Coercive Control in intimate relationships: A cross-cultural study of Perceptions and Blame Attribution

Claudia María Monroy Huás

Master's Thesis

Department of Conflict, Risk and Safety

Faculty of Behavioral, Management, and Social Sciences (BMS)

University of Twente

Supervisor: Dr. Steven J. Watson

2nd Supervisor: Dr. Jiska Jonas

April, 2025

Abstract

Coercive control is a form of intimate partner violence where, in an intimate relationship, one of the partners shows patterns of oppressive behavior that seeks to control, manipulate, isolate, degrade and intimidate the other. This study aims to investigate the different perceptions on Severity of Abuse, Acceptance and Blame Attribution for coercive control of individuals belonging to two different countries and cultures, namely the Netherlands (dignity culture) and Guatemala (honor culture). Different nationalities and cultural norms can lead to different perceptions. For instance, dignity cultures focus on the value of the individual and its autonomy, while honor cultures focus on maintaining social respect with more rigid roles. Such cultures are very different in the way they deal with conflict and might thus appraise coercive control differently. For this study, participants evaluated a case of a heteronormative relationship in which one of the partners demonstrated coercive control behavior. Participants were randomly assigned to a case with either a female victim or a male victim without any further changes to the contents of the case. Participants were also asked about their Gender Role Beliefs, Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms and Perceived Honor Cultural Norms through different scales. This study concluded that male victims were comparatively blamed more while their victimhood was also deemed less severe and more accepted compared to a female victim. Additionally, Dutch individuals blamed victims more compared to Guatemalans and showed more acceptance of coercive control. All tested moderators also appeared to have a significant effect on at least one of the investigated perceptions. The results of this study address culture and its impact on how people appraise cases of abuse. This perspective is key to get a more overarching approach that can improve legislation and the design of preventive measures, such as a holistic training for authorities and more targeted educational programs that challenge traditional gender stereotypes. Moreover, it highlights the need of awareness of societal biases to provide the necessary support and interventions for victims of any type of IPV regardless of their gender.

Introduction

There are different ways in which abuse can be manifested within an intimate relationship such as coercive control. Coercive control is a form of intimate partner violence (IPV), and it is described as when in a relationship, one of the partners show patterns of oppressive behavior that seeks to control, manipulate, isolate, degrade and intimidate the other (Martín-Fernández et al., 2022). As the name suggests it is made up of two separate elements. The first element is coercion, defined as "the use of force or threats to compel or dispel a particular response" (Stark, 2007, p.228). It typically includes threats or actual physical assaults. The second element is control, which encompasses different ways of compelling obedience indirectly by managing resources, dictating choices, micro-regulating a partner's behavior, limiting options, and depriving supports needed to perform independent judgement (Stark, 2007). Control is characterized by non-physical behaviors that can include emotional, financial or psychological abuse and stalking (Otter et al., 2022).

These behaviors lead to negative impacts on victims, with cognitive, emotional and social consequences and consequences on their mental health. For instance, victims can experience post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, anxiety and/or substance abuse (Bishop and Bettinson, 2017; Hines & Douglas, 2011). The consequences would likely result in victims being isolated and with a little sense of self-worth or self-esteem (Walklate & Fitz-Gibbon, 2019). Moreover, coercive control tends to escalate over time, therefore the risk of other more severe types of abuse that might increase over time, such as physical or sexual abuse (Amell et al., 2022; Cinquegrana et al., 2023; Stewart & Vigod, 2019; Stubbs & Szoeke, 2021).

Regarding coercive control and the gender of victims, both men and women can be victims of coercive control perpetrated by their partners (Carmo et al., 2011) and moreover it has been found that the perceptions on the severity of abuse depends on the gender of the victim (Rhatigan et al., 2011).While coercive control causes significant harm, it remains underreported for both genders. For female victims, underreporting is commonly caused by reliance on family and friends for support, the fear of not being taken seriously by police or perceiving the non-violent nature of coercive control unworthy of professional attention (Brennan et al., 2021; Prosman et al., 2013). For male victims, underreporting might be caused by an internalized

stigma, the lack of visible services for men, fear of reprisals, discreditation and/or shame (Taylor et al., 2021).

Coercive control is not always perceived as serious as other forms of IPV in every country. This is because the tolerance of abuse by victims is mainly affected by a country's culture (McMahon and Banyard, 2011). Specifically, culture can have an impact on the normalization and the acceptance of different forms of abuse (Cinquegrana et al., 2023). These differences on perceptions of such detrimental forms of abuse embody one of the obstacles regarding criminalization of coercive control and psychological abuse. That is because the cultural expectations of how a person should behave in a relationship can be considered abusive in one culture but might not be perceived as such in another.

In conclusion, it is paramount to understand what are the different perceptions of coercive control and what is the influence of certain cultural dimensions, since such forms of abuse carry alarming repercussions for the victims' overall physical and psychological health. Some of the key cultural dimensions that are relevant might be honor and masculinity. To explore the impact that these dimensions might have in the way people appraise the severity, responsibility and acceptance of coercive control, two countries will be compared. One with more focus on masculinity and honor (Guatemala) and one with less focus on honor and with more progressive views on gender equality (the Netherlands). Moreover, the Netherlands holds the 28th position out of 146 countries in the Gender Equality Index (Gender Equality Index, 2024). Conversely Guatemala holds the 105th, reflecting a larger gender inequality. By including perspectives of both countries, this study aims to get new insights on the relationship between culture, victim and perpetrator gender and coercive control. Understanding these relationships could lead to a better approach on how to support victims from the side of law and how to develop more tailored countermeasures. Additionally, there are not many studies yet that focus on specific cultural dimensions and its impact on coercive control.

Legal frameworks for coercive control in Guatemala and The Netherlands

In some Western countries, like parts of Australia, Northern Ireland and the UK, coercive control has been criminalized. This trend is not solely limited to developed countries, however. In Guatemala, due to the high statistics of abuse of women and femicide, there is a law that protects

them from any type of abuse including the behaviors observed in coercive control. Interestingly, in Guatemala, men do not enjoy similar protection from coercive control or any other type of intimate partner violence. The detection of coercive control in general, is further hampered by the fact that it can occur without physical violence, which makes prosecution rely on the victim's witness statements, other witnesses and on the suspect's own testimony (Watson et al., 2022). Moreover, there are some barriers when it comes to prosecuting coercive control, such as lack of physical evidence, the authority's subjectivity, a focus on physical violence and gender stereotypes (Barlow et al., 2019). Therefore, law enforcement officers tend to investigate isolated incidents rather than a pattern of abusive behavior that characterizes coercive control. It might be that having separate laws for women in Guatemala but not for men might create more differing perceptions of male compared to female victims in Guatemala, in contrast to the Netherlands where the laws of domestic abuse apply equally for both sexes.

The rate of violence against women in Guatemala reached 19,684 cases in 2024 (Ormusa, 2024) and the prevalence of psychological abuse showed that 23.7% of women have been victims of this type of abuse (World Health Organization, 2021). These results are alarming and represent the distressing situation for Guatemalan women caused by "unequal power relations between men and women in the social, economic, legal and political fields." (Ley contra el femicidio y otras formas de violencia contra la mujer, 2008, Art. 1). Therefore, a law was created to protect Guatemalan women from any type of IPV, the so-called "Law against Femicide and other Forms of Violence against Women". This law addresses psychological, economical and physical harm, thus including behavior of coercive control.

In the Netherlands, domestic violence is not a separate offense under Dutch law but can be prosecuted under the articles of other serious offenses and might be subject to a penalty augmentation due to the context. Domestic violence is understood to include abuse of (ex-) partners and people that you share a (legal) familial relationship with. However, prosecution under these articles does not address long-term patterns pertaining to coercive control, making effective prosecution of said behavior difficult. Nevertheless, psychological abuse and coercive control might go unnoticed by authorities. Moreover, 27% of Dutch women have reported to suffer from psychological abuse in this country (World Health Organization, 2021).

In summary, Guatemala has a specific law to combat coercive control, but it only applies to female victims. The Netherlands has no specific laws at all, but the behaviors might be

captured under existing legislation, even if the behaviors are not prosecuted in practice. These differences in law may lead to a contrast in how people perceive the severity of coercive control by country and on who is held responsible for coercive and controlling behaviors. Besides the differences in the legal framework shaping perceptions of abuse, additional cultural aspects might have an impact on these perceptions. Such aspects are gender role beliefs and the cultural values that each country endorses.

Gender Role Beliefs

Gender roles are described as the belief that certain attributes differentiate men and women (Hamilton, 2015). Gender refers to "social and behavioral norms which, within a specific culture, are widely considered appropriate for individuals of a specific sex." (European Institute for Gender Equality, 2016).

Understanding expectations about gender roles is central to the reasons some people might find to normalize the use of violence since more traditional expectations on gender often place men as more authoritarian and women as more passive (Kim et al., 2019). For instance, the culture in Guatemala is a Latino culture where there are clearly defined gender roles and Latino women are shaped to be caregivers and their place is traditionally at home. They often accept men to be dominant and controlling in the relationship while Latino men are shaped to be authoritarian figures (Perilla, 1995). Cases of extreme violence in relationship can be based on aspects of revenge and serving as a warning for women to return to the domestic space and to their family role when they have assumed a more public role (Kristinsdóttir, 2015). This cultural interpretation of femininity indirectly excuses or minimizes violence by rewarding women being loyal when they stay in abusive situations (Vandello et al., 2008).

In contrast with Guatemala, the Netherlands holds comparatively less traditional family values, less strict expectations regarding traditional gender roles and more liberal views about marriage and sexuality (Arends-Tóth & Van De Vijver, 2008). A trend towards secularization has weakened the adherence to traditional gender norms. Moreover, the level of education has increased in the last century leading to an influence that promoted gender egalitarianism (Thijs et al., 2019). Therefore, a difference in culture can lead to a difference in strength of gender roles for men and women and it might also shift abuse perception and blame attribution.

Attribution Theory is useful for understanding the way in which individuals might assign the responsibility for behaving in a coercive or controlling way within an intimate relationship. Attribution defines the processes by which individuals assign causal explanations to their behavior and the behavior of others within a scenario and particularly whether these motives are either internal or external (APA Dictionary of Psychology, 2023). The internal attribution occurs when the cause for the behavior and events is attributed to an individual's personal qualities. On the other hand, external attribution occurs when the cause for the behavior is attributed to the social context and environmental pressures (Gudjonsson, 1984). When gender role stereotypes are challenged while dealing with coercive control, people with more traditional views on gender roles might attribute more responsibility to victims. This might be due to individuals assigning more emphasis on internal causes. For instance, in non-stereotypical cases with a male victim, it might be that the idea that the victim is behaving in an "unmanly" way by allowing a woman to violate the gender norms. Moreover, a female perpetrator might be perceived as violating the stricter standards for feminine behavior.

Therefore, for this study, it is anticipated that more traditional Gender Role Beliefs will result in higher victim blame regardless of the victim's sex and more acceptance of coercive control, less perceived severity and lower perpetrator blame. In addition to this, more traditional gender role beliefs are expected for Guatemala than in the Netherlands.

Endorsement of Dignity and Honor cultural norms

As previously mentioned, IPV rates, perceptions, acceptance and normalization vary across different countries (Ozaki & Otis, 2016; White & Satyen, 2015; Cinquegrana et al., 2023). It might be that certain cultural norms and its context dictate the individual perceptions of coercive control which allows for some cultures to normalize or justify such behaviors. Thus, it might be that some of these differences could be related to a culture's emphasis on honor, dignity and/or saving face since such emphases inflict differences on how people perceive and deal with conflict (Forsyth, 2018). Therefore, Guatemala – an honor culture – and the Netherlands – where honor is of less significance, but there is more emphasis on dignity – were selected for this study.

Dignity is described as self-worth based on the individual's achievements in pursuit of the individual's goals and values. In dignity cultures, members learn that everyone has inherent value

and that the quality of their character is not defined by other people (Yao et al., 2017). It contrasts honor cultures since dignity has a focus on individual guilt based on self-evaluation instead of shame based on external judgement with a reputation that must be defended, as seen in honor cultures (Leung & Cohen, 2011). The important role of self-worth in dignity cultures generates individualism and an acceptance of self-interest and autonomy (Mosquera et al., 2002).

Furthermore, dignity is most likely immune to insults and external threats to the self (Krys et al., 2017). This will likely have an impact on how different societal problems are appraised. In the case of perceptions of IPV, the emphasis on self-worth contradicts one of the justifications for coercive control, which often relies on control and dominance in relationships because there is not social status or reputation to maintain. Instead, IPV can be judged by dignity cultures as a violation of the rights of an individual and thus lead to less acceptance. However, cultural ideals do not fully nullify the existence of IPV. On the contrary, some aspects of dignity cultures can also lead to certain limitations allowing for a paradoxical perception of IPV. For example, a lack of consideration for other individuals, their experiences, constraints and the emphasis in autonomy can have a negative effect on how individuals of a dignity culture may perceive coercive control.

On the contrary, honor is self-worth based on the individual's reputation and in their own assessment of what others think (Aslani et al., 2016). Honor cultures have been described as those where people want to avoid offending others but might respond aggressively if they feel they have not encouraged a suffered aggression (Forsyth, 2018). Additionally, the importance of maintaining social respect even through aggressive means is strengthened (Cohen & Kitayama, 2020). Honor cultures can also be characterized by strong levels of family cohesion and it is based on the gender norms of behavior for men and women. These norms are related to the perception of IPV in honor cultures. For example, in cultures where the protection of masculine honor is a key value, IPV is more likely to be accepted if its aim is to protect men's honor (Mosquera, 2013). Consequently, IPV is often triggered by the perception that a woman's behavior violates the feminine honor code. Additionally, honor ideology has been found to be directly related to more endorsement of IPV (Katzman et al., 2024).

In summary, the idea of rightful conduct is stressed in both dignity and honor cultures, even though the definition of 'rightful' differs (IJzerman & Cohen, 2011). Dignity and honor cultures both aim for self-worth, but each culture reflects a unique motivational system (Leung

and Cohen 2011). For instance, in honor-like cultures where reputation is important, individuals might excuse abusive behaviors under the idea that reputation must be preserved. Conversely, individuals within dignity culture might overemphasize internal characteristics such as autonomy and thus make the victim accountable for their own victimhood instead of recognizing external factors such as economic independence or past experiences. Consequently, it can be predicted that Guatemala will have a higher endorsement of honor cultural norms and the Netherlands a higher endorsement of dignity cultural norms. It is also expected that the cultural emphasis will influence the attribution of blame on either the victim or the perpetrator with honor cultures blaming the victim more when compared to dignity cultures.

The current study

As previously mentioned, cross-cultural differences in attitudes towards intimate partner violence have been identified. However, it is unclear if these differences are explained by specific cultural dimensions, personal values or gender stereotypes.

The aim of this research is to investigate whether the differences in the attribution of blame, perceived abuse severity and acceptance between individuals of different countries might be led by the victim's and the perpetrator's gender and an individual's cultural norms when presented with a case of coercive control within an intimate relationship.

Firstly, it is expected that Dutch individuals will attribute less blame to the victim and more blame to the perpetrator, while rating abuse severity higher and showing less acceptance when presented with a case of coercive control in comparison to Guatemalan individuals.

Secondly, building upon previous literature it is hypothesized that victim's and perpetrator's gender influence blame attribution, abuse severity and acceptance. Blame attribution will be higher for male victims and perpetrators compared to their female counterparts. Furthermore, abuse severity will be higher, and acceptance will be lower for female victims compared to male victims.

Finally, exploratory analyses will be conducted to determine the moderating effects of endorsement of Honor and Dignity Cultural Norms and Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs to have a more overarching picture and explore a possible variation within and not only between cultures. The individual endorsement of these norms and gender role beliefs might prove crucial

to understanding the impact of culture on the perceptions of coercive control expanding upon an individual's nationality.

Methods

A 2 Nationality of the Participants (Dutch or Guatemalan) x 2 Gender of the Victim (Female or Male) between participants design was used for this research. For the variable gender of the victim, a case of coercive control was presented to the participants differing on the gender of the victim and the perpetrator as follows: a female victim with a male perpetrator to a male victim with a female perpetrator. The dependent variables that were included were: Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attribution, Perceived Severity of Coercive Control and Acceptance. Additionally, Gender Role Beliefs and Perceived Dignity and Honor Cultural Norms were used as exploratory moderators.

Participants

The sample of this study comprised participants from the Netherlands and Guatemala. To be eligible for inclusion participants had to be born and raised in those countries and be fluent in either Dutch or Spanish. G*Power software ($\alpha = 0.04$, $\beta = 0.80$, $f = 0.23$) was used to determine the sample size, which resulted in 151. A total of 192 participants out of 258 met all the requirements and completed the study. It was decided not to exclude participants that met all requirements because it would have not been sensible to disregard their input once they completed the study. This decision also allowed for greater precision in the moderator and exploratory analyses. However, a total of four participants were excluded because they did not meet the nationality requirement, and 62 participants withdrew from the survey.

From the total, 21 participants were recruited via the test subject pool SONA supported by the University of Twente and were granted with 0.25 credits for their participation. The rest of individuals that participated in the study were recruited via the social network of the researcher. Out of 258 participants, 138 were Guatemalan and 120 were Dutch. Regarding the gender of the participants, 85 were men and 107 were women. Additionally, the average age of the participants for the Netherlands was $M = 43.60$ $(SD = 20.61)$ and for Guatemala $M = 30.38$ $(SD = 6.13)$.

Finally, most of the sample for both countries indicated to be highly educated with a Bachelor's or a Master's degree. With a 52.3% for the Netherlands and 86.7% for Guatemala.

Materials

The materials were provided in Dutch and Spanish. This was based on the findings of Van de Vijver and Leung (2011) who concluded that participants feel "more constrained and less comfortable in expressing themselves when they do not speak their own language". Moreover, the availability in two languages promoted inclusivity to non-English speaking participants because Spanish and Dutch are the languages spoken in the two countries of interest.

The study included socio-demographics questions (age, gender, nationality, and educational level) followed by four different scales that aimed to measure Gender Role Beliefs, Perceived Dignity and Honor Cultural Norms, Victim and Perpetrator Blame Attribution, Perceived Severity and Acceptance of coercive control. All the materials that were used for this study, namely the informed consent, scales and vignettes for both languages can be found in Appendices A (Spanish) and B (Dutch). For clarity, an unpublished English version was also added in Appendix C.

Case Description

The research was conducted online via Qualtrics, and it consisted of four different scales and a case vignette describing a situation that displayed behaviors of coercive control. The vignette used for this research, was created based on the Checklist of Controlling Behaviors (CCB) by Lehmann et al. (2012) and in the Controlling or Coercive Behavior Statutory Guidance Framework of the UK Government (2023) by using the items related to coercive control. These included economic abuse, intimidation, threats, minimizing, denying, blaming and isolation. The description included coercive control behaviors like "Pablo also insisted that they share all passwords for social media, emails, and access to the bank accounts" and "When Lisa went to run errands, Pablo would start to call her constantly to make sure she would be back on time". The names were altered among the two vignettes to reflect more similarity with the respective culture.

While the case description is identical for both versions, depending on the condition on which the participant got randomly assigned, the gender of the victim and the perpetrator differed.

Perceived Severity and Acceptance of coercive control

A scale based on work by Schomaker (2024) and Ostermann (2023) was used to measure the perceived severity of coercive control. Perceived harmfulness and wrongfulness were used to develop such scale since these two perceptions of criminal behavior were found to be the most important dimensions of perceived seriousness (Warr, 1989). *Perceived harmfulness* is established through an evaluation of the impact and consequences of the offence on the victim, for example: “I believe that Pablo's behavior harmed Lisa's well-being”. *Wrongfulness* is the result of an evaluation of the moral magnitude of committing the act. For example: “I believe Pablo's actions were immoral”. Participants rated each statement on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly agree). The items measuring Perceived Severity had a Cronbach’s alpha of .82 for the female victim and .81 for the male victim.

Additionally, three questions were developed to study the Acceptance of the behaviors that were displayed in the vignette. This items included questions like: “I think that these type of behaviors are acceptable within an intimate relationship”. The items measuring Acceptance had a Cronbach’s alpha of .51 for the female victim and .73 for the male victim.

Blame Attribution

This scale was built upon previous work by Orywahl (2024) and Schmuck (2021) to measure Blame Attribution and allocation of responsibility in coercive control situations. Attributions of blame to the victim and perpetrator were measured separately with 5 items that measured Victim Blame and 5 items that measured Perpetrator Blame. The items were adapted with the names of the victim and the perpetrator. An example of the items for victim blame is “Lisa provoked Pablos’s behavior towards her”. On the contrary, for perpetrator blame: Pablo would behave the way he does towards any partner, not only Lisa. Moreover, two items were developed by the author to emphasize respect and obedience, since these are paramount values for honor cultures, especially for intimate relationships (Brown et al., 2017). The participants

were instructed to indicate their response to all items on a 5-point Likert scale with 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much) for each measure.

Nevertheless, some of the items showed a low internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.5$). Therefore, only one item for victim blame and one item for perpetrator blame were conserved for the data analysis:'How responsible is Lisa for the behaviors in the relationship?' and 'How responsible is Pablo for the behaviors in the relationship?'. These two items captured the global impressions of attribution and seemed to be less impacted by ceiling and flooring effects.

Non-Traditional Gender Role Beliefs

To explore Gender Role Beliefs the Gender Role Belief Scale by Kerr and Holden (1996) was utilized. The scale consists of 20 items that are aimed to measure individual perceptions about gender roles beliefs and expectations about the appropriate behavior for men and women. The scale has shown strong internal consistency and test–retest reliability (Kerr & Holden 1996). The Cronbach's alpha for the items measuring Gender Role Beliefs in this study was .86.

A 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree; 7 = Strongly agree) was used to evaluate attitudes towards different behaviors displayed by men and women. A decrease in the score signifies more traditional gender roles, while an increase in score means more feminist and thus less traditional views on gender roles. Some of the items on the original scale made use of formal words (such as 'lady'), which are forms of outdated language in the countries of interest, therefore the items modified by Orywahl (2024) were included instead.

Perceived Cultural Norms

To measure the Perceived Cultural Norms, a modified version of the measurement model for dignity, face, and honor cultural norms by Yao et al. (2017) was used. Participants were asked to rate how much they perceive people in their culture feel, think, or act in the ways described in each item. The perception of Cultural Norms will most likely have an impact on the way people feel, act and think regarding coercive control. The Dignity items focus on the "intrinsic and inalienable nature of self-worth" present in dignity cultures and the Honor items focus on the

"competing logics and impermanent nature of self-worth" present in honor cultures (Yao et al., 2017, p.721).

The original scale to measure Perceived Cultural norms also contains items related to Face Culture. Since the focus of this research is on Dignity and Honor, these items were excluded. Participants were asked to rate each item on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly agree). The Cronbach's alpha for the items measuring Dignity was .79 and Honor was .88.

Procedure

Before starting with data collection, ethical approval was received from the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Behavioral, Management, and Social Sciences at the University of Twente (Request Number 24094).

To take part in the study, participants were able to access with a link that directed them to the study in Qualtrics. When accessing, each participant was provided with the duration of the study, the contact information of the researcher and a general description of the aims of the study. Information about the sensitive contents of the study was provided as well as contact information from different channels that support Intimate Partner Violence victims. After reading the information letter, participants had to give their consent to take part in the study.

Subsequently, questions regarding socio-demographic characteristics were presented, which also served as screening questions to ensure that the participant belonged to one of the desired countries and that they could speak either Spanish or Dutch. Following this and to avoid bias before the experimental manipulation occurred, the Gender Role Beliefs scale and the Perceived Dignity and Honor Cultural Norms scales were presented.

After participants completed the scales, a vignette depicting a fictional case, describing a situation where coercive control is present, was disclosed with either the case of a male victim and female perpetrator or a female victim and male perpetrator. Afterwards, participants were asked to answer questions regarding Attribution of Blame. Subsequently, participants completed the Perceived Severity and Acceptance scales. Finally, participants were asked one open question where they could explain their reasoning for who was responsible for the behaviors in the displayed scenario. These answers were later useful to give a meaning to the obtained results.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

The mean scores, standard deviations, and minimum to maximum scores are presented in Table 1. Gender Role Beliefs was normally distributed. In contrast, Victim Blame and Acceptance were positively skewed and Perpetrator Blame, Perceived Severity, Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms and Perceived Honor Cultural Norms were negatively skewed.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for the dependent variables and moderators

	M	***SD***	**Min**	**Max**
Victim Blame *	2.18	1.20	1.00	5.00
Perpetrator Blame *	3.66	1.20	1.00	5.00
Perceived Severity *	4.35	0.62	1.00	5.00
Acceptance *	1.65	0.85	1.00	5.00
Gender Role Beliefs **	5.08	0.78	2.80	6.85
Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms **	4.24	0.96	1.00	6.60
Perceived Honor Cultural Norms **	4.67	1.24	1.75	7.00

** 5-point Likert scale*
*** 7-point Likert scale*

Table 2 shows the correlation matrix with the independent variables and the moderators. The results of the correlation showed that, at a significant level, Victim Blame is negatively correlated with Perceived Severity and Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs. Conversely, it is positively correlated with Acceptance. In contrast, Perpetrator Blame is positively correlated with Perceived Severity. Moreover, Perceived Severity is negatively correlated with Acceptance. There was also a positive correlation between Perceived Severity and Gender Role Beliefs. Additionally, Acceptance is negatively correlated with Gender Role Beliefs and positively correlated with Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms. Lastly, Perceived Honor Cultural Norms is negatively correlated with Gender Role Beliefs and Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms.

Table 2

Correlation matrix for the dependent variables and moderators

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Victim Blame	-						
Perpetrator Blame	.04	-					
Perceived Severity	**-.24**	**.28**	-				
Acceptance	**.30**	**-**.14	**-.43**	-			
Gender Role Beliefs	***-.16***	-.04	***.16***	***-.15***	-		
Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms	.05	.12	-.07	**.26**	.04	-	
Perceived Honor Cultural Norms	-.07	-.04	-.04	-.02	**-.45**	**-.21**	-

bold = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
bold italics = Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Hypothesis Testing

Two-way ANOVAs were computed to examine the main effects of the independent variables: Victim Gender and Nationality. The summary for all the means, standard deviations and F-tests results can be found in Table 3. The results showed that Victim Gender had a significant effect on Victim Blame, Perceived Severity and Acceptance. Male victims were blamed more than female victims, male perpetrators were blamed more than female perpetrators, severity of coercive control was deemed higher for female victims than for male victims and that acceptance of coercive control was lower for female victims than for male victims.

Participant Nationality (Guatemala or the Netherlands) had a main effect on the Victim Blame and Acceptance, meaning that the victim was blamed more in the Netherlands compared to Guatemala and that acceptance of coercive control was higher in the Netherlands. However, no significant main effects of nationality were found for Perpetrator Blame or Perceived Severity. Lastly, there were no significant interaction effects between the independent variables.

Table 3

Group Means per experimental condition for all the dependent variables

Independent Variable	**Dependent Variable**							
Victim Gender	Victim Blame		Perpetrator Blame		Perceived Severity		Acceptance	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Male	2.44	1.21	3.44	1.15	4.20	0.59	1.92	0.95
Female	1.94	1.15	3.86	1.22	4.48	0.62	1.41	0.66
Hypothesis test	$F = 10.72$ $df = 1\ (188)$ $p =$ **.001** $\eta_p^2 = .05$		$F = 1.44$ $df = 1\ (188)$ $p = .23$ $\eta_p^2 < .01$		$F = 7.71$ $df = 1\ (188)$ $p =$ **.006** $\eta_p^2 = .04$		$F = 15.58$ $df = 1\ (188)$ $p <$ **.001** $\eta_p^2 = .07$	
Country	Victim Blame		Perpetrator Blame		Perceived Severity		Acceptance	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
GT	2.07	1.24	3.57	1.25	4.20	0.59	1.54	0.85
NL	2.31	1.14	3.77	1.13	4.30	0.68	1.78	0.85
Hypothesis test	$F = 4.70$ $df = 1\ (188)$ $p =$ **.03** $\eta_p^2 = .02$		$F = 2.44$ $df = 1\ (188)$ $p = .12$ $\eta_p^2 = .01$		$F = 1.21$ $df = 1\ (190)$ $p = .27$ $\eta_p^2 < .01$		$F = 4.69$ $df = 1\ (188)$ $p =$ **.03** $\eta_p^2 = .02$	
Interaction	Victim Blame		Perpetrator Blame		Perceived Severity		Acceptance	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Male V. / GT	2.46	1.28	3.42	1.21	4.21	0.59	1.87	1.02
Male V. / NL	2.41	1.13	3.46	1.07	4.18	0.60	1.99	0.85
Female V. / GT	1.71	1.10	3.69	1.28	4.54	0.53	1.25	0.50
Female V. / NL	2.22	1.15	4.07	1.12	4.41	0.73	1.60	0.80
Hypothesis test	$F = 2.64$ $df = 1\ (188)$ $p = .11$ $\eta_p^2 = .01$		$F = 0.90$ $df = 1\ (188)$ $p = .34$ $\eta_p^2 < .01$		$F = 0.37$ $df = 1\ (188)$ $p = .55$ $\eta_p^2 < .01$		$F = 0.98$ $df = 1\ (188)$ $p = .32$ $\eta_p^2 < .01$	

GT = Guatemala, NL = the Netherlands
bold = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
bold italics = Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Exploratory Analyses

Some of the national differences might be explained by moderators such as Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs or an emphasis in Honor and Dignity Cultural Norms. To test this, different exploratory analyses were performed.

Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs

An independent groups t-test was used to determine whether Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs differed depending on Nationality. The results for the Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs scale showed a higher average score for the Netherlands ($M = 5.49$, $SD = 0.65$) compared to Guatemala ($M = 4.74$, $SD = 0.71$), $t(190) = -7.51$, $p < .001$. These results met expectation.

Following this, a linear model was used to determine whether Gender Role Beliefs had a moderation effect on all dependent variables – Victim Blame, Perpetrator Blame, Perceived Severity and Acceptance. Firstly, a linear model with Nationality and Victim Gender as independent variables and Gender Role Beliefs as a moderator, interacting with both independent variables separately and combined, was conducted to investigate moderation effects on all outcome variables. Victim Gender showed a significant positive main effect on Perpetrator Blame and Acceptance, indicating a replication of the results of Table 3 when moderated with Gender Role Beliefs. The inclusion of Gender Role Beliefs nullifies the main effect of Victim Gender and Nationality on Victim Blame, but there is an association between Gender Role Beliefs and Victim Blame. An increase in Gender Role Beliefs resulted in significantly lower Victim Blame ($b = -0.47$, $SD = 0.22$, $t = -2.05$, $p = 0.04$). Two significant two-way interactions for the dependent variables Perpetrator Blame and Acceptance and a significant three-way interaction for the dependent variable Acceptance were also identified. A summary of the results of this model can be found in Table 4.

Table 4

	Victim Blame			**Perpetrator Blame**			**Perceived Severity**			**Acceptance**		
	F	***df***	***p***	***F***	***df***	***p***	***F***	***df***	***p***	***F***	***df***	***p***
Nationality	0.01	1	.93	0.38	1	.54	2.30	1	.13	0.10	1	.75
Victim Gender	0.53	1	.47	*3.97*	*1*	***.05***	0.09	1	.76	4.40	1	***.04***
Gender Role Beliefs	4.20	1	***.04***	0.01	1	.93	0.79	1	.38	2.81	1	.10
Nationality * Victim Gender	0.68	1	.41	0.14	1	.71	0.15	1	.70	5.39	1	***.02***
Nationality * Gender Role Beliefs	0.27	1	.60	0.59	1	.44	1.53	1	.22	0.01	1	.92
Victim Gender * Gender Role Beliefs	0.09	1	.77	5.01	1	***.03***	0.01	1	.92	2.50	1	.12
Nationality * Victim Gender * Gender Role Beliefs	0.41	1	.52	0.20	1	.65	0.07	1	.78	5.14	1	***.02***

bold = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
bold italics = Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

On the basis of Table 4, the two-way interaction between Victim Gender moderated by Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs to predict Perpetrator Blame and the three-way model between Victim Gender, Nationality moderated by Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs to predict Acceptance were further investigated. The two-way interaction between Nationality moderated by Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs to predict Acceptance can be found in Appendix D Table D-1.

Perpetrator Blame and its relationship with Victim Gender and Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs. The effect of Victim Gender on the dependent variable Perpetrator Blame depends on the different levels of Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs. A summary of the results is displayed in Table 5. Male perpetrators are attributed more blame than female perpetrators, except when participants endorsed traditional gender role beliefs to a high degree, as indicated by a low score on the Gender Role Beliefs scale. Moreover, a test to compare the slopes between the female victim and male victim cases moderated by Gender Role Beliefs was used, the contrast was found to be significant with $b = 0.60$, $SE = 0.22$, $t(188) = 2.75$, $p = .007$. Only the slope for the male victim was found to be significant in a negative relationship ($b = -0.38$, $SE = 0.15$, $t(188) = -2.46$, $p = .01$). Individuals with less traditional Gender Beliefs blamed the perpetrator less if the perpetrator was female.

Table 5

Perpetrator Blame scores at three levels of Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs by Victim Gender

Gender Role Beliefs	Victim Gender	*M*	*SE*	*B*	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*
High	Female	4.02	0.16	-0.90	0.24	188	0.13	**< .001**
	Male	3.12	0.18					
Moderate	Female	3.84	0.17	-0.36	0.17	188	-2.57	**.01**
	Male	3.41	0.12					
Low	Female	3.67	0.17	0.03	0.24	188	-3.75	.90
	Male	3.70	0.16					

High (mean + 1 sd) = 5.86, Moderate (mean) = 5.08, Low (mean – 1 sd) = 4.30
bold = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
bold italics = Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Acceptance and its relationship with Nationality, Victim Gender and Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs. In Table 6, it can be seen that for Guatemala (for more traditional and moderate Gender Role Beliefs) and for the Netherlands (for less traditional Gender Role Beliefs), the behavior of coercive control displayed towards male victims was significantly more accepted. Additionally, it was found that Dutch individuals accepted the behavior significantly more than

Guatemalan individuals for both victim genders for less traditional Gender Role Beliefs and for female victims for moderate Gender Role Beliefs.

Table 6

Acceptance scores at three levels of Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs by Nationality and Victim Gender

Nationality		**Gender Role Beliefs**	***M*** **Male**	***M*** **Female**	***B***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
Guatemala	M vs. F	High	1.16	0.98	0.17	0.28	0.618	.54
Netherlands	M vs. F	High	2.07	1.53	0.54	0.19	2.81	**.006**
Guatemala	M vs. F	Moderate	1.62	1.18	0.44	0.17	2.60	**.01**
Netherlands	M vs. F	Moderate	1.92	1.71	0.21	0.20	1.07	.29
Guatemala	M vs. F	Low	2.08	1.39	0.70	0.18	3.91	**< .001**
Netherlands	M vs. F	Low	1.77	1.89	-0.12	0.35	-0.34	.73
Victim Gender		**Gender Role Beliefs**	***M*** **NL**	***M*** **GT**	***B***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
Female	NL vs. GT	High	1.53	0.98	0.54	0.23	2.37	***.02***
Male	NL vs. GT	High	2.07	1.16	0.91	0.25	3.61	**< .001**
Female	NL vs. GT	Moderate	1.71	1.18	0.52	0.18	2.92	**.004**
Male	NL vs. GT	Moderate	1.92	1.62	0.30	0.19	1.61	.11
Female	NL vs. GT	Low	1.89	1.39	0.50	0.28	1.80	.07
Male	NL vs. GT	Low	1.77	2.08	-0.31	0.28	-1.13	.26

High (mean + 1 sd) = 5.86, Moderate (mean) = 5.08, Low (mean – 1 sd) = 4.30
M = Male, F = Female; NL = the Netherlands, GT = Guatemala
bold = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
bold italics = Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms

The results for the Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms showed a higher average for the Netherlands ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 0.58$) compared to Guatemala ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.06$), $t(190) = -6.35$, $p < .001$.

A linear model with Nationality and Victim Gender as independent variables and Dignity Culture as a moderator, interacting with independent variables separately and combined, was conducted to investigate moderation effects on all outcome variables. The analysis showed that Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms showed a significant positive main effect on Perpetrator Blame ($b = 0.29$, $SD = 0.15$, $t = 1.97$, $p = 0.05$). This indicates that an individual attributes more blame to the perpetrator with a higher score for Dignity Culture. One significant two-way and one significant three-way interactions were also identified for the dependent variable Acceptance. A summary of the results of this model can be found in Table 7.

Table 7

	Victim Blame			**Perpetrator Blame**			**Perceived Severity**			**Acceptance**		
	F	***df***	***p***	***F***	***df***	***p***	***F***	***df***	***p***	***F***	***df***	***p***
Nationality	0.79	1	.38	0.89	1	.35	1.85	1	.18	1.94	1	.16
Victim Gender	0.04	1	.84	1.47	1	.23	0.37	1	.55	3.79	1	.05
Dignity Score	0.01	1	.92	3.89	1	***.05***	0.53	1	.47	< 0.01	1	.97
Nationality * Victim Gender	0.67	1	.41	1.59	1	.21	1.86	1	.17	3.04	1	.08
Nationality * Dignity Culture	0.31	1	.58	0.72	1	.40	2.42	1	.12	2.89	1	.09
Victim Gender * Dignity Culture	0.44	1	.51	2.54	1	.11	1.87	1	.17	9.55	1	**< .01**
Nationality * Victim Gender * Dignity Culture	1.22	1	.27	1.50	1	.22	2.31	1	.13	4.27	1	***.04***

bold = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
bold italics = Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Based on Table 7, the three-way interaction between Victim Gender, Nationality moderated by Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms to predict Acceptance was further investigated. The two-way interaction between Victim Gender moderated by Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms to predict Acceptance can be found in Appendix D Table D-2.

Acceptance and its relationship with Nationality, Victim Gender and Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms. Table 8 shows that for Guatemala and for the full range of Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms, the behavior of coercive control displayed towards male victims showed to be more accepted. On the other hand, for the Netherlands, for moderate Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms, the behavior of coercive control displayed towards male victims was significantly more accepted. For the case of the female victim, with high Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms, Dutch individuals significantly accepted the Coercive Control behavior more than Guatemalan individuals.

Table 8

Acceptance scores at three levels of Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms by Nationality and Victim Gender

Nationality		**Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms**	***M*** **Male**	***M*** **Female**	***B***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
Guatemala	M vs. F	High	2.35	1.25	1.10	0.22	4.99	**< .001**
Netherlands	M vs. F	High	2.04	1.71	0.34	0.19	1.75	.08
Guatemala	M vs. F	Moderate	1.99	1.25	0.74	0.16	4.72	**< .001**
Netherlands	M vs. F	Moderate	1.92	1.40	0.52	0.22	2.38	***.02***
Guatemala	M vs. F	Low	1.73	1.25	0.47	0.16	3.04	**.003**
Netherlands	M vs. F	Low	1.83	1.18	0.65	0.36	1.84	.07
Victim Gender		**Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms**	***M*** **NL**	***M*** **GT**	***B***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
Female	NL vs. GT	High	1.71	1.25	0.45	0.20	2.28	***.02***
Male	NL vs. GT	High	2.04	2.35	-0.31	0.21	-1.45	.15

Female	NL vs. GT	Moderate	1.40	1.25	0.15	0.19	0.81	.42
Male	NL vs. GT	Moderate	1.92	1.99	-0.07	0.19	-0.37	.71
Female	NL vs. GT	Low	1.18	1.25	-0.07	0.27	-0.26	.80
Male	NL vs. GT	Low	1.83	1.72	0.11	0.28	0.39	.70

High (Percentile 75) = 5.00, Moderate (Percentile 50, median) = 4.20, Low (Percentile 25) = 3.60
M = Male, F = Female; NL = the Netherlands, GT = Guatemala
bold = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
bold italics = Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Perceived Honor Cultural Norms

The results for the Perceived Honor Cultural Norms showed a higher average for Guatemala ($M = 5.46$, $SD = 0.88$) compared to the Netherlands ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 0.87$), $t(190) = 13.90$, $p < .001$.

A linear model with Nationality and Victim Gender as independent variables and Honor Culture as a moderator, interacting with both independent variables separately and combined, was conducted to investigate potential moderation effects on all outcome variables. Victim Gender showed a significant positive main effect on Perpetrator Blame. This indicates that more blame was attributed to a male perpetrator in a female victim scenario compared to the female perpetrator in a male victim scenario, when moderated by Perceived Honor Cultural Norms. Two significant two-way and one three-way interaction were also identified for the dependent variable Perpetrator Blame. A summary of the results can be found in Table 9.

Table 9

	Victim Blame			**Perpetrator Blame**			**Perceived Severity**			**Acceptance**		
	F	***df***	***p***	***F***	***df***	***p***	***F***	***df***	***p***	***F***	***df***	***p***
Nationality	0.01	1	.92	0.16	1	.69	1.32	1	.25	< 0.01	1	.98
Victim Gender	1.13	1	.29	5.98	1	***.02***	3.16	1	.08	< 0.01	1	.95
Honor Culture	0.16	1	.69	< 0.01	1	.99	0.14	1	.71	0.18	1	.67

Nationality * Victim Gender	2.22	1	.14	5.48	1	***.02***	0.74	1	.39	0.56	1	.45
Nationality * Honor Culture	0.07	1	.80	0.01	1	.90	3.43	1	.07	0.48	1	.49
Victim Gender * Honor Culture	2.56	1	.11	5.21	1	***.02***	1.81	1	.18	0.33	1	.57
Nationality * Victim Gender * Honor Culture	2.97	1	.09	5.80	1	***.02***	0.19	1	.67	1.03	1	.31

bold = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
bold italics = Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

On the basis of Table 9, the three-way model between Victim Gender, Nationality moderated by Perceived Honor Cultural Norms to predict Perpetrator Blame were further investigated. Although Table 9 seemed to imply a significant two-way model Victim Gender moderated by Perceived Honor Cultural Norms to predict Perpetrator Blame, such significance was not found.

Perpetrator Blame and its relationship with Nationality, Victim Gender and Perceived Honor Cultural Norms. Table 10 shows that for Guatemala when honor is high, Guatemalans do not blame male perpetrators more when compared to female perpetrators, and for the Netherlands at any level of Perceived Honor Cultural Norms, the male perpetrator is blamed significantly more than the female perpetrator. Moreover, for low Perceived Honor Cultural Norms, Dutch individuals blamed the female perpetrator more than Guatemalan individuals.

Table 10

Perpetrator Blame scores at three levels of Perceived Honor Cultural Norms by Nationality and Victim Gender

Nationality		**Perceived Honor Cultural Norms**	***M*** **Male**	***M*** **Female**	***B***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
Guatemala	M vs. F	High	3.45	3.70	-0.24	0.23	-1.10	.27
Netherlands	M vs. F	High	2.83	4.00	-1.18	0.58	-2.02	***.04***
Guatemala	M vs. F	Moderate	3.01	3.70	-0.69	0.29	-2.38	***.02***
Netherlands	M vs. F	Moderate	3.11	4.03	-0.92	0.40	-2.32	***.02***
Guatemala	M vs. F	Low	2.41	3.69	-1.28	0.49	-2.59	**.01**
Netherlands	M vs. F	Low	3.49	4.06	-0.57	0.25	-2.25	***.03***
Victim Gender		**Perceived Honor Cultural Norms**	***M*** **NL**	***M*** **GT**	***B***	***SE***	***t***	***p***
Female	NL vs. GT	High	4.00	3.70	0.31	0.46	0.68	.50
Male	NL vs. GT	High	2.83	3.45	-0.62	0.43	-1.47	.14
Female	NL vs. GT	Moderate	4.03	3.70	0.34	0.36	0.94	.35
Male	NL vs. GT	Moderate	3.11	3.01	0.11	0.34	0.31	.76
Female	NL vs. GT	Low	4.06	3.69	0.37	0.38	0.97	.33
Male	NL vs. GT	Low	3.49	2.41	1.08	0.41	2.65	**.009**

High (Percentile 75) = 5.50, Moderate (Percentile 50, median) = 4.75, Low (Percentile 25) = 3.75
M = Male, F = Female; NL = the Netherlands, GT = Guatemala
bold = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
bold italics = Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Additional exploratory analysis: Age

Finally, because some unexpected results were found that might be explained by the difference in age of the populations, an additional exploratory analysis was performed for Age in relation to the dependent variables and moderators. For this purpose, a table of correlation coefficients with Age for the combined nationalities and separate nationalities was constructed. The results of two Guatemalan participants were excluded, because they opted to not fill in their

age during the survey ($N = 190$). When the participants were separated by nationality, $N = 104$ for Guatemala and $N = 86$ for the Netherlands. The results can be seen in Table 11.

Table 11

Correlation matrix for Age in relation to the dependent variables and moderators

Variables	Age GT + NL	Age GT	Age NL
Age	-	-	-
Victim Blame	***.26***	.12	**.35**
Perpetrator Blame	**-.15**	.05	**-.35**
Perceived Severity	-.06	-.12	-.01
Acceptance	**.17**	.11	.15
Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs	.08	***-.19***	-.19
Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms	.07	-.13	-.20
Perceived Honor Cultural Norms	***-.35***	-.05	-.13

bold = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
bold italics = Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

From Table 11, it can be deduced that Age has a positive relationship with Victim Blame and Acceptance and a negative relationship with Perpetrator Blame and Perceived Honor Cultural Norms. Thus, with an increase in Age, Victim Blame and Acceptance increased. On the contrary, with increasing Age Perpetrator Blame and Perceived Honor Cultural Norms decreased.

Summary of the exploratory analyses

No significant moderator correlations were found for Victim Blame and Perceived Severity. Gender Role Beliefs was important for Perpetrator Blame and Acceptance. Indeed, higher Perpetrator Blame was found for a male perpetrator regardless of the level of gender role beliefs. Conversely, less traditional Gender Role Beliefs decreased Perpetrator Blame but only for female perpetrators. For more traditional and moderate Gender Role Beliefs for Guatemala and less traditional Gender Role Beliefs for the Netherlands, the acceptance was higher for male victims.

Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms influenced Acceptance. For all levels of Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms for Guatemala and moderate levels for the Netherlands, the behavior was more accepted for male victims.

Perceived Honor Cultural Norms were found to be important for Perpetrator Blame. Dutch and Guatemalan individuals blamed the male perpetrator more for all levels of Perceived Honor Cultural Norms except for a strong endorsement of honor cultural norms for Guatemala. Furthermore, for low Perceived Honor Culture, Dutch individuals blamed female perpetrators more compared to Guatemalans.

Finally, Age was found to correlate positively with Victim Blame and Acceptance and negatively with Perpetrator Blame, Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs and Perceived Honor Cultural Norms.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine if there exists a difference on how people perceive and appraise the severity of a coercive control situation when they come from two culturally different countries (Guatemala and the Netherlands), as well as if the victim's and perpetrator's gender influenced the attribution of blame. Moreover, the effects of Gender Role Beliefs, Perceived Dignity and Perceived Honor Cultural Norms as moderators was studied.

The results demonstrated that, as expected, male victims were blamed more than female victims and the perceived severity of coercive control was deemed higher for female victims than for male victims. Additionally, acceptance showed to be lower for female victims. For nationality it was found that, contrary to expectations, Dutch individuals blamed victims more than Guatemalan individuals and showed more acceptance of coercive control behaviors. Moreover, when moderated by honor cultural norms, Dutch and Guatemalan individuals blamed the male perpetrator more, except when there was a strong endorsement of honor cultural norms for Guatemala contrary to the hypothesis. On the other hand, an endorsement of Dignity Cultural Norms for Guatemala and moderate levels for the Netherlands, the coercive control behavior was more accepted for male victims.

Finally, for less traditional gender role beliefs, more blame was attributed to a male perpetrator compared to a female. On the contrary, an endorsement of more traditional gender

role beliefs was related to victim blaming supporting the hypothesis. It also showed more female perpetrator blame and more acceptance of the behaviors by Guatemalan individuals.

The importance of victim and perpetrator gender

This study has demonstrated that in cases of coercive control within an intimate relationship, the gender of the victim and the perpetrator are of notable importance. As was predicted, male victims were blamed more than female victims, even if the described behaviors for both genders were identical. Perceived severity of the abuse was higher for female victims and the acceptance of the coercive control behavior was higher for male victims.

These results are in line with previous research that showed concern on the biases of gender, where individuals showed to be less likely to see scenarios that described behaviors from IPV as acceptable when the victim was female in comparison to male (Ayala et al., 2015; Bates et al., 2018; Santana et al., 2006). However, the rates for women who suffer from coercive control, or any other form of IPV is higher. Indeed, Stark (2018) describes coercive control as an extension of "gendered inequality" with women being victims more often, also Barlow et al. (2019) highlighted the gendered nature of coercive control.

Nevertheless, it is important to understand that it does not imply that men cannot be victims of coercive control, but rather that they are less likely to be victims (Walklate et al., 2022). Male victims can also suffer from impactful health and well-being consequences when they become victims of any type of IPV (Carmo et al., 2011). Men reporting being victims of the same abuse as women might be underappreciated and thus be deprived from getting necessary support from authorities. Consequently, their suffered distress might go unnoticed.

In this study, it was found that Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs lowered Victim Blame regardless of the gender of the victim. This contributes to the existing literature where it has been found that victim blame is most likely influenced by the perceptions that individuals might have on gender roles stereotypes (García-Cueto et al., 2014; Orywahl, 2024; Stanziani et al., 2019; Vandello & Cohen, 2008). These gender stereotypes and victimization can be harmful; if society thinks women to be the only target for abuse, then this is likely related to less societal awareness about male victimization (Bates et al., 2018; Felson & Paré, 2005).

Interestingly, this study also showed that less traditional gender role beliefs resulted in more male perpetrator blame and less female perpetrator blame. It appears to be that individuals who do not endorse gender stereotypes are less likely to accept justifications, which could lead to hold male perpetrators more accountable than female perpetrators. On the contrary, people with more traditional views on gender roles might excuse violence perpetrated by men (Yamawaki et al., 2009). Indeed, the results revealed that holding such traditional views resulted in more female perpetrator blame. It could be that the behavior of the female perpetrator did not comply with what is expected from a woman's role in a relationship, that is that women are generally seen as more concerned with the well-being of others, more submissive and sacrificing (Vandello & Cohen, 2008). This ideation subsequently results in more blame being attributed to a female perpetrator. Moreover, previous research has also discussed the idea that women and men can be equally aggressive, and bidirectional abuse is common suggesting that the role of women in a violent relationship is of importance (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2012; Lysova et al., 2024).

In conclusion, while men might be unfairly treated where there are less traditional gender expectations, it appears that for women it may be where there are more traditional expectations toward females. Suggesting that any degree of endorsement of gender role stereotypes does not result in male and female perpetrators being treated equally, thus indicating a potential societal problem. More research should be conducted on people with less traditional views and in the way they would appraise female and male perpetrators and victims.

Additionally, the results showed that Guatemalans accepted the behavior more when having more traditional gender role beliefs. Conversely, holding less traditional gender role beliefs led to less acceptance of the behavior for both countries. Research found that coercive control operates through gender norms (Bishop, 2017). Thus, less subscription to gender norms would naturally lead to more condemnation of coercive control behavior and vice versa. Interestingly, Dutch individuals showed more acceptance towards the coercive control even with moderate to less traditional Gender Role Beliefs. Furthermore, Dutch individuals showed more acceptance than Guatemalans for less traditional Gender Role Beliefs, which contradicted the expectations. This is a noteworthy result, since the Netherlands as a country is attributed more support of gender egalitarianism. Indeed, the Dutch participants of this study showed less traditional views on Gender Role Beliefs. This is also in line with previous research in which the Netherlands was found to be one of the most feminine societies (Thijs et al., 2019). The

unexpected results might be explained by other variables like age. As observed by Schierjott (2024) and Schomaker (2024), age might have had an impact on the way people perceive coercive control in general and in the endorsement of gender roles. Participants in Guatemala had a mean age of 30.38 years and 43.60 in the Netherlands. Age and generational effects might represent a stronger effect and could possibly explain the differences between countries. Indeed, studies have previously focused on the effects of generational gaps and in their perceptions on gender role stereotypes and have found significant differences (Camilo & Minas, 2023). With older generations, having more traditional attitudes towards gender roles (Dogan Gangal et al., 2024).

Finally, it is critical to get a better insight into how coercive control operates within intimate relationships to develop more nuanced and overarching measures that provide all the victims with all the necessary support, disregarding of their gender. Additionally, this could help the development of proper training that will provide authorities with the necessary expertise to avoid gender bias and to better appraise cases of coercive control or any other type of IPV.

The importance of participant nationality and cultural norms

It was hypothesized that Dutch individuals would blame the victim more, blame the perpetrator less, perceive the scenario of coercive control as more severe and accept the behavior less. Interestingly and contrary to what was expected, without any moderators, Dutch individuals blamed victims more and showed more acceptance to the behaviors in comparison to Guatemalans. However, the participants' nationality did not show any relationship with perpetrator blame and perceived severity. This implies that there might be underlying causes for such differences, other than the relationship between nationality and victim gender. An example was the identified correlation between age and victim blame where an increase in age increased victim blame for Dutch individuals. Future research could address the research gap by explicitly including people from different generations and compare their views on cases of coercive control.

The Netherlands held higher dignity cultural norms compared to Guatemala and compared to honor cultural norms. It thus met the theoretical framework established for the Netherlands and its respective culture (Leung & Cohen, 2011; Mosquera et al., 2002). It was found that an endorsement of dignity cultural norms increased perpetrator blame. Thijs et al. (2019) discussed that the values that characterize individualistic cultures have an emphasis on

personal autonomy, nuclear family structures and egalitarian gender roles. It could be that the emphasis on these values played a role in the way Dutch participants evaluated the situation presented in the vignette. These cultural differences might be the underlying cause provoking that everyone was held as responsible for their own actions, for accepting the behaviors or for not confront the perpetrator and show their personal value and autonomy. This is reflecting by higher dignity cultural norms resulting in higher perpetrator blame.

Additionally, when moderated by dignity cultural norms, the demonstrated behavior was accepted more for the male victim by both countries. One rationale for this could be that dignity cultures subscribe to the notion that a relationship should be equal and thus show more acceptance of the behaviors because it is the couple's own decision to remain together. Some examples of the responses of participants to the open question included in the study that support this idea were "In the Netherlands, the relations are the same. Both people are co-responsible for shaping equality and trust" and "Regardless of whether a man or woman exhibits this behavior, it is not desirable for a relationship to be so unequal." It could be interesting to study the effect of dignity cultural norms directly by including more details that depict the values that are instilled in this type of culture more clearly into the study case to see whether the acceptance of coercive control behaviors will shift.

On the other hand, Guatemala held higher honor cultural norms compared to the Netherlands and compared to dignity cultural norms as expected, based on previous literature (Leung & Cohen, 2011; Mosquera et al., 2002). Contrary to the hypothesis, higher honor cultural norms increased the male perpetrator blame for Guatemalans while female perpetrator blame appeared stable. Additionally, Dutch individuals were found to blame the perpetrator more when having lower honor cultural norms. Further rationale that could potentially explain the results is the difference in the legal framework for both countries. Even though there are countries with specific laws where coercive control is a criminal offense, like Northern Ireland, a study by Lagdon et al. (2022) found that this does not automatically translates in more visibility, public understanding and awareness of coercive control and that there are more variables that could explain this lack of awareness such as age or economic status. Nevertheless, it is possible that due to Guatemala having a specific law that protects women against violence and more awareness has been raised regarding the topic, Guatemalan individuals showed to accept the behaviors less than Dutch individuals, since there is not a Dutch law against this type of abuse. Other individual

influences like character, personality or past experiences could have also provoked said acceptance (Flynn & Graham, 2010). More studies that include different individual and cultural assessments should be conducted to get a better understanding of other variables that might play a role. Indeed, these results do not imply that these specific cultures accept or support violence in intimidate relationships, but rather that besides it, there might be another underlying societal problem that could explain this acceptance (Ozaki, 2016).

The current research provides a more complete approach to the perceptions of coercive control for countries with different legal backgrounds and with a different endorsement of cultural norms, honor and dignity, addressing an important gap in the expertise of coercive control. In the case of the Netherlands and countries where there is a lack of a legal framework that addresses this societal problem, it would be beneficial to further study more variables that might be related to perceptions of coercive control such as age, educational and socioeconomic level as well as promote public awareness and educational programs so victims can identify such behaviors and report them to authorities. This growth in awareness and education can subsequently result in calls for the definition of a concrete legal framework. Moreover, Guatemala could also benefit from the observed biases in gender regarding this societal problem and construct a more overarching legal framework that protects every victim regardless of their sex.

Limitations

The first limitation of this study is that the survey was performed online through a fictional vignette that depicted a situation of coercive control. This might have not been as equally impactful as a real-life scenario where the emotions of the victim and the perpetrator are displayed and it could have possibly led to a simplification of the situation resulting in participants not fully engaging in the described situation. However, this method allows to maintain the uniformity across all the experimental groups. To reduce this limitation the vignette was designed by addressing behaviors of coercive control that have been stablished in literature such as the Checklist of Controlling Behaviors (CCB) by Lehmann et al. (2012) and in the Controlling or Coercive Behavior Statutory Guidance Framework of the UK Government (2023).

Secondly, the data showed signs of being skewed. Floor or ceiling effects for some of the scales caused the responses to cluster in either the lower or the upper limit (Koedel & Betts, 2010). Nevertheless, the residual errors showed to be sufficiently normally distributed and therefore it ensures the reliability of the analysis (Howell, 2010).

Additionally, most of the population indicated to be highly educated for both countries, which is not representative for the overall population. For instance, in Guatemala only the 35.1% of the total population between 20 and 24 years completed high school in 2023 (CEPALSTAT, n.d.) leaving a fraction of the country's population with a completed university education compared to the 86.7% of the Guatemalan participants possessing a university degree. In the Netherlands, 16% of the population is educated at a university level, which is markedly lower than the 52.3% of the Dutch participants (Maslowski, 2020). Therefore, there is a limited generalizability of the results. More studies in countries and populations that do not possess the same educational level, or the same socio-economic level should be conducted.

Equally, studies should also focus on non-heteronormative relationships and ingroup-outgroup perpetrators/victims to ensure inclusivity and an overarching understanding of the impacts of coercive control in all the victims, regardless of their gender and their sexual orientations. Moreover, studying the perceptions for ingroup-outgroup perpetrators and victims can provide new insights into stereotypes and bias, specially by authorities, victims and bystanders when appraising cases of coercive control. Furthermore, the study could be expanded with the appraisal of Perceived Face Cultural Norms and the participation of a Face culture. By adding the values that face cultures install, there could be a more complete understanding of how different cultures deal with conflict, specifically with cases of coercive control.

Lastly, the research topic itself might have been sensitive for some participants, and it could have been subject to socially desirable answers. This might have caused participants to not be completely truthful when responding to the questionnaire but instead responding what they thought would be more socially acceptable. Although there is no proof of this affecting the present study, a between subject design was used to minimize the desirability effects (Walzenbach, 2019). Moreover, the study was conducted in an anonymous way so it could not be traced back to ensure participants that they could respond as honestly as possible.

Conclusion

It can be concluded that male victims are blamed more and their suffered coercive control was deemed less severe and more accepted, whilst Dutch individuals blamed the victim more and accepted the demonstrated behavior more compared to Guatemalan individuals. Additionally, it was shown that Gender Role Beliefs and Perceived Cultural Norms can indeed play a moderating role in the definition of perceptions regarding coercive control.

This study revealed that belonging to a certain country, to an honor or dignity culture or having more progressive beliefs, can still make individuals potentially vulnerable to harmful interpretations. The appraisal of male victims in a coercive control setting is especially troubling when contrasted with female victims. A female in the same setting is met with less victim blame, less acceptance and higher perceived severity of the suffered behavior, though the appraisal is already not adequate considering the toxic nature of the coercive control behavior being discussed. This research demonstrates the necessity to appraise coercive control as seriously harmful regardless of the gender of the victim and the culture in which said behavior takes place. The apparent disregarding attitude towards male victims calls for added attention to support for male victims in addition to general victim support. Moreover, the ambivalent role of Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs in the appraisal of coercive control depending on the gender of the victim warrants further educational measures to ensure the appropriate evaluation of coercive control irrespective of the type of victim.

References

Amell, R. C., Soler, A. R., Cobo, J., & Alberti, J. M. S. (2022). Psychological consequences and daily life adjustment for victims of intimate partner violence. *The International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*, *58*(1), 6–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/00912174211050504

American Psychological Association. (2023). *Attribution theory*. *APA Dictionary of Psychology*. https://dictionary.apa.org/attribution-theory

Arends-Tóth, J., & Van De Vijver, F. J. R. (2008). Cultural differences in family, marital, and gender-role values among immigrants and majority members in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Psychology*, *44*(3), 161–169. https://doi.org/d47jpb

Aslani, S., Ramirez-Marin, J., Brett, J., Yao, J., Semnani-Azad, Z., Zhang, Z., Tinsley, C., Weingart, L., & Adair, W. (2016). Dignity, face, and honor cultures: A study of negotiation strategy and outcomes in three cultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *37*(8), 1178–1201. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2095

Ayala, E. E., Kotary, B., & Hetz, M. (2015). Blame attributions of victims and perpetrators: effects of victim gender, perpetrator gender, and relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *33*(1), 94–116. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515599160

Barlow, C., Johnson, K., Walklate, S., & Humphreys, L. (2020). Putting Coercive Control into Practice: Problems and Possibilities. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 60(1), 160–179. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azz041

Bates, E. A., Kaye, L. K., Pennington, C. R., & Hamlin, I. (2018). What about the Male Victims? Exploring the Impact of Gender Stereotyping on Implicit Attitudes and Behavioral Intentions Associated with Intimate Partner Violence. *Sex Roles*, *81*(1–2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-018-0949-x

Bishop, C., & Bettinson, V. (2017). Evidencing domestic violence*, including behavior that falls under the new offence of 'controlling or coercive behavior.' *The International Journal of Evidence & Proof*, *22*(1), 3–29. https://doi.org/gn4c5j

Brennan, I., Myhill, A., Tagliaferri, G., & Tapley, J. (2021). Policing a new domestic abuse crime: effects of force-wide training on arrests for coercive control. *Policing & Society*, *31*(10), 1153–1167. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2020.1862838

Brown, R. P., Baughman, K., & Carvallo, M. (2017). Culture, masculine honor, and violence toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *44*(4), 538–549. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217744195

Carmo, R., Grams, A., & Magalhães, T. (2011). Men as victims of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, *18*(8), 355–359. https://doi.org/c38qks

Cinquegrana, V., Marini, M., & Galdi, S. (2023). Psychological abuse is not a problem! Exploring the role of domestic violence myths in psychological revictimization. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1228822

Cohen, D., & Kitayama, S. (2020). *Handbook of Cultural Psychology, Second edition*. Guilford Publications.

Dogan Gangal, A., Yaren Yigit, Yildiz Ali, & Dogan Gangal, A. (2024). Generational Differences in Attitudes towards Gender Roles and Violence Against Women. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, *17*(1), 198–199.

Estadísticas e indicadores - CEPALSTAT Bases de Datos y Publicaciones Estadísticas. (n.d.)https://statistics.cepal.org/portal/cepalstat/dashboard.html?lang=es&indicator_id=2119&area_id=930

European Institute for Gender Equality. (2016). *Gender roles*. https://eige.europa.eu/publications-resources/thesaurus/terms/1114?language_content_entity=en

European Institute for Gender Equality. (2024). *Gender Equality Index 2024: Sustaining momentum on a fragile path*. https://eige.europa.eu/publications-resources/publications/gender-equality-index-2024-sustaining-momentum-fragile-path

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*, 175-191.

Felson, R. B., & Paré, P. (2005). The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to the police. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *67*(3), 597–610. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00156.x

Flynn, A., & Graham, K. (2010). "Why did it happen?" A review and conceptual framework for research on perpetrators' and victims' explanations for intimate partner violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *15*(3), 239–251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2010.01.002

Forsyth, D. R. (2018). *Group dynamics*. Cengage Learning.

García-Cueto, E., Rodríguez-Díaz, F. J., Bringas-Molleda, C., López-Cepero, J., Paíno-Quesada, S., & Rodríguez-Franco, L. (2014). Development of the Gender Role Attitudes Scale (GRAS) amongst young Spanish people. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, *15*(1), 61–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2014.10.004

Gudjonsson, G. H. (1984). Attribution of blame for criminal acts and its relationship with personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *5*(1), 53–58. https://doi.org/fgk6fv

Hamilton, D. L. (2015). Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior. Psychology Press.

Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2011). Symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder in men who sustain intimate partner violence: A study of helpseeking and community samples. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *12*(2), 112–127. https://doi.org/b5b5nm

Howell, D. C. (2010). *Statistical methods for psychology* (7th ed.). Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

IJzerman, H., & Cohen, D. (2011). Grounding cultural syndromes: Body comportment and values in honor and dignity cultures. European Journal of Social Psychology, 41(4), 456–467. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.806

Katzman, H., Brand, O., Rapp, S., Frias-Gil, C., Rusgrove, M., Shyne, F., & O'Dea, C. J. (2024). Masculine honor beliefs and perceptions of intimate partner violence by men lower in relational power. Personality and Individual Differences, 221, 112529. https://doi.org/gtwpdg

Kim, J. J., Visserman, M. L., & Impett, E. A. (2019). Power in close intimate relationships. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks* (pp. 192–224). https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108131490.010

Koedel, C., & Betts, J. (2010). Value added to what? How a ceiling in the testing instrument influences Value-Added Estimation. *Education Finance and Policy*, *5*(1), 54–81. https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp.2009.5.1.5104

Kristinsdóttir, R. S. (2015). *Cultura de violencia: normalización de la violencia de género en Guatemala*. http://hdl.handle.net/2077/38420

Krys, K., Xing, C., Zelenski, J. M., Capaldi, C. A., Lin, Z., & Wojciszke, B. (2017). Punches or punchlines? Honor, face, and dignity cultures encourage different reactions to provocation. *Humor - International Journal of Humor Research*, *30*(3). https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2016-0087

Lehmann, P., Simmons, C. A., & Pillai, V. K. (2012). The validation of the Checklist of Controlling Behaviors (CCB). *Violence Against Women*, *18*(8), 913–933. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801212456522

Leung, A. K., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within- and between-culture variation: Individual differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*(3), 507–526. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022151

Ley contra el Femicidio y otras Formas de Violencia Contra la Mujer, Decreto 22-2008 (2 de mayo de 2008).https://www.oas.org/dil/esp/ley_contra_el_femicidio_y_otras_formas_de_violencia_contra_la_mujer_guatemala.pdf

Lysova, A., Hanson, K., & Mackay, J. (2024). Bidirectional and unidirectional intimate partner Violence: A Comprehensive review. *Partner Abuse*, PA-0039.R1. https://doi.org/10.1891/pa-2024-0039

Martín-Fernández, M., Gracia, E., Lila, M., Stark, Martín-Fernández, M., Gracia, E., Lila, M., Domenech Del Rio, I., Sirvent Garcia Del Valle, E., & Coker, A. L. (2022). *Understanding Psychological Violence against Women*. https://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/EIGE_Factsheet_PsychologicalViolence.pdf

Maslowski, R. (2020, September 9). *Onderwijs*. De Sociale Staat Van Nederland: 2020. https://digitaal.scp.nl/ssn2020/onderwijs/

McMahon, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2011). When Can I help? A Conceptual Framework for the Prevention of Sexual Violence Through Bystander Intervention. *Trauma Violence & Abuse*, *13*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838011426015

Mosquera, P. M. R., Manstead, A. S., & Fischer, A. H. (2002). The role of honour concerns in emotional reactions to offences. Cognition & Emotion, 16(1), 143–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930143000167

Mosquera, P. M. R. (2013). In the name of honor: On virtue, reputation and violence. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *16*(3), 271–278. https://doi.org/gmsj3d

Ostermann, J. C., & Watson, S. J. (2024). Perceptions of the freezing response of male and female rape victims, and the moderating role of rape myth beliefs. *Journal of Criminal Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1108/jcp-01-2024-0002

Ormusa. (2024, July 2). *Observatorio de violencia contra las mujeres*. Observatorio De Violencia Contra Las Mujeres | ORMUSA. https://observatoriodeviolenciaormusa.org/

Orywahl, M.,(2024). *Beyond stereotypes - the role of gender and denial of victim in coercive control* [Master's Thesis]. https://essay.utwente.nl/102612/1/Orywahl_MA_BMS.pdf

Otter, C., Bosanko, M., & Parliamentary Library and Information Service. (2022). What is coercive control? In *Parliamentary Library and Information Service: Vol. No. 2* (p. 1) [Research Paper]. https://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/49184d/globalassets/sections-shared/about/publications/research-papers/what-is-coercive-control_2022_2.pdf

Ozaki, R., & Otis, M. D. (2016). Gender Equality, patriarchal cultural norms, and Perpetration of intimate partner violence: Comparison of male university students in Asian and European cultural contexts. *Violence Against Women*, *23*(9), 1076–1099. https://doi.org/gbnntj

Perilla, J. L. (1995). *Culture and domestic violence: The ecology of abused Latinas*. https://www.proquest.com/openview/f8ebab334fb366796d2c3491f51d11c4/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

Portal Estadisticas Inacif *INACIF*. (n.d.). https://www.inacif.gob.gt/estadisticasweb/necropsias.php

Prosman, G., Lo Fo Wong, S. H., & Lagro-Janssen, A. L. (2013). Why abused women do not seek professional help: a qualitative study. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, *28*(1), 3–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.12025

Rhatigan, D. L., Stewart, C., & Moore, T. M. (2011). Effects of gender and Confrontation on attributions of Female-Perpetrated Intimate Partner Violence. *Sex Roles*, *64*(11–12), 875–887. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-9951-2

Santana, M. C., Raj, A., Decker, M. R., La Marche, A., & Silverman, J. G. (2006). Masculine Gender Roles Associated with Increased Sexual Risk and Intimate Partner Violence Perpetration among Young Adult Men. *Journal of Urban Health*, *83*(4), 575–585. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-006-9061-6

Schierjott, L. (2024). *Manipulation of blame in cases of control and coercion within intimate relationships* [Master's Thesis, University of Twente]. https://essay.utwente.nl/104446/1/Schierjott_MA_BMS.pdf

Schomaker, C. (2024). *Psychological abuse in the context of control and coercion: Investigating how severity of abuse and denial of the victim influence the tendency to blame the victim* (By University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands). https://essay.utwente.nl/102139/1/Schomaker_MA_BMS.pdf

Schmuck, A. (2021). *The effect of denial of the victim arguments on the attribution of blame to the suspect during a simulated investigative interview in a control and coercion context* (By University of Twente, Netherlands). https://essay.utwente.nl/88143/1/Schmuck_MA_BMS.pdf

Stanziani, M., Newman, A. K., Cox, J., & Coffey, C. A. (2019). Role call: sex, gender roles, and intimate partner violence. *Psychology Crime and Law*, *26*(3), 208–225. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316x.2019.1652746

Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. Oxford University Press.

Stark, E. (2018). Coercive control as a framework for responding to male partner abuse in the UK. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 15–27). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315612997-2

Stewart, D. E., & Vigod, S. N. (2019). Update on mental health aspects of intimate partner violence. *Medical Clinics of North America*, *103*(4), 735–749. https://doi.org/n5xj

Stubbs, A., & Szoeke, C. (2021). The Effect of Intimate Partner Violence on the Physical Health and Health-Related Behaviors of Women: A Systematic Review of the literature. *Trauma Violence & Abuse*, *23*(4), 1157–1172. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838020985541

Taylor, J. C., Bates, E. A., Colosi, A., & Creer, A. J. (2021). Barriers to men's help seeking for intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *37*(19–20), NP18417–NP18444. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211035870

Thijs, P., Grotenhuis, M. T., Scheepers, P., & Van Den Brink, M. (2019). The Rise in Support for Gender Egalitarianism in the Netherlands, 1979-2006: The roles of educational expansion, secularization, and female labor force participation. *Sex Roles*, *81*(9–10), 594–609. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-019-1015-z

UK Government. (2023). *Controlling or Coercive Behavior Statutory Guidance Framework*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1148945/Controlling_or_Coercive_Behavior_Statutory_Guidance_-_final.pdf

Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (2008). Culture, gender, and men's intimate partner violence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*(2), 652–667. https://doi.org/cq9ffz

Vandello, J. A., Cohen, D., Grandon, R., & Franiuk, R. (2008). Stand by your man. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *40*(1), 81–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022108326194

Van de Vijver, F. J., & Leung, K. (2011). Equivalence and bias: A review of concepts, models, and data analytic procedures.

Walklate, S., & Fitz-Gibbon, K. (2019). The criminalisation of coercive control: The power of law? International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy, 8(4), 94–108. https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.157951715982213

Walzenbach, S. (2019). Hiding Sensitive Topics by Design? An experiment on the Reduction of Social Desirability Bias in factorial surveys. https://doi.org/10.18148/srm/2019.v1i1.7243

Warr, M. (1989). What is the perceived seriousness of crimes? *Criminology*, *27*(4), 795–822. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1989.tb01055.x

White, M. E., & Satyen, L. (2015). Cross-cultural differences in intimate partner violence and depression: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *24*, 120–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.05.005

World Health Organization. (2012). Understanding and addressing violence against women: Health consequences. In *World Health Organization*. https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/77431/WHO_RHR_12.43_eng.pdf

World Health Organization. (2021). Violence Against Women Prevalence Estimates, 2018. In *https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240022256* (No. 978-92-4-002225–6). World Health Organization. Retrieved September 26, 2024, from https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/341337/9789240022256-eng.pdf?sequence=1

Yamawaki, N., Ostenson, J., & Brown, C. R. (2009). The functions of gender role traditionality, ambivalent sexism, injury, and frequency of assault on domestic violence perception. *Violence Against Women*, *15*(9), 1126–1142. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801209340758

Yao, J., Ramirez-Marin, J., Brett, J., Aslani, S., & Semnani-Azad, Z. (2017). A measurement model for dignity, face, and honor cultural norms. *Management and Organization Review*, *13*(4), 713–738. https://doi.org/10.1017/mor.2017.49

Appendix A

Spanish version of the survey

Scale – Honor and Dignity Norms

Lea las siguientes preguntas. Antes de responder evalúe con qué frecuencia la gente en Guatemala piensa, siente o actúa de la forma en que se describe en cada enunciado.

	Totalmente en desacuerdo (1)	Muy en desacuerdo (2)	En desacuerdo (3)	Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo (4)	De acuerdo (5)	Muy de acuerdo (6)	Totalmente de acuerdo (7)
1. En Guatemala, la gente dice lo que piensa.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
2. En Guatemala la gente toma decisiones basadas en sus propias opiniones y no en lo que piensan los demás.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
3. En Guatemala, la gente es fiel a sí misma sin importar lo que piensan los demás.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. En Guatemala, la gente defiende lo que cree incluso cuando otros no están de acuerdo.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

5. En Guatemala, es mucho más importante cuánto una persona se respeta a sí misma que cuánto la respetan los demás.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
6. En Guatemala, a la gente le preocupa que su familia tenga una mala reputación.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
7. En Guatemala, la gente no permite que otros insulten a su familia.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
8. En Guatemala, la gente se preocupa por defender la reputación de su familia.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
9. En Guatemala, a la gente le preocupa arruinar la reputación de su familia.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Scale – Gender Role Beliefs

A continuación, encontrará una serie de afirmaciones. Para cada una de ellas, por favor seleccione la opción que mejor refleje su nivel de acuerdo o desacuerdo.

	Totalmente en desacuerdo (1)	Muy en desacuerdo (2)	En desacuerdo (3)	Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo (4)	De acuerdo (5)	Muy de acuerdo (6)	Totalmente de acuerdo (7)
1.Es irrespetuoso que un hombre maldiga en presencia de una mujer.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
2. Las mujeres no deben de esperar que los hombres les ofrezcan sus asientos en el bus.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
3. En una cita, el hombre siempre debe hacer el primer moviento/ dar el primer paso.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. Las relaciones homosexuales deberían ser tan aceptadas socialmente como lo son las relaciones heterosexuales.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
5. Me molesta más ver a una mujer prepotente que a un hombre prepotente.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
6. Al sentarse a una mesa, es una muestra de respeto cuando el hombre sostiene la silla para la mujer.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

7. Las mujeres deberían tener tanta libertad sexual como los hombres.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
8. Las mujeres deben apreciar la protección y el apoyo que les han brindado los hombres tradicionalmente.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
9. Las mujeres con hijos no deberían trabajar fuera del hogar si no lo necesitan económicamente.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
10. No veo nada malo en una mujer a la que no le gusta usar faldas ni vestidos.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
11. El esposo debe ser considerado el representante legal de la familia en todas las cuestiones jurídicas.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
12. Me gustan las mujeres que son sinceras.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
13. Excepto quizás en circunstancias muy especiales, un hombre nunca debe permitir que una mujer pague la cuenta.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

14. Es bueno que exista cierta igualdad en el matrimonio, pero en general el marido debe tener la palabra principal en los asuntos familiares.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
15. Los hombres deben seguir mostrando cortesías hacia las mujeres, como abrirles la puerta o ayudarlas a ponerse los abrigos.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
16. Es ridículo que una mujer cambie el aceite de un carro y que un hombre adorne la casa.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
17. La mujer debe ser tan libre como el hombre para proponer matrimonio.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
18. Las mujeres deberían preocuparse por sus tareas familiares y domésticas más que por el deseo de una carrera profesional.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

19. Las malas palabras y las obscenidades son más repulsivas cuando las hace una mujer que un hombre.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
20. Hay algunas profesiones y tipos de negocios que son más adecuados para hombres que para mujeres.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Case Description – Female Victim

Instrucciones: A continuación se le presentará una descripción de la dinámica de una relación. Por favor, lea el texto detenidamente.

Lisa y Pablo han estado casados por tres años. Hace algunos meses, cuando Lisa salió por la noche a tomar algo con sus amigos y amigas, Pablo apareció en el lugar sin avisar. Pablo se enojó mucho y le dijo a Lisa que ella no priorizaba su relación, porque «Todo lo que quería hacer era pasar tiempo con sus amigos y familia y no con él». También le dijo que su comportamiento era inaceptable porque una mujer no debería salir tanto, especialmente si está casada. Pablo frecuentemente decía frases como: «Si realmente me amaras, no necesitarías a nadie más».

Cuando Lisa salía a hacer mandados o sus actividades diarias, Pablo la llamaba frecuentemente o monitoreaba dónde estaba pidiéndole que le compartiera su ubicación en tiempo real. Pablo también le decía a Lisa que cuando las personas están casadas, deberían de compartirse los mensajes de texto y las contraseñas de las redes sociales para construir más confianza entre ellos. Pablo empezó a revisar los mensajes de Lisa regularmente y le exigía explicaciones por cualquier contacto que él considerara sospechoso. Además, solía hacerle

comentarios a Lisa sobre el tiempo que pasaba en su teléfono, insistiendo en que eso la distraía de hacer sus deberes en la casa como buena esposa.

Lisa solía trabajar, pero tuvo que renunciar porque Pablo le dijo que su ingreso era suficiente y que sería mejor que se quedara en casa para mantener todo limpio, ordenado y cocinar para ambos. Pablo también la acusó de engañarlo con uno de sus colegas porque a veces le enviaba mensajes o almorzaba con él en el trabajo. Aunque Lisa insistió en que él era solo un amigo, Pablo pensaba que una mujer casada no debería de tener amigos. Después de que ella renunció, Pablo tomó el control de la cuenta bancaria de Lisa argumentando que él era mejor manejando el dinero. Pablo pagaba a Lisa una cantidad de dinero mensual. Cuando Lisa intentaba pedirle a Pablo que aumentara la cantidad de dinero, él se enojaba y criticaba sus gastos y le pedía las facturas de todas sus compras. Él argumentaba que tiene que controlar el dinero, porque Lisa probablemente lo usaría para comprar cosas innecesarias o para salir de noche sin él.

Antes de casarse, cada uno tenía su propio carro. Pablo le sugirió a Lisa que sería buena idea vender el carro de ella para que pudieran usar el dinero en otra cosa. Ahora, cada vez que Lisa quiere salir con el carro, Pablo dice que una mujer no debería conducir sola, y que es trabajo de un hombre llevar a su esposa a los lugares. Frecuentemente le repite frases como: «¿Para qué necesitas salir en el carro sin mí de todas formas?». Cuando Lisa le pide a Pablo que la lleve a algún lugar, él suele responder que esta demasiado ocupado para hacerlo y que Lisa debería planificar mejor las cosas de acuerdo con el horario de Pablo.

Cuando Lisa se viste para salir, Pablo critica su apariencia y su ropa. Constantemente decide qué ropa debe usar y comprar, porque Pablo cree que una mujer siempre debe lucir bien, pero no demasiado atractiva para que otros hombres no la miren. Cuando Lisa expresa alguna insatisfacción en la relación, Pablo enfatiza todo el esfuerzo que ha hecho para mantenerse fiel al matrimonio y en proveer todo el dinero para el hogar. Por ejemplo, cuando Lisa le dijo que se sentía estresada y abrumada con todas las tareas del hogar, él le respondió: « Lisa, eres demasiado haragana, yo soy quien trabaja duro para mantenernos». Pablo frecuentemente le dice cosas como «Si te vas, te arrepentirás porque soy un buen esposo para ti». También expresa que es Lisa quien provoca la mayoría de las discusiones.

Attention check

¿Cuál es el nombre de la esposa de Pablo?

- ○ Eloisa (1)
- ○ Lisa (2)
- ○ Ana (3)

Q43 ¿Quién maneja el dinero y las cuentas de banco en la relación?

- ○ Lisa (1)
- ○ Pablo (2)
- ○ Ninguna opción es correcta (3)

Scale - Blame Attribution Female Victim

Lea las siguientes afirmaciones y califique qué tan de acuerdo o en desacuerdo está con ellas.

	Totalmente en desacuerdo (1)	En desacuerdo (2)	Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo (3)	De acuerdo (4)	Totalmente de acuerdo (5)
1. Lisa provocó el comportamiento de Pablo.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Lisa es una mala persona.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Lisa mostró respeto a su esposo.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Lisa fue desobediente.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Pablo es una buena persona.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Pablo actuó como lo hizo debido al carácter de Lisa.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Pablo es responsable de sus propias acciones.	○	○	○	○	○
8. Pablo se comportaría como lo hace con cualquier pareja, no solo con Lisa.	○	○	○	○	○
9. Lisa es responsable de los comportamientos en la relación.	○	○	○	○	○
10. Pablo es responsable de los comportamientos en la relación.	○	○	○	○	○

Scale - Perceived Abuse Severity and Acceptance Female Victim

Lea las siguientes afirmaciones y califique qué tan de acuerdo o en desacuerdo está con ellas.

	Totalmente en desacuerdo (1)	En desacuerdo (2)	Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo (3)	De acuerdo (4)	Totalmente de acuerdo (5)
1. Creo que el comportamiento de Pablo perjudicó el bienestar de Lisa.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Creo que Lisa está sufriendo por cómo se comportó Pablo con ella.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Creo que las acciones de Pablo fueron inmorales.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Creo que las acciones de Pablo fueron inherentemente incorrectas.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Creo que el comportamiento de Pablo es aceptable dentro de una relación íntima.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Creo que Lisa estaba actuando de manera correcta como la mujer de la relación.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Creo que Pablo estaba actuando de manera correcta como el hombre de la relación.	○	○	○	○	○

Case Description – Male Victim

Instrucciones: A continuación se le presentará una descripción de la dinámica de una relación. Por favor, lea el texto detenidamente.

Lisa y Pablo han estado casados por tres años. Hace algunos meses, cuando Pablo salió por la noche a tomar algo con sus amigos y amigas, Lisa apareció en el lugar sin avisar. Lisa se enojó mucho y le dijo a Pablo que él no priorizaba su relación, porque «Todo lo que quería hacer era pasar tiempo con sus amigos y familia y no con ella». También le dijo que su comportamiento era inaceptable porque un hombre no debería salir tanto, especialmente si está casado. Lisa frecuentemente decía frases como: «Si realmente me amaras, no necesitarías a nadie más».

Cuando Pablo salía a hacer mandados o sus actividades diarias, Lisa lo llamaba frecuentemente o monitoreaba dónde estaba pidiéndole que le compartiera su ubicación en tiempo real. Lisa también le decía a Pablo que cuando las personas están casadas, deberían de compartirse los mensajes de texto y las contraseñas de las redes sociales para construir más confianza entre ellos. Lisa empezó a revisar los mensajes de Pablo regularmente y le exigía explicaciones por cualquier contacto que ella considerara sospechoso. Además, solía hacerle comentarios a Pablo sobre el tiempo que pasaba en su teléfono, insistiendo en que eso lo distraía de hacer sus deberes en la casa como buen esposo.

Pablo solía trabajar, pero tuvo que renunciar porque Lisa le dijo que su ingreso era suficiente y que sería mejor que se quedara en casa para mantener todo limpio, ordenado y cocinar para ambos. Lisa también lo acusó de engañarla con una de sus colegas porque a veces le enviaba mensajes o almorzaba con ella en el trabajo. Aunque Pablo insistió en que ella era solo una amiga, Lisa pensaba que un hombre casado no debería de tener amigas.

Después de que él renunció, Lisa tomó el control de la cuenta bancaria de Pablo argumentando que ella era mejor manejando el dinero. Lisa pagaba a Pablo una cantidad de dinero mensual. Cuando Pablo intentaba pedirle a Lisa que aumentara la cantidad de dinero, ella se enojaba y criticaba sus gastos, también le pedía las facturas de todas sus compras. Ella argumentaba que tiene que controlar el dinero, porque Pablo probablemente lo usaría para comprar cosas innecesarias o para salir de noche sin ella. Antes de casarse, cada uno tenía su propio carro. Lisa le sugirió a Pablo que sería buena idea vender el carro de él para que pudieran usar ese dinero en otra cosa. Ahora, cada vez que Pablo quiere salir con el carro, Lisa le dice que

un hombre no debería conducir solo, y que es trabajo de una mujer llevar a su esposo a los lugares. Frecuentemente le repite frases como: «¿Para qué necesitas salir en el carro sin mí de todas formas?». Cuando Pablo le pide a Lisa que la lleve a algún lugar, ella suele responder que esta demasiado ocupada para hacerlo y que Pablo debería planificar mejor las cosas de acuerdo con el horario de Lisa.

Cuando Pablo se viste para salir, Lisa critica su apariencia y su ropa. Constantemente decide qué ropa debe usar y comprar, porque Lisa cree que un hombre siempre debe lucir bien, pero no demasiado atractivo para que otras mujeres no lo miren. Cuando Pablo expresa alguna insatisfacción en la relación, Lisa enfatiza todo el esfuerzo que ha hecho para mantenerse fiel al matrimonio y en proveer todo el dinero para el hogar. Por ejemplo, cuando Pablo le dijo que se sentía estresado y abrumado con todas las tareas del hogar, ella le respondió: «Pablo, eres demasiado haragán, yo soy quien trabaja duro para mantenernos». Lisa frecuentemente le dice cosas como «Si te vas, te arrepentirás porque soy una buena esposa para ti». También expresa que es Pablo quien provoca la mayoría de las discusiones.

Attention check

¿Cuál es el nombre del esposo de Lisa?

- ○ Pedro (1)
- ○ Pablo (2)
- ○ Luis (3)

Q43 ¿Quién maneja el dinero y las cuentas de banco en la relación?

- ○ Lisa (1)
- ○ Pablo (2)
- ○ Ninguna opción es correcta (3)

Scale - Blame Attribution Male Victim

Lea las siguientes afirmaciones y califique qué tan de acuerdo o en desacuerdo está con ellas.

	Totalmente en desacuerdo (1)	En desacuerdo (2)	Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo (3)	De acuerdo (4)	Totalmente de acuerdo (5)
1. Pablo provocó el comportamiento de Lisa.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Pablo es una mala persona.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Pablo mostró respeto a su esposa.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Pablo fue desobediente.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Lisa es una buena persona.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Lisa actuó como lo hizo debido al carácter de Pablo.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Lisa es responsable de sus propias acciones.	○	○	○	○	○
8. Lisa se comportaría como lo hace con cualquier pareja, no solo con Pablo.	○	○	○	○	○
9. Pablo es responsable de los comportamientos en la relación.	○	○	○	○	○
10. Lisa es responsable de los comportamientos en la relación.	○	○	○	○	○

Perceived Abuse Severity and Acceptance Scale

	Totalmente en desacuerdo (1)	En desacuerdo (2)	Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo (3)	De acuerdo (4)	Totalmente de acuerdo (5)
1. Creo que el comportamiento de Lisa perjudicó el bienestar de Pablo.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Creo que Pablo está sufriendo por cómo se comportó Lisa con él.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Creo que las acciones de Lisa fueron inmorales.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Creo que las acciones de Lisa fueron inherentemente incorrectas.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Creo que el comportamiento de Lisa es aceptable dentro de una relación íntima.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Creo que Pablo estaba actuando de manera correcta como el hombre de la relación.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Creo que Lisa estaba actuando de manera correcta como la mujer de la relación.	○	○	○	○	○

Open Question

Q23 Por favor utilice el cuadro de texto a continuación para dar más detalles o explicar por qué cree que Pablo, Lisa, ambos o ninguno son responsables de los comportamientos demostrados en la relación. También le recordamos que cualquier respuesta es válida y que es totalmente anónima, por lo que no se puede rastrear personalmente hacía usted.

Appendix B

Dutch Version of the survey

Scale – Honor and Dignity Norms

Lees de volgende vragen. Evalueer, voordat je antwoord geeft, hoe vaak mensen in Nederland denken, voelen of handelen op de manier die in elke uitspraak wordt beschreven.

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Sterk mee oneens (2)	Mee oneens (3)	Niet eens, niet oneens (4)	Mee eens (5)	Sterk mee eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
1. In Nederland zeggen mensen wat ze denken.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
2. In Nederland nemen mensen beslissingen op basis van hun eigen mening en niet op basis van wat anderen denken.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
3. In Nederland blijven mensen trouw aan zichzelf, ongeacht wat anderen daarvan vinden.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. In Nederland komen mensen op voor waar ze in geloven, ook als anderen het daar niet mee eens zijn.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

5. In Nederland is de mate waarin iemand zichzelf respecteert veel belangrijker dan de mate waarin anderen hem respecteren.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
6. In Nederland zijn mensen bang dat hun familie een slechte reputatie zal hebben.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
7. In Nederland staan mensen niet toe dat anderen hun familie beledigen.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
8. In Nederland maken mensen zich zorgen over het verdedigen van de reputatie van hun familie.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

9. In Nederland zijn mensen bezorgd over het ruïneren van de reputatie van hun families.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Scale – Gender Role Beliefs

Hieronder vind je een reeks stellingen. Selecteer voor elk ervan de optie die het beste jouw mate van overeenstemming weergeeft.

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Sterk mee oneens (2)	Mee oneens (3)	Niet eens, niet oneens (4)	Mee eens (5)	Sterk mee eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
1. Het is respectloos als een man vloekt in het bijzijn van een vrouw.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
2. Vrouwen moeten niet verwachten dat mannen hun zitplaatsen zullen aanbieden in de bus of de trein.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
3. Op een date moet de man altijd de eerste stap zetten.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. Homoseksuele relaties moeten net zo sociaal geaccepteerd worden als heteroseksuele relaties.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
5. Het stoort me meer om een arrogante vrouw te zien dan een arrogante man.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
6. Als je aan tafel gaat zitten, is het een teken van respect als de man de stoel voor de vrouw vasthoudt.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
7. Vrouwen moeten evenveel seksuele vrijheid hebben als mannen.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
8. Vrouwen moeten de bescherming en steun waarderen die mannen hen traditioneel hebben gegeven.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
9. Vrouwen met kinderen mogen niet buitenshuis werken als ze dit financieel niet nodig hebben.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

10. Er is niets mis met een vrouw die niet graag rokken of jurken draagt.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
11. De echtgenoot moet in alle juridische aangelegenheden worden beschouwd als de wettelijke vertegenwoordiger van het gezin.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
12. Ik houd van vrouwen die oprecht zijn.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
13. Behalve misschien in zeer bijzondere omstandigheden, mag een man nooit toestaan dat een vrouw de rekening betaalt.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
14. Het is goed dat er enige gelijkheid in het huwelijk bestaat, maar over het algemeen moet de man de belangrijkste stem hebben in gezinsaangelegenheden.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
15. Mannen moeten hoffelijkheid blijven tonen tegenover vrouwen, door bijvoorbeeld de deur voor hen open te doen of hen te helpen hun jas aan te trekken.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
16. Het is belachelijk voor een vrouw om de olie in een auto te verversen en voor een man om het huis te versieren.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
17. De vrouw moet net zo vrij zijn als de man om een huwelijksaanzoek te doen.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

18. Vrouwen zouden zich meer zorgen moeten maken over hun gezins- en huishoudelijke taken dan over het verlangen naar een professionele carrière.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
19. Slechte woorden en obsceniteiten zijn weerzinwekkender als ze door een vrouw worden gedaan dan door een man.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
20. Er zijn bepaalde beroepen en soorten bedrijven die geschikter zijn voor mannen dan voor vrouwen.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Hieronder krijg je een beschrijving van de dynamiek van een relatie te zien. Neem graag de tijd om dit aandachtig te lezen.

Lisa en Bram zijn drie jaar getrouwd. Een paar maanden geleden, toen Lisa 's avonds uitging om wat te gaan drinken met haar vrienden, verscheen Bram onaangekondigd ter plaatse. Hij raakte erg overstuur en vertelde Lisa dat ze geen prioriteit gaf aan hun relatie, “omdat ze alleen maar tijd wilde doorbrengen met haar vrienden en familie en niet met hem.” Hij zei ook dat haar gedrag onaanvaardbaar was, omdat een vrouw niet zoveel uit moet gaan, vooral niet als ze getrouwd is. Hij zei enkele zinnen zoals: "Als je echt van me hield, zou je niemand anders nodig hebben." Als Lisa boodschappen ging doen of haar dagelijkse bezigheden wilde uitvoeren, belde Bram haar regelmatig of hield in de gaten waar ze was door haar te vragen om haar live locatie te delen. Hij vertelde Lisa dat mensen berichten en wachtwoorden voor sociale media moeten delen als ze getrouwd zijn om meer vertrouwen in elkaar op te bouwen. Bram begon haar berichten regelmatig te controleren en eiste uitleg voor elk contact dat hij verdacht vond. Bovendien maakte hij vaak opmerkingen tegen Lisa over de hoeveelheid tijd die ze op haar

telefoon zat, waarbij hij benadrukte hoe dit haar afleidde van het uitvoeren van haar taken thuis als een goede echtgenote.

Lisa werkte vroeger, maar ze moest stoppen omdat Bram haar vertelde dat zijn inkomen voldoende was en dat het voor haar beter zou zijn om thuis te blijven, zodat ze het huishouden netjes kon houden en voor hen beiden kon koken. Bram beschuldigde haar er ook van hem te bedriegen met één van haar mannelijke collega's, omdat ze hem soms sms'te of met hem lunchte op het werk. Ondanks dat Lisa zei dat hij slechts een vriend was, vond Bram dat een getrouwde vrouw geen mannelijke vrienden mocht hebben.

Nadat ze gestopt was met werken, nam Bram de bankrekening van Lisa over met het argument dat hij beter met geld kon omgaan. Hij gaf Lisa een maandelijkse bijdrage. Als Lisa Bram probeerde te vragen om de bijdrage te verhogen, bekritiseerde hij haar uitgaven en vroeg haar om de bonnetjes van al haar aankopen. Hij stelde dat hij dat in de gaten moest houden, omdat Lisa het geld waarschijnlijk zou gebruiken om onnodige dingen te kopen of om 's avonds zonder hem op stap te gaan.

Voordat ze trouwden, hadden ze allebei hun eigen auto. Bram deed Lisa de suggestie dat het een goed idee zou zijn om haar auto te verkopen, zodat ze het geld voor iets anders konden gebruiken. Elke keer dat Lisa met de auto op pad wil, zegt Bram dat een vrouw niet alleen zou moeten rijden, en dat het de taak van een man is om zijn vrouw naar bepaalde plaatsen te brengen. Hij benadrukte voortdurend bepaalde zinnen zoals: “Waarom zou je überhaupt weg moeten gaan met de auto zonder mij?” Als Lisa Bram vraagt haar ergens heen te brengen, antwoordt hij vaak dat hij het daar te druk voor heeft. En dat ze de zaken beter moest plannen, in lijn met zijn schema.

Als Lisa zich kleedt om uit te gaan, bekritiseert Bram haar uiterlijk en haar kleding. Hij besliste voortdurend welke kleding ze moest dragen en kopen, omdat hij vindt dat een vrouw er altijd leuk uit moet zien, maar niet té mooi voor andere mannen. Wanneer Lisa enige ontevredenheid over de relatie zou uiten, zou Bram alle moeite benadrukken die hij heeft gedaan om trouw te blijven aan het huwelijk en om al het geld voor het huishouden te verstrekken. Toen Lisa bijvoorbeeld vertelde hoe gestrest en overweldigd ze zich voelde door al het huishoudelijk werk, zei hij: “Je bent gewoon te lui, ik ben degene die hard werkt om voor ons te zorgen.” Bram

zei regelmatig dingen als: “Als je weggaat, zul je er spijt van krijgen, want ik ben zo’n goede echtgenoot voor je.” Hij zou ook zeggen dat het Lisa was die de meeste discussies uitlokte.

Attention check

Wat is de naam van de echtgenote van Bram?

- ○ Lieke (1)
- ○ Lisa (2)
- ○ Fleur (3)

Wie beheert het geld en de bankrekeningen?

- ○ Lisa (1)
- ○ Bram (2)
- ○ Geen van beide opties (3)

Scale - Blame Attribution Female Victim

Lees de volgende stellingen en geef aan in hoeverre je het ermee eens of oneens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Niet mee eens (2)	Niet eens, niet oneens (3)	Mee eens (4)	Helemaal mee eens (5)
1. Lisa provoceerde het gedrag van Bram.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Lisa is een slecht persoon.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Lisa toonde respect voor haar man.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Lisa was ongehoorzaam.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Bram is een goed mens.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Bram handelde zoals hij deed vanwege Lisa's karakter.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Bram is verantwoordelijk voor zijn eigen daden.	○	○	○	○	○
8. Bram zou dit gedrag bij elke partner tonen, niet alleen bij Lisa.	○	○	○	○	○
9. Lisa is verantwoordelijk voor het gedrag in de relatie.	○	○	○	○	○
10. Bram is verantwoordelijk voor het gedrag in de relatie.	○	○	○	○	○

Scale - Perceived Abuse Severity and Acceptance Female Victim

Lees de volgende stellingen en geef aan in hoeverre je het ermee eens of oneens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Niet mee eens (2)	Niet eens, niet oneens (3)	Mee eens (4)	Helemaal mee eens (5)
1. Ik geloof dat Brams gedrag het welzijn van Lisa schaadde.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Ik denk dat Lisa lijdt onder de manier waarop Bram zich tegenover haar gedroeg.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Ik geloof dat de daden van Bram immoreel waren.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Ik geloof dat de daden van Bram inherent verkeerd waren.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Ik denk dat dat Brams gedrag acceptabel is binnen een intieme relatie.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Ik denk dat Lisa zich correct gedroeg als vrouw in de relatie.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Ik denk dat Bram zich correct gedroeg als man in de relatie.	○	○	○	○	○

Case Description – Male Victim

Hieronder krijg je een beschrijving van de dynamiek van een relatie te zien. Neem graag de tijd om dit aandachtig te lezen.

Lisa en Bram zijn drie jaar getrouwd. Een paar maanden geleden, toen Bram 's avonds uitging om wat te gaan drinken met zijn vrienden, verscheen Lisa onaangekondigd ter plaatse. Zij raakte erg overstuur en vertelde Bram dat hij geen prioriteit gaf aan hun relatie, “omdat hij alleen maar tijd wilde doorbrengen met zijn vrienden en familie en niet met haar.” Ze zei ook dat zijn gedrag onaanvaardbaar was, omdat een man niet zoveel uit moet gaan, vooral niet als hij getrouwd is. Ze zei enkele zinnen zoals: "Als je echt van me hield, zou je niemand anders nodig hebben."

Als Bram boodschappen ging doen of zijn dagelijkse bezigheden wilde uitvoeren, belde Lisa hem regelmatig of hield in de gaten waar hij was door hem te vragen om zijn live locatie te delen. Ze vertelde Bram dat mensen berichten en wachtwoorden voor sociale media moeten delen als ze getrouwd zijn om meer vertrouwen in elkaar op te bouwen. Lisa begon zijn berichten regelmatig te controleren en eiste uitleg voor elk contact dat zij verdacht vond. Bovendien maakte ze vaak opmerkingen tegen Bram over de hoeveelheid tijd die hij op zijn telefoon zat, waarbij ze benadrukte hoe dit hem afleidde van het uitvoeren van zijn taken thuis als een goede echtgenoot.

Bram werkte vroeger, maar hij moest stoppen omdat Lisa hem vertelde dat haar inkomen voldoende was en dat het voor hem beter zou zijn om thuis te blijven, zodat hij het huishouden netjes kon houden en voor hen beiden kon koken. Lisa beschuldigde hem er ook van haar te bedriegen met één van zijn vrouwelijke collega's, omdat hij haar soms sms'te of met haar lunchte op het werk. Ondanks dat Bram zei dat ze slechts een vriendin was, vond Lisa dat een getrouwde man geen vrouwelijke vrienden mocht hebben.

Nadat hij gestopt was met werken, nam Lisa de bankrekening van Bram over met het argument dat zij beter met geld kon omgaan. Ze gaf Bram een maandelijkse bijdrage. Als Bram Lisa probeerde te vragen om de bijdrage te verhogen, bekritiseerde ze zijn uitgaven en vroeg hem om de bonnetjes van al zijn aankopen. Ze stelde dat ze dat in de gaten moest houden, omdat

Bram het geld waarschijnlijk zou gebruiken om onnodige dingen te kopen of om 's avonds zonder haar op stap te gaan.

Voordat ze trouwden, hadden ze allebei hun eigen auto. Lisa deed Bram de suggestie dat het een goed idee zou zijn om zijn auto te verkopen, zodat ze het geld voor iets anders konden gebruiken. Elke keer dat Bram met de auto op pad wil, zegt Lisa dat een man niet alleen zou moeten rijden, en dat het de taak van een vrouw is om haar man naar bepaalde plaatsen te brengen. Ze benadrukte voortdurend bepaalde zinnen zoals: “Waarom zou je überhaupt weg moeten gaan met de auto zonder mij?” Als Bram Lisa vraagt hem ergens heen te brengen, antwoordt ze vaak dat ze het daar te druk voor heeft. En dat hij de zaken beter moest plannen, in lijn met haar schema. Als Bram zich kleedt om uit te gaan, bekritiseert Lisa zijn uiterlijk en zijn kleding. Ze besliste voortdurend welke kleding hij moest dragen en kopen, omdat ze vindt dat een man er altijd leuk uit moet zien, maar niet té mooi voor andere vrouwen. Wanneer Bram enige ontevredenheid over de relatie zou uiten, zou Lisa alle moeite benadrukken die zij heeft gedaan om trouw te blijven aan het huwelijk en om al het geld voor het huishouden te verstrekken. Toen Bram bijvoorbeeld vertelde hoe gestrest en overweldigd hij zich voelde door al het huishoudelijk werk, zei ze: “Je bent gewoon te lui, ik ben degene die hard werkt om voor ons te zorgen.” Lisa zei regelmatig dingen als: “Als je weggaat, zul je er spijt van krijgen, want ik ben zo’n goede echtgenote voor je.” Ze zou ook zeggen dat het Bram was die de meeste discussies uitlokte.

Attention check

Wat is de naam van de echtgenoot van Lisa?

- ○ Richard (1)
- ○ Bram (2)
- ○ Dirk (3)

Wie beheert het geld en de bankrekeningen?

○ Lisa (1)

○ Bram (2)

○ Geen van beide opties (3)

Scale - Blame Attribution/Male Victim

Lees de volgende stellingen en geef aan in hoeverre je het ermee eens of oneens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Niet mee eens (2)	Niet eens, niet oneens (3)	Mee eens (4)	Helemaal mee eens (5)
1. Bram provoceerde het gedrag van Lisa.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Bram is een slecht persoon.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Bram toonde respect voor zijn vrouw.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Bram was ongehoorzaam.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Lisa is een goed mens.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Lisa handelde zoals ze deed vanwege Brams karakter.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Lisa is verantwoordelijk voor haar eigen daden.	○	○	○	○	○
8. Lisa zou dit gedrag bij elke partner tonen, niet alleen bij Bram.	○	○	○	○	○
9. Bram is verantwoordelijk voor het gedrag in de relatie.	○	○	○	○	○
10. Lisa is verantwoordelijk voor het gedrag in de relatie.	○	○	○	○	○

Scale - Perceived Abuse Severity and Acceptance Male Victim

Lees de volgende stellingen en geef aan in hoeverre je het ermee eens of oneens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Niet mee eens (2)	Niet eens, niet oneens (3)	Mee eens (4)	Helemaal mee eens (5)
1. Ik geloof dat Lisa's gedrag het welzijn van Bram schaadde.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Ik denk dat Bram lijdt onder de manier waarop Lisa zich tegenover hem gedroeg.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Ik geloof dat de daden van Lisa immoreel waren.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Ik geloof dat de daden van Lisa inherent verkeerd waren.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Ik denk dat Lisa's gedrag acceptabel is binnen een intieme relatie.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Ik denk dat Bram zich correct gedroeg als man in de relatie.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Ik denk dat Lisa zich correct gedroeg als vrouw in de relatie.	○	○	○	○	○

Open Question

Gebruik alsjeblieft het onderstaande tekstvak om meer details te geven of om uit te leggen waarom je denkt dat Bram, Lisa, beiden of geen van beiden verantwoordelijk zijn voor het gedrag dat in de relatie wordt getoond. We herinneren je er ook aan dat elk antwoord geldig en volledig anoniem is en dus niet tot jou persoonlijk kan worden herleid.

Appendix C

English Version of the Survey

Dignity and Honor Scale

Please indicate how frequently do people in your culture think, feel, or act in the ways described in each question:

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1. In Guatemala people should speak their mind.					
2. In Guatemala people should make decisions based on their own opinions and not based on what others think.					
3. In Guatemala people should be true to themselves regardless of what others think.					
4. In Guatemala, people should stand up for what they believe in					

even when others disagree.	
5. In Guatemala, how much a person respects himself is far more important than how much others respect him.	
6.In Guatemala, people are concerned about their family having a bad reputation.	
7. In Guatemala people do not allow others to insult their family.	
8. In Guatemala, people are concerned about defending their families' reputation.	

9. In Guatemala, people are concerned about damaging their families' reputation.

Gender Role Beliefs scale

Please read the following statements and rate how much you agree or disagree with them.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1. It is disrespectful for a man to swear in the presence of a woman.					
2. Women should not expect men to offer them their seats on the bus or train.					
3. When dating, the man should always make the first move/take the first step.					

4.Homosexual relationships should be as socially accepted as heterosexual relationships	
5. It bothers me more to see a woman who is pushy than a man who is pushy.	
6. When sitting down at a table, it shows respect when the man holds the chair for the woman.	
7. Women should have as much sexual freedom as men.	
8. Women should appreciate the protection and support that men have traditionally given them.	
9. Women with children should not work outside the home if they do not have to financially.	
10. I see nothing wrong with a woman who doesn't like to	

wear skirts or dresses.

11. The husband should be regarded as the legal representative of the family in all matters of law.

12. I like women who are outspoken

13. Except perhaps in very special circumstances, a man should never allow a woman to pay for the bill.

14. Some equality in marriage is good, but generally the husband should have the main say – so in family matters

15. Men should continue to show courtesies to women such as holding open the door or helping them on with their coats.

16. It is ridiculous for a woman to change the oil of a car and for a man to decorate the house.

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

18. Women should be concerned with their family and house duties rather than with the desire for a professional career.

19. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive when a woman does it rather than a man

20. There are some professions and types of businesses that are more suitable for men than women.

Case Description: Female Victim, Spanish names

Instructions: below you will be presented with a description of the dynamics of a relationship. Please take the time to read this carefully.

Lisa and Pablo have been married for three years. Some months ago, when Lisa went out at night to get drinks with her friends, Pablo showed up at the place unannounced, he got very upset and told Lisa that she did not prioritize their relationship, "because all she wanted to do was to spend time with her friends and family and not with him." He also said her behavior was unacceptable because a woman should not go out that much, especially if she is married. He would state some phrases like "If you really loved me, you would not need anyone else."

When Lisa went to run errands or to perform her daily activities, Pablo would call her frequently or monitor where she was by asking her to share her real time location. He told Lisa that when people are married, text messages and passwords for social media should be shared to build more trust in each other. Pablo started to check her messages regularly and he would demand explanations for any contact he considered suspicious. Additionally, he often made comments to Lisa about how much time she spent on her phone insisting on how that distracted her from performing her duties at home as a good wife.

Lisa used to wor~~k, b~~ut she had to quit because Pablo told her that his income was enough and that it would be better for her to stay home, so she could keep it neat, tidy and cook for them both. Pablo would also accuse her of cheating on him with one of her male colleagues because she sometimes texted him or had lunch at work with him. Pablo thought that a married women should not have male friends.

After she quit, Pablo took over Lisa's bank account arguing that he was better with managing money. He gave Lisa a monthly allowance. When Lisa tried to ask Pablo to increase the allowance, he would criticize her spending and ask her for receipts of all her purchases. He argued that he had to keep an eye on that, because Lisa would probably use the money to buy unnecessary things or to go out at night without him.

Before getting married, each had their own car. Pablo suggested Lisa that it was a good idea to sell her car, so they could use the money for something else. Now, every time Lisa wants to go out with the car, Pablo says that a woman should not drive alone, and that it is a man's job

to drive his wife to places. He would constantly stress some phrases like “Why would you need to go out in the car without me anyway?” When Lisa asks Pablo to bring her somewhere, he often responds that he is too busy to do so. And that she should plan things better in line with his schedule.

When Lisa gets dressed to go out, Pablo would criticize her appearance and her clothes. He would constantly decide on what clothes she should wear and buy because he thinks that a woman should always look nice but not too nice for other men to see her.

When Lisa would express any dissatisfaction in the relationship, Pablo would emphasize all the effort he has been putting into keeping faithful to the marriage and in providing all the money for the household. For example, when Lisa said how stressed and overwhelmed she has been feeling with all the housework, he said “you are just too lazy, I am the one who works hard to provide for us”. Pablo frequently said things like “If you leave, you will regret it because I am such a good husband to you.” He would also express that it was Lisa who provoked most of the arguments.

Case Description: Male Victim, Spanish names

Pablo and Lisa have been married for three years. They live in Guatemala City. In the last year they have been having some trouble in the relationship.

Some months ago, after Lisa went out at night to get drinks with her friends, Lisa got very upset and told Pablo that he did not prioritize their relationship, “because all he wanted to do was to spend time with his friends and family and not with her.” She also thought that his behavior was unacceptable because a man should not go out that much, especially if he is married. She would state some phrases like “If you really loved me, you would not need anyone else.” Therefore, Pablo decided to stop attending social events and rarely invited his family and friends over, since he did not want Lisa to be disappointed.

When Pablo went to run errands or to perform her daily activities, Lisa would always start calling him constantly or monitor where he was by asking him to share his real time location. She told Pablo that when people are married, text messages and passwords for social media should be shared to build more trust in each other. So, Lisa insisted that they share all passwords including the ones for bank accounts So, Pablo accepted. Few days after that, Lisa started to check his

messages regularly and she would demand explanations for any contact she considered suspicious. Additionally, she often made comments to Pablo about how much time he spent on his phone insisting on how that distracted him from performing his duties at home as a good husband.

Pablo used to work as a doctor in a clinic, but he had to quit because Lisa told him that her income was enough and that it would be better for him to stay home, so he could keep it neat, tidy and cook for both. They also had too many discussions because Lisa believe that he was cheating on her with one of his female colleagues because he sometimes texted her or had lunch at work with her After he quit, Lisa took over Pablo's bank account arguing that she was better with managing money. She gave Pablo a monthly allowance, which Pablo found to be less than what he really needed. When Pablo tried to ask Lisa to increase the allowance, she would criticize his spending and ask him for receipts of all his purchases. She argued that she had to keep an eye on that, because Pablo would probably use the money to buy unnecessary things or to go out at night without her.

Before getting married, each had their own car. Lisa suggested Pablo that it was a good idea to sell his car, so they could use the money for something else. Now, every time Pablo wants to go out, Lisa says that a man should not drive alone, and that it is a woman's job to drive her husband to places. She would constantly stress some phrases like "Why would you need to go out in the car without me anyway?" "I will drive the car, because it is mine and a man should not be driving around without his wife". Additionally, when Pablo asks Lisa to bring him somewhere, she often responds that she is too busy to do so. And that he should plan things better in line with her schedule.

Every time Pablo gets dressed to go out, Lisa would criticize his appearance and his clothes. She would constantly decide on what clothes he should wear and buy because she thinks that a man should always look nice but not too nice for other women to see him.

When Pablo tried to talk to Lisa about how stressed and overwhelmed, he has been feeling with all the housework, she would respond to him with phrases like "you are overacting" or "you are just too sensitive and lazy, you do not have anything else to do". Moreover, every time Pablo would express how he felt about some of Lisa's actions, she would turn around the conversation by emphasizing all the effort she has been putting into keeping faithful to the marriage and in providing all the money for the household. Lisa frequently said things like "If you leave, you will

regret it because I am such a good wife to you." She would also express that it was Pablo who provoked most of the discussions.

Pablo recently noticed that he has lost his appetite. He also finds it difficult to sleep at night and during the days he just feels like staying in bed. Additionally, he has been suffering from constant headaches, stomachaches, and feels very anxious and stressed overall.

Blame Attribution Scale

Please read the following statements and rate how much you agree or disagree with them.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1. Lisa provoked Pablo's behavior					
2. Lisa is a bad individual.					
3. Lisa showed respect to her husband.					
4. Lisa was too disobedient.					
5. Pablo is a good individual.					

6. Pablo acted the way he did because of Lisa's character.

7. Pablo is responsible for his own actions.

8. Pablo would behave the way he does toward any partner, not only Lisa.

9. How responsible is Lisa for the behaviors in the relationship?

10. How responsible is Pablo for the behaviors in the relationship?

Perceived Abuse Severity Scale

Please read the following statements and rate how much you agree or disagree with them.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1.I think that Pablo's behavior harmed Lisa's well-being.					
2. I think Lisa is suffering because of how Pablo behaved toward her.					
3. I think that Pablo's actions were immoral.					
4. I think Pablo's actions were inherently wrong.					

Acceptance of behavior

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1. I think that these type of behaviors are acceptable within an intimate relationship.					

2. I think that Pablo was acting the right way as the man of the relationship.
3. I think that Lisa was acting the right way as the woman of the relationship

Open Question:

You can use the text box below to give more details or explain why you believe that either Pablo, Lisa, both or neither are responsible for the behaviors shown in the relationship. We also remind you that any answer is valid and that it is entirely anonymous, so it cannot be traced back to you personally.

Appendix D

Additional two-way interactions for the purpose of exploratory analyses

Acceptance and its relationship with Nationality and Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs. The effect of Nationality on the dependent variable Acceptance depends on the different levels of Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs. A summary of the results is displayed in Table D-1. It indicated that Dutch individuals accepted the behavior more except for when they endorsed traditional Gender Role Beliefs (having a low score of Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs). Using a test comparing the slopes between the Guatemalan and Dutch cases moderated by the Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs, the contrast was found to be significant with b = -0.42, SE = 0.18, $t(188)$ = -2.39, p = .02. Only the slope for Guatemalan individuals was found to be significant in a negative relationship (b = -0.48, SE = 0.11, $t(188)$ = -4.32, $p < .001$). More Non-traditional Gender Score Beliefs yielded lower Acceptance for Guatemalans. Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs did not predict Acceptance for Dutch individuals, while Gender Role Beliefs did not predict Acceptance in the Netherlands.

Table D-1

Acceptance scores at three levels of Non-traditional Gender Role Beliefs by Nationality

Gender Role Beliefs	Nationality	*M*	*SE*	*B*	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*
High	Guatemala	1.01	0.15	0.75	0.18	188	4.25	**< .001**
	Netherlands	1.76	0.1					
Moderate	Guatemala	1.38	0.09	0.43	0.14	188	3.16	**.002**
	Netherlands	1.81	0.1					
Low	Guatemala	1.76	0.09	0.10	0.21	188	0.5	.62
	Netherlands	1.86	0.18					

High (mean + 1 sd) = 5.86, Moderate (mean) = 5.08, Low (mean – 1 sd) = 4.30

bold = *Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)*

bold italics = *Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Acceptance and its relationship with Victim Gender and Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms. The effect of Victim Gender on the dependent variable Acceptance depends on the different levels of Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms. A summary of the results is displayed in Table D-2. Regardless of the level of Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms Acceptance was always higher for male victims. Moreover, a test to compare the slopes between the female victim and male victim cases moderated by the Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms was used, the contrast was found to be only near significant with b = -0.22, SE = 0.12, t(188) = -1.83, p = .06. Only the slope for the male victim was found to be significant in a positive relationship (b = 0.35, SE = 0.09, t(188) = 3.94, p < .001). Higher Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms yielded more Acceptance for the case of the male victim.

Table D-2

Acceptance scores at three levels of Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms by Victim Gender

Perceived Dignity Cultural Norms	**Victim Gender**	***M***	***SE***	***B***	***SE***	***df***	***t***	***p***
High	Female	1.51	0.10	0.68	0.14	188	4.69	**< .001**
	Male	2.19	0.11					
Moderate	Female	1.40	0.08	0.50	0.11	188	4.45	**< .001**
	Male	1.91	0.08					
Low	Female	1.32	0.09	0.37	0.14	188	2.73	**.007**
	Male	1.69	0.10					

High (Percentile 75) = 5.00, Moderate (Percentile 50, median) = 4.20, Low (Percentile 25) = 3.60

bold = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

bold italics = Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)