attitudes do affect the propensity for physical abuse in marital relationships and the perception of psychological abuse. Spence & Helmreich (1978) described sex roles as including expectations about marital and family roles. These fall along a continuum from traditional to nontraditional (Tarr, 1978). Coller & Resick (1987) sampled 76 female undergraduates who were chosen on the basis of their extreme scores on the Sex Role Stereotyping Scale (Burt, 1980). Vignettes of date rape were used to manipulate the degree of victim empathy. The relationship among sex role stereotyping, empathy with the victim, and blaming of the victim was assessed using questionnaires. Coller & Resick (1987) found that traditionally sex-typed women responding to a date rape scenario were less likely to perceive forced sex on a date as rape and attributed more responsibility to the victim than did nontraditional women. Further, Coleman & Straus (1986)

interviewed 2,143 couples who were married or cohabiting from a nationally representative sample, randomly selecting the husbands in half of the sample and wives in the other half. Balance of power was measured using questions based on Blood & Wolfe (1960). Each couple was classified into a power type, and marital conflict was assessed using a conflict index constructed by the researchers. Marital violence was measured using The Violence Scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979, 1981). Coleman & Straus (1986) found that relationships which exhibited a marked power differential were associated with a much higher risk of violence at similar levels of conflict than in equalitarian families.

Dobash & Dobash (1979) and Yllo (1983) argue that such perspectives are part of a broader societal attitude concerning women's rights and roles, and that these contribute to the norms and values of individuals and families. Yllo (1983) empirically investigated the impact of the societal status of women on wife battering using American states as units of analysis for assessing women's status. Yllo devised a Status of Women Index using indicators of theoretical relevance and state-level data on them. Four dimensions were examined (economic, educational, political, legal). Violence rates were based on data from a national area-probability sample of 2,143 adult Americans. Yllo

acknowledges that the causes of wife abuse are complex; however, he clearly demonstrates that the status of women is related to the level of violence against wives with women of lowest status experiencing the highest levels of violence.

Many of the studies described thus far have utilized select populations (e.g., offenders, advocates for battered women, victims) as well as samples of the general public or students in assessing sex role stereotyping, attitudes regarding battering, and perceptions of abuse. Many of these dimensions have been studied separately (Burris & Jaffe, 1984; Coleman & Straus, 1986; Collier & Resick, 1987; DeGregoria, 1987; Ewing & Aubrey, 1987; Saunders et al, 1987; Yllo, 1983) on different populations. This study utilized a nonclinical sample of university students (who are thought to be more well-informed and tolerant than the "average citizen") in order to overcome confounding factors involved in using special populations. It investigated the extent to which the stereotypes and attitudes discussed herein are prevalent in this particular population.

### Gender Stereotyping

One particular form of stereotyping is that of gender, consisting of sociocultural expectations associated with an individual's sex (Bem, 1981; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Bem (1981) argued that beliefs about one's

masculinity and femininity, and about sex-linked attributes and behaviours, become an important part of self-identity. Sex-typed individuals encode and organize information in terms of the culture's definitions of masculinity and femininity and decide, on the basis of gender, which of these should be associated with their self-concepts and which should not. Bem (1981) developed the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) as a measure of gender stereotyping. Bem asserted that sex-typed individuals would be more likely to restrict their personalities and behaviours to conform to cultural definitions of sex-appropriate standards of masculinity and femininity. These individuals, according to Bem, are gender schematic. Androgynous and undifferentiated individuals, according to Bem, may possess the same highly differentiated knowledge in the masculine and feminine domains. However, they do not attach any particular salience to masculine and feminine domains, and thus, may be considered aschematic. Feather (1981), in two studies with two separate samples involving the BSRI, found that conceptions of masculinity and femininity that are built into an individual's gender schemas are not affectively neutral, but involve a prescriptive and evaluative structure of beliefs. Not only descriptive beliefs about characteristic ways of behaving are tapped, but also prescriptive beliefs about preferred modes of conduct. Researchers' efforts

have provided evidence for Bem's central hypothesis that sex-typed individuals are more likely to engage in gender-based schematic processing. These individuals avoid cross-sex behaviours while individuals with androgynous, nontraditional personality traits do not. Therefore, sex-typed individuals appear to buy into traditional sex roles in endorsing qualities that are "masculine" and "feminine" in our society (Bem, 1975; Bem & Lenney, 1976; Deaux & Major, 1977; Deutsch & Gilbert, 1976; Falbo, 1977, Orlofsky & Windle, 1978).

Howard (1984) demonstrated that sex-based stereotypes were closely related to criminal victimization. Reactions to videotaped sexual assault vignettes were obtained wherein sex of victim and assault situation were manipulated. Howard found that women were perceived as more likely to be victimized than men, that women received higher attributions of general and characterological blame, and that men received higher attributions of behavioural blame. Thus, both men and women were evaluated in gender-stereotypic patterns. Walker & Browne (1985) explain that victimization by intimates is encouraged by sex-role socialization and a lack of responsiveness by a society that tends to condone coercion and aggression as a style of relating in close personal interactions.



Gender Stereotyping and Perceptions of Abuse

Many of the studies described have used instruments aimed at measuring sex role stereotyping in terms of a general attitude about women in society. For example, DeGregoria (1987) used the Attitude Toward Women Scale, Finn (1986) used the Attitudes Toward Sex Role Scale, and Coller & Resick (1987) used the Sex Role Stereotyping Scale, which are all measures of the degree of sex role stereotyping acceptance. These studies have addressed the question of whether acceptance of sex role stereotyping influences attitudes regarding wife abuse. However, the question they do not address concerns whether self-perception in terms of sex roles is related to an individual's attitudes and perceptions of external situations such as the issue of wife abuse. Bem's (1981) scale, as described, also examines societal expectations, but in terms of one's own sex-linked attributes and behaviours. We do not know whether one's perception of self (in this case, one's gender schema) has an influence on perceptions and attitudes toward an issue like wife abuse. If an individual endorses culturally ascribed "characteristics" of masculinity and femininity, will the individual also accept cultural beliefs about wife abuse and react differently to this issue than individuals who do not subscribe to rigid gender schemas? The present study expanded on the approach to this unusual

ambivalence in our reactions to victims, emphasizing the relationship between schematic gender stereotypes and our perceptions of wife abuse. If an individual endorses culturally prescribed traditional sex roles for him or herself, will that individual also endorse cultural beliefs about others and about external situations? Since it appears that sex-typed schematic individuals seem to endorse traditional sex roles in marriage, which permits dominance of the male and submission of the female, this study addresses whether or not individuals subscribing to sex-typed gender schemas are more likely to adhere to erroneous cultural beliefs about wife abuse than aschematic individuals.

#### Gender Stereotyping and Failure to Perceive Abuse

Failure to perceive abuse in marital interactions has also been identified as a factor involved in attitudes supporting marital violence. Studies indicate that within the marital context, abuse is sometimes not recognized as such. Abuse is tolerated so that some types of abuse are considered acceptable and justified in relationships and is further seen as qualitatively different (DeGregoria, 1987; Finn, 1986; Kincaid, 1982; Roscoe, 1987; Shotland & Straw, 1976; Sinclair, 1985). Finn (1986) explored the relationship between sex role attitudes and attitudes regarding the use of marital violence by men against women. He developed the Personal Opinion Scale, which consists of

the subscales Attitudes Toward Sex Role (assessing degree of agreement with traditional sex role stereotypes) and Attitudes Toward Force in Marriage (assessing attitudes towards the use of physical force by husbands against wives). Three hundred students were sampled. Finn established a relationship between traditional sex role preferences and attitudes supporting the use of physical force. He found that men holding more traditional attitudes than women were more likely to endorse the use of physical force. Roscoe (1987) studied violence in courtship. He sampled 126 female university students where a statement was presented reporting the occurrence of violence in relationships. Students were requested to list five forms of physical force they believed were acceptable in a dating relationship, and five situations in which they might consider the use of force appropriate. Roscoe (1987) reported that approximately 70 percent of his sample listed at least one form of violence as acceptable (e.g., slapping, punching) and more than 80 percent could supply situations in which physical force in a dating relationship is appropriate. For example, within the marital context, many individuals may consider slapping to be "mild" and not warranting intervention, and stabbing as "severe" and requiring intervention. The two are seen as discontinuous, or qualitatively different. Therefore, "milder" abuse is excused or not perceived as abusive.

Gelles (1972) and Straus (1980) found that clinicians will often minimize information that a woman has been slapped occasionally because they subscribe to the popularly held belief that some "mild" and "infrequent" forms of physical harm are actually a "natural" part of the marital relationship. Greenblat (1985) developed a scale to assess such dimensions as beliefs about offenders and victims, responsibility for abuse, and reactions to victims and offenders. However, she used single items for each dimension and did not establish the reliability and validity of her measures. Greenblat (1985) concluded that general approval of wife abuse and approval of certain acts and situations was demonstrated. Despite mounting evidence that violence tends to be cumulative and progressive in form and intensity, involving escalating coercive cycles, the discounting of marital violence appears to be prevalent (Degregoria, 1987; Finn, 1986; Roscoe, 1987; Sinclair, 1985; Walker, 1979).

This study examines perceptions of abuse in order to ascertain whether individuals do, indeed, fail to recognize abuse as such and whether this affects the decisions they make. The relationship between gender stereotypes, adherence to cultural myths, and recognition of abuse will be examined. It is hypothesized that 1) there is a relationship between sex-typed gender schemas and failure to perceive abuse; 2) individuals who adhere to cultural beliefs

about wife abuse will be less likely to recognize abuse; and 3) those who fail to recognize abuse will differ in their attributions regarding wife abuse and will make different decisions than those who do not.

### Attribution of Responsibility

Researchers have provided evidence for victimizer and victim derogation in assigning responsibility for abuse, noting that subjects are likely to attribute responsibility for abuse to the victimizer or to both partners equally. The victim has also been perceived to be responsible both for the occurrence of the abuse and for the solution (e.g., terminating the abuse situation, leaving the partner) (Breines & Gordon, 1983; Brickman, Rabinowitz, Karuza, Coates, Cohn & Kidder, 1982; Cohn & Sugarman, 1980; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Kalmuss, 1979; Loseke & Cahill, 1984; Richardson & Campbell, 1980; Sugarman & Cohn, 1986). Loseke & Cahill (1984), in an extensive review of the literature by experts on battered women, focused on the experts' opinions themselves. Loseke & Cahill argue that the "experts" have constructed a new pattern of deviance -- battered women who stay with their spouses. They conclude that women in this situation are often considered by "experts" to be unreasonable and incompetent, suffering from immaturity, femininity, or syndromes which stereotype victims of abuse and influence professionals'

approaches to assisting them. The researchers note, "In a sense, battered women may now be victimized twice, first by their mates, and then by the experts who claim to speak on their behalf" (p. 306). Sugarman & Cohn (1986) presented abuse vignettes to 354 female and male students varying problem duration, abuse frequency, and abuse outcome in order to determine the effect of sex differences and seriousness of abuse on observers' attributions of responsibility. Subjects were asked to rate the duration of the abuse, the frequency of the abuse, seriousness of injuries, how responsible the abusive husband and abused wife were for the origin of and solution to the problem, and the amount of control they each had over the solution of the problem. Results indicate that husbands were held more responsible for origin, wives for solution. Sex differences regarding attribution for responsibility occurred only for the husband, who was attributed origin and solution responsibility more by women. There was no clear association with seriousness of the abuse situation, possibly because the abuse situations utilized were presented as subtle newspaper articles and did not depict dynamic, "real-life" violent interactions.

Brickman, Rabinowitz, Karuza, Jr., Coates, Cohn & Kidder (1982) devised four models representing forms of behaviour people will take in helping others or themselves, depending on how they attribute responsibility for

origin and solution of a problem (internal versus external). These are: 1) moral (actor held responsible for problem and solution); 2) compensatory (actor responsible for problem but not for solution; "empowerment"); 3) medical (actor responsible for neither origin nor solution and needs treatment); and 4) enlightenment (actor responsible for problem and solution but unwilling or unable to provide it and needs discipline). Brickman et al (1982) argue that evidence for each of these different internally consistent orientations exists in the minds of helpers, aggressors, victims, social institutions and professionals, and has significant characteristic consequences for the competence, status, and well-being of those in need of assistance.

Some researchers investigating attribution processes have found a tendency for observers to blame victims, and for victims to engage in self-blame (Coates, Wortman & Abbey, 1979; Deaux, 1976; Ickes & Layden, 1978; Lerner & Miller, 1978; Ross & Ditecco, 1975; Wortman, 1976). Others have found a tendency for self-blame at initial victimization with a shift to victimizer-blame over subsequent violent incidents (Frieze, 1979; Shields & Fox, 1980). Victimizers, on the other hand, have demonstrated a strong tendency to blame their abusive behaviour on external (situational, environmental) causes. When husbands and wives are compared, husbands (as

victimizer) are more likely than wives (as victims) to blame female victims for the violence directed against them (Shields & Hanneke, 1983). Shields & Hanneke (1983) sampled men and women who had been in a relationship for at least six months where the husband/partner had been violent with another adult during the time they had been together. Causal attributions were investigated in terms of whether violent behaviour would be perceived as internally caused (personal disposition of husband) or externally caused (blamed on wife, relative, or other external factors). Husbands and wives differed significantly, with husbands making external attributions for their violent behaviour, and wives making internal attributions (disposition of husband) for the violent behaviour. Finally, when husbands and wives were compared, husbands were more likely to blame female victims for their victimization. These results are compelling; however, the sample used in this study consisted of violent men who had been arrested and convicted for violence and may be unwilling to accept blame, and women who had been victims and who had sought help for their situations, and, thus may be more willing to attribute the partner's violence to internal causes. The question of responsibility is addressed in this study using a student nonclinical sample in order to investigate this relationship.



The possible weakness of vignettes utilized by Sugarman & Cohn (1986) may also be a problem with the methodologies of other studies. Ewing & Aubrey (1987) employed a hypothetical scenario in which many possible excuses for the violence were included (e.g., husband's loss of job, months without work, etc.). As one of the popular myths about battering includes external excuses, it is possible that a true effect of the battering was not obtained. Coller & Resick's (1987) study was designed for date rape, and presented a scenario in which the impact was not presented, and in which the portrayal of the violence of a rape was possibly not dynamic and realistic. This study employs scenarios intended to be more realistic and dynamic. The scenarios were developed on various descriptions of battering incidents by victims. It is expected that the use of more "true to life," dynamic scenarios will be related to the types of attributions that respondents will make.

Another purpose of the present study focuses on whether gender stereotypes and adherence to cultural myths are related to origin and solution responsibility attributions; and whether these attributions would be related to the individual's failure to recognize abuse. The following hypotheses are addressed : 1) individuals who subscribe to schematic gender stereotypes will be more likely to blame the victim in abusive situations than those who are

aschematic; 2) those who adhere to cultural myths regarding wife abuse will be more likely to blame the victim; and 3) as abuse becomes more "severe" and therefore "recognizable," these differences are likely to disappear.

### Sanctions

Reactions to abuse could be particularly problematic if gender schematic individuals' perceptions of social sanctions are associated with the use of violence in the marital relationship (Berk & Newton, 1985; Grasmick & Green, 1980; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). It is possible that highly schematic people, who are expected to endorse cultural myths regarding wife abuse, may perceive the certainty and severity of possible sanctions as minimal. Carmody & Williams (1987) describe social sanctions as expected and/or actual negative responses by others. In their study, Carmody & Williams (1987) examined both legal and extralegal sanctions with a sample of assaultive and non-assaultive men. On average, both groups perceived sanctions as relatively unlikely, though severe, with an inverse relationship between criminal involvement and perception of social condemnation and arrest. However, the researchers were unable to demonstrate any significant pattern of differences between groups. It is possible that gender schematic individuals, if they endorse social norms and thus subscribe to cultural myths in regard to wife

abuse, may exhibit a lack of consciousness that wife abuse is an unacceptable and criminal act, particularly if they fail to recognize abuse as such. It is hypothesized that: 1) gender schematic individuals will be less likely than aschematics to perceive the certainty and severity of sanctions; 2) individuals who subscribe to cultural beliefs about wife abuse will be less likely to perceive certainty and severity of sanctions; and 3) these differences may lessen when the abuse scenario is "severe" and therefore recognizable.

The relationships between sex of respondent, gender schema, acceptance of cultural myths regarding wife abuse, and attitudes and perceptions of wife abuse in a nonclinical population are examined. The question of whether those individuals who demonstrate rigid gender schemas will be more likely to subscribe to erroneous cultural beliefs about wife abuse than those individuals who are aschematic is addressed. Further, the association between gender stereotypes and cultural beliefs in the perception of sanctions, likelihood of intervention, attribution of blame, and recognition of abuse are also a focus of the present study. The following hypotheses are examined:

1. Men and women differ in their perceptions and attributions about wife abuse, such that men will be more likely to derogate the victim; place responsibility for origin and solution on the victim; will be less likely to

perceive certain and severe sanctions; less likely to see wife abuse as probable and believable; less likely to intervene in some way; more likely to tolerate certain abusive behaviours and consider them non-abusive; and more likely to adhere to beliefs about wife abuse. Sex differences are likely to disappear as severity of abuse escalates.

2. Individuals who are gender schematic will differ significantly from aschematics. Schematic individuals will be more likely to blame the victim; attribute responsibility for origin and solution to the victim; will be more likely to adhere to cultural beliefs about wife abuse; and to consider certain situations as non-abusive. Schematic individuals will be less likely to perceive sanctions as certain and severe; will be less likely to intervene in some way; less likely to see wife abuse as probable and believable; and less likely to recognize abuse. As severity of abuse increases, some of these differences may disappear.

3. Individuals who subscribe to cultural beliefs about wife abuse will be more likely to attribute origin and solution of the problem to the victim. These individuals will be less likely to recognize abuse; less likely to intervene; less likely to perceive certainty and severity of sanctions; and less likely to perceive

wife abuse as believable and probable. These differences may disappear with an increase in severity of abuse.

4. Gender schema is expected to be related to adherence to cultural beliefs about wife abuse, such that highly schematic individuals should subscribe to these beliefs, whereas aschematic individuals should not.

5. Abuse situation may serve as a mediating variable, such that as perceived severity of victimization escalates, perception and attributions differences in regard to wife abuse may lessen.

## Method

### Subjects

One hundred and sixty-eight students (109 female; 59 male) from the Introduction to Psychology course at Lakehead University participated in the study.

### Measures

#### Bem Sex Role Inventory

Bem (1981) constructed the BSRI using a pool of 200 personality characteristics that seemed to be valued and either masculine or feminine in tone. Judges independently rated the desirability of the characteristics for a woman and a man. Emphasis was placed on how American society would evaluate the characteristics in order to avoid personal values. Personality characteristics qualified as feminine if they were independently judged by both females and males to be significantly more desirable for a female than a male; male characteristics were evaluated similarly. Seventy-six items satisfied criteria, 20 were chosen for each, and 20 filler items were included in the inventory. Internal consistency was reported by Bem (1981) as highly reliable, ranging from .75 to .90. Bem also empirically demonstrated that masculinity and femininity are logically independent by correlating the scores, ranging from

-.14 to .33. Test-retest reliability was also good, ranging from .75 to .94.

Factor analysis demonstrated high factor loadings on masculinity and femininity. Two independent factors have been identified as power, dominance, and masculinity; empathy, tender concern for others, and femininity. Mazrah & Choo (1986) investigated the factor structure of the BSRI and also concluded that the masculinity and femininity scales tend to load highly on two major independent factors.

#### Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating

Subjects were assessed on the Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating (IBWB) (Saunders, Lynch, Grayson & Linz, 1987). The IBWB was developed on students, non-students, a clinical population (men who batter), and advocates for battered women in order to identify and differentiate readiness to subscribe to stereotyped attitudes about battered women. The first subscale reflects the attitude that wife beating is justified in general and because of the victim's behaviour (e.g., "Sometimes it's okay for a man to beat his wife"; "Episodes of a man beating his wife are the wife's fault"). The second subscale reflects the belief that battered women derive gains of some kind from being abused (e.g., "Most wives secretly desire to be beaten by their husbands"). Subscale three reflects the attitude that help should be given (e.g., "If I heard a woman being

attacked by her husband, it would be best that I do nothing"). The fourth subscale reflects the attitude that the offender should be punished (e.g., "The best way to deal with wife beating is to arrest the husband"). The fifth subscale reflects the belief that the offender is responsible (e.g., "Cases of wife beating are the fault of the husband"). The authors found support for their hypothesis that negative attitudes toward victims were related to traditional views of women's roles in some samples, and that these include beliefs that wife beating can be justified, that women gain from abuse, and that in certain contexts interference is unwarranted. Saunders et al (1987) reported that the five subscales developed were reliable and that tests of validity were supported. The IBWB was utilized as a measure of cultural beliefs that schematic individuals are expected to adhere to.

### Design

The study utilized one vignette representing husband and wife problem-solving with no abuse in the context, and three vignettes that vary as to type of abuse outcome ("mild", "moderate", "severe"). Four specific contrasts were employed (no abuse, "mild" abuse, "moderate" abuse, "severe" abuse). The four scenarios are shown in Appendix A.

The study included manipulation checks to test whether the vignettes



differ on the basis of seriousness of the abuse measured on a 5-point scale with "0" being "not at all," and "5" being "very serious." Scores were aggregated to obtain a single seriousness measure for purposes of analyses.(See Appendix B). Paired t-tests were conducted on the factors involved .

Perceived certainty and severity of the following sanctions were measured: 1) spouse hits back; 2) spouse separates/divorces; 3) perpetrator is arrested; and 4) disapproval/loss of respect of friends and relatives. Responses on perceived certainty were obtained by asking the respondent to rate on a 5-point scale the chances of each sanction (0 = no chance at all; 3 = 50/50 chance; 5 = 100 percent chance). Responses on perceived severity were obtained by asking respondents to rate on a 5-point scale how bad each sanction would be from the perspective of the perpetrator (0 = not bad at all; 5 = extremely bad). These measures are modelled after a study by Carmody & Williams (1987).

The probability and believability of wife abuse of this nature occurring in the home was measured on a 5-point scale, with "0" being "not at all" and "5" being "very believable" and "very probable." Likelihood that a woman will be victimized in this fashion was measured on a 5-point scale with "0" being "not at all likely" and "5" being "extremely likely." Scores were aggregated to

obtain a single probability measure for purposes of analyses. (See Appendix C).

Likelihood of intervention and right to intervene in a spousal abuse situation was measured on a 5-point scale with "0" being "definitely would not intervene" and "no right at all to intervene" and "5" being "definitely would intervene" and "every right to intervene." Scores were aggregated to obtain a single likelihood of subject intervention in abuse situations measure. (See Appendix D).

Attributions of the responsibility and control each spouse has separately over the origin of the abuse and solution of the abuse was measured on a 5-point scale, with "0" being "no responsibility at all" and "no control at all" and "5" being "total responsibility" and "total control." This measure is taken from a study by Sugarman & Cohn (1986).

### Procedure

Participants were asked if they would be willing to voluntarily participate in the study, and signed informed consents upon agreement (see Appendix E).

The BSRI was administered to all participants, who were then classified into one of four groups using Bem's (1975) median split method for the present sample, consisting of a) high-masculine (schematic); b) high-feminine

(schematic); c) androgynous (aschematic); and d) undifferentiated (aschematic). Bem's (1977) study demonstrated a median masculinity score of 4.89, and a median femininity score of 4.78. In the present study the median masculinity score was 4.95, and the median femininity score was 4.80. In order to achieve acceptable cell sizes and avoid the possibility of type two error, androgynous and undifferentiated individuals were classified into one group called non sex-typed (consisting of 65 individuals; 34 male and 31 female), and high-masculine and high-feminine were classified into a second group called sex-typed (consisting of 103 participants; 78 female and 25 male) . It is interesting to note that, in this study, 3/4 of the sex-typed individuals are female, while only 1/4 are male, yet in the non sex-typed group 1/2 are female and 1/2 are male.

The IBWB was then administered to all subjects in order to obtain measures of adherence of cultural myths as described by Saunders et al (1987).

Presentation of the four vignettes was randomized in order to control for ordering effects. The description varies from no abuse to severe abuse, as described. All participants were required to fill out a questionnaire reporting demographic information and answering the rating questions discussed earlier for each vignette.

Once this was completed, subjects received a written debriefing (shown in Appendix F), and were encouraged to discuss any questions or concerns with the researcher.

## Results

### Manipulation Check

The study included a manipulation check to test whether the abuse vignettes differed on the basis of seriousness of the problem. A series of paired two-tailed t-tests were used to compare the means on the seriousness ratings for all participants. Findings, shown in Table 1, indicate that subjects rated the four conditions as significantly different in terms of seriousness.

Table 1.

### Mean Ratings of Perceived Seriousness of the Scenarios

Abuse Scenario	M	SD
No	4.22	2.38
Mild	7.53	2.02
Moderate	9.32	2.98
Severe	12.53	1.31

t(168)\*

\*all p. < .001

IBWB

It was hypothesized that subjects' scores on the IBWB would be related to subjects' responses to the four scenarios. This question was evaluated using correlation coefficients.

Although significant relationships between the IBWB and other measures were indicated, it must be noted that significant correlations were moderate to low, thus a strong relationship between the IBWB subscales and subjects' responses to the scenarios was not indicated. However, results do indicate trends in the data that are worthy of note.

The wife beating attitude scales were generally related to the measures in the predicted direction across the sample. The beliefs that wife beating is justified and that wives gain from beatings were negatively related to ratings of seriousness, probability of occurrence, and likelihood of intervention. The beliefs that help should be given, the husband is responsible, and the offender should be punished were generally positively related to ratings of seriousness, probability of occurrence, and likelihood of intervention. These significant relationships were indicated in responses to all four abuse scenarios.

Generally, significant relationships between the IBWB subscales and measures of certainty/severity of sanctions and husband/wife responsibility and

control of the problem were indicated only for the more serious abuse scenarios. Beliefs that wife beating is justified and wives gain from beatings were negatively related to certainty of divorce, charges, and societal disapproval, but positively related to severity of divorce, charges, and societal disapproval. Thus it appears that those individuals with less liberal attitudes on the IBWB subscales tend to believe that certainty of sanctions is relatively unlikely, but severity of the sanctions for the offender would be likely. The beliefs that the husband is responsible, help should be given, and the offender should be punished were positively related to certainty of divorce, charges, and societal disapproval and negatively related to severity of divorce, charges and disapproval. Thus, it appears that individuals who express more liberal attitudes on the IBWB subscales believe that certainty of sanctions is more likely and severity of sanctions for the offender is low.

Husband/wife responsibility and control of the problem ratings were generally uncorrelated with the subscales of the IBWB, however, some exceptions are worthy of note. The beliefs that wife beating is justified and wives gain from beatings is negatively related to husband responsibility for problem origin and husband control and responsibility for problem solution, and positively related to attributions of wife control and responsibility for

problem solution. Therefore, it appears that individuals holding more conservative views of wife abuse on the IBWB subscales tend to attribute low husband responsibility and control, and higher wife responsibility and control, at least for problem solution. The beliefs that the husband is responsible, help should be given, and the offender should be punished were positively related to attributions of husband responsibility and control of problem origin, and husband control of solution, but negatively related to wife responsibility and control of solution. Thus, individuals who endorse more liberal views on the IBWB subscales appear to believe that the husband is responsible and in control of the problem, and the wife is not. See Appendix G for tables of correlations.

Mean ratings of all measures across the sample are included in Table 2.

Table 2.

Mean Responses to all Measures Across Sample

Measure	Scenario			
	No Abuse	Mild	Moderate	Severe
Seriousness**	4.23	7.54	9.32	12.53
Probability of Occurrence	3.40	.103	1.30	.044
Likelihood of Intervention*	.24	2.01	2.96	3.96
Certainty of Retaliation	.93	1.86	1.73	1.09
Certainty of Divorce*	.80	1.73	2.57	3.30
Certainty of Arrest/Charges*	.21	1.11	2.14	3.00
Certainty of Societal Disapproval*	.48	1.85	2.89	3.71
Severity of Retaliation	3.22	2.80	2.67	2.15
Severity of Divorce	3.22	2.71	2.39	21.0
Severity of Arrest/Charges	2.88	2.45	2.24	2.05
Severity of Societal Disapproval	2.79	2.43	2.22	2.00
Husband Control Origin	3.93	3.78	4.07	4.21



Table 2.Mean Responses to all Measures Across Sample

Measure	Scenario			
	No Abuse	Mild	Moderate	Severe
Wife Control Origin*	3.92	3.41	2.85	2.49
Husband Responsibility Origin	3.90	3.77	4.02	4.27
Wife Responsibility Origin	3.90	3.45	2.76	2.43
Husband Control Solution	4.15	3.94	4.16	4.05
Wife Control Solution	4.14	3.55	3.03	2.71
Husband Responsibility Solution	4.18	4.02	4.17	4.36
Wife Responsibility Solution	4.18	3.64	3.14	2.87

\* t p. &lt; .05

\*\* t p. &lt; .001

Mean ratings of the sample from this study and Saunders et al (1987) are included in Table 3.

Table 3.

Mean Responses of Saunders et al (1987) Sample and Current Sample

Saunders et al (1987)	M	SD	IBWB Subscale	Current Sample	M	SD
Students	1.81	.76	WJ	Students	2.13	1.02
Male	2.17	.85		Male	2.28	.97
Female	1.53	.53		Female	2.07	.77
				ST*	2.39	1.04
				NST*	1.77	1.00
Students	2.24	.82	WG	Students	2.62	.91
Male	2.50	.83		Male	2.70	.88
Female	2.02	.74		Female	2.60	.84
				ST	2.87	1.01
				NST	2.25	.77
Students	5.91	.77	HG	Students	5.13	.88
Male	5.61	.81		Male	3.65	.94
Female	6.16	.64		Female	3.67	1.02
				ST	3.55	1.01
				NST	3.83	1.04

Table 3.  
Mean Responses of Saunders et al (1987) Sample and Current Sample

Saunders et al (1987)	M	SD	IBWB Subscale	Current Sample	M	SD
Students	3.93	1.05	OP	Students	4.24	1.01
Male	3.73	1.04		Male	3.73	.88
Female	4.08	1.06		Female	4.54	.73
				ST	4.08	.64
				NST	4.36	1.00
Students	4.48	.91	HR	Students	4.47	.56
Male	4.45	.87		Male	4.50	.85
Female	4.50	.92		Female	4.47	.74
				ST	4.13	.88
				NST	5.04	1.01

\*ST = Sex-Typed; NST = Non Sex-Typed.

A 2(gender schema) x 2(sex of subject) analysis of variance was conducted to examine the relationship between gender schema and sex of subject on responses to the five subscales of the IBWB. Paired t-tests were conducted to determine the effects of the IBWB subscales on responses of the groups involved in the study (see Table 4).

IBWB subscale responses (shown in Table 2) indicate that non sex-typed individuals rate HG and HR significantly higher than sex-typed

individuals, while sex-typed individuals endorse the myths WJ and WG significantly. Sex differences occur only in response to OP, as females endorse the punishment of the husband/offender significantly higher than males, and WJ, as males rate the justification of wife beating significantly higher than females.

Table 4.

Mean Responses to IBWB Subscales - Sex of Subject x Gender Schema

Subscale	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
WJ	2.85	2.24	1.87	1.65	11.03**	26.59**	
WG	3.10	2.80	2.40	2.09		24.52**	
HG	4.68	5.06	5.42	5.30		10.94**	
OP	3.96	4.49	3.57	4.66	14.31**		
HR	3.73	4.26	5.08	5.00		26.10**	

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .001$

It is interesting to note that non sex-typed individuals gave the lowest overall ratings of justifiability of wife abuse, then females, sex-typed, with males giving the highest rating of justifiability. For WG, non sex-typed gave

the lowest overall rating, then females, males, and sex-typed gave the highest rating that wives gain from beatings. Non sex-typed endorsed HG highest, then males, females, and sex-typed, respectively. In reacting to OP, females gave the highest rating, then non sex-typed, sex-typed, and males, respectively. HR responses show that non sex-typed attributed greatest husband responsibility, then males, females, and sex-typed individuals, though males, females, and sex-typed appear to give relatively equal attributions regarding this measure.

#### Seriousness of Abuse

A 2(sex of subject) x 2(gender schema) analysis of variance was used to examine the relationship between sex of subject and gender schema on ratings of seriousness of abuse. Abuse scenario (no, mild, moderate, severe) constituted a within-subjects factor, and was analyzed with paired t-tests.

Mean seriousness ratings and F ratios are included in Table 5. Severity was rated significantly higher by non sex-typed individuals for the mild abuse scenario, while for the other three scenarios a sex of subject by gender schema interaction emerged, with the greatest differences being between the ratings of the non sex-typed males (who rated all three scenarios as more serious) than the other three groups.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the seriousness ratings of the four scenarios across the sample. Analyses revealed that ratings were significantly different across the four scenarios (all p's < .001).

Table 5.

Mean Ratings of Seriousness of Scenario - Sex of Subject x Gender Schema

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	2.72	3.97	5.88	4.26			6.75*
Mild	6.96	6.97	8.56	8.29		7.42*	
Moderate	7.52	8.79	11.24	10.00			18.25**
Severe	11.04	12.21	14.06	12.81			10.64**

\* p. < .05

\*\* p. < .001

Probability of Occurrence

A 2(sex of subject) x 2(gender schema) analysis of variance was used to examine the relationship between sex of subject and gender schema on ratings of probability of occurrence of abuse. Scenario (no, mild, moderate, severe)

constituted a within-subjects factor, and paired t-tests were conducted to determine the effects of this factor on the responses of the groups.

Mean ratings of probability of occurrence and F ratios are included in Table 6. Probability of occurrence of abuse was rated significantly higher by non sex-typed individuals for the no abuse, mild abuse, and moderate abuse scenarios, while for severe abuse a sex of subject by gender schema interaction indicated that gender schema makes a difference only for males, as non sex-typed males rate the probability of severe abuse occurring as significantly higher than the other three groups.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the probability of occurrence ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the four scenarios did not differ significantly from each other.

Table 6.

Mean Ratings of Probability of Occurrence - Severe Abuse - Gender Schema xSex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	3.96	3.57	4.17	3.93		5.66*	
Mild	2.96	3.09	3.73	3.51		12.47**	
Moderate	3.12	3.29	3.79	3.59		6.92*	
Severe	2.36	2.90	3.97	2.97			15.81**

\* p. &lt; .05

\*\* p. &lt; .001

Likelihood of Intervention

A 2(gender schema) x 2(sex of subject) analysis of variance was used to examine the relationship between gender schema and sex of subject on ratings of likelihood of subject intervention in abusive situations. Scenario (no, mild, moderate, severe) constituted a within-subjects factor, and paired t-tests were conducted to determine its effects on the sample's responses.



Mean ratings of likelihood of intervention and F ratios are included in Table 7. Likelihood of intervention in marital abuse situations indicated an interaction between sex of subject and gender schema for mild and moderate abuse, as the effect of gender schema occurs only for males, with non sex-typed males rating likelihood of intervention significantly higher than the other three groups. For severe abuse non sex-typed individuals rate likelihood of intervention significantly higher than sex-typed individuals.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the likelihood of intervention ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the ratings were significantly different for the four scenarios.

Table 7.

Mean Ratings of Likelihood of Intervention - Mild Abuse - Gender Schema xSex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	.16	.29	.29	.13			
Mild	1.08	1.58	3.29	2.45			7.10*
Moderate	2.08	2.63	4.03	3.35			6.01*
Severe	3.60	4.59	3.72	4.19	14.42**		

\* p. &lt; .05

\*\* p. &lt; .001

Certainty and Severity of SanctionsCertainty of Retaliation

A 2(gender schema) x 2(sex of subject) analysis of variance examined the relationship between gender schema and sex of subject in response to the certainty of retaliation measure. Paired t-tests were conducted for each level of

the independent variables to assess the effect of abuse scenario (no, mild, moderate, severe) as a within-subjects factor.

Mean ratings of certainty of retaliation and F ratios are included in Table 8. Certainty of retaliation was rated significantly higher by females for the severe abuse scenario, while for the moderate abuse scenario an interaction between gender schema and sex of subject indicated that the effect of gender schema is present only for females, as non sex-typed females attributed significantly higher ratings to the certainty of retaliation than sex-typed females. No other effects were indicated.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the certainty of retaliation ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the ratings were significantly different for the four scenarios with the exception that no abuse and severe abuse retaliation ratings did not differ significantly.

Table 8.

Mean Ratings of Certainty of Spousal Retaliation - Gender Schema x Sex ofSubject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	.76	1.00	.68	1.19			
Mild	1.84	1.90	1.41	2.35			
Moderate	1.76	.91	1.82	2.35			9.01**
Severe	.88	1.31	.35	1.52	11.50**		

\* p. &lt; .05

\*\* p. &lt; .001

Certainty of Divorce

Certainty of divorce mean ratings and F ratios are included in Table 9.

Certainty of divorce was rated significantly higher by non sex-typed individuals for the mild, moderate, and severe abuse scenarios. No other effects were indicated.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the certainty of divorce ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the ratings were significantly different for the four scenarios.

Table 9.

Mean Ratings of Certainty of Divorce - Gender Schema x Sex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	.56	.74	.79	1.13			
Mild	1.20	1.53	2.03	2.32		19.71**	
Moderate	2.12	2.26	3.21	3.00		24.92**	
Severe	2.96	2.88	4.18	3.65		27.99**	

\* p. < .05

\*\* p. < .001

Certainty Husband Arrest/Charges

Mean ratings of certainty of husband arrest and F ratios are included in Table 10. Certainty of husband arrest/charges was rated significantly higher by

non sex-typed individuals across scenarios. No other effects were indicated.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the certainty of arrest/charges ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the ratings were significantly different for the four scenarios.

Table 10.

Mean Ratings of Certainty of Husband Arrest/Charges - Gender Schema x Sex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	.16	.22	.09	.39			
Mild	.72	1.00	1.50	1.26		8.61**	
Moderate	1.80	1.85	2.82	2.39		15.76**	
Severe	2.76	2.64	3.85	3.16		16.81**	

\* p. < .05

\*\* p. < .001

Certainty of Societal Disapproval

Mean ratings and F ratios for certainty of societal disapproval are included in Table 11. Certainty of societal disapproval was rated significantly higher by non sex-typed individuals in response to the mild and moderate

abuse scenario, while for severe abuse a sex of subject by gender schema interaction emerged, indicating that the effect of gender schema occurs only for males, as non sex-typed males rated certainty of societal disapproval significantly higher than sex-typed males and females.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the certainty of disapproval ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the ratings were significantly different for the four scenarios.

Table 11.

Mean Responses to Certainty of Societal Disapproval Measure - GenderSchema x Sex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	.16	.62	.15	.74	9.49**		
Mild	1.48	1.72	1.97	2.35		5.23*	
Moderate	2.28	2.67	3.47	3.29		17.28**	
Severe	3.20	3.49	4.44	3.87			4.59*

\* p. &lt; .05

\*\* p. &lt; .001

Severity of Spousal Retaliation

Mean ratings of spousal retaliation and F ratios are included in Table 12. No main effects or interactions were indicated for mild, moderate, and severe abuse. The no abuse scenario responses indicate a main effect of gender schema, indicating that non sex-typed individuals rate severity of spousal



retaliation significantly higher than sex-typed.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the severity of retaliation ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that only no abuse and severe abuse differed significantly.

Table 12.

Mean Responses to Severity of Spousal Retaliation Measure - Gender Schema

x Sex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	2.36	2.94	4.15	3.61		12.34**	
Mild	2.24	2.88	2.91	2.90			
Moderate	2.68	2.72	2.35	2.87			
Severe	2.00	2.28	2.06	2.06			

\* p. < .05

\*\* p. < .001

Severity of Divorce

Mean ratings and F ratios for severity of divorce are included in Table

13. No main effects or interactions were indicated for mild and moderate abuse scenarios. Responses to mild abuse indicated that non sex-typed individuals rate severity of divorce significantly higher than sex-typed. However, in response to severe abuse this effect was reversed, as sex-typed individuals rated severity of divorce significantly higher than non sex-typed individuals.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the severity of divorce ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that only no abuse versus moderate and severe and mild versus severe differed significantly.

Table 13.

Mean Responses to Severity of Divorce Measure - Gender Schema x Sex ofSubject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	2.12	2.91	4.03	4.00		18.14**	
Mild	2.12	2.78	2.91	2.77			
Moderate	2.76	2.51	2.18	2.03			
Severe	2.80	2.27	1.65	1.61		6.56*	

\* p. &lt; .05

\*\* p. &lt; .001

Severity of Husband Arrest/Charges

Mean ratings and F ratios for severity of husband arrest/charges are included in Table 14. No main effects or interactions were indicated for no, mild, and moderate abuse responses. Severe abuse responses indicated that sex-typed individuals rated severity of charges significantly higher than non

sex-typed.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the severity of husband arrest/charges ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that only no versus moderate and severe abuse differed significantly.

Table 14.

Mean Responses to Severity of Husband Arrest/Charges - Gender Schema x

Sex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	2.12	2.82	3.38	3.10			
Mild	2.00	2.49	2.82	2.29			
Moderate	2.32	2.36	2.26	1.87			
Severe	2.68	2.23	1.59	1.61		5.65*	

\* p. < .05

\*\* p. < .001

Severity of Societal Disapproval

Mean ratings and F ratios for severity of societal disapproval are included in Table 15. No main effects of interactions were demonstrated in responses to no, mild, and moderate abuse scenarios. Severe abuse responses indicated that sex-typed individuals rate severity of societal disapproval significantly higher than non sex-typed in this extreme situation.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the severity of societal disapproval ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that only no versus moderate and severe abuse differed significantly.

Table 15.

Mean Responses to Severity of Societal Disapproval - Gender Schema x Sex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	2.16	2.71	3.26	2.97			
Mild	1.96	2.59	2.53	2.29			
Moderate	2.32	2.37	2.03	1.97			
Severe	2.64	2.14	1.50	1.68		5.03*	

\* p. &lt; .05

\*\* p. &lt; .001

Husband/Wife Responsibility and Control for the Problem

A 2(gender schema) x 2(sex of subject) analysis of variance examined the relationship between gender schema and sex of subject in response to the measures of husband/wife responsibility and control for problem origin and solution. Paired t-tests were conducted to determine the effects of scenario (no, mild, moderate, severe) on the responses of the groups.

Husband Control Problem Origin

Mean ratings and F ratios for husband control of the problem origin are included in Table 16. No abuse responses demonstrated that males rate husband control of problem origin significantly higher than females, while for the other three scenarios non sex-typed individuals rated husband control of problem as significantly higher than sex-typed individuals.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the husband control of problem origin ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the four scenarios did not differ significantly from each other.

Table 16.

Mean Responses to Husband Control of Problem Origin - Gender Schema xSex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	4.24	3.79	4.35	3.55	11.40**		
Mild	3.88	3.53	4.00	4.10		8.52*	
Moderate	4.08	3.90	4.29	4.26		6.44*	
Severe	4.20	3.99	4.53	4.42		8.41*	

\* p. &lt; .05

\*\* p. &lt; .001

Wife Control Problem Origin

Mean ratings and F ratios for the wife control of problem origin measure are included in Table 17. No main effects or interactions in response to mild and severe scenarios were indicated. No abuse responses indicated that males rated wife control of the problem origin significantly higher than

females, while moderate abuse responses revealed that sex-typed individuals rated wife control of problem origin significantly higher than non sex-typed individuals.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the wife control of problem origin ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the four scenarios differed significantly from each other.

Table 17.

Mean Responses to Wife Control of Problem Origin - Gender Schema x Sex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	4.20	3.86	4.21	3.55	7.24*		
Mild	3.64	3.31	3.53	3.35			
Moderate	3.28	2.91	2.62	2.58		5.65*	
Severe	2.76	2.60	2.24	2.26			

\* p. < .05

\*\* p. < .001



Husband Responsibility Problem Origin

Mean ratings and F ratios for husband responsibility for problem origin are included in Table 18. No main effects or interactions were demonstrated for no and moderate abuse responses. Mild and severe abuse responses revealed that non sex-typed subjects rated husband responsibility for problem origin significantly higher than sex-typed.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the husband responsibility for problem origin ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the four scenarios did not differ significantly from each other.

Table 18.

Mean Responses to Husband Responsibility for Problem Origin - Gender Schema x Sex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	4.00	3.69	4.32	3.90			
Mild	3.80	3.62	3.91	4.00		4.50*	
Moderate	3.76	3.97	4.12	4.26			
Severe	4.24	4.14	4.47	4.42		4.69*	

\* p. &lt; .05

\*\* p. &lt; .001

Wife Responsibility for Problem Origin

No main effects or interactions were demonstrated for the scenarios on this measure.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the wife responsibility for problem origin ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the only scenarios that did not differ significantly from each other were no versus mild abuse; moderate versus severe abuse.

Husband Control of Problem Solution

Mean ratings and F ratios for husband control of problem solution are included in Table 19. No main effects or interactions were demonstrated for no and moderate abuse responses. Mild abuse responses revealed that non sex-typed individuals rated husband control of problem solution significantly higher than sex-typed, while for severe abuse a sex of subject by gender schema interaction emerged, indicating that the effect of gender schema occurs only for males, as non sex-typed males rated husband control of problem solution significantly higher than sex-typed males.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the husband control of the problem solution ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the four scenarios did not differ significantly from each other.

Table 19.

Mean Responses to Husband Control of Problem Solution - Gender Schema xSex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	4.20	3.95	4.56	4.16			
Mild	3.84	3.78	4.18	4.16		8.28*	
Moderate	3.80	4.15	4.35	4.26			
Severe	3.44	4.04	4.41	4.19			4.77*

\* p. &lt; .05

\*\* p. &lt; .001

Wife Control of Problem Solution

Mean ratings and F ratios for wife control of problem solution are included in Table 20. No main effects or interactions were revealed in responses to the no and mild abuse situations, while moderate and severe abuse responses demonstrated that sex-typed subjects rated wife control of problem

solution significantly higher than non sex-typed subjects.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the wife control of problem solution ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the only scenarios that did not differ significantly from each other were moderate versus severe abuse.

Table 20.

Mean Responses to Wife Control of Problem Solution - Gender Schema x Sex of Subject

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	4.20	4.01	4.41	4.10			
Mild	3.80	3.51	3.59	3.39			
Moderate	3.32	3.17	2.91	2.58		6.34*	
Severe	3.56	2.95	2.24	1.94		24.44**	

\* p. < .05

\*\* p. < .001

Husband Responsibility for Problem Solution

Mean ratings and F ratios for husband responsibility for problem solution are included in Table 21. Husband responsibility for problem solution

was rated significantly higher by non sex-typed individuals for no, mild, and moderate abuse situations, while for severe abuse a sex of subject by gender schema interaction indicated that the effect of gender schema occurred only for males, with non sex-typed males rating husband responsibility for problem solution significantly higher than sex-typed males.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the husband responsibility for problem solution ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the four scenarios did not differ significantly from each other.

Table 21.

Mean Ratings of Husband Responsibility for Problem Solution - Sex of Subject x Gender

Schema

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	4.00	4.05	4.59	4.19		11.67**	
Mild	3.92	3.86	4.35	4.16		8.83*	
Moderate	3.84	4.08	4.53	4.29		9.87*	
Severe	4.04	4.28	4.76	4.35			5.25*

\* p. < .05

\*\* p. < .001

Wife Responsibility for Problem Solution

Mean ratings and F ratios for wife responsibility for problem solution are included in Table 22. No main effects or interactions were indicated for no abuse and mild abuse scenarios. Moderate and severe abuse responses revealed that sex-typed individuals rated wife responsibility for problem solution significantly higher than non sex-typed subjects.

See Table 2 for the results of the paired t-test on the wife responsibility for problem solution ratings across the sample. Analyses indicated that the only scenarios that did not differ significantly from each other were moderate versus severe abuse.

Table 22.

Mean Ratings of Wife Responsibility for Problem Solution - Sex of Subject x Gender Schema

Scenario	Sex-Typed		Non Sex-Typed		Factor Effects F Ratios (1,167)		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sex	Gender Schema	Interaction
No	4.00	4.13	4.44	4.16			
Mild	3.84	3.64	3.44	3.74			
Moderate	3.20	3.53	2.47	2.84		16.60**	
Severe	3.40	3.31	1.79	2.52		28.47**	

\* p. &lt; .05

\*\* p. &lt; .001

## Discussion

Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating

All individuals in the present study subscribed somewhat to the societal myths of the IBWB, including the impression that wife beating is justified, that wives gain from beatings, and that wives should not necessarily be helped. Mean scores on the subscales for students in the present sample are slightly higher on the wives gain, wife beating is justifiable, and offender should be punished subscales, and slightly lower on the help should be given subscale than student norms from the original Saunders et al (1987) study. On the face of it, although public education about wife abuse has increased in the years since the Saunders et al study, individuals continue to engage in victim blaming and acceptance of cultural myths in relation to this issue.

These beliefs complicate the issue of prevention and treatment of abuse for assaulted women. Saunders et al (1987) demonstrated that traditional views about women's role in society (e.g., attitudes toward married working women, personality role behaviour, marital decision-making, division of labour, family role enactment) were related to the myths of the Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating, especially the notion that wife beating is justified, a relationship supported by the results from Finn (1986) and Greenblat (1985). Traditional

attitudes towards women seem to act as mechanisms supporting the use of violence by men against women, as studies show that individuals embracing these attitudes are more likely to express the desirability of the use of physical force by men in marital relationships (Coleman, 1980; DeGregoria, 1987; Finn, 1986). In addition, a link has been demonstrated between the approval of marital violence and the propensity to abuse (Dibble & Straus, 1980). The interplay between beliefs and attributions is demonstrated in the present study by the relationship between gender schema, the IBWB subscales, and attributions about wife abuse. This study contributes to research about the issue of wife abuse. It goes beyond sex role ideology regarding the behaviour of males and females in marital relationships to address the question of whether self-identity in terms of sex roles is related to perceptions of external situations. Do one's self-perceptions motivate attributions and behaviour?

As hypothesized, sex-typed (schematic) individuals, who seem to invest in the traditional male or female role, exhibited significantly less sympathy for victims of wife abuse (as measured by the IBWB). Sex-typed individuals appear to be entrapped in the beliefs that women gain from violence (e.g., provoke violence or enjoy it), and that wife beating can be justified. Non sex-typed (aschematic) persons, who according to Bem (1981), seem to adhere to a



wider range of behaviours without utilizing sex-role implications, were significantly less likely to excuse wife abuse. They were also more likely to hold the husband responsible for his actions and to believe that help should be given to victims (according to IBWB subscales). Neither group indicated strong agreement with the idea that punishment/divorce is necessarily the answer to wife abuse, an interesting finding that will be discussed in the section dealing with sanctions.

Sociocultural expectations and traditions for males includes dominance and aggression, and for women passivity and compliance. Society exhibits social tolerance of abuse of wives. Therefore, it was expected that males and females would differ significantly in response to the IBWB subscales, with males expressing a higher propensity to believe the IBWB myths. However, sex differences in response to the IBWB subscales were significant only for two of the five subscales. Males assigned significantly higher scores to the belief that wife beating is justifiable. Females assigned significantly higher scores to the offender should be punished subscale. There was a lack of sex differences with regard to help should be given, wives gain, and husbands are responsible for the abuse subscales. Regarding the lack of sex differences with respect to the beliefs that wives gain from beatings and the husband is

responsible, it may be that since the majority of both men and women in this sample adhere to traditional sex and marital roles, as assessed by the BSRI and the IBWB, both men and women are less sensitive to the realities of abuse and assign some responsibility and less sympathy to the victim. Both men and women in this sample are inclined to endorse some of the myths on the IBWB. Not only the men fall into the trap of condoning such violence, women do as well, in roughly equal numbers. Whatever the forces are which perpetuate violence, women take part in them too. It does not seem so much a gender issue, as a person issue. Persons (regardless of gender) who rigidly define themselves according to fixed social norms, appear inclined to endorse these myths. Hence, we must question the tendency for persons to adopt rigid definitions of who they are and what role they occupy in society. Perhaps other factors, for example sex role typing, rather than gender are better predictors of beliefs. Non sex-typed males, who apparently do not endorse "traditional" notions of masculinity, appeared to consistently demonstrate knowledge and sympathy regarding wife abuse in this study.

Authors have utilized a sociocultural analysis of wife abuse to describe the relationship between the abuse of women and sex inequality, sex role stereotyping, and unequal power distribution between men and women (Dobash

& Dobash, 1979; Sinclair, 1985; Straus, 1976; Walker, 1984). Spouse abuse is seen as resulting from a struggle between men and women over resources/goals within a culture of social norms and legal mechanisms that endorse the use of marital violence. Sex role socialization is viewed as a social mechanism that creates and legitimizes the authority and power of males in our society. Future research into this question is crucial, as the implications of such findings are enormous. If it is not a simple matter of genes directing our way of thinking about ourselves and the world, but the way we are socialized to perpetuate certain roles in our society, and to uphold the power differential between men and women, then we will be remiss if we do not rethink our manner, as a society, of rearing and educating our children. The current services provided to wife-abuse victims and offenders may be band-aids that deal with the immediate problem while serving to mask the culmination of years of indoctrination into roles that are the root of the problem.

#### Perceptions of Seriousness, Occurrence Probability, and Intervention Likelihood

As expected, non sex-typed individuals, who are less likely to subscribe to the myths of the IBWB, rated abuse situations as probable. Sex-typed individuals, who endorse the myths of the IBWB, indicated that such abuse was less probable. However, when abuse was most extreme, only non sex-

typed males rated probability significantly higher than sex-typed males.

Interestingly, seriousness of scenario was related to subjects' responses, as scores escalated consistently with the extremity of abuse. This is a significant finding, as failure to acknowledge the reality of abuse and its occurrence in our society may be a factor in the perpetuation of the victimization of women.

Sex-typed individuals may be more vulnerable to denial of the existence of violence in the home. One issue for change, therefore, will be the dissemination of accurate information about wife abuse and increasing awareness through education and access to resources.

Likelihood of intervention ratings were also associated with gender schema, as non sex-typed individuals were more likely to intervene in the four situations depicted. However, for the most severe situation, only non sex-typed males indicated intervention likelihood. All subjects demonstrated an indication that likelihood of intervention increased as abuse worsened. Thus far, we see that aschematic individuals, who do not endorse the subscales of the IBWB, appear to see abuse as more probable and worthy of intervention.

The fact that the no abuse scenario was rated as somewhat serious ( $M = 4.22$ ) can be explained by the fact that the scenario in this case is presented as being a very emotionally intense argument between the spouses. Although it

ends amicably, the intensity of the argument could be perceived as a serious rift in a relationship by most individuals.

Overall, sex differences with respect to subjects' ratings of seriousness of the abuse were lacking. However, sex of subject did interact with gender schema in determining subjects' responses to perceived seriousness and likelihood of intervention. Non sex-typed males perceived the seriousness of abuse as significantly more serious than sex-typed males in response to the moderate and severe scenarios. Sex-typed and non sex-typed females did not differ. Non sex-typed females perceived the no abuse scenario as more serious than sex-typed females. Non sex-typed and sex-typed males did not differ. All non sex-typed individuals perceived mild abuse as significantly more serious than sex-typed individuals. Non sex-typed males also indicated likelihood of intervention as significantly higher than sex-typed males in response to the mild, moderate, and severe abuse situations. Interestingly, contrary to hypothesis, differences did not disappear as abuse escalated. The no abuse scenario was also rated as significantly more serious by non sex-typed females over sex-typed females, although these ratings were very low by all groups. The above suggests, as hypothesized, that beliefs about oneself do activate attributions and behaviours. This provides evidence that the Bem Sex Role

Inventory, while designed to measure perceptions of oneself, also seems to be associated with a propensity to believe and behave in a sex-differentiated manner.

It was hypothesized that as the seriousness of the abuse situation increased, differences between males/females and sex-typed/non sex-typed groups would disappear as participants reacted to the escalating abuse. It is apparent that this hypothesis was not confirmed. Generally, non sex-typed male participants, who do not endorse the myths of the IBWB as significantly as sex-typed males, were more likely to see the problem as serious than sex-typed males. This difference did not dissipate even in the most obviously abusive scenario. However, absolute levels of measures did generally increase across all subjects (e.g., sympathy to victim, attributions of husband responsibility, etcetera). Possibly, for males, gender schema is a more important predictor of individual attributions than the seriousness of the abusive situation. Perhaps gender schema may be more related to attitudes, with sex-typed males clinging to the roles of power and aggression as acceptable in marital relationships. Sex-typed males express a "traditional" acceptance of abuse of women. Non sex-typed males, who appear to express little relationship with traditional concepts of "masculinity", are less inclined to

accept abuse under any circumstances. While all participants may become somewhat more sympathetic as abuse escalates, initial internally held differences may be more compelling than evidence presented in external situations. It would also be valuable to know whether individuals who do not subscribe to traditional sex roles simply believe that all abuse is serious and warrants intervention regardless of type and degree of violence.

It seems that the employment of abuse outcome cues differs for sex-typed and non sex-typed male individuals, only with respect to males. But why not for females? Generally, non sex-typed and sex-typed females did not differ significantly when responding to seriousness, probability of occurrence, and likelihood of intervention ratings, even as abuse escalated. A task for further evaluation must be to question the result that non sex-typed versus sex-typed females did not employ abuse outcome cues. The evidence from this study seems to point to sex role stereotyping as playing a role in attitudes about abuse. Why do we not see that non sex-typed females employ outcome cues, while sex-typed females do not? Perhaps, for females, there is a more comprehensive interplay between societal beliefs, community response, and the psychosocial experience of women. For males the traditional male role is related to attitudes, but for females the traditional female role may be part of a

larger experience.

### Certainty and Severity of Sanctions

Carmody & Williams (1987) compared responses of assaultive and non-assaultive men and found that the groups perceived sanctions as relatively unlikely, though severe, with an inverse relationship between criminal involvement and perception of social condemnation and arrest (men with higher criminal involvement gave lower ratings of social condemnation and arrest). However, nonassaultive men perceived the certainty and severity of social condemnation as significantly higher, and assaultive men perceived the certainty (but not severity) of retaliation as significantly higher. Carmody & Williams speculated that the fear of stigmatizing reactions may play a role in preventing some men from abusing their spouses. The men in that study were not identified and grouped according to gender schema. The present study, as discussed earlier, hypothesized that gender aschematic (non sex-typed) individuals would be less likely to adhere to cultural myths about wife abuse and would be more sympathetic to victims. Certainty and severity findings appear to support this hypothesis.

Findings demonstrate that, in reference to the no abuse and three abuse scenarios, non sex-typed individuals generally express the belief that sanctions



are significantly more certain. Overall, non sex-typed appear to believe, in response to the mild, moderate, and severe scenarios, that divorce and charges are likely outcomes. Non sex-typed males, responding to moderate abuse, appear to regard certainty of societal disapproval and retaliation as more certain. Further, non sex-typed individuals appear to see consequences as less severe as abuse escalates, but certainty of consequences as higher. Non sex-typed perceive severity of retaliation as higher only in response to no abuse, and severity of divorce higher in response to mild abuse. Sex-typed individuals view the severity of charges, divorce, and societal disapproval as higher when abuse is at its most extreme. It may be that non sex-typed individuals feel that victimizers deserve the consequences as abuse escalates, and, therefore, do not feel that the sanctions are as severe to the offender as when abuse takes milder forms. It would be interesting to investigate such a finding further to ascertain sex-typed subjects' reasoning in perceiving the severity of these sanctions as significantly higher, especially when the severity of abuse in this case is so enormous. Do sex-typed individuals, invested in traditional notions of men, women, and family life, see these sanctions as severe because of the threatened loss of family life through divorce or jailing of the husband? Is societal disapproval perceived by these individuals as

significantly more severe because of its effects on traditional notions of social roles for men and women? Further investigation into the relationship between sex roles and the socio-cultural factors affecting perceptions of sanctions is necessary. Generally, across participants, severity of sanctions is rated lower as abuse escalates.

Females perceive greater certainty of retaliation in response to the severe abuse scenario, and certainty of societal disapproval in response to the no abuse scenario than do males. It seems that negative sanctions are not expected to be consistently applied. Thus, it appears that in intimate relationships men and women tend to think that spouse abuse can be gotten away with. Why? Is it that the experiences of men and women in our society both personally and through media are that sanctions are unlikely? Or is there a shared belief that wife abuse is justifiable and not particularly objectionable? Interestingly, for both sexes, non sex-typed individuals applied higher ratings of certainty of sanctions than sex-typed. Thus, it seems that gender schema, rather than gender per se, may be a crucial component to perceptions of sanctions in intimate relationships. Further research aimed at a comprehensive analysis of these processes is necessary.

Relevant questions in relation to gender schema are implied by the

findings. First, does the experiential process of sex-typed and non sex-typed individuals differ, and does this relate to perceptions of sanctions. Highly sex-typed individuals seem to embrace inflexible roles for men (dominant, aggressive) and women (passive, gentle), and these roles are related to the justification of wife abuse. Non sex-typed individuals seemingly do not do so. Thus, is the use or nonuse of abusive behaviour against spouses associated with gender schema, such that highly schematic individuals would be found to be more assaultive than non sex-typed, or aschematic, individuals? If so, would their different experiences with wife abuse be related to perceptions of sanctions (e.g., perhaps retaliation is perceived as more certain by sex-typed individuals because their own expression of physical aggression has been met with defensive aggression by their spouses). If future research on gender schema and perceived certainty and severity of sanctions produces more definitive evidence that attributions are associated with gender schema, then public education campaigns that reflect the unacceptability and criminality of wife abuse will be only one implication. The greatest control of wife abuse may be the diffusion of the message through public education that sex-typed gender schemas are hazardous to our individual and collective health. In effect, our societal conception of highly stereotyped roles for males (e.g.,

dominant, aggressive) and females (e.g., passive, nurturant), and family roles (e.g., male - head of hierarchical structure in household, provider; female - family caretaker, secondary role), may set the stage for the abuse of women in marriage. Social tolerance of abuse perpetuates the issue. For this social problem to be taken seriously, not only must the statistics be documented to clearly stress the extent of the problem, but also, community models should be created involving comprehensive presentations of wife abuse to get the message across. Future research should involve a comprehensive analysis of the separate effects and interaction of sex and sex-typing of individuals and their association with the perceptions of sanctions.

Findings for no abuse and mild abuse situations generally suggest retaliation and divorce as the most likely and severe sanctions, and arrest and disapproval as least likely. Responses to moderate and severe situations suggest social condemnation and divorce as the most certain and severe sanctions, with arrest and retaliation receiving the lower ratings. The findings for social condemnation and arrest seem to support the deterrence process (fear of stigmatizing reactions) hypothesis by Carmody & Williams (1987), suggesting lower involvement with wife abuse because of a greater perceived threat of sanctions. The experiential process discussed by the researchers is

also a possible explanation, suggesting a higher involvement on the part of some men because sanctions have not been consistently applied.

The finding for retaliation may be explained by our societal perception of assault. It is possible that victims of "milder" assault would be capable of retaliation, while victims who are assaulted with greater injury would be less capable of retaliation. Further, those who engage in assaultive behaviour may have experienced defence tactics involving violent retaliation by victims, and thus, expect retaliation to be more likely than those who do not engage in assaultive behaviour. As far as social condemnation is concerned, responses cannot be minimized. It appears that individuals tend to find excuses for "lesser" forms of wife assault, as indicated by responses to the IBWB. Therefore, it appears they are not as likely to feel that abusers should or do experience social condemnation for these acts. Only when wife abuse is horribly extreme do individuals seem to expect that social condemnation to play a significant role. The findings about arrest are worthy of further attention. It appears that, commonly, arrest is not perceived as being particularly likely or severe, even when abuse is at its most extreme. Again, the experiential process of the public may be that sanctions have not been consistently applied, hence the idea that sanctions are a deterrent to wife assault

is not supported in the public mind. Responses appear to suggest that many people think that wife abuse is not always objectionable and can be excused. If this is the case, sanctions are not necessarily the answer as long as people continue to believe that the use of abuse in intimate relationships is acceptable.

#### Responsibility and Control of Husband/Wife for Problem

Generally, responsibility and control for both origin and solution of the problem was attributed to the husband. Responsibility for the problem and solution of the problem was rated highest.

Overall, sex differences were not significant in relation to attributions about the problem with respect to the husband and wife. Men and women tended to assign responsibility and control similarly.

Non sex-typed individuals generally assigned control and responsibility to the husband significantly more than sex-typed individuals for problem origin and solution. However, for the severe abuse, only non sex-typed males significantly assigned responsibility to the husband for solution to the problem. Sex-typed individuals, in response to moderate abuse, tended to assign higher wife control over problem origin. The most interesting finding is the evidence that, when abuse worsens (moderate and severe situations), sex-typed individuals assign significantly higher responsibility and control of the solution

of the problem to the wife. Considering the unequal physical power of men and women, and the severity of the abuse rendering the victim virtually helpless to defend or end the abuse, why then would this be the case? Is it because sex-typed individuals, adhering to the traditional notion of women as being the family caretakers, see it as the woman's responsibility to effect change in the relationship? It would be more revealing to investigate subjects' reasoning in coming to this decision. For example, perhaps perceiving the perpetrator to be out of control in the worst situations of abuse, sex-typed individuals would expect the wife to flee the situation placing the onus on her to escape.

The husband control measure revealed that for origin and solution both sex-typed and non sex-typed individuals rated husband culpability higher than wife. However, non sex-typed consistently rated husband control for origin and solution higher than sex-typed. Non sex-typed and female sex-typed individuals generally perceived the husband as having more control over problem solution than origin, while male sex-typed rated husband control as higher for origin of the problem. The wife control measure revealed that sex-typed individuals, as abuse escalated, applied overall greater control scores to wives than non sex-typed individuals for both origin and solution of the

problem. Again, male sex-typed persons rated control of solution over origin, while non sex-typed and female sex-typed perceived the wife as having control over origin before solution. Across subjects wives were assigned significantly less culpability as abuse escalated, while husbands were assigned significantly more culpability as abuse escalated.

Again, subjects' reasoning in coming to decisions regarding husband/wife culpability must be investigated. Is the offender excused, and if so, how? Is the victim blamed, and if so, how? Is the victim attributed solution responsibility because the individual sees as a goal her choice not to be a victim? Or because as family caretaker and nurturant woman she is held responsible for the situation? The societal stand on social issues will be reflected in the attitudes of its members. We have seen that the individuals in this study all subscribe somewhat to the myths of the IBWB, sex-typed individuals in particular. Faulty reasoning may condone abusive behaviour, and such attitudes are unlikely to facilitate change. Thus, a comprehensive analysis of the reasoning involved in attitudes about wife abuse and sex roles is warranted to help people to identify the primary relationship between abuse, faulty thinking in hidden societal opinions about wife abuse, and the realities of the issue.



### Conclusions

Overall findings provide support for the hypotheses being tested. There is clear support for hypotheses predicting that gender schematic (sex-typed) individuals subscribe to cultural misconceptions about wife abuse (e.g., engage in victim derogation and demonstrate less sympathy for victims, according to the WJ and WG subscales of the IBWB), and that male sex-typed individuals are likely to perceive abuse as less serious and to perceive sanctions as uncertain.

Generally sex differences were not strongly demonstrated in this study. Females believed that the sanction of retaliation was more certain for severe abuse and societal disapproval was more certain with no abuse, and that as abuse escalated, women become more responsible for finding a solution to the problem. A lack of endorsement of certainty/severity by women in this case may possibly be the result of the role of female victimization and the female experience, wherein women perceive no definitive evidence of deterrence/sanctions being applied consistently; whereas male exposure to husband arrest, etcetera., of males for such behaviour may cause them to perceive certainty/severity of sanctions as more likely. Further, women, as victims, may perceive the possibility of retaliation/self defence as being more

probable than males, as offenders.

Sugerman & Cohn (1986) also found that wives tended to be attributed high solution responsibility in their study. They argued that the victim activation hypothesis plays a role in such attributions, wherein the victim wife is seen as responsible for terminating the abuse. There is another possible explanation for a general belief that women should take responsibility for resolving an abusive situation that is situated in societal values and beliefs about women. Women are socialized in our society to take a compensatory role in relationships, whether with parents, spouse, children, or friends. Their measure as successful individuals tends to be taken from how well they take care of others, nurturing, protecting, and taking a secondary role for those they love and receiving approval from pleasing others. Sinclair (1985) posits that such socialization for women places them in great danger, "Training for the traditional female role prepares a woman well for the position of victim. She has been trained to think herself selfish if she puts her needs ahead of others...She is placed under tremendous pressure to make the marriage work, or at least appear to make it work. She is held responsible for the success or failure of the union" (p. 26). This kind of thinking feeds into the interplay between community and individual in endangering women who feel responsible

for keeping the family intact. Even if we place responsibility on the victim to terminate the situation, rather than keeping the marriage together, as a society we are guilty of ignoring the complexities of wife abuse. We must not fall into the trap of placing expectations on victims who are faced with obstacles to employ immediate and dramatic solutions. Thus, as Loseke & Cahill (1984) discussed, abused women may be victimized not only first in the spousal situation, but also within the attitudes of society and "experts" providing services if women who stay with their spouses are considered to be somewhat deviant.

Contrary to hypothesis, differences in perceptions and attributions generally do not disappear as abuse escalates. Thus, even in the most extreme situations, our misconceptions about wife abuse still appear to hold and to obscure our recognition of the realities facing abused women.

The major finding to emerge from this research is that all participants demonstrated at least some measure of adherence to cultural myths about wife abuse. Sinclair (1985) argues that societal beliefs interplay with the type and availability of community resources and responses to battered women, and to the psychosocial experience of victimization. Results of this study suggest, as well, that individuals who adhere to traditional female and male sex roles

complicate the lives of abused women. They are at high risk for accepting cultural myths and making attributions about the victimization of women based on traditional sex roles.

This is not surprising, given that we are all products of our social environment and reflect cultural origins in all that we do. It appears that society and societal attitudes are part of the problem of abuse, and must be part of the solution. Some of the values and beliefs embedded in our society are the roots of wife abuse. These must be addressed. One way to do this is to recognize that values and beliefs about traditional male and female roles contribute to the origins and perpetuation of abuse.

Societal education that enhances consciousness about the myths of wife abuse and the absolute unacceptability and criminality of same is indicated. Further, a comprehensive understanding of the complexities of sex roles and societal beliefs and the ties between them is necessary before service can be given and change effected. Some findings indicate that non sex-typed and sex-typed males differ significantly on some measures, while sex-typed versus non sex-typed females do not. It would be worthwhile to pursue this line of investigation in several directions. Studies clarifying the role of gender schema and sex would be useful to determine more conclusively just how strong a role

gender schema plays for both sexes in determining perceptions and attitudes. Also, spouses who have experienced wife abuse (perpetrators and victims) should be surveyed and evaluated in terms of gender schema and attitudes toward spousal abuse. The question of whether individuals in these relationships subscribe to sex-typed gender schemas and traditional marital roles seems crucial in order to explore the power of such roles in exacerbating the problem of abuse of women. Further, if women adhere to misconceptions similarly, despite differing in gender schema, perhaps it is because of the differing experiential process of women. In this case, do societal attitudes have more of an effect on the attitudes of women than gender schema? Is the popular conception of women as having little power in relationships and as being the victim so strong that it minimizes the effect of being gender aschematic? If this is so, then the approach of education about the issue of woman abuse may have to be different for women, focusing on the unacceptability of such perceptions of powerlessness in societal roles. It appears that intense education about wife abuse and the dangers of traditional sex roles and other societal myths can change the social conditions that encourage and perpetuate the problem of violence against wives.

A number of future research directions are suggested by these results.

First, research aimed at examining the question of whether abuse in intimate relationships is sensitive to attributions of responsibility/control and to sanctions is worth pursuing, as the present research design demonstrates complex findings which are difficult to draw conclusions from. Second, research that empirically links attributions about and responses to wife abuse versus stranger assault is important. Such research will serve to highlight the tendency of society to minimize and to respond inappropriately to wife abuse, and will serve to emphasize the need for change in attitudes and resources. Attempts should be made to obtain norms from the general population, as the central hypothesis concerns the attributions and perceptions of same, and the relationship indicated in this study may have been confounded with the demographic characteristics of the sample (university students in an educational atmosphere, who are generally considered more "liberal"). An investigation into the relationship of gender schema, sex and marital roles with couples involved in abusive relationships is warranted. Finally, it seems crucial to assess the attributions and perceptions of any professionals (e.g., police, clergy, family doctors, psychologists, advocates) who will come in contact with abused women, as these individuals have opportunities to directly influence victims of abuse. If professionals harbour societal misconceptions about wife abuse,

and/or adhere to traditional sex roles for themselves, they may be compelled to direct clients according to these, and therefore perpetuate the problem of abuse.

A number of limitations in the present study should be mentioned.

First, norms were not derived from a large sample of the population, but from a group of introductory psychology students who volunteered to participate.

Second, although dynamic vignettes were employed as social stimuli, participants may have had difficulty in employing the written information.

Resulting perceptions and attributions may be affected by the use of more dynamic stimuli, such as video depictions of abuse. Finally, the seriousness manipulation, although seemingly appropriate, may be more effectively and validly employed. In the present study, differences along the levels of this factor may be questioned. Pre-testing of any seriousness manipulation would be a helpful addition to this type of study.

Despite the limitations discussed, this is an extensive study which documents in a scientific framework the psychological and attitudinal implications of stereotypes, the expression of negativity towards women, and the acceptance of violence against women. Wife abuse is just one of the many examples of violence against women which include sexual assault, harassment, and denial of equality in the workplace, which are legitimized within our

sociocultural framework. As long as we continue to internalize the imposition of traditional cultural values and beliefs about sex roles and power differentiation between men and women as fundamental truths, abuse of women will continue.



References

- Albrecht, S.L., Bahr, H.M., & Chadwick, B.A. (1979). Changing family and sex roles: An assessment of age differences. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 41-50.
- Bell, C., & Newby, H. (1976). Husbands and wives: The dynamics of the deferential dialectic. In D.L. Baker & S. Allen (Eds.). Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage, (p. 154). New York: Longman.
- Bem, S. (1975). Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31(4), 634-643.
- Bem, S.L., & Lenney, E. (1976). Sex-typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 48-54.
- Berk, R.A., & Newton, P.J. (1985). Does arrest deter wife battering: An effort to replicate the findings of the Minneapolis abuse experiment. American Sociological Review, 50, 253-262.
- Berk, R.A., Newton, P.J., & Berk, S.R. (1986). What a difference a day makes: An empirical study of the impact of shelters for battered women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48(3), 481-490.
- Bernard, M.L., & Bernard, J.L. (1985). Violent intimacy: The family as a model for love relationships. Family Relations, 32, 283-286.

Blood, R.O., & Wolfe, D.M. (1960). Husbands and Wives. Glencoe: Free Press.

Bograd, M. (1982). Battered women, cultural myths and clinical interventions:

A feminist analysis. In New England Association for Women in Psychology

(Eds.). Current Feminist Issues in Psychotherapy, (pp. 69-78). New York:

Haworth Press.

Bograd, M. (1984). Family systems approaches to wife battering: A feminist

critique. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 54, 558-568.

Brienes, W., & Gordon, L. (1983). The new scholarships on family violence.

Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8(3), 490-531.

Brickman, P., Rabinowitz, V.C., Karuza, I., Coates, D., Cohen, E., & Kidder,

L. (1982). Models of helping and coping. American Psychologist, 37, 368-

384.

Burris, C.A., & Jaffe, P. (1984). Wife battering: A well-kept secret. Canadian

Journal of Criminology 12, 1171-1177.

Burt, M.R. (1980). Cultural myths and support for rape. Journal of Personality

and Social Psychology, 38(2), 217-230.

Byles, J. (1980). Family violence in Hamilton. Canadian Mental Health, 28, 1.

Carmody, D.C., & Williams, K.R. (1987). Wife assault and perceptions of

sanctions. Violence and Victims, 2(1), 25-38.

- Coates, D., Wortman, C.B., & Abbey, A. (1979). Reactions to victims. In I.H. Frieze, D. Bar-Tal, & J.S. Carroll (Eds.). New Approaches to Social Problems, (pp. 21-52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohn, E.S., & Sugarman, D.B. (1980). Marital abuse: Abusing the one you love. Victimology, 5(2-4), 203-212.
- Howard, J.A. (1984). The "normal" victim: The effects of gender stereotypes on reactions to victims. Social Psychology Quarterly, 47(3), 270-281.
- Finn, J. (1986). The relationship between sex role attitudes and attitudes supporting marital violence. Sex Roles, 14(5-6), 235-244.
- Frieze, I.H. (1979). Perceptions of battered wives. In I. Frieze, D. Bar-Tal, & J. Carroll (Eds.). New Approaches to Social Problems, (pp. 79-108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gelles, R.J. (1976). Abused wives: Who do they stay? Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 659-668.
- Grasmick, H.G., & Green, D.E. (1980). Legal punishment, social disapproval and internalization as inhibitors of illegal behavior. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 71, 325-335.

- Greenblat, K. (1985). "Don't hit your wife...unless...": Preliminary findings on normative support for the use of physical force by husbands. Victimology: An International Journal, 10(1-4), 221-241.
- Hilberman, E. (1980). Overview: The "wife-beater's wife" reconsidered. American Journal of Psychiatry, 137, 1336-1347.
- Hilberman, E., & Munson, K. (1977-1978). Sixty battered women. Victimology, 2, 460-470.
- Hotaling, G.T., & Sugarman, D.B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1, 101-124.
- Howard, J.A. (1984). The "normal" victim: The effects of gender stereotypes on reactions to victims. Social Psychology Quarterly, 47(3), 270-281.
- Ickes, W.J., & Layden, M.A. (1978). Attributional styles. In J.H. Harvey, W.J. Ickes, & R.F. Kidd (Eds.). New Directions in Attribution Research 2, (pp. 121-152). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Jaffe, P., Wolfe, D., Wilson, S., & Zak, L. (1986). Similarities in behavioral and social maladjustment among child victims and witnesses to family violence. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 56, 142-146.

- Kalmuss, D. (1979). The attribution of responsibility in a wife-abuse context. Victimology: An International Journal, 4(2), 284-291.
- Kincaid, P. (1982). The Omitted Reality: Husband Wife Violence in Ontario and Policy Implications for Education. Toronto: Learnx Press.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J.M. (1970). The Unresponsive Bystander: Why Doesn't He Help. (2nd ed.) New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Lerner, M.J., & Miller, D.T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 1030-1051.
- Loseke, D.R., & Cahill, S.E. (1984). The social construction of deviance: Experts on battered women. Social Problems, 31(3), 296-310.
- MacLeod, L. (1980). Wife Battering in Canada: The Vicious Cycle. Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.
- Martin, D. (1976). Battered wives. New York: Pocket Books.
- Mazrah, I., & Choo, P.F. (1986). The factor structures of the BSRI. International Journal of Psychology, 21(1), 31-41.
- Resick, P. (1983). Sex-role stereotypes and violence against women. In V. Franks & E. Rothblum (Eds.). The Stereotyping of Women: Its Effect on Mental Health, (pp. 230-256). New York: Springer.

Richardson, D.C., & Campbell, J.L. (1980). Alcohol and wife abuse: The effect of alcohol on attributions of blame for wife abuse. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 6(1), 51-56.

Roscoe, B. (1987). Courtship violence: Acceptable forms and situations. College Student Journal, 13, 389-393.

Ross, M., & Ditecco, D. (1975). An attributional analysis of moral judgments. Journal of Social Issues, 31, 91-109.

Rossi, F.E., Waite, C.E., & Berk, R. (1974). The seriousness of crimes: Normative structure and individual differences. American Sociological Review, 39, 224-237.

Roy, M. (Ed.). (1980). The Abusive Partner: An Analysis of Domestic Battering. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Saunders, D.G., Lynch, A.B., Grayson, M., & Linz, D. (1987). The Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating: The construction and initial validation of a measure of beliefs and attitudes. Violence and Victims, 2(1), 39-57.

Shields, N.M., & Fox, S.B. (1980). Interactional aspects of attribution processes in the context of violence between intimates. Unpublished manuscript. Policy Research and Planning Group, Inc., St. Louis.

- Shields, N.M., & Hanneke, C.R. (1983). Attribution processes in violent relationships: Perceptions of violent husbands and their wives. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 13(6), 515-527.
- Shotland, R.L., & Strw, M.K. (1976). Bystander response to an assault: When a man attacks a woman. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 990-999.
- Sinclair, D. (1985). Understanding Wife Assault: A Training Manual for Counsellors and Advocates. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, Family Violence Program.
- Spence, J.T., & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates, and Antecedents. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Steinfeld, T.J. (1986). Spouse abuse: Clinical implications of research on the control of aggression. Journal of Family Violence, 1(2), 197-208.
- Steinmetz, S.K. (1978). Violence between family members. Marriage and Family Review, 1, 1-13.
- Straus, M.A. (1976). Sexual inequality, cultural norms, and wife-beating. Victimology: An International Journal, 1, 54-70.

- Straus, M.A. (1978). Wife-beating: How common and why. Victimology: An International Journal, 2, 443-458.
- Straus, M. (1980). Victims and aggressors in marital violence. American Behavioral Scientist, 23, 681-704.
- Straus, M. (1980). A sociological perspective on the causes of family violence. In M. Geer (Ed.). Violence and the Family. Boulder, C.A.: Westview Press.
- Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J., & Steinmetz, S.K. (1980). Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family. Garden City, New York: Anchor.
- Sugarman, D.B., & Cohn, E.S. (1986). Origin and solution attributions of responsibility for wife abuse: Effects of outcome severity, prior history, and sex of subject. Violence and Victims, 1(4), 291-303.
- Symonds, A. (1979). Violence against women -- The myth of masochism. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 33, 161-173.
- Symonds, M. (1980). The "second injury" to victims. Evaluation and Change, Special Issue, 36-38.
- Szinovacz, M.E. (1983). Using couple data as a methodological tool: The case of marital violence. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45(3), 633-644.



- Tarr, L. (1978). Developmental sex role theory and sex role attitudes in late adolescents. Psychological Reports, 42, 807-814.
- Tomeh, A.K. (1978). Sex role orientation?: Analysis of structural and attitudinal predictors. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 341-354.
- Waites, E. (1977-1978). Women, masochism, and the enforced restriction of choice. Victimology, 2, 535-544.
- Walker, L.E. (1977-1978). Battered women and learned helplessness. Victimology: An International Journal, 2(3-4), 525-534.
- Walker, L.E. (1979). The Battered Woman. New York: Harper and Row.
- Walker, L.E. (1981). Battered women: Sex roles and clinical issues. Professional Psychology, 12, 81-91.
- Walker, L.E. (1983). The battered woman syndrome study. In D. Finkelhor, R. Gelles, G. Hotaling, & M. Straus (Eds.). The Dark Side of Families. Beverly Hills, C.A.: Sage Publications.
- Walker, L.E. (1984). The Battered Woman Syndrome. New York: Springer.
- Walker, L.E., & Browne, A. (1985). Gender and victimization by intimates. Journal of Personality, 53(2), 179-195.
- Weidman, A. (1986). Family therapy with violent couples. Social Casework, 67(4), 211-218.

- Wolfe, D.A., Jaffe, P., Wilson, S.K., & Zak, L. (1985). Children of battered women: The relation of child behavior to family violence and maternal stress. Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology, 53, 657-664.
- Wortman, C.B. (1976). Causal attributions and personal control. In J.H. Harvey, W.I. Ickes, & R.F. Kidd (Eds.). New Directions of Attribution Research 1. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Yakimovitch, D., & Saltz, E. (1971). Helping behavior: The cry for help. Psychonomic Science, 23, 427-428.
- Yllo, K. (1983). Sexual equality and violence against wives in American states. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 14(1), 67-86.

Appendix A.

Wife Abuse Scenarios

No Abuse

You witness the following scene as it takes place between the couple next door in their driveway:

Voices have become raised as an argument is taking place. You hear an escalating war of words, as each partner attacks the vulnerable spots of the other. The fight moves into their back yard, where you can see them, standing face to face. Insults and insinuations are hurled, as husband and wife spit out challenges to each other over who will leave first. Suddenly they move apart and turn their backs to each other. There is a long, quiet pause, then they turn toward each other again and gaze without speaking. Finally they begin to speak together in a much quieter tone, and while you can't hear exactly what they are saying, you notice after several minutes of discussion that they smile, hug, and return inside together.

Mild

You witness the following scene as it takes place between the couple next door in their driveway:

Voices have become raised as an argument is taking place. You hear an

escalating war of words, as each partner attacks the vulnerable spots of the other. The fight moves into their back yard, where you can see them, standing face to face. Insults and insinuations are hurled, as husband and wife spit out challenges to each other over who will leave first. As the husband turns to leave he grabs her by the arm and pushes her out of the way, causing her to stumble and fall to the ground.

#### Moderate

You witness the following scene as it takes place between the couple next door in their driveway:

Voices have become raised as an argument is taking place. You hear an escalating war of words, as each partner attacks the vulnerable spots of the other. The fight moves into their back yard, where you can see them, standing face to face. Insults and insinuations are hurled, as husband and wife spit out challenges to each other over who will leave first. The husband slaps her face, then, as he turns to leave he pushes her forcefully to the ground.

#### Severe

Voices have become raised as an argument is taking place. You hear an escalating war of words, as each partner attacks the vulnerable spots of the other. The fight moves into their back yard, where you can see them, standing face to

face. Insults and insinuations are hurled, as husband and wife spit out challenges to each other over who will leave first. As the husband turns to leave, he grabs her by the arm and throws her forcefully to the ground, repeatedly punching and kicking her about the face and body. She has curled up into a protective ball and is pleading for him to stop.

Appendix B.

Measures of Perceived Duration, Frequency, Seriousness of Vignettes

Consider the scenarios you read. Please rate on a scale from 0 to 5 how long you think the problem has been occurring, with "0" meaning "not at all long", "3" meaning "for a fairly long time" and "5" meaning "for a very long time".

0      1      2      3      4      5

Please rate on a scale from 0 to 5 how often the problem has been occurring, with "0" meaning "not at all often", "3" meaning "somewhat often", and "5" meaning "very often".

0      1      2      3      4      5

Please rate on a scale from 0 to 5 how serious you think the injuries to the victim are with "0" meaning "not at all serious", "3" meaning "somewhat serious" and "5" meaning "very serious".

0      1      2      3      4      5

Appendix C.

Measures of Perceptions of Probability, Believability and Likelihood of Victimization

Please rate from 0 to 5 how believable you think this problem is, with "0" meaning "not at all believable", "3" meaning "somewhat believable", and "5" meaning "very believable".

0      1      2      3      4      5

Please rate from 0 to 5 how probable you think this problem is, with "0" meaning "not at all probable", "3" meaning "somewhat probable", and "5" meaning "very probable".

0      1      2      3      4      5

Please rate from 0 to 5 how likely it is that a woman will be victimized in this fashion, with "0" meaning "not at all likely", "3" meaning "somewhat likely", and "5" meaning "extremely likely".

0      1      2      3      4      5

Appendix D.

Questions Posed Regarding Likelihood of Intervention and Right to Intervene

Please rate on a scale from 0 to 5 how likely it is that you would intervene in some way if you were actually a witness to the scenario that you just read, with "0" meaning "definitely would not intervene", "3" meaning "somewhat likely to intervene", and "5" meaning "definitely would intervene".

0      1      2      3      4      5

Please rate on a scale from 0 to 5 how much right any individual has to intervene in such a situation involving spouses, with "0" meaning "no right at all to intervene", "3" meaning "some right to intervene", and "5" meaning "every right to intervene".

0                      2      3      4      5



Appendix E.

Informed Consent Given to Each Subject

In the present study I am interested in examining how people think about the world around them. The following scenario and its accompanying questionnaires will provide data that will be helpful in understanding this area of interest. The answers you give will be kept in the strictest confidence and will be destroyed upon completion of this study. You are at liberty to refuse to take part in this study, but it will be very helpful if you will take the hour required to complete this study. If, at any time, you wish to end your participation, please feel free to do so. If you wish to participate, just sign your name below, with today's date.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature and Student Number

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Appendix F.

Debriefing Form Presented

Shotland & Strau (1976) demonstrated that the context in which an emergency takes place may effect the way we interpret the event. The interpretation of a situation may change the meaning of a scene and alter the individual's perception of the appropriate form of action to take. Shotland & Strau had observers witness an argument between a man and a woman, wherein the woman was physically assaulted by the man. If the woman verbally stated that she did not know the man, 65 percent of the bystanders intervened. If she indicated that they knew each other, bystanders rated the assault as less of an emergency, and intervention dropped to 19 percent. Thus, bystanders were less likely to intercede if they believed the individuals involved were in a relationship. This study examines a different approach to this unusual ambivalence in our reactions to victims, emphasizing the role of gender stereotypes and cultural misconceptions in regards to wife battering in directing our reactions, both in the decision to intervene and in attributions about the victims. Bem (1975) introduced the notion of psychological androgyny versus sex-typed gender stereotypes, suggesting that psychologically androgynous persons are more likely to display sex role adaptability across situations, while sex-typed persons are more likely to rigidly

adhere to gender appropriate behaviours. Howard (1984) demonstrated that sex-based stereotypes were closely related to criminal victimization, such that gender stereotypes structured responses to victimization. Saunders, Lynch, Grayson & Linz (1987) developed the Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating (IBWB) in order to identify and differentiate readiness to subscribe to stereotyped attitudes about battered women. This study was designed to examine the hypotheses that sex-typed individuals adhere to cultural beliefs about wife battering and will be more likely to react according to gender stereotypes in responding to battering incidents. The findings may suggest a relationship between gender stereotypes, cultural beliefs about wife battering, and responses to victimization. If you want more information or are interested in the results of this study, please feel free to contact me to discuss your questions by leaving a message with the psychology department secretary.

---

Sherry Ann Jackson

#### References

- Bem, S. (1975). Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31(4), 634-643.
- Howard, J.A. (1984). The "normal" victim: The effects of gender stereotypes on reactions to victims. Social Psychology Quarterly, 47(3), 270-281.

Saunders, D.G., Lynch, A.B., Grayson, M., & Linz, D. (1987). The Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating: The construction and initial validation of a measure of beliefs and attitudes. Violence and Victims, 2(1), 39-57.

Shotland, R.L., & Strau, M.K. (1976). Bystander response to an assault: When a man attacks a woman. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 990-999.

## Appendix G.

Tables of Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Dependent MeasuresCorrelations Between IBWB Subscales and Attributions of Seriousness

Scenario	Subscales(a)				
	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.20*	-.15*	.14*	-.01	.10
Mild	-.30**	-.38**	.20*	-.05	.24*
Moderate	-.36**	-.42**	.31**	.14*	.34**
Severe	-.30**	-.28**	.26**	.14*	.25**

(a) Key: WJ = Wife Beating is Justified; WG = Wives Gain from Beatings;  
 HG = Help Should Be Given; OP = Offender Should Be  
 Punished; HR = Husband is Responsible.

\*p < .05; \*\* p < .01.

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Probability of Occurrence

Scenario	Subscales				
	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.17*	-.16*	.15*	.03	.19*
Mild	-.38**	-.42**	.31**	.07	.30**
Moderate	-.41**	-.46**	.30**	.06	.29**
Severe	-.36**	-.44**	.27**	.13*	.29**

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Likelihood of Intervention Ratings

Scenario	Subscales				
	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.02	.04	-.05	.00	-.05
Mild	-.31**	-.33**	.31**	.18*	.28**
Moderate	-.27**	-.24*	.21*	.21*	.28**
Severe	-.21*	-.26**	.22*	.19*	.19*

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Certainty of Retaliation

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	.02	-.05	.02	.04	-.06
Mild	-.03	-.05	.02	.09	.11
Moderate	-.09	-.04	.09	.20*	.07
Severe	-.01	.03	.02	.10	.06

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Certainty of Divorce

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	.04	-.07	.04	.10	-.08
Mild	-.20*	-.23*	.16*	.03	.10
Moderate	-.20*	-.19*	.14*	.10	.19*
Severe	-.12	-.13*	.06	.16*	.15*

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Certainty of Charges

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	.10	.02	-.12	.16*	-.22*
Mild	-.07	-.10	.05	.13*	.03
Moderate	-.11	-.14*	.03	.07	.10
Severe	-.08	-.13*	.00	.19*	.15*

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Certainty of Societal Disapproval of Husband

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	.04	.07	-.11	.20*	-.13*
Mild	-.10	-.07	.11	.07	.08
Moderate	-.20*	-.16*	.15*	.02	.19*
Severe	-.15*	-.09	.08	.16*	.17*

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Severity of Retaliation Measures

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.23**	-.22**	.20*	-.00	-.05
Mild	-.15*	-.12	.18*	.10	-.03
Moderate	.03	.03	.13*	.03	.00
Severe	.07	.06	.11	.05	-.06

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Severity of Divorce Measure

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.23**	-.25**	.18*	.02	.10
Mild	-.04	.02	.04	.03	-.04
Moderate	.21**	.26**	.13*	.06	-.21**
Severe	.29**	.34**	-.24**	.06	-.28**



Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Severity of Charges Measure

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.18*	-.12	.14*	.08	.00
Mild	.01	.02	.03	.02	-.06
Moderate	.16*	.21*	-.12	.08	-.16*
Severe	.26**	.30**	-.20*	.09	-.24*

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Severity of Societal Disapproval Measure

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.18*	-.12	-.15*	.11	.00
Mild	-.03	.03	-.02	.06	-.02
Moderate	.12	.19*	-.11	.05	-.10
Severe	.27**	.31**	-.22*	.04	-.22*

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Husband Control of Problem OriginMeasure

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.04	.06	.01	.22*	.02
Mild	-.10	-.13*	.08	.18*	.12
Moderate	-.06	-.11	.04	.12	.23**
Severe	-.12	-.08	.01	.14*	.21*

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Wife Control of Problem OriginMeasure

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.00	.09	-.02	.23*	-.04
Mild	.05	.00	-.06	.09	-.00
Moderate	.14*	.11	-.02	.10	-.17*
Severe	.12	.06	-.06	.11	-.09

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Husband Responsibility for  
Problem Origin Measure

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.12	-.07	.03	.19*	.03
Mild	-.08	-.03	.01	.22*	.06
Moderate	-.18*	-.15*	.08	.04	.18*
Severe	-.20*	-.16*	.06	.16*	.20*

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Wife Responsibility for Problem  
Origin Measure

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.08	-.05	-.01	.20*	-.04
Mild	.08	.05	-.10	.12	-.06
Moderate	.05	.05	.01	.08	-.14*
Severe	.10	.05	-.03	.07	-.11

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Husband Control of ProblemSolution

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.05	-.02	.07	.11	.02
Mild	-.15*	-.07	.12	.08	.09
Moderate	-.15*	-.15*	.16*	.07	.24**
Severe	-.17*	-.12	.12	.02	.17*

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Wife Control of Problem Solution

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.00	.06	-.00	.11	-.04
Mild	.09	.02	-.09	.06	.03
Moderate	.14*	.14*	-.08	.22*	-.27**
Severe	.30**	.20*	-.18*	.11*	-.23*

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Husband Responsibility for  
Problem Solution Measure

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.05	-.00	.05	.10	.01
Mild	-.08	-.07	.05	.05	.08
Moderate	-.13*	-.12	.06	.04	.17*
Severe	-.28**	-.11	.08	.14	.11

Correlations Between IBWB Subscales and Wife Responsibility for Problem  
Solution Measure

Scenario	WJ	WG	HG	OP	HR
No	-.01	.05	-.00	.12	-.06
Mild	.07	.02	-.15	.09	-.04
Moderate	.16*	.11	-.05	.21*	-.20*
Severe	.24*	.19*	-.14*	.17*	-.28**