



**Judgements of Men who Perpetrate Psychological  
Partner Aggression:  
The Role of Sexual Jealousy and  
Sociosexual Orientation**

**UNIVERSITY  
OF TWENTE.**

Author: Sheila Türkis (s2159783)

1<sup>st</sup> Supervisor: Dr. Pelin Gül

2<sup>nd</sup> Supervisor: Kars Otten

Bachelor Thesis in Positive Psychology & Technology  
Faculty of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences

2021

### Abstract

**Background:** Previous research has suggested that sexual jealousy and sociosexual orientation predict the support of ideologies that restrict women's sexuality as a function of indirect mate-guarding. However, little is known whether these individual-level psychological factors are associated with condoning judgements of male perpetrators against their female partners. Therefore, the purpose of this research was to investigate whether sexual jealousy and sociosexual orientation predict condoning judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression against a female partner.

**Method:** With a convenience sample ( $n = 101$ ) of mostly students (71%) an online survey was conducted, which included the Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (MJS), the Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R), two scenarios displaying psychological aggression and questions about the judgement of the male perpetrator within the scenarios. A correlational analysis between the variables sociosexual orientation, sexual jealousy and judgements of the perpetrator and a moderation analysis with MJS as the predictor and SOI as the moderator variable was conducted.

**Results:** The results demonstrated that there was no correlation between MJS, SOI and global judgements of the perpetrator. The moderation analysis indicated that SOI is not a significant moderator on the relationship of jealousy and judgements of perpetrator.

**Conclusion:** Based on this study's results, sociosexual orientation and sexual jealousy are not linked to lenient judgements of a perpetrator who conducts partner aggression. It is recommended that future research should focus on verifying the results with a more heterogeneous sample and different scenarios displaying different types of psychological aggression as well as other forms of aggression (physical, sexual, and cyber).

*Keywords:* sexual jealousy, sociosexual orientation, male perpetrators, psychological aggression, domestic violence

### **Judgements of Men who Perpetrate Psychological Partner Aggression: The Role of Sexual Jealousy and Sociosexual Orientation**

Intimate partner violence, also known as IPV, against women remains a widespread problem, which occurs in all settings among all socioeconomic and cultural groups. The World Health Organization (2017) has estimated that 35% of women worldwide experience violence from an intimate partner during their lifetime. Victims who have experienced IPV from their partners suffer from adverse health consequences, such as mental health issues, complications with pregnancy, and early death (O'Doherty et al., 2015). For example, women who experience psychological aggression by an intimate partner during pregnancy are at higher risk to suffer from postnatal depression (Ludermir et al., 2010). Despite the alarming consequences for women, condoning judgements of men who perpetrate aggression against women are still a problem worldwide (Gracia, 2014).

Research has shown that multiple factors influence people's judgements of perpetrators of IPV, such as the social environment, cultural background, and demographic characteristics (Sanchez-Prada et al., 2020). For instance, condoning judgements of aggression against women is more common among men than women (Romano & De Luca, 2001). Moreover, older, and less educated individuals are more likely to blame the victim and share supportive attitudes of men who perpetrate partner aggression (Gracias & Tomas, 2014).

Additionally, the actions of the perpetrator and the victim can influence an individual's judgements of who is to blame in cases of partner aggression. Individuals blamed perpetrators more when the victim needed medical aid because of violent actions (Taylor & Sorenson, 2005). On the other hand, people judged perpetrators as less guilty when they perceived the victims as responsible for the assault by flirting with someone outside the partnership (Witte, Schroeder, & Lohr, 2006). Also, a minor fault was assigned to the perpetrator when the aggressive behaviour occurred more than once (Taylor & Sorenson, 2005).

Abundant studies also show that sociocultural beliefs and norms influence individuals' judgements of IPV, perpetrators and victims. For instance, individuals who endorse higher traditional gender roles, rape myths, and sexist attitudes (Yamawaki et al., 2007) have more lenient judgments of partner abuse (Pavlou & Knowles, 2001) and higher victim-blaming attitudes (Valor-Segura et al., 2008). These outcomes show that demographic, cultural and situational factors are contemplated when people judge male perpetrators in IPV cases. While the role of these types of factors has been well-established in the literature

(Sanchez-Prada et al., 2020; Romano & De Luca, 2001; Gracias & Tomas, 2014), there is not much research on how individual-level psychological factors, - i.e., affective, and motivational factors –, could influence people's judgements of men who perpetrate aggression against women in intimate partnerships.

Some researchers state that having a better understanding of people's judgments of male perpetrators in IPV, by investigating each type of IPV independently, is important for accomplishing clarity about the nature of IPV against women (Dobash & Dobash, 1998).

Generally, there are four different types of IPV: physical violence, sexual violence, stalking, or psychological harm by a current or former partner or spouse (Center for Disease Control, 2020). Psychological aggression refers to verbal and social demonstrations planned to dominate, embarrass, scare and threaten one's partner (Follingstad, Coyne, & Gambone, 2005). Most IPV victims reported that psychological abuse is the most harmful type of abuse because the consequences are long-lasting (WHO, 2013). Therefore, this study will focus on one type of IPV: psychological aggression.

The acceptance of partner aggression and perpetrators who conduct partner aggression, prevents victims from seeking help (Archer & Graham, 2003). Thus, perceiving men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression as acceptable creates a social environment that generates further psychological aggression (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008a). In particular, male perpetrators who use psychological partner aggression to control their partners are perceived as acceptable by others (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). This suggests that focusing attention on factors influencing judgements of only psychological partner aggression is crucial in light of research revealing the harmful impacts of psychological aggression.

Hence, the present study will focus on judgements of men who perpetrate psychological aggression against women in intimate partnerships. By displaying different scenarios in which men engage in psychological aggression against women in relationship contexts, the present study will investigate to what extent judgements of psychological partner aggression against women are influenced by individual-level psychological factors such as sexual jealousy and sociosexual orientation. Therefore, the following sections will review sexual jealousy and sociosexual orientation related to judgements of psychological partner aggression against women.

### **Sexual Jealousy and Judgements of Psychological Aggression against Women in Intimate Partnerships**

Jealousy is characterized as a state enacted when there is a perceived danger to a valued relationship (Daly et al., 1982). In particular, sexual jealousy is evoked in response to a perceived threat of sexual infidelity, in which the partner might be having sexual intercourse with someone outside of the partnership (Buss, 2013). From an evolutionary perspective, women and men feel jealous when there is a threat to the relationship and the loss of a partner but for different reasons (Buss, 2018).

For women, the supply of eggs and pregnancies is limited during their lifetime (Busche et al., 2013). Consequently, the chances for women to pass on their genes to the next generation increases if the children they produce are of higher quality (Busche et al., 2013). Women are dependent on commitment since childbearing requires support and resources (Busche et al., 2013). Therefore, a women's jealousy is focused on fighting the possibility that her partner could leave her and her child (Busche et al., 2013; Buss et al., 1992).

Contrary to women, men are faced with paternity uncertainty because fertilization occurs in women (Busche et al., 2013). Men are confronted with cuckoldry since men cannot assure that any given offspring carries their genes (Buss et al., 1992.). As a result, men are at risk of investing their time and commitment in genetically unrelated children (Busche et al., 2013; Peters et al., 2002) Thus, men's jealousy is focused on sexual infidelity to solve paternity uncertainty and prevent cuckoldry (Busche et al., 2013; Daly et al., 1982; Peters et al., 2002).

Generally, eliminating problems to reproductions, such as the fear of losing commitment and assuring paternity certainty, have been labelled as mate-guarding behaviour (Buss, 2015). Much literature has stated that sexual jealousy causes IPV due to mate guarding concerns (Goetz et al., 2008). According to evolutionary history, partner aggressions are more severe types of mate retention behaviour that range from psychological aggression to physical aggression (Buss & Shackelford, 1997).

Although men and women, both have reported to equally participate in partner violence (Henning & Feder, 2004), men's sexual jealousy has been linked to aggressive behaviour evoked by mate retention concerns (Shackelford et al., 2005), which is shown to be more severe in contrast to women (Henning & Feder, 2004). Men were found to be more aggressive toward their female partner when they suspected that their female partner would cheat on them opposed to when they did not suspect their partner cheat on them (Cousins & Gangestad, 2007).

Concerning judgements of partner aggression, Haj-Yahia (2003) found that partner aggression against women was perceived as less severe when women were seen as unfaithful towards their husbands in contrast to other situation in which partner aggression was used against women. This indicates that support for partner aggression was given when it was caused due to sexual infidelity. However, this study focuses on judgements of partner aggression and the role of sexual jealousy in how third parties judge the perpetrator who conducted psychological partner aggression. Since sexual jealousy has contributed to practices, such as female genital cutting and women's religious veiling, because of mate guarding motives that restrict a women's sexuality (Daly & Wilson, 1992; Howard & Gibson, 2019; Pazhoohi et al., 2017) it might be that individuals with higher levels of sexual jealousy may not only be at risk of engaging in direct forms of mate guarding, such as perpetrating partner aggression, but also more indirect forms of mate guarding, such as giving support for ideologies that control women's sexuality.

In line with this assumption, previous research has demonstrated that more sexually jealous individuals are also more supportive of ideological forms of mate guarding, such as supporting norms that restrict female sexuality (Gul & Kupfer, 2021). Given that partner abuse and aggression are direct forms of mate guarding, individuals who are more sexually jealous may also be more accepting of men who commit partner aggression as a form of ideological mate-guarding, mainly when the aggression results from jealousy evoked by mate-guarding concerns.

### **Sociosexual Orientation and Judgements of Psychological Aggression against Women in Intimate Partnerships**

Another relevant factor that might be associated with judgements of men who perpetrate partner aggression is sociosexual orientation. According to Simpson and Gangestad (1991), "sociosexuality" is defined as "the individual differences in willingness to engage in sexual relations without closeness, commitment, and other indicators of emotional bonding".

Contrary to sociosexual unrestricted men, sociosexual restricted men are at higher risk of paternity uncertainty, as they prefer investing in a primary mate (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Men in monogamously oriented relationships are inclined to use mate guarding behavior to solve problems of paternity uncertainty such as partner infidelity (Burch & Gallup, 2020). Moreover, Individuals in monogamously oriented relationships experience higher levels of jealousy when exposed to the threat of sexual infidelity (Rydell et al., 2004). Committed individuals show higher levels of jealousy because they are at a higher risk of

investing their time in a cheating partner and therefore perceive possible threats to the relationship from third parties as more severe (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993).

Previous research has established links between a restricted sociosexuality and social conservatism; for example, monogamously oriented individuals support socially conservative political ideologies (Tybur et al., 2015). Furthermore, it was found that sociosexually restricted men who have a higher fit of sexual jealousy are more likely to engage in ideological forms of mate guarding, such as giving stronger support for norms about controlling women's sexual behaviour (Gul & Kupfer, 2021).

As monogamously oriented men are at higher risk of cuckoldry (Burch & Gallup, 2020) and are likely to support socially conservative ideologies including, the control of women's sexuality (Gul & Kupfer, 2021; Tybur et al., 2015; Weeden & Kurzban, 2013), they should be more likely to support ideologies that restrict women's sexuality, and one manifestation can be giving less disapproval or punishment of men who commit partner aggression. Hence, it can be assumed that a restricted sociosexual orientation is related to more lenient judgements of aggression against their female partner when it is used as a punishment against a partner to minimize the risk of infidelity. In line with this assumption, it might be that the relationship between sexual jealousy and judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression would be amplified among restricted individuals in conflicts that are jealousy related.

### **The Current Study, Research Question and Hypotheses**

The present study investigates whether sexual jealousy and sociosexual orientation influences judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression. In general, condoning judgements of aggression contribute to the actual perpetration of men's partner aggression against women and prevent females from seeking support (Gracia, 2014; Waltermaurer, 2012). This increases the risks for victims to suffer longer due to fear of consequences shaped by society (Gracia, 2014). Therefore, understanding factors that support lenient judgements of men who perpetrate partner aggression is crucial in reducing misogyny and female victim-blaming. The research question derived for the present study is: *To what extent are sexual jealousy and sociosexual orientation associated with judgments of males who perpetrate psychological aggression against women?* Specifically, the following hypotheses have been formulated:

**Hypothesis 1 (H<sub>1</sub>):** *Individuals with higher levels of sexual jealousy are expected to be more lenient in judging men who perpetrate psychological aggression against their female partner in conflicts that are jealousy related but not when the conflict is not related to jealousy.*

**Hypothesis 2 (H<sub>2</sub>):** *Individuals with a restricted sociosexuality are expected to have more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate psychological aggression against their female partner when the conflict is jealousy related but not when the conflict is not related to jealousy.*

**Hypothesis 3 (H<sub>3</sub>):** *The relationship between sexual jealousy and more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression is expected to be amplified among sociosexual restricted individuals.*

## **Method**

### **Participants**

The sample in this study consisted of 124 participants selected through a random snowball sampling with the support of social media platforms (WhatsApp, Facebook & Instagram). Furthermore, students from the University of Twente participated in the study through SONA and received in return study credits (0.25 credits). Inclusion criteria for the study were that the participants were at least 18 years old and understood a sufficient English level. Due to inclusion criteria, missing or incomplete data, the data of 101 participants was used for this study. In table 1, an overview of the sample characteristics is given.

**Table 1**

*Sample Social Demographic Characteristics (n=101) in Frequencies, Percentages, Mean and Standard Deviation (SD)*

Variables		n	%	Mean	SD
Age (in years)		101	-	25.80	10.60
Gender Identity	Women	78	77.2	-	-
	Men	22	21.8	-	-
Nationality	Dutch	11	10.9	-	-
	German	83	82.2	-	-
	Other	7	6.9	-	-
Ethnicity	White	95	94.1	-	-
	Black	1	1.0	-	-
	Mixed race	1	1.0	-	-
	Other	4	4.0	-	-
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	89	88.1	-	-
	Homosexual	4	4.0	-	-
	Bisexual	7	6.9	-	-
	Other	1	1.0	-	-
Relationship Status	Single	44	43.6	-	-
	Closed Relationship	45	45.5	-	-
	Married	11	10.9	-	-
Religiosity	From 1 (Not at all) to 7 (very)	101	-	2.87	1.64
Political Orientation	From 1 (Very left-wing) to 7 (Very right wing)	101	-	3.24	1.06
Current Occupation	Student	71	70.03	-	-
	Employee with wage	21	20.08	-	-
	Self-employed	5	5.0	-	-

---

	Other	4	4.0	-	-
Degree/Level of Education	VMBO/Middleschool	2	2	-	-
	HAVO/VWO/High-School	73	72.3	-	-
	Academic Bachelor	17	16.8	-	-
	Academic Master	8	7.9	-	-

---

### Design and Procedure

A cross-sectional study was conducted during April 2021 and the data collection took four weeks, using an online questionnaire, designed via Qualtrics. Before conducting the study, it was approved by the BMS Ethics Committee of the University of Twente on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of March 2021 (#210256). After the informed consent form (see Appendix A for the informed consent) was obtained, the participants were asked to fill in their demographics (see Appendix B for the demographics).

Next, the participants were randomly assigned to one of two different scenarios displaying psychological partner aggression against a woman. Both scenarios entailed a conflict between a heterosexual couple and ended with the man using psychological aggression against his female partner. The only difference between the two scenarios was that in the jealousy-based scenario, the aggression was caused by the wife's infidelity. In contrast, in the non-jealousy-based scenario, the aggression was caused by the wife lied about her friendship with the women from next door. After reading the scenario assigned to them, participants were asked about their judgement regarding the partner aggression within the scenario they had just read.

Then, participants completed scales regarding their sociosexual orientation and their dispositional (sexual) jealousy. The researcher decided that the scales were administered after the scenarios to avoid participants judging the perpetrator differently, as completing the scales of sociosexual orientation and jealousy before reading the scenario could have influenced participants judgements.

Attention check items such as "*What was the name of the perpetrator/victim in the scenarios that you have just read?*" and "*To show that you are reading this statement, please select two as a response to this question*" were used to make sure that the participants were completing the survey attentively and ensuring the validity of the results. Also, the questions

in the survey were randomized to account for order effects. Lastly, the participants were debriefed about the explicit content of the study (see Appendix C for the debriefing text used). The estimated time to participate in the survey was 15 minutes.

## **Manipulation**

### ***Psychological Aggression Scenarios***

Two scenarios from Gul and Schuster (2020) were taken and adjusted by the author of this thesis into displaying psychological aggression (see Appendix D for the scenarios). Both scenarios were about a heterosexual married couple (Tom and Karen), who are having a conflict, which ends with Tom using psychological aggression against Karen (“*Tom yells at Karen: “Slut” and tells her that she is fat and ugly and that no one will ever love her*”). The scenarios differ in the reason for the conflict. In the jealousy-related scenario, Tom’s aggression is caused by Karen having an affair with their male neighbour. In contrast, the non-jealousy-related scenario displayed Tom’s aggression caused by Karen keeping her friendship with the female neighbour as a secret from Tom.

### ***Perceived Jealousy***

Two manipulation check items were used to check whether the participants perceived the two different scenarios as intended (“*To what extent do you think Karen’s behaviour is considered cheating?*” and “*To what extent do you think Tom’s behavior was provoked by jealousy?*”). Both items were measured with a 7-point Likert scale (1= “*Not at all*” to 7= “*Very much*”). A correlation analysis examined the relationship between the two items. It indicated a positive correlation ( $r(101) = .54$ ), therefore the items were combined as one scale measuring the manipulation check in this study, namely the perceived jealousy scale. A Spearman-Brown coefficient was calculated and indicated  $r_{SB} = .85$ .

## **Measures**

### ***Judgements of Perpetrator***

Participant’s judgements were measured with 18 items (see Appendix E for judgement items) selected from previous studies (Krahé et al., 2007; Capazza & Arriaga, 2008b). All items were measured with a 7-point Likert scale (1= “*Not at all*” to 7= “*Very much*”). Within the 18 items, two questions concerned the perception of the victim “*Karen*” (e.g., “*How responsible is Karen for what happened?*”), two questions regarding the perception of the punishment of the perpetrator “*Tom*” (e.g., “*Do you think Tom should be punished?*”), twelve questions measured the judgement and perception of the perpetrator

“Tom” (e.g., “How understandable do you find Tom’s behaviour?”), and two questions examined the perceived seriousness of the aggression/incident (e.g., “How serious was the incident?”).

Since this questionnaire was put together by the researcher an exploratory factor analysis utilizing principal axis factoring as the extraction method and oblimin rotation of the 18 items was conducted on the whole sample (combining participants in both scenario conditions) to assess its preliminary construct validity.

The exploratory factor analysis suggested a three-factor solution; hence, three scales were created: *acceptance of the perpetrator* (11 items; loadings ranged from .47 to .93), *absence of punishment* (3 items; loadings ranged from .42 to .70) and *tolerance of aggression* (4 items; loadings ranged from .35 to .76). Items that loaded on more than one factor were allocated to the factor with the highest item loading. The results of the pattern matrix can be found in Appendix F. Reliability analysis showed good reliability for the scale *perceived acceptance of the perpetrator* ( $\alpha = .83$ ), acceptable reliability for the scale *absence of punishment* ( $\alpha = .71$ ) and acceptable reliability for the scale *tolerance of aggression* ( $\alpha = .70$ ).

The global judgement scale was also created by averaging the means of the 18 items ( $\alpha = .90$ ), in which a high score on the global judgement scale and subscales (*perceived acceptance of the perpetrator*, *absence of punishment* and *tolerance of aggression*) represents more lenient judgements of the perpetrator.

### ***Dispositional Jealousy***

The degree of sexual jealousy was measured with 16 items from the Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (MJS) (see Appendix H for MJS). The MJS measures three different subscales: cognitive, emotional, and behavioural jealousy (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989) but for this survey, only the items of the subscales cognitive jealousy and emotional jealousy were used.

The cognitive jealousy subscale was measured with eight items about the frequency of jealous thoughts of a current partner or partner in interest (e.g., “I suspect that X is secretly seeing someone of the opposite sex.”) on a 7-point Likert-scale (1= “All the time” to 7= “Never”). Emotional jealousy was measured with eight items about the degree of upset when experiencing jealousy evoking situations involving a current partner or partner in interest (e.g., “X comments on you how great looking a particular member of the opposite sex is.”) on a 7-point Likert-scale (1= “Very pleased” to 7= “Very upset”). Participants were instructed to think of a romantic partner or partner in interest while responding to all items.

The overall sexual jealousy scale was created by averaging the means of the 16 items ( $\alpha = .70$ ), in which higher scores represented higher levels of dispositional (sexual) jealousy.

### ***Sociosexual Orientation***

A revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R) was used to measure the participant's sociosexual orientation (see Appendix G for SOI-R). The SOI-R measures three different subscales: sociosexual behaviour, sociosexual attitude, and sociosexual desire (Penke & Arsendorf, 2008). The subscale scale sociosexual behaviour was measured with three items (e.g., "*With how many different partners have you had sex within the past 12 months?*") with a 9-point Likert scale (from "0" to "20 or more"). The sociosexual attitude was measured with three items (e.g., "*I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying "casual" sex with different partners*"); these items were rated on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("*Strongly disagree*") to 9 ("*Strongly agree*"). Sociosexual desire was measured with three items (e.g., "*How often do you experience sexual arousal when you are in contact with someone you are not in a committed romantic relationship with?*"), that were measured with a 9-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 ("*Never*") to 9 ("*At least once a day*").

The global sociosexual orientation scale was created by averaging the means of the eight items ( $\alpha = .83$ ). Higher scores on the global sociosexual orientation represent a restricted sociosexuality, and low scores indicate an unrestricted sociosexuality. Due to an error, one item ("*In everyday life, how often do you have spontaneous fantasies about having sex with someone you just met?*") within the sociosexual desire subscale had to be deleted and is missing.

### **Data Analysis**

All analyses were conducted using SPSS version 27. First, descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were conducted per scenario (jealousy-based and non-jealousy-based aggression) to present the trends in the data. For manipulation checks, an independent sample t-test was performed to examine whether the two different scenarios were perceived as intended on the perceived jealousy scale. The perceived jealousy scale was used as the dependent variable and the type of the scenario was used as the independent variable. To check whether the means of the judgement variables were significantly different between both scenarios, an independent sample t-test was conducted. Judgement variables were used as the dependent variables and the scenarios were used as the independent variable.

To test the first hypothesis “*Individuals indicating higher levels of sexual jealousy are expected to be more lenient in judging men who perpetrate psychological aggression against their female partner in conflicts that are jealousy related but not when the conflict is not related to jealousy*” and the second hypothesis “*Individuals with a restricted sociosexuality are expected to have more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate psychological aggression against their female partner when the conflict is jealousy related but not when the conflict is not related to jealousy*”, Pearson correlations were conducted between the dependent variables “global judgement”, “perceived acceptance of the perpetrator”, “absence of punishment” and “tolerance of aggression” and the independent variables “sexual jealousy” and “sociosexual orientation” in the two scenario conditions.

Lastly, to answer the third hypothesis “*The relationship between dispositional jealousy and more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression is expected to be amplified among sociosexual restricted individuals*”, a moderation analysis was conducted using the Process macro (model 1) by Hayes (2017).

For the correlational analyses the effect size was estimated to be low if the value of  $r$  varies around .10, medium if  $r$  varies around .30 and large if  $r$  was higher than .50. The hypotheses of the study were accepted if the correlations showed a significance level of  $p < .05$ .

## Results

### Preliminary Analysis

#### *Manipulation Check*

An independent-sample t-test was conducted to compare whether the two different scenarios were perceived differently by the participants. The results indicated that there was a significant difference between the two scenarios. Participants who were assigned to read the jealousy related scenario ( $M = 5.89$ ,  $SD = .96$ ,  $N = 44$ ) had a higher score on the manipulation check items compared to the participants who were assigned to read the non-jealousy related scenario ( $M = 3.47$ ,  $SD = .91$ ,  $N = 56$ );  $t(98) = -12.80$ ,  $p < .001$ , two-tailed. This indicates that participants who were assigned to read the jealousy related scenario perceived the scenario as indented.

### *Descriptive Statistics*

The mean scores and standard deviations of the jealousy related scenario and the non-jealousy related scenario subgroups for the variables “global judgements”, “perceived acceptance of the perpetrator”, “absence of punishment”, “tolerance of aggression”, “sociosexual orientation” and “dispositional jealousy” are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2**

*Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables in two scenarios*

		<u>Jealousy related</u>	<u>Non- jealousy related</u>
	Scale Range	<u>scenario</u>	<u>scenario</u>
		<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Global Judgements	1-7	3.91(0.78)	2.58(0.71)
Acceptance of the Perpetrator	1-7	3.84(0.83)	2.60(0.70)
Absence of Punishment	1-7	3.85(0.92)	2.56(1.03)
Tolerance of Aggression	1-7	4.15(0.96)	2.56(0.70)
Sociosexual Orientation	1-9	3.71(1.36)	3.87(1.52)
Dispositional Jealousy	1-7	3.54 (0.63)	3.39 (0.63)

*Note.* *n (Jealousy related Scenario Subgroup) = 44, n (Non-jealousy related Scenario Subgroup) = 56. M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation.*

### *Inferential Statistics*

To compare whether the means of the judgement variables are significantly different in the two conditions (jealousy and non-jealousy related scenario), an independent sample t-test was conducted. For the global judgement scale, individuals in the jealousy related scenario ( $M = 3.91$ ,  $SD = .78$ ) demonstrated significantly higher scores,  $t(97) = -8.83$ ,  $p < .001$ , compared to the non-jealousy related scenario ( $M = 2.58$ ,  $SD = .71$ ). Concerning the acceptance of the perpetrator subscale, there was a significant difference between the jealousy ( $M = 3.84$ ,  $SD = .83$ ) and the non-jealousy related scenario ( $M = 2.60$ ,  $SD = .70$ ),  $t(97) = -8.00$ ,  $p < .001$ . There was a significant difference in the scores for the absence of punishment subscale between participants who were assigned to the jealousy related scenario ( $M = 3.85$ ,  $SD = .92$ ) compared to participants assigned to the non-jealousy related scenario ( $M = 2.56$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ),  $t(97) = -$

6.46,  $p < .001$ . Further, for the subscale tolerance of aggression, a significant difference between the jealousy related scenario ( $M = 4.15$ ,  $SD = .96$ ) and the non-jealousy related scenario ( $M = 2.56$ ,  $SD = .70$ ),  $t(98) = -8.75$ ,  $p < .001$  was found.

## **Correlational Analysis**

### ***Hypotheses Testing***

In table 3 the correlations between sociosexual orientation, sexual jealousy and global judgements of the jealousy related scenario and the non-jealousy related scenario are presented. For *Hypothesis 1* and *Hypothesis 2*, the results showed that dispositional (sexual) jealousy, sociosexual orientation and global judgements had non-significant relationships in the jealousy-related scenario. Regarding the subscales, results indicated that dispositional (sexual) jealousy had a non-significant relationship with acceptance of perpetrator ( $r = .037$ ,  $p = .813$ ), absence of punishment ( $r = -.050$ ,  $p = .749$ ) and tolerance of aggression ( $r = .108$ ,  $p = .490$ ) in the jealousy related scenario. Sociosexual orientation had non-significant relationships with acceptance of perpetrator ( $r = .166$ ,  $p = .282$ ), absence of punishment ( $r = .261$ ,  $p = .100$ ) and tolerance of aggression ( $r = .165$ ,  $p = .284$ ) in the jealousy related scenario.

Concerning *Hypothesis 3*, the interaction term that revealed from the moderation analysis was statistically non-significant ( $b = -.012$ ,  $s.e. = .163$ ,  $p = .939$ ), indicating that the sociosexual orientation was not a significant moderator of the relationship between dispositional jealousy and global judgements. Furthermore, sociosexual orientation was not a significant moderator of the relationships between dispositional (sexual) jealousy and acceptance of the perpetrator ( $b = -.020$ ,  $s.e. = .123$ ,  $p = .866$ ), dispositional (sexual) jealousy and absence of punishment ( $b = .126$ ,  $s.e. = .150$ ,  $p = .404$ ), and dispositional (sexual) jealousy and tolerance of aggression ( $b = .022$ ,  $s.e. = .148$ ,  $p = .878$ ).

### ***Additional Findings***

Concerning the subscales for the non-jealousy related scenario, results indicated that dispositional jealousy had a non-significant relationship with acceptance of perpetrator ( $r = .065$ ,  $p = .647$ ) and absence of punishment ( $r = -.072$ ,  $p = .610$ ). One significant relationship was found between dispositional jealousy and tolerance of aggression in the non-jealousy related scenario ( $r = .96$ ,  $p < .01$ ). This indicates that participants who were higher on dispositional jealousy perceived the non-jealousy-related aggression less aggressively. Moreover, sociosexual orientation had non-significant relationships with acceptance of

perpetrator ( $r = -.039, p = .782$ ), absence of punishment ( $r = .030, p = .828$ ) and tolerance of aggression ( $r = -.194, p = .155$ ).

**Table 3**

*Correlations of Study Variable for both conditions*

Condition	Variable	1.	2.
Jealousy Condition ( $n = 44$ )	1.Dispositional Jealousy	1	
	2.Sociosexual Orientation	-.130(.408)	1
	3.Global Judgements	.044(.203)	.203(.186)
Non-jealousy Condition ( $n = 56$ )	1.Dispositional Jealousy	1	
	2.Sociosexual Orientation	.119(.400)	1
	3.Global Judgements	.095(.505)	-.067(.630)

*Note.* P-values are reported in parenthesis. \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

## Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine whether high levels of sexual jealousy and a restricted sociosexuality are related to more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression against their female partner. In line with previous studies that demonstrated that higher levels of sexual jealousy and restricted sociosexuality predict supportive ideologies of controlling women's sexuality (Gul & Kupfer, 2021), higher levels of sexual jealousy and a restricted sociosexual orientation were assumed to correlate with more lenient judgements of male perpetrators due to ideological forms of mate guarding. To date, no studies have identified sociosexual orientation and sexual jealousy as potential predictors of judgements of partner aggression. The current study filled this literature gap by testing sexual jealousy and a restricted sociosexual orientation as potential factors for lenient judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression. However, the present study results indicated no relationship between sexual jealousy, sociosexual orientation, and judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression when the aggression was caused by infidelity.

### Theoretical implications

The first hypothesis, concerning individuals indicating higher levels of sexual jealousy are expected to be more lenient in judging men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression against their female partner in conflicts that are jealousy related was not supported. The hypothesis assumed that lenient judgements of men who perpetrate partner aggression are linked with ideological mate-guarding, therefore it was assumed that sexual jealousy individuals have a higher tendency of having lenient judgements of men who perpetrate partner aggression. However, the results of the current study could not confirm the assumption. The results of the first hypothesis are not in line with previously conducted research by Gul and Kupfer (2021), which demonstrated that higher levels in sexual jealousy correlate with the support of ideological forms of mate guarding, such as supporting norms that restrict female sexuality. It might be that sexual jealousy triggers mate guarding concerns which may manifest as support for certain ideologies. However, it may not manifest into supportive or lenient judgments of psychological aggression or perpetrators. Furthermore, this study focused on third-party judges in the role of observers of the partner aggression, whereas the study by Gul and Kupfer (2021) focused on third party judges, who had to imagine their own partner being involved in the conflict. The role of perspective taking might also influence the perception of partner aggression. For example, the study by Gonzalez-Liencre et al. (2020) showed that the perception of partner aggression changed by

experiencing virtual reality from a first-person perspective in contrast to experiencing it from a third person perspective. In addition, the study by Seinfeld et al. (2018) has demonstrated, that being embodied in a female victim suffering from partner aggression changed the perception of offenders.

The second hypothesis was also not supported, as individuals with a restricted sociosexuality have not made more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression against their female partner in conflicts that are jealousy related. The hypothesis was formulated based on the findings by Gul and Kupfer (2021), which found that the support of ideological forms of mate guarding, such as controlling women's sexual behaviour, is stronger for people who are sexually more restricted and monogamously oriented. A restricted sociosexual orientation may manifest stronger support of ideological forms of mate guarding, such as giving support for norms that restrict women's sexuality. However, the result of the current study suggests that a restricted sociosexual orientation may not manifest into more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression due to mate guarding reasons. In line with this assumption, Scott et al. (2013) have found that sociosexual orientation does not correlate with victim-blaming of sexual aggression. However, it is important to note that the study by Scott et al. (2013) focused on victim-blaming and sexual aggression, not perpetrator blaming and psychological aggression. In contrast, Yost and Zurbriggen (2006) demonstrated that an unrestricted sociosexual orientation is associated with male perpetrators of sexual aggression in partnerships. Sexual aggression and psychological are both types of partner aggression, however this study focused on psychological aggression and not sexual aggression. Thus, more research is needed to explore if sociosexual orientation is a crucial factor in predicting lenient judgements of men who perpetrate partner aggression or if its relationship is eligible.

The third and last hypothesis was a moderation hypothesis which predicted that the relationship between sexual jealousy and more lenient judgements of jealousy-related psychological partner aggression would be amplified among sexually restricted individuals. The moderation hypothesis was not supported. There is no moderation effect because sexual jealousy and sociosexual orientation are not associated with judgements of men who perpetrate psychological aggression. The baseline for this hypothesis was provided by the findings of Rydell et al. (2004) and Peters et al. (2014), which demonstrated a link between a restricted sociosexual orientation and sexual jealousy. However, the purpose of this study was not the relationship between SOI and sexual jealousy; the aim of this study was whether the link between dispositional jealousy and judgements of men who perpetrate psychological

partner aggression would be amplified among sociosexual restricted individuals. As for the first and second hypotheses, both were not supported.

Furthermore, inferential statistics showed that participants assigned to the jealousy-related scenario had higher mean scores for all judgement related scales in contrast to participants assigned to the non-jealousy related scenario. These findings are in line with previous conducted research (Haj-Yahia, 2003; Puente & Cohen, 2003; Witte et al., 2006). The results by Puente and Cohen (2003) demonstrated that partner aggression (from psychological to sexual partner aggression) that happened after infidelity is, in general, more accepted than partner aggression that is not related to infidelity. In line with this Haj-Yahia (2003) found that individuals are more likely to condone men's physical aggression against their female partner only when the conflict was jealousy related induced by being unfaithful towards their husbands. However, the study sample by Hai-Yahia (2003) consisted of 500 married men from the Middle East, whereas the sample in this study consisted of 78 women and 22 men from western Europe. Consequently, Hai-Yahia (2003) provided a basis for similar research in the Middle East, but these findings may not be applicable for samples from European countries with less conservative gender values (Inglehart et al., 2003). Moreover, Haj-Yahia (2003) focused on physical aggression, whereas this study focused on psychological aggression.

In general, the present study results demonstrated that sociosexual orientation and sexual jealousy are not significant factors that contribute to more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression because of mate guarding ideologies. The outcomes of this study are not in line with previously established connections between sexual jealousy, sociosexual orientation and judgements of the perpetrator. However, since the sample was relatively small in this research, the hypotheses may not have been tested accurately, especially since the established relationships in previous research had small effect sizes.

### **Strengths, Limitations and Future Research**

One major strength of this study was testing sexual jealousy and sociosexual orientation as potential factors associated with judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression. No previous research or literature known to the author has either hypothesized these relationships before. In particular, research on psychological aggression is a relatively unexplored area (Johnson et al., 2013). Although psychological aggression has been shown to have a more negative impact on mental wellbeing than physical aggression (Lawrence et al., 2009), it is perceived as more acceptable (Capezza & Arriaga,

2008b). This study contributes to the understanding of judgements of men who perpetrate partner aggression but specifically to a type of aggression underestimated by society. As research on individual-level psychological factors concerning judgements of male perpetrators of partner aggression has not been conducted before, the present study strengthens the availability of data on this topic for future researchers.

A further strength was the usage of attention check items and manipulation check items. They supported the validity of the results and whether the two different scenarios were perceived as intended by the participants. In addition, the two scenarios provided two different types of reasons for the usage of partner aggression, as in one scenario, the aggression was caused due infidelity whereas the other scenario was not jealousy-related, and the aggression was caused because the victim had lied to the perpetrator.

Another strong point of the study was the self-constructed questionnaire for judgements of the perpetrator, which showed a high internal consistency for all the survey items of the construct and can be used for future research concerning judgements of the perpetrator, who conduct partner aggression. Additionally, the construct for judgements of the perpetrator focused on more than one type of judgements; it included items regarding the perpetrator's perception, perception of the victim, perception of the punishment for the perpetrator, and the perception of the seriousness of the perpetrator aggression.

Moreover, since the survey was an online survey, participants could fill in the questionnaires from home or any other safe environment. Regarding sensitive topics and intimate questions regarding their sociosexual orientation, a safe environment might have helped them fill out the questionnaires.

Although this research contributes to understanding how perpetrators of psychological partner aggression are perceived, it has limitations. One major limitation is that only one type of psychological aggression was examined in this study, but not other types such as extreme isolation or making threats against someone's life. Future research should focus on other types of psychological aggression to explore whether certain types of psychological aggression would be perceived as more severe and unacceptable. Besides different types of psychological aggression, future research could also focus on other types of aggression (e.g., physical, sexual, cyber). In line with this suggestion, Williams et al. (2012), has demonstrated that observers perceived physical aggression as more severe than psychological aggression.

Furthermore, the researcher of this study decided that the scales SOI and MJS were administered after the participants had to read the scenario to avoid them judging the perpetrator and the aggression differently. However, reading the scenarios first might

influenced participants scores on SOI and MJS. Therefore, future research could replicate this study by testing whether participants score differently on SOI and MJS when reading the scenario afterwards.

Another limitation in this study was that the scenarios presented to the participants were written scenarios and probably perceived as hypothetical scenarios. It might be that scenarios observed in virtual reality (VR) may be perceived as more aggressive, as virtual worlds provide the opportunity to experience the aggression as if it was real (Sanchez-Vives & Slater, 2005). VR enables studying factors related to intimate partner violence without exposing participants to dangerous situations (Madary & Metzinger, 2016). Therefore, future research should use VR to display scenarios regarding intimate partner violence.

There are also limitations with the obtained sample in this study. The sample size was relatively small for both scenarios, 46 participants for the jealousy related scenario and 55 participants for the non-jealousy related scenario. Because the sample size was not large enough (i.e., had low power to detect small effects), and if the effects are generally small, it is possible that the relationships tested may not have reached significance. Hence, it is recommended for future research to obtain a larger sample size when verifying the results of this study.

Concerning limitations of the participants within this study, the sample consisted of most students (71%) who were female (78%), German (83%) and white (95%). As this sample mainly consisted of women and more lenient judgements of the perpetrator have been demonstrated to be more common among men than women (Romano & De Luca, 2001), it is not clear whether the results of this study hold for men as well. Regarding the occupation, the participants in this sample were mainly students. In contrast, research has revealed that less-educated individuals are more likely to support the perpetrator in intimate partner violence cases (Gracia & Tomas, 2014). Moreover, the average age of the participants in this sample is 25 years; previous research has shown that older individuals are less likely to blame the perpetrator (Gracia & Tomas, 2014). Younger participants tend to hold fewer aggression-condoning attitudes and do not follow patriarchal ideologies (Beeble et al., 2008). In contrast, older generations tend to hold more traditional views regarding intimate partner violence (Worden & Carlson, 2005). Consequently, no generalizations can be made since it is unclear whether the results hold for a broader and more heterogeneous sample. Thus, future research should investigate the relationship of sexual jealousy, sociosexual orientation and judgements of the perpetrator by verifying it in gender, age, and education-wise more heterogeneous samples.

Another limitation of this study is that the data collection took place during the COVID-19 pandemic (April 2021), in which social interactions were restricted based on new regulations. Due to the restrictions of social contacts, the situation might harm one's sociosexual orientation. A previous study by Hille et al. (2021) has already demonstrated changes in sexual behaviour caused due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In line with this, another study by Wignall et al. (2021) found that the levels of sexual desire were higher before the COVID-19 pandemic. Future research is needed to test the predicted relationship after the COVID-19 pandemic is over, as the societal crisis-affected people's sexual behaviour.

### **Conclusion**

In this study, the relationship between sociosexual orientation, sexual jealousy and judgements of male perpetrators was tested, showing no relationship between these individual-level psychological factors and judgements of men who perpetrate psychological partner aggression. However, since the topic of this study is a relatively unexplored area, it provides initial theoretical and methodological insights for further investigation of judgements of men who perpetrate partner aggression. Although the generality of the results must be established by future research, it demonstrated that the perpetrator was judged less harsh when the aggression was caused by sexual jealousy compared to a non-jealousy related conflict. Considering the existence of condoning judgements of men who perpetrate aggression against women and its negative consequences for female victims, it is hoped that this research could provide insights for future research that might help identify factors that contribute to tolerant attitudes toward partner aggression and eventually help reducing lenient judgements that are detrimental to victim's well-being.

### References

- Archer, J., & Graham-Kevan, N. (2003). Do beliefs about aggression predict physical aggression to partners?. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, 29(1), 41-54. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.10029>
- Beeble, M. L., Post, L. A., Bybee, D., & Sullivan, C. M. (2008). Factors related to willingness to help survivors of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(12), 1713-1729. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508314333>
- Burch, R. L., & Gallup Jr, G. G. (2020). Abusive men are driven by paternal uncertainty. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, 14(2), 197. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ebs0000163>
- Busche, L., Marks, M., & Oates, K. (2013). The effect of recent sexual activity on partner desirability: An evolutionary perspective. *Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology*, 7, 51–65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0099174>
- Buss, D. M. (2013). Sexual jealousy. *Psihologijske teme*, 22(2), 155–182. <http://hrcak.srce.hr/108507>
- Buss, D. (2015). *Evolutionary psychology: The new science of the mind*. Psychology Press
- Buss, D. M. (2018). Sexual and emotional infidelity: Evolved gender differences in jealousy prove robust and replicable. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(2), 155-160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617698225>
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological science*, 3(4), 251-256. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1992.tb00038.x>
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). From vigilance to violence: Mate retention tactics in married couples. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 72(2), 346. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.2.346>

- Capezza, N. M., & Arriaga, X. B. (2008a). Factors associated with acceptance of psychological aggression against women. *Violence Against Women, 14*, 612-633. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801208319004>
- Capezza, N. M., & Arriaga, X. B. (2008b). You can degrade but you can't hit: Differences in perceptions of psychological versus physical aggression. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 25*(2), 225-245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407507087957>
- Center for Disease Control (2020, October 9). *Intimate Partner Violence*. <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/index.html>
- Cousins, A. J., & Gangestad, S. W. (2007). Perceived threats of female infidelity, male proprietariness, and violence in college dating couples. *Violence and victims, 22*(6), 651-668. <https://doi.org/10.1891/088667007782793156>
- Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, S. J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and sociobiology, 3*(1), 11-27. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095\(82\)90027-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095(82)90027-9)
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy* (pp. 179-206). New York: Free Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2067357>
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1998). Violent men and violent contexts. In R. E. Dobash & R. P. Dobash (Eds.), *Rethinking violence against women* (pp. 141–168). Sage Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452243306.n6>
- Follingstad, D. R., Coyne, S., & Gambone, L. (2005). A representative measure of psychological aggression and its severity. *Violence and victims, 20*(1), 25-38. <https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.2005.20.1.25>
- Goetz, A. T., Shackelford, T. K., Starratt, V. G., & McKibbin, W. F. (2008). Intimate partner violence. *Evolutionary forensic psychology, 65-78*. Oxford University Press.

- Gracia, E. (2014). Intimate partner violence against women and victim-blaming attitudes among Europeans. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, *92*, 380-381. <https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.13.131391>
- Gracia, E., & Tomás, J. M. (2014). Correlates of victim-blaming attitudes regarding partner violence against women among the Spanish general population. *Violence against women*, *20*(1), 26-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801213520577>
- Gonzalez-Liencre, C., Zapata, L. E., Iruretagoyena, G., Seinfeld, S., Perez-Mendez, L., Arroyo-Palacios, J., & Sanchez-Vives, M. V. (2020). Being the victim of intimate partner violence in virtual reality: first-versus third-person perspective. *Frontiers in psychology*, *11*, 820. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00820>
- Gul, P., & Kupfer, T. (2021) Female honor norms as ideological mate guarding  
Sexual jealousy and reproductive strategy shape support for female honor norms.  
<https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/mrjhe>
- Gul, P., & Schuster, I. (2020). Judgments of marital rape as a function of honor culture, masculine reputation threat, and observer gender: A cross-cultural comparison between Turkey, Germany, and the UK. *Aggressive Behavior*, *46*(4), 341-353. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21893>
- Haj-Yahia, M. M. (2003). Beliefs about wife beating among Arab men from Israel: The influence of their patriarchal ideology. *Journal of Family Violence*, *18*, 193-206. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024012229984>
- Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford publications.
- Henning, K. & Feder, L. (2004). A comparison of men and women arrested for domestic violence: Who presents the greater threat? *Journal of Family Violence*, *19*, 69-80. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOFV.0000019838.01126.7c>

- Hille, Z., Oezdemir, U. C., Beier, K. M., & Hatzler, L. (2021). The disruptive impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on sexual behavior of a German-speaking population. *Sexologies, 30*(1), e23-e33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sexol.2020.12.013>
- Howard, J. A., & Gibson, M. A. (2019). Is there a link between paternity concern and female genital cutting in West Africa?. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 40*(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2018.06.011>
- Inglehart, R., Norris, P., & Ronald, I. (2003). *Rising tide: Gender equality and cultural change around the world*. Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, M. D., Anderson, J. R., Liu, W., Zheng, F., Ratcliffe, G. C., Jordan, R., & Rutter, R. (2013). Prevalence and correlates of psychological aggression in male and female college students from mainland China: an exploratory study. *Partner Abuse, 4*(3), 314-331. <https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.4.3.314>
- Krahé, B., Temkin, J., & Bieneck, S. (2007). Schema-driven information processing in judgements about rape. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 21*(5), 601-619. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1297>
- Lawrence, E., Yoon, J., Langer, A., & Ro, E. (2009). Is psychological aggression as detrimental as physical aggression? The independent effects of psychological aggression on depression and anxiety symptoms. *Violence and victims, 24*(1), 20-35. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.24.1.20>
- Ludermir, A. B., Lewis, G., Valongueiro, S. A., de Araújo, T. V. B., & Araya, R. (2010). Violence against women by their intimate partner during pregnancy and postnatal depression: a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet, 376*(9744), 903-910. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(10\)60887-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60887-2)
- Madary, M., & Metzinger, T. K. (2016). Real virtuality: a code of ethical conduct. Recommendations for good scientific practice and the consumers of VR-technology. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI, 3*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frobt.2016.00003>

- O'Doherty, L., Hegarty, K., Ramsay, J., Davidson, L. L., Feder, G., & Taft, A. (2015). Screening women for intimate partner violence in healthcare settings. *Cochrane database of Systematic reviews*, (7).  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD007007.pub3>
- Pavlou, M., & Knowles, A. (2001). Domestic violence: Attributions, recommended punishments and reporting behavior related to provocation by the victim. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 8, 76-85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13218710109525006>
- Pazhoohi, F., Lang, M., Xygalatas, D., & Grammer, K. (2017). Religious veiling as a mate-guarding strategy: Effects of environmental pressures on cultural practices. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, 3(2), 118-124.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-016-0079-z>
- Peters, J. R., Eisenlohr-Moul, T. A., Pond Jr, R. S., & DeWall, C. N. (2014). The downside of being sexually restricted: The effects of sociosexual orientation on relationships between jealousy, rejection, and anger. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 51, 18-22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2014.04.002>
- Peters, J., Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (2002). Understanding Domestic Violence Against Women: Using Evolutionary Psychology to Extend the Feminist Functional Analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 17(2), 255–264.  
<https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.17.2.255.33644>
- Penke, L., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2008). Beyond global sociosexual orientations: a more differentiated look at sociosexuality and its effects on courtship and romantic relationships. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 95(5), 1113.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.5.1113>
- Pfeiffer, S. M., & Wong, P. T. (1989). Multidimensional jealousy. *Journal of social and personal relationships*, 6(2), 181-196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026540758900600203>

- Puente, S., & Cohen, D. (2003). Jealousy and the meaning (or nonmeaning) of violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(4), 449-460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250912>
- Romano, E., & De Luca, R. V. (2001). Male sexual abuse: A review of effects, abuse characteristics, and links with later psychological functioning. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 6(1), 55-78. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789\(99\)00011-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(99)00011-7)
- Rusbult, C. E., & Buunk, B. P. (1993). Commitment processes in close relationships: An interdependence analysis. *Journal of social and personal relationships*, 10(2), 175-204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026540759301000202>
- Rydell, R. J., McConnell, A. R., & Bringle, R. G. (2004). Jealousy and commitment: Perceived threat and the effect of relationship alternatives. *Personal Relationships*, 11(4), 451-468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2004.00092.x>
- Sanchez-Vives, M. V., & Slater, M. (2005). From presence to consciousness through virtual reality. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 6(4), 332-339. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1651>
- Sánchez-Prada, A., Delgado-Alvarez, C., Bosch-Fiol, E., Ferreiro-Basurto, V., & Ferrer-Perez, V. A. (2020). Measurement of supportive attitudes towards intimate partner violence against women among a Spanish-speaker sample. *Plos one*, 15(11), e0241392. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0241392>
- Scott, G. S., Hanscom, M. E., & Spence, H. H. (2014). An Examination of Sociosexuality, Susceptibility to Rape Myths, and Blame Attribution Regarding Rape Case Scenarios. *National Social Science*, 92. [https://nssa.us/journals/pdf/NSS\\_Journal\\_43\\_1.pdf#page=96](https://nssa.us/journals/pdf/NSS_Journal_43_1.pdf#page=96)
- Seinfeld, S., Arroyo-Palacios, J., Iruretagoyena, G., Hortensius, R., Zapata, L. E., Borland, D., & Sanchez-Vives, M. V. (2018). Offenders become the victim in virtual reality: impact of changing perspective in domestic violence. *Scientific reports*, 8(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-19987-7>

- Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., Buss, D. M., Euler, H. A., & Hoier, S. (2005). When we hurt the ones we love: Predicting violence against women from men's mate retention. *Personal Relationships, 12*(4), 447-463. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2005.00125.x>
- Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 60*(6), 870. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.6.870>
- Taylor, C. A., & Sorenson, S. B. (2005). Community-based norms about intimate partner violence: Putting attributions of fault and responsibility into context. *Sex Roles, 53*(7-8), 573. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-7143-7>
- Tybur, J. M., Inbar, Y., Güler, E., & Molho, C. (2015). Is the relationship between pathogen avoidance and ideological conservatism explained by sexual strategies?. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 36*(6), 489-497. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2015.01.006>
- Valor-Segura, I., Expósito, F., & Moya, M. (2008). Atribución del comportamiento del agresor y consejo a la víctima en un caso de violencia doméstica [Attribution of the aggressor's behavior and advice to the victim in a case of domestic violence]. *Revista de Psicología Social, 23*, 171-180. <https://doi.org/10.1174/021347408784135896>
- Waltermaurer, E. (2012). Public justification of intimate partner violence: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 13*(3), 167-175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838012447699>
- Weeden, J., & Kurzban, R. (2013). What predicts religiosity? A multinational analysis of reproductive and cooperative morals. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 34*(6), 440–445. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.08.006>
- Wignall, L., Portch, E., McCormack, M., Owens, R., Cascalheira, C. J., Attard-Johnson, J., & Cole, T. (2021). Changes in sexual desire and behaviors among UK young adults

during social lockdown due to COVID-19. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 1-10.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2021.1897067>

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

Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The man who mistook his wife for a chattel. *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*, 289-322. Oxford University Press.

Witte, T. H., Schroeder, D. A., & Lohr, J. M. (2006). Blame for intimate partner violence: An attributional analysis. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 25(6), 647-667. <https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.13.131391>

Worden, A. P., & Carlson, B. E. (2005). Attitudes and beliefs about domestic violence: Results of a public opinion survey: II. Beliefs about causes. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 20(10), 1219-1243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260505278531>

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

World Health Organization. (2017). Violence against women.  
<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/violence-against-women>

Yamawaki, N., Darby, R., & Queiroz, A. (2007). The moderating roles of ambivalent sexism: The influence of power status on perception of rape victim and rapist. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 147, 41-56. <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.147.1.41-56>

Yost, M. R., & Zurbriggen, E. L. (2006). Gender differences in the enactment of sociosexuality: An examination of implicit social motives, sexual fantasies, coercive sexual attitudes, and aggressive sexual behavior. *Journal of Sex Research*, 43(2), 163-173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490609552311>

## Appendix A

### Consent Form

**PROJECT TITLE:** Emotions and Judgments of Relationship Conflicts

**INVESTIGATORS:** Sheila Türkis and Kara Tönsmeier (B.Sc. Psychology Students), and Dr. Pelin Gül, Department of Psychology, Health, and Technology, University of Twente, Netherlands,

#### **PURPOSE**

This study is designed to examine peoples' emotions and judgments of relationship conflicts. You are being asked to participate in this study because we are interested in these processes in a wide variety of people. The purpose of this study is to advance our understanding of people's emotions about their partner and sexual desires in relation to judgements of intimate partner aggression.

#### **PROCEDURES**

If you agree to participate, you will be asked general demographics questions (age, gender, nationality, etc.). Afterwards, a personalized imaginary scenario will be presented and you will be asked to describe your feelings and thoughts evoked by the described situation. Then, you will be asked to tell us your agreement with a number of statements regarding your emotions and thoughts in your own relationship, and your attitudes towards sex. Finally, you will be provided with more details about this study. Your participation will last approximately **15 minutes**. People who participate via SONA Systems will be compensated with **0.25 credits**. **We are seeking participants who are at least 18 years old. If you are younger than 18, please close the survey now and do not participate.**

#### **PARTICIPANT RIGHTS**

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are free to decline to participate, refuse to answer any individual questions, or withdraw from the study at any time without the need to give any reason.

#### **RISKS AND BENEFITS**

There are no known or anticipated risks associated with this study. Although this study will not benefit you personally, we hope that our results will add to the knowledge about how individual-level psychological factors influence judgements of aggression.

#### **TRIGGER WARNING**

Some elements of this study are concerned with private matters (your sexual behaviour and desires) and present statements and scenarios which may evoke negative feelings or stress among some participants. If you do not feel comfortable with this, please do not participate in this study. If you don't feel comfortable at any point during the questionnaire, you can skip the questions or simply stop your participation without the need to give a reason.

#### **CONFIDENTIALITY**

Your responses are completely anonymous and cannot be traced back to you because no personally identifying information such as names are asked in this survey. The information you provide will not be disclosed to third parties, and they will be aggregated with the responses of other participants and examined for hypothesized patterns. Your anonymous

responses will be used for scientific research into various aspects of personality and social psychology, and will be published.

### **QUESTIONS**

For further information about this study, you may contact Dr. Pelin Gül, p.gul@utwente.nl, the person in charge of this research study.

If you would like to talk with someone other than the researchers to discuss problems or concerns, to discuss situations in the event that a member of the research team is not available, or to discuss your rights as a research participant, If you have any questions about the rights of research participants, please contact the Ethical Review Committee of the Behavioral and Management Sciences Faculty, University of Twente, Netherlands, ethicscommittee-bms@utwente.nl.

### **CONSENT AND AUTHORIZATION PROVISIONS**

In order to continue with this survey, you have to agree with the aforementioned information and consent to participate in the study by clicking on each box.

I have read and understood the information given above.

I understand that I can refuse to answer questions and that I can withdraw from the study at any point of time without giving a reason.

I understand that my collected anonymized personal information that could identify me, such as first name of my partner, will not be shared beyond the study team.

I give my voluntary consent to participate in the study

**Appendix B**  
**Demographics**

*What is your age? (Enter in years)*

*What gender do you identify with?*

Male

Female

Other

*What is your nationality?*

Dutch

German

Other, please specify\_

*What is your ethnicity?*

White

Black

Mixed race

Other, please specify\_

*What is your sexual orientation?*

Heterosexual

Homosexual

Bisexual

Asexual

Other

*What is your relationship status?*

Single

Closed Relationship

Open Relationship

Engaged

Married

Divorced

Windowed

*How religious do you consider yourself to be, on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all religious) to 7 (very religious)?*

*How would you describe your political orientation when it comes to social issues, on a scale ranging from 1 (very left-wing) to 7 (very right-wing)?*

*What is your current occupation?*

Student

Employee with wage

Self-employed

Pensioner

Other, please specify: \_

*What is your highest degree or level of education you have completed?*

Primary school

VMB=/Realschule/Hauptschule/Middleschool

HAVO/VWO/Gymnasium/Highschool

Academic Bachelor

Academic Master

PhD or higher degree

## Appendix C

### Debriefing Information

**Thank you very much for participating in our study!**

#### **Information about the Study**

Research has shown that condoning judgements of violence against women contributes to actual perpetration of men's partner violence against women. Thus, understanding the origins of violence-supportive attitudes to women and factors that shape persistence of these attitudes are crucial to tackling female oppression and associated phenomena such as gender-based violence. However, little is known about the factors that produce condoning judgements against men who perpetrate dating violence.

Previous research suggests that sociosexual orientation and sexual jealousy predict the support of female honor norms as part of a mate-guarding strategy. As such, this research focuses on the role these two individual-level psychological factors play in judgements of men who perpetrate violence against women. We test the prediction that high dispositional jealousy and restricted/unrestricted sociosexual orientation correlate with more condoning judgements.

We thank you for your help and the decision to participate in our study. If you know of any friends or acquaintances that are eligible to participate in this study, we ask that you do not discuss it with them until after they have had the opportunity to participate. Prior knowledge of questions asked during the study can invalidate the results. We greatly appreciate your cooperation.

For further information about this study, you may contact **Dr. Pelin Gül**, [p.gul@utwente.nl](mailto:p.gul@utwente.nl), the person in charge of this research study, or write an email to **k.t.toensmeier@student.utwente.nl** or **s.turkis@student.utwente.nl**, one of the researchers.

If you have any questions about the rights of research participants, please contact the Ethical Review Committee of the Behavioral and Management Sciences Faculty, University of Twente, Netherlands, [ethicscommittee-bms@utwente.nl](mailto:ethicscommittee-bms@utwente.nl).

Thanks again for your participation.

## Appendix D

### Psychological Aggression – Scenarios

#### Jealousy related scenario

*Tom and Karen (a heterosexual couple) have been happily married for five years. Over the last few months, when Tom is away at work, Karen has been visiting her neighbor (a male) with whom they have been friends since they moved into the apartment. Over time, their meetings have become more regular, and the two have established an intimate relationship which they decided to keep secret from Tom.*

*One day, Tom becomes suspicious that his wife may be having an affair after accidentally seeing a text message with sexual content on her phone. When Tom comes home from work that evening, he confronts Karen, but Karen keeps silent. He asks her whether she has been sleeping with another man. Feeling uncomfortable and sensing Tom's anger, Karen turns around to leave the house. Tom grabs Karen's arm and repeats his question. Getting annoyed with Tom's persistence, Karen admits to sleeping with their neighbor. She then says "I don't want you; I want to be with him. He is an amazing lover and so much better than you in bed". In his rage, upon hearing these words Tom yells at Karen: "Slut" and tells her that she is fat and ugly and that no one will ever love her.*

#### Not jealousy related scenario

*Tom and Karen (a heterosexual couple) have been happily married for five years. Over the last few months, when Tom is away at work, Karen has been visiting her neighbor (a female) with whom they have been friends since they moved into the apartment. Over time, their meetings have become more regular and the two have established a good friendship which Karen decided to keep secret from Tom because she knew that he is not fond of their neighbor very much.*

*One day, Tom becomes suspicious that his wife is friends with the neighbor girl after accidentally seeing a text message on Karen's phone. When Tom comes home from work that evening, he confronts Karen, but Karen keeps silent. He asks her whether she has been hiding something from him. Feeling uncomfortable and sensing Tom's anger, Karen turns around to leave the house. Tom grabs Karen's arm and repeats his question. Getting annoyed with Tom's persistence, Karen admits to being friends with their neighbor and hanging out with her. She then says "I drink coffee with her, she is fun and a really good friend". In his rage, upon hearing these words Tom yells at Karen: "Slut" and tells her that she is fat and ugly and that no one will ever love her.*

## Appendix E

### Judgements of Perpetrator – Items

#### Attention Check items

*What is the name of the perpetrator?*

Tom  
Paul  
John

*What was the name of the women in the scenario?*

Lisa  
Emily  
Karen

#### Perceived Jealousy items

Please indicate your perceptions on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much).

*To what extend do you think Karen's behaviour is considered cheating?*

*To what extend do you think Tom's behaviour was provoked by jealousy?*

#### Judgement items

Please indicate your perception on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much)

*How positive were Tom's actions?*

*How negative were Tom's actions?*

*How wrong was Tom's behaviour?*

*How much does Tom love Karen?*

*How much do you sympathize with Tom?*

*How understandable do you find Tom's behaviour?*

*How acceptable was Tom's reaction?*

*Would you like to be friends with Tom?*

*Would you want to have Tom as a work colleague?*

*Do you think Tom should be punished?*

*How strongly do you think Tom ought to be held criminally liable for the incident?*

**Appendix F**  
**Pattern Matrix**

**Table 4***Factor Matrix*

	<u>Factor</u> 1	<u>Factor</u> 2	<u>Factor</u> 3
How positive were Tom's actions?	.325		.351
How negative were Tom's actions?	.475		.467
How wrong was Tom's behaviour?	.688		
How much does Tom love Karen?	.575		
How much do you sympathize with Tom?	.850		
How understandable do you find Tom's behaviour?	.937		
How acceptable was Tom's reaction?	.738		
Would you like to be friends with Tom?	.726		
Would you want to have Tom as a work colleague?	.553		.335
Do you think Tom should be punished?	.612	.457	
How strongly do you think Tom ought to be held criminally liable for the incident?	.326	.706	

How responsible is Karen for what happened?	.876	.312	
How much did Karen deserve what happened?	.886		
How intentional was Tom's behaviour?		.611	
How much do you think Tom had control over his behaviour?		.429	
How serious was the incident?			.704
How aggressive was the incident?			.733
Was Tom's behaviour aggressive?			.761

---

## Appendix G

### Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R)

Please respond honestly to the following questions.

*With how many different partners have you had sex within the past 12 months?*

0 1 2 3 4 5-6 7-9 10-19 20 or more

*With how many different partners have you had sexual intercourse on one and only one occasion?*

0 1 2 3 4 5-6 7-9 10-19 20 or more

*With how many different partners have you had sexual intercourse without having an interest in a long-term committed relationship with this person?*

0 1 2 3 4 5-6 7-9 10-19 20 or more

Please respond honestly to the following questions on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree).

*Sex without love is OK.*

*I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying "casual" sex with different partners.*

*I do not want to have sex with a person until I am sure that we will have a long-term, serious relationship.*

Please respond honestly to the following questions on a scale from 1 (Never) to 9 (at least once a day)

1 – never

2 – very seldom

3 – about once every two or three months 4 – about once a month

5 – about once every two weeks

6 – about once a week

7 – several times per week

8 – nearly every day

9 – at least once a day

*How often do you have fantasies about having sex with someone you are not in a committed romantic relationship with?*

*How often do you experience sexual arousal when you are in contact with someone you are not in a committed romantic relationship with?*

*In everyday life, how often do you have spontaneous fantasies about having sex with someone you have just met?*

## Appendix H

### Multidimensional Sexual Jealousy (MJS)

Please think of a person with whom you are having or have had a strong romantic/love relationship. This person is referred to as X in this questionnaire. Please rate your response to the following questions on a scale from 1 (all the time) to 7 (never).

*I suspect that X is secretly seeing someone of the opposite sex.*

*I am worried that some member of the opposite sex may be chasing after X.*

*I suspect that X may be attracted to someone else.*

*I suspect that X may be physically intimate with another member of the opposite sex behind my back.*

*I think that some members of the opposite sex may be romantically interested in X.*

*I am worried that someone of the opposite sex is trying to seduce X.*

*I think that X is secretly developing an intimate relationship with someone of the opposite sex.*

*I suspect that X is crazy about members of the opposite sex.*

Please think of a person with whom you are having or have had a strong romantic/love relationship. This person is referred to as X in this questionnaire. How would you emotionally react to the following situations on a scale from 1 (very pleased) to 7 (very upset).

*X comments to you on how great looking a particular member of the opposite sex is.*

*X shows a great deal of interested or excitement in talking to someone of the opposite sex.*

*X smiles in a very friendly manner to someone of the opposite sex.*

*A member of the opposite sex is trying to get close to X all the time.*

*X is flirting with someone of the opposite sex.*

*Someone of the opposite sex is dating X.*

*X hugs and kisses someone of the opposite sex.*

*X works very closely with a member of the opposite sex (in school or office).*